Cañada College

Midterm Report 2016

Midterm Report 2016

To

Accrediting Commission for Community and junior Colleges

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Submitted by

Cañada College

4200 Farm Hill Boulevard

Redwood City, CA 94061

650.306.3100

www.canadacollege.edu

February 2016

Midterm Report 2016 – Certification Page

Date: February 16, 2016

This Midterm Report 2016 is submitted to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges/Western Association of School (ACCJC/WASC) for the purpose of fulfilling the Commission's requirement to produce a Midterm Report in the third year after the College's comprehensive evaluation.

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

Signed:

_____
Dave Mandelkern, President, Board of Trustees

_____
Ron Galatolo, Chancellor

_____
Jennifer Hughes, Interim College President

_____
Douglas Hirzel, President, Academic Senate

_____
Debbie Joy, President, Classified Senate

_____
XXX, President, Associated Students of Cañada College

_____
Dr. Chialin Hsieh, Accreditation Liaison Officer/Dean of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness

Table of Contents

Report Preparation

Background

Cañada College submitted its Self Evaluation Report 2013 in July 2013, which was followed by an evaluation team visit on October 22-24, 2013. On February 7, 2014, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (the Commission) reaffirmed the College's accreditation with the requirement of a Follow-Up Report due October 15, 2014, which would address resolution of recommendation relating to the following specific area:

College Recommendation 2
In order to meet the Standard, the College must review its system for identifying course outlines of record that are out of date to improve and implement a curriculum process that ensures all Course Outlines of Record are reviewed and curriculum currency is maintained. (II.A.2.e)

The College submitted its Follow-Up Report 2014 to the Commission on October 8, 2014, which was followed by an evaluation team visit on November 12, 2014. On February 6, 2015, the Commission found that the College has addressed 2013 Recommendation 2, resolved the deficiencies, and met Standard II.A.2.e.

Preparation of the Midterm Report 2016

In March 2015, the College began preparations for this Midterm Report which serve to update the Commission on the College's progress on all recommendations noted below.

College Recommendation 2
In order to meet the Standard, the College must review its system for identifying course outlines of record that are out of date to improve and implement a curriculum process that ensures all Course Outlines of Record are reviewed and curriculum currency is maintained. (II.A.2.e)

College Recommendation 1
In order to improve institutional effectiveness the College should provide evidence of 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)

District Recommendation 1
In order to increase effectiveness the District and Colleges should broadly communicate the modification of the evaluation process for faculty and others directly responsible for student progress, which includes student learning outcomes, and ensure that the process is fully implemented. (III.A.1.c)

District Recommendation 2

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the Board of Trustees should develop goals for increasing its professional development and orientation of new Trustees. (IV.B.1.f)

District Recommendation 3
In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the District should establish a regular cycle for the evaluation of its services and provide documentation regarding the outcomes of the evaluations. (IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.g)

In order to prepare this report, the interim president led a College wide conversation about the recommendations for improvement, established a timeline for the report's completion, identified responsible parties for each recommendation, reviewed processes, provided adequate support, and finalized the details of the preparation plan. The ad hoc committee, Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC), under The Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) was established with members serving as liaisons to and providing support for specific committees assigned to address each recommendation. Further, the president emphasized to the AOC members that the completion of the Midterm Report 2016 required broad participation from constituent groups, including participatory governance committees, faculty, staff, and students.

Describe timeline of preparation and process of reviewing during Spring 2016.

During the week of August 12, 2016, the final draft of the Midterm Report 2016 was sent for feedback to members of the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, the Student Senate, all the Planning Councils, and the President's Cabinet. Planning and Budgeting Council approved the report at their meeting on September 7, 2016. The approved report was sent to the Chancellor's Council for review and approval.

Lastly, the Midterm Report 2016 was submitted to the Board of Trustees for first read on September, 21, 2016, and the board approved it on October 5, 2016.

The final Midterm Report 2016 was submitted to the Commission by **October 10, 2016**.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank all members of the College and the District who have generously contributed to the preparation of this report.

College Recommendation 2
Curriculum Committee Chair Dani Behonick, PhD, Academic Senate President/Planning and Budgeting Council co-chair Professor Doug Hirzel, Vice President of Instruction Gregory Anderson, EdD, Dean of Science and Technology Janet Stringer, MD, PhD, and all members of the Curriculum Committee.

College Recommendation 1
Academic Senate President/Planning and Budgeting Council co-chair Professor Doug Hirzel, Classified Senate President/Planning and Budgeting Council co-chair Debbie Joy, Instructional Planning Council co-chairs Jessica Kaven, EdD and Gregory Anderson, EdD, Student Services Planning Council co-chairs Ruth Miller and Kim Lopez, Administrative Planning Council chair Chialin Hsieh, EdD, Vice President of Administrative Services, Michelle Marquez, Dean of Science and Technology Janet Stringer, MD, PhD, and all planning council members.

District Recommendation 1
Vice Chancellor of Human Resources Eugene Whitlock and Vice Chancellor of Educational Services and Planning Jamillah Moore

District Recommendation 2
Director of Community/Government Relations Barbara Christensen

District Recommendation 3
Director of General Services Susan Harrison and Vice Chancellor of Educational Services and Planning Jamillah Moore

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

_____

Jennifer Hughes
Interim President

Response to 2013 Team Recommendations
Letter from ACCJC of Affirmation of Accreditation (February 7, 2014)

College Recommendation #2
In order to meet the Standard, the College must review its system for identifying course outlines of record that are out of date to improve and implement a curriculum process that ensures all Course Outlines of Record are reviewed and curriculum currency is maintained. (2.A.2.e)

Actions Completed to Fully Address Recommendation

Course Outlines of Record (COR) Process Revision: October/November 2013

In early September 2013, prior to the arrival of the Accrediting Team in October, the new Vice President of Instruction reviewed the status of the course outlines of record as part of the orientation process for his new position. After his review, he noted, similar to the team's finding, there were CORs which were out-of-date. The VPI met with the Instructional Deans on September 9, 2013 to discuss the need to assure currency. Subsequent to this meeting, the Deans immediately began communicating with faculty members of the need for all courses to be current.

Early in September (after his review), the VPI also communicated with the College President regarding his concern, including the need for additional resources (funding) to assist faculty leadership in reviewing and strengthening the curriculum review process. This funding was approved by the President and provided support for a second faculty member to assist the Curriculum Chair in the revision of the process and review of the CORs.

Information about outdated CORs was shared with the Curriculum Committee at their September 27, 2013 meeting, and they too were concerned about the currency of the curriculum and that the existing process for ensuring regular review and revision of CORs had fallen short of its intended purpose. Curriculum updates were part of the larger process of Instructional Program Review for disciplines. Programs were asked to identify whether their course outlines of record (CORs) had been updated at least once every six years and to detail a plan to bring any outdated course outlines into compliance. At that time, the new VPI discussed with the Curriculum Committee the need for a more effective process by which CORs should be regularly reviewed and how that process must be followed to ensure the review is completed in a timely manner. The group discussed effective processes including methods for communicating with faculty about updating CORs.

In October and early November 2013, faculty and administration worked in earnest to update out-of-date curriculum. Concurrently, the Curriculum Committee engaged in a series of

discussions to create a new policy and procedure for updating curriculum. The draft of this policy, *Resolution for ongoing review and update of prerequisites, corequisites, advisories and course outlines of record,* was first reviewed by the Curriculum Committee on November 8, 2013. The Curriculum Committee provided revisions at this meeting and the revised draft was circulated to the faculty as part of the attachments for the November 14, 2013 Academic Senate meeting. The Senate made comments on the draft document and provided those to the Curriculum Committee. The final document was approved by the Curriculum Committee on November 22, 2013, endorsed by the Academic Senate on December 12, 2013, and was included in the *Cañada College Curriculum Handbook* for the 2014-2015 academic year on pages 40-41.

The new policy clearly defines the timeframe for reviewing CORs (two years for CTE courses and five years for non-CTE courses) and describes the consequences of not completing the review and revision within that timeframe. These included outdated courses being deactivated ("banked") and removed from the College catalog and, if applicable, from the schedule of classes.

The following is an excerpt which describes the process to be used to **identify CORs that are out of date**:

Each January the Office of Instruction will generate a list of all CTE courses that have reached their two-year review cycle and a separate list of all other courses that have reached their five-year review cycle. These lists will be distributed to all faculty, the Curriculum Committee, Division Deans, and posted online no later than the third week of the spring semester. Faculty will have 1 calendar year to update all courses that will remain active. For example, in January 2014, a list of courses will be generated that must be updated for inclusion in the Fall 2015-Spring 2016 catalogue.

The following excerpt from the policy **ensures timely review and currency**:

In accordance with Title 5 and C-ID, the Office of Instruction will generate a list of any courses that have failed to meet the required review deadline. The Curriculum Committee will bank (classify as inactive) and remove from the schedule of classes and catalog those courses until such a time as the COR is updated and approved. The Committee will provide a list of all affected courses to the Academic Senate Governing Council.

In extenuating circumstances, the Curriculum Committee may recommend a one-year extension for updating a COR, during which time the course will continue to be listed in the schedule of classes and catalog. The extension is subject to approval from the Academic Senate Governing Council and Vice President of Instruction.

All CORs Up-to-Date: January 2014

Working closely with faculty and division deans throughout the months of November 2013, December 2013 and January 2014, the Curriculum Committee reviewed all of the outdated CORs that were not in compliance with the new policy review cycle and/or with Title 5 and California Community College Chancellor's Office standards for C-ID. As of the end of January 2014, all CORs were up-to-date according to timeframe outlined in the new policy.

Follow-Up Report 2014

The College submitted its Follow-Up Report 2014 to the Commission on October 8, 2014, which was followed by an evaluation team visit on November 12, 2014. On February 6, 2015, the Commission found that the College has addressed 2013 Recommendation 2, resolved the deficiencies, and met Standard II.A.2.e.

A Letter from ACCJC of Follow-Up Report with visit (February 6, 2015)

Continuous Improvement

The 2014-2015 academic year was the first year of full implementation of this new curriculum policy. This policy was communicated to campus faculty directly (e.g. presentation to faculty by the Curriculum Committee Chairperson at beginning-of-year Instructional Division meetings, email notification) and was included in the Curriculum Handbook. Two hundred and forty four (244) courses were identified as needing review/update during the 2014-2015 academic year; of these, 22 courses (9.02%) were not updated. According to the policy in place, discipline faculty responsible for these courses could petition the Curriculum Committee for a 1-year extension of their curriculum update based on extenuating circumstances. Five disciplines, responsible for 11 of these 22 outdated courses, submitted extension requests; the Curriculum Committee granted 3 of these requests. The remaining 8 courses, along with the 11 outdated courses for which no extension was requested, were banked, removed from any applicable degrees/certificates and removed from the 2015-2016 college catalog and Fall 2015 Schedule of Classes by the Curriculum Committee.

Following the first year of its implementation, this policy was revised further and this revised draft was reviewed and approved by the Curriculum Committee on September 11, 2015. This revised policy is included in the Cañada College Curriculum Handbook for the 2015-2016 academic year on pages 47-48. In particular, the process to identify CORs that are out of date was revised to reflect the timeline used during the 2014-2015 academic year.

Each June the Office of Instruction will generate a list of all CTE courses that have reached their two-year review cycle and a separate list of all other courses that have reached their five-year review cycle. These lists will be distributed to all faculty, the Curriculum Committee, division deans, and posted online no later than the first week of July. Faculty will have 1 academic year to

update all courses (and programs where necessary/appropriate) that will remain active. For example, in July 2015, a list of courses will be generated that must be updated for inclusion in the Fall 2016-Spring 2017 catalogue. These courses (and associated programs, where necessary/appropriate) must be updated, reviewed and approved at one of the Curriculum Committee meetings during the 2015-2016 academic year to remain active in the 16-17 catalogue.

The policy was also revised to eliminate the option for faculty to request a 1-year extension to their curriculum updates based on extenuating circumstances. Beginning in the 2015-2016 academic year, all courses that are scheduled for update during an academic year that are not updated will be banked by the Curriculum Committee (and removed from degrees/certificates, the college catalog, and, as applicable, from the Schedule of Classes) at the end of that academic year. A series of materials were also created to assist Instructional Deans in guiding their faculty through this Curriculum Update process.

Conclusion

The College has met the directive of the Team's recommendation outlined in the External Evaluation Report by making the following changes:
1. Curriculum review (regular update of courses and programs) is no longer part of the Instructional Program Review process, but rather occurs as a separate process overseen by the Curriculum Committee.
2. A policy was developed and implemented that both identifies CORs that are out of date and ensures timely review and currency of curriculum. This policy was communicated to faculty both directly (e.g. by presentation at Instructional Division meetings and email notification) and through inclusion in the Curriculum Handbook.
3. Following the first year of implementation, this policy was revised to reflect an updated procedural timeline and to simplify the process.

We believe no additional action is necessary to further review our system or implement additional processes. The system is well-established and integrated into the curriculum process.

The College has met College Recommendation 2 in full.

Evidence

See evidence for College Recommendation 2. (Website)

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." The college community recognizes that it is our responsibility to communicate the outcomes of the conversations resulting from this high level participation through minutes, postings on our 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, the College 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.

Documenting Reallocation of Time-Limited Funding

As Measure G, the San Mateo County parcel tax that significantly augmented the college's budget, neared expiration 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 created a web page upon which has documented the process and timeline to be followed, all relevant program justification reports, detailed minutes of the discussion during PBC, and the president's final report and explanation of the decision. This website can be found at
http://canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/MeasureG.php

Documenting Human Resource Allocations

The College's Participatory Governance Manual delineates the process for proposing and prioritizing the funding of faculty/staff/administrative positions. The process varies depending upon the funding source, type of position, and whether it is a new or replacement position. The college evaluates new general fund positions on a biennial basis. Each semester a dedicated web page is constructed that delineates the steps of the process. Links to relevant documentation, such as proposals, presentations, meeting minutes and emails are added to each step. Every effort is made to capture in the minutes the rich dialogue that occurs. The president announces and explains the rationale for the decision both at the Planning and Budgeting Council and through the President's newsletter, the Olive Hill Press. By providing this compilation of documents in chronological order, all employees and the public at large are afforded the ability to easily follow the process and better understand the rationale that led to the outcomes.

For greater clarity, please view our 2015-16 New Position Process at:
http://canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/staffing-1516.php

The college employs a different standard of documentation for other types of position decisions. For categorical- or grant-funded positions, temporary positions, and replacement of general fund vacancies, the decision-making process does not involve college-wide participation. Rather, the discussion occurs in Cabinet, Academic Senate, and/or the classified staff collective bargaining unit. Documentation of the dialogue occurs within the meeting minutes of those entities. In all cases, the final decision is announced at the college's Planning and Budgeting Council through its regular "Staffing Updates" agenda item.

Documenting Space Allocation Decisions

The College relies upon its Participatory Governance Manual (PGM) to codify the processes by which decisions are made and how employees can participate through their respective

governance groups. The PGM is an online web-based 'living' document that is continually revised in response to feedback and assessments made at the end of a decision process. When gaps are identified, new processes are created and added to the manual. One such example occurred in fall 2015 with a proposal to relocate our transfer and career centers into spaces currently occupied by an art gallery and meeting room. There was no existing process in the PGM for this type of space allocation. So the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) constructed a web page to document the steps this proposal would follow. These are found on this URL http://canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/career_transfer_relocation.php

As input from the participatory governance groups was being gathered, the PBC began crafting a new process by which future space allocation decisions would comply. This new process is document here http://canadacollege.edu/pgm/space-substantive.php

Documenting 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 at http://www.canadacollege.edu/academicsenate/programreview.php

The College continues to improve its program review process. In order to evaluate the program review process and the assessment effort, PBC established the Assessment Advisory Group in fall 2015. Members include PBC, IPC, SSPC, APC chairs, Curriculum chair, and an instructional deans. The charges of this group are to (a) evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the College's program review and assessment effort and provide recommendations to PBC; (b) provide the Institutional Learning Outcome Report to PBC, (c) ensure that Cañada meets ACCJC standards with regards to Student Learning Outcomes and provide recommendations to PBC, (d) update/evaluate Assessment Manual and provide recommendations to PBC, (e) complete/update ACCJC Annual Report and provide recommendations to PBC.

http://www.canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/1516/AnalysisofCollegeAssessmentEffortsRecommendations_final.pdf

The recommendations from the Assessment Advisory Group regarding program review and assessment efforts were (a) revision of the feedback forms, (b) clarification and refinement of resource requests, and (c) to provide training to program review authors, reviewers, and deans on program review template/feedback from, and resource requests. These recommendations were accepted by IPC, SSPC, and APC and implemented in spring 2016.

Documenting Discussions on Enrollment Management

Allocating instructional funds is perhaps the most important function of the college's leadership. Through careful enrollment management a college can successfully offer the schedule of course offerings that is needed to meet student needs balanced with institutional priorities and financial constraints. Extensive communication and education, especially of faculty, is key to ensuring that enrollment management activities are seen as a collaborative and collegial process. Due to the extensive and protracted nature of discussions around this topic, the Academic Senate compiled and maintained records of meeting minutes, reports, and educational presentations at this URL http://www.canadacollege.edu/academicsenate/enrollment.php. This page records the robust dialogue that occurred between the faculty, Academic Senate, deans, and Office of Instruction about these important resource allocation decisions.

Documenting Reassigned Time

The ASGC identified as one of its 2013-14 goals, the need to create a transparent process for awarding reassigned time to faculty for completing non-instructional assignments. Currently approximately 42% of full-time faculty have some form of non-instructional assignment (not including librarians or counselors who, by position, are not completely assigned to instruction). Some of these non-instructional assignments are clearly non-discretionary as they are stipulated by AFT contract or accreditation requirement. Other faculty have "bought out" of teaching by using grant or banked funds. The remaining awards are more discretionary in nature and include time for program coordination. It is this last category that raises so many questions about process and accountability. The robust dialogue and documentation were displayed in Academic Senate meeting minutes and Instructional Planning Council meeting minutes.

    Strategy

- Develop an application for Reassigned Time
- Develop a rubric for evaluating the application
- Add a prompt to Program Review requiring reflection on the impact of non-instructional assignments

    Process

Date	Milestone
August 22, 2013	ASGC sets goal to study non-instructional assignments
December 12, 2013	Presentation to ASGC on Reassigned Time - slides ASGC agrees to include impact of faculty reassigned time in new Annual Planning document

February 27, 2014	ASGC receives first draft of application View draft Process and Application
October 3, 2014	Divisions discuss draft process
October 9, 2014	ASGC revises process based upon division feedback View draft Process - clean copy or red edits View draft request form
November 13, 2014	Divisions discuss revised process and request form ASGC adopts process and request form
January 28, 2015	Website is launched
Oct. 2015	Appeals process is created

http://www.canadacollege.edu/academicsenate/noninstructional.php

Documenting 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.

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*.

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. business office, technology purchasing committee, Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, etc.).

 A report is prepared for PBC that summarizes fulfilled requests and identifies un-funded needs. These documents are posted online on the appropriate Resource Allocation website. http://canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/budget.php

Documenting Institutional Effectiveness Goal Setting

In spring 2015, the state requiring community colleges to develop, adopt and post a goals framework that addresses the following four areas: student performance and outcomes, accreditation status, fiscal viability, and programmatic compliance with state and federal guidelines. This requirement is a condition of receipt of Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) funds. All constituent groups were to discuss this and overall goals recommendation were discussed at the Planning and Budgeting Council meeting on May 20, 2015. In summary, the Institutional Effectiveness Goal Setting has been discussed throughout the institution, the robust dialogue was documented, and feedback was provided to the Planning and Budgeting Council.

Strategic Plan Online (SPOL) System

In spring 2016, the College implements a new online system for program review and resource allocation, as well as planning, called Strategic Planning Online (SPOL). SPOL hosts all the program review reports (including 44 instructional program reviews, 11 student services program reviews, and 6 administrative program reviews), as well as the resource requests. SPOL streamlines the process and provides a mechanism for reviewers to provide instant feedback. In addition, SPOL enhance us for documenting our robust dialogue. The college has offered training and venues for discussion about this new tool on Flex Days.

Conclusion

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

The College has met College Recommendation 1 in full.

Evidence

See evidence for College Recommendation 1. (Website)

District Report Preparation

The San Mateo County Community College District works closely and collaboratively with all three Colleges to facilitate an excellent teaching and learning environment. The District began its activities to address the "District Recommendations" made in the 2014 Commission Action Letters as soon as the District staff became aware of the areas noted for improvement. Following is an update on the progress made to date on these recommendations.

The individuals assigned to address the recommendations included:

Recommendation	Contact office	Summary of Actions Taken
District Recommendation #1 Broadly communicate the faculty evaluation process	Human Resources	The evaluation process for faculty has been revised over the past two years and the new, approved document is included in the Appendices.
District Recommendation #2 Develop goals for professional development & orientation of new Trustees	Office of Communication	Developed goals for professional development and oriented new Trustee. Documented actions taken.
District Recommendation #3 Establish regular cycle of evaluation of services and document outcomes	Office of General Services	Enhanced/Revised regular cycle of evaluation, timeline, and procedures. Documented services outcomes and actions taken.

District Response to Commission Action Letter

District Recommendation #1

In order to increase effectiveness, the District and Colleges should broadly communicate the modification of the evaluation process for faculty and others directly responsible for student progress, which includes student learning outcomes, and ensure that the process is fully implemented. (III.A.1.c)

In the last report dated October 14, 2014, the District reported on how it fully responded to this recommendation by implementing a new evaluation process which incorporated, among other enhancements, student learning outcomes as an integral part of that evaluation process. District Staff and faculty representatives worked together to revise faculty evaluation procedures over a period of two years. Changes were communicated to faculty several times during the revision process, with the final new procedures being introduced to and approved by all faculty in August and September 2014.

The new procedures have been well-received and in the first year of implementation (2014-15), to date (November 2015), the new procedures have been used to evaluate 538 out of approximately 1200 (45%) full and part time faculty and staff across the three Colleges of the District. (Each faculty member is evaluated at least once every three years.) As we have begun using these procedures, District staff and faculty representatives have continued to work together to refine and improve the process based on input from those who use the new procedures most frequently: faculty and deans. For example, based on feedback, the District has now included an online component for students to provide feedback on classes as part of the evaluation process. This collaborative approach has increased everyone's understanding and acceptance of the new procedures.

Conclusion

The District has met District Recommendation 1 in full.

Evidence

See evidence for District Recommendation 1. (Website)

District Recommendation #2

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the Board of Trustees should develop goals for increasing its professional development and orientation of new Trustees. (IV.B.1.f)

Three members of the Board of Trustees have served SMCCCD in their elected capacity ranging from 12 years to 20 years; one Board member has served for two years and a newly elected Trustee took office this year.

Since the last update report, each Trustee has attended many conferences and workshops to enhance their knowledge and awareness of a wide variety of academic, fiscal, legislative and governance matters. The conferences and meetings attended by Trustees in 2015 are included in the Evidence section. The Student Trustee typically attends the bi-annual Statewide Student Senate General Assemblies (Fall and Spring) as well as the Student Leadership Conference hosted by the California Community College Student Affairs Association. Also, all newly elected Student Trustees attend a Student Trustee workshop sponsored by the Community College League of California. Often, Student Trustees attend the National Student Advocacy Conference hosted by the American Student Association of Community Colleges in Washington DC.

Board Policy 1.10, Duties and Responsibilities of the Board, specifically references Trustee professional development activities. It lists, as one of the responsibilities of the Board: "To engage in ongoing development as a Board and to attend trustee education programs that includes a new trustee orientation. The Board will conduct study sessions, provide access to reading materials and support conference attendance and other activities that foster trustee education." 1.01 (2) (h)

For the 2014-15 year, the Board incorporated in its Board Goals a commitment to increase its participation in professional development activities and ensure newly elected Trustees receive orientation training. The District also developed a program for New Trustee Orientation that was used when a new Trustee joined the Board in late 2013 and will be used for the Trustee elected in Nov 2015.

The Board conducts an annual self-evaluation process in a public Board meeting in which they review the Board's performance on a number of items, including Board Operations, Chancellor/Trustee Relations, Faculty/Student/Classified Relations, and Community and Governmental Relationships. The most recent evaluation was conducted in late October, 2015.

Board members regular attend both College and community events regarding educational matters and report the highlights of these meetings at each Board meeting under the "Board Comments"

section of the agenda. Board member s also attend CCLC and CCCT Trustee conferences and occasionally participate in national trustee conferences.

On each regular Board meeting agenda (except during summer months), there is a topic titled "Board Series Presentation—Innovations in Teaching, Learning and Support Services." These presentations--offered by faculty, staff and students--highlight new or innovative aspects of programs and services provided by the Colleges and serve as a means to keep the Board well informed about activities at the Colleges. Recent presentations have covered Project Change, an innovative program at CSM that brings college classes to juvenile detention facilities; The Educator Preparation Institute at Skyline College; ¡ESO! (Expanding Student Opportunities) Grant and Cañada College's Role as a Hispanic Serving Institution; BΘO: Skyline College Phi Theta Kappa Honors Society; *CSM Car*es – A Program Designed To Address the Mental Health Needs of Students; Skyline College – Entering the CIPHER: Fresh Techniques, Hip Hop Elements, and Edutainment in the Classroom; Collaboration Across Boundaries for Equity and Success: Cañada College's Student Success and Equity Projects; and the Small Business Development Center at College of San Mateo. Also at each Board meeting, there is an "Executive Report" in which the Chancellor, Presidents and Academic Senate President update the Board on recent happenings at the Colleges.

New Trustee Orientation

The new Trustee elected in November will be asked to complete the following tasks:

- Meet with the Board Chair to discuss the current issues the District Board is facing.
- Meet the Chancellor and Executive Staff to receive an overview of District operations, budget and governance.
- Meet with each of the three College Presidents to gain an understanding about the College programs, strengths and weaknesses
- Meet with the District Academic Senate President
- Attend the CCCT "New Trustee Orientation" program that is offered annually.
- Review Chapter 1 of District Policy and Procedures to gain an understanding about the duties and responsibilities of the Board, organizational structure of the Board, expectations for Board decorum and Board meeting protocols.

Conclusion

The District has met District Recommendation 2 in full.

Evidence

See evidence for District Recommendation 2. (Website)

District Recommendation #3

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the District should establish a regular cycle for the evaluation of its services and provide documentation regarding the outcomes of the evaluations. (IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.g)

Regular Cycle: Although the District Office regularly and continuously evaluates the services to the Colleges and documents its findings to improve such services, the schedule for these evaluations had not been presented in written form. After discussing the schedule and activities among the various District Departments, a program review calendar was established in October, 2014. The calendar was reviewed and revised again by administration and the districtwide accreditation team during the 2015 program review cycle. The review cycle was adjusted slightly to align with the District's accreditation cycle. Additionally, several district programs, including District International Education, Education Services and Planning, Public Safety, Emergency Preparedness, Community Education, Auxiliary and Enterprise Services, and the Chancellor's office were added to the Calendar. The new Calendar is as follows:

Unit	Review Date	Responsible Individual
IT	March 2016	Vaskelis
Public Safety	March 2016	Nunez
Emergency Preparedness	March 2016	Nunez
Education Services and Planning	March 2016	Moore
Accreditation Mid-term Report 2016		
HR	March 2017	Whitlock
Auxiliary and Enterprise Services	March 2017	Bauer
Community Education	March 2017	Bauer
Chancellor's Office	March 2017	Galatolo
District International Education	March 2018	Luan
Administrative Services (Accounting, Payroll, Purchasing)	March 2018	Blackwood
Facilities Planning, Maintenance and Operations	March 2018	Nunez
IT	March 2019	Vaskelis
Public Safety	March 2019	Nunez
Emergency Preparedness	March 2019	Nunez
Education Services and Planning	March 2019	Moore
Accreditation Self Study 2019		

District Programs: The program review cycle is ongoing and is aligned with the District's accreditation cycle. District Office Program Review process is scheduled in March of each year. The following units are reviewed on a rotating basis once every three years: Administrative Services (including Accounting, Payroll, Purchasing) Facilities, Public Safety, Emergency Preparedness, Information Technology, Human Resources, International Education, Community Education, Education Services and Planning, Auxiliary and Enterprise services and the Chancellor's Office.

The program review is typically conducted via a survey administered to all District Employees. The units most recently added to the process may choose another audience to survey or use another methodology to assess their units. Part of the process for these newly added units will be to develop the tool(s) most appropriate for their unit. The survey tool supported by IT is NoviSurvey.

Prior surveys, survey results and executive summaries of the program review are located on the DO Program Review Sharepoint site. (login and password required).

Program Review Process/Timeline:

January-February: Review/Revise Prior survey questions

February: Revise/develop/test survey in NoviSurvey (contact IT for an administrative logon, access to prior surveys and/or technical support.)

March: Deliver survey tool to all district employees via email.

April - June: Review/summarize results and post reports, including narrative pertinent to accreditation, to Program Review Sharepoint site.

Documentation of the Outcomes: Each department will prepare a Program Review which encompasses the following elements:

Program Review Template:

1. Executive Summary
2. Unit description
3. Describe major accomplishments since last review
4. Current state of the Unit
    a. Describe the current state of the unit (May include strengths and challenges).
    b. What changes could be implemented to improve your unit?
5. Action plan. Describe how opportunities for improvement will be addressed
6. Needs: Equipment, Professional Development, Facilities, Staffing, Research (when appropriate)

The 2015 program review cycle was completed in June 2015. Administrative Services, Facilities and International Education were evaluated. Executive summaries of the review process are located at the DO Program Review Sharepoint site. (login and password required).

Conclusion

The District has met District Recommendation 3 in full.

Evidence

See evidence for District Recommendation 3. (Website)