



College Recommendation Report 2014
Response to
Accreditation Site Visit Recommendation

To

Planning and Budgeting Council

Submitted by

**Cañada
College**

4200 Farm Hill Boulevard
Redwood City, California
94061

Table of Contents

Report Preparation	3
College Recommendations for Improvement	4
College Recommendation #1	4
Background	4
Actions Completed to Fully Address Recommendation.....	5
Conclusion	7
Evidence.....	7

Report Preparation

Cañada College received a letter dated February 7, 2014 from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges requiring us to address the recommendations we received during our fall 2013 site visit in our Midterm Report. In response, the College began preparing a report of the actions taken to improve our institutional effectiveness.

In October, the College Recommendation Report 2014 was submitted to all planning councils and constituent groups to review and provide feedback. On November 5, 2014, the members of the Planning and Budgeting Council approved the report.

College Recommendations for Improvement

College Recommendation #1

In order to improve institutional effectiveness the college should record the robust dialogue that exists at the College between planning councils and governance groups, particularly the exchanges that relate to planning and resource allocation outcomes and processes. (I.B.4)

Background

The college sincerely appreciated the commendation made by the Team on “imbuing a culture of inclusion by fostering a high level of participation in the decision making process leading to outstanding collegiality and collaboration among the faculty, staff, students, and administration.” And, we recognize it is our responsibility to communicate the outcomes of the conversations resulting from this high level participation through minutes, postings on the website, etc. As the team noted on page 31 of the *External Evaluation Report*, “The College demonstrated robust dialog to the visiting team; however providing a record of the dialog and resource decisions could be better communicated.”

Of particular concern to the Team was the communication of information in our primary resource allocation activity – the new position proposal process. In this process, the dialog among the four participatory governance groups was robust, and although we captured the comments, these were not posted or distributed campus-wide. In addition, when the President made his decision about the positions to hire, he sent an all-campus email, but this was not documented in the minutes of the Planning and Budgeting Council meetings nor posted to the website.

The college recognizes the need to improve our processes and make certain that campus conversations are recorded, circulated among the campus communities, and documented on the website. We have taken action and implemented processes which are described below and have now fully addressed this recommendation.

Actions Completed to Fully Address Recommendation

Beginning in November 2013, we established a new enhanced standard for documenting and communicating planning and resource allocation decisions. The College now creates dedicated web pages for discussions and decisions related to budget development, new staffing positions, and allocation of resources for equipment, research and professional development. On these web pages, links are provided in chronological order to relevant documents including: process, timelines, discussion notes, meeting minutes, and college-wide communications. By collating documentation that exists in disparate locations we are able to show clearly the evidence of dialogue and communication that occurs among our participatory governance groups, the campus and our community.

Below are several examples that illustrate our new documentation and communication standards.

Reallocation of Measure G Funding

As Measure G, the San Mateo County parcel tax that significantly augmented the college's budget, was heading to expire, the President asked the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) to create a transparent process for determining the allocation of carryover Measure G funds and transfer of one-time funded programs to other sources of funding including the General Fund. In order to ensure that the process and dialogue was clearly recorded and communicated, the college records detailed minutes of meetings and posts all relevant documentation online in chronological order.

1. The process created by PBC involved requiring the affected programs to provide a report of their activities, proposals to function at reduced funding and projected impact of reduced or lost funding.
2. These reports were made available to the entire college by posting online.
3. The meeting agenda for PBC's discussion and prioritization was distributed college-wide.
4. Concerted effort was made to ensure that detailed content of the discussion and PBC's recommendation to the president was recorded in meeting minutes.
5. The President's decision was reported to PBC and shared with the entire college and our community through the Olive Hill Press.
6. All documents and minutes were posted online in chronological order.
<http://canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/MeasureG.php>

Prioritization of Funding New Positions

The College's Participatory Governance Manual delineates the process for proposing and prioritizing the funding of new faculty/staff/administrative positions. This process occurs twice yearly: once in fall semester, once in spring semester and is based upon program review and submission of a New Position Proposal. In order to ensure that the process and dialogue was clearly recorded and communicated, the college records detailed minutes of meetings and posts

all relevant documentation online in chronological order.

1. The prioritization process includes posting of all New Position Proposals and Program Reviews online.
2. Representatives make college-wide presentations of their proposals. These are video recorded and posted on iTunesU for the entire campus community to view.
3. Discussion groups, consisting of members from all Planning Councils (IPC, SSPC, APC, PBC), the Academic Senate, constituent groups, and the college community at large, identify the pros and cons of each proposal. These lists are posted on the walls during the meeting so all attending are able to review them.
4. The lists of pros and cons generated from the meeting are transcribed, posted online, and distributed as part of the agenda packet for the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) meeting to discuss.
5. PBC discusses the process and makes final recommendation to the president. This is captured in meeting minutes.
6. The President's decision is announced to the PBC, recorded in meeting minutes, and announced via email to the campus.
7. All documents and minutes were posted online in chronological order:
<http://canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/staffing-1314.php>
<http://canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/staffing-1415.php>

Continual Improvement of Program Review

The Academic Senate established a goal to revise and improve the Program Review and resource request process, forms, and timeline. This process would involve dialogue with the four planning councils (IPC, SSPC, APC and PBC). To ensure that the process was transparent, inclusive, and communicated, the Senate recorded detailed minutes of meetings and posted all relevant documentation online in chronological order.

1. Academic Senate held discussions about the strengths and weaknesses of current program review processes and recorded those in meeting minutes. Senate also conducted faculty-wide surveys, advertised by all-college emails, and posted the results online.
2. Academic Senate and Instructional Planning Council (IPC) constructed a draft proposal, held discussions and conducted additional faculty-wide surveys to gain feedback on the proposal.
3. Academic Senate discussed and adopted the final proposal.
4. IPC developed and adopted a timeline for Instructional Program Review.
5. In consultation with SSPC and APC, the timeline is revised and adopted by PBC for college-wide use.
6. All documents and minutes were posted online in chronological order:
<http://www.canadacollege.edu/academicsenate/programreview.php>

Allocation of Resources Requests from Program Review

A significant component of Program Review at Cañada College is the request for human, equipment, facilities, research and professional development resources. The process of reviewing these requests and decisions for allocation of funding is clearly delineated and communicated by posting all relevant documentation online in chronological order.

1. The process for reviewing and allocating funds for new position proposals has been described previously in this report in the section entitled *Prioritization of Funding New Positions*.
2. The process for allocating funds for instructional equipment, information technology, facilities, research and professional development requests begins with a review of the requests by the Instructional, Student Services, and/or Administrative Planning Councils based upon the justification provided in the most recent program review Program Plan. The planning councils forward requests that are recommended for funding to the appropriate administrative units or funding committee (e.g. instructional deans council, technology purchasing committee, Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, etc.).
3. A report is prepared for PBC that summarize fulfilled requests and identifies un-funded needs. These documents are posted online on the appropriate Resource Allocation website. <http://canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/budget.php>

Conclusion

The College has enhanced its system of documenting dialogue, especially those related to planning and resource allocation, and is currently implementing this process.

Evidence

[Prioritization of Funding New Positions](#)

[Reallocation of Measure G Funding](#)

[Improvement of Program Review](#)

[Allocation of Resources](#)