AGENDA ITEM   B   **DATE** October 12, 2011

PURPOSE   Focused Midterm Reports for Contra Costa College and Los Medanos College

      The Focused Midterm Reports for Contra Costa College (CCC) and Los Medanos College (LMC) are presented to the Board for review, information and discussion. They have been prepared in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. Evidence cited in these reports is available for viewing in the offices of the President, CCC and LMC, and Chancellor, Contra Costa Community College District.

                                       Mojdeh Mehdizadeh

Accreditation Focused Midterm Report

October 15, 2011

Submitted By

Contra Costa College
Contra Costa Community College District
2600 Mission Bell Drive
San Pablo, CA 94806-3195

Submitted to

Accrediting Commission for
Community and Junior Colleges of the
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATION OF CONTRA COSTA COLLEGE'S FOCUSED MIDTERM REPORT

Date: September 30, 2011

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

From: Contra Costa College
   2600 Mission Bell Drive
   San Pablo, California 94806

This Focused Midterm Report certifies that there was broad participation by the campus community and that the Midterm Report accurately responds to the Accrediting Commission's recommendations.

Signed

Helen Benjamin, Chancellor, Contra Costa Community College District

---

John Nejedly, President
Contra Costa Community College District Governing Board

McKinley Williams, President, Contra Costa College

Wayne Organ, President, Contra Costa College Academic Senate

Kelly Ramos, President, Contra Costa College Classified Senate

---

Wayne Organ, Chairperson of College Council

Rodney Wilson, ASU President

Accrediting Commission Recommendations

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, prescribed in its reaffirmation of the accreditation of Contra Costa College that the college complete a Focused Midterm Report by October 15, 2011. The Midterm Report demonstrates the college and district's progress in meeting the recommendations that were set forward as follows:

College Recommendation 1: *In order to further improve its practices in relation planning and resource allocation,*
   a) *The College should review and revise as necessary its institutional planning model to make the timing, processes, and expectations of all staff in the institutional planning process more widely known and understood. (Standards I.B., I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, IV.A.2, IV.A.3)*
   b) *Technology planning should be updated and include increased technology training and subsequent utilization by staff and faculty. (Standards I.B.a, II.A.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.B, II.B.3.f, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.b, III.A.1, III.C.2, III.D.1.a, IV.A.1, IV.B.1.b)*

College Recommendation 2: *In order to achieve the Proficiency level of the ACCJC rubric relative to student learning outcomes by the year 2012, Contra Costa College should develop a comprehensive timeline for SLOs in the areas of courses and programs, library services, student services and administrative services. The college should thoroughly incorporate student learning outcomes into the curriculum and program review processes, identify systematic measureable assessments, and use the results for the improvement of student learning and instructional effectiveness.*
   a) *Student Services should engage all student services departments to complete SLOs immediately. Upon completion each department should develop meaningful assessments that will enhance planning, evaluation and lead to program improvement and feed seamlessly into the well-established program review process to support college decision making.*
   b) *Library and Learning Resources support services should immediately expand its dialogue to engage in appropriate and meaningful SLO assessment so that assessment will enhance planning, evaluation and lead to program improvement and feed seamlessly into the well-established program review process to support college decision making.*
   c) *The advice of advisory committees should be incorporated into the process of establishing and refining SLOs for vocational programs in order to provide feedback on the occupational significance and appropriateness of the SLOs. (II.A.2b)*
   d) *The college's administrative services should identify SLOs where appropriate, establish assessments and use the results for improvement. (IV.B.2.b)*

College Recommendation 3: *In order to improve its provision of information to the public, the college should develop an approach to its website redesign that will ensure its currency, accuracy and effectiveness for students and other audiences. (II.A.6.c)*

College Recommendation 4: *In order to further improve college governance, the college should establish a policy for regular evaluation of its governance policy and processes. (IV.A.5)*

District Recommendation 1: *In order to improve its resource allocation process, the district should expedite development of a financial allocation model, including the following (Standards III.C.1, III.D.1.a, III.D.2.a, III.D.3, IV.3.C):*
   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; and*
   c) *technology funding*

The special focus of the midterm report is the following:

District Recommendation 2: *In order to meet the standard, the district should establish a written code of professional ethics which includes managers. (III.A.1.d)*

District Recommendation 3: *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 towards achieving student learning outcomes. (III.A.1.c)*

District Recommendation 4: *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 colleges, and the governance and decision making structures. The results should be widely distributed and used as a basis for improvement. (IVA, IVA.1, IVA.2, IVA.3, IV B.3, IVB.3.a, IVB.3.b, IVB.3.e, IVB.3.f, IVB3.g.)*

Statement of Report Preparation

The Focused Midterm Report was written based on the progress made from Fall 2008 until early Fall 2011. Some of this progress has already been reported in the 2009 and 2010 Follow-up Reports (1. 2009 Follow-up Report and 2. 2010 Follow-up report). For the Midterm report, the faculty, staff, students, and managers directly affected by the recommendations and local planning agendas drafted, reviewed, and edited the appropriate portion of the Accreditation Focused Midterm Report.

Starting in fall 2010, the College Council, the college's main shared governance body, initiated the preparation of the Focused Accreditation Midterm Report (3. College Council Minutes – November 10, 2010). The relevant recommendations were discussed at the college's shared governance College Council, President's Cabinet, various operational groups or committees, and with individuals who participated in implementing the responses. The report was developed, reviewed, and revised numerous times throughout spring, summer and early fall 2011.

The Focused Midterm Report and its drafts were posted on the college website (4. Focused Midterm Report website). It was emailed to college faculty and staff for review, comments, and edits. The College Council approved the Focused Midterm Report at their September 2011 meeting (5. College Council Minutes-September 14, 2011). It was reviewed by the district Governing Board at their October meeting (6. Governing Board Agenda – October 12, 2011).

Response to Accrediting Commission Recommendations

College Recommendation 1 *In order to further improve its practices in relation planning and resource allocation,*
1a) The College should review and revise as necessary its institutional planning model to make the timing, processes, and expectations of all staff in the institutional planning process more widely known and understood. (Standards I.B., I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, IV.A.2, IV.A.3)

Descriptive Summary
By spring 2011, the Research and Planning Committee had reviewed the planning process and an updated integrated planning model was developed ‹7. College Council Minutes- December 8, 2010). There were clearer links among the components of the integrated planning model, especially to Student Learning Outcome Assessment (SLOA) and its consequent improvement strategies. The update also led to a clearer description of the college's process and staff involvement in planning. These changes continue the college's long standing, dynamic, and continuous planning process and clarify the integrated planning model (8. Integrated Planning Model and 9. Integrated Planning Model narrative).

In the updated integrated planning and resource allocation model, there are four main components:

1. **Strategic Initiatives** –
    Strategic Initiatives are based on the college's mission, the college's over-arching goals and are the umbrella for the development of the other integrated planning components - college wide plans, unit plans, and program review and SLOs.

    The timeline, procedure and staffing expectations:
    Strategic initiatives are developed through the College Council with participation by all constituent groups and by members of the community we serve. The initiatives are updated every five years. Updates to the strategic initiatives are completed annually along with a status report on the initiatives to the College Council and the Governing Board. Staff participates in strategic planning through their constituent representatives, committee participation, and through their operational function at the college.

2. **College Plans** –
    College wide plans include a variety of specific plans; i.e., the Educational Master Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, the Basic Skills Plan, the Technology Plan, the Matriculation Plan, and the Enrollment Management Plan.

    The timeline, procedure and staffing expectations:
    College-wide plans are developed by constituent based committees which are sub-committees of the College Council, the college's main governance body. College staff who participate in these committees are directly involved in the planning process for a particular area.

    College plans address broad college-wide issues such as enrollment management, and are typically five years in duration. The plans are reviewed and updated annually by the respective members of the sub-committee of College Council. At the end of

7

five years, an overall revision of the plan is completed by the sub-committee members and approved by the College Council (10. Sample College plans).

College strategic initiatives and the corresponding college-wide plans identify actions which may require college resources, and the plans are used to justify resource allocations authorized by the budget committee, College Council, President's Cabinet, human resources (college position prioritization-Box 2a), and management decisions.

Each year, the various committees' constituent members review their respective plans in fall term and develop targeted planned actions for that year. In spring term, committee members identify outcomes of the annual targeted action plans--both accomplishments and plans that are still outstanding. Subsequently, a report is made to College Council on the accomplishments as they support the college Strategic Initiatives. This annual reporting informs constituent representatives who can report back to their constituent groups and is publicized in College Council minutes which are available on the *Insite* portal to all college staff. The same report goes to the Governing Board about CCC's planned accomplishments (11. 2009-10 Report on Strategic Initiatives).

3. **Program Review and Student Learning Outcomes**
   Program review has long been established at CCC and fully incorporates SLOs. It is a process of continuous self study and assessment by programs and units of the college. It ensures an ongoing cycle of review, analysis, action plans, and improvements.

   The timeline, procedure and staffing expectations:
   Program review occurs every four years for all educational and administrative programs/units of the college and is updated every two years for career technical educational programs. Programs are assigned a fall or spring term due date to complete their program review. This program review timeline is widely available and posted on the college website (12. Program Review timeline).

   Programs are alerted at the beginning of each term of their responsibilities. College members who are part of a program/unit complete a self study and assess student learning outcomes (SLOs) or as appropriate, administrative unit outcomes (AUOs). College members assemble the results of their self study and SLOAs/AUOAs and develop recommendations and action plans for the program/unit. These program reviews address facility, human resource, technology, curricular, learning, and fiscal resource needs. The program review action plans and recommendations are validated by a cross constituent team and reported to President's Cabinet for review and to address their resource needs as budget allows.

   The program review handbook for instructional and non-instructional programs and the SLO/AUO handbook clearly outline expectations and processes for conducting both program review and SLO/AUO assessment and the necessity for developing action plans and identifying resource needs (13. Instructional Program Review guidelines, 14. Non-instructional Program Review guidelines, and 15. SLO Handbook).

4. **Annual unit plans**

Unit plans are submitted annually to the Business office and designate the yearly plan for each operational unit. This is usually completed as part of a request for budget augmentation.

The timeline, procedure and staffing expectations:
Operational unit plans are created yearly by the staff of each operational area of the college. They are based on program review, SLO/AUO assessment findings, align with the college's strategic initiatives and as much as possible, reflect college-wide plans. Requests for annual unit plans are tied to the budget augmentation process. The Business Office requests the submission of unit plans and correlated budget augmentation applications in early spring term. The Budget Committee reviews the augmentation requests, unit plans and other metrics approved by the College Council to prioritize budget augmentation awards (16. College Council minutes-April 13, 2011). CCC's budget augmentation process relies on the justification of unit plans, their tie to program review findings, strategic initiatives, SLOA recommendations, and other college planning efforts.

The college has updated its integrated planning model and communicated the various timelines, process, and responsibilities identified above with college staff in a PowerPoint presentation brought to each division, emailed to all staff, and posted on the website (17. Planning PowerPoint Presentation). The Integrated Planning Model and college plans are also available on CCC's web site (18. Planning Website).

Analysis of the Results Achieved to Date
To make the planning process more widely understood, the college's integrated planning model was reviewed and updated by the constituent based Research and Planning Committee. With the guidance of College Council, the integrated planning model's processes, timelines, and staff roles and expectations were communicated to college staff in a variety of ways. A PowerPoint was developed of the integrated planning model's main components, timelines, individuals, committees, or units who are involved and responsible for the planning components. It serves as an employee resource to clarify and update the functions of CCC's integrated planning model and how staff is involved. This presentation was presented at each college division in spring 2011. It was emailed to all college staff and the planning presentation is appended to the integrated planning model and posted on the college website. College members have been updated about the integrated planning model and its correlated timelines, processes, and responsibilities through a variety of means.

Additional Plans: None

College Recommendation 1: *In order to further improve its practices in relation planning and resource allocation,*
1b) Technology planning should be updated and include increased technology training and subsequent utilization by staff and faculty. (Standards I.B.a, II.A.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.B, II.B.3.f, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.b, III.A.1, III.C.2, III.D.1.a, IV.A.1, IV.B.1.b)

Descriptive Summary

The college's Technology Strategic Plan has been updated by the CCC Technology Committee to address technology planning through 2012 (19. CCC Technology plan and 20. College Council minutes – April 13, 2011). The Technology Strategic Plan focuses primarily on the following themes: training, access, efficiency, and standards. Additionally, the collective technology management of the district, which includes the technology managers from each of the campuses, the district Chief Information Officer, and the other district technology managers, has completed a district-wide Technology Plan. The district-wide plan addresses voice and data equipment infrastructure as well as cabling and physical plant (21. District-wide Strategic Infrastructure / Telecommunications Plan).

The campus Technology Strategic Plan called for the implementation of a new college website (www.contracosta.edu) which was completed in March 2010. Training in the use and maintenance of the new website has been ongoing since its launch, occurring twice a month through the end of the first calendar year and then once a month thereafter (22. Sample staff development calendar).

The CCC Information Technology department has also provided individualized training as needed. Staff and content owners are trained to edit and update their own web pages. This has been especially helpful since the college, due to budget cuts, can no longer afford to maintain a full-time webmaster position. Numerous staff members have completed the website maintenance training and the vibrant website is now maintained by staff across the college (23. SharePoint training document).

Training has improved for the development of online courses. The college standardized on a self hosted WebCT learning management system and created a reassigned time faculty position - distance education coordinator - to provide training to faculty. The faculty distance education coordinator provides regular training during flex/staff development week and ongoing individual and group trainings during the school year, which has led to an increase in hybrid and online class offerings.

Another mechanism which has increased faculty and staff use of electronic media is the launching of the district *Insite* portal mid-2010 and the training offerings in its use. The *Insite* portal provides more communication with faculty, staff, and students and access to course listings, and additional faculty generated course section information. Trainings are coordinated through the staff development office and offered by District Information Technology staff. Contra Costa College currently has been the most active in the use of the *Insite* portal with over 70 course sections adopting it in the fall 2010 term. The college has also created portal sites for organizational units and items such as committee minutes on the *Insite* portal (24. *Insite* portal website).

Recognizing the plan for increased reliance on technology and electronic communication, the college designated funds to upgrade computers and/or implement virtualization of computers. There is a $100,000 set aside for computer upgrades (25. Designated Reserves). The college has improved its campus IT infrastructure and added thirteen new smart classrooms in Fall 2011 due to faculty demand for access to smart classrooms (26. Fall 2011 Classroom List and 27. Council of Chairs minutes-October 6, 2010).

Analysis of the Results Achieved to Date

The college has a current, updated Technology Strategic plan. The college has increased technology training and use of technology faculty and staff. According to plan, the college has

expanded technology training and support for instructional technology use. These efforts have resulted in faculty and staff continuing to increase their use of technology - for example with WebCT- distance education, the CCC website, or the *Insite* portal pages for classes and departments. In addition to providing training and increasing technology use, the college has prioritized funding for technology equipment and upgrades to ensure continued technological use.

Additional Plans: None

College Recommendation 2: *In order to achieve the Proficiency level of the ACCJC rubric relative to student learning outcomes by the year 2012, Contra Costa College should develop a comprehensive timeline for SLOs in the areas of courses and programs, library services, student services and administrative services. The college should thoroughly incorporate student learning outcomes into the curriculum and program review processes, identify systematic measureable assessments, and use the results for the improvement of student learning and instructional effectiveness.*

Descriptive Summary
The college developed a comprehensive timeline for Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), as stated in its 2009 Follow-up Report (28. 2009 Follow-up Report). The SLO timeline has been integrated into the well established ongoing program review timeline (29. Program review timeline). This integration created a seamless tie between ongoing SLO assessment (SLOA) and ongoing program review and its recommendations and action plans. This has ensured an ongoing cycle of SLO development, assessment, evaluation and improvement. All units of the college – courses, programs, student services, library and learning support services, and administration are conducting ongoing SLO assessment and will have completed at least one cycle of SLOA/AUOA by the end of 2012. With SLOs tied to the program review's two- or four-year cycles, the pattern of ongoing assessment is well established.

As mentioned in the 2009 Follow-Up Report, the college has incorporated SLOs into both the curriculum and program review procedures. For years, the College Instruction Committee (CIC) has overseen the development and updating of SLOs. When a new course or program is submitted for approval, it must also submit appropriate SLOs. The college has also incorporated SLO and assessment into the program review process. The instructional and non-instructional program review guidelines were revised to incorporate SLOs by the Academic Senate and approved by the College Council in 2009 (30. Instructional program review guidelines, 31. Non-instructional program review guidelines).

Since the 2009 Follow-up Report, the college has continued to build its ongoing assessment of student learning. The 2010 year had a large amount of assessment for instructional and service programs SLOs taking place as part of the program review cycle.

Leadership for the development of ongoing SLOA has stemmed from the Academic Senate and the SLO Coordinating Committee, made up of faculty representatives from each division, the faculty SLO coordinator, a division dean, a student services manager, the faculty CIC chairperson, the Senior Dean of Research and Planning, the Academic Senate President, and college Vice President. They have regular meetings either every other week or monthly as needed. They discuss issues regarding the establishment of ongoing SLO assessment at the college.

11

The SLO Coordinating Committee also acts as a resource for faculty and staff in the implementation of SLOAs. In 2010, the SLO Coordinating Committee decided that prior college-wide SLO training had run its course of effectiveness and focus on departmental or individual training was the next step to support SLOA implementation. To accomplish this, they created a faculty SLO mentor (a representative on the committee from each division) who took responsibility for SLO training of faculty and staff in their division who were working on ongoing assessment and program review. This intervention directly assisted faculty and staff with practical operational suggestions for how to implement SLO assessment in their own course, program or service. The Senior Dean of Research and Planning also assisted faculty and staff with assessment designs on an individual basis as requested (32. Sample SLO Coordinating Committee minutes).

The SLO Coordinating Committee has also resolved procedural assessment questions with unique courses. This was the case with 298 - independent study courses. These courses are offered randomly, as student need arises. Each subject area has an active 298 – independent study course - even though it might not be offered for many years. The SLO Coordinating Committee recommended that a standard 298-independent study course SLO be developed through the CIC. The college then assessed 298-independent study outcomes of 298 courses offered that year, and the results were reported to the Council of Chairs. This led to faculty discussions about independent study findings and awareness of how to improve student learning in independent study courses (33. Council of Chairs minutes- October 6, 2010).

Another major player in support of SLO implementation is the college's reassigned time faculty SLO coordinator. The SLO coordinator is actively involved in supporting SLO assessment throughout the college, revised program review guidelines to include SLOs, created a standard SLO assessment reporting form, and published a comprehensive SLO handbook that synthesizes the information from many of the SLO trainings that were held since 2008 (34. SLO handbook). The SLO coordinator also created a thorough SLO and assessment website to provide support, guidance, forms, and materials on SLOs (35. SLO website). In addition, faculty and staff who are completing SLO assessment, report their findings at a division meeting to promote dialog about SLOs.

The college has ongoing SLO assessment taking place throughout the various instructional, student and learning services and administrative units of the college. Most units are in the process of conducting assessment, making improvements based on their findings, and/or revising their SLOs to measure new information or to more effectively measure current efforts. In order to determine if the college has ongoing assessment, CCC has developed an SLO tracking system that records completed assessment cycles as assessment results are incorporated into program review. This system allows the college to track SLOA progress. In the future, the college hopes to have an electronic SLO tracking system. However, with the reduction of staff due to budget, the college has chosen to refine the manual system.

The college has made excellent Student Learning Outcome and assessment progress. One hundred percent of all courses, programs, student services, learning resources, and administration have SLOs or as appropriate AUOs. The college has been actively involved in developing ongoing SLO assessment according to the program review timeline. Seventy-six percent of courses and sixty-two percent of instructional programs have ongoing assessment and have completed at least one cycle of assessment. The library and learning resources have ongoing SLO assessment. All of student services units have ongoing assessment. One hundred percent of administrative services, with their primary focus on Administrative Unit

Outcomes (AUOs), have SLOs or AUOs. Eighty-eight percent of administrative units have ongoing assessment according to the program review timeline. The college is in the process of conducting general education assessment and institutional core competency outcome assessment (36. SLO assessment progress report).

The feather in the CCC's SLO hat is that both the Speech and Culinary Arts departments received the 2010-11 State-wide Research and Planning Group's P.O.W.E.R awards for outstanding program outcome assessment (37. POWER award notification). Instead of giving just one award, the judges, who are SLO experts from the Research and Planning group and the State Academic Senate, were so impressed with the "innovative ways that each department used program outcomes assessment to improve student success," that they gave two awards for excellence to Contra Costa College programs.

Analysis of the Results Achieved to Date

The college has a timeline for SLO assessment (SLOA), and it is the timeline for its well established program review cycle. This program review/SLO timeline has been established so that all college units, courses and programs should have ongoing assessment by 2012. Program review guidelines incorporate SLOs and expect SLOA findings to be reported as part of program review.

The CIC reviews and approves SLOs for courses and programs. The SLO Coordinating Committee effectively supports SLO assessment as do the division deans. College faculty and staff are following the program review guidelines and assessing SLOs as part of their program review cycle and incorporating those findings into their program review action plans and recommendations.

One hundred percent of all courses, programs and services had SLOs in spring 2011. There has been significant progress in SLO assessment with seventy-six percent of college courses and sixty-two percent of instruction programs with ongoing assessment. One hundred percent of student services have ongoing assessment. The library services have ongoing SLO assessment. All administrative units have AUOs or as appropriate SLOs and eighty-eight percent have ongoing assessment. College core competencies and general education requirements are currently in the process of being assessed.

The receipt of two P.O.W.E.R. awards is a strong indicator of CCC's successful commitment to SLO assessment to improve student learning and how the faculty and staff have integrated SLOA and its benefit to student learning into its ongoing efforts to improve student learning.

The findings of SLO assessment are incorporated into program review recommendations and plans. The college is on track with its program review timelines and should reach a proficiency level with the implementation of SLOs by 2012.

Additional Plans: Continue to implement ongoing SLO assessment of courses, programs, and administration.

College Recommendation 2a) Student Services should engage all student services departments to complete SLOs immediately. Upon completion each department should develop meaningful assessments that will enhance planning, evaluation and lead to program

improvement and feed seamlessly into the well-established program review process to support college decision-making.

Descriptive Summary

As stated in the 2009 Follow-up Report, all student services departments completed their SLOs in 2009. Currently all student service departments have ongoing assessment (36. SLO assessment progress report). These SLO assessments have resulted in recommendations to improve services and/or affirmations of current service effectiveness, as mentioned in the 2009 Follow-up Report (38. 2009 Follow-up Report). Student service departments, according to program review guidelines, have incorporated their SLO findings into program review recommendations.

The student services division also developed student services core competencies to provide a common focus for each student service department to develop its own SLOs. Holistically setting student services core competencies paid off with a deeper understanding of SLOs shared by all departments.

Analysis of the Results Achieved to Date

Student service departments have embraced SLOAs and implemented the findings in their departments. For example, this has led to improvements in the methods to disseminate financial aid information. All student services departments have ongoing SLO assessment, some have made improvements based on SLOA findings, and all have incorporated SLOA findings into their program review and its action plans. Student services core competencies are being assessed at the department level. This allows individual departments to be guided by the core competencies, to create SLOs, and to conduct assessment that meets their specific department's student learning needs while supporting student service division core competencies.

Additional Plans: None

College Recommendation 2b) Library and Learning Resources support services should immediately expand its dialogue to engage in appropriate and meaningful SLO assessment so that assessment will enhance planning, evaluation and lead to program improvement and feed seamlessly into the well-established program review process to support college decision making.

Descriptive Summary

In summer 2009, Library and Learning Resources expanded their dialogue about SLO assessment as outlined in the 2009 Accreditation Follow-up Report (38. 2009 Follow-up Report). Library staff reviewed their SLOs and collaboratively identified which SLOs to assess. Since then the library has continued ongoing SLO assessment while maintaining faculty and staff participation in the review of SLOAs. The library completed a recent program review with SLO assessment results and action recommendations. In addition to expanding their dialogue within the library, staff broadened involvement and shared their SLO assessment findings at a division meeting as expected by the CCC program review guidelines (39. LAVA division minutes April 11, 2009).

Learning resource staff have ongoing SLO assessment and expanded their SLOA dialogue to include multiple tutoring sites. For example, college-wide tutoring updated their SLOs, and

14

various tutoring sites agreed to use similar SLOs and assessment measures. College-wide tutoring and College Skills Center completed program review in Spring 2010. SLOA outcomes were incorporated into learning resource program reviews and action plans (40. College Skills Center program review- section C-4 and C- 5).

Analysis of the Results Achieved to Date
The library and learning resource areas have expanded their dialogue about SLOA and are conducting ongoing SLO assessment and incorporating their findings into their program review's self study. These efforts have enhanced college decision making. For example, with assessment results demonstrating the effectiveness of tutoring, the college created additional funds to support tutoring even as it made budget reductions in other areas.

Additional Plans: Continue ongoing SLO assessment.

College Recommendation 2c) The advice of advisory committees should be incorporated into the process of establishing and refining SLOs for vocational programs in order to provide feedback on the occupational significance and appropriateness of the SLOs. (II.A.2b)

Descriptive Summary
In 2009, the CCC's Career Technical Education (CTE) programs held a college-wide CTE advisory summit for all CTE programs. This strategy assisted the college in continuing a successful relationship between CTE advisory boards and CTE programs that ensured the occupational significance and appropriateness of both CTE programs and their SLOs. The 2009 CTE summit allowed CTE programs to get feedback from their advisory committees on SLOs and SLOAs. In addition, other CTE programs that didn't attend the summit conducted separate meetings, some of which were electronic, to ensure they got feedback about program SLOs (41. 2009 Follow-up Report).

In March 2011, the second CTE advisory board summit was planned to review the results of the SLO assessments and to further develop methodologies for assessments of CTE program SLOs. However, a college-wide power outage prevented the summit from occurring. Instead, CTE programs worked individually with their advisory boards or on online conferences (CCConfer.org) to review SLOA outcomes and to garner feedback and suggestions as needed (42. Sample Nursing CTE program advisory minutes and 43. HHS CTE program advisory survey on SLOs). In addition, the CTE programs, through their CTE committee, institutionalized a standard survey, with some tailoring for individual CTE programs, to capture employer feedback, satisfaction, or needed improvement with program graduates' skills that can be used to refine SLOs and provide SLOA information (44. ADJUS employer survey results).

Analysis of the Results Achieved to Date
The CTE advisory boards have reviewed and been involved in developing their respective CTE program and course SLOs and SLO assessment results for CCC's CTE programs. Advisory committee involvement in SLOs and SLOAs is a natural extension of their involvement with CCC CTE programs. They ensure CTE programs meet occupational needs and are high quality educational preparation for the workforce.

Additional Plans: Continue involving advisory boards in refining SLOs

College Recommendation 2d) The college's administrative services should identify SLOs where appropriate, establish assessments and use the results for improvement. (IV.B.2.b)

Descriptive Summary
One hundred percent of the college's administrative units have developed AUOs or SLOs as appropriate to the functions of the unit. The college's well established non-instructional program review procedure has incorporated administrative unit SLO/AUOs and has a program review timeline that will make sure that administrative units complete assessment by fall 2012 (45. Non-Instructional Program review and 46. Program review timeline). Eighty-eight percent of the administrative units have completed SLO/AUO assessment (47. SLO assessment progress report).

Analysis of the Results Achieved to Date
The college's administrative units are implementing AUO or SLO assessment, as appropriate. Fifteen of seventeen administrative units have ongoing assessment. Administrative units will be at the proficiency level by 2012.

Additional Plans: Continue ongoing SLO/AUO assessment

College Recommendation 3: In order to improve its provision of information to the public, the college should develop an approach to its website redesign that will ensure its currency, accuracy and effectiveness for students and other audiences. (II.A.6.c)

Descriptive Summary
The college completed the revision of its website in March 2010 (48. Contra Costa College Website - www.contracosta.edu). It was completed over a period of one and one-half years and was developed using SharePoint, a software that allows end users to maintain their own webpage information. A college taskforce was assembled to guide the development of the new website which had broad representation including students (49. Sample Website Team minutes - April 21, 2009). The taskforce provided direction to website focus, appearance, the organization of information, and the software to allow the college to maintain current accurate data on the website. The new website was designed primarily for potential students and external audiences and secondarily for current students and faculty and staff.

The approach to website development and maintenance relies on each college unit or faculty/staff to maintain their own web pages. This allows faculty and staff, once trained in easy to use software – SharePoint - to build and update their own web pages. Training has been provided monthly by the college and with the advent of the district *Insite* portal which relies upon the same SharePoint software – even more staff have been trained and are using the same software to maintain both the college website and its portal (50. Sample staff development calendar with SharePoint training).

Analysis of the Results Achieved to Date
The updating of the college website has created currency, accuracy and a greater amount of useful information on the website. The new college website also has a better look and feel with much clearer information organization and ease of navigating the site. The communication of information through the college website to students has significantly improved. Website information updating is standardized on SharePoint software and much easier. The college is

satisfied with its updated website and the ongoing maintenance of accurate and current information.

Additional Plans: None

College Recommendation 4: In order to further improve college governance, the college should establish a policy for regular evaluation of its governance policy and processes. (IV.A.5)

Descriptive Summary
The college has established a procedure for regular evaluation of its governance process. On March 20, 2009, College Council approved this new governance evaluation procedure, A1008.00 - Reviewing the Governance Process (51. CCC procedure A1008 - Reviewing the Governance Process and 52. College Council minutes- March 20, 2009). In the process of discussing college governance, College Council agreed to review its by-laws. As the main shared governance body, College Council formed a constituent based sub-committee to make recommendations about changes to its by-laws. These by-laws were drafted and submitted to the College Council for discussion and approved (53. College Council minutes December 8, 2010). The by-laws constituted a codification and clarification of the College Council's governance decision making process (54. College Council by-laws).

In Spring 2011, according to CCC's procedure A1008, the Research and Planning Office conducted an evaluation of the CCC governance process. They developed a survey which was administered to students and staff constituents regarding the governance process.
In fall 2011, College Council reviewed the governance evaluation results. College Council began its discussion of these evaluation results at their September 14, 2011 meeting (54.5 Sept 14, 2011 College Council meeting minutes).

Analysis of the Results Achieved to Date
The college has approved an evaluation policy and is implementing its first cycle of evaluation.

Additional Plans: None

District Recommendations Introduction
Subsequent to the October 2008 comprehensive visits from the ACCJC to the colleges, the District received four District-wide recommendations in January 2009. Of the four recommendations, District Recommendation 1 regarding the resource allocation process required expeditious action and has been addressed to the satisfaction of the ACCJC.

District Recommendation 1: In order to improve its resource allocation process, the district should expedite development of a financial allocation model, including the following (Standards III.C.1, III.D.1.a, III.D.2.a, III.D.3, IV.3.C):
   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; and
   c) technology funding

Descriptive Summary and Analysis of Results Achieved to Date

This recommendation has been satisfied as witnessed by a letter to each college from ACCJC dated January 31, 2011 (55. January 31, 2011 letter to CCC from the Accrediting Commission).

Additional Plans: None. This recommendation has been satisfied.

District Recommendation 2: *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

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.

Analysis of Progress to Date

The Governing Board adopted new Board Policy 2056, Code of Ethics, (56. Board Policy 2056) 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, Employee Code of Ethical Behavior, (57 .HR procedure 1040.08) previously adopted by the Chancellor's Cabinet on April 5, 2005, is directed to all District administrators.

Additional Plans: None

District Recommendation 3: *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

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 On-line 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, 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 (58. Revised faculty evaluation forms).

Analysis of Progress to Date
The evaluation of student learning outcomes was implemented in the faculty evaluation process in the Fall 2010 term. 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.

Additional Plans: None

District Recommendation 4: 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
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.

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) and Board Policy 1012 (with related Administrative Procedure 1012.01), are attached in evidence. In addition, a District Governance Survey has been developed to solicit feedback from district stakeholders on the effectiveness of the governance and decision-making process. Results of the 2011 governance survey – 2011 CCCCD District Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment Report—are attached in evidence. See chart below for attached evidence.

Analysis of Progress to Date
The chart below summarizes actions taken to satisfy district-wide Accreditation Recommendation 4.

Policy/Procedure/Survey	Action
• Board Policy 1009, Institutional Leadership and Governance (59. Board Policy 1009)	Revised to include institutional leadership and alignment with the governance and decision-making structure
• Administrative Procedure 1009.01,	Revised to acknowledges the "participatory"

Participatory Governance (60. Administrative Procedure 1009.01)	governance structure and includes management in that structure
• Board Policy 1012, Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment, and Continuous Improvement (61. Board Policy 1012)	Revised to address institutional effectiveness and broaden the scope to include assessment, continuous improvement, and a linkage to budget allocations
• Administrative Procedure 1012.01, Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment, and Continuous Improvement (62. Administrative Procedure 1012.01)	Developed new procedure which delineates roles and responsibilities and addresses assessment and continuous improvement activities
• District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment Report (63. 2011 CCCCD District Level Governance and Decision Making Report)	Developed assessment survey through District Governance Council (DGC) to solicit feedback from District stakeholders and assess the effectiveness of the District's governance and decision-making structure. The survey was administered District-wide on February 24, 2011, and the results were shared first with Cabinet on May 4, 2011, and then with the District Governance Council (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.

Additional Plans: None

CCC Self Study Planning Summary

Overview

Since the completion of the accreditation report, CCC has been faced, as most colleges in California, with major budget reductions. This decline in resources has affected the college's ability to complete some of its self identified plans--especially ones that rely upon funding for completion. However, a great deal of progress has been made, and the college has reprioritized its efforts to effectively serve students with fewer resources.

In some cases, the college's self-identified planning agenda directly corresponds to the Accrediting Commission recommendations; i.e., SLOs. SLO implementation is also mentioned a number of times in various planning agendas. When this is the case, the planning summary may refer the reader to the corresponding, more comprehensive college "Response to the Accrediting Commission's Recommendations" in the first portion of this report.

Standard I

1. Complete the design, implementation, and assessment of SLOs in academic programs and Student Services.

The college's SLO and SLOA implementation is well on its way. One hundred percent of all courses, programs, and student services have SLOs or, as appropriate, AUOs. The college has been actively involved in conducting ongoing SLO assessment. Seventy-six percent of courses and sixty-two percent of instructional programs have ongoing assessment. The library and learning resources have ongoing SLO assessment. All of student services units have ongoing assessment. The college will meet its proficiency level for SLO implementation by 2012.

Please see the college's response to the Accrediting Commission's college recommendation #2 on SLOs above for more complete SLO information, analysis and evidence.

Timeline: 2012 and ongoing   Responsible: CCC managers, faculty, and staff

2. Ensure all constituency groups share the college planning agenda and actions with their members and the information is recorded in meeting minutes.

College Council and all sub-committees of College Council are composed of governance constituent members. As the sub-committees, develop their respective plans, the constituent members participate in the plan development and have the responsibility of taking the proposed plan to their respective constituent members for review and feedback. When the proposed plan goes to College Council for approval, the, Council's constituent members also communicate the plan and its actions at their constituent meetings.

Timeline: Ongoing   Responsible: Constituent Presidents

Standard II

1. Continue to work on the implementation and documentation of student learning outcomes.

The college continues to implement SLO and SLOA according to its program review timeline. This implementation is documented in the SLO assessment progress report.

Please see the college's response to the Accrediting Commission's college recommendation #2 on SLOs above for more information. It provides a more complete description, analysis and evidence of SLO and SLO assessment throughout the college.

Timeline: 2012 and ongoing   Responsible: CCC managers, faculty, and staff

2. *Expand the use of instructional technology, bringing new and exciting teaching modes to our students.*

Since 2009, the college continued to increase its use of instructional technology with two primary methods – training and the provision of instructional equipment. The college designated a faculty distance education coordinator and provided reassigned time to support other faculty and their development of online and hybrid classes and other instructional technology use. Secondly, the college built more 'smart' classrooms. In 2010, CCC remodeled the AA building to include more 'smart' classrooms with greater instructional technology capacity. In 2011, to meet faculty demand for classroom instructional technology, the college added 13 more smart classrooms across the campus. In addition, the college revised its website and opened the *In*site portal for student and faculty use. Both the website and the *In*site portal use the software SharePoint that allows end users to update their web or portal data. This has led to increased instructional and student service web content and over 70 classes with information posted on the *In*site portal for student access. In addition, a 2009-10 sabbatical leave focused on hybrid class instruction and others included development of electronic instructional material to enhance learning. Please see college recommendation #1b above for more information, analysis and evidence.

Timeline: Ongoing   Responsible: Staff development, Technology Committee, Information Technology manager, Vice President

3. *Implement the assessment of SLOs and make learning outcome improvements.*

The college's SLO and SLOA implementation is well on its way with assessment happening in seventy- six percent of courses, sixty-two percent of programs, one hundred percent of student services, and eighty-eight percent of administration with ongoing assessment by early fall 2011. The college will meet its proficiency level for SLO implementation by 2012.

Please see the college's response to the Accrediting Commission's college recommendation #2 above for more information. It provides a more complete description, analysis and evidence of SLO and SLO assessment throughout the college.

Timeline: 2012 and ongoing   Responsible: CCC managers, faculty, and staff

4. *Develop a documentation method for SLO assessment processes.*

The college has an effective SLO assessment progress tracking system using a spreadsheet. The college would like to have an electronic tracking system. However, budget has limited progress on the design and implementation of an electronic system. For further information, please see the college's response to the Accrediting Commission's college recommendation #2 above. It provides a more complete description, analysis and evidence of SLO and SLO assessment throughout the college.

Timeline: Completed

5. Develop SLO design and assessment processes appropriate to the academic disciplines that have not done so.

The college's SLO and SLOA implementation is well on its way with about seventy-six percent of courses, sixty-two percent of programs and ongoing assessment in the library and learning resources by fall 2011. The college will meet its proficiency level for SLO implementation by 2012.

Please see the college's response to the Accrediting Commission's college recommendation #2 above for more information. It provides a more complete description, analysis, and evidence of SLO and SLO assessment throughout the college.

Timeline: 2012 and ongoing   Responsible: CCC managers, faculty and staff

6. Complete the development and assessment of program and GE SLOs.

Program assessment
Program SLOs have been developed through the College Instruction Committee (CIC) and assessed as part of the college's systematic program review. According to program review guidelines, when an instructional program is reviewed it includes assessment of its program/s SLOs. To assist with program SLO assessment, the SLO coordinator has provided program SLOA examples that are available on the college SLO resources website.

According to the program review timeline, all programs should have completed program review and assessed their programs by fall 2012.   As of early fall 2011, sixty-two percent of programs have ongoing assessment.

General Education Assessment
In 2009-10, the college developed General Education (GE) SLOs through the Academic Senate's General Education Committee. The SLO coordinator in collaboration with the Research and Planning Committee developed a method of assessing the GE SLOs. An assessment of General Education SLOs and college core competencies are currently in progress this fall 2011.

Please see the college's response to the Accrediting Commission's college recommendation #2 above for more information. It provides a more complete description, analysis, and evidence of SLO and SLO assessment throughout the college.

Timeline: 2012 and ongoing   Responsible: Research and Planning Committee and SLO coordinator

7. Improve our college's website and develop a system for maintaining up to date webpage information.

The college has completely revised and launched its new college website in March 2010.   It uses SharePoint software that allows each end user to update their own web information. Please see the college's response to the Accrediting Commission's College recommendation #3 above for more information, analysis and evidence.

Timeline: Completed

8. Develop a plan to better identify support needs of incoming students.

In order to develop a plan to meet student needs, the student services division first surveyed new students to determine their needs. The survey was piloted in spring 2010. It mainly focused on gauging the use and knowledge of student services by new students. The survey data provided information about what services students used and the ease of use. The survey information was reviewed and included in the Student Life Program review. This allowed student service units to more clearly identify the support needs of incoming students and develop annual unit action plans to address students' stated needs within the limits of budget.

In addition, student services developed a means for new students to identify their student service needs and interests on the current online application form – CCCApply. Students check areas of service need on the application and receive an email informing them of a specific person's contact information for the student service area/s they identified.

Timeline: 2012   Responsible: Student Services

9. Increase outreach efforts to under-represented segments of service area.

Though CCC resources are more limited than before due to budget cuts, the college continues to support outreach efforts to at risk students: Veterans, Foster Youth, Hispanics, and the African-American male population. There is an effort to target special groups and maximize reduced resources. Since 2009, CCC has developed a Re-entry Connection, received an EOPS grant for service to ex-offenders, and established a Veterans Committee to provide better outreach and services. CCC has also applied for numerous grants to increase outreach to under-represented groups. The college was just awarded a five year Title V Hispanic serving institution grant to provide more outreach to the Hispanic population.

Some of the activities the college has provided even with reduced funding are: more consistent hours for CTE counselors at all feeder High Schools, recruitment to our Puente and UMOJA learning communities, and faculty representatives who participate in outreach.

In 2009, the college established three off-campus locations for class offerings in Pittsburgh, El Cerrito and Hercules to serve its off-campus community. In 2010-11 the Pittsburgh Culinary Center was closed. The other two off-campus centers are still active. CCC continues to hold college classes at local high schools in the late afternoon. The EOPS/CARE Program offers the Summer Academic Bridge which targets re-entry and graduating seniors from high school and provides students with a college success course and a cultural field trip. The college also offers a grant funded National Action Council for Minorities in Engineering (NAMCE) summer program for high school seniors and graduates to improve math and science skills.

Financial aid continues to offer "I Can Afford College" and "Cash for College" campaigns with financial aid workshops both on-campus and at local feeder high schools. To support former foster youth, grant funds were used for emergency aid and book vouchers. Notwithstanding limited staffing and funding, student services continues to support outreach activities for the college's under-represented student population. Currently, a workshop series provides foster youth financial literacy and community resource information in the area of budgeting, transitional/emergency housing, and employment. There are educational workshops for CalWORKS, ESL, and Veteran populations. In spring 2011, the college conducted outreach efforts to under-represented groups by promoting the Kennedy-King Memorial Scholarship

Program and the Chicana/Latina Foundation Scholarship via workshops, mock interviews and individual appointments.

CCC also sponsors on campus events for middle school and high school students to develop an early knowledge of a pathway to college. For example, the college has sponsored the "Expanding Your Horizons" conference for middle school girls for four middle schools.

Timeline: Ongoing   Responsible: Student Services Council, Financial Aid, Vice President, President, and various departments

10. Build First Year Experience (FYE) to support student success.

Implemented in fall 2008 and strengthened in fall 2010 to support first year basic skills students, the FYE program provides first year students support to improve their retention, success and persistence at CCC. The FYE consists of the following components: A designated FYE academic counselor, classroom presentations recruiting FYE students, special orientation to college for FYE students, FYE student assessment, orientation and educational planning, and special FYE events and workshops throughout the year. The college has also emailed all new CCC students and targeted students enrolled in basic skills classes to inform them of the FYE program and events.

Though the scope of FYE has been limited due to budget reductions, Basic Skills Initiative funding continues to help support FYE. In spring 2011, the college held a very successful FYE convocation with over 100+ first year and first year basic skills students in attendance for an afternoon of activities about how to be successful students. This is one of the more successful FYE events the college has had since the beginning of the program.

Timeline: Ongoing   Responsible: Student Services, Basic Skills Committee

11. Increase Financial Aid staffing if possible, within financial limits.

Financial aid programs have grown from 4,986 students receiving $4,383,309 in aid for the academic year 2005-2006, to a total of 5,661 students receiving $10,303,347 in aid for 2009-2010. By spring 2011, the Financial Aid office awards exceeded the 2009-2010 awards by over 20%. Moreover, with the Direct Loan program started July 1, 2010, financial aid has seen loan volume increase by 35% alone. The Financial Aid office workload continues to expand.

The Financial Aid office has only four permanent staff. One staff has an out-of-class assignment and another is also administering the CCC scholarship program. Given this scenario, financial aid needs to increase staff as soon as money allows. Unfortunately, due to the decreased state funding and a resultant college budget reduction, the Financial Aid office has not been able to expand its staff, although it may be needed based on the recent demand for financial aid from CCC students.

Timeline: When funds are available   Responsible: Financial Aid Director, Student Services Dean, President, and Vice President

12. Offer assessment off-campus as part of outreach recruitment, for example, in high schools.

The implementation of this recruitment effort has been limited by local school district computer resources. The only feeder high school in our college's service area that is able to accommodate the college's assessment software is El Cerrito High School. It has the correct computers and has allowed the college to install and offer assessment testing at its site. When other high schools or off campus sites have appropriate computers, CCC will be able to expand its off campus assessment testing.

Timeline: Dependent on external school district capacity   Responsible: Matriculation
                                                                                        Coordinator

13. Explore the development of a leadership course for student leaders and other interested students.

In 2009, students were surveyed as to their interest in a student leadership course. Of 223 participants surveyed individually by fellow students, 70% were not interested in a student leadership course. The survey results indicated that a student leadership course was not desired, and there was no need to create this course.

Timeline: Completed

14. Develop counseling policy and procedure to deal with students in severe emotional crisis.

Before developing the policy and procedure, the counseling department received additional professional development. A mental health professional, from the U. S. Department of Veteran Affairs, presented at a counseling department meeting how to better serve and counsel veterans returning from combat. In addition, Student Services staff attended a workshop titled, "Strategies for Success: Meeting the Needs of Student Veterans with Post Concussive Symptoms (PCS) and Co-occurring Conditions". By fall 2012, the counseling policy and procedure on how to deal with students in severe emotional distress should be developed.

Timeline: Fall 2012   Responsible: Counseling Department, Student Services
                                                             Dean

15. Explore implementation of Automated Communication for Educational Success (ACES) in other departments.

Due to budget limitations, the college cannot increase the use of ACES in other academic areas or departments.

Timeline: Not applicable

16. Continue with the development, implementation, and assessment of SLOs.

The college's SLO and SLOA implementation is well on its way with about seventy-six percent of courses, sixty-two percent of programs, one hundred percent of library and learning resources, one hundred percent of student services, and eighty-eight percent of administrative services with ongoing SLOA or AUOA by early fall 2011. The college will meet its proficiency level for SLO implementation by 2012.

Please see the college's response to the Accrediting Commission's college recommendation #2 above for more complete information, analysis, and evidence.

Timeline: 2012 and ongoing   Responsible: College managers, faculty and staff

17. Seek additional funding for part-time library faculty and/or continued release time for the bibliographic instruction librarian to administer information competency requirement within budget limits.

Release time or funds for part-time librarians to assist the bibliographic instruction (BI) librarian is no longer needed. This is due to the spring 2008 separation of the information competency requirement from its previous status of being embedded in English 142B. The BI librarian no longer has to work with the English department to implement the time consuming joint departmental information competency effort. Currently information competency is overseen by the college library's BI faculty.

Timeline: Not applicable

18. Seek to provide Reference Desk services during all open hours, including summer sessions within the limits of funding.

Although the Library has never completely covered all summer session reference desk hours, it has been fairly successful in improving summer reference desk coverage.

The library accomplished this improvement by prioritizing its open hours to reflect summer course offering needs and times of student demand for reference service. It also applied for additional funding to support summer reference desk services. The library has been successful in obtaining non-ongoing, additional funding for reference desk services. It has received funds from the CCC Foundation budget augmentations, small amounts from outside grants, and one time supplemental funding from the Instruction office. CCC summer classes are primarily offered in six weeks with very few extending to eight weeks.

A summary of summer library reference desk coverage follows:
- Summer 2008 – Library open 40 hours a week for 8 weeks
- Summer 2009 – Library open between 38-40 hours a week for 6 weeks and 20 hours a week for an additional two weeks.
- Summer 2010 – Library open 42 hours a week for 6 weeks
- Summer 2011 – Library open between 36-42 hours for 6 weeks

Timeline: Ongoing within budget limitations Responsible: Library Coordinator and Division Deans

19. Secure additional ongoing funding for tutoring and the Supplemental Instruction programs.

The college prioritized its general fund budget to support ongoing tutoring efforts. College tutoring funding has increased to $40,000 a year, even in times of budget reduction, due to its commitment to support student success. The Basic Skills Committee has also prioritized $44,000 of its ongoing budget to support tutoring and student success. Though the amount of Basic Skills funds may vary, it has remained stable for the last three years. In addition, the

college has a number of grants which are used to support tutoring activities such as First 5 in Early Childhood Education and a Career Technical Education grant in Hybrid Automotive. Grant funded tutoring is not ongoing, but the combination of different funding sources has provided reasonable tutoring funding. Supplemental Instruction, on the other hand, has not continued to be funded due to increased budget limitations.

Timeline: Ongoing   Responsible: Business Director, Basic Skills Committee, Instructional and Student Service divisions

20. Address the need for funding of regular computer upgrades through the Technology Committee.

In 2010-11, the college addressed the need for technology funding for regular computer upgrades by committing $100,000 of its greatly reduced budget to implement computer virtualization and/or upgrades as needed. Computer virtualization allows the college to increase its computing capacity on fewer computers thus reducing long term costs by reducing the number of computers that need to be maintained or replaced. This has already been implemented for the college's computer servers, such as the server for the website, when it needed an upgrade. As the college progresses with computer virtualization, it will be implemented for individual users and their computer upgrades (25. Designation of reserves for computer upgrades).

Timeline: 2013   Responsible: President, Information Technology Director

Standard III

1. Work with the district to review and update hiring procedures as needed.

First, with the current budget reduction, there has been a slowdown in hiring. Second, the district implemented a new online recruitment system – PeopleAdmin. It is designed for higher education and is a web-based automation of the hiring process which features position creation, position posting, applicant tracking, reporting and data management. Third, the classified employees union, Local 1, and the District are negotiating to streamline the selection process for filling temporary out of classification assignments.

With these three circumstances, the plan to revise the district hiring procedures is not a priority at this time. However, as recruitment occurs, the district and college are modifying the out-of-date hiring process to reflect necessary improvements.

Timeline: Ongoing   Responsible: Business Director, District Human Resources

2. Develop a college database accessible to managers, supervisors, and others responsible for evaluations.

Due to budget reductions, developing a college database for faculty evaluations is no longer a priority. The Vice President's office and the division offices maintain records of when full- and part-time faculty evaluations are due.

Timeline: Not Applicable

28

1. Seek to improve the full- to part-time faculty ratio to the extent that the District Box 2-A (faculty position prioritization) process will allow and as funds become available.

While the college would prefer to hire new and replacement full-time faculty, budget reductions have required the employment of more part-time faculty.   For the past two years, the hiring of full-time faculty has been limited at CCC. One nursing position was recruited.   The college's schedule of classes has also been reduced, thus necessitating fewer teaching faculty on the whole.

With the new budget allocation model, there is no longer a district wide allocation of positions through district "Box 2A" (faculty position prioritization) process. The allocation of funds for hiring faculty is a college decision and determined by the college "Box 2A" process.

CCC's ratio of full-time to part-time faculty has decreased slightly to a level similar to the ratio at its sister colleges -- Diablo Valley College and Los Medanos College. The ratio remains well above state mandated levels of full-time to part-time faculty.

Timeline: Postponed   Responsible: The CCC Box 2A committee – President, Vice President, Academic Senate President, and U.F. Vice President

4. Develop the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) plan in collaboration with the other colleges and the district Human Resources (HR) department.

The Equal Employment Opportunity District Advisory Committee, in collaboration with the human resources department, drafted the EEO plan in the 2010-11 year. The plan was based on the template and guidelines that came from the State Chancellor's Office.

Timeline: Completed

5. Offer staff development activities/programs for faculty that focus on improving teaching and learning.

The college has an ongoing focus in improving teaching and learning and supports staff development within its reduced budget to increase student learning and excellent teaching and student services. Many different staff development opportunities exist at the college.

Currently, both the district and college are focused on closing the Achievement Gap as a college and district-wide effort to improve student learning outcomes. The staff development activities to support this effort have been district trainings and brainstorming meetings, discussion at division meetings, College Council, and the Academic Senate to develop a college approach.

Contra Costa College started with a focus on three areas to improve the student learning outcomes of under-represented groups and thus to close the achievement gap. One is to encourage the development of service learning on campus, a second to engage students in study groups, and the third to continue to create a welcoming and friendly campus.

Staff development on these topics has occurred over a number of years. In 2009, the college sponsored a webinar: "College Service-Learning: Keys to Design and Implement a Successful Program."   In 2010, the college received a grant and sponsored a district-wide service learning conference designed to inspire, support and encourage college faculty and staff to offer

students service learning opportunities. Cross campus email discussion about encouraging study groups and engaging students occurred with the college president and many faculty. The fall 2010, All College Day presentation had a speaker, Mr. Andrade, who discussed strategies for engaging urban students and supporting their educational success.

Another staff development effort came from the Basic Skills Committee which funded faculty to attend a Reading Apprenticeship program and to bring back the learning to the college. Since 2009, there has been a reading apprenticeship faculty group meeting to share about how these techniques enhance student learning.

Staff development offers annual training in the use of classroom assessment techniques (CAT) for full- and part-time faculty. It is a mandatory workshop for new tenure track faculty. It also sponsors a Classroom Assessment Group (CAG) in spring terms for faculty who go through initial training and then meet regularly to discuss and share CAT they have used. In addition to CAG, there is an ongoing Wiki that offers threaded discussion with colleagues about CATs. Staff development also offers a monthly Teacher Talk series, annual workshops on classroom management and avoiding grade grievances, and structured peer observation of colleagues so faculty can build teaching ideas (22. sample staff development calendar).

The Academic Senate created a faculty mentorship program pairing new faculty with seasoned faculty, and the district office has a faculty internship program.

Of course, the college staff development office coordinates more training activities from training on online instruction and software expertise to a new faculty orientation program and training in Student Learning Outcomes.

Timeline: Ongoing   Responsible: Staff Development Coordinator, Division
                                      Deans and Academic Senate

6. Continue training on the use of instructional technology.

The college has ongoing training on the use of instructional technology. It has provided regular training on the new district *Insite* portal and training on the use of Wikis for communication and sharing of instructional information. CCC has over 70 courses using the *Insite* portal. Both the college web site and the *Insite* portal use the application, SharePoint, so that training for the website and *Insite* portal use enhance one another (23. SharePoint training manual).

The college distance education coordinator, a faculty with reassigned time, is in charge of distance education training and assisting faculty in the development of web based, online courses, and hybrid courses. The focus has been on the development of WebCT based courses and integrating ADA compliant video and sound into online instruction. The college has used a grant to caption video content for online delivery. There has been an increase in hybrid course offerings and an increased use of web-based resources for classroom support such as homework answers, lecture notes via the new *Insite* portal class site or syllabi online. The library has obtained digital licensing rights for selected titles in its media collection which will make it easier for faculty and students to view these titles online from either a link on a class *Insite* portal page or from the library's website.

The college has also allocated funds for the building of more smart classrooms. Faculty demand for smart classrooms has grown since the initial creation of smart classrooms, and this

demand has been met with the creation of more smart classrooms in both new and remodeled classrooms. For fall 2011, the college created thirteen additional smart classrooms (26. Smart classrooms list and 27. Council of Chairs minutes –October 6. 2010).

Timeline: Ongoing   Responsible: Staff Development Coordinator, IT,
                                     Technology Committee, and Distance Education
                                     Coordinator

7. Develop an effective means of maintaining essential equipment.

The college realizes the importance of maintaining essential equipment. Although resources are not adequate to fully fund equipment maintenance, under the new allocation model the college budgeted funds to ensure its priority. The college allocated $27,000 of instructional equipment funds to be used for equipment maintenance and replacement. As funds allow, the college will continue to budget as effectively as possible for the maintenance of equipment.

Timeline: Ongoing   Responsible: Business Director

8. Continue to review handicapped access on our campus and make plans for improvements.

In 2009, the District hired a consultant to review the campus and identify ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) exceptions. They completed a two volume ADA Transition Plan, broken down by buildings and outside areas which documented areas the campus needs to improve its ADA compliance.

The Buildings and Grounds department refers to the ADA Transition Plan when they are doing campus repairs so that ADA improvements can be made while conducting normal maintenance and with the available budget for repair work.

The campus also completed building construction and renovation that addressed needed ADA improvements. Construction projects are approved by the Division of State Architecture for ADA compliance. The following are a few improvements completed in the past year:

1) AA Building – The restrooms in the building were totally renovated and brought up to full ADA compliance.
2) Automotive Technology – An ADA entrance to a classroom was repaired.
3) Parking Lot 3 - Four new handicap parking spaces were added.
4) Parking Lot 15 – Four new handicap parking spaces were added.

Timeline: Ongoing   Responsible: Buildings and Grounds Director

9. Continue to monitor and identify safety hazards on campus, either environmental or criminal, and develop action plans as needed for prompt correction.

The college has an active Safety Committee that meets monthly. Its members represent all of the constituencies on campus, including our campus Police Services and the district's safety officer. The meetings discuss all safety related issues including; facilities, grounds, and security on campus. The committee approves action steps to correct problems and the appropriate department or staff is designated responsibility.

The college conducts an annual "Slips, Trips and Falls" inspection and report. Each department reviews their area and reports accidents and potential safety concerns so issues can be corrected. The reports are summarized and given to the district office.

The school's insurance company, Contra Costa County Schools Insurance Group, conducts regular safety training sessions each year for safety, health and ergonomic related areas. This last year, they worked with the Custodial Services department and Buildings and Grounds department on work related safety, including ladder safety. In addition, the CCC Buildings and Grounds department conducts regular inspections of the campus and its facilities identifying and when possible addressing safety concerns.

The campus has added surveillance cameras in the Student Services Center and in the Book Store for the security of financial transactions. The college is considering adding cameras at the bus stop and in some parking lots.

The district has a district-wide Safety and Emergency Preparedness Committee that meets on a regular basis to implement first aid, emergency concerns and security issues at all its campuses. The committee has installed AED machines throughout the CCC campus and has been responsible for numerous trainings on emergency response. It implemented a Neighborhood Watch program this past year. The district training officer also coordinated the installation of a state of the art 4CD Alert siren system which alerts the campus to emergency problems.

Timeline: Ongoing   Responsible: Business Director, Safety Committee, District, and CCC Buildings and Grounds

10. Improve technology training offerings.

In addition to the instruction technology training, mentioned in # 6 above, in 2010, the college provided extensive training for all staff on using both the college's new website and the *In*site portal—use of both relies on SharePoint software. The college also provides regular training on Microsoft Word, Excel, and PowerPoint, on the educational use of Wikis, and on how to make online class materials accessible to students with disabilities (22. Sample staff development calendar). In the 2011 year, the college started implementation of another mainframe Datatel application -- the continuing education package which requires training and direct involvement in its implementation.

Timeline: Ongoing   Responsible: Technology Committee, IT manager, distance education coordinator, and staff development coordinator

11. Develop strategies to fund technology upgrades which recognize funding inconsistencies and make progress towards maintaining adequately up-to-date technology.

The college is focusing on computer virtualization technology and cost saving, long-term solutions to maximize limited funding for technology upgrades. The Information Technology (IT) department is expanding its successful implementation of virtualization of its server networks to desktop PCs. Although still in the planning and research stages, it is believed that, with a budget of $100,000, roughly 200 PCs can be updated at one time using virtualization technology (25. Designation of reserves for computer upgrades/virtualization).

With virtualization, data processing and storage is maintained at one central location while end users receive seamless upgrading and ready access to their data as though they had individual computers. Only computer peripherals such as keyboards, mice, monitors, optical drives, etc. would be housed at individual work stations. All other computer functions would take place at a central location connected by the network, thus providing a virtual computer environment. In the short term, it is anticipated that this will yield some cost savings but, more importantly, the long term promises substantial savings in upgrades and maintenance.

Timeline: 2013   Responsible: IT Director, Technology Committee and Business Director

12. Participate with the other colleges and district in discussion and possible implementation of the recommendations made by consultant Mike Hill.

After more than a year of research, discussions, brainstorming and consultation, the district with the full participation of the colleges and the District Governance Council has formulated a new allocation model based on SB 361. It is codified in Business Procedure 18.01. This process was described fully in the 2010 Accreditation Follow-up Report (2. 2010 Follow-up Report). Discussion of Mike Hill's recommendations were part of the year long process which led to the new district budget allocation model that was implemented on July 1, 2010.

Some of the basic criteria used in developing the budget model are fairness and equity, understandability, and provision for financial stability. The model provides for performance incentives and should work both in good times and in bad times. The evaluation of the budget model will be conducted with the same collaborative approach as was used in its formulation.

Timeline: Completed

13. Seek to increase college enrollment.

Since the establishment of this planning agenda in 2008, the district has reached its enrollment cap, and the state of California has imposed a reduction in funding. This has decreased the amount of CCC enrollment that will be paid for by the state. The college no longer seeks to increase enrollment.

Timeline: Not applicable

14. Work with the district to review and change, as appropriate, the part-time hourly (C-hourly) allocation methodology.

The part-time hourly (C-hourly) budget allocation model was reviewed and changed in 2009-10 to reflect the actual paid hours for part-time faculty necessary to generate FTES. However, after lengthy research and consultation, the district and colleges through the district Governance Council formulated a new budget allocation model based on SB 361 codified in Business Procedure 18.01. This resolved the prior concerns with the part-time hourly (C-hourly) allocation methodology. With the advent of the new budget allocation model in the 2010-11 year, the part-time hourly allocation was incorporated into the college's budget allocation and is no longer a separate allocation methodology. Please see district recommendation 1 and 2 and the 2010 Follow-up Report for more complete information (2. 2010 Follow-up Report).

Timeline: Completed

15. *Work with the district to evaluate its budget allocation processes, including the part-time faculty (C-hourly) allocation formula. Once agreement is reached, work with the district to implement the new allocation methodology.*

After over more than a year of research, discussions, and consultation, the district, with the participation of the colleges and the district governance council, formulated a new budget allocation model based on SB 361 and codified in Business Procedure 18.01. The process for developing the new budget allocation method was described fully in the 2010 Accreditation Follow-up Report. The new budget allocation process resolves prior concerns with old part-time hourly (C-hourly) allocation methodology. The part-time hourly allocation was incorporated into the college's budget allocation and is no longer a separate allocation methodology (2. 2010 Follow-up Report).

The new budget allocation model was implemented in the 2010-11 year. The evaluation of the budget model will be conducted in a year with the same collaborative approach as was used in its formulation. Please see district recommendation 1 and 2 and the 2010 Follow-up Report for more complete information, analysis and evidence.

Timeline: Completed

Standard IV
1. *Make every effort to rebuild trust in the governance process.*

At the college, employee trust in the governance process has been rebuilt and is stabilized. At regular constituent based President Cabinet meetings and at the college's main shared governance body, College Council, participatory governance is active and integral to the college's overall quality. In the six years from when the survey was conducted, the college and district have gone through a change of leadership. The new Chancellor and new CCC President are strong believers in and implementers of shared governance and have worked hard to authentically involve constituents in governance. The President has supported the participation of all constituency groups in the governance process. Classified staff, students, administrators, and faculty work collegially to address campus issues and problems. Evidence of this can be seen in the minutes of the College Council and its sub-committees, and in other campus committees that have representatives from each constituency.

Timeline: Ongoing   Responsible: CCC and CCCCD

2. *Develop a timeline, through College Council, for the review of the governance process with particular focus on the roles of the leadership and the integrity and effectiveness of the process.*

The college has approved a procedure for reviewing the CCC governance process on a five-year cycle. The procedure indicates that an employee survey about satisfaction with governance will be completed and the results reviewed by the College Council (51. CCC procedure A1008). Based on these results, the College Council may make governance changes as needed. The procedure also indicates that any constituent group may suggest a

34

change to the governance process as needed. In fall 2011, College Council began its review of the governance evaluation survey results and its discussion of the effectiveness of the governance process.

In addition to the governance evaluation, College Council reviewed its governance by-laws and formed a sub-committee to draft a revision proposal in 2009-2010. This draft was reviewed by College Council, and it codified many common, but unspoken governance processes. The revised by-laws were approved by the College Council in Fall 2010.

Timeline: Completed   Responsible: President and College Council

3. Continue to take actions that ensure the financial integrity of the district.

The Governing Board has continued to ensure that actions are taken to secure the financial integrity of the district since the last accreditation visit in 2008. After having to drastically reduce the district budget in academic years 2009-10 and 2010-11, the district maintained a reserve above the 10% reserve required by the Board. The Board reaffirmed its commitment to maintaining a 10% reserve in its January 2011 meeting. In the 2010-11 academic year, the district implemented a new allocation model which gives the colleges more accountability, including establishing a campus-level reserve. Further, financial audits since 2008 have shown marked improvement in financial reporting and compliance.

Timeline: Ongoing   Responsible: Chancellor and Governing Board

4. Continue to develop SLOs at the program and course level for all disciplines.

The college's SLO and SLOA implementation is well on its way with assessment happening in seventy-six percent of courses, sixty-two percent of programs, one hundred percent of student services, and eighty-eight percent of administration with ongoing assessment by early fall 2011. The college will meet its proficiency level for SLO implementation by 2012.

Please see the college's response to the Accrediting Commission's college recommendation 2 above. It provides a complete description, analysis and evidence of SLO and SLO assessment throughout the college.

Timeline: 2012 and ongoing   Responsible: CCC managers, faculty, and staff

5. Conduct an evaluation of the roles and responsibilities of the district and the colleges
as delineated in the document and make changes as needed after a time to be agreed
upon by affected groups.

The process to evaluate the roles and responsibilities of the district/colleges and to make changes based on that evaluation were codified in Board Policy 1012, revised January 26, 2011, and Administrative Procedure 1012.01, adopted November 23, 2010, both titled Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment and Continuous Improvement, which indicate:

> Board Policy 1012   (61. Board Policy 1012)
> The Chancellor shall establish and implement regular cycles of review for assessing the effectiveness of (1) the district's administrative organization, (2) the delineation of roles and responsibilities of the district and the colleges, and (3) the district governance and decision-making processes.

<u>Administrative Procedure 1012.01</u> (62. Administrative Procedure 1012.01)
In its role of supporting the mission and functions of the colleges, the district office shall maintain a document delineating the roles, responsibilities and service outcomes of the colleges and the district office in departments shared by each entity. The contents of the document shall be evaluated every four years and the results used as a basis for continuous improvement of the operations.

The district office implemented a Department/Unit Review process, whereby each department will have completed its first review within a two-year period, beginning 2009-10. An essential element of this review is a "...delineation of district and college roles, responsibilities, service outcomes" – accomplished through the collaborative process of the district office department/unit manager and the corresponding college unit in completing this evaluation, review, and update of the district's "Delineation of District and College Roles, Responsibilities, and Service Outcomes" document.

Timeline: 2012 and ongoing   Responsible: CCC and CCCCD

6. Improve the capacity and precision of the technology support system to the colleges.

The district has made marked progress in improving the capacity and precision of the technology support system to the colleges. In 2009, the district completed a District-wide Technology Infrastructure and Telecommunications Plan using a cross constituency team. In developing the plan, the team reviewed each college's Strategic and Technology Master Plans, as well as the district-wide Strategic Directions. The result was a thorough planning document which provides guidance and a clear path for improving our technology infrastructure and services throughout the district. Upon examination and approval by the Chancellor's Cabinet and review by the Governing Board, a budget for district-wide technology support, which includes annual software maintenance, acquisition, and an infrastructure refresh budget, was put in place. Additionally, the district has moved forward with the acquisition and initial stages of the implementation process called out in the plan. Implementation of the plan will result in a homogeneous approach to the district's telecommunication, Wide Area, Local Area, and Wireless Networks, as well as a coordinated method for managing and supporting the infrastructure (21. District-wide Strategic Infrastructure and Telecommunications Plan).

Timeline: Ongoing   Responsible: CCCCD and CCC Information Technology

7. Implement changes to the funding formulas that will more adequately meet the needs of the colleges.

All of the work for the development and implementation of a new allocation model was completed in the fall of 2009 and the spring and summer of 2010. The Chancellor, Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services, and two consultants reviewed the new allocation model and simulation with the leadership at each college, after which an implementation issues document was developed. 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. Once input had been received from the District Governance Council in January 2010, the revision of Business Procedure 18.01, <u>The Contra Costa Community College District General Fund Budget</u>, began and was approved by the Governing Board on July 28, 2010. This procedure codifies the district's new financial allocation model and includes funding for 1) adjunct faculty in a way that supports college and district intentions to increase enrollment and

2) technology funding. To assist in the implementation of the SB 361 Allocation Model, a document providing implementation guidelines and strategies for transition was developed and placed on the district web site. During February, a financial simulation was developed in order to prepare projections for the Tentative Budget and budget reductions for fiscal year 2010-11. The 2010-11 Adoption Budget was developed based on the new allocation model and was approved by the Governing Board on September 8, 2010.

In an effort to keep the model fresh and responsive to the changing community college landscape, staff began an assessment process of the allocation model in January 2011, which was completed July 2011.

Please see district recommendation 1 and 2 and the 2010 Follow-up Report for more complete information, analysis and evidence.

Timeline: Completed   Responsible: CCCCD and CCC

8. Continue to pursue a philosophy of fiscal conservatism.

The district has continued its conservative approach in the finance area. The district has managed its expenditures well and had a combined restricted/unrestricted reserve of over 15% for the last three years.

2008-09	17.3% (Actual)
2009-10	17.3% (Actual)
2010-11	15.8% (Revised budget)

Timeline: Ongoing   Responsible: CCCCD Chancellor and Governing Board

9. Develop mechanisms for regularly evaluating role delineation and governance and decision-making structures.

Processes to regularly evaluate role delineation and governance and decision-making structures were codified in Board Policy 1012, revised January 26, 2011, and Administrative Procedure 1012.01, adopted November 23, 2010, both titled Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment and Continuous Improvement, which indicate:

Board Policy 1012   (61. Board Policy 1012)
The Chancellor shall establish and implement regular cycles of review for assessing the effectiveness of (1) the district's administrative organization, (2) the delineation of roles and responsibilities of the district and the colleges, and (3) the district governance and decision-making processes.

Administrative Procedure 1012.01   (62. Administrative Procedure 1012.01)
In its role of supporting the mission and functions of the colleges, the district office shall maintain a document delineating the roles, responsibilities and service outcomes of the colleges and the district office in departments shared by each entity. The contents of the document shall be evaluated every four years and the results used as a basis for continuous improvement of the operations.

District governance and decision-making processes shall be evaluated every three years and the results used as a basis for improving the processes. At a minimum, all persons who

serve in leadership positions at the district level and all who serve on district committees shall participate in the evaluation process.

Evaluating Role Delineation
The district office implemented a Department/Unit Review process, whereby each department will have completed its first review within a two-year period, beginning 2009-10. An essential element of this review is a "...delineation of district and college roles, responsibilities, service outcomes" – accomplished through the collaborative process of the district office department/unit manager and the corresponding college unit in completing this evaluation, review, and update of the district's "Delineation of District and College Roles, Responsibilities, and Service Outcomes" document.

Evaluating Governance and Decision-Making Structures
A "District-Level Governance and Decision-Making Assessment" survey was developed through the District Governance Council (DGC) and was administered district-wide on February 24, 2011. The results were shared first with Cabinet on May 4, 2011, and then with the District Governance Council 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.

Timeline: Ongoing   Responsible: CCCCD and DGC

EVIDENCE

Statement on Report Preparation

1. 2009 Follow-up Report
   *http://coast.contracosta.edu/aboutccc/publicationsreports/research/Shared%20Documents/2009%20AC
   CREDITATION%20FOLLOW-UP%20REPORT.pdf*
2. 2010 Follow-up Report
   *http://www.contracosta.edu/aboutccc/publicationsreports/research/Shared%20Documents/2010%20AC
   CREDITATION%20FOLLOW-UP%20REPORT.pdf*
3. College Council Minutes – November 10, 2010
4. Focused Mid Term Report on College Website
   *http://www.contracosta.edu/aboutccc/publicationsreports/research/Shared%20Documents/2011%20AC
   CREDITATION%20DRAFT%20MID%20TERM%20REPORT.pdf*
5. College Council Minutes - September 14, 2011
6. Governing Board Agenda – October 12, 2011

College Recommendation 1

7. College Council Minutes – December 8, 2010
8. Integrated Planning Model
   *http://www.contracosta.edu/websites/research/Shared%20Documents/pdf/Integrated%20Planning/I
   ntegrated%20Planning%20Model%20Revised%20graphic%20Sept2011.pdf*
9. Integrated Planning Model Narrative
   *http://www.contracosta.edu/websites/research/Shared%20Documents/INTEGRATED%20PLANNI
   NG.aspx*
10. Sample College plans
    10a. Strategic Initiatives
    *http://www.contracosta.edu/aboutccc/publicationsreports/plans/Shared%20Documents/STRATEGI
    C%20INITIATIVES%202007-12.aspx*
    10b. Educational Master Plan
    *http://www.contracosta.edu/aboutccc/publicationsreports/plans/Shared%20Documents/EDUCATIO
    NAL%20MASTER%20PLAN%20(2007-12).aspx*
    10c. Technology Strategic Plan
    *http://www.contracosta.edu/aboutccc/publicationsreports/plans/Shared%20Documents/TECHNOL
    OGY%20STRATEGIC%20PLAN%20(2008-13).aspx*
    10d. Enrollment Management Plan
    *http://www.contracosta.edu/aboutccc/publicationsreports/plans/Shared%20Documents/ENROLLM
    ENT%20MANAGEMENT%20PLAN%20(2007-12).aspx*
11. 2009-10 Report on Strategic Initiatives
12. Program Review timeline
    *http://www.contracosta.edu/facultystaff/resources/progrev/Shared%20Documents/PROGRAM%20
    REVIEW%20SCHEDULE,%20SP2011-FA2016.pdf*
13. Instructional Program Review guidelines (Academic and CTE)
    *http://www.contracosta.edu/facultystaff/resources/progrev/Shared%20Documents/INSTRUCTIONA
    L%20PROGRAMS,%20GUIDELINES.pdf*
14. Non-instructional Program Review guidelines
    *http://www.contracosta.edu/facultystaff/resources/progrev/Shared%20Documents/NON-
    INSTRUCTIONAL%20PROGRAMS,%20GUIDELINES.pdf*
15. SLO Handbook
    *http://coast.contracosta.edu/websites/slo/slo_auo_resources/Shared%20Documents/SLO-
    AUO%20HANDBOOK%20(MARCH%202010).pdf*
16. College Council Minutes – April 13, 2011
17. Integrated Planning PowerPoint presentation
    *http://www.contracosta.edu/websites/research/Shared%20Documents/pdf/Integrated%20Planning/I
    ntegrated%20planning%20model%20ROAD%20SHOW.pdf*

18. CCC Planning website
   http://www.contracosta.edu/aboutccc/publicationsreports/plans/Shared%20Documents/default.aspx
19. CCC Technology Plan
   http://www.contracosta.edu/aboutccc/publicationsreports/plans/Shared%20Documents/TECHNOL OGY%20STRATEGIC%20PLAN%20(2008-13).aspx
20. College Council Minutes – April 13, 2011
21. District-Wide Strategic Infrastructure / Telecommunications Plan
   http://www.4cd.edu/business/technology/docs/CCCC-Final-Rpt.pdf
22. Sample staff development calendar with SharePoint and other technology training
   http://www.contracosta.edu/facultystaff/staffdev/Shared%20Documents/WORKSHOP%20CALEND AR.aspx?CalendarDate=3%2F14%2F2011
23. SharePoint training document
24. *Insite* Portal website
   http://www.4cd.edu/webadvisor/default.aspx
25. Designation of reserves for computer upgrades
26. Fall 2011 Classroom List
27. Council of Chairs Minutes – October 6, 2010.

College Recommendation 2

28. 2009 Follow-up Report
29. Program review timeline
   http://www.contracosta.edu/facultystaff/resources/progrev/Shared%20Documents/PROGRAM%2R EVIEW%20SCHEDULE,%20SP2011-FA2016.pdf
30. Instructional Program Review guidelines
   http://www.contracosta.edu/facultystaff/resources/progrev/Shared%20Documents/INSTRUCTIONA L%20PROGRAMS,%20GUIDELINES.pdf
31. Non-instructional Program Review guidelines
   http://www.contracosta.edu/facultystaff/resources/progrev/Shared%20Documents/NON- INSTRUCTIONAL%20PROGRAMS,%20GUIDELINES.pdf
32. Sample SLO Coordinating Committee Minutes- May 16, 2011
33. Council of Chairs minutes of October 6, 2010-discussion of 298 SLOA
34. SLO Handbook
   http://coast.contracosta.edu/websites/slo/slo_auo_resources/Shared%20Documents/SLO- AUO%20HANDBOOK%20(MARCH%202010).pdf
35. SLO website
   http://www.contracosta.edu/websites/slo/slo_auo_resources/Shared%20Documents/default.aspx
36. SLO assessment progress report
37. POWER SLO award notification
38. 2009 Follow-up Report
39. LAVA Division Meeting Minutes - September 11, 2009
40. College Skills Center program review section C-4 and C- 5).
41. 2009 Follow-up Report
42. Sample Nursing CTE program advisory minutes
43. Sample HHS CTE program advisory survey on SLOs
44. ADJUS employer and workforce survey results
45. Non-Instructional Program Review
46. Program Review Timeline
47. SLO assessment progress report

College Recommendation 3

48. Contra Costa College website
   http://www.contracosta.edu/Shared%20Documents/default.aspx
49. Sample CCC Website Team Meeting Minutes - April 21, 2009

50. Sample staff development calendar with SharePoint training
    *http://www.contracosta.edu/facultystaff/staffdev/Shared%20Documents/WORKSHOP%20CALEND
    AR.aspx?CalendarDate=3%2F14%2F2011*

College Recommendation 4

51. CCC Procedure A1008 Reviewing the Governance Process
    *http://www.contracosta.edu/aboutccc/publicationsreports/Shared%20Documents/COLLEGE%20PR
    OCEDURES%20HANDBOOK.pdf*
52. College Council Minutes- March 20, 2009
53. College Council Minutes – December 8 2010.
54. College Council by-laws
54.5 Sept 14, 2011 College Council Meeting Minutes

District Recommendation 1

55. Accrediting Commission letter to CCC January 31, 2011

District Recommendation 2

56. Board Policy 2056, Code of Ethics
57. Human Resources Procedure 1040.08, Employee Code of Ethical Behavior

District Recommendation 3

58. Revised faculty evaluation forms

District Recommendation 4

59. Board Policy 1009, Institutional Leadership and Governance
60. Administrative Procedure 1009.01, Participatory Governance
61. Board Policy 1012, Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment, and Continuous Improvement
62. Administrative Procedure 1012.01, Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment, and Continuous Improvement
63. District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment Report

Updates on Substantive Change Proposals in Process, Pending, or Planned

Distance Education
In a previous annual report, Contra Costa College indicated that some Administration of Justice programs have by default reached the distance education definition of 50% or more course offerings. This was not the college's plan. Since that time, the college has reduced its distance education Administration of Justice offerings and begun the internal review and necessary changes to be ready to propose a distance education substantial change. The college expects that in about a year, it will submit a substantial change proposal for Administration of Justice distance education programs.

Transfer Degrees – AB 1440
As Contra Costa College receives state approval for transfer degrees, it will notify the Accrediting Commission requesting a response regarding the need for a substantial change report for these degrees.

Accreditation Focused Midterm Report

Los Medanos College

Submitted by:

Los Medanos College
Contra Costa Community College District
2700 East Leland Road
Pittsburg, CA 94565

LOS MEDANOS COLLEGE

Submitted to:

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges

October, 2011

Midterm Report – Certification Page

October, 2011

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

We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community and believe that this report accurately reflects the nature and substance of the institution.

_____

Dr. Helen Benjamin, Chancellor, Contra Costa Community College District

_____

John T. Nejedly, President, CCCCD Governing Board

_____

Richard Livingston, Interim President, Los Medanos College

_____

A'kilah Moore, President, LMC Academic Senate

_____

Shawn DeMille, President, LMC Associated Students

_____

Linda Kohler, President, LMC Classified Senate

Table of Contents

Statement on Report Preparation

Following receipt of the commission's post-visit communication in early 2009, the Los Medanos College president assigned specific managers to follow up on each of the four college recommendations. The District Office took a similar approach with its recommendations. The idea was to ensure that the recommendations were addressed and resolved in an expeditious manner and not allowed to languish due to inattention.

During 2010, LMC's interim president/ALO also identified a "responsible action agent" to address each of the college's self-identified issues. These employees, with responsibility for the issues being addressed, were charged with gathering information and putting together a draft of each response.

Status reports on accreditation issues were shared with the management team on a regular basis during 2010-11. District-level issues and responses were reviewed by the Chancellor's Cabinet.

On March 30, 2011, the Shared Governance Council (SGC) devoted a half-day retreat to accreditation. Those responsible for each college recommendation and self-identified issue presented information and requested feedback. The SGC also spent a significant amount of time on the self-identified issues involving improved communication and the need to increase participation in governance.

Drafts of all sections of the document were submitted to the ALO during April, 2011 – he then compiled a draft of the entire document. The overall draft was shared with the SGC and management team during June. The ALO also posted the draft on the college intranet and requested feedback. Based on the feedback from groups and individuals, the ALO revised and polished the draft during summer 2011.

At its August 24th meeting, the Shared Governance Council endorsed the final draft. In addition, on August 29, 2011, a College Assembly was held in order to brief the entire community on the contents of this report. The report was approved by the Governing Board at its October 12, 2011 meeting and then submitted on-time to the Commission.

Richard Livingston
Interim President

Response to Team Recommendations
and the Commission Action Letter

College Recommendation 1

Although the college has made significant strides in developing institutional and program SLOs, the team found that approximately 75 percent of the college's courses do not have SLOs as part of the course outline of record. Therefore, the team encourages the college to accomplish what it set out to do in meeting its timeline for reaching proficiency in its course-level SLOs by 2012. Furthermore, the team recommends that processes be implemented so that by 2012 the college will have developed and implemented methods for assessing those SLOs and use the results of those assessments to improve student learning in all its courses. (Standards IB1, IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2a, IIA2b, IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2g, IIA2i, IIA3, IIA6, IIA6a, IIB4, IIC1a, IIC2, IIIA1c)

Since the completion of the Institutional Self Study in 2008, the college launched a major initiative to include course level student learning outcomes (CSLOs) in all course outlines of record (COORs). However, having achieved that milestone, the college still has work to do in assessing the CSLOs and providing evidence of systematically using the results to improve teaching and learning.

During the 2009-10 academic year, the college engaged in a sustained effort to update all COORs. As a result, currently all COORs have been updated and include CSLOs. A calendar for future COOR updates has been developed by the Curriculum Committee and Office of Instruction to ensure timely review and revision of all COORs within the Title 5 mandated five-year timeline.

Since the visiting team's recommendation, the college has spent substantial time and effort on evaluating and revising its SLO assessment model. Fortunately, for 2010-11 LMC was selected as one of 15 colleges in the state to receive a Bridging Research, Inquiry and Cultures (BRIC) initiative grant from the RP Group of California. As part of this grant, the college received technical assistance in three areas: Student Learning Outcomes Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness Assessment, and Turning Data Into Meaningful Action. Each of these areas is closely tied to student learning outcomes assessment. LMC engaged in college-wide dialog to collectively determine the best way to move forward in the three areas using the 150 hours of technical expertise provided through BRIC. The project included the first BRIC meeting with the three technical experts in September, 2010, which was attended by members from all constituencies on campus. Next, a joint planning retreat of the Shared Governance Council (SGC), the Teaching and Learning Project (TLP), which oversees assessment at the college, and the Academic Senate, was held in October, 2010 to create the action plan for the remaining BRIC retreats on campus.

During January, 2011, the college used this action plan in an SLO retreat with the BRIC technical expert to re-evaluate its entire assessment cycle at all levels – course, program and "institutional" (degree/certificate). A second retreat with a BRIC expert was held in March, 2010 on Institutional Effectiveness, which is tied to assessment, and included representatives from TLP, LMC's Research and Planning Group (RP), and the SGC. Another retreat was held during May, 2011, around Turning Data Into Meaningful Action, and TLP, RP, and SGC representatives were again key participants in this retreat. A final retreat, scheduled for early fall 2011, focused on communication -- specifically to help the college in communicating assessment results in order to lead to meaningful action.

During 2010-11, the TLP faculty also gathered data from the college to inform the project members about perceptions of the assessment process on campus and to generate ideas on how to move the college forward. This process included individual meetings, as well as department meetings, and a faculty survey to which more than 80 percent of full-time faculty responded. The results of the BRIC retreats, faculty dialog and survey are being used to improve the process of assessment at all levels. As a result of these activities, including the external experts' input, TLP members determined that the current SLO model was too complex and cumbersome. Therefore, during spring 2011, the TLP began developing a proposal to restructure its membership, as well as to create more streamlined and better aligned cycles for the assessment process at all levels -- CSLO, PSLO and ISLO. These changes will facilitate both the meaningful work of assessment to improve student learning and meet with accreditation compliance. The proposed revision of the assessment process for student learning outcomes assessment, including the leadership and membership structure, will be presented to the Academic Senate and Shared Governance Council when completed in fall 2011.

Also during 2010-11, the college engaged in a substantial amount of work around CSLO assessment. To head up the effort, the college provided reassigned time for a CSLO faculty lead, who was also the Curriculum Committee Chair. The lead worked extensively with faculty, staff, and managers on creating templates and structures for completing assessment. This lead also coached faculty on completing various parts of the assessment cycle, including the assessment plan, data collection, review, and use of results (improvement plan). Also during 2010-11, the college supported a technical web designer to build an in-house data collection system called CLASS -- Course-Level Assessment Software System. The software system was created and piloted. However, given the complexity of the system and the amount of data being collected at the student level, the system was not deemed effective. Therefore, the CLASS system was not fully implemented. The college is currently using Word documents and housing the faculty work on the college computer network's public drive. LMC is currently looking at alternative methods of collecting data in order to provide evidence of improved teaching and learning at the course level.

While the database was being developed and the research conducted, the CSLO faculty lead continued to work with faculty to complete the assessment of CSLOs. However, this is an area the college needs to improve rapidly. As of this writing, of approximately 600 courses, 179 have assessment plans in place, and 63 have completed the process through the improvement plan stage. To help with the planning process, and to move the college forward, the department chairs, who are now charged with assessment as part of their reassigned time load, were asked to complete a grid that shows all of the courses and the semester in which they will be assessed through the 2012-2013 academic year (with 100 percent to be assessed by 2012-13). The grids were completed and sent to the faculty lead and the Office of Instruction. The faculty lead and senior academic manager are reviewing these grids during fall. This list will be sent to the TLP, the deans and the department chairs for additional follow up.

The TLP-proposed revised assessment model, if adopted by the Academic Senate and the Shared Governance Council, will be implemented in 2012-13, including the revised structure and cycles for assessment, leadership, and membership. The academic year 2011-12 is a transition and "catch up" year.

Additional plans:

Under the leadership of the TLP, the college will continue to refine its approach to the assessment of student learning outcomes, with a focus on meeting the commission's 2012 expectations. Assessment results will be used to improve teaching and learning.

EVIDENCE:

1. Proposed timeline for updating COORs from department chairs
2. Action Plan for BRIC retreats
3. Notes from BRIC retreats
4. Assessment forms – planning, collection, improvement (single paper form)
5. Snapshots of CLASS
6. Excel spreadsheet of CSLO completion by course (Janice's worksheet)
7. Individual departmental scheduling grids through 2012-2013 academic year
8. Summary of departmental grids with gaps

College Recommendation 2

The team recommends that the college develop mechanisms to ensure the closer alignment of the Brentwood Center with college operations, services and practices. (Standards IIB3a, IIC.1.c, III.C.1.c, IVA.1)

Los Medanos College continues to make progress in aligning its two locations: the main campus in Pittsburg and the Brentwood Center. Although coordination existed previously, since the visiting team's recommendation was written, the college has taken a number of concrete steps to improve alignment, which are outlined in this response.

LMC's interim president has given clear and repeated messages to his management team that the expansion of services at the Brentwood Center is a college priority. As the district/college financial situation has worsened, he has also made it clear that Brentwood should not suffer disproportionally from the reductions for fiscal years 2010-11 and 2011-12.

For a number of years, administrative oversight for the Brentwood Center was exercised by a faculty coordinator with 100 percent reassigned time; she reported to an academic dean located at the main campus. While the coordinator did a fine job, alignment between the two locations was not always optimal. And the college needed more of a management presence in Brentwood, as required as the college seeks formal center status for Brentwood. In order to improve the situation, the interim college president, in collaboration with the chancellor and president of Diablo Valley College, arranged for the executive dean of the DVC's San Ramon Campus, to have management responsibility for both centers. Following a transition in spring 2011, the executive dean assumed his duties in June 2011.

For his Brentwood responsibilities, the executive dean reports to the college president and is a member of the LMC President's Cabinet. The new structure is designed to improve management communication and oversight of the Brentwood Center. The structure will be evaluated for effectiveness once it has been in place for at least one semester.

Student Services have been expanded significantly in Brentwood in order to better serve those taking classes at that location. In order to coordinate those services and to serve as a liaison with the main campus, a student services and instructional support coordinator was hired during fall 2009. The classified staff member hired for the position was working at the main campus, so she had the background to provide the required coordination. She was joined by a full-time counselor – the first full-timer to be assigned to that location. The counselor conducts workshops and teaches counseling courses, in addition to providing appointments and drop-in coverage. The college has also created a mechanism by which the counselor and students in Brentwood can access transcripts, which are necessary during counseling sessions. Starting in August, 2009, Admissions and Records staffing in Brentwood was increased from 2.0 to 2.75 FTE and the college's director of admissions and records has provided additional training for the employees

at that location. As a result, A&R services provided in Brentwood are now similar to those provided on the main campus.

There are other expanded student services in Brentwood, which have been implemented in collaboration with the main campus:

- Financial Aid services are available one day per week.
- DSPS counseling is also available one day per week.
- Expanded information/outreach is offered to Brentwood students, including welcome days and student services information tables.
- Transfer Center has arranged to have university representatives to visit Brentwood.
- Career Center has offered classroom workshops, information tables and career consultation appointments.
- The Employment Center provides job referral information and workshops.

Instructional support and instruction has also increased and/or improved at the center. Brentwood's first classified lab coordinator was hired in August, 2009. New space for the Math Lab and for tutoring was added in January, 2010. Tutoring and reading/writing consultations, delivered in conjunction with The Center for Academic Support on the main campus, are now available 16 hours per week in Brentwood. Both the Math Lab and tutoring services are heavily used by students. Several "smart classrooms", equipped with the latest instructional technology, were also added. An additional smart classroom will be added this fall. The computer lab for instruction and for student use has also been upgraded – the PCs are now as good, or better, than those in Pittsburg. Several other student-use computers have been added at various locations in the center. Brentwood computers have now been placed on the same replacement rotation as those on the main campus. Also, reserve books are now available for students on-site, similar to the arrangement in Pittsburg.

Finally, when one of the four full-time math instructors retired, through its faculty allocation process the college allocated a full-time replacement – despite the current severe financial limitations. The center coordinator has produced a draft human resources plan (the Short and Long Range planning document) which calls for an increased full-time faculty presence in Brentwood, once hiring resumes.

LMC has also demonstrated its commitment to Brentwood in terms of facilities. Since the last visit, the college has added four classrooms and the tutoring lab in the existing facility – a remodeled super market in a small strip mall. LMC has also applied for a Hispanic Serving Institutions STEM grant which would provide funds to build a multi-purpose science lab at the present location. Of greater long-term importance, at its November 2010 meeting the Governing Board authorized expenditure of $4.8 million to purchase 17 acres south of Brentwood, funded by local bond revenues, on which it intends to build a permanent center. The district and college have produced a needs study, initial project proposal, final project proposal (summer 2011) and

environmental impact report for the proposed facility. LMC will be applying for official "center status" for Brentwood during 2011-12. The Governing Board, college management team and Shared Governance Council have received regular updates on planning for the project. The executive dean is developing a plan to include employees from both locations in the more detailed planning for the permanent center.

Finally, LMC continues to strive to improve collaboration and communication with the Brentwood Center. During academic year 2010-11, the chancellor and interim president met several times with employees located in Brentwood to share information and discuss items of mutual interest, particularly budgetary issues. The Academic Senate has an official Brentwood representative, a Brentwood classified staff member sits on the Shared Governance Council and a faculty member serves on the Curriculum Committee. In addition to these specific positions, more general discussions are underway on how to improve Brentwood employees' participation in college governance processes. During May 2011, a 10th year celebration for the center (at its current location) was held with extensive participation from employees at both locations and significant community participation.

In summary, LMC has made significant progress in aligning Brentwood Center and main campus operations, services and practices.

Additional plans:

Led by the newly-hired executive dean, the college will continue to expand instruction and services at the Brentwood, with a focus on alignment between the two locations. LMC will also apply for official center status and continue more detailed planning for the permanent center.

EVIDENCE:

Governing Board Minutes, November 10, 2010
Brentwood Center Short and Long Range Planning, September, 2010
Key Aspects Planning for the Brentwood Center, May, 2011
Brentwood Center: Initial Project Proposal

College Recommendation 3

In order to increase effectiveness and respond fully to the previous team recommendation, the team recommends that the college implement an integrated professional development plan to ensure that employees have regular structured training on information technology and instructional design. (Standard III.C.1.d)

The college has designed and implemented an integrated professional development plan. A task force was set up to analyze college professional development and to recommend changes/improvements. It developed a proposal that included mission, values, outcomes and guidelines and operational procedures. The proposal was accepted by the Shared Governance Council (SGC) and college president.

As a result, the Professional Development Advisory Committee (PDAC) was formed during spring 2010. This shared governance group receives annual charges from the SGC. The structure provides for six PDAC standing committees, including one on technology.

There have been several action-responses to the accreditation team's recommendation specific to the need for regular training on information technology and instructional design, including:

    A. Distance Education Strategic Plan (February 2009);
    B. Creation of a Technology Sub-Committee of the college-wide PDAC;
    C. Professional Development in on-line instruction and instructional design;
    D. Various technology trainings.

A. **A Distance Education Strategic Plan** was written by the shared governance Distance Education Task Force, which has representatives from faculty, classified staff and managers. The purpose of the plan is *"to provide recommendations and direction to the college in providing online services of rigor, breadth and depth that are substantiated through an ongoing cycle of planning, assessment and improvement."* The plan includes four (4) Distance Education-related goals, with the fourth goal directly tied to Professional Development: *"To ensure high quality online instruction, LMC will provided sufficient training to all faculty interested in teaching online....Training will be provided to address both pedagogical and technical needs...."*
There is a related objective to provide quality online educational opportunities that are seamless in delivery both pedagogically and technically. Recommended strategies include: 1) on-going PD opportunities for all faculty who teach on-line; 2) establishment of a resource library; 3) coordination with sister colleges and district; and 4) marketing of PD opportunities. Work on these four strategies is underway.

B. **LMC's shared governance Professional Development Advisory Committee (PDAC) has created a Technology Sub-Committee.** This PDAC sub-committee – along with the campus Local Planning Group, which oversees flex opportunities for faculty, and the Distance Education Committee – works closely with the other two groups to implement the goals and objectives of the Distance Education Strategic Plan.

C. **Professional Development in On-Line Instruction and Instructional Design** has been offered through various means, including:

- Flex and non-flex workshops/training activities throughout the semester -- approximately 12 options throughout each semester, with an average of 15 faculty in attendance at each.
- On-line resources available on the professional development web-site and webinar; and other opportunities are sent electronically to faculty through e-mail.
- Funding for individual faculty members to attend conferences, workshops and trainings regarding information technology and instructional design.

D. Technology Trainings are available throughout the year for all faculty, classified staff and managers to become more familiar and comfortable with the use of current and emerging technologies. The opportunities are publicized through "everyone at LMC" e-mail distributions.

Additional plans:

The college will continue to refine and evaluate its redesigned professional development programs. Particular emphasis will be placed on information technology and instructional design, in order to fully address the recommendation.

EVIDENCE:

Professional Development Task Force Recommendation to SGC, May, 2009
Plan for Professional Development Program Administration ("Plan B"), October, 2009
Professional Development Advisory Committee (PDAC) minutes
Annual Charges from SGC
List of PDAC Sub-Committees and membership
Technology Sub-Committee minutes
Distance Education Strategic Plan, February, 2010
Flex and non-flex workshop archives
Professional Development links on websites for PDAC and for flex
Office of College Advancement – Record of conferences attended by employees

College Recommendation 4

The visiting team recommends the institution comply with the audit recommendation to disclose all instructional materials fees in the class schedule or course catalog.

The college catalog and the class schedule state "an optional material fee may be applied" in each of the classes that may have material fees, based on Board Policy 5024. The information conforms to the State Chancellor's Office Student Fee Handbook. Where applicable, in the schedule class description a statement such as "an optional materials fee may be applied" is included. The catalog explains that the fee may only be charged if the materials have value to the student outside of the classroom setting and/or the end product has continuing value. Students are informed that they may purchase the materials on their own or choose to pay the materials fee.

For classes that have known amounts, the specific amount is specified in the description of the class. For example, for Emergency Medical Technician I that statement is "Materials lab fee of $50 required to be paid..." At the beginning of each semester, faculty members are reminded to include material fees information in their syllabi.

To determine the optional/mandatory material fees amount charged to each student, evidence of the cost to the District (invoice/purchase order) and the justification/documentation for requiring the student to pay instructional material fees is included. If the justification indicates that it is cheaper for the District to buy in bulk, rather than if the student were to purchase on his/her own, it is stated as such. Also the cost to the District includes the cost of the item, plus shipping, tax and any other expenses related to the purchase of the instructional material(s).

All material fees are paid at the Bookstore or the Cashier's Office. When the Cashier's Office is closed, i.e. Saturday, the faculty members are responsible for collecting the fees and depositing them the next business day with the Cashier's Office.

Additional plans: The college has complied with this recommendation.

EVIDENCE:

2011-12 College Catalog, page 13
Fall 2011 Class Schedule, page 6
Board Policy 5024, Student Fees

District Recommendation 2

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

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 – it was presented to District Governance Council (DGC) and to employee groups (Local 1, United Faculty and Management Council) for input. Following consideration of all input, the new Board policy was presented to Chancellor's Cabinet and then to the Governing Board for final approval.

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

Additional plans: This recommendation has been addressed and resolved.

EVIDENCE:

Board Policy 2056, Code of Ethics
Human Resources Procedure 1040.08, Employee Code of Ethical Behavior

District Recommendation 3

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)

The District determined that faculty have a direct responsibility for student progress toward achieving student learning outcomes (SLOs) and has incorporated SLOs into the faculty self-evaluation process. To that end, 15 self-evaluation forms, tailored to instructor status and method of instruction, have been developed: Classroom Faculty (adjunct, tenure track, tenured, repeated for each instructor classification), Counselors, Learning Disabilities Specialists, Librarians and On-line Classroom Faculty. Faculty evaluate themselves on the following two measurements:

- I use appropriate and varied tools for evaluating and assessing student learning outcomes.
- 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, the results are incorporated into the evaluation packet by the evaluation review team. The evaluation occurs annually for non-tenured faculty and every three years thereafter once the faculty member is tenured.

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

In a related change, the United Faculty and District agreed to modify Article 6.2.3.2 to add to department chair duties to "oversee and facilitate the development and assessment of course and program-level student learning outcomes."

Additional plans: This recommendation has been addressed and resolved.

EVIDENCE:

United Faculty revised evaluation forms

District Recommendation 4

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)

The District has developed policies and implemented procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of its administrative organization, college and District roles/responsibilities 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 same document. The governance and decision-making structure as a whole is now defined in recently-revised Board Policy 1009, Institutional Leadership and Governance.

The recommendation also asks the District to develop a policy and implement procedures for this evaluation process. The District already had two policies in this area, 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) and Board Policy 1012 (with related Administrative Procedure 1012.01), are submitted as evidence. In addition, the District Governance Survey has been developed and implemented to solicit feedback from stakeholders on the effectiveness of the governance and decision-making process.

The chart below summarizes actions taken to satisfy District Accreditation Recommendation 4:

Policy/Procedure/Survey	Action
• Board Policy 1009, Institutional Leadership and Governance	Revised to include institutional leadership and alignment with the governance and decision-making structure
• Administrative Procedure 1009.01, Participatory Governance	Revised to acknowledge the "participatory" governance structure and includes management in that structure.
• Board Policy 1012, Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment, and Continuous Improvement	Revised to address institutional effectiveness and broaden the scope to include assessment, continuous improvement and a linkage to budget allocations
• Administrative Procedure 1012.01, Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment, and Continuous Improvement	Developed new procedure which delineates roles and responsibilities and addresses assessment and continuous improvement activities
• District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment Report	Developed assessment survey through District Governance Council to solicit feedback from District stakeholders in order to assess effectiveness of District's governance and decision-making structure.

	Survey was administered Districtwide on February 24, 2011 and results were shared first with Chancellor's Cabinet on May 4, 2011 and then with DGC on May 17, 2011 and June 14, 2011. DGC has developed an initial set of recommended actions which will be vetted this fall and shared with Chancellor's Cabinet for final review prior to implementation.

Additional plans: This recommendation has been satisfied – there are no additional plans.

EVIDENCE:

Board Policy 1009, Institutional Leadership and Governance
Administrative Procedure 1009.01, Participatory Governance
Board Policy 1012, Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment and Continuous Improvement
Administrative Procedure 1012.01, Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment and Continuous Improvement
District-Level Governance and Decision Making Report

Response to Self-identified Issues

Standard 1

I.B.1 The SGC will develop a process by which there is more regular and continuous communication by institutional groups. For example, all standing committees can publish their agendas and minutes on the college website, or distribute them to all employees via campus e-mail.

All shared governance committees now have either web-page or and intranet presence accessible to all employees through LMC's web-site. Agendas, minutes and committee documents are available on these pages. Several of the committees also send agendas and/or minutes to the campus community through e-mail. Based on a standing agenda item, the Shared Governance Council itself also communicates significant actions/outcomes to the college community after each of its meetings by using the "everyone at LMC" e-mail distribution list.

I.B.4 SGC, in collaboration with upper management, will more clearly articulate processes, develop ways to motivate constituents to participate in the planning, resource allocation processes and committees in general, enhance trust among colleagues, and improve communication to all.

During spring 2011, SGC hosted a retreat which focused the afternoon activities on developing strategies to motivate constituents to participate in shared governance committees and other organizations, groups and committees, and related activities. The lively discussion identified current challenges and barriers regarding participation and generated some ideas to address these issues. The discussion led to a detailed work plan and time line, which was approved by SGC in April, 2011; implementation began in summer 2011. This plan includes professional development activities, the creation of a multi-constituent Leadership Academy which is now underway for fall '11, development and implementation of a college-wide Respect Campaign and SGC's modeling of effective engagement practices.

I.B.7 All program leads will evaluate the results of assessment cycles in order to implement improvements in programs.

Since the completion of the Institutional Self Study in 2008, the college has continued to revise the Program Review, Assessment, and Planning Templates annually, based on feedback from the units and programs involved in the processes. Units and programs are using the revised template to improve not only student learning through assessment, but also their units and programs.

More specifically, the Teaching and Learning Project (TLP) has done substantial work in evaluating assessment cycles at all levels -- course, program, and institutional. Part of this evaluation included a 37-question survey to all faculty, with a high response rate of 87.5 percent of full-time and 25 percent of part-time faculty. A proposed modified assessment model will help provide stronger integration of Program Review and SLO assessment. The new timelines and cycles are currently being vetted and slated to be implemented in 2012-13. During the current academic year, the college continues its work under the existing model, which has been revised since the 2008 self-study. The college continues to improve its processes based on annual feedback.

During 2010-11, the TLP utilized the Title 5 definition of programs to clarify what constitutes a program at the college. The clarification resulted in a more reasonable assessment of authentic program level student learning outcomes.

The college will implement a process of peer review for the Unit/Program Review in 2011-12. The Shared Governance Council (SGC) is identifying the Peer Review Committee membership structure, based on recommendations from the Research and Planning Committee. Peer reviews will be based on a rubric and conducted by cross-constituent teams to better inform programs on ways to improve program/unit performance. The change will bring LMC in line with one of the statewide "best practices" for program review.

Prior to 2008, the TLP was responsible for coordinating feedback on program-level assessment. Subsequently, the TLP was in transition and did not conduct as thorough a review or coordinate program assessment results. A proposed new assessment model may fold into the peer review process, but that approach is still in discussion. Once the new model is in place, the TLP will once again take a lead role in coordinating assessment review and feedback.

The TLP, led collaboratively by faculty and academic managers, will continue to lead efforts to achieve the required 2012 assessment proficiency level.

Standard 2

II. A.1.b During the 2008-09 academic year, the Distance Education Committee and Research Office will engage a study to evaluate the effectiveness, retention and success rates of online courses at LMC; the committee will investigate the feasibility of an entirely online associate degree.

During 2009, the Office of Institutional Research completed a study on student achievement in online courses, compared to face-to-face courses, and a hybrid course. The results of this study were analyzed and discussed in the Distance Education Committee and the Shared Governance Council.

The comparative and longitudinal study over a two-year period included information on success, retention, and persistence, as well as demographic characteristics. Student success, retention, and persistence varied in online courses during this time period, based on the course students took. In general, during this period, student success, retention, and persistence were lower in online courses, compared to the comparable face-to-face course. Similarly, student success and persistence in the hybrid course, compared to the face-to-face course, were also lower. However, student achievement in the same hybrid course, as compared to the online course, varied, with comparable retention results, but higher success and persistence.

In terms of demographics, the study showed that students taking online courses tended to be younger (under age 24), white or Hispanic, female, with long-term goals, and from the local service area. Compared to the college student body population, there was a higher proportion of younger students who were female and white in online courses, compared to the face-to-face courses.

The Distance Education Committee also began the study of the possibility of an entirely online degree. The committee worked with the district office on a possible study across the three colleges. The committee discussed several challenges in designing/implementing an online degree, including lack of curricular supports (course development, instructors), lack of funds and lack of professional development. Given the identified challenges, combined with the relatively low student achievement in online courses compared to face-to-face courses, and the increasingly difficult budget situation which emerged in 2010-11, the study was not fully completed or vetted. Expansion on online offerings is not an option at present since the college is making significant cuts to its course offerings during 2010-11 and 2011-12.

The Distance Education Committee is charged with the on-going evaluation of online offerings at the college.

II.A.1.c The Teaching and Learning Project will develop and implement processes and professional development activities to ensure that the assessment cycle is completed – that is, that assessment results are used to make improvements at the course, program and institutional levels.

Since 2008, the Teaching and Learning Project (TLP) has provided a variety of professional development opportunities for faculty, staff, and administrators on assessment and related topics.

A major focus of assessment has been at the course level. Given the amount of work needed to be completed, beginning in fall 2010 the TLP included a faculty lead, with reassigned time, for course-level student learning outcomes (CSLO) as part of its membership. The CSLO lead has held several training workshops, seminars, and has provided one-on-one coaching. Professional development trainings, including hands-on workshops in computer labs, have been held during flex days, all-college days, and throughout the semester. The college has reserved two hours on Mondays as a time for "all-college" activities, when full-time faculty are not scheduled to teach, so that the institution can address college priorities, including assessment. During a typical semester, three or four Monday afternoon meetings have been devoted to professional development activities directly related to assessment. Finally, during August, 2011, flex, one day was dedicated to outcomes and assessment.

During 2010-11, the TLP Faculty Lead attended several Department Chair meetings to inform the chairs about assessment, including proposed changes in the model and cycles, and the progress of assessment. This communication will be ongoing.

Currently, the Professional Development Advisory Committee (PDAC), is working with various campus committees to target professional development opportunities to specific needs on campus. A member of PDAC has attended TLP meetings and works closely with the TLP members as areas for professional development are identified.

During fall 2010, three managers and a classified staff member attended the Student Success Conference, which included a significant assessment component. Those who attended are part of the TLP and presented their findings to the other TLP members.

Assessment-related professional development at the individual, department, and college-level will continue, under the leadership of PDAC and TLP.

II.A.2.h The Curriculum Committee and Teaching and Learning Project will develop and implement faculty development activities to improve alignment of student learning outcomes, assessment and grading practices.

During 2009-2010, a substantial amount of work was done by faculty members, and approved by the Curriculum Committee, to update Course Outlines of Record (COORs), which resulted in better alignment among student learning outcomes, assessment and grading. Currently, all COORs have course level student learning outcomes (CSLOs) that are aligned to program level outcomes (PSLOs), and include grading standards based on assessment levels of "above proficiency", "meets proficiency", or "below proficiency." This work was completed through numerous "Camp COOR" workshops conducted by the Curriculum Committee chair. The chair, who is also the TLP CSLO lead, provided coaching to groups, as well as to individuals.

Additionally, beginning in 2010-11, the TLP CSLO lead worked with faculty to implement CSLO assessment. Faculty wrote planning forms, collected data and wrote improvement plans where needed. As part of the planning process, faculty members identified proficiencies for each of the CSLOs for their courses. This work was also completed through the coaching by the CSLO faculty lead, as well as other faculty leaders on campus who were involved in the process.

The TLP is currently reviewing the data collection and alignment processes on campus. The TLP experimented with a home-grown electronic system of tracking and aggregating data. However, during the pilot the TLP evaluated its usage and determined there is a better way to collect data and stronger ways to ensure alignment. The TLP is currently reviewing the Program Review templates as a mechanism to collect not only PSLO information, but CSLO information as well. This approach will aid in the alignment between CLSO and PSLO assessments, as well as tie it to planning. Professional development on the revised approach will occur when the model is completed later this academic year.

II.B.1 The Student Services Planning Task Force will develop annual goals for Student Services as a whole, during 2008-09. These goals will be folded into student learning outcomes for each program/service and an annual assessment will follow at the end of the academic year, evaluating the progress and/or achievement of those goals.

While the development of Student Services goals did not occur according to the anticipated schedule, the goals are now in place and they will inform future student learning outcomes for Student Services. The goals were drafted in spring 2010 by the Student Services Planning Committee. During the fall 2010 semester, all Student Services employees had the opportunity to review and discuss the draft goals and provide feedback. Based on the feedback received and further discussion, the goals were revised and finalized at the end of the fall semester. Given the delay in developing the goals, they will remain in place through spring, 2012.

During the spring 2012 semester, the Student Services Planning Committee will initiate an assessment of progress made on the goals and the relationship to student learning outcomes for Student Services programs.

II.B.3.a The Counseling staff and Student Services managers will explore the feasibility of web-based counseling, so that more comprehensive and secure counseling services can be offered online.

The counseling staff has explored the feasibility of offering web-based counseling, but has not been able to design a mechanism that would adequately address the issue of student privacy. However, the present protocol offers students an email response from a counselor that is delivered within 48 hours, but is not "live."

Once LMC students are provided a secure college e-mail account – which was being implemented gradually during spring 2011 – the college should be able to provide students "live chat" counseling through WebAdvisor. The counselors' plan is to pilot this new service during fall semester, 2011

II.B.3.a The director of student life will develop a strategic plan to address program development and goals, as well as related budget and staffing needs.

During fall 2010, the Office of Student Life completed a three-year strategic plan. The planning team was led by the director of student life and included the student life coordinator and the dean of student development. The basis of the plan was a mission statement: "We provide leadership development opportunities that support students in becoming agents of positive social change and responsible members of a diverse and global community". It also included a vision statement: "We will be a hub of student engagement and leadership development at Los Medanos College."

More specifically, in the strategic plan the team identified goals/objectives with related timelines for measuring progress in five areas: policies and procedures; equipment, technology and facilities; communication and marketing; programs and partnerships; and budget and staffing. The Office of Student life achieved many of the outcomes specified for year one (2010-11) of the plan.

II. B.3.f Admissions and Records will implement and then evaluate the policy and procedure changes that are designed to protect the integrity of student grades and evaluate the changes during 2008-09.

The Admissions and Records directors continue to monitor the colleges' grade changes each month by running a report, attaching each item of back-up and checking the report with the back-up documentation. Since performing the monthly grade change report, there have been no irregularities or inconsistencies in any grade changes.

In September, 2008, the district undertook a project to import legacy records into Datatel's Colleague system in order to respond to accreditation questions and issues at Diablo Valley College. Because of this project, additional A&R personnel were given access to the grade change screen (STAC) and an additional report was developed to monitor the importing of these records. Because of the lack of district funding, the project was discontinued in 2010; however, the colleges were directed to continue importing legacy records since students need the coursework for transcripts or graduation. The report is run and checked monthly by the Admissions and Records directors.

The district routinely performs compliance assessment pursuant to Student Services Procedure 3028 -- the most recent audit was completed in March, 2010. The results of this audit were favorable regarding the college's compliance to the policies set out in Board Policy 3024, Recording Grade Changes and Securing Student Records.

II.C.1 The April 2008 proposal Tutoring/Academic Support Services at LMC: Proposal to the SGC will be implemented beginning in fall of 2008 and evaluated at the end of the first academic year.

Since the completion of the Institutional Self Study in 2008, the college has made changes to the tutoring services and continues to evaluate the changes and make improvements. During 2009, tutoring and reading and writing services moved into a permanent location, at the center of the College Complex, now called the Center for Academic Support. The new location provides greater access and visibility for all students. The center offers various opportunities for support, including peer tutoring, faculty reading and writing consultants and a *The Professor Is In* program with faculty.

The Center for Academic Support has engaged various assessment activities which then resulted in changes to the services and procedures of the center. Activities include assessment of student learning outcomes, faculty observations, and meetings with an assessment consultant.

SLO assessment activities involving tutoring are coordinated through the Tutoring Support Team (TST). During 2009, this team created tutoring SLOs that aligned with the Library and Learning SLOs. At this time, the TST also created learning outcomes for the peer tutors (TSLOs) to better inform the tutor training curriculum. Assessment for SLO #1 (tutees) was conducted in fall, 2009. Based on the results, the team revised the survey and implemented it again in spring, 2010 at both the Pittsburg and Brentwood locations. The team also conducted assessment on SLO #2. Results of the assessments were used to improve tutor training and used in the Program Review process. Assessment of SLOs is ongoing. The TST will conduct assessment of tutors (TSLOs) during this semester, and use the results in spring 2012.

Beginning in 2009, the Center for Academic Support Coordinator began documenting changes in tutor training based on the training evaluations. These evaluations are dynamic and inform the initial and ongoing training of students each semester. During fall, 2010, tutor training sessions held during the semester were reduced due to budget cuts. Evaluations and observations of the services indicated that the decrease in training had an impact on the quality of tutoring, so trainings were re-established for spring 2011. Tutor training evaluations continue to be conducted by the Center for Academic Support Coordinator and will inform training of tutors throughout the semester.

In spring 2010, the Center for Academic Support Coordinator began conducting and using Tutor Self-Evaluations. These evaluations are completed each semester and are used to inform the coordinator about training strengths, gaps and needs. Results are used within the same semester during the follow up tutor training sessions, as well as in the new trainings in subsequent semesters.

Beginning in fall, 2010, the Reading and Writing Consultants Faculty Lead conducted observations of most of the faculty consultants working in the Center for Academic Support. The observations were based on a rubric and used for dialog with faculty one-on-one around pedagogy. The rest of the consultants were evaluated in spring, 2011. These observations will be ongoing, conducted by the faculty lead, and used to improve teaching and learning.

The Reading and Writing Consultants Faculty Lead also developed a "Regulars Study." This study was administered beginning in spring, 2011 and is conducted with students who regularly use the Reading and Writing Consultant services. The results will be shared with all Reading and Writing Consultants and used to improve teaching and learning.

The senior academic manager, Center for Academic Support coordinator, and the Reading and Writing Consultants Faculty Lead have been working with the Center for Urban Education (CUE) team to assess services in the Center for Academic Support through an "equity lens." Surveys and observation protocols were developed and revised in fall 2010 for students and faculty in English 90 courses, as well as those using the tutoring and reading and writing services in the Center for Academic Support. Surveys and observations were conducted in spring, 2011 and used to inform the CUE team on campus, as well as the Center for Academic Support, on ways to improve teaching and learning for all students. The senior academic manager, who is also a participant in the CUE project, was responsible for the observations, and for the coordination of using the results of all assessment measures.

The Center for Academic Support coordinator and the Reading and Writing Consultants Faculty Lead used contacts from the *International Writing Centers Association* conference they attended in summer 2010 to inform them about assessment and evaluation practices. In addition, managers and the Center for Academic Support coordinator met with a consultant from City College of San Francisco, on methods of assessment in tutoring. The faculty, staff, and managers, working with the District research office, are determining a research plan for assessment to be conducted in fall, 2011. The senior academic manager will be responsible for spearheading the evaluation, and will coordinate efforts around using the results for improved teaching and learning.

II.C.1.b During the 2008-09 academic year, the librarians, in conjunction with the Academic Senate, interested faculty and other appropriate college committees and/or bodies, will explore the need for an information literacy requirement or proficiency.

At the spring 2008 plenary session, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) passed a resolution stating: "Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to ensure that students demonstrate information competency and provide advice and assistance to local senates that seek to institute new requirements in information competency" (Resolution 9.04, Spring 2008).

In March, 2009, the Los Medanos College Academic Senate discussed the formation of a task force on information competency that would be charged with investigating whether or not information competency learning outcomes are embedded in existing curriculum; documenting those existing outcomes and identifying gaps in the curriculum; and addressing the possible need for a stand-alone graduation requirement. The task force would have been responsible for examining the different ways information competency instruction could be delivered, such as infusing it into existing curriculum, offering a course dedicated to the subject, or as different modules added to existing related courses.

In anticipation of the college adopting an information competency graduation requirement, the Library Department redesigned its Library Studies 14 course in the fall of 2007 to better address the Association of College and Research Libraries' information literacy/competency standards. The course in its new form, Library Research and Information Literacy Skills, was launched in spring 2008. This course is currently used by some students from both DVC and CCC to meet the Information Competency graduation requirement at those colleges.

More recently, the passage of SB1440 has had a significant impact on the discussion of an information competency graduation requirement. The resulting focus on local graduation requirements, which are not allowed to be part of the new SB1440 transfer degrees, led the LMC Academic Senate to vote to revisit all LMC graduation requirements. An information competency graduation requirement is a part of those discussions, which are currently underway. In addition to the discussions in the Academic Senate, and while decisions surrounding existing curriculum are being going on, a needs assessment can still be performed to gather data on the current information competency skill level of LMC students and whether that skill level needs to be addressed with additional instruction. The Library Department is taking the lead on performing the needs assessment in fall, 2011.

II. C.1.c The librarians, in collaboration with other learning support services and the Brentwood Center staff, will secure a permanent space with access to computers for learning support services in Brentwood by fall 2009.

Since the last self study, LMC has significantly increased space for learning support services at the Brentwood Center.

During 2010, the college was able to secure additional leased space from the City of Brentwood is the existing facility. As a result, classroom 13 was converted into space to be used for the Tutoring and Reading and Writing Center. Two computers were added to the new space for use by faculty and students involved in the consultation process.

The college also established a coordinator of student services position at Brentwood. As a result, a conference room was converted into a Student Services Resource Center. Two computers were installed to allow students to access their information through WebAdvisor.

Brentwood also has a computer classroom which is available for student drop-in use, when it is not actually scheduled for classes.

II.C.1.c The staff of the Reading and Writing Center will develop a plan for the Brentwood Center that includes a permanent space with additional computer work stations and expanded hours to meet the needs of students at that location. This plan will be completed by the spring 2009 semester and implemented as resources become available.

Since the completion of the Self Study in 2008, the college has improved services for reading and writing at the Brentwood Center. During 2009, reading and writing services were increased from 6 to 12 hours per week. However, due to budget limitations, combined with limited student use, consultation hours were limited to 9 hours per week during fall 2010 at the Brentwood Center.

Prior to fall 2010, there was limited space for consultations, forcing instructors to hold consultations in any available office. Additional space was added to the center, so currently the Reading and Writing Consultation services and tutors share a dedicated room for all tutoring services. In addition, Brentwood students can access the online consultation services available to all LMC students.

The college will continue to monitor Reading and Writing Center services to ensure appropriate levels of support and services at the Brentwood Center.

II. C.2 Reading and Writing Center staff will provide professional development on ways to utilize the center for faculty and students, including a FLEX activity on writing clear assignments and connecting students to the RWC for reading and writing needs.

The college provides several opportunities for professional development related to reading and writing activities, including conferences, faculty trainings and one-on-one coaching

The Center for Academic Support Coordinator and the Reading and Writing Consultants Faculty Lead attended the *International Writing Centers Association* Conference in summer 2010, which included the following topics: Writing center pedagogy; multilingual writer; diversity and writing center work; writing center leadership; writing center research; writing center assessment; tutor development. The faculty and staff have utilized contacts from this conference to gain a better understanding about assessing the center -- they will continue to use what they have learned to assess and improve services.

The Reading and Writing Consultants Faculty Lead coordinates monthly workshops for faculty and staff on topics related to the reading and writing services. These workshops are conducted by faculty and are based on needs at that time. Non-RWC individuals are invited as guests and are welcome to attend. Usually guests are faculty; however, other guests include a DSPS counselor, representatives from IDEA, and the senior academic manager.

The Center for Academic Support coordinator and the Reading and Writing Consultants Faculty Lead conduct flex activities for the campus around reading and writing needs. Workshops were scheduled in August 2010 on *How to Design Great Writing Assignments and Guide Students: Through Them (Without Killing Yourself or Others),* and in January 2011 on *Scaffolding writing assignments and using the Center for Academic Support.* There were no participants for the second flex activity, so the members reviewed the need for workshops. Flex workshops are coordinated primarily by the Reading and Writing Consultants Faculty Lead and are ongoing.

The Reading and Writing Consultants Faculty Lead meets with reading and writing consultants on their individual sessions. The faculty lead observes the sessions and evaluates the faculty member based on a rubric. The evaluations are used in dialog to improve teaching and learning. Observations are conducted by the Faculty Lead and are ongoing.

II.C.2 The Library and Learning Support Services Committee will work with the professional development committee to offer targeted professional development in SLOs and their assessment to campus computer lab staff by spring 2009.

The Library and Learning Support Services Committee was transformed into the Tutoring Support Team (TST), which includes members from LLSS and tutoring across college labs, including computer labs. This committee created student learning outcomes in 2008 for all tutoring services on campus, including the Brentwood Center. During 2009, the committee approved four common SLOs for all tutoring labs. The TST has completed the assessment cycle for the first SLO, including survey administration, data collection, and dialog based on the results. Earlier in fall 2011, the TST met to plan the assessment of the second SLO. The committee will convene in May to discuss the results and make improvements.

Professional development occurs in various forms throughout the assessment cycle. In 2008, a facilitator from the professional development committee met with the TST to develop SLOs. Since 2008, the TST has met a minimum of twice each semester to discuss SLOs and make improvements based on the results of assessment and dialog. Dialog and discussion are ongoing. The TST will be organizing more targeted professional development focusing on the analysis os SLOs and assessment results.

Standard 3

III.A.2 The college president and faculty organizations will work with the District to address the under representation of full-time faculty at LMC (compared to the other two colleges in the CCCCD).

Since the completion of the Institutional Self Study in 2008, the college has made strides in increasing the number of full-time faculty, in spite of significant overall budget reductions for the District and college.

At the time the self study was written, the college had 107 full-time faculty. Using the "Box 2A process", which was how the District allocated full-time faculty, during academic year 2008-09 the District allocated six new faculty positions to Los Medanos College and grant funds were used to create a seventh position. During the fall, 2009 semester, new full-time faculty were hired in anthropology, biology, math, counseling, drama, English and MESA, which increased the number of full-timers to 114.

Based on analysis of its own needs and a recommendation from the Accrediting Commission, the District developed a new financial allocation model, based on the State SB361 model, which was implemented for the 2010-11 fiscal year. This model allocates operating funds to the colleges based on the same formula that the State allocates funds to community college districts. The colleges now determine how to allocate these funds to all its instructional, student and support services.

Under the new SB361 allocation model, the college president approved the replacement of 6 full-time faculty retirements for fall, 2010, in spite of the 7.9 percent total college budget reduction for the 2010-11 academic year. Included were hires in programs that previously had only adjunct faculty – ETEC, Fire Technology and PTEC. For fall 2010, there were 113 full-time faculty.

The tentative 2011-2012 budget required a further budget reduction of at least 9.1 percent in the total college allocation and a corresponding 8-12 percent reduction in the academic year class schedule. In spite of these required budget and class schedule reductions, the college president approved 4 full-time faculty replacements for 2011-2012 academic year. It is anticipated that for fall 2011, there will be a total of 115 full-time faculty, although late retirements could change that figure.

Therefore, since the time this self-study recommendation was made, the college has increased its full-time faculty by 7.5 percent, as represented in the following table. When funds to the college increase, the college now has authority on its own to further increase its number of full-time faculty.

Fall Semester:	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Full-Time Faculty Headcount	107	110	114	113	115
Change vs. Prior Year	--	+2.8%	+3.6%	-0.9%	+1.8%
Change vs. 2007	--	+2.8%	+6.5%	+5.6%	+7.5%

III.A.4.b Under the leadership of the director of business services, the college will work with the District Equal Opportunity and Diversity Advisory Committee to develop the diversity plan; it will then form its own diversity committee to implement the plan at the college level by June 2009.

The development of the college Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Plan has been on hold while the district and campus waits for further direction and data from the State Chancellor's Office. During the 2010-11 academic year, the district-wide committee (EEODAC) did not meet. Given the budget crisis in the state, this issue appears to be on the back burner and we do not anticipate additional direction from the district in the short term.

Since 2008, members of the IDEA Committee have served on EEODAC and have worked on campus-based initiatives, such as improving our campus climate and culture through the work with Center for Urban Education, the Student Equity Plan and professional development opportunities.

Despite the lack of direction from the state, the IDEA Committee, as charged by Shared Governance Council, will work with District Human Resources during the fall 2011 semester to establish a campus EEO committee, based on the recommended structure outlined in the CCCCD EEO Advisory Committee Procedures and Objectives. IDEA will also update LMC's EEO plan. The plan will provide mechanisms to monitor diversity in hiring, to train hiring committees, to ensure that LMC is following the state EEO guidelines, and to continue to nurture a culture of inclusion, tolerance and appreciation for diversity. Training on these issues can happen regardless of a state model/plan. The IDEA Committee will also collaborate with Professional Development Advisory Committee to provide supporting professional development opportunities.

III.A.5.b. Under the direction of the college president, the college will adopt, implement and evaluate its newly redesigned professional development programs.

A Professional Development Advisory Task Force was formed in April, 2008 and met through February, 2009. During that time it a created a professional development (PD) mission, values, outcomes and guidelines and operational procedures. This information was reported to the Shared Governance Council (SGC) in a May, 2009, report, *Recommendation for PD Program at LMC*. SGC and the college president approved the report.

During February, 2010, the task force transitioned to the shared governance Professional Development Advisory Committee (PDAC). This committee, staffed by the Office of College Advancement, is comprised of representatives from faculty, classified staff, managers and students and meets monthly to fulfill the charges assigned by SGC. The committee reports to SGC annually; it reported in February 2011 for the first time.

The committee recommends a budget (funded by the college and the district office) which is approved by the president. PDAC uses the LMC "disaggregated" results of a district-wide PD survey to lead its planning efforts.

There are six standing PD committees, with membership from PDAC, as well as additional members from outside of the committee. The committee agreed that themes of Student Success and Assessment would weave through all PD activities. PDAC is working closely with the Planning Committee to integrate information about PD needs and activities through the program review process.

The six standing committees are:

- Teaching and Learning
  o Semester-long faculty support networks have been established

- Technology
  o Workshops regarding current and emerging technologies are presented

- Leadership and Organizational Development
  o A series of six workshops were held in spring 2011
  o A semester-long Leadership Academy (for 12 participants) has begun in fall, 2011

- Health and Wellness
  o Workshops and activities for all faculty and staff

- Conference Approval Committee

- The Local Planning Group (LPG)
  o Approves and organizes Flex activities, per the United Faculty contract
  o Chaired by the Senior Dean of Instruction with membership of faculty and managers from PDAC, plus two additional faculty members.

Sub-committees are formed as necessary. Members of PDAC also connect with all other committees on campus to learn of their PD needs.

In terms of evaluation, one of the "guiding principles" of the professional development program is to "integrate evaluation and assessment into the design of all professional development activities." This principle has been implemented as follows:

- All PD activities include expected learning outcomes for participants.
- An evaluation is completed by all participants at the conclusion of all PD activities. The 10-question evaluation asks respondents to rate the activity on how it met expectations, on the overall quality and on how it met the identified learning outcomes.
- PDAC uses the results of the evaluations in order to improve activities and for planning purposes.
- PDAC reports annually to the SGC, which includes a self-evaluation component.

III.B.1 The President's Office will coordinate the development and review of options for a new Brentwood Center.

Under the leadership of the former college president, LMC has made great strides in moving toward a permanent location for its Brentwood Center.

For the past 10 years, the center has been located in space that is leased from the City of Brentwood. While the remodeled supermarket space has served the college well; even with recently added space, it is now at capacity. Therefore, for the past several years, LMC has aggressively pursued a permanent site for the center.

Such a center will provide educational opportunities to the rapidly-growing communities in the eastern portion of LMC's service area. As growth in the area continues, cities such as Brentwood and Oakley are being transformed into highly populated suburban communities. The permanent outreach center will relieve pressures on LMC and provide a more efficient and traffic-sensitive solution for providing programs and services to residents of the area.

During early 2011, the college district purchased 17 acres on the south side of Brentwood, on which it will eventually build a permanent center. At its November 2010 meeting, the Governing Board amended the 2006 Measure Bond Project list to authorize expenditure of $4.8 million in local bond funds to purchase the property; accepted the planning report for the property; and authorized the actual purchase of the land.

The project proposes construction of a new education center that will eventually serve 5,000 full- and part-time students. The center will offer general education and developmental curriculum, with a limited number of career technical programs. Two 44,000 square-foot buildings are planned for the site, which will house classrooms, laboratories and administrative and faculty offices.

During summer of 2011, the district submitted a "final project proposal" to the state for construction of the permanent center. Application for official center status will be submitted during 2011-12.

Standard 4

IV.A.2 The college president and Shared Governance Council will develop and implement a plan to promote employee engagement with institutional governance processes during the 2008-09 academic year.

The Shared Governance Council (SGC) took a more proactive role in the direction of each of the shared governance committees during 2008-09. Time was spent reviewing the purpose of each committee; then, using the Master Plan goals as a guide, the SGC developed specific goals (charges) for each of the committees. SGC members shared this information with each of their constituent groups -- Academic Senate, Associated Students, Classified Senate, and Management Council – in order to identify appropriate representatives for each committee. Through this process of developing clear and specific committee goals and intentional committee recruitment, engagement in the governance process improved.

During fall, 2009, the SGC began the practice of hosting a retreat each semester to address various governance processes and issues. During fall '09 and spring '10 the retreats, which involved SGC members and several additional students, faculty, staff and managers, reviewed each of LMC's planning processes and documents to understand how to best coordinate and integrate planning on campus. During fall '10, the retreat brought over 40 campus stakeholders together to indentify issues around campus climate and to begin to identify strategies to address the identified issues. In spring '11, the retreat brought governance representatives together to review progress on accreditation responses and self-study recommendations and to develop a plan to increase employee engagement in governance and other groups and committees.

IV.B.1.b. The Board will develop metrics by which to monitor educational programs. It will also update and promulgate a districtwide strategic plan and complete a workforce development plan.

The Governing Board monitors educational programs through the District Educational Policy Committee (EPC), which was established by Board Policy 4008. The policy requires the committee to meet at least annually "to discuss the review, establishment, modification and discontinuance of courses and program for each of the colleges."

At the college level, program review is the mechanism to monitor the quality of its educational and student services programs. As mandated by board policy, the review process is conducted every five years, with annual updates required each fall. While the process is slightly different at each college, the policy requires "both quantitative and qualitative elements and should assist programs in developing and articulating a vision for promoting academic excellence." It goes on to mandate that the review be "based on appropriate core data, i.e. enrollment trends, and should relate to college planning processes and lead to better utilization of existing resources and increased quality of instruction and service."

Every fall, each college reports a summary of program review results to the EPC, including the requirement to list programs identified as "in trouble" based on program review or enrollment management issues. LMC has had no programs "in trouble" in recent years.

During spring 2011, the District's Strategic Plan was updated using a participatory process involving all constituencies, under the leadership of LMC's retired vice president.

Finally, for 2011-12, the Governing Board adopted three objectives, based on the Strategic Plan, related to this recommendation:

- Track progress for 2009-10 against designated indicators of student learning and success, using 2009-10 as the base year.
- Receive reports on criteria used to make decisions regarding educational courses, programs and services offered or reduced/eliminated and their impact on students.
- Increase Board member understanding of the workforce demands in Contra Costa County, how they are determined, and how the District supports those demands.

IV.B.3.b. Under the leadership of the college president, LMC will evaluate the District's new administrative structure for efficiency and effectiveness.

The LMC management team regularly informally evaluates the District's services to the college – to its employees and to its students. The college president periodically takes information to the Chancellor's Cabinet for discussion and follow up.

Partially as a result of cabinet discussions, during spring 2011, the chancellor redesigned the District's administrative structure, with a view to improving efficiency and effectiveness. Major changes focused on the roles/responsibilities of the now three vice chancellors and their divisions. Implementation began during summer 2011. The college will continue its informal evaluation of District services once implementation is complete.

LMC also has active representatives on the District Governance Council (DGC), which provides input and feedback on District services. During 2010-11, the DGC was chaired by an LMC faculty member.

During spring 2011, the District also conducted an extensive employee survey that focused on governance and decision making. Of 167 respondents to the survey, 37 were from LMC. The open-ended responses to the questions included feedback on some issues involving efficiency and effectiveness. Survey results are being analyzed and will be used to improve services.

At its retreat in August, 2011, the Chancellor's Cabinet conducted an informal evaluation of the District's administrative structure. One of the objectives from the Districtwide Strategic Plan is to "increase operational and administrative efficiency to deliver educational services utilizing the most cost effective methods."

IV.B.2.c. Under the leadership of the college vice president, the college will evaluate the District's hourly teaching budget formulas in terms of adequacy in supporting the effective operations of the colleges and propose modifications, as needed.

Since the completion of the Institutional Self Study in 2008, the college has made great strides in fully funding the hourly teaching budget, in spite of significant overall budget reductions for the District and the college.

The college was successful in working with the District Office to revise the hourly teaching budget to correct the major flaw in the model. Historically, the budget model ignored the college average hours per full-time faculty equivalent. It had assumed that all faculty are assigned a full-time equivalent workload of 15 hours per week, based on the lecture mode of instruction. Los Medanos College has traditionally scheduled a significant number of sections with the laboratory mode of instruction, thus increasing the average hours per full-time faculty equivalent to 16.36 hours per week. This flaw had resulted in the college significantly overspending the hourly teaching budget in spite of the productivity (FTES/FTEF) it had achieved, as compared to the agreed-upon productivity goal.

Beginning in fiscal year 2009-10, the District revised the budget model to incorporate the actual college average hours of full-time instructors per full-time faculty equivalent. With this new allocation methodology resulting in a more realistic budget based on FTES goals and productivity, Los Medanos College was successful in keeping spending well within its hourly teaching budget based on improved college productivity for the first time since the inception of the flawed hourly teaching budget methodology. All previous fiscal years, the college's spending had significantly exceeded the hourly teaching budget, in spite of achieving the budgeted productivity, as represented in the following table:

Fiscal Year:	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Goal Productivity	16.4	16.5	16.7	18.0
Actual Productivity	15.0	16.4	18.1	18.4
Budget Under/(Over) Spent	$(1,251,969)	$(850,557)	$522,257	$85,394

Based on one of the recommendations from the Accrediting Commission, the District developed a new financial allocation model based on the State SB361 model. It was implemented for the 2010-11 fiscal year. This model allocates operating funds to the colleges based on the same formula the State allocates funds to the colleges. Now the college itself determines how to allocate these funds to all its instructional, student and support services.

This new allocation methodology has provided Los Medanos College full authority to determine what level of funds to allocate to instructional costs. With this new authority, the college has further improved the hourly teaching budget to properly incorporate the projected instruction from full-time faculty in order to correctly project the instructional budget for part-time faculty, in order to achieve the college FTES and productivity goals. The projected instruction from full-time faculty now accurately projects the budget impact of other variables, such as reassigned time, grant-funded instruction and banked load. This new approach allows the college to

accurately budget and track its instructional costs. The hourly teaching budget projections for fiscal year 2010-11 presented above reflect these improvements.

Also related to the teaching budget, during the current semester, LMC is evaluating its faculty reassigned time in terms of "deliverables" and cost effectiveness.

IV.B.2.g. The District will develop mechanisms for regularly evaluating role delineation and governance and decision-making structures, and make improvements, such as increasing participation in district governance, based on the evaluation results.

Processes to regularly evaluate role delineation and governance and decision-making structures were codified in Board Policy 1012, revised January 26, 2011, and Administrative Procedure 1012.01, adopted November 23, 2010, both titled Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment and Continuous Improvement. They indicate:

Board Policy 1012

The Chancellor shall establish and implement regular cycles of review for assessing the effectiveness of (1) the District's administrative organization and (2) the delineation of roles and responsibilities of the District and the colleges, and (3) the District governance and decision-making processes.

Administrative Procedure 1012.01

In its role of supporting the mission and functions of the colleges, the District Office shall maintain a document delineating the roles, responsibilities and service outcomes of the colleges and the District Office in departments shared by each entity. The contents of the document shall be evaluated every four years and the results used as a basis for continuous improvement of the operations.

District governance and decision-making processes shall be evaluated every three years and the results used as a basis for improving the processes. At a minimum, all persons who serve in leadership positions at the District level and all who serve on District committees shall participate in the evaluation process.

Evaluating Role Delineation

The District Office implemented a Department/Unit Review process, whereby each department will complete its first review within a two-year period, beginning 2009-10. An essential element of this review is a "…delineation of District and college roles, responsibilities, service outcomes" – accomplished through the collaborative process of the District Office department/unit manager and the corresponding college unit in completing this evaluation, review, and update of the District's "Delineation of District and College Roles, Responsibilities, and Service Outcomes" document.

Evaluating Governance and Decision-Making Structures

A "District-Level Governance and Decision-Making Assessment" survey was developed through the District Governance Council (DGC) and was administered Districtwide on February 24, 2011. The results were shared first with the Chancellor's Cabinet on May 4, 2011 and then with the District Governance Council on May 17, 2011 and June 14, 2011. DGC has developed an initial set of recommended actions which will be vetted this fall and shared with the Chancellor's Cabinet for final review prior to implementation.

Appendices – Evidence

CR1: SLO assessment

CR2: Brentwood Center alignment

CR3: Professional development plan

CR4: Disclosure of materials fees

DR2: Code of ethics

DR3: SLOs and faculty evaluation process

DR4: Evaluation of administrative organization