

FOCUSED MIDTERM REPORT
Resubmitted
March 15, 2012

Submitted to

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Submitted by

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

March 15, 2012

Certification of the Midterm Report

Date: March 15, 2012

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,
 Western Association of Schools and Colleges

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

This Midterm Report is submitted to the ACCJC for the purpose of assisting in the determination Diablo Valley College's accreditation status.

We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community in the preparation of the report, and we believe that the report is an accurate reflection of the nature and substance of the institution.

Helen Benjamin, Ph.D.	
Name	Chancellor, CCCC

Tomi Van de Broeke	
Name	President, Governing Board

Peter Garcia	
Name	President, DVC

Laurie A. Lema, M.A.	
Name	President, Faculty Senate

Ann Patton	
Name	President, Classified Senate

Name	President, Associated Students
------	--------------------------------

Table of Contents

Statement of Report Preparation	4
Response to Team Recommendations and Commission Action Letter	
College Recommendation 1	6
College Recommendation 2	10
College Recommendation 3	15
College Recommendation 4	21
College Recommendation 5	22
College Recommendation 6	23
College Recommendation 7	24
District Recommendation 8	29
District Recommendation 9	32
District Recommendation 10	33
District Recommendation 11	33
Responses to Self-Identified Issues (Planning Agenda)	36
Evidence	46

Statement on Report Preparation

On January 10-12, 2012, the ACCJC took action to require Diablo Valley College to resubmit its Focused Midterm Report in complete form as per Commission requirements. Upon receipt of the Commission's direction to resubmit, the president identified and confirmed that the college had failed to follow the required format of a Focused Midterm Report as described on the ACCJC website by not including information on College Recommendations 1-7, and District Recommendation 8. The college has been working on all of these since the 2008 Comprehensive Self Study, and much of this work has been addressed in required follow up reports (see chart on page 5). The only explanation that the president offers for his error is that the "focused" nature of the report, Recommendations 9-11, temporarily distracted him from the required format. A valuable lesson has been relearned regarding the simple step of reviewing the ACCJC website for basic information. The college appreciates and recognizes the value of the Commission's offer to resubmit this report.

After receiving the Commission's letter, dated February 1, 2012, the president convened the accreditation liaison officer and other campus leaders to identify a process to complete the Focused Midterm Report as requested. A plan was set for the writing, review, and approval of this completed version. The accreditation liaison officer, who also serves as the senior dean of curriculum and instruction, provided the college with an initial draft. The initial draft was reviewed by the Accreditation Steering Committee and went through several revisions. This report has been widely circulated and reviewed by the college community. It has been presented for review and comment at the DVC Faculty Senate Council on August 9 and 23, 2011, February 7, 2012, and February 24, 2012 (SPR-1 and SPR-2), the Classified Senate Council on August 24, 2011, and February 15, 2012 (SPR-3), Management Council on August 24, 2011 (SPR-4) and the Associated Students of DVC on August 23, 2011, and February 21, 2012 (SPR-5). The report was also presented to the DVC College Council on August 29, 2011, and February 13, 2012 (SPR-6). In addition, this report has been reviewed by the Governing Board of the Contra Costa Community College District at their meetings of September 12, 2011, and February 22, 2012 (SPR-7).

This resubmitted Focused Midterm Report accurately demonstrates the resolution of College Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and of District Recommendations 8, 9, 10, and 11 as per the Commission's corrected action letter of April 11, 2011 and its subsequent letter of February 2, 2012. In addition, the report also demonstrates the institution's progress in addressing items from the self study planning agenda as well as providing an update on current Substantive Change Proposals. The Focused Midterm Report has been reviewed and approved by CCCCD Governing Board, College Council, Faculty Senate, Classified Senate, and ASDVC (SPR-8).

	Recent DVC Accreditation History	Date
1	College Self Study Submitted	Report dated: August 27, 2008
2	Site visit	Visit dates: October 13-16, 2008
3	ACCJC imposes "Show Cause" sanction	Letter dated: February 3, 2009
4	College submits "Show Cause" Report	Report dated: October 15, 2009
5	Site visit	Visit dates: November 3-4, 2009
6	ACCJC removes "Show Cause" sanction and imposes "Probation"	Letter dated: January 29, 2010
7	College submits Follow-Up Report	Report dated: October 15, 2010
8	Site visit	Visit date: November 18, 2010
9	ACCJC removes "Probation" and reaffirms Accreditation	Letter dated: January 21, 2011
10	College submits Focused Midterm Report	Report dated: October 15, 2011
11	ACCJC requests DVC to resubmit its Focused Midterm Report	Letter dated: February 1, 2012
12	College resubmits Focused Midterm Report	Report dated: March 15, 2012

I. Response to Team Recommendations and Commission Action 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)*

Descriptive Summary of Deficiency Resolution: As noted in our report of October 15, 2010, the visiting team of November 3-4, 2009, recommended that DVC continue to work for the full implementation of its new organizational structure and “flesh out the reporting structure, and find all redundancies or omissions, evaluate the new model, and then perhaps modify functions.” The college has fully implemented the new organizational structure. All committees have been established and procedures have been written and adopted to implement the new structure (Standard IV.A.3) (CR-1.1). Two evaluations cycles have been completed and improvements have followed (CR-1.2).

The following new committees have been established:

- Student Equity Committee (12/14/09)
- Institutional Effectiveness Committee (2/8/10)
- Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee (2/22/10)
- Enrollment Management Committee (3/8/10)
- Facilities Committee (3/8/10)

The following new procedures have been adopted:

- 1016.01 (Program Review Procedure) – January 25, 2010*
- 1018.01 (Student Learning Outcomes and Achievement Procedure) – January 25, 2010 (Standard IV.A.2.b)
- 1010.01 (Integrated Planning) – May 17, 2010
- 4001.07 (Course Compliance Update) – February 22, 2010
- 4001.08 (Program Revitalization and Discontinuance) – approved by the Faculty Senate Council on April 27, 2010 (CR-1.3), and awaiting consultation between the college and Faculty Senate presidents.

*Templates for the Instructional Unit Program Review (IUPR), Student Services Program Review (SSPR) and Administrative Program Review (APR) were modified as a result of the evaluation process conducted in the spring of 2010.

In order to assist in the effort to locate any redundancies or omissions among the committees that comprise the organizational structure, and to evaluate the new structure, the college developed and distributed a collegewide survey to all employees and representatives of the Associated Students of Diablo Valley College (ASDVC) in May of 2010. The electronic survey was conducted primarily using Survey Monkey; however, hard copies of the survey were prepared and made available to employees who may not have ready access to a computer (per a request from classified staff). The survey was conducted during the period May 13-21, 2010, and resulted in 295 responses (with 599 comments), 288 from employees and seven from students (CR-1.2). The employee responses equal approximately 37 percent

of all full-time employees, and approximately 20 percent of all full and part-time employees combined.

The collegewide survey asked 17 questions and provided the opportunity for respondents to comment on 11 of these questions. The results indicated that of 16 college committees listed in the survey, more than 50 percent of the respondents indicated their awareness of 14 of the 16 committees. Over 75 percent of respondents were aware of the four primary governance committees and councils (College Council, Budget Committee, Integration Council and Institutional Planning Committee).

Another question asked respondents whether they felt welcomed at committee meetings; in all cases at least 66 percent of respondents felt welcomed at the meetings of these committees. When queried about the number of committees on which they serve, respondents indicated:

Answer Options	Classified	Faculty	Management	Everyone
5 or more	0.0 percent	0.7 percent	9.1 percent	1.4 percent
3 or 4	0.0 percent	4.2 percent	27.3 percent	5.1 percent
1 or 2	41.2 percent	32.6 percent	33.3 percent	35.4 percent
0	58.8 percent	62.5 percent	30.3 percent	58.2 percent

Of 288 employees who responded to this question, 123 served on at least one collegewide committee. It is important to note that the survey did not ask respondents if they served on any constituency-based committees. The focus was only on the 16 collegewide committees.

A common theme throughout the 599 comments made by the survey respondents was the perception that DVC has too many committees, that the charges and functions of some of the committees seemed to overlap, and it was difficult to determine which committee was responsible for a particular task. Similar concerns were expressed in the annual committee Self Evaluation Forms completed by 12 of the 16 collegewide committees (CR-1.2). To address these concerns, the college president, executive assistant to the president, and the accreditation liaison officer met in early June to review the comments from: the visiting team's November 2009 evaluation report (CR-1.4); the survey comments (CR-1.2); and the annual Self Evaluation Forms (CR-1.5) with the intent of evaluating and clarifying the reporting structure among committees and councils locating all redundancies or omissions. In addition, modifications to the charge and function of several committees were proposed to address concerns about overlapping functions. The 2009 visiting team acknowledged that all committees are adopting a co-chair structure and recommended that the focus on membership continue to emphasize expertise.

The college president and the accreditation liaison officer brought recommendations to the Accreditation Steering Committee on August 3, 2010, to modify the charge/function and membership of certain committees to more clearly delineate their roles and reporting structure. (CR-1.6) After review by the Accreditation Steering Committee, these recommendations were forwarded to College Council on August 23, 2010, for discussion and

dissemination to all constituent groups (CR-1.7). In order to respond to a request for increased involvement and transparency, the College Council established a task force consisting of the co-chairs of the four major governance committees, College Council, Integration Council, Budget Committee, and Institutional Planning Committee, to review the recommended changes. Using the visiting team’s November 2009 evaluation report, the collegewide survey results, the committee self-evaluations, and the individual committees’ responses to the recommended changes the review was completed (CR-1.8). This task force reported back to College Council at its meeting of September 20, 2010. College Council made a final recommendation regarding the committee structure to the college president (CR-1.9).

The survey also asked respondents to consider all 16 collegewide committees when responding to the following questions. Responses were indicated using a Likert scale where 5 equals ‘Strongly Agree’, 4 equals ‘Agree’, 3 equals ‘Neutral’, 2 equals ‘Disagree’, and 1 equals ‘Strongly Disagree’. The table below indicates the average response for each question by constituent group.

The work of collegewide committees and councils has...				
Answer Options	Classified	Faculty	Managers	Everyone
been communicated regularly to the college community	3.53	3.37	3.94	3.45
improved the level of transparency and openness with respect to governance at DVC	3.40	3.36	3.84	3.41
been communicated to the college community through sources that are easily accessible	3.50	3.33	3.74	3.40
increased my knowledge of the roles of the collegewide committees and councils at DVC	3.21	3.32	3.71	3.34
contributed toward creating meaningful dialog at DVC	3.41	3.30	3.45	3.33
created a sense of inclusiveness at DVC	3.02	3.19	3.52	3.18

The college will continue its work in these areas. This is a significant accomplishment for DVC given the changes the college has made over the past three years. DVC administered this survey in spring 2010 and spring 2011 and will continue to periodically monitor progress in this area through surveys and collegewide dialogue (Standard IV.A.5).

Each of the 16 collegewide committees was given the opportunity to ask a few survey questions that were specific to their committee. Eight of the 16 committees responded with questions. The results of these responses along with any comments were forwarded to each committee for review and appropriate action beginning in the fall of 2010.

To ensure that the college had strategic directions in place for the start of the 2010-2011 academic year, the college president expedited the process of determining strategic directions

by soliciting recommendations from both the DVC Faculty Senate and College Council (CR-1.10) (Standard IV.B.2.b). These recommendations were forwarded to the college president for a final decision. The college president accepted the recommended strategic directions and, given the fiscal outlook for the next few years, added a strategic direction on diversifying college resources. These strategic directions for 2010-2011 were distributed to all employees via email on June 1, 2010 (CR-1.11). The college president shared these with the incoming president of ASDVC at a meeting held on June 28, 2010 (Standard I.B.2). The DVC Faculty Senate Council discussed the achievement gap and student success at their meeting on August 11, 2010. The Faculty Senate Council discussed action steps to be used in achieving these strategic directions (CR-1.12) (Standard I.B.1, IV.A.2.a). The Institutional Planning Committee developed objectives to meet the College's Strategic Directions at its August 16 meeting (CR-1.13). These objectives were forwarded to College Council, accepted at its September 13 meeting, and forwarded to the president. (CR-1.8) The president approved these objectives for 2010-2011, 2011-12, and 2012-13 and notified the college of the strategic directions, associated objectives, and change in timeline in an email dated September 16, 2010 (CR-1.14).

Updates Since October 2010: Sustained Improvements and Changes

As noted in the Commission's letter to the college dated, January 31, 2011, (CR-1.15) the college has resolved the issues that led to this recommendation. With this in mind, the college has continued to implement its revised governance and committee structure and has used the results of the spring 2011 collegewide survey, (CR-1.2) and annual May 2011 committee reports (CR-1.16) to make continuous improvements. The spring 2010 collegewide survey was referenced as a benchmark against which to measure spring 2011 and future progress on this recommendation. The College Council continues to review periodic collegewide survey results and annual reports, most recently on May 2, 9, and 16, 2011 (Evidence 1.17) to improve the work being done by college committees.

With ongoing changes in fall 2011, Instruction and Administrative program reviews now more closely mirror Student Services program reviews to include action steps that demonstrate how each unit's activities are aligned with and promote the college mission, values and strategic directions (CR-1.18).

Analysis of Results: This recommendation was initially satisfied as witnessed by a letter from the ACCJC dated January 31, 2011 (CR-1.15). The college continues to meet this Standard and engage in continuous improvement around it.

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, and resource allocation (Standards: IB3, IB4, IIA1, IIA2, IIB1, IIB, 4, 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).*

Descriptive Summary of Deficiency Resolution:

As noted in our report of October 15, 2010, the visiting team evaluated a draft version of the DVC integrated planning model and noted that the plan as presented would address many of the recommendations concerning planning. DVC Procedure 1010.10 (Integrated Planning) (CR-2.1) was initiated by the Institutional Planning Committee (CR-2.2) and forwarded to the College Council for discussion and action. The College Council recommended approval of the procedure to the college president on May 17, 2010 (CR-2.3) (Standards I.B.3, I.B.4, III.D, III.D.1.a, III.D.1.d). Although codified as a DVC procedure in May 2010, the college had been implementing this procedure since it was developed and agreed to as part of the preparation of the Show Cause Report. This procedure identifies the Institutional Planning Committee as the body charged with overseeing the development, scheduling, coordination and validation of collegewide plans. The Institutional Planning Committee is a college governance committee with representation from all constituent groups as well as from the San Ramon Valley Center (CR-4).

In the October 2009 Show Cause Report, DVC outlined a three phase approach to implementing the resource allocation component of the integrated planning model. This approach was predicated on the availability of one-time funds in 2009-10 (Phase 1) to be used to fund resource requests from program reviews and approved collegewide plans. Like most publicly-funded community colleges in California, Diablo Valley College faced a significant budget reduction as a result of enrollment caps mandated by the State of California. This budget reduction amounted to approximately \$5.2 million for fiscal year 2010-2011 (CR-2.5). As such, program reviews and collegewide plans that had been written anticipating the possibility of increased funds now had to be used to make decisions about either reducing or reallocating funds. Although this resulted in some frustration among members of the Integration Council (charged with reviewing and evaluating program reviews and collegewide plans and prioritizing resource requests) and the Budget Committee (charged with using recommendations from the Integration Council to develop a plan for reducing the college budget), the college continued to implement the model as planned. This turned out to be a good test of the planning model and it provided valuable feedback currently being used to improve the model and the program review templates for future use (CR-2.6) (Standards III.D, III.D.1.a).

With knowledge that the college budget would need to be reduced significantly, the college president and the accreditation liaison officer convened an all college staff development activity on January 20, 2010. Some 144 employees of the college attended an all-day staff development activity entitled 'Back to the Future II', designed to both educate the college community on the nature of the budget reductions facing the college as well as developing some ideas about how to reduce and/or reallocate resources while maintaining the mission of the college to serve students and promote student learning and achievement (CR-2.7) (Standards I.B.4, IV.A.1). The many comments from this activity were reviewed and used to develop a list of values and a separate list of ideas to be considered when making budget decisions (CR-2.8). In addition, the Faculty Senate Council prepared a document entitled 'Guiding the Budget Cuts: Feedback from the Faculty Senate' (CR-2.9). At the request of the college president, the accreditation liaison officer took these documents along with the approved 'Statement of Values' from the DVC Strategic Plan and developed a 'Synthesis of Values and Ideas' to help guide the college as it began to consider how to reduce both staffing and operating expenses. This 'Synthesis of Values and Ideas' was presented at the Budget Committee on March 12, 2010, at the Integration Council on March 12, 2010, and at the College Council on March 22, 2010 (CR-2.10).

Since 94 percent of the college budget is spent on costs related to personnel, it became clear that there would need to be staffing reductions. On May 20, 2010, the college president sent an email to the college community outlining her decisions regarding personnel and operating fund reductions (CR-2.5). This email clearly indicated that the college president and her senior staff incorporated, to the extent possible, the values and ideas developed by the Integration Council (CR-2.6), information from the January 20, 2010 staff development activity, Back to the Future II (CR-2.7), guidelines prepared by the DVC Faculty Senate (CR-2.89), the college's statement of mission and values (CR-2.11), and collective bargaining agreements when making staffing reduction decisions. Staffing reductions that impacted academic managers were made in accordance with California state law which requires a notice of termination on or before March 15 of the calendar year (Standards III.A, III.A.6).

As an outcome of the evaluation and prioritization of the program reviews, the Integration Council (IC) drafted a document entitled 'Integration Council Recommendations to the College Council (Augmented with links to DVC Strategic Directions, Responsible Entities and ACCJC Standards, as appropriate)' (CR-2.12). This document outlines guiding principles used by the Budget Committee when evaluating how to make reductions and reallocations to the college's operating budgets. To ensure that the budget reduction/reallocation process was clear to all parties, the co-chairs from the Budget Committee and Integration Council met along with the accreditation liaison officer on February 18 and March 16, 2010 (CR-2.13) to review the IC recommendations and to draft a document entitled 'Budget Reductions for the 2010-2011 Fiscal Year Roles, Responsibilities, Recommendations and Decision Making' which was distributed to the entire college on March 17, 2010 (CR-2.14). This document provides background information describing why the college had to reduce its general operating budget by \$5.2 million for the 2010-2011 fiscal year. The document outlines the roles and responsibilities of the various components of the governance structure in developing recommended resource reductions to the college

president. It also included a timeline and decision-making and recommending process for implementing these recommendations. This document provided the charge to the Budget Committee to make recommendations on how to reduce operating fund expenditures (CR-2.15). The results of the collegewide survey conducted in May of 2010 indicated that respondents generally agreed that the work of college committees and councils had improved the level of transparency and openness with respect to governance at DVC (CR-2.16) (Standards IV.A.1, IV.A.3).

On April 20, 2010, after holding nine open meetings during the spring term (CR-2.17), the Budget Committee issued a report entitled 'Diablo Valley College Budget Committee Recommendation for Reducing Operating Funds for the 2010-2011 Fiscal Year' (CR-2.15). This report lists the charge of the Budget Committee, recommended reductions to operating funds for 2010-11, and the process used to develop the recommendations. The document also outlines expectations for how the operating fund reductions are to be implemented at the unit level and includes a requirement that each unit provide a brief report to the accreditation liaison officer that clearly describes how the unit: applied the results of the 09-10 program review to the development of their revised budget; linked their revised budget to the college mission, vision and/or strategic directions; and ensured that their revised budgets were developed in an open, transparent manner with the opportunity of input from all constituents in the unit (CR-2.18) (Standards I.B.4, II.A.1, III.D.3, IV.A.1). The Budget Committee's recommendations only applied to operating fund reductions as the decisions about staffing reductions were made by the college president and senior staff members. It is important to reiterate that both staffing reductions (with the exception of academic managers) and operating fund reductions were based on the results of the Integration Council, the January 20 All College Focus group activity, information from the Faculty Senate and the overarching principles as articulated in the College's Values and Mission Statement (CR-2.11) (Standard III.A.6). The work of the Budget Committee was strongly endorsed by the college community as evidenced by the survey results (CR-2.19). The Budget Committee also completed a self evaluation which, along with the survey results, will be used to make improvements to the financial management processes in the current fiscal year (Standard III.D.2.g).

The visiting team recommended that specific action steps be taken from each manager's evaluation and used to outline an action plan for the implementation of the college's strategic plan. The use of action steps from each manager's evaluation would be a temporary way for the college to assess how well it had achieved its strategic directions for 2009-10. The college compiled the action steps from senior manager's evaluations for the 2009-10 strategic directions (from the approved strategic plan) and used them to evaluate the extent to which the college has accomplished those strategic directions (CR-2.20) (Standard I.B.3). The college annually reports to the Contra Costa Community College District Governing Board on its accomplishments towards the achievement of its Strategic Directions (CR-2.21) (Standard I.B.5). In May, the college president asked the DVC Faculty Senate to select two of the Strategic Initiatives from the Contra Costa Community College District (CCCCD) to serve as one of DVC's strategic directions for 2010-11 (CR-2.22). They selected strategic initiatives A 1.1, Increase the percentage of students who transfer to a variety of four-year institutions while narrowing the transfer gap across subgroups, and A 1.4 Increase the

percentage of students who are proficient in Basic Skills while narrowing the proficiency gap across subgroups. These equate to DVC's strategic directions A.1-Assess student learning outcomes; A.2-Enhance student success; and A.3-Improve the progress of underrepresented students (Standard IV.B.2.b). The college has begun to take action towards achieving these strategic directions by establishing College Success Inquiry (CSI): Transforming Achievement for African American Students at DVC. The results of this inquiry will be used to reduce the achievement gap and is funded by the Basic Skills Initiative at DVC (CR-2.23).

On May 17, 2010, the College Council asked its members to suggest additional initiatives (CR-2.24). They recommended the selection of DVC's Strategic Directions: D.5 Improve Organizational Effectiveness; and F.2 Involve stakeholders in decision making. All these recommendations were forwarded to the college president for a final decision and approval (Standard I.B.4). The college president accepted these recommendations: the two from the Faculty Senate, and D.5, Improve Organizational Effectiveness, from College Council. The president chose an additional strategic direction, E.3 Diversify Funding, to address impending fiscal concerns. The college president then conveyed the 2010-2011 Strategic Directions to the entire college community in an email dated June 1, 2010 thereby fulfilling the visiting team's recommendation that any new action plans that evolve out of the new governance structure be included to further augment the planning process (CR-2.25) (Standard IV.B.2.b). The Institutional Planning Committee subsequently developed objectives for achieving the 2010-2011 strategic directions at their meeting of August 16, 2010 (CR-2.26). The objectives were presented at the August 23 College Council meeting and accepted at the September 13, 2010 meeting (CR-2.27). In addition, program reviews will include action steps and will demonstrate how each unit's activities are aligned with and have promoted the college mission, values and strategic directions.

At their meeting of August 11, 2010, the Faculty Senate Council discussed specific action plans and strategies for achieving the college's strategic directions related to the achievement gap, transfer and basic skills (CR-2.28) (Standards I.B.4, IV.A.2.a).

Updates Since October 2010: Sustained Improvements and Changes

By March 1, 2012, with the college president's acceptance of a resource allocation recommendation from the College Council, the college will have completed its third consecutive year of integrated planning and resource allocation in accordance with DVC Procedure 1010.01 (Integrated Planning) (CR-2.29). College leadership has evaluated and improved the effectiveness of the model through a series of governance chair meetings and conversations throughout the year. (CR-2.30) During the 2010-2011 fiscal year, the Institutional Planning Committee convened three meetings with co-chairs of committees that are responsible for collegewide plans and the co-chairs of the four major governance committees to discuss the Integrated Planning Model implementation. These meetings were held on January 25, March 31 and May 3, 2011 (CR-2.31). In addition, a college wide flex workshop was offered on August 9, 2011 (CR-2.32). The intent of these meetings was to discuss the implementation of the integrated planning and resource allocation model and to offer recommendations for improvement. Items discussed included:

- ensuring that collegewide plan development guidelines have been met, based on a rubric developed by the IPC;

- ensuring that each collegewide plan has an implementation grid with goals, long-term objectives, strategies, and immediate objectives with the involved units;
- ensuring that the all committees with responsibility for a collegewide plan will prepare an annual progress update based on the implementation grid, to assess progress towards the stated goals of the plan, integration of the plan with program review, integration of the plan with resource allocation and any modifications to short or long-term goals of the plan.

For the fiscal year, 2011-2012, the college moved to Phase II of the college's allocation model as described in the original Show Cause Report. This phase focuses on bringing the college governance committees and the college as a whole to a more transparent understanding of the operating budget. While the ongoing fiscal crisis in California has shifted the college's attention to budget reductions, the intent of Phase II, better collegewide understanding of the budget, is being accomplished (CR-2.33). The Budget Committee implemented this process by requiring all units to review their budgets and how those funds are allocated among the various budget categories (CR-2.34). Funding categories now accurately reflect where expenditures are being made. This will facilitate the Budget Committee's efforts to do a comparative analysis of expenditures across all units thereby promoting fiscal efficiency and ensuring that limited resources are being focused on student learning and achievement.

All program review templates have direct links between unit plans, college strategic plans, and the college mission statement. The Integration Council, now comprised of representatives from both the Pleasant Hill and the San Ramon campuses and at least one representative from all constituent groups as recommended by the Commission, continues to evaluate all program reviews, synthesizes key areas of needs related to college strategic directions, and makes recommendations to the Budget Committee to inform the allocation of declining resources in an open, transparent process (2010-11 and 2011-12) (CR-2.35). The Budget Committee (expertise and constituency based with at least one representative from both the Pleasant Hill and the San Ramon campuses) reviews resource needs information from the Integration Council and allocate resources, as available, to meet those needs. (CR-2.36).

As part of the college's commitment to continuous improvement, the Integration Council conducted an evaluation in fall 2011 of the process by which resource requests from program reviews are ranked in terms of allocation of college resources (CR-2.37). The evaluation resulted in a change to how Integration Council acts on program reviews. The change involves reading resource requests in specific categories (such as technology or human resources) and ranking those request using publicly available rubrics.

In addition, College Council met with the co-chairs of the Budget Committee, the Institutional Planning Committee and the Integration Council to clarify how recommendations come to College Council from both the Budget Committee and Integration Council (CR-2.37). The outcome clarifies where and when recommendations go while promoting transparency and stability.

As the college readies itself to begin another strategic planning process, the co-chairs of the Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) called a series of meetings with the co-chairs of the other governance committees to clarify the roles and responsibilities of each committee regarding strategic planning (CR-2.38).

On a monthly basis the public information officer sends out an email entitled 'Governance at a Glance' which contains a synopsis of all actions taken by any of the four governance committees (CR-2.39). In addition, the college public information officer sends a weekly email 'What's up at DVC Next Week?' informing the college of any upcoming events, including meeting from governance or operational committees (CR-2.40). These emails are sent to everyone at DVC (both the Pleasant Hill and San Ramon campuses).

Analysis of results

This recommendation was initially satisfied as witnessed by a letter from the ACCJC dated January 31, 2011 (CR 1.15). The college continues to meet this Standard and engage in continuous improvement around it.

There are no additional new plans.

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, IV A5, IV2b)

Descriptive Summary of Deficiency Resolution:

As noted in our report of November 3-4, 2009, at the beginning of the fall 2009 term, DVC began implementing its revised Instructional Unit Program Review (IUPR) process for all instructional units. In addition, student services units continued to implement their well established and visiting team commended program review process with minor modifications for continuous improvement. The Administrative Program Review (APR) process was officially revised on December 9, 2009, and was used in the 2009-10 Administrative Program Review process. Data was collected and analyzed and used in the revised templates. Essential data was provided by the Research Office, the Instruction Office and Student Services units.

The implementation of the revised IUPR process was successful. By November 24, 2009, 45 IUPRs (21 cumulatives and 24 annuals) were submitted to the vice president of instruction's office (Standards II.C.1.a, II.C.2). One IUPR was not submitted and one other was found to be incomplete in the validation process. As a result neither of these instructional units was considered for any resources in the Perkins Grant Funding allocation process (CR-3.1). The implementation of the revised IUPR process, including the validation process, strengthened the link between program reviews and resource allocation, enhanced communication both

within and between instructional units and helped the college's instructional units to focus on student learning and achievement by requiring direct evidence of student learning and achievement in the instructional unit program reviews as recommended by the visiting team (Standard II.A.1). Further, the validation process ensured that all instructional unit program reviews provided evidence that each instructional unit was updating its curriculum according to the agreed schedule as recommended by the November 2009 visiting team (CR-3.2) (Standard II.A.1). The revised IUPR and Student Service Program Review (SSPR) processes assure that the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and student services and instructional programs are an integral component of these processes (Standard II.A.2).

There were five comprehensive and nine annual Student Services Program Reviews for 2009-2010. There were three comprehensive and 12 annual Administrative Program Reviews in 2009-2010. All of the program reviews enable the college to institutionalize its continuous improvement process (Standard I).

While the college was prepared to make funding allocations based on program review, unfortunately, due to unanticipated budget reductions, the college found itself with no additional, one-time, unencumbered financial resources to fund additional needs that were identified in either program reviews or collegewide plans. In September 2009, the college was required to make one-time cuts to the 2009-2010 budget. The college chose to use one-time only funds for these cuts. Consequently, there were no one-time funds available to allocate to the Integration Council (CR-3.3). DVC had planned to use approximately \$300,000 in one-time funds to support the implementation of the revised integrated planning and resource allocation process in 2009-10 (Phase 1 as identified in the Show Cause Report). As such, program reviews and collegewide plans were written with an eye toward identifying and justifying (through links to student learning, college strategic directions, and mission) the allocation of these additional resources.

All IUPRs were reviewed and validated as part of the revised program review process (mutually agreed upon in spring 2009). SSPRs were reviewed and validated using the existing process (received a commendation from the 2008 comprehensive visiting team) (Standards II.B.1, II.B.4). APRs were reviewed and validated using the process approved on December 9, 2009. Once all program reviews were validated, the program reviews and the Technology Master Plan (the only collegewide plan with resource requests) were provided to the members of the Integration Council (IC) for review, discussion and ranking as recommended by the November 2009 visiting team (CR-3.4).

Prior to evaluating the program reviews and collegewide plan, the Integration Council (IC) established a sub-committee to develop a template and rubric to be used during the evaluative process (CR-3.5). The template and rubric were developed based on prioritizing needs and requests for additional resources and unfortunately had limited usefulness as a ranking tool when it became clear that no additional resources would be available for allocation. As indicated earlier, there were no additional resources to allocate; in fact, the college had to reduce and reallocate existing resources. As such, the IC had to decide how to use the information contained in the program reviews and collegewide plans in order to develop meaningful recommendations that would allow the Budget Committee (BC) to develop a

plan for reducing and reallocating operational resources. After two joint meetings between the co-chairs of the IC, the co-chairs of the Budget Committee and the accreditation liaison officer (Feb 18 and March 16) a strategy to delineate the roles and responsibilities for the budget reduction process was prepared entitled: 'Budget Reductions for the 2010-2011 Fiscal Year Roles, Responsibilities, Recommendations and Decision Making' (CR-3.6). This document was shared with the entire college in an email from the college president dated March 17, 2010 (CR-3.7).

The Integration Council decided to evaluate all program reviews and the Technology Master Plan and look for common areas of critical need where operational funding should not be reduced. After extensive discussion, the Integration Council developed a series of recommendations based on the program reviews and the Technology Master Plan (CR-3.8) (Standards III.C, III.C.2). These recommendations focused on priorities for program resource preservation and also identified critical program issues that merited in-depth analysis to determine appropriate future funding allocations and were tied to the college's strategic directions as well as the ACCJC Standards (CR-3.9). The co-chairs of the Integration Council presented these recommendations at open meetings before the Budget Committee and College Council (CR-3.10). The Budget Committee used these recommendations when developing its recommendations for reducing operating funds for the 2010-2011 fiscal year.

Although designed for budget allocation rather than reduction or reallocation, the information in program reviews was the basis for recommendations from the Integration Council. Specific resource allocation recommendations (based on program reviews) were made in the areas of workforce development and basic skills as these areas both had categorical funds available that were restricted to their particular areas. In the case of workforce development, instructional units in career technical education prepared proposals for funding which were evaluated and ranked using program reviews, unit plans and recommendations from the Integration Council (CR-3.11). For Basic Skills Initiatives, DVC's Foundations for College Success (FCS), instructional and student services units prepared proposals for funding which were evaluated based on the direct impact on students, student learning outcomes, program review and department/area priority, FCS strategic initiatives and a plan to institutionalize the project (CR-3.12).

In response to the state mandated workload reduction, the college reduced its schedule of course offerings. After its reduction, the college still had a four million dollar imbalance between projected revenue and expenses. With 94 percent of the college budget devoted to salaries and benefits, it became obvious that staffing reductions would be required. At the Budget Committee meeting of February 26, 2010, the college president requested input from the Budget Committee on the allocation of the projected 2010-2011 major funding categories (CR-3.13). The president proposed reducing non-faculty staffing by 15 percent. Doing so would account for all but approximately \$714,000 of the four million dollar imbalance. The remainder would be handled through a commensurate reduction in unit operating funds. The Budget Committee discussed, but did not alter the president's proposal.

Due to confidentiality and issues surrounding collective bargaining agreements, decisions regarding staffing reductions are the purview of the college president and senior administrators. Using the values and ideas from the Integration Council, information gathered at a January 20, 2010 all college focus activity ('Back to the Future II'), information from the faculty senate, and the overarching principles articulated in the college's statement of values and mission statement in the college strategic plan, the college president, in conjunction with senior staff members developed a list of positions that would be eliminated (CR-3.14). Staffing reductions that impacted academic managers were made in accordance with California State law which requires a notice of termination on or before March 15 of the calendar year.

This left a deficit of \$714,000 to be made up by cuts to operating funds. The Budget Committee evaluated a number of possible combinations of cuts to operating funds using information drawn from recommendations from the Integration Council, the Synthesis of Values and Ideas, and input received from individuals attending Budget Committee meetings (CR-3.15). After recommending targeted cuts, the Budget Committee developed a sliding scale of reductions to operating funds that reflected the results of program reviews, the Synthesis of Values and Ideas and the college mission statement (CR-3.16). Instructional and student service units with direct services to students were to reduce by 11.35 percent, collegewide support services were to reduce by 17.15 percent, and administration was to reduce by 22.22 percent. The Budget Committee then developed implementation guidelines for all units that mandated linking reductions to program reviews. In addition, each unit was instructed to prepare a brief report for the accreditation liaison officer that clearly described how the unit:

- Applied the results of the 09-10 program review to the development of their revised budget;
- Linked their revised budget to the college mission, vision and/or strategic directions;
- Ensured that their revised budgets were developed in an open, transparent manner with the opportunity for input from all constituents in the unit (CR-3.17).

Evaluation of the program review process occurred for the APR, SSPR and IUPR. Embedded into the IUPR template were questions on the utility of the templates and an area for recommendations to improve both the templates and the process. A survey was sent to all faculty members who served on IUPR validation teams asking them for their views on both the process and forms (CR-3.18). In addition, the Integration Council also provided recommendations for improving both the process and templates. Since this is an academic and professional matter, this information was reviewed by a joint task force of the DVC Faculty Senate and the administration which made recommendations for improvement. These recommendations were discussed and approved at a meeting of the Faculty Senate Council on May 25, 2010 (CR-3.19).

Evaluation of the SSPR template and process involved meetings of the Student Services Validation Committee and included evaluation of recommendations for improvement from the Integration Council. At their March 9, 2010, meeting the Student Services Validation Committee recommended changes to the SSPR templates and process (CR-3.20). These

recommendations were accepted by the vice president of student services and are slated to be implemented in academic year 2010-2011 (CR-3.21). There was a conscious effort on the part of the SSPR evaluation team to align the summary document with that being used in the IUPR process in order to facilitate review and evaluation by the Integration Council.

The evaluation of the APR process and template included written comments from the APR validation team (CR-3.22), recommendations from the Integration Council, as well as discussions among managers at Management Council and President's Staff meetings (CR-3.23). As a result of feedback obtained from the initial use of the IUPR process in 2009-10, the Instructional Deans have proposed modifications to the Administrative Program Review templates in order to more accurately track and reflect the work done in the instructional division offices (CR-3.24).

The modified program review process and templates for all program reviews will be used in academic year 2010-2011 and will be evaluated again at the end of the spring 2011 term. In spring 2010, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) prepared a draft summary sheet for all program reviews which will be circulated for comment and possible adoption during the fall 2010 term (CR-3.25).

During the process of implementing the improved program review process, the college was also working to codify the process in the form of a DVC procedure. On February 22, 2010, the College Council adopted DVC Procedure 1016.01 (Program Review) (CR-3.26). This procedure ensures that the college will conduct annual program reviews and periodic comprehensive/cumulative program reviews. It specifies the procedure for each of the three program reviews and describes the process for ranking resource requests from program reviews. Finally, the procedure specifies that the Institutional Effectiveness Committee conduct a review of the program review process at least once every two years to ensure continuous quality improvement.

The college implemented its improved program review processes through the Integration Council, Budget Committee and College Council. This improved process successfully linked program reviews with resource allocation (or reallocation) and program improvements with the college budget and strategic planning as recommended by the November 2009 visiting team (Standard I.B.3). In addition, program review processes for administrative, student services and instructional units were evaluated at the end of the spring 2010 term. Modifications were made and are being implemented in the current academic year for both instructional and student services program review as part of the college's commitment to continuous improvement (Standards I.B.4; I.B.6; I.B.7). Administrative program reviews will continue to use the process established for 2009-10 while undergoing further evaluation.

Program reviews were used in the resource allocation decisions in the selection of full-time faculty positions open for recruiting in the fall 2010 term. The decision about which positions to fill was made through the college's full-time hiring process (internally referred to as the 'Box 2a process') (CR-3.27). Integral to this process was the evaluation of IUPRs for instructional units that were requesting full-time faculty positions. (Standards III.A, III.A.6).

Updates Since October 2010: Sustained Improvements and Changes

As noted in the Follow-Up Report from the Commission dated November 18, 2010, “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.”

Since November 2010, the college has continued using its agreed upon program review processes (CR-3.28). In the academic year 2011-2012, all units conducted a program review by January 9, 2012. The IUPRs and Administrative program reviews were completed using the improved templates (based on feedback obtained during the last year) with questions specifically directed to consider how the unit would implement reductions to operating funds and staffing (CR-3.29). Student services areas have continued to conduct comprehensive and annual program reviews according to their established schedule using an updated template (CR-3.30). All program review processes are evaluated annually as part of the college’s commitment to continuous improvement.

The completion of student learning outcomes is a prerequisite for instructional and student service units to request resources and must be included in order to consider the program review completed and validated by the college (CR-3.29 and 3.30). Integration Council used only validated program reviews in two different cycles for resource allocation (CR-3.31).

The college is completing its third consecutive year of program review pursuant to DVC Procedure 1016.01 (Program Review). All college units complete program review: Student Services Program Reviews; Instructional Unit Program Reviews; and Administrative Program Reviews (CR-3.32). All program reviews undergo a thorough validation process before being sent to the Integration Council for an evaluation of program reviews and recommendations for resource allocation (to the Budget Committee) based on these reviews (CR-3.33).

As a part of the college’s commitment to continuous improvement, all college units undergo an annual evaluation of the program review templates and process (CR-3.34). In the spring and summer of 2011, meetings were held with representatives from instruction, student services and administration in an attempt to bring all three program review processes to a common template and timeline. These meetings also revised the program review summary report for Student Services, Administration and Instructional Unit (CR-3.35).

Analysis of Results: This recommendation has been satisfied, as witnessed by a letter from the ACCJC dated January 31, 2011 (CR-1.15). The college continues to meet this Standard and engage in continuous improvement around it.

Recommendation 4: *The team recommends that the college accelerate its Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) and assessment cycle in the instruction area to fully demonstrate proficiency by 2012 as stated in the ACCJC rubric for SLOs. (Standards: IIA, IIA1a) The team further recommends that Student Learning Outcomes should be incorporated into the college mission statement. (Standard: IA)*

Descriptive Summary of Deficiency Resolution:

By year's end 2008, DVC had defined SLOs for 122 courses with 12 courses having been assessed. Program level SLOs were developed for 15 programs with 2 having been assessed. As of spring 2012, all 1,287 courses have defined SLOs and 60% of all courses have been assessed at least once, with some key courses having been assessed multiple times. All disciplines listed in the college catalog have courses that have been assessed. Course level SLOs are included in classroom syllabi. In addition, all 168 programs offered by the college have established program level SLOs that are published in the college catalog. New curriculum approval processes insure that new courses and programs include SLO development and are integrated into the departments SLO assessment cycle (CR-4.1). The SLO committee evaluates its process on a regular basis as part of continuous improvement (CR-4.2). The college is on track to achieve proficiency and sustainability in this area by fall 2012.

DVC Procedure 1017.01 (Reviewing the Mission Statement: September 15, 2008) requires that the college review the college mission statement every two years or at shorter intervals, if necessary (CR-4.3). As a result of a review conducted in the fall of 2010 and spring of 2011, the college president in collaboration with the College Council, notified the entire college by email of a revised college mission statement which includes specific reference to student learning (CR-4.4).

To assist with the development, assessment, modification and tracking of both course and program level SLOs, the college has granted a permanent, full-time faculty member reassigned time for technical support for development of a web-based SLO system - WebSLOs 2.0. This system has helped to streamline and track the SLO process so that faculty can focus on student learning rather than the mechanics of tracking. The system allows faculty to generate reports showing when courses have been assessed and the results and improvements from those assessments (CR-4.5).

The college established a five-year plan for initiating the assessment of course-level SLOs. Once a course has been assessed it will be reassessed within 3 years. All departments/disciplines have the option of assessing their courses more frequently, but that is at the discretion of the department/discipline. The remaining 40% of the courses are scheduled for assessment during the next two academic years 2012-2013/2013-2014 and are being tracked in WebSLOs 2.0 for their completion. The SLO committee in coordination with the department/discipline currently selects 33% of the courses from that department/discipline to be assessed each academic year over a 3 year cycle. The DVC SLO committee developed alignment matrices to align program level SLOs with course level SLOs (CR-4.6). The committee then used the alignment matrices to review program level

SLOs. All program level SLOs have been aligned with course content so that they have relevance to the program. As course level SLOs are assessed and changes occur, action plans are created which may include changes to program level SLOs. As new courses or programs are developed, SLOs are a required component prior to approval by the Curriculum Committee (CR-4.7).

To ensure that the college continues to focus on SLOs, the college developed DVC Procedure 1018.01 (Student Learning Outcomes and Achievement, February 22, 2010) (CR-4.8). In addition, course and program level SLOs are a compliance component on all instructional unit program reviews. If an instructional unit does not adhere to the prescribed timelines, that unit becomes ineligible for resources through the college resource allocation process.

WebSLOs 2.0 is the online public site, <http://www.dvc.edu/slos>, with outcome statements, summary reports, blank forms, and submittal forms. For faculty use, assessment results and action plans, are hosted on a college maintained shared drive. The system allows faculty, department chairs, deans and college administrators to generate reports showing when courses have been assessed, the results for the assessments and improvements from those assessments. These reports can be generated for the discipline, department, division, SLO committee, or the college.

The SLO committee has developed a process for reviewing and approving course and program level SLOs (CR-4.2). During the fall semester the committee reviews all Program SLO assessment action plans submitted during the previous spring semester. Also in the fall semester, departments/disciplines are entering their course SLO assessment results, analyzing those assessment data and creating course SLO action plans. During spring semester the committee reviews all course SLO assessments submitted during the previous fall semester. At the beginning of each semester the WebSLOs system emails to all faculty associated with a course scheduled for that semester - the official course outline, the previous SLO assessment results and action plan. The SLO committee evaluates its process on a regular basis as part of continuous improvement. The committee has gone from a slow, paper driven evaluation process to a cross platform (PC and Mac), scalable web enabled system that has allowed the college achieve proficiency and sustainability in this area by fall 2012. (CR-4.2).

Analysis of Results: This recommendation has been satisfied.

Recommendation 5: *The team recommends that Diablo Valley College develop a new technology master plan that reflects current and future needs which is integrated into college wide planning and resource allocation including the evaluation and support of instructional, student services and administration functions for the college and off-campus sites. (Standards: IIC1d, IIIc1c, IIIc1d, IIIc2)*

Descriptive Summary of Deficiency Resolution:

In spring 2009, the DVC Technology Committee (an expertise based, multi constituency committee) developed The Technology Master Plan 2009-2013. This plan was reviewed and approved by the Leadership Council (the governance committee in effect at that time). In reference to the college's 2009-2013 Technology Report, the Show Cause Report issued by the Commission on November 3-4, 2009, noted, "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." (CR-5.1)

In spring 2010, technology requests from administrative, student services and instructional program reviews were reviewed by the Information Technology Committee and then used to inform resource allocation planning and an annual update to the Technology Master Plan. In fall 2011, the Integration Council forwarded technology request information from program reviews to the Information Technology Committee. These technology requests and the goals set out in the Technology Master Plan were reviewed by the Information Technology Committee to determine which computers were to be replaced and to prioritize additional technology-related purchases. These recommendations were forwarded to the Integration Council, then to the College Council where they were approved and presented to the college president (CR-5.2). On December 9, 2011, the Budget Committee recommended to the College Council that \$494,000 be allocated to meet the technology needs identified in program reviews and collegewide plans as noted by the IC and the Information Technology Committee. The College Council on January 27, 2012, agreed with this recommendation and forwarded it to the president who will act on it by early March 2012.

Analysis of Results: This recommendation has been resolved, and the college continues to implement its new technology plan as permitted in very difficult budgetary times. As witnessed by the Show Cause Report issued by the Commission dated November 3-4, 2009, page 20 (CR-5.3), the college immediately addressed and resolved the issues related to Eligibility Requirement 19. As the college considers its next strategic planning process, the role and function of the Technology Plan will be addressed. In the meantime, college governance and program review appropriately reference the college's Technology Plan (CR-5.3).

Recommendation 6: *The team recommends that Diablo Valley College fully implement recommendation 2 from the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report which states, "Improvement of the 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)*

Descriptive Summary of Deficiency Resolution: By the end of May 2009, the course outlines of record for all courses were brought up-to-date and remain so (CR-6.1). The senior dean of instruction under the supervision of the vice president of instruction is responsible for

the course and program approval processes. All course outlines are maintained in a locally developed database (Web Curriculum System, WCS). Classified and management support for this process is sufficient to maintain this process as evidenced by the up-to-date course outlines of record. A detailed outline and description of the process to maintain the currency of outlines and the approval of new courses and programs was prepared and approved by the Curriculum Committee in the fall of 2009 (CR-6.2).

DVC Procedure 4001.07 Course Update Compliance was developed and adopted February 22, 2010, to address Title 5 non-compliance (CR6.3). This procedure requires each department/unit to establish a calendar for regularly updating course outlines and to adhere to that timeline, <http://www.dvc.edu/org/info/slos/status.htm?calendar>. If the unit does not complete the regularly scheduled course updates, the course(s) in question will be removed from the following fall schedule. If the unit has not completed the update approval process by the end of the fall semester, the course(s) will be deleted from the college catalog.

In addition, course currency is a compliance element required of all Instructional Unit Program Reviews. If an instructional unit does not maintain its curriculum, that unit's program review will not be validated and will not be eligible for resource allocation through the program review process.

The college has improved the program approval through implementing a development and approval timeline that includes input from the discipline/department, followed by college and district approval (CR-6.4). All new programs must adhere to the development and approval timeline.

Analysis of Results: This recommendation has been satisfied, as witnessed by the statement on the visiting team report dated November 3-4, 2009, page 20 (CR-5.3) and a letter from the ACCJC dated January 31, 2011 (CR-1.14). The college continues to meet this Standard and engage in continuous improvement around it.

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: III B2b, IIIC, IIIC2, IIID1a, IIID1d, IVA1, IVA2, IVA2b).*

Descriptive Summary of Deficiency Resolution:

As noted in our report of October 15, 2010, the visiting team urged 'college leaders and pioneers to consistently demonstrate their commitment to inclusion, honesty, transparency and good communication'. To ensure that the college community is informed of upcoming meetings and encouraged to participate, meeting dates, times and locations for all college committees, councils and task forces as well as all constituency-based committees and staff development activities are posted to a publically-accessible, web-based calendar at: http://www.dvc.edu/faculty/calendar.htm?action=list&cid=Campus_percent20meetings. In addition, agendas and minutes for the college-committee meetings are available on a shared computer drive (available both on-campus and off-campus) and are distributed by email.

Hard copies of these minutes were placed in nine key locations (eight on the Pleasant Hill Campus and one at the San Ramon Valley Center). All collegewide committees that met more than twice in the 2009-10 academic year completed an internal committee evaluation form summarizing their accomplishments, identifying major obstacles with the committee function, recommending changes to the committee charge/function, recommending changes to improve the committee efficiency, changes to the committee representation/composition and a list of goals for the upcoming year (CR-7.1). The evaluation forms were distributed widely and are being used by the College Council as part of their annual evaluation of the college governance and consultation model. The evaluation forms were also used by the college president and the accreditation liaison officer, along with the results from the annual college survey of committees to develop recommended modifications to the college committee structure as recommended by the visiting team. Several committees were created late in the spring semester 2009 and as such met only once instead of at least two times as planned. These committees completed an internal committee evaluation form at the end of the 2010-2011 academic year.

During the period May 13-20, 2010, the college administered a collegewide survey to gather information on the governance and committee structure. All 16 of the existing college committees were encouraged to submit key questions to be incorporated in the survey. The responses to these questions provided information used by the committees as they evaluated their performance and assisted in developing their plans for 2011-2012. Eight of the 16 committees actually submitted questions for the survey. The results of the 295 collegewide survey responses (including 599 comments to eleven of the survey questions) have been posted to the DVC intranet for access by all employees. Analyses of these results include:

- The college is generally aware of the 16 collegewide committees. Responses ranged from 95 percent being aware of the Budget Committee (Standard III.D.1.d) to less than 50 percent for the Equal Employment Opportunity Committee and the Student Equity Committee. It should be noted that these last two committees were created by the dissolution of the Cultural Diversity Committee during the spring 2010 term and may be the reason why these two committees scored so low on awareness.
- Respondents were asked to indicate whether they felt welcomed at meetings of the college committees. The Budget Committee received the highest positive response with 86 percent of respondents indicating they felt welcomed (Standard III.D.1.d). In general people felt welcomed at the college committee meetings.
- A significant majority (72 percent) feels that DVC has too many committees and councils. None of the existing committees recommended that they be abolished. This issue was addressed by the college president and the accreditation liaison officer at the fall 2010 convocation (CR-7.2). It may be that the increase in communication from the existing committees gave the impression that the college had significantly increased the number of college committees. This topic was re-evaluated in the subsequent collegewide survey and annual reports from the collegewide committees in the spring of 2011.
- Email is the preferred source to learn about the activities of committees and councils (71 percent) followed by conversations with colleagues (37 percent), committee meetings (23 percent) and the intranet (14 percent). Other less preferred sources include constituent group meetings. The use of hard copies in binders was used by 6

percent of respondents; however, a review of the sign-up sheets on these binders did not reveal any use during the year. Because of this apparent inconsistency, the college will continue to maintain hardcopies of agendas and minutes but reduce the number of locations to three (two at Pleasant Hill and one at SRVC) (Standards III.C, III.C.2).

The remaining questions used a Likert scale for responses where 5 equals strongly agree, 4 equals agree, 3 equals neutral, 2 equals disagree and 1 equals strongly disagree. The average Likert scale responses to the statement, “The work of collegewide committees and councils...” are as follows:

- Created a sense of inclusiveness at DVC – 3.18
- Improved the level of transparency and openness with respect to governance at DVC – 3.41
- Increased my knowledge of the roles of the collegewide committees and councils at DVC – 3.34
- Contributed toward creating meaningful dialog at DVC – 3.33
- Been communicated regularly to the college community – 3.45
- Been communicated to the college community through sources that are easily accessible – 3.40

The survey results seemed to indicate that the respondents view the work of the collegewide committees favorably. Considering these were the responses after the first year of implementing significant changes to the governance and committee structure, a favorable response, is positive (Standard IV.A.1). Specific questions were asked about College Council, Integration Council, Budget Committee, Institutional Planning Committee, Foundations for College Success Committee, Collegewide Staff Development Committee, Sustainability Committee, and the Information Technology Committee. Although these questions were more specific to the charge/function of the individual committees, in general, responses to these questions were slightly more positive than those listed above. The 599 comments to the survey will be used by the various committees to make improvements during this next year. The college used the first survey as a benchmark and resurveyed the college in spring 2011. The results have been compared and used to evaluate the effectiveness of any changes. The college will administer a similar survey periodically as part of the ongoing effort to promote continuous improvement.

With the proliferation of individual web pages for departments, programs and divisions, the director of marketing and communication developed a central repository of all communications (newsletters and announcements). This web site (www.dvc.edu/communications) is used to facilitate the communication of information of general interest to the college community as a whole including student success announcements and the college’s Newsmakers (CR-7.3) (Standard III.C). In addition, the college is reaching out to students with social networking. The Marketing and Communications Department maintains a Facebook page and Twitter to convey information of general interest to students. (<http://www.facebook.com/pages/Pleasant-Hill-CA/Diablo-Valley-College/36613561655>) (http://twitter.com/dvc_updates)

The Financial Aid Department also maintains a Facebook site to provide information on how to apply for financial aid, <http://www.facebook.com/dvcfinaid>. The San Ramon Valley Center maintains a Facebook page, (<http://ja-jp.facebook.com/DVCSanRamon?v=wall&viewas=0>).

In order to ensure that new employees are informed of the governance and committee structure, the visiting team recommended that the college provide training to all new faculty members. The college has expanded this to include all new employees by incorporating governance and committee training for new full-time faculty through the faculty orientation program entitled Nexus and for part-time faculty through staff development activities (CR-7.4). The Classified Staff Development Committee recommended that training for all new classified staff be provided by the college human resources staff at the time of hiring with assistance from the accreditation liaison officer (CR-7.5). The Management Staff Development Committee will provide training to all new managers through the newly created Administrators Sharing Knowledge (ASK) program (CR-7.6).

On July 19, 2010, the Classified Senate president and vice president emailed all classified staff and managers at DVC with the Classified Senate meeting schedule for the upcoming 2010-2011 academic year (CR-7.7). Since 2010-2011, all meeting dates, times and locations have been entered into the DVC meeting calendar web page. In addition, the Classified Senate leadership has also established a classified blog and a Facebook page (to promote communication among classified members). They have also developed a survey through which classified members can provide input on goals for the classified senate for the upcoming year (CR-7.7).

The August 12, 2010, all college convocation was held in the Performing Arts Center with an introduction of the 2010 ASDVC president and speeches from the Classified Senate President, Faculty Senate President, and college president (CR-7.8). Also on the agenda, the college president and the accreditation liaison officer presented an update on DVC's accreditation status including an outline review of this Follow-Up Report (CR-7.2). The presentation was attended by approximately 200 people. A question and answer period followed the presentation. At the convocation, the Faculty Senate and Classified Senate invited the ASDVC Executive Board to join them in a fall meeting of the senates (CR-7.9). The August 25, 2010 edition of the Faculty Senate *Forum* included the texts of all of the speeches presented at the 2010 Convocation (CR-7.10).

The June 29, 2010 retirement announcement of the college president, emailed to the entire college, proved the college's ability to be transparent and communicate effectively (CR-7.11). On July 1, 2010, while the chancellor acknowledged the president's retirement in an email to everyone at DVC (CR-7.12), she outlined a recruitment timeline for hiring a new permanent president for DVC (CR-7.13). In addition, the chancellor announced an all college meeting to be held on July 14 at DVC. The college successfully communicated and participated in this transition with the chancellor.

On July 14, 2010 the District chancellor held meetings at DVC, one with vice presidents, one with Management Council, executives with Faculty Senate and Classified Senate, and

another, open meeting for the entire college, to announce her decision to appoint an acting president of DVC, effective October 1, 2010. The chancellor also outlined her timelines for hiring a new, permanent college president. Throughout the transition period from the president's retirement to the hiring of an acting and then permanent president, the college manifested open honest dialogue among constituents and with the chancellor.

Updates Since October 2010: Sustained Improvements and Changes

With respect to the recommendation to increase collaboration, transparent decision making and honest dialogue, the college has transformed itself. Numerous meetings among the chairs of various key governance committees, constituent leader meetings with the president, and two historic joint meetings among the three senates are testament to this change. (CR-7.14). An innovative approach to schedule building that stands as clear evidence of transparent decision making and honest dialogue is the management/faculty agreement to build the college instructional schedule through a collaborative taskforce (CR-7.15).

In response to the recommendation for more widespread dissemination of internal college documents, during the fall 2011 term, college implemented two new electronic announcements that are sent to all staff. 'Governance at a Glance' is a monthly announcement updating the college community on the status of the four college governance committees (College Council, Budget Committee, Integration Council and the Institutional Planning Committee) (CR-7.16). Every week, the college Public Information Officer sends out an email entitled 'What's up at DVC Next Week?' (CR-7.17). This email includes a list of all meetings and events at the college for the upcoming week. Each event is a hyperlink that takes the reader to a detailed description of the event. The college administered a survey in spring 2011 similar to the collegewide survey conducted in May of 2010 (CR-7.18). Based on feedback from the 2010 survey, the 2011 survey was administered early enough to allow committees time to review the results and incorporate them into their annual reports (CR-7.19). The college continues to use electronic media for announcing meeting days and times as well as for communicating agendas and minutes from committee meetings. Due to the relatively low response on the hard copies as a primary source of information, the college reduced the number of hard copy locations from nine to three (two at the Pleasant Hill campus and one at the San Ramon Campus). DVC continues to inform the college community about upcoming events through a variety of media, primarily electronic and posts hardcopy announcements and flyers as appropriate (CR-7.20). As a result of the collegewide survey and the annual committee evaluations, in the fall of 2011 the College Council recommended to the college president that the Institutional Effectiveness Committee be merged with the Institutional Planning Committee to reduce overlap between the charges of the two committees (CR-7.21).

Analysis of Results: This recommendation has been satisfied, as witnessed by a letter from the ACCJC dated January 31, 2011 (CR-1.15). The college continues to meet this Standard and engage in continuous improvement around it.

District Recommendations

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.*

Descriptive Summary of Deficiency Resolution:

As noted in our report of October 15, 2010, the district and college identified the development of a new allocation model as a need in the 2008 accreditation self-study for Diablo Valley College. The visiting team at that time agreed. For the 2009-10 academic year, the district implemented a new formula for funding adjunct faculty and incorporated into the budget new funding for technology with a plan for funding technology in the future (CR-8.1). All of the work for the development and implementation of the new allocation model was completed in the fall of 2009 and the spring and summer of 2010.

The district's established participatory governance process was used in developing the allocation model and the accompanying policies and procedures. During the fall of 2009, district staff worked with the college leadership to discuss details of California State Senate Bill 361 (SB361) which laid out the foundation for state funding allocations to all California community colleges. A draft SB 361 allocation simulation and a financial allocation model proposal were developed by the vice chancellor for administrative services (VCAS), and two consultants. The proposal included implementation issues and four strategies for implementing the SB 361 allocation model. The chancellor of the Contra Costa Community College District, VCAS, and the two consultants reviewed the proposal and simulation with the leadership at each college on the following dates:

- November 12, 2009 – Contra Costa College (CR-8.2)
- November 16, 2009 – Diablo Valley College and Los Medanos College (CR-8.2)
- On November 10, 2009, the VCAS met with the District Governance Council (DGC) to educate and gather input on the principles of SB 361. Members of DGC were asked to develop values and principles they would like to see in the new allocation model (CR-8.3).

The feedback and suggestions, as well as issues from the college leadership, were documented into an implementation issues document. The constituent groups of DGC were given a presentation, the proposal, and simulation at the December 1, 2009, meeting (CR-8.4). The members of DGC were requested to review and share this information with their respective constituent groups and bring back feedback to the DGC meeting on January 26, 2010. Staff gave a presentation to the Governing Board on December 9, 2009, summarizing the SB 361 principles, the rationale for using the model, and the impact (CR-8.5).

Throughout fall 2009, spring 2010, and a portion of the summer of 2010, the VCAS provided the leadership, through the Chancellor's Cabinet, to complete the development and implementation of the district's new financial allocation model. The district engaged the services of two experienced consultants on financial planning models to assist in the development of the model. An inclusive process was used in developing and implementing the model because of the extent to which the model would change the way the district conducted its business. The new model would contain elements (values, principles, formulas) that required explanation and consensus.

At the January 26, 2010, DGC meeting, staff received feedback from the DGC. The DGC endorsed the general principles of the SB 361 model with a request that concerns expressed at DGC be solved for the colleges by May 1, 2010, and reported to DGC at the May meeting (CR-8.6). Once input had been received from the DGC in January 2010, the revision of the relevant budget procedures (Business Procedures 18.01, 18.02 and 18.03) to implement the new funding model began. During February, staff developed a financial simulation to start projecting the Tentative Budget and budget reductions for FY 10-11.

The simulation (CR-8.7) was shared with the college business officers and reconciled to the college budgets through individual meetings and phone calls with the business officers. In February, the process began to develop the FY 10-11 Tentative Budget based on the SB 361 allocation model. In March, revisions to the simulation were made based on budget assumptions and resolution of how assessments for centralized services and regulatory costs were displayed (CR-8.8).

In the spring of 2010 annual budget forums were held at each district location for all employees, the new allocation formula was presented (CR-8.9). Employees in attendance were given an opportunity to interact with the chancellor and district finance staff on details of the new model.

The following updates were given to DGC:

- February 16, 2010 – staff addressed funding of transition subsidy (CR-8.10)
- March 23, 2010 – staff updated DGC on the progress of the business procedures for the new model and conducted a discussion on the assessments for centralized services (CR-8.11)
- April 20, 2010 – staff introduced the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document to address concerns raised by the colleges and concerns brought to the January DGC meeting. Staff also updated the DGC on principles of SB 361 in preparation for the Tentative Budget (CR-8.12).

During the spring of 2010, Business Procedure 18.01 The Contra Costa Community College District General Fund Budget was revised to reflect new business procedures for budget development as a result of the new model. Business procedure 18.02 was revised and changed from Guidelines for College Operating Budget Allocations to Parameters for Budget Development and Preparation. Business Procedure 18.03 Guidelines for College Classified

Staffing (CR-8.13) was eliminated, as it was no longer relevant because college funding is not allocated on a per Full Time Equivalent Student (FTES) basis, not by personnel classification. All changes were vetted extensively through shared governance processes as noted below:

- March 23, 2010 – The Cabinet was given Business Procedures 18.01, 18.02, 18.03 and feedback was requested at the April 27, 2010, Cabinet meeting (CR-8.14).
- April 20, 2010 – The first draft of Business Procedures 18.01, 18.02 and 18.03 were vetted through DGC. Concerns were expressed for additional revisions (CR-8.12).
- April 27, 2010 – The Cabinet requested revisions to Business Procedures 18.01, 18.02, and 18.03 and approval was given to include on the May 18, 2010, DGC agenda (CR-8.15).
- May 11, 2010 – The Cabinet reviewed Business Procedures 18.01, 18.02, and 18.03 and requested additional revisions (CR-8.16).
- May 13, 2010 - The chancellor and VCAS consulted with presidents of the college Academic/Faculty Senates on Business Procedure 18.01 as an academic and professional matter. Agreement was reached on minor changes to the document. 18.01 (CR-8.17).
- May 18, 2010 – The DGC reviewed changes requested on Business Procedure 18.01 (revised), 18.02 (revised), and 18.03 (deleted) (CR-8.18)
- June 21, 2010 – The DGC reviewed Business Procedure 18.01 with changes from the previous meeting and the Academic Senate (CR-8.19).
- June 22, 2010 – The Cabinet agreed to move Business Procedure 18.01 forward for approval (CR-8.20).
- June 30, 2010 – Business Procedure 18.01 was presented to the Governing Board for a first reading with official action to be taken at the July 28, 2010, Board meeting (CR-8.21).
- July 28, 2010 – Business Procedure 18.01 was presented to the Governing Board for a second reading and was approved. (CR-8.22).

Business Procedure 18.01 codifies the district's new financial allocation model and fulfills the requirements of the recommendation by developing and implementing a model as a whole that includes funding for (1) adjunct faculty in a way that supports college and district intentions to increase enrollment and (2) technology funding.

During the development of the implementation document, it was agreed the district Office, districtwide and regulatory costs would be reviewed before the implementation of the model and regularly thereafter (CR-8.23, p. 11). The district office began in March developing a document that detailed the services and budgets for all district office and districtwide services. The document was shared with the college presidents on June 3, 2010 (CR-8.24). Regulatory costs were reviewed with the college business officers in March 2010 and feedback included in the revised simulation (CR-8.8).

In addition, as part of the implementation of the new allocation model, DVC FTES targets were reduced by 182 resident FTES to 15,393 for FY 2010-11. When funded growth is available from the State, DVC will be allowed to grow 182 FTES (within parameters of paid

growth from the State) before funded growth is allocated to Contra Costa College and Los Medanos College. (CR-8.23, page 13)

As part of the district's participatory governance process, DVC was involved throughout the development of the new allocation model with the vice president of finance and administration and college president playing a lead role for the college. The vice presidents of instruction and student services were involved as needed. Constituent groups at the college were involved as the allocation model was reviewed and approved by the District Governance Council.

Updates Since October 10, 2010: Sustained Improvements and Changes

The District has used the new SB 361 allocation model for FY 10-11 and FY 11-12 (CR-8.25). The District is currently using this model to develop the FY 12-13 budget.

In October 2010, the State of California provided growth funds to community colleges. These funds triggered the return of 182 FTES to DVC prior to the allocation of any funded growth to either Contra Costa College or Los Medanos College, per the requirements of the SB 361 model.

As originally planned, the SB361 model underwent a full review in July 2011. This review began with three separate meetings with the college vice presidents of finance and administration along with representatives from the District. These meetings occurred on June 2, July 7, and July 19, 2011 (CR-8.26). As recommended changes to the model were being considered, Chancellor's Cabinet was engaged in the discussion on both July 12 and July 26 (CR-8.27). District Business Procedure 18.01 (The Contra Costa Community College District Budgeting System), will be updated as a result of the review and then taken through the District approval process by June 30, 2012.

Analysis of Results: This recommendation has been satisfied, as witnessed by a letter from the ACCJC dated January 31, 2011 (CR-1.15). The college continues to meet this Standard and engage in continuous improvement around it.

District Recommendation 9: *In order to meet the standard, the district should establish a written code of professional ethics which includes managers. (III.A.1.d)*

Descriptive Summary of Deficiency Resolution

The district proposed a new Board policy that would establish a code of ethics that included managers. The new policy followed the participatory governance approval process, whereby it was presented to the District Governance Council (DGC) and to the individual employee groups (Local 1, United Faculty, and Management Council) for input. Upon consideration of all input, the new Board policy was presented to Cabinet and then to the Board for final approval (DR 9.1).

Analysis of Results:

The Governing Board adopted new Board Policy 2056, Code of Ethics (DR 9-1), at its October 21, 2009, meeting. This new policy addresses all members of the district community, including managers. In addition, Human Resources Procedure 1040.08 (DR 9-2), Employee Code of Ethical Behavior, previously adopted by the Chancellor's Cabinet on April 5, 2005, is directed to apply to all district administrators.

This recommendation has been satisfied.

District Recommendation 10: *In order to meet the standard, the district should integrate student learning outcomes into the evaluation process for those who have a direct responsibility for student progress toward achieving student learning outcomes. (III.A.1.c)*

Descriptive Summary of Deficiency Resolution:

The district determined that faculty has direct responsibility for student progress toward achieving student learning outcomes and has incorporated student learning outcomes (SLOs) into the faculty self-evaluation process. To that end, fifteen self-evaluation forms, tailored to the instructor status and method of instruction, have been developed: Classroom Faculty (adjunct, tenured track, tenured, repeated for each instructor classification), Counselors, Learning Disabilities Specialists, Librarians, and Online Classroom Faculty. Faculty members evaluate themselves on the following two measurements:

- I use appropriate and varied tools for evaluating and assessing student learning outcomes; and
- I participate in department committees/tasks (i.e. curriculum development, SLOs, Course Outline/Title 5 Rewrites/Content Review).

Once the faculty member completes the self evaluation (DR 10-1), the results are incorporated into the evaluation packet by the evaluation review team.

The evaluation occurs annually for the first four years for non-tenured faculty and every three years thereafter once the faculty member is tenured.

Analysis of Results:

The evaluation of student learning outcomes was implemented in the faculty evaluation process in fall 2010. Two cycles have been completed. All faculty evaluated during that period responded to the queries on his/her individual progress in the two areas used to measure progress.

This recommendation has been satisfied.

District Recommendation 11: *In order to meet standards, the district should develop a policy and implement procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of the district's administrative organization, the delineation of responsibilities of the district and the colleges, and the governance and decision making structures. The results should be widely*

communicated and used as a basis for improvement. (IV.A, IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.3, IV.B.E, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.e, IV.B.3.f, IV.B.3.g)

Descriptive Summary of Deficiency Resolution:

The district has developed policies and implemented procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of its: 1) administrative organization, 2) college and district roles/responsibilities, and 3) governance and decision making structures. The district’s administrative organization is referenced in the Rules and Regulations of the Governing Board, while the roles and responsibilities of the colleges and district are referenced in the document of the same name. The governance and decision making structure, as a whole, is now defined in the recently revised Board Policy 1009, Institutional Leadership and Governance (DR11-1).

The recommendation also asks the district to develop a policy and implement procedures for this evaluation process. The district already had two policies, but needed to revise them in order to provide clarification regarding institutional leadership/governance and institutional effectiveness. Those two revised policies, Board Policy 1009 (with related Administrative Procedure 1009.01 (DR 11-2) and Board Policy 1012 (DR 11-3) (with related Administrative Procedure 1012.01 (DR 11-4), are attached. In addition, the attached District Governance Survey (DR 11-5) has been developed to solicit feedback from district stakeholders on the effectiveness of the governance and decision making process.

Analysis of Results:

The chart below summarizes actions taken to satisfy District Recommendation 11.

Policy/Procedure/Survey	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board Policy 1009, <u>Institutional Leadership and Governance</u> 	Revised to include institutional leadership and alignment with the governance and decision making structure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Procedure 1009.01, <u>Participatory Governance</u> 	Revised to acknowledges the “participatory” governance structure and includes management in that structure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board Policy 1012, <u>Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment, and Continuous Improvement</u> 	Revised to address institutional effectiveness and broaden the scope to include assessment, continuous improvement, and a linkage to budget allocations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Procedure 1012.01, <u>Institutional Effectiveness: Planning,</u> 	Developed new procedure which delineates roles and responsibilities and

<u>Assessment, and Continuous Improvement</u>	addresses assessment and continuous improvement activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment Report 	<p>Developed assessment survey through DGC to solicit feedback from district stakeholders and assess the effectiveness of the district's governance and decision making structure</p> <p>The survey was administered districtwide on February 24, 2011, and the results were shared first with Cabinet on May 4, 2011, and then with the DGC on May 17, 2011, and June 14, 2011. DGC has developed an initial set of recommended actions which will be vetted in the fall and shared with Chancellor's Cabinet for final review prior to implementation.</p>

This recommendation has been satisfied.

Responses to Self-Identified Issues (Planning Agenda)

Diablo Valley College identified 27 plans in its 2008 accreditation self study. The following is a brief description of each of these issues, including progress made thus far, timelines to completion and responsible parties.

Planning Agenda Item 1: “Develop processes and increase coordination between campuses to ensure that SRVC [San Ramon Valley Center] faculty has a voice in curriculum development. (IIA1a)” Progress made to date includes DVC Faculty Senate leadership in the development of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Pleasant Hill Campus and the San Ramon Valley Center (SRVC) outlining SRVC’s role in curriculum development, faculty evaluations and communication between the two locations (PA 1-1). This MOU has been used by the art, speech, computer science and biology departments at the Pleasant Hill campus and SRVC to collaborate on curriculum development and course updates and revisions. This MOU also addresses faculty evaluations and communication between the Pleasant Hill campus and the San Ramon Valley Center. For example the biology department at Pleasant Hill and the math and sciences department at SRVC both amended their department bylaws to form an “Interdepartmental Curriculum Committee” to resolve and align inter-campus curriculum changes (PA 1-2, PA 1-3). Additional instructional units are planning to use the MOU in order to facilitate the development of curriculum while ensuring that SRVC faculty have a clearly established voice in the development of new curriculum beyond their current representation on the DVC Curriculum Committee. The development of an MOU between SRVC and the Pleasant Hill campus has addressed the original planning agenda item. Ensuring the effectiveness of the MOU will require ongoing evaluation and assessment by the vice president of instruction, the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate. This planning agenda item has been completed.

Planning Agenda Item 2: “Update and revise the program review process according to the recommendations of the Program Review Task Force. (IIA2a)” Through its work in both the Show Cause Report (October 2009) and a Follow-Up Report (October 2010), the college has standardized its program review process for instruction, student services and administration with the adoption of DVC Procedure 1016.01 (Program Review) (PA 2-1). The college recently completed its second year using this process and conducts an annual review of the process for continuous improvement. This planning agenda item has been completed.

Planning Agenda Item 3: “Develop procedures to guide action when disagreement occurs between faculty and senior administration on curriculum issues (Including class size and new course outlines). (IIA2a)” Through a collaborative process involving the vice president of instruction, the Curriculum Committee chair and the vice president of the United Faculty (the faculty collective bargaining agent), the curriculum development procedures were revised so that new course outlines and proposed changes to class size now go to the vice president of instruction before being reviewed by the Curriculum Committee, thereby ensuring that the Curriculum Committee does not approve a course with class size and/or teaching load that are not acceptable to the vice president of instruction (PA 3-1). This

planning agenda item has been completed, however, these procedures are reviewed annually by the Curriculum Committee to ensure continuous improvement (PA 3-2, PA 3-3).

Planning Agenda Item 4: “Integrate program review into the overall budget and resource allocation/planning processes. (IIA2f)” Through its work in both the Show Cause Report (October 2009) and a Follow-Up Report (October 2010), the college has adopted DVC Procedure 1010.01 (Integrated Planning) (PA 4-1) and has established and charged the Integration Council (IC) with reviewing resource requests from program reviews and collegewide plans using a publicly available rubric (PA 4-2, PA 4-3). The IC then uses the results of that review to recommend resource allocation to the Budget Committee and ultimately to the president. The college has recently completed its second year of implementing this integrated budget and resource allocation/planning process. This process is reviewed annually through a collegewide survey and self evaluations completed by all college committees in order to ensure continuous improvement (PA 4-4). This planning agenda item has been completed.

Planning Agenda Item 5: “Evaluate the effectiveness of the current process for assessing learning for the general education program, and make appropriate adjustments. (IIA2g)” At the time of this planning agenda item, DVC did have a Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) committee of the Faculty Senate. Beginning in the 2009-2010 academic year, the college allocated 100 percent reassigned time for a full-time faculty member to coordinate the institutionalization of SLOs, as well as develop and implement the necessary technological infrastructure to support this effort. The college continued this support with a 60 percent reassigned time in academic year 2010-2011 and 25 percent in 2011-2012. As of this date, 100 percent of the courses and programs at DVC have established SLOs. Ongoing assessment for course-level SLOs is 44 percent and for instructional program-level SLOs it is 94 percent. For student services, 100 percent of programs have established SLOs and 100 percent of those programs have regular assessment in place. Assessment of learning for the general education (GE) program is accomplished through the assessment of course level SLOs which have been aligned with specific learning outcomes as expressed for the three GE patterns at DVC. Faculty are directed to review and ensure that the stated alignments continue to be valid as part of the regular curriculum review process. The college recently approved an institutional SLO (ISLO) (PA 5-1), with multiple measurable components, and is currently in the process of assessing some of those outcomes using course and program assessment procedures as well as a collegewide student survey implemented in spring 2011. DVC is on track to be at the proficiency level, according to the ACCJC rubric (as revised May 25, 2011), by fall 2012.

Planning Agenda Item 6: “Continue the development and validation of processes for measurement of student achievement of learning outcomes. (IIA2i)” As was mentioned above, the Faculty Senate SLO Committee has been actively working to ensure that SLOs are established and assessed for all instructional courses and programs at the college. This effort has been supported with a 100 percent reassigned time position in 2009-2010, a 60 percent reassigned time position in 2010-2011 and continues with a 25 percent reassigned time position in 2011-2012. The establishment and assessment of instructional SLOs (both at the course and program levels) has been included as a minimum compliance element in all

instructional unit program reviews (PA 6-1). In addition, student services areas continue their exemplary efforts to assess student learning outcomes for their respective areas. SLOs are a key component in both the cumulative and annual student services program review process. Compliance is monitored by the student services dean to whom the unit is assigned as well as the Student Services Validation Committee. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee proposed an ISLO, with several measurable components, for review by the college community in fall 2010. After a broad, collegewide discussion, the ISLO was reviewed by the College Council and recommended for approval to the president. The president accepted this ISLO on March 1, 2011 (PA 5-1). This process of integrating and focusing the college on student learning and success is codified in DVC Procedure 1018.01 (Student Learning Outcomes and Achievement) (PA 6-2). This planning agenda item has been addressed but will require ongoing evaluation as part of continuous improvement.

Planning Agenda Item 7: “Raise the minimum mathematics requirement for an associate’s degree to be in compliance with the new state requirements. (IIA3)” The math department was notified of the need to raise the minimum mathematics requirement and after considerable discussion, acted to do so (PA 7-1). New language, approved by the Curriculum Committee, was developed for the 2009-2010 college catalog (PA 7-2, PA 7-3, PA 7-4, PA 7-5). This planning agenda item has been completed.

Planning Agenda Item 8: “Include in the college catalog information about learning outcomes for degrees and certificates, as they are identified. (IIA6)” This planning agenda item was included in a finding made by the comprehensive visiting team in November 2008 under Eligibility Requirement 10. The college responded immediately by ensuring that SLOs for all degrees and certificates are published in the college catalog. The visiting team for the Show Cause Report indicated that the college had satisfied Eligibility Requirement 10 in their report dated November 2009. This planning agenda item has been completed.

Planning Agenda Item 9: “Ensure that faculty members include on their course syllabi the course’s learning objectives, consistent with the official course outline of record. (IIA6)” The college now requires that every course syllabus include the SLOs for that course. Faculty are required to submit their syllabi to their instructional division offices for filing. Division deans are required to ensure that all courses offered in their divisions have a course syllabus on file in the division office. The requirement to include SLOs on course syllabi is part of the curriculum of required faculty orientation workshops for all new full and part-time faculty (PA 9-1, PA 9-2). Faculty development curriculum, regarding the application of SLOs, is now a required part of ongoing training for continuing faculty (PA 9-3, PA 9-4, PA 9-5). The college communicates the requirement for course syllabi learning outcomes to the faculty through individual division and department communiqués including division/department meetings and departmental email. This planning agenda item has been completed.

Planning Agenda Item 10: “Address training and workload responsibilities in the Admissions and Records Office. (IIA6a)” In order to reduce workload responsibilities in this key area, the former interim vice president of student services and the dean of outreach,

enrollment and matriculation implemented cross-training in several areas and functions of admissions and records. The college has also provided additional training in the administrative software package (Datatel) as well as technical training in other areas (PA 10-1). This planning agenda item has been completed, although additional cross-training will be required if further staff reductions or changes are made. Ongoing technical training is necessary to stay abreast of changes and updates. Ongoing technical training will be provided by District Information Technology.

Planning Agenda Item 11: “Re-establish the College Diversity Committee with an updated charge. (IIB3d)” In fall 2009, the Cultural Diversity Committee was dissolved and two new committees were established. The College Council approved the Student Equity Committee in December 2009 (PA 11-1) and the Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee in February 2010 (PA 11-2). Both committees have been formed and are currently active with both agendas and minutes posted on a shared access hard drive (PA 11-3, 11-4). As part of the annual review of all committees, both the Student Equity Committee and the Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee gave a status report to College Council on May 2, 2011 (PA 11-5). Neither committee recommended a change to their current charge. This planning agenda item has been completed.

Planning Agenda Item 12: “Develop an effective process for responding to the increasing diversity of the student body, ensuring that faculty and staff reflect the diversity of our students and community, and creating a campus climate of tolerance and understanding. (IIB3d)” The Student Equity Committee (SEC) is currently updating the 2004 Student Equity Plan (PA 12-1). The Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee (EEOAC) is working to ensure that all employees serving on hiring committees have received training on hiring practices within the last three years (PA 12-2, PA 12-3, PA 11-4). Training for faculty hiring is provided by the Faculty Senate and/or college administration. The EEOAC is working with the Contra Costa Community College District EEOAC to update diversity and cultural sensitivity training for consideration as a requirement of the hiring process. A major effort of Staff Development for the 2010-2011 academic year was the ‘Whistling Vivaldi’ project, a collegewide project designed to engender awareness of a variety of barriers to academic and professional success, rooted in issues of race, socioeconomics, physical and emotional challenges, age, sexual orientation, and other cultural stereotypes. In spring 2010, a cross constituency group of faculty, staff, administrators and students came together as the College Success Inquiry Group (CSI) with a focus on narrowing the achievement gap of African American students in basic skills classes at DVC. The CSI group received funding from the Basic Skills Initiative to develop an innovative, research based, sustainable model to effectively address the achievement gap of African American students in basic skills courses (PA 12-4). Although this planning agenda item has been addressed, it will require an ongoing commitment by the college, led by the SEC, EEOAC and Staff Development, to continue the dialog and education about the importance and value of diversity and cultural sensitivity.

Planning Agenda Item 13: “Address recommendations received in the ACCJC June 2008 report as a result of the April 4, 2008 Special Team Visit. (IIB3f)” These recommendations were addressed by the vice president of student services and the president

in a Follow-Up Report to the ACCJC dated August 29, 2008. The ACCJC responded with a letter, dated February 4, 2009, indicating that the Commission accepted the Follow-Up Report. The Commission noted that issues of grade security and integrity that were the subject of the Follow-Up Report appear to have been satisfactorily resolved. This planning agenda item has been completed.

Planning Agenda Item 14: “Investigate the possibility of ensuring how the public college web site can stay up and available as a source of information for employees and students during power outages or other emergency situations. (IIB1a)” As part of a major information technology and telecommunications plan, the college and District are in the process of implementing a redundant backbone. This will allow the college to move web services to the San Ramon Campus during planned and unplanned power outages.

Planning Agenda Item 15: “Improve signage throughout the Pleasant Hill campus. (IIB1b)” New interior and exterior signage was installed in spring 2009. Following input from faculty, in fall 2010 additional signage around the Life and Health Sciences buildings was installed. As division offices have been closed due to budget reductions, the DVC campus map was updated in fall 2010 and published. This map will be updated annually. During summer 2011 the quad area of the campus was blocked off to start a large two-year bond funded building project. This project required students to learn new routes to navigate the campus. Much planning has taken place to insure that new signage and banners are in place to help students, including students with disabilities, find their way (PA 15-1, 15-2, 15-3). Although this planning agenda item has been completed, the college recognizes the need to monitor ongoing conditions as campus facilities change, and update signage accordingly. Ongoing responsibility for this effort rests with the vice president of finance and administration.

Planning Agenda Item 16: “Ensure that the college meets the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) requirements. (IIB1a)” The college has resolved all outstanding compliance issues related to the OCR review. The college reported to the California Community College State Chancellor’s Office on unresolved items identified as part of a voluntary compliance plan (April 22, 2009). In a letter from the Chancellor’s Office dated June 28, 2010, the college was informed that it had met its final compliance responsibilities (PA 16-1). This planning agenda item has been completed.

Planning Agenda Item 17: “The college president and vice presidents will work with other college leaders to actively encourage and invite participation by all interested parties to renew institutional excellence. (IVA1)” DVC has developed a new governance structure and modified DVC Procedure 1009.01 (College Governance) to encourage participation by all interested parties (PA 17-1). The redesigned governance structure emphasizes committee representation based on expertise. The redesigned governance structure provides ample opportunities for administrators, classified staff, faculty and students to participate in any of the four college governance or twelve college operational committees. The committee handbook includes the following statement, “Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to

take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation” (PA 17-2). This planning agenda item has been addressed and will continue to be a focus of the college as the College Council evaluates the governance structure regularly to ensure widespread participation and continuous improvement (PA 17-3).

Planning Agenda Item 18: “Opportunities for leadership at all levels will be identified and highlighted, with acknowledgement of individual initiative and support for reasonable risk-taking. Leadership may need to create new mechanisms for empowering constituents to develop creative ideas, innovations and collegewide improvements. (IVA1)” The revised DVC governance structure includes opportunities for representatives from different constituent groups to co-chair college committees (PA 17-2). The college provided a training workshop for employees who want to learn how to effectively participate on a committee, how to chair/co-chair a committee and how to facilitate meetings (PA 18-1). DVC is committed to providing opportunities for current employees and students to develop the leadership skills needed to meet the future needs of the college. During spring 2010, the Contra Costa Community College District sponsored a leadership institute with the express purpose of developing leadership skills for existing employees. DVC sent seven employees to this five-month institute, one faculty, four classified staff and two managers (PA 18-2). In June 2011, DVC sent nine classified staff members to a statewide classified leadership institute (PA 18-3). The college has made significant progress in addressing this planning agenda item and will continue to look for and promote opportunities for leadership for all members of the college community.

Planning Agenda Item 19: “Because the college is clearly going through a transitional phase in its participatory governance structures and decision making processes, it will continue to better define roles in the college’s governance structures for faculty, staff, students, and administrators. (IVA2a)” As mentioned above, the college has redesigned its governance structure to make it more participatory. DVC Procedure 1009.01 (College Governance) was revised to more clearly define the roles and responsibilities of various constituent groups in the governance of the college (PA 17-1). As a result of this revision, there are spaces for more than 220 employees, including students, to participate on collegewide governance and operational committees (PA 19-1). These modifications were accepted by the ACCJC when DVC was removed first from Show Cause and placed on Probation and subsequently when the college was removed from Probation and received reaffirmation of accreditation in January 2011. This planning agenda item has been completed.

Planning Agenda Item 20: “The college will document and seriously consider input from all constituents before finalizing decisions. An important component of considered input requires providing adequate lead-time so that constituents can fully deliberate on and give informed consultation on important matters before the college. As much as possible, college administrators will begin processes such as facilities planning, faculty and staff hiring, and major schedule changes early enough to facilitate wide participation with a reasonable opportunity for recommendations to come forward, be

widely considered, and included in final decisions and implementation. For routine and recurring matters, the college will standardize reasonable timelines. (IVA2a)” As part of the governance reorganization and codification, and integration and codification of planning, program review and resource allocation, DVC has established clear procedures for decision making (PA 2-1, PA 17.1, PA 17-3, PA 20-1, PA 20-2). In addition to the changes that have been made, the college conducts a collegewide committee survey regularly (PA 4-4). The results of this survey are disseminated widely and discussed thoroughly and then used to make improvements in college procedures as well as committee charges. An example of a more deliberate and consultative atmosphere at the college is the creation of a joint Faculty Senate/Administrative Scheduling Task Force to work collaboratively with the administration when planning for significant reductions to the class schedule for academic year 2011-2012 (PA 20-3, PA 20-4, PA 20-5, PA 20-6, PA 20-7, PA 20-8, PA 20-9). Responses from the most recent collegewide survey of committees (conducted in spring 2011) indicate that 56 percent of respondents believe that governance is improving decision making at the college, compared to only 12.5 percent who disagreed and 31.9 percent who did not know (PA 4-4). This planning agenda item has been addressed and will continue to be evaluated annually by the College Council as part of the college’s commitment to continuous improvement.

Planning Agenda Item 21: “Collegewide councils will be chaired or co-chaired by individuals other than those to whom final recommendations will be forwarded. (IVA2a)” College committees have been restructured to ensure that individuals other than those to whom final recommendations are chairs or co-chairs of each committee (PA 17-2). This planning agenda item has been completed.

Planning Agenda Item 22: “The college will work to provide greater support for participation of classified staff in the governance of the college. (IVA2a)” The redesigned college committee structure provides opportunity for approximately 90 classified staff to participate, including opportunities to co-chair committees (PA 22-1). During the 2010-2011 academic year, the Classified Senate used available funds to pay for substitute employees to cover work stations when classified members were serving on college or district committees. This planning agenda item has been completed.

Planning Agenda Item 23: “The college will improve the governance process, creating and implementing processes to evaluate the integrity and effectiveness of governance and decision making structures. These processes will include widespread participation by constituents at every level of the college and all collegewide processes including budget, enrollment management, scheduling, research, college programs, operations, and overall institutional planning and implementation efforts. The evaluation processes will be on an established time line, resulting in open communication about the results and concrete steps for implementing recommended changes. (IVA5)” The college has developed a comprehensive process to ensure that the governance structure is evaluated annually and that the results of those evaluations are shared widely and used to make improvements to the governance and decision making structures. DVC Procedure 1009.01 (College Governance) (PA 17-1), DVC Procedure 1001.01 (Process to introduce new or revise existing DVC procedures) (PA 20-1), DVC Procedure 1001.02 (College Council

function and membership) (PA 17-3), DVC Procedure 1001.03 (College Council Evaluation) (PA 23-1), DVC Procedure 1010.01 (Integrated Planning) (PA 4-1), and DVC Procedure 1016.01 (Program Review) (PA 2-1) are all part of a comprehensive restructuring of governance and decision making made by the college as a result of the Commission's Show Cause Action. A key component of this structure is an annual, collegewide evaluation of the committee structure (PA 17-3). The results of this annual evaluation will be used to make modifications to the structure as part of the college's commitment to institutional effectiveness and continuous improvement. In addition, all college committees are required to prepare an annual committee evaluation which is submitted to the College Council for review in an open meeting (PA 17-2, PA 23-2, PA 23-3). The College Committee Handbook is updated annually and made available online to all members of the college community (PA 17-2). The handbook lists committee charges and functions, reporting relationships and members. The college recently completed its second year implementing this revised structure and is currently reviewing the results of the annual collegewide survey of committees (available to everyone at the college) (PA 4-4). All college committees have submitted an annual evaluation and made a presentation to the College Council on their successes and challenges for last year and their goals for next year. This planning agenda item has been addressed and will continue to be evaluated by the College Council as part of the college's commitment to continuous improvement.

Planning Agenda Item 24: “The college will strongly advocate that the district review and revise funding formulas for calculating the distribution of credit and noncredit FTES allocations and other funding mechanisms to the colleges. (IVB1b)” This planning agenda item was addressed as part of a recommendation made by the comprehensive visiting team in November 2008. District Recommendation 8 resulted in the development and implementation (effective July 1, 2010) of a new district funding model (the SB361 model). The ACCJC accepted the implementation of this model as having met the requirements of the recommendation and the standards by reaffirming DVC's accreditation in January 2011. This planning agenda item has been completed.

Planning Agenda Item 25: “The college will complete the process of creating and implementing an evaluative review of all administrative structures and functions. The administrative program reviews will provide the opportunity to regularly evaluate structural and operational effectiveness, to recommend needed changes, and to implement them in a timely manner. (IVB2a)” The college has developed an administrative program review procedure and codified that procedure as part of DVC Procedure 1016.01 (Program Review) (PA 2-1). The procedure calls for comprehensive program review for administrative programs on a three year cycle, with annual updates. Administrative program reviews are validated by a multi-constituency team and are reviewed and used by the Integration Council for resource allocation recommendations to the Budget Committee. As part of continuous quality improvement, a taskforce was formed in spring 2011 to review the administrative program review process and templates (PA 25-1, PA 25-2, PA 25-3, PA 25-4). Based on this review, recommendations for change were presented for approval in fall 2011 to be implemented in the 2011-2012 academic year. This planning agenda item has been completed.

Planning Agenda Item 26: “While district policies and practices are not in the control of this college, for the purpose of consistency, the district and the college must have standardized sources and formulas for gathering data as confidence in the accuracy and relevance of all research data is necessary for planning processes. For the college community to gain that confidence, the college administration will strongly advocate that the college and district agree upon standardized sources and formulas used in determining program planning data. (IVB2b)” The college has made significant progress toward using research data for decision making. The following examples demonstrate actions taken by the college to address this item:

- As part of the annual review of the integrated planning process, the resource allocation process and the program review process, the IC requested a standardized program review summary sheet in order to facilitate the evaluation of collegewide plans and administrative, student services and instructional unit program reviews. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee worked with the IC to develop an executive summary which was implemented in fall 2010 (PA 26-1). After one year of use and an evaluation by all users, the executive summary, containing standardized metrics, has been modified to become a part of the program review template for all three groups (PA 25-1).
- The Institutional Planning Committee hosted several meetings of the co-chairs of committees charged with developing collegewide plans in order to develop a standardized template for collegewide plans (PA 26-2, PA 26-3 and PA 26-4).
- As a result of significant reductions to the number of students that the college is funded to serve, the college community has become much more aware of the standardized calculations for determining productivity and how those values impact the size of the teaching schedule. These productivity and enrollment measures were used heavily by the joint Faculty Senate/Administrative Scheduling Task Force in spring 2011 (PA 20-3, PA 20-4, PA 20-5, PA 20-6, PA 20-7, PA 20-8, PA 20-9). In addition, research staff at the Contra Costa Community College District Office regularly publish these data (PA 26-5).
- Severe budget reductions have provided the college and the district with both the opportunity and incentive to look for efficiencies. One such efficiency is to centralize research functions in the district office. A by-product of the centralization of research services may be a more standardized approach to generating research data.

Additional work will be done as the college continues to implement its three year resource allocation plan as described in the Show Cause Report dated October 15, 2009.

Planning Agenda Item 27: “The college administration will robustly advocate for a comprehensive reexamination of the funding of the three colleges, San Ramon Campus and Walnut Creek Center, and the district office. While the budget goals, calendar and processes are reviewed and discussed at District Governance Council and recently budget goals for 08/09 were proposed and discussed at DGC [District Governance Council], this effort is clearly not adequate. The college will work with the district to establish a funding formula for district office internal operations while recognizing that it is the colleges that directly serve students. Therefore, college funding formulas must be modified so that all the colleges receive adequate funding to fulfill their missions.

The formula should reflect an understanding of the unique situation at each college, as well as providing a transparent, fair, and appropriate allocation of available funds.

(IVB3c)” As discussed above this planning agenda item was addressed as part of a recommendation made by the comprehensive visiting team in November 2008. District Recommendation 8 resulted in the development and implementation (effective July 1, 2010) of a new District funding model (the SB361 model). The ACCJC accepted the implementation of this model as having met the requirements of the recommendation and the standards by reaffirming DVC’s accreditation in January 2011. This planning agenda item has been completed although evaluation of the efficacy of the model will be challenging given the severity of the budget reductions experienced by both the college and district.

In Walnut Creek at a property leased by the college, the course offerings never amounted to 50 percent of the courses required for any educational program. Student demand was consistently weak and the college chose to allow the lease to expire and ceased offering courses in Walnut Creek.

Evidence

Statement on Report Preparation

SRP-1	DVC Faculty Senate Council Minutes (08/09/11)
SRP-2	DVC Faculty Senate Council Minutes (08/23/11) DVC Faculty Senate Council Agendas (02/07/12 and 02/14/12)
SRP-3	DVC Classified Senate Council Minutes (08/24/11) DVC Classified Senate Council Agenda (02/15/12)
SRP-4	DVC Management Council Minutes (08/24/11)
SRP-5	ASDVC Minutes (08/23/11) ASDVC agenda (02/21/12)
SRP-6	College Council Minutes (08/29/11) College Council agenda (02/13/12)
SRP-7	Contra Costa Community College Governing Board Minutes (09/12/11) Contra Costa Community College Governing Board Agenda (02/22/12)

College Recommendation One

CR-1.1	2010 New Committees and Procedures
CR-1.2	Collegewide committee survey
CR-1.3	April 27, 2010, Faculty Senate minutes
CR-1.4	October 15, 2009, Show Cause Report October 23, 2009, Addendum to Show Cause Report December 17, 2009, Addendum to Show Cause Report
CR-1.5	Collegewide committee annual reports
CR-1.6	August 3, 2010, Accreditation Steering Committee minutes
CR-1.7	August 23, 2010, College Council agenda
CR-1.8	September 13, 2010, College Council minutes
CR-1.9	September 20, 2010, College Council minutes Collegewide Committee Handbook
CR-1.10	May 11, 2010, Faculty Senate minutes May 17, 2010, College Council minutes
CR-1.11	June 1, 2010, President's message email
CR-1.12	August 11, 2010, Faculty Senate minutes
CR-1.13	August 16, 2010, Institutional Planning Committee minutes
CR-1.14	September 16, 2010, President's Message
CR-1.15	January 31, 2012 ACCJC Letter
CR-1.16	May 2011 Collegewide committee annual reports
CR-1.17	May 2, 9, and 16, 2011 College Council minutes
CR-1.18	Fall 2011 Program Review templates

College Recommendation Two

CR-2.1	DVC Procedure 1010.01
CR-2.2	December 7, 2009, Institutional Planning Committee minutes
CR-2.3	May 17, 2010, College Council minutes
CR-2.4	2010-2011 Institutional Planning Committee Membership

- CR-2.5 May 20, 2010, President’s message on Budget Reduction
- CR-2.6 Integration Council recommendations
- CR-2.7 January 20, 2010, FLEX sign-in sheets
- CR-2.8 Mohamed Eisa, Dean of Planning, Research, and Student Outcomes summary of January 20, 2010, FLEX outcomes
- CR-2.9 Faculty Senate, “Guiding the Budget Cuts” document
- CR-2.10 March 12, 2010, Budget Committee minutes
March 12, 2010, Integration Council minutes
March 22, 2010, College Council minutes
- CR-2.11 College Mission and Values statement
- CR-2.12 Integration Council recommendations with accompanying Accreditation Standards
- CR-2.13 February 16, 2010, minutes and March 16 Roles and Responsibilities documents from the co-chairs of the Integration Council and Budget Committee
- CR-2.14 March 17, 2010, President’s message email
- CR-2.15 Budget Committee Report – Recommendations for Reducing Operating Funds for the 2010-2011 Fiscal Year
- CR-2.16 Collegewide survey, question 5, item 2
- CR-2.17 April 20, 2010, Budget Committee minutes
- CR-2.18 College unit reports
- CR-2.19 Collegewide, Budget Committee, survey results #9
- CR-2.20 Manager action steps towards the accomplishments of college strategic directions
- CR-2.21 October 2009, College Accomplishments towards District Strategic Goals
- CR-2.22 May 11, 2010, Faculty Senate minutes
- CR-2.23 College Success Inquiry Documents
- CR-2.24 May 17, 2010, College Council minutes
- CR-2.25 June 1, 2010, President’s message email
- CR-2.26 August 16, 2010, Institutional Planning Committee minutes
- CR-2.27 August 23, 2010, College Council Minutes
- CR-2.28 August 11, 2010, Faculty Senate minutes
- CR-2.29 February 6, 2012, Email from College Council Chair
- CR-2.30 Governance Committee Co-Chair Meeting Dates
- CR-2.31 Institutional Planning Committee Co-chair Meeting Dates with Governance Committee Co-chairs
- CR-2.32 Fall 2011 Staff Development Flex Workshop Announcement and Attendance
- CR-2.33 Budget Committee minutes
- CR-2.34 Budget Committee Recommendations
- CR-2.35 March 18, 2011 and April 15, 2011 Integration Council Minutes
- CR-2.36 Integration Council Report
- CR-2.37 Fall 2011 Revised Integration Council Ranking Rubrics

College Recommendation Three

- CR-3.1 Kim Schenk’s email
- CR-3.2 Link to Instructional Unit Program Review Curriculum update schedule

- CR-3.3 September 16, 2009, President's email regarding one-time cuts
- CR-3.4 Program Review validation forms
- CR-3.5 Integration Council program review template and rubric
- CR-3.6 Budget Reduction for the 2010-2011 Fiscal Year Roles and Responsibilities document
- CR-3.7 March 17, 2020, President's message email
- CR-3.8 Integration Council recommendations
- CR-3.9 Integration Council recommendations with Accreditation Standards referenced
- CR-3.10 March 23, 2010, Budget Committee minutes
March 22, 2010, College Council minutes
- CR-3.11 Workforce Development guidelines
- CR-3.12 Basic Skills Initiative-Foundation for College Success Spring 2010 Application for Funds
- CR-3.13 February 26 Budget Committee minutes with Attachment A
- CR-3.14 May 20, 2010, President's message email
- CR-3.15 Budget Committee Recommendation for Reduction Operating Funds for the 2010-2011 Fiscal year, pages 5-7
- CR-3.16 Synthesis of Values and Ideas document
- CR-3.17 Unit Budget Reports and ALO Summaries
- CR-3.18 Instructional Unit Program Review survey results
- CR-3.19 May 25, 2010, Faculty Senate Minutes
- CR-3.20 March 9, 2010, Student Services Validation Committee minutes
- CR-3.21 July 14, 2010, email from Donna Floyd
- CR-3.22 February 26, 2010, Ann Patterson email
- CR-3.23 October 28, 2009 and August 4, 2010 President's Cabinet meeting minutes
November 11, 2009 Management Council minutes
- CR-3.24 June 30, 2010, Instructional Dean meeting minutes
- CR-3.25 May 11, 2010, Institutional Effectiveness Committee meeting minutes
- CR-3.26 February 22, 2010, College Council meeting minutes
- CR-3.27 Box 2A process
- CR-3.28 Instructional Unit Program Review Example, Validation, and Tracking Sheet
- CR-3.29 Administrative Program Review Template
- CR-3.30 Student Services Program Review Template
- CR-3.31 April 15, 2011, and January 27, 2012 Integration Council Minutes
- CR-3.32 Instruction Unit, Administrative, and Student Services Program Review Completion List
- CR-3.33 February 15, 2012, Rachel Westlake Email
- CR-3.34 Instructional Unit Program Review Improvement Notes
Student Services Program Review Improvement Notes
Administrative Program Review Improvement Notes
- CR-3.35 Program Review Taskforce Meeting Notes

College Recommendation Four

- CR-4.1 New College Curriculum Process
- CR-4.2 SLO data for the 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012

- CR-4.3 DVC Procedure 1017.01
- CR-4.4 March 1, 2011 Email from President Garcia
- CR-4.5 eSLO link, <http://www.dvc.edu/slos>
- CR-4.6 SLO Alignment Matrix
- CR-4.7 10-11 New Course Form
- CR-4.8 DVC Procedure 1018.01

College Recommendation Five

- CR-5.1 Show Cause Evaluation Report
- CR-5.2 February 6, 2012, email for College Council Chair
- CR-5.3 Show Cause Evaluation Report, page 20
- CR-5.4 December 12, 2011, College Council Minutes

College Recommendation Six

- CR-6.1 May 2009 Curriculum Committee minutes
- CR-6.2 Fall 2009 Curriculum Committee Minutes
- CR-6.3 DVC Procedure 4001.07
- CR-6.4 Program Development Form

College Recommendation Seven

- CR-7.1 Collegewide committee annual reports
- CR-7.2 August 2010, All College Convocation presentation
- CR-7.3 July 7, 2010, email from Chrisanne Knox, Director of Marketing & Communication
- CR-7.4 Nexus agendas and fall staff development activities
- CR-7.5 May 5, 2010, Classified Staff Development meeting minutes
- CR-7.6 ASK mentor program email from Chrisanne Knox
- CR-7.7 July 19, 2010, Coleen Lento's, Vice President of Classified Senate, email
- CR-7.8 August 2010, All College Convocation flyer and speeches
- CR-7.9 August 9, 2010, email from Faculty Senate President
- CR-7.10 Faculty Senate *Forum*
- CR-7.11 June 29, 2010, President's message email
- CR-7.12 July 1, 2010, chancellor's email
- CR-7.13 College president recruitment timelines
- CR-7.14 August 2, 2010 email from Faculty Senate President
November 16, 2010 Faculty Senate Minutes
Constituent Leaders Meeting Dates with President
- CR-7.15 Scheduling Taskforce Meeting Notes
- CR-7.16 Sample "Governance at A Glance"
- CR-7.17 Sample "DVC Next Week"
- CR-7.18 College Committee Survey Results
- CR-7.19 2011 Collegewide Committee Annual Reports
- CR-7.20 Sample College Event Notification
- CR-7.21 August 29, 2011, College Council Meeting Minutes

District Recommendation Eight

- DR-8.1 Information Technology Multi-Year Budget
- DR-8.2 New Allocation Model Proposal of November 5, 2009
- DR-8.3 District Governance Council Agenda and Minutes of November 10, 2009
- DR-8.4 District Governance Council Agenda and Minutes of December 1, 2009
- DR-8.5 Presentation to the Governing Board of December 9, 2009
- DR-8.6 District Governance Council Agenda and Minutes of January 26, 2010
- DR-8.7 2010/11 SB 361 Revenue Allocation Simulation
- DR-8.8 2010/11 SB 361 Revised Revenue Allocation Simulation
- DR-8.9 Spring 2010 Annual Budget Forum Presentation
- DR-8.10 District Governance Council Agenda and Minutes of February 16, 2010
- DR-8.11 District Governance Council Agenda and Minutes of March 23, 2010
- DR-8.12 District Governance Council Agenda and Minutes of April 20, 2010
- DR-8.13 Business Procedures 18.01, 18.02 and 18.03
- DR-8.14 Chancellor's Cabinet Agenda of March 23, 2010
- DR-8.15 Chancellor's Cabinet Agenda and Minutes of April 27, 2010
- DR-8.16 Chancellor's Cabinet Agenda of May 11, 2010
- DR-8.17 Academic Senate input to Business Procedure 18.01 from May 13, 2010 Meeting
- DR-8.18 District Governance Council Agenda and Minutes of May 18, 2010
- DR-8.19 District Governance Council Agenda and Minutes of June 21, 2010
- DR-8.20 Chancellor's Cabinet Agenda and Minutes of June 22, 2010
- DR-8.21 Governing Board Minutes of June 30, 2010
- DR-8.22 Governing Board Report of July 28, 2010 on Business Procedure 18.01
- DR-8.23 SB 361 Allocation Model of June 9, 2010
- DR-8.24 District Office Services Draft of June 1, 2010
- DR-8.25 Business Procedure 18.01
- DR-8.26 Business Director Meeting Notes, June 2, July 7, and July 19, 2011
- DR-8.27 Chancellor's Cabinet Notes, July 12, July 25, 2011

District Recommendation Nine

- DR 9-1 Board Policy 2056, Code of Ethics
- DR 9-2 Human Resources Procedure 1040.08, Employee Code of Ethical Behavior

District Recommendation Ten

- DR 10-1 Self Evaluation for Faculty

District Recommendation 11

- DR 11-1 Board Policy 1009, Institutional Leadership, Governance, and Decision-making
- DR 11-2 Administrative Procedure 1009.01, Participatory Governance
- DR 11-3 Board Policy 1012, Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment and Continuous Improvement
- DR 11-4 Administrative Procedure 1012.01, Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment and Continuous Improvement

DR 11-5 2011 CCCCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment Report and 2011 CCCCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment Results Matrix

Planning Agenda

- PA 1-1 Memorandum of Understanding for Procedures and Best Practices for Communication between the Pleasant Hill and San Ramon Valley campuses of Diablo Valley College (05/19/09)
- PA 1-2 Biology Department Bylaws (May 2010)
- PA 1-3 Math and Science Department Bylaws (03/31/09)
- PA 2-1 DVC Procedure 1016.01, Program Review
- PA 3-1 Course Revision form
- PA 3-2 Curriculum Committee Minutes (09/22/08)
- PA 3-3 Curriculum Committee Minutes (10/13/08)
- PA 4-1 DVC Procedure 1010.01, Integrated Planning
- PA 4-2 Integration Council Program Review Ranking Rubric 2010-2011
- PA 4-3 Sue Handy email to Everyone@DVC (11/15/10)
- PA 4-4 Collegewide Survey of Committees and Councils (Spring 2011)
- PA 5-1 Peter Garcia email to Everyone@DVC (03/01/11)
- PA 6-1 Instructional Unit Program Review template (2011-12)
- PA 6-2 DVC Procedure 1018.01, Student Learning Outcomes and Achievement
- PA 7-1 Math Department Minutes
- PA 7-2 Diablo Valley College Catalog (2011-12) - Associate Degree requirements (pages 59-74)
- PA 7-3 Curriculum Committee Minutes (02/23/09)
- PA 7-4 Curriculum Committee Minutes (05/04/09)
- PA 7-5 Curriculum Committee Minutes (05/11/09)
- PA 9-1 Fall 2011 Flex Schedule
- PA 9-2 Part-Time Faculty Orientation (08/09/11)
- PA 9-3 Probationary Tenure Track Faculty Orientation (08/09/11)
- PA 9-4 Faculty: Frequently Asked Questions
- PA 9-5 Syllabus Guidelines
- PA 10-1 Staff Development Workshops Offered at District Office with Rosters (2009-2011)
- PA 11-1 College Council Minutes (12/14/09)
- PA 11-2 College Council Minutes (02/22/10)

- PA 11-3 Student Equity Committee Agenda and Minutes (04/21/11)
 PA 11-4 EEOAC Agenda and Minutes (10/20/10)
 PA 11-5 College Council Minutes (05/02/11)
- PA 12-1 Student Equity Committee Minutes (05/06/11)
 PA 12-2 EEOAC Minutes (09/08/10)
 PA 12-3 EEOAC Minutes (09/22/10)
 PA 12-4 College Success Inquiry Report (May 2011)
- PA 14-1 Ben Seaberry email to Everyone@DVC (12/14/10)
- PA 15-1 Chris Leivas email to Ted Wieden (07/19/11)
 PA 15-2 Chris Leivas email to Ted Wieden (07/19/11)
 PA 15-3 DVC Campus Map (updated fall 2011)
- PA 16-1 Letter from State Chancellor's Office regarding OCR Compliance (06/28/10)
- PA 17-1 DVC Procedure 1009.01, College Governance
 PA 17-2 Diablo Valley College Handbook on College Committees (October 2010)
 PA 17-3 DVC Procedure 1001.02, College Council Charge and Function
- PA 18-1 Leading Effective Meetings (03/12/10)
 PA 18-2 Contra Costa Community College District Leadership Institute (4CDLI)
 (Spring 2010)
 PA 18-3 Classified Leadership Institute (June 2011)
- PA 19-1 Re-organization of DVC Committee Structure - Board Report presentation by
 Ted Wieden
- PA 20-1 DVC Procedure 1001.01, Process to Introduce New or Revise Existing DVC
 Procedures
 PA 20-2 DVC Procedure 1013.01, Statement of Cooperation
 PA 20-3 Scheduling Task Force Notes (02/24/11)
 PA 20-4 Scheduling Task Force Notes (03/10/11)
 PA 20-5 Scheduling Task Force Notes (03/11/11)
 PA 20-6 Scheduling Task Force Notes (03/17/11)
 PA 20-7 Scheduling Task Force Notes (04/14/11)
 PA 20-8 Scheduling Task Force Notes (04/15/11)
 PA 20-9 Scheduling Task Force Notes (04/29/11)
- PA 22-1 Coleen Geoffray-Lento email to Everyone@DVC and attachment (09/28/10)
- PA 23-1 DVC Procedure 1001.03, College Council Evaluation
 PA 23-2 College Council Minutes (05/02/2011)
 PA 23-3 College Council Minutes (05/09/2011)

- PA 25-1 Administrative Program Review Taskforce Notes (05/24/11)
- PA 25-2 Administrative Program Review Taskforce Notes (06/13/11)
- PA 25-3 Administrative Program Review Taskforce Notes (06/27/11)
- PA 25-4 Administrative Program Review Taskforce Notes (07/11/11)

- PA 26-1 Executive Summary for All Program Reviews (2010-2011)
- PA 26-2 Emily Stone email to co-chairs (01/21/11) and Minutes from Institutional Planning Committee meeting with co-chairs (01/25/11)
- PA 26-3 Emily Stone email to co-chairs (03/29/11) and attachments for Institutional Planning Committee meeting with co-chairs (03/31/11)
- PA 26-4 Emily Stone email to co-chairs (05/01/11) and attachments for Institutional Planning Committee meeting with co-chairs (05/03/11)
- PA 26-5 J. Dardin email with weekly enrollment reports (08/01/11)