



**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 .....	4
College Recommendations for Improvement .....	5
College Recommendation #1 .....	5
Background .....	5
Actions Completed to Fully Address Recommendation .....	6
Conclusion .....	7
Evidence .....	7

## **Report Preparation**

Cañada College began its preparations for its College Recommendation Report 2014 addressing the recommendation of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (the Commission) cited in their letter of February 7, 2014, that required the College to address it to its Midterm Report.

In October, the College Recommendation Report 2014 was submitted to all planning councils and constituent groups to review and 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 correct this process and make certain campus conversations are recorded, circulated among the campus communities, and documented on the website. Beginning in December, we employed this documentation process with our group discussions about new positions for 2014-2015. These discussions were communicated widely to campus and included in the minutes of the Planning and Budgeting Council and were recorded for future reference. The revised process is described below.

## Actions Completed to Fully Address Recommendation

*Record the robust dialogue that exists between planning councils and governance groups, particularly the exchanges that relate to planning and resource allocation outcomes and processes*

To assure that the robust dialogue occurring during our planning and resource allocation in relation to hiring process. Joint meetings is well documented, the following process is being used:

1. Discussion Groups (including all Planning Councils, constituent groups, and college community): The groups discuss the pros and cons of the proposal (in the case of December 4, this is for each of the ten new positions proposed).
2. Posting: The pros and cons from each group are posted during the meeting so all attending are able to review them.
3. Documenting: The pros and cons from the meeting are transcribed.
4. Presenting: The pros and cons information were send out as part of the agenda packet for the Planning and Budgeting Council meeting and discuss as a report. The report is posted to the website as part of the attachments to the meeting minutes.
5. Decision-making: When the president makes a decision (in this case about hiring), he sends an email to campus, and also formally announce the information to the Planning and Budgeting Council. A document is then included as an attachment to the Planning and Budgeting Council meeting minutes.

In addition to what the Team's recommendation, the College summarizes processes that occur during 2013-2014 related to planning and resource allocation.

To assure that the robust dialogue occurring during our planning and resource allocation in relation to **Measure G**. Measure G funding has been ended by July 2014. The president brought this topic to Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) in early January 2014 and asked PBC to create a process so the planning and resource allocation would be transparent. Again Joint meetings is well documented, the following process is being used:

1. Discussion Groups (including all Planning Councils, constituent groups, and college community): The groups discuss the pros and cons of each programs that were funded by Measure G (PBC meeting minutes XXX).
2. Ranking: Each of the funded programs were ranked from each group and discussed in the big group.
3. The list of the ranking was forwarded to the president along with explanation. (PBC meeting minutes XXX).
4. Decision-making: The president makes a decision, he sends an email to campus, and also formally announce the information to the PBC on September 3, 2014. A document is then

included as an attachment to the PBC meeting minutes (09/03/2014). The decision is also aligned with the College's priorities--the Educational Master Plan.

To assure that the robust dialogue occurring during our planning and resource allocation in relation to **the program review resource requests**. The following process is being used:

1. Planning Councils: each planning council discusses their program review resource requests, especially hiring needs, technology equipment and instructional equipment. (PCs meeting minutes XXX)
2. Division: each division prioritize these needs and brought to VPs.
3. VPs: VPs discuss and recommend these needs with CBO and the president.
4. Decision-making: The president makes decisions for funding the needs and VPs release the funding to division.

## Conclusion

**The College has expanded the system of documenting discussions by the campus community and is currently implementing this process.**

## Evidence

Planning & Budgeting Council

Planning & Budgeting Council Meeting Agenda and Minutes

Hiring process cycle and decision

Measure G resource allocation

Allocation of Resources