FOLLOW-UP VISIT

Diablo Valley College

321 Golf Club Road

Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited

Diablo Valley College on November 4-5, 2015

Submitted to:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Submitted By:

Don Warkentin, President (Team Chair)   **West Hills College Lemoore**

Sarah Sheppard, Faculty, Business   **West Hills College Coalinga**

Kathy Werle, Vice President of Instruction   **Saddleback College**

Tim Flood, Chief Business Officer   **Grossmont College**

DATE: November 10, 2015

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

FROM: Don Warkentin, Chair

SUBJECT: Report of the Follow-Up Visiting Team to Diablo Valley College

Introduction:
At its meeting in January 2015, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges reviewed the report from the visiting team conducting the comprehensive visit for Diablo Valley College's request for reaffirmation of accreditation. At that meeting, the Commission directed Diablo Valley College to prepare a Follow-up Report addressing three college recommendations and one college/district recommendation.

The Follow-up Report was due in October 2015 and be followed by a visit to verify progress with the Commission recommendations. The Follow-Up Report would provide evidence that the college and district have resolved deficiencies and have addressed the recommendations from the visiting team. Prior to the visit, the Commission representatives were provided a copy of the College's Follow-Up Report.

In general, the team found that Diablo Valley College was well prepared for the visit by arranging for meetings with campus representatives at the Diablo Valley campus and the San Ramon campus. The College also arranged for meetings with District staff. Evidence of progress with the recommendations was provided to each team member either via the Follow-Up Report or at the campus team room.

The Follow-Up Report and Visit were expected to document resolution of the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1:
In order to fully meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College provide equitable student services to the San Ramon Campus. (II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.B.4)

Recommendation 2:
In order to fully meet the Standard, it is recommended that the library develop and systematically assess administrative unit outcomes to ensure quality improvement. (II.C.2)

Recommendation 3:
In order to fully meet the Standards, the College needs to identify its long term facilities needs by incorporating facilities management into the governance process. In order to capture all future operating costs, it is recommended that a total cost of ownership model be developed and incorporated into facilities and equipment acquisition and maintenance. (III.B.1, III.B.2.a, III.D.1.b, III.D.1.c, III.D.1.d)

College/District Recommendation 1:
In order to meet the Standard, the College and the District should thoroughly integrate student learning outcomes into the evaluation process for those who have a direct responsibility for student progress toward achieving student learning outcomes, including non-instructional faculty and staff. (III.A.1.c)

Team Analysis of College Responses to the 2015 Evaluation Team Recommendations

Recommendation 1: In order to fully meet the Standard the team recommends that the College provide equitable student services to the San Ramon Campus (II.B.1, II.B.3.a, and II.B.4)

Findings and Evidence: In response to the recommendation, the College has taken several steps to ensure equitable access to its programs and services at the San Ramon Campus. The team was able to verify by examining survey results, meeting minutes, student activity flyers, and student services program plans that the College is systematically gathering and assessing data from a variety of inputs and effectively using the information to improve support services.

The College has created a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the student service units at the Pleasant Hill and San Ramon Campuses that provides guidelines for coordination, collaboration, and communication surrounding the delivery of student support services. The College has strengthened its ability to provide services through increased hiring in several areas, most notably an interim full time senior academic student services manager who has assumed responsibility for all student services activities on the San Ramon Campus. The College has increased its professional development activities and is currently promoting the use of innovation funding to generate additional ideas focused on energizing and improving student services. Research, including a thorough needs assessment, has been conducted to help identify services specific to student's needs. As a result of that data, the campus has improved signage on campus, increased its student life activities, and is doing in-reach to current students to raise awareness of available support services.

The team interviewed student services personnel representing administration, staff, and counseling; all of whom confirmed that the College is committed to continued integration and robust communication surrounding student services to ensure that students' needs are met regardless of their location.

Conclusion: Through systematic evaluation and a commitment to continuous improvement, the College ensures that the student services at the San Ramon Campus are equitable and meet student needs. The College has met the expectations of the recommendation and now meets the Standard.

Recommendation 2: In order to fully meet the Standards, it is recommended that the library develop and systematically assess administrative unit outcomes to ensure quality improvement. (I.B.7, I.C, II.A, II.C.2)

Findings and Evidence: By the November 4, 2015 team visit, the College had conducted thoughtful evaluative data collection to inform administrative unit outcomes assessment and taken actions to improve the physical environment in the library. The Follow-Up Report identified tools used to assess library administrative unit outcomes, including student and faculty surveys and comparative

benchmarking across other libraries both in California and nationwide. Analysis of data and subsequent planning has already led to allocation of college resources to implement improvements. The team was able to confirm these activities by reviewing survey data and through conversation with five key library employees. For example, students were using a white board to make suggestions to improve their library experience, and free ear plugs were available in the study areas to reduce distraction. A tour of the library allowed the team to observe the resultant quality improvements in the physical environment.

The Follow-Up Report also indicates that ongoing assessment has become key to development of improvement plans, tying department plans to college planning, and securing resources to make continued improvement in outcomes. The team found evidence to support this assertion. There is also evidence that this recommendation has led to campus-wide communication about the value of this unit in support of student success initiatives.

Conclusion: The College has developed and implemented an ongoing assessment plan to improve service to students, and a full administrative unit review will be conducted in the 2016-2017 academic year, as scheduled. Assessment data are being discussed and analyzed by the unit members, and there is evident of action taken on the basis of assessment dialog. The team concludes that the standards addressed with this recommendation have been met.

Recommendation 3: In order to fully meet the Standard, the College needs to identify its long-term facilities needs by incorporating facilities management into the governance process. In order to capture all future operating costs, it is recommended that a total cost of ownership model be developed and incorporated into facilities and equipment acquisition and maintenance (Standards III.B.1, III.B.2.a, III.D.1.b, III.D.1.c, and III.D.1.d).

Findings and Evidence: In the Follow-Up Report, the College provided information and evidence that the College and District were planning for long-range facilities needs and incorporating facilities management into institutional and resource planning. The team found that the institution was appropriately planning for long-term maintenance and capital construction needs by reviewing various planning documents including the Facility Master Plan and the 5-year Construction Plan which are all routed through shared governance processes. The team was also able to review College Council and Governing Board meeting minutes, and interview key college and district personnel to verify that the college community is involved in the facility planning and implementation processes. The team reviewed newly updated Business Processes that established annual institutional allocations to fund prioritized maintenance projects, and reviewed plans for implementing long-term capital construction and modernization needs utilizing a recently passed bond measure.

In response to the recommendation, the College stated it had strengthened the role share governance processes play in planning for institutional facility needs and making resource allocation recommendations. Through interviews and review of planning and college forum documents the team was able to verify that the College has strengthened processes and communication efforts to fully incorporate facilities management and long-term facilities planning and resource allocation into the shared governance process. The team was able to verify that constituent groups are being engaged in facilities planning in a systematic way as part of the College's annual planning and resource allocation processes. The team was able to verify that the College, in collaboration with the District Chief Facilities Planner, has established regular processes to engage constituent groups through the College Council

and college wide forums as evidenced by the recent Measure E Planning forums. The team was able to confirm, through a review of College Council meeting minutes and interviews with constituent group representatives, that that facilities needs are annually incorporated into the College planning and resource allocation processes and is a component of program review.

The College Council Co-Chairs confirmed that changes they had requested to include building representatives during facility condition inspections had been implemented.   The team was also able to review college wide facilities forums presentations highlighting future capital construction and modernization activities funded through CCCD's measure E bond funds which provided evidence of continuing campus wide outreach and communication efforts.

In its Follow-Up Report, the College reported that the Contra Costa Community College District (CCCCD) was in the process of establishing a total cost of ownership model that will be utilized for all future facilities projects. The team was able to confirm through interviews with the District Chief Facilities Planner and Co-Chairs of the College Council that the district total cost of ownership model was currently in draft form. Once finalized, the model will be vetted through the College Council for review and approval.

The draft document that will be used to inform annual and long-term institutional planning and resource allocation processes was provided to the team. The team also reviewed updated District Business Procedures that confirm total cost of ownership calculations will be required for all large equipment, facilities construction and major remodel projects throughout the district including Diablo Valley College. The team was able to review evidence that the College's resource request form had been updated to include total cost of ownership calculations for equipment requests.

Conclusion: The institution uses Board Policies, Business Processes, as well as planning documents, which will include the newly developed total cost of ownership model, to guide facilities construction, modernization, large maintenance projects, and equipment purchases. Constituents are involved in the process through share governance committees and councils as well as college-wide forums. The College has implemented total cost of ownership into its resource allocation requests for equipment. The District Total Cost of Ownership Model for major construction and remodel projects is in draft form, but has been institutionalized through Business Process documents and established rubrics. Once finalized and approved, the model will be used on all upcoming measure E projects once project scaling has been completed. The team believes that the College has met the expectations of the recommendation and now meets standards.

College and District Recommendation 1:
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District and the College include, as a required component of the formal evaluations of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress towards achieving stated student-learning outcomes, a means to evaluate the effectiveness of that responsibility. (Standard III.A.1.c)

Findings and Evidence: The district team met with District administrators and faculty union representatives to verify the progress made on the inclusion of SLOs into the evaluation process and instruments. At the time of the visit, the District had concluded negotiations with the United Faculty

(UF), faculty union, and had engaged in a meet and confer process with the Management Council Executive Board (MCEB). The president and vice president of the UF confirmed that the negotiated process had resulted in the inclusion of SLOs into the faculty evaluation process. The revised process and instruments were ratified by union members on October 6, 2015, followed by Board approval on October 7, 2015. The team was able to review sample evaluation instruments including the forms for planning, classroom observation, self-evaluation and other forms that verify the inclusion of SLOs into the evaluation process.

The Executive Vice Chancellor, Administrative Services, who is the District's chief negotiator, also verified the evaluation process for academic administrators had been revised to include SLOs. The District Governing Board approved changes to the MCEB evaluation process and forms to include SLOs as a component of academic administrators' evaluations at its meeting on September 9, 2015. The revised process utilizes two components: Goals and Objectives Form and a Behavioral Skills Survey.

The revised evaluation process for faculty with the new forms is being piloted in fall 2015 with full implementation scheduled to take place in spring 2016. The new evaluation for administrators began in fall 2015 with the setting of goal and objectives. The inclusion of SLOs will be evident in spring 2016 when the process concludes.

The Diablo Valley College team met with DVC faculty and the Vice President of Instruction and verified the comments and evidence from the meeting with District administrators and key faculty union representatives.

Conclusion: The changes that have been made to the evaluation process for both faculty and administrators who have direct responsibility for student progress toward achieving student learning outcomes have resulted in the integration of SLOs into the evaluation process for both groups and ensure compliance with the Standard. The team finds that the colleges and District have met the expectations of the recommendation and have fully addressed the recommendation, corrected the deficiencies, and now meet the Commission's Standard.