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Description of Report Preparation

Preparation of the Accreditation midterm report for San Diego City College began in the fall 2012 semester and continued through spring 2013, with final edits completed during summer 2013. During the academic year, the Accreditation Steering Committee scheduled twice-monthly meetings to assign preparation of draft completion to committee members and other campus faculty and staff who had expertise in areas related to recommendations and planning agenda items. The Accreditation Steering Committee was composed of representatives from all college constituent groups, and drafts of the report were shared with the college community as completed. The final report was reviewed and approved by the San Diego City College Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Master Planning, Assessment, and Resource Oversight Committee, and President’s Council. In addition, the final report was reviewed by the San Diego Community College District Chancellor’s Cabinet, Governing Board Subcommittee on Accreditation and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), District Governance Council, and approved by the San Diego Community College Board of Trustees.

Members of the San Diego City College Accreditation Steering Committee included:

Randy Barnes  Vice President of Instruction  
Jacque Bell  Vice President, Administrative Services  
Daniel Caldera  President, Associated Students 2012-2013  
Jacqueline Clark  Senior Secretary, Student Development  
Dotti Cordell  Director of Student Health Services, SLO Co-Coordinator  
June Cressy  Duplicating Services Lead  
Salley Deaton  Professor, Accounting  
Helen Elias  Dean, Student Development  
Lori Erreca  Dean, Behavioral & Social Sciences and Consumer & Family Studies  
Jaime Estrada  Professor, Spanish  
Robbi Ewell  Dean, Information and Learning Technology  
Kitz Garcia  Senior Secretary, Health, Exercise Science, and Athletics  
Lydia Gonzales  Administrative Secretary, Vice President of Instruction  
Mary Granderson  Supervisor, Business Services  
Paul Greer  Professor, Health and Exercise Science  
Berta Harris  Academic Senate President-elect, SLO Co-Coordinator  
Marilyn Harvey  Director, Transfer Center  
Josolyn Hill  Senior Secretary, Information and Learning Technology  
John Markley  Professor Emeritus, English  
Kathy McGinnis  Dean, Health, Exercise Science, and Athletics  
Carolina Moreno  President, Associated Students 2013-2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Pesce</td>
<td>Professor, Learning Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne Schmeltz</td>
<td>Senior Secretary, Arts, Humanities, and Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neary Sim</td>
<td>Secretary, Behavioral &amp; Social Sciences and Consumer &amp; Family Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanie Tyler</td>
<td>Director, Off-Campus Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Whisenhunt</td>
<td>Vice President, Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xi Zhang</td>
<td>Campus Researcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letter

Recommendation 1

To fully meet the standards, the college needs to further integrate and evaluate all planning, including but not limited to technology, library and learning support services, and resource allocation, into the college’s master planning process to support continuous quality improvement and institutional effectiveness. (I.B.3; II.C.1)

College response/actions:

San Diego City College integrates and evaluates all planning, including technology, library and learning support services, and resource allocation through a carefully structured and well-documented annual process. This process begins with Program Review at the program and department levels, proceeds with the development of program and department-level Master Plans, moves up through school and division level reviews and plans, and culminates with the Annual Master Plan Update. Results of the annual review and master planning process are reviewed by the Master Planning, Assessment, and Resource Oversight Council (MPAROC), where discussions take place regarding the allocation of available resources. (R1-1) The college meets Standard I.B.3 and Standard II.C.1.

The Instructional, Student Services, Institutional Technology and Master Planning, Assessment, and Resource Oversight Councils are forums in which discussion takes place about the evaluation of department and division plans and the effectiveness of planning processes as a whole. These discussions have, in recent years, led to improvements in our integrated planning process, which include:

- Consolidation of the Institutional Assessment Committee into the Master Planning and Resource Oversight Council (MPROC) into a newly combined group, the Master Planning, Assessment, and Resource Oversight Council (MPAROC) (R1-2).
- Development of the Annual Departmental Technology Planning process (Form T). (R1-3)
• Creation and support of a City College Research Committee as a subcommittee of the MPAROC, to better integrate research data with program review and planning and assessment. (R1-4)

• Adoption of an integrated resource management system (Taskstream) to serve as the repository for the development and assessment of learning and administrative outcomes to map outcomes to Program Review and Master Planning.

• Modification of the Program Review and Master Planning cycle to better align with the annual budget development cycle. The revised cycle is as follows (R1-5):

San Diego City College Master Planning, Assessment & Resource Allocation Annual Cycle

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER
Departments complete program review, technology plan, and master planning process, incorporating student learning outcome improvement data

NOVEMBER 1
Department program review, and master plan due to school dean

DECEMBER 1
School master plan and program review due to division vice president

NOVEMBER-DECEMBER
MPAROC reviews mission, priorities, and criteria for staffing and equipment

MARCH 1
MPAROC approves division plans and distribution of available funds for staffing and equipment

JANUARY 15
Division plan with requests for equipment and position funding due to MPAROC

MAY
Review of accreditation recommendations and planning agendas

APRIL – MAY
Departments complete SLO assessment for current year

JUNE – JULY
Office of Institutional Research prepares Program Review Data Packets

This process is driven by the Master Planning, Assessment & Resource Oversight Council (MPAROC)

Beginning in 2010-2011, the college Master Planning process was expanded to incorporate the Educational Plan (Instructional Goal Summary), the updated College-wide Research Agenda, the Information Technology Plan, Learning Resource Center/Library Plan, Student Services Division Master Plan, and Administrative Services Division Master Plan. This Master Plan encompassed the current status of each division, college and division goals, resources needed to achieve these goals, and processes required to assess the achievement of goals and college priorities. (R1-6)
After significant discussion at MPAROC meetings during the 2012-2013 academic year (R1-5), the annual Program Review process was modified in 2013 with respect to the timing of the review and planning processes. To better align with annual budget development, the Program Review and Master Planning process is now conducted in the fall semester rather than in the spring semester. The Instruction and Student Services divisions have slightly different required metrics in their Program Review to meet the unique needs of each division, but measure the same college Institutional Priorities—Student Success; Collaborative and Outreach Ventures; Equity, Inclusiveness, and Diversity; Environmental Stewardship; and Innovative Approaches. The Administrative Services division uses a combined Program Review and Master Plan process. (R1-7) All Program Review entails an examination of identified Student Learning or Administrative Outcomes with assessment and designated outcome results available to departments and programs. The results are a central part of department and program dialogue, and form the basis of subsequent action and improvement plans. (R1-8)

In November of each year (formerly in May), departments/units meet with their dean or appropriate administrator to prioritize a list of school requests based on needs identified in the Annual Departmental Academic and Master Plan (Form B). (R1-9) School deans then meet with their Vice President to prioritize a division list. The divisions present their list to MPAROC for review and approval, consistent with the college’s Institutional Priorities. (R1-10) Final approval is granted by the President’s Council and then communicated to the college community.

The annual Master Plan update process incorporates important fiscal events which impact annual college planning. Such events include the level of state funding; bond measures S and N; together with funding sources such as Basic Skills, Title V grant funds, and the Federal Career-Technical Education Act (CTEA). Additionally, the process considers changing trends in population, job opportunities, transfer requirements, and preparedness of incoming high school students. Finally, the process also examines progress made on the 2010 ACCJC site visit recommendations, together with Planning Agendas and Tasks identified in the 2010 Self Study. A Master Planning annual calendar has been drafted for review by MPAROC to facilitate review and discussion of key planning topics on an annual basis. (R1-11)

At each step in the Program Review and Master Planning process, various research and data sources are drawn upon, including:

- Student Learning and Administrative Outcomes findings and improvement plans (R1-12)
- Student Satisfaction Survey reports (R1-13)
- Employee Satisfaction Survey reports (R1-14)
- Point-of-Service Survey reports (R1-15)
Data on course and program outcomes provided by the San Diego Community College District Office of Institutional Research and Planning (R1-16)

Research data on student characteristics, outcomes, and productivity are drawn upon to assess institutional effectiveness and to identify opportunities for improvement in the upcoming annual cycle. Assessment and evaluation occurs within each instructional department and each Student Services program during annual Program Review. Findings are input into Taskstream, the online integrated resource and assessment management system used to facilitate information storage and mapping to larger organizational initiatives. Proposed changes resulting from assessment and evaluation are then reflected in the department/program Master Plan and/or Departmental Technology Plan. Program Review and Master Plans are reviewed and consolidated at the division level in Student Services, Instruction, and Administrative Services. (R1-17)

Technology, Library and Learning Support Services Planning

The visiting team’s recommendation points to Standard II.C.1 as an area in which the college needs to strengthen its assessment, planning and resource-allocation processes, particularly as they relate to the integration of technology, the Learning Resource Center (LRC), and learning support services. The visiting team also recommended additional enhancement of the college’s support of the role of these academic support areas in undergirding Instructional and Student Services programs. The LRC has actively participated in the college’s Program Review and Master Planning processes for many years. The Library Collection Development Plan was presented to, and approved by, the President’s Council in spring 2005, and was most recently updated in spring 2010. (R1-18) In addition, a long-term plan to address all aspects of the Learning Resources Center is under development with the multi-year plan to be finalized in fall 2013. LRC personnel develop and submit the unit’s Program Reviews to MPAROC for support staffing needs and capital expenditure consideration.

Annually, the LRC faculty create and review assessment measures for instructional Student Learning Outcomes related to the Library Science (LIBS) 101 credit course, the 90-minute library instruction sessions, library tours, and reference service. (R1-19) Other outcome measures for LRC services include:

- A point-of-service user satisfaction survey distributed as part of the self-study process (R1-20)
- Questions integrated into the larger satisfaction surveys distributed to students during the self-study process (R1-21)
The resulting findings from these outcome assessments have served as one basis for review of the LRC’s effectiveness and for planning improvements, as well as part of the overall Instructional division’s prioritization of resource requests through MPAROC. The college reaffirms its commitment to learning resources planning - of which the LRC is an integral part - in the October 2010 Self Study’s Planning Agenda #2. (R1-22)

In addition to the planning and outcome assessment measures integrated into the college processes mentioned above, LRC personnel develop and deploy resources that align with instructional support for the college over the longer term. This has been accomplished in part by assigning librarians to work as faculty liaisons to designated instructional departments in order to develop library collections, as well as participating in college governance through committee service. Alignment of LRC activities with college programs and campus activities has been further enhanced by converting the Multimedia Department into the Office of Classroom Technology Management (OCTM). This is to better reflect how the OCTM’s services integrate the purchase, deployment, and maintenance of new classroom equipment with fulfillment of instructional needs.

In order to meet the challenge of adequate staffing and technology support for the above-mentioned services, the college has focused on critical human resource needs for the LRC. Over the past ten years, personnel turnover has included the following:

- Library full-time faculty turnover: two retirements and three new hires, the latter being upgraded from 10 month to 12 month contracts in 2011. One position remains vacant. The current personnel total is four faculty librarians.
- Library full-time staff turnover: two retirements, three promotions, and one new hire; one position remains vacant. The current personnel total is three staff and one supervisor.
- Independent Learning Center/OCTM staff turnover: four retirements, four new hires and one upgraded position. One position remains vacant. The current personnel total is three staff, one supervisor, and one faculty.
- LRC administration: a permanent dean position was created in 2007 and filled in 2010. A senior secretary position to support the dean remains a temporary but full-time assignment.

The college notes that the identification of library and other learning resource needs is now an integral part of many grant proposals to outside agencies, since the activities generated by these grant awards often creates additional demands upon LRC resources. Recent examples of college grants benefiting LRC resources include:
• An allocation of $50,000 over five years from the college’s Title V federal grant to fund student computers.
• An allocation within the college’s CTEA grant to fund vocational-related library materials.
• An allocation within the college’s state Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) budget for basic skills-related library materials.
Recommendation 2

To meet the ACCJC requirement for proficiency in student learning outcomes by 2012, the college needs to implement fully the cycle of development, assessment, evaluation, documentation, and reporting of outcomes across the college and must use the results to improve student success across the institution (I.B.7; II.A.2.a; II.B.1; II.B.3.c; II.B.4; II.C.2).

College response/actions:

As noted in San Diego City College’s (SDCC) College Status Report on the Student Learning Outcomes Implementation (October 15, 2012), the college is at the Proficiency level with respect to Student Learning and Administrative Outcomes. (R2-1)

Instruction

The total number of college courses at San Diego City College (active courses in the college catalog, offered on the schedule in some rotation) is 967. All 967 (100%) had defined Student Learning Outcomes (or Objectives). The number of SDCC college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes is 696, or 72% of courses. SLO assessment for the remaining courses is in progress and will be completed by 2015. SDCC has a total of 87 college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college). All 87 (100%) had defined SLOs and had ongoing assessment of learning outcomes.

Student Learning and Support Activities

City College has identified 27 student learning and support activities for student and administrative outcomes implementation. All 27 of these (100%) have defined SLOs, and all 27 (100%) of these programs have student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes. (R2-2)

Institutional Learning Outcomes

The following are SDCC’s Institutional Competencies (Outcomes) (R2-3):

- Communication/Interpersonal Skills
- Critical thinking
- Analyses/Computation
- Cultural Sensitivity/Global Awareness
- Information Management/ Literacy
- Personal Responsibility
- Civic and Environmental Responsibility

All are defined and all seven (100%) have demonstrated ongoing outcome assessment linked to program, department and course outcomes. (R2-4)

SDCC has learning and administrative outcomes and assessment in place at the course, program, degree, and institutional level. All instructional programs have designated SLOs in the catalog (R2-5) and all Student Services programs have ongoing SLO assessment. SDCC Institutional Outcomes are mapped to course and program SLOs. (R2-6) All course SLOs are documented in the District’s online curriculum management system (CurricuNET) (R2-7), are reviewed by the Curriculum Committee, and are in process with transition to the online management system, Taskstream. (R2-8) Program Review and Master Planning is conducted annually and is informed by the results of institutional, program and course outcome findings. (R2-8 and R2-9)

Our online integrated resource management system, Taskstream, clearly demonstrates linkages between course, program, institutional and General Education outcomes. Entry of either a student learning or administrative outcome into Taskstream prompts completion of a mapping process to demonstrate linkages at the course, program, and institutional level. (R2-10) As appropriate, outcome entry also prompts mapping to our General Education outcomes. SDCC began its rigorous assessment work at the program level. Currently, 100% of instructional programs and 100% of Student Service programs have ongoing assessment work in process. Campus decision-making includes dialogue on assessment findings and results so as to align institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning. (R2-11, R2-12, R2-13) Informed by Student Learning and Administrative Outcomes, City College has made changes to:

- The curriculum in Child Development (R2-14) and Business and Accounting
- English gateway courses via the use of portfolios
- First Year Services program (R2-15)
- Student Health Services

SLO assessment integrally impacts Program Review. Indeed we have built into our online assessment program (Taskstream) a workspace to document Program Review and Master Planning, informed by the results of assessment and other college data. (R2-8)
There is a widespread institutional dialogue about assessment results and identification of gaps.

A chronology of examples of institutional dialogue about Student Learning/Administrative Outcomes identification and assessment includes:

- 2004: Assessment website constructed to structure communication and resource sharing (R2-16)
- Fall Convocations 2005, 2006
- Faculty FLEX activities in spring 2007 linking Title V work with the learning needs of diverse populations so as to enhance retention (R2-11)
- 2007: All day classified staff retreat (R2-12) to:
  - Improve collaboration and communication
  - Reinforce classified staff integral role in student success
- Online assessment management program, Taskstream, adopted in January 2009 to document, analyze, and organize outcome assessment work efforts (R2-17)
- Fall 2009 SLOAC Philosophy statement adopted by Academic Senate and all City College shared governance bodies (R2-18)
- 2010 Self-study stands as a testament to SDCC dialogue and assessment efforts (R2-19)
- Eight “SLO Salon” sessions in Fall 2008 (R2-13)
- Faculty meetings to introduce the robust assessment management system of Taskstream. These have included extensive formal departmental meetings, small group and one-to-one sessions since 2008
- Linkage of GE courses to broader General Education Outcomes
- Incorporation of outcomes results on the City College website which is accessible to students and the public at large (R2-16)
- Updates on SLO assessment are routinely shared at department and Dean’s meetings, in the Academic Senate, and in the President’s Cabinet. (R2-20) Our current Master Planning, Assessment and Resource Oversight Council has representation of the two SLO Coordinators and our Institutional Researcher, with a standing agenda item on assessment results and improvement at SDCC (R2-21)
- In fall 2012, the college sponsored the “SLO September” workshops to facilitate development of assessment results (R2-22)
Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.

The Institutional Assessment Committee (IAC), established in 2003, was the forum in which the assessment cycle was discussed and outcome data shared. (R2-23) IAC was incorporated into City College’s Master Planning and Resource Oversight Council in 2009-10 to reflect the essential integration of Program Review, Assessment and Master Planning. (R2-24) The Master Planning process is guided now by the Master Planning, Assessment, and Resource Oversight Council (MPAROC), whose primary focus is departmental Program Review integration with outcome assessment measures and findings. A separate Program Review/Master Plan workspace within the assessment management software, TaskStream, has been designed and is utilized. (R2-8) Departments and programs are charged with:

- Identifying program and course Student Learning and Administrative Outcomes
- Mapping/linking outcomes to City College’s mission statement, institutional priorities and competencies
- Linking General Education courses to overarching General Education outcomes
- Describing the means of assessment/measurement and the criteria for success for each outcome
- Collecting data
- Identifying results
- Using the results for incremental program improvement through an identified Action Plan
- Reviewing progress on Action Plans to ensure continuous improvement

Departments have continued measurement of their Student Learning and Administrative Outcomes and have developed action plans based upon the results of assessment. This process integrally informed Program Review/departmental planning as reported in spring 2012 departmental Master Plans. (R2-9) The Master Planning process outlines institutional progress toward achieving college priorities. It informs decisions regarding continual improvement in institutional effectiveness including program evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, program implementation and re-evaluation. All divisions/departments participate in the Master Planning process, culminating in the development of the City College Master Plan. (R2-25)

Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.

Outcome assessment efforts have been supported at SDCC since their inception in 2003. This is underscored through a continued 20% reassigned time each for two faculty SLO Coordinators:
one Instructional and one representing Student Services. San Diego Community College District allocated resources to SDCC for purchase of Taskstream, our online assessment management, planning, and Program Review system. These funds were dispersed in January 2009, in a time of unprecedented state and district budget shortfalls. (R2-17) The online organizational framework, Taskstream, has provided a readily accessible electronic monitoring system coupled with at-a-glance management reports. The flexibility of Taskstream enabled us to utilize and build upon our prior existing SLO framework, the Nichol’s Model. (R2-25) This model was familiar to faculty and staff, and was readily and effectively integrated into the Taskstream online framework. SDCC SLO Coordinators presented the college’s successful outcome work on Taskstream on October 3, 2012 at the RP Group’s 2012 Student Success Conference: Embracing and Leading Change. (R2-26)

**Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.**

The Student Learning Outcome Assessment Cycle is well-established in the SDCC culture. Each course has the breadth of student learning outcomes as documented in CurricuNET. (R2-7) Each program reports assessment work, linked to courses and institutional learning outcomes via the Taskstream online management system. (R2-27, R2-28) Taskstream readily displays linkages between course, program, GE and institutional priorities and learning outcomes. Summative assessment reports are readily generated at the institutional, department/program level, and course level. (R2-29) Data are entered into Taskstream at the course or program level in the corresponding year in which assessment was conducted. Data points include the learning or administrative outcome, the measurement method, the criteria for success, findings, and the action plan based upon the findings, and a corresponding status report describing whether the cycle is complete or in process. (R2-30) Course level outcomes are aligned at the program and institutional level, while program level outcomes map to the institutional level outcomes. From the outset, both SDCC Student Services and Instructional programs/departments have entered assessment work into the same model framework, whether hardcopy, Word document, or Taskstream. (R2-31)

**Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.**

The online assessment system, Taskstream, was structured at SDCC such that course entry of an SLO requires that the outcome be “mapped” or aligned with the college mission, SDCC priorities, and SDCC institutional learning outcomes. (R2-14) In March, 2013, the college included mapping of General Education courses to GE learning outcomes. In addition, Taskstream incorporates curriculum maps, which serve to clearly delineate the mapping of course level outcomes to the larger program level outcomes. The Curriculum Map enables a
professor to describe whether the program SLO is introduced, practiced or mastered in the particular course. (R2-27)

Assessment work at SDCC remains a grass-roots effort. It is a faculty-driven process in which the faculty designates which outcomes are of importance at the program level. It is then within the individual professors’ purview to delineate in Taskstream in what specific manner course outcomes align with program, GE (as appropriate) and institutional outcomes. The Instructional Academic Master Plan for each School and Department designates in which year a particular course will be assessed. (R2-32) As per the SDCC 2010 Self-Study “San Diego City College awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program’s stated learning objectives” and “… ensures that achievement of stated programmatic learning outcomes are the basis for awarding degrees and certificates. (R2-33) Student learning outcomes for programs leading to the awarding of degrees and certificates currently are satisfied by the completion of a required subset of courses for each program.”

**Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.**

SDCC utilizes a variety of methods to inform students of course and program purposes and outcomes. Beginning with the SDCC website, the student is able to navigate to the San Diego City College current academic year’s catalog which outlines both program and institutional outcomes. All courses at SDCC have identified SLOs for the particular course as listed in the course syllabus in CurricuNET. (R2-7) All syllabi are reviewed by the Department Chair and Dean prior to the semester to assure compliance with required information. Syllabi are distributed to students via hardcopy syllabus or via the San Diego Community College District’s Blackboard.

Verification that SDCC students have received expected learning outcome information is readily demonstrated from Student Satisfaction Surveys. In spring 2009, 81% of student respondents strongly agreed or agreed that instructors inform them about the skills and learning outcomes they were expected to master. This increased to 83% in spring of 2012. In 2009 75% strongly agreed/agreed that instructors explain how they will be assessed prior to the beginning of an assignment or test. This increased among respondents to 81% in the 2012 survey. (R2-34)

San Diego City College is soundly at the Proficient level in Student Learning Outcomes, for the following reasons:

- SLO assessment is in place for courses, programs and degrees. Course SLOs are aligned with program, GE (as appropriate) and institutional student learning outcomes. The college awards degrees and certificates based upon student achievement of a program’s
stated learning outcomes. SDCC assures that achievement of programmatic learning outcomes are the basis for awarding degrees/certificates. Program level outcomes were first identified in the 2009-10 catalog to increase student awareness of these essential programmatic outcomes. SLOs for programs leading to the awarding of degrees and certificates are currently satisfied by the completion of a required subset of courses for each program.

- SDCC has widespread institutional dialogue about assessment results and improvement action plans (R2-35, R2-36)
- Institutional decision-making increasingly includes dialogue on the results of SLO assessment (R2-35, R2-36)
- SDCC is purposefully directed toward alignment of institutional practices to support and improve student learning.
- Despite unparalleled state budget cuts, the district/college continues to prioritize appropriate assessment resources.
- Through Taskstream, comprehensive assessment reports are generated and/or updated regularly.
- Enrolled SDCC students indicate that they are aware of the goals and purposes of their courses/programs.

The college is addressing needed refinements and improvements through further work on our systematic processes. We emphasize the mapping of GE Courses to Program GE Outcomes. We generate more regular Taskstream reports with larger distribution. We enhance interdepartmental networking via Taskstream and departmental meetings to assure networking opportunities are optimized. Finally, SLO assessment processes are regularly reviewed and discussed to identify ways in which our processes may be continually improved.
Recommendation 3

In order to improve beyond the standard, the team recommends that the college work with district instructional services, district student services, and appropriate college faculty to initiate the cycle of review and validation for placement tests and placement practices to ensure their effectiveness for placement while minimizing bias. (II.B.3.e)

College response/actions:

All three colleges in the San Diego Community College District use the same:

- assessment tests
- cut-scores for placement into courses
- review cycle for the periodic reevaluation of the tests and the cut-scores.

Given this consistency, the District Office of Institutional Research and Planning established both an ongoing cycle for review and for conducting disproportionate impact and consequential validation studies for our English (reading and writing), Math and ESOL placement processes. The review cycle and the validation studies serve as an on-going effort to validate the placements used by the San Diego Community College District (SDCCD). Review and validation of the assessment system occur according to the following cycles:

**Placement Test Validation Timelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Summer 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Summer 2016</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>Summer 2021</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td>Summer 2011</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Summer 2021</td>
<td>Spring 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disproportionate Impact</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential Validation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math (MDTP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start Date</strong></td>
<td>Summer 2011</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>Summer 2021</td>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Due Date</strong></td>
<td>Summer 2011</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Summer 2021</td>
<td>Spring 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disproportionate Impact</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential Validation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESOL (CELSA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Due Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disproportionate Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential Validation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All validation tests are facilitated and analyzed by the District Office of Institutional Research and Planning. The tests are validated every five years in compliance with California Community Colleges State Chancellor's Office (CCCCCO) regulations.

**2011 Consequential Validity Study.** The tests were conducted via an in-class survey administered to faculty and students, respectively in the Math, English, and ESOL classes. Surveys seek both faculty and student opinion about the appropriateness of their placement in those courses with required placement by skill level. The population of interest includes those students who assessed into these courses by test. Three methods of data collection were used to gather input:

- Math, English, and ESOL faculty were asked to rate the accuracy of student placement for students who placed into the course by test.
- Students in Math and English courses were surveyed online and asked to rate whether or not they belonged in the course.
Due to the small population size and the students' English language constraints, ESOL students were surveyed in-class.

After the faculty and the students were surveyed separately, for each skill level, a threshold of 75% judgment of appropriate placement by both faculty and students was set. This threshold is commonly adopted by many studies in the literature and is recommended by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCO) through its Assessment Validation Training offered in Spring 2012. Analytical response categories were: Belong in Course and Belong in Lower/Higher Course. (R3-1)

In five out of eight skill levels, judgment of appropriate placement by both faculty and students exceeded the 75% threshold, including: Associate Degree Math, transfer Math; transfer English, ESOL 20, and ESOL 30. The skill levels that did not meet the 75% threshold were Basic Skills Math, Basic Skills Reading, and Basic Skills Writing. While faculty ratings exceeded the thresholds in these courses, student ratings did not. More than one-quarter of the students felt that they should have been placed at a higher level. In light of the findings, a recommendation was made to further explore the relationship between student placement levels, the student’s judgment of appropriate placement, and their actual eventual success in the course after final course grades have been determined. As a result, a follow-up study was conducted.

2012 Consequential Validity Study. In the summer of 2012, a follow-up study to the fall 2011 Consequential Validation Study was conducted. This study sought to examine in greater detail and over time the fact that in the original study there were four courses in which more than 25% of the assessed students felt they had been inappropriately placed:

- Two Basic Skills English courses
- One Basic Skills Math course
- One transfer-level Math course

In most of these cases, students felt they should have been placed into a higher level course. The follow-up study compared the success rates in the four courses of the students who felt they were appropriately placed against those who did not. Study findings indicated that, in fact, students in the two Math courses who felt they were inappropriately placed (i.e., placed too low) did have statistically significant higher course success rates than students who felt they were appropriately placed. Higher success rates were also realized in the two English courses, but not at the level of statistical significance. The recommendation was that the Math 46 and Math 104 placement rules and cut scores be re-evaluated. (R3-2)
2011 Disproportionate Impact Study. Tests were conducted by examining the average placement rate across all ethnic groups, then multiplying the average by 80% (the acceptable threshold that is suggested by the EEOC guidelines and approach suggested by Kangas (1992)). Groups falling below the 80% threshold indicate disproportionate impact. (R3-3)

The Disproportionate Impact Study for City College covered the assessment results of first-time college students who tested between May 1 and October 1 in 2008, 2009, and 2010. Results were analyzed utilizing the EEOC guidelines and approach suggested by Kangas (1992), in which equity in placement testing is ensured by evaluating whether student placements differed significantly by ethnicity. Nine assessment tests used in the San Diego CCD were examined:

**Mathematics**
- Accuplacer Arithmetic Assessment (online)
- MDTP-I Pre-Algebra Assessment (paper/pencil)
- Accuplacer Elementary Algebra Assessment (online)
- MDTP-III Intermediate Algebra Assessment (paper/pencil)

**Reading**
- Accuplacer Reading Comprehension Assessment (online)
- Companion Reading Comprehension Assessment (paper/pencil)

**Writing**
- Accuplacer Sentence Skills Assessment (online)
- Companion Sentence Skills Assessment (paper/pencil)

**ESOL**
- Combined English Language Skills Assessment (CELSA) (paper/pencil)

In each of the nine tests, the average scores by ethnic group exceeded the 80% threshold at each of the skill levels. While the data encompass three years of fall term assessments in order to maximize group sample sizes, there remain groups within which there are too few students to draw conclusions about disproportionate impact. This is particularly true among American Indian students and in the CELSA assessment skill levels. That being said, among groups with substantive sample sizes, all groups exceeded the 80% threshold in each of the skill levels and tests. A general conclusion can therefore be drawn that there appears to be inconsequential test bias, with equity in placement among ethnic groups.

In short, San Diego City College, with the assistance of the District Office of Institutional Research and Planning, has fully addressed this Recommendation and fully meets Standard II.B.3.e.
District Recommendation 1

The team recommends that the Board of Trustees develop a policy to address the selection and evaluation of college presidents (IV.B.1.j).

College/District response and actions:

The college and district meet Standard IV.B.1.j. This recommendation is fully met by Board Policy 2437, which was adopted by the Board of Trustees on December 9, 2010. (DR1-1)
Responses to Self-Identified Issues

San Diego City College identified eight planning agendas in completing the 2010 Self-Study.

Planning Agenda #1: To continue its ongoing, collegial and self-reflective dialogue about Student Learning and Administrative Outcomes, the MPAROC and department chairs, and with the active support of the President and Vice Presidents, has attained the proficiency Level in Student Learning Outcomes. The college continuously identifies, revises, implements and assesses student learning and administrative outcomes in all instructional, student services and administrative service programs. Assessment information is used for continuous program improvement.

As noted in the institution’s response to Team Recommendation 2, above, and in the college’s College Status Report on the Student Learning Outcomes Implementation (October 15, 2012), City College has steadily expanded and strengthened its identification, revision, implementation and assessment of student learning outcomes in all areas of the college, and uses that assessment information for continuous program improvement through the annual Program Review and Master Planning process. The college is at the Proficient level in regard to Student Learning Outcomes. (PA1-1)
Planning Agenda #2: The Master Planning, Assessment, and Resource Oversight Council (MPAROC) will work with college governance groups to fully integrate into the current college Master Plan, by June 2011, the Educational Plan, Information Technology Plan, Library and Learning Resources Plan, Student Services Plan, Administrative Services Plan and Facilities Plan. In addition to identifying the college’s goals and priorities, and describing the college’s overall planning and resource allocation processes, the unified Master Plan will draw upon each of the six component planning documents to identify for the college as a whole the following:

- Current status of instruction, student services, and administrative services
- Near- and mid-term goals for each area of the college and for the college as a whole
- Fiscal, human, facilities and technology resources needed to implement the goals
- Response to and updates for the college-wide Research Agenda
- Assessment of the extent to which goals have been met
- Assessment of the extent to which college priorities have been met

Using the college’s master planning process embedded in the Master Plan, MPAROC will:

- Oversee, through the Vice Presidents and respective governance groups, the annual review, assessment, and updating of each of the six component plans within the Master Plan.
- Review and update annually the college-wide faculty, classified and administrator staffing priorities as part of the campus commitment to rebuild programs and services that have been cut during the current economic downturn.
- Establish and monitor the implementation of a consistent, sufficient, and ongoing funding formula for the staffing, institutional technology, Learning Resource Center, support services, and other college-wide priorities, including the regular acquisition, maintenance, upgrading and periodic replacement of major equipment, computers, and other hardware and software.

The college has met this planning agenda item as evidenced by the 2010-2011 Master Plan. (PA2-1) This Master Plan, which contained 2010-2011 Program Review data and analysis and the Master Plan summaries for 2011-2012, expanded upon previous plans to incorporate the Educational Plan (Instructional Goal Summary), Information Technology Plan, the updated College-wide Research Agenda, Learning Resource Center/Library Plan, Student Services Division Master Plan, and Administrative Services Division Master Plan. This Master Plan described the current status of each division, college and division goals, resources needed to achieve these goals, and processes to assess the achievement of goals and college priorities.
The Master Planning, Assessment, and Resource Oversight Council (MPAROC, formerly Master Planning and Resource Oversight Council, MPROC) is the body charged with development and assessment of the college Program Review, Master Planning, and resource allocation functions. This council annually reviews and refines these functions with input from the Instructional, Student Services, Institutional Technology and Master Planning, Assessment, and Resource Oversight councils. In these councils, discussion takes place about the content of department and division plans and the effectiveness of planning processes as a whole (PA2-2).

In 2012, MPAROC discussed effective ways to further integrate Student Learning Outcomes and Administrative Outcomes into the Program Review and Master Planning process. After evaluative discussion, MPAROC recommended the adoption of the integrated resource management system, Taskstream, used as a repository for outcome development and assessment, to also serve as the system to map these outcomes to Program Review and Master Planning. This system facilitates the integration of all division and operational plans into the overarching college Master Plan. Therefore, in addition to leveraging Taskstream as a repository for the collection and study of outcome information, college personnel use Taskstream to map program and course level Student Learning and Administrative Outcomes to:

- City College Mission
- Institutional Priorities
- Institutional Competencies( Learning Outcomes)
- General Education Outcomes (as appropriate)

Moreover, TaskStream enables users to identify linkages among Instruction, Student Services, and Administrative Services, together with their respective connection to City College’s mission, Institutional Priorities, and Institutional Competencies. For each instructional department, program, and course, the faculty, staff and administration collaboratively create an assessment plan; record the assessment findings, develop an action plan, and integrate outcome findings into the college Program Review process. Student Learning and Administrative Outcome work, together with Institutional Research, informs and supports program improvement and further substantiates budget requests in the planning process. Full implementation of this program has been underway with the 2012-2013 Program Review and Master Planning process and will be completed in the 2013-2014 program review and master planning cycle. Review and assessment of this revised process is scheduled in the annual MPAROC calendar for early spring 2014 (PA2-3).

Significant progress has also been made in developing updated Contract Faculty Hiring Criteria. Revised criteria were developed during the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 academic years and approved by the Academic Senate in May 2013. Plans are underway to pilot test this procedure.
during the 2012-2013 Program Review/Master Planning cycle in Fall 2013. During this cycle, classified staffing needs will also be prioritized. Administrative staffing has not been impacted by the hiring freeze and is deemed adequate. (PA2-4)

During the 2012-2013 academic year, the Master Planning, Assessment, and Resource Oversight Council has discussed strategies for establishing a consistent, sufficient, and ongoing funding formula to meet the staffing, technology, and equipment needs for the Learning Resource Center and other college-wide priorities. On the recommendation of the Instructional Cabinet (PA2-5), the regularly scheduled 2011-2012 Master Plan was temporarily suspended in order to focus on strategies to incorporate SLO data into Program Review and Master Planning and to develop a pilot program based on this model. This plan continues to be developed and is scheduled to be in place during the 2013-2014 academic year. (PA2-6)
Planning Agenda #3: To enhance the quality of all instructional programs, the college, under the leadership of the Vice President of Instruction, will develop and implement by January 2011 a detailed plan for the consistent orientation, training, professional development and institutional inclusion of adjunct faculty. The plan will include training of full-time faculty who evaluate adjunct faculty in using the assessment tool to provide supportive and constructive feedback, including, when necessary, a plan for improvement.

San Diego City College is committed to assisting its adjunct faculty in professional growth. Using a two-pronged approach — professional development and the flexible calendar professional development workshops and activities (flex) — the college provides abundant opportunity for adjunct faculty to participate in activities that enhance student success. Furthermore, recognizing that the adjunct faculty are critical to instruction and the institution as a whole, the college welcomes adjunct faculty participation in shared governance committees and activities. Through funds provided for by AB 1725, the Community College Staff Development Fund, adjunct faculty are encouraged to attend conferences, workshops, and association meetings that will contribute to the improvement of instruction in their area of assignment at the college. Adjunct faculty are encouraged to apply and submit for funds that will further develop their professional skills.

In spring 2010, an ad-hoc college committee, formed under the auspices of the Vice President of Instruction, began working on a comprehensive professional development program for adjunct faculty at San Diego City College. In early spring 2010, the instructional department chairs were surveyed. The survey’s focus was to obtain information on what department chairs believed to be high-priority orientation and professional development activities needed for adjunct faculty. The survey response was overwhelming and provided information used to generate a survey for adjunct faculty. (PA3-1)

Using the results of the department chair survey, the ad-hoc professional development committee, of which the Academic Senate Adjunct Faculty Senator was a member, developed an adjunct faculty survey encompassing topics from the hiring process to preferences for professional development/FLEX activities. Adjunct faculty were surveyed in late spring 2010. Those survey results were used to augment campus FLEX workshop offerings and to enhance professional development offerings. (PA3-2)

Each fall and spring, prior to the start of the semester, the Office of Instruction hosts an All Adjunct Faculty Welcome Back Workshop as part of the professional development plan. This workshop brings adjunct faculty together with administration and staff to receive departmental and policy updates, ask questions, and participate in a school meeting with their dean and colleagues. This activity has been offered each semester since fall 2010. (PA3-3)
By the fall of 2011, on-campus flex workshop offerings doubled. Mindful that many adjunct faculty work during the day or teach at other area institutions, evening and online workshop offerings were increased. Additionally, to gauge the effectiveness of each activity, the workshop is evaluated by the participants. Evaluation results are tallied and discussed monthly at the campus Flex Committee meeting. Using participant input, workshops are reviewed for efficiency, success, and usefulness (PA3-4).

Acknowledging the importance of faculty professional development, the college wrote provisions for professional development into its current Title V grant, which was awarded in 2011. Specific funds were designated for the development of faculty and classified staff. Professional Development activities supported by the Title V grant, of which adjunct faculty were participants, have included:

- *Using Brain Research to Enhance and Energize Instruction.* Presented by Dr. Janet Zandina, Assistant Professor. (Fall 2011)
- *The College Fear Factor: How Students and Professors Misunderstand One Another.* Convocation presentation given by author Rebecca Cox. Afternoon campus breakout session led by the author. (Fall 2011)
- *Strategies for Student Success: What Every Adjunct Needs to Know!* Presented by campus contract and adjunct faculty. (Fall 2011)
- *On Course I.* Campus contract and adjunct faculty attended multi-day training. (Fall 2011)
- *On Course II.* Campus contract and adjunct faculty attended multi-day training. (Fall 2012)

Utilizing local-area institutional resources, representatives from the Campus Flex Committee worked with the dean from San Diego State University’s College of Extended Studies to bring two graduate-level workshops to campus. This provided contract and adjunct faculty the opportunity to participate in workshops on campus that would provide them Continuing Education units. The first workshop was offered on campus during the fall 2012 semester. The second workshop followed the subsequent semester (spring 2013). A third workshop is scheduled to be offered in fall 2013 (PA3-5).

Knowing that the ratio of adjunct faculty to contract faculty is disproportionate, and that adjunct numbers outweigh that of the contract faculty, City College administration acknowledges and relies upon the valuable input from its adjunct faculty. Adjunct faculty are included on most campus committees and also represent the college in the community. The following is a partial list of committees on which adjunct faculty serve:
In addition, adjunct faculty are encouraged to participate in the Furniture, Fixtures, and Equipment (FF&E) procurement process for new buildings, and in departmental activities related to the identification and assessment of Student Learning and Administrative Outcomes.

With a comprehensive professional development plan in place, the Office of Instruction at San Diego City College looks to the next level of quality instructional program improvement which is the effective evaluation of its adjunct faculty. Adjunct faculty at City College are covered by a collective bargaining agreement and are represented by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). Policies and procedures for the evaluation adjunct faculty are contract driven; however, in the spirit of putting student success first, student and peer evaluations are used as tools to enhance and enrich instruction.

Adjunct faculty are peer evaluated by a contract faculty member in their discipline within the first year of employment and at least once every six regular semesters thereafter. Student evaluations occur at least once during their first term of assignment and at least once during every three semesters of subsequent assignment. Contract faculty are trained using the Contract-Adjunct Faculty Appraisal: A Guide, which was developed in consultation with AFT (PA3-6). The guide provides standards and evaluation procedures as well as describes evaluation domain and criteria. The guide also lists several “examples of performance” for each criterion. These examples primarily describe behaviors that may indicate whether, how, and how well a faculty member meets the various criteria. Most contract faculty provide a narrative along with the evaluation instrument. Each peer evaluation is discussed with the adjunct faculty member and must be signed by the faculty member, evaluator, department chair, and discipline dean.
In summary, since spring 2010, City College has significantly increased professional
development opportunities for adjunct faculty. Institutional inclusiveness for adjunct faculty is
comprehensive, and the evaluation process is effective and assists adjunct faculty in making
instructional improvement.
Planning Agenda #4: The college Vice President of Student Services, in conjunction with district Instructional Services and district Student Services and respective college faculty, will re-establish the review cycle for the placement tests used to assess students’ readiness in mathematics, English composition, reading, and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL). The re-established review cycle will begin in fall 2010.

As described in the institution’s response to Team Recommendation #3, above, the college and the District Institutional Research office have implemented a recurring review cycle that fully addresses Planning Agenda #4. The first set of disproportionate impact and consequential validation studies for our English (reading and writing), Math and ESOL placement processes occurred during the 2011-2012 academic year. Future review and validation of the assessment system will occur according to the following cycles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement Test Validation Timelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Reading and Writing (Companion/Accuplacer)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Due Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disproportionate Impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consequential Validation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Math (MDTP)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Due Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disproportionate Impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consequential Validation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ESOL (CELSA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Summer 2016</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>Summer 2021</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start Date</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Due Date</strong></td>
<td>Summer 2011</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Summer 2021</td>
<td>Spring 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disproportionate Impact</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential Validation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All validation tests will be facilitated and analyzed by the District Office of Institutional Research and Planning. The tests will be validated every five years in compliance with California Community College State Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) regulations. (PA4-1, PA4-2, PA4-3)
Planning Agenda #5: Under the leadership of the Vice Presidents of Instruction and Student Services, a plan will be designed and implemented at the college and departmental/program levels by June 2011 for outreach, recruitment, mentoring and support of a diverse adjunct faculty pool. This plan will address the need for diverse full-time and adjunct faculty across the campus, including departments that have had difficulty maintaining diversity among their faculty.

To address the goal of establishing a more diverse adjunct faculty hiring pool, the college and the San Diego Community College District Human Resources Office have established practices that will promote all aspects of diversity as the college recruits new adjunct faculty. As a result of budget reductions and the District’s contract faculty hiring freeze, the number of adjunct faculty has fluctuated from 2007 to 2011, as reflected in the table below.

**Ethnicity of Adjunct Faculty, 2007-2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ADJUNCT FACULTY</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there has been a slight improvement in ethnic diversity over this period of time, full development of a Diversity Hiring Plan and projected budget improvements should permit the college to increase adjunct faculty hiring and promote gains in the diversity of our adjunct faculty. In addition, as the budget situation permits the college to begin hiring full-time faculty, the college and District will continue the focus on recruiting a diverse applicant pool. (PA5-1, PA5-2, PA5-3, PA5-4, PA5-5)

Planning to improve diversity in part-time and full-time hiring has been led by the San Diego City College Diversity Committee, a shared governance committee that reports to the Academic Senate. In 2010, this committee was charged with strengthening efforts to recruit adjunct faculty from diverse backgrounds. The committee was successful in identifying several practices in this effort. In summary:
1) The Diversity Committee added a link on *Best Hiring Practices for Diverse Faculty Pool* and included supplemental resources. This material is to be shared by San Diego City College faculty and staff in outreach and recruitment. (PA5-6) http://www.sdcity.edu/CollegeServices/FacultyStaffResources/Committees/Diversity/HiringBestPractices

2) The Diversity Committee set a goal for committee members to complete district-held EEO and Diversity Training for Screening/Selection Committees. This commitment helps create diverse search committees who understand and support the importance of a diverse faculty. Members continue to receive training so that they can play an active engaged role in the hiring process. Scheduled trainings dates are shared at committee meetings (PA5-7).

3) The Diversity Committee Chair, with full support of the committee, played a pivotal role in getting campus, program and departmental approval of the criterion *Demonstrated Sensitivity to the Issues of Diversity* on faculty appraisal forms. This revision to the appraisal process emphasized fostering and educating current and newly hired faculty on the importance of all aspects of diversity in the campus environment, and allowed assessment of cultural competence.

4) The Diversity Committee added website links titled *Guidelines for Faculty and Classified Applicants*. These links provide support to those applying to the San Diego Community College District. The documents within the links include recommendations as to how applicants might share their diverse life experiences and the ways in which they have shaped them as an employee or instructor. Information on San Diego City College’s mission, which actively promotes inclusion and a commitment to an urban population, is also provided. (PA5-8) http://www.sdcity.edu/CollegeServices/FacultyStaffResources/Committees/Diversity/GuidelinesforApplicants

5) The Diversity Committee began sharing resources to help support and mentor faculty in the classroom. Resource tools included: *Tools for Teaching Diversity in the Classroom, Teaching Tolerance, and Strategies for Classroom Success*. (PA5-9) http://www.sdcity.edu/CollegeServices/FacultyStaffResources/Committees/Diversity/EducationalResources

6) The Diversity Committee established a formal vision which served as a blueprint for the committee’s mission and allowed direct action to be taken on pertinent issues. The vision is a 5-point plan with emphasis on Outreach & Education, Hiring, Curriculum, Data Collection, and District Collaboration. The plan continues to guide the goals and activities of the committee and campus at large. (PA5-10)
7) The Diversity Committee encouraged members to serve as departmental consultants on diversity by soliciting department needs, promoting available diversity resources and encouraging faculty to mentor and attract diverse adjunct pools. Though the campus experienced a major decline in hiring during this period, the recommendation to attract and recruit a diverse faculty remained a priority. Committee members felt that it was essential for departments to maintain a deep and broad range of candidates interested in our campus when employment opportunities returned.

The District Human Resources office has also recently established or strengthened practices to promote diversity in all hiring, including adjunct faculty hiring. A summary of these practices is as follows:

1) In March 2011, the Employment Office implemented a new and improved online Applicant Tracking System (ATS) which permits Human Resources to create applicant pools to which individuals may apply for consideration of hire. Having all SDCCD applicants apply online for either a Contract Academic, Contract Classified, Adjunct, or Non-Academic Non-Classified positions allows the ATS to collect voluntary diversity data on the EEO Survey. (PA5-11)

2) All Interview Selection Summaries, which list the names of the applicants selected for interview for a contract vacancy, are submitted by the Screening Committee Chair to the EEO & Diversity Office to complete an Adverse Impact Analysis. The analysis references the voluntary EEO information provided by the applicant. The AIA report is then sent confidentially to the President or Vice Chancellor for review of a diverse and balanced interview pool. Once approved, the Interview Selection Summary is forwarded to the Employment Office to proceed.

3) In September 2010, the Employment Office designed a New Hire Diversity Report. Anonymous diversity data on all new hires (internal and external) is downloaded and a report is produced for review by the Chancellor’s Cabinet. This has been done on a quarterly basis for several years and by request for other time periods. (PA5-12)

4) In early 2011, the Employment Office analyzed advertising sources about job vacancies with regard to providing exposure to a diverse public; targeting specific outlets when seeking particular skills and disciplines; and determining cost value for various advertising media, locations, and success rates. At that time, a baseline for all advertised positions was established. Unique additional advertising was also added specific to the job announcement for improved success in drawing the applicant pool. Among other outlets, the baseline
included *Hispanics in Higher Education, Blacks in Higher Education*, and *Asians in Higher Education*.

The Human Resources department has strongly recommended that Vice Presidents, Deans and Department Chairs first review available and current applications in the adjunct hiring pools, and to rely less upon referrals from current employees or unsolicited resume submissions. Centralized advertising and recruitment helps to ensure that a broader range of diverse applicants will be reached.
Planning Agenda #6: Under the leadership of the college Vice President of Administrative Services, and in conjunction with the district Vice Chancellor of Facilities Management, the college will assess the facilities services provided to the college, including custodial deployment, by June 2011 and, based on that assessment, will formulate specific recommendations to the district Vice Chancellor of Facilities Management for improvements in facilities-related procedures and services at the college.

Review of facilities services has been ongoing, with steps taken to improve the efficiency of services while maintaining appropriate levels of maintenance for grounds and buildings. Facilities Services, including grounds keeping, custodial, and maintenance, are centralized within the San Diego Community College District. San Diego City College has relatively limited control over the scheduling of these services. As a result of concerns raised about the condition of grounds and facilities, the following actions have been undertaken over several years:

- The Vice Chancellor of Facilities Management and the District Architect established a practice to meet with end users of each new building six months after completion to develop a list of items that need correction.
- District facilities representatives have continued to meet regularly with campus representatives to review service delivery and quality at regularly scheduled Review of Services committee meetings. These meetings have successfully brought providers and users of services to a collaborative forum to interact, communicate and collaborate on issues. (PA6-1)
- Relative to the issue of campus facilities services quality, the 2013 Facilities Services Voice of Customer satisfaction survey reveals that the District community is generally satisfied with the current level of service provided. It will be important to continue to measure the impact of adding additional square footage on campus with the same level of resources to service and maintain facilities. (PA6-2)

The college has set an expectation of cleanliness using standards set by the Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA):

- Floors shine and/or are bright and clean. Carpets are clean and vacuumed. Base moldings are clean. There is no buildup in corners or along walls, but there can be up to two days of stains or streaks.
- External walkways are clean, free of trash, spills, dirt.
- All vertical and horizontal surfaces are clean, but marks, dust, smudges, and fingerprints could be noticeable with close observation.
- Vents will be clean and dust free.
- Washroom and shower tile and fixtures are bright/clean and are odor free. Supplies are well stocked.
- Chalk boards/white boards and erasers are cleaned. Chalk is stocked for rooms with chalk boards.
- Lamps all work and all fixtures are clean.
- Trash containers and pencil sharpeners are empty, clean, and odor-free.

The industry standard indicates that in order to maintain the current level of cleanliness that recommended staffing level for custodians is 1 for every 25,000 square feet of building/ground area. At December, 2012 at City College the ratio is 1:32,254 square feet. With the recent addition of the MS Building the campus has added an additional 66,000 square feet of space. Continued monitoring of conditions will inform recommendations to the Vice Chancellor of Facilities.
Planning Agenda #7: Under the leadership of the Vice President of Administrative Services, the college will ensure that all constituent groups and planning-related committees are familiar with the district strategy and timeline for the maintenance and operation, including custodial services, of the new and remodeled facilities funded through the district’s construction bonds. The Vice President of Administrative Services will also work with the district Vice Chancellor of Facilities Management to periodically assess college users’ satisfaction with the new facilities’ maintenance and operational support.

This Planning Agenda is currently in progress. San Diego City College has completed two new buildings under the Proposition S and N bond funding, with three additional buildings scheduled for completion and occupancy during 2014. There have been a number of challenges in adequately maintaining these buildings as staffing resources have not kept pace with growth in assignable square footage. The San Diego Community College District Facilities Department is in the process of identifying funding to provide additional custodial support for new buildings district wide. (PA7-1)

The college’s Review of Services committee is the primary forum for sharing information on facilities issues, including maintenance and operations. This committee is chaired by the Vice President of Administrative Services and includes members from the District’s Facilities Services office. The committee includes representatives from classified staff, faculty, and administrators, and reports from the committee are shared with the college constituent groups. (PA7-2)

Satisfaction with facilities maintenance is gauged by the Employee Satisfaction Survey, conducted every three years. In the 2012 survey, 70% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that “The grounds are pleasing and adequately maintained.” 67% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that “The exterior of the campus buildings are adequately maintained,” yet only 47% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that “The interior of the classrooms, offices, and restrooms are adequately maintained.” In the Student Satisfaction Survey (2012), 76% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that “The grounds are adequately maintained.” 73% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that “The exterior features of the campus buildings are adequately maintained.” Student’s impressions of building interior spaces were more favorable than that of staff, as 68% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that “The interior of the offices and buildings are adequately maintained.” The relatively low marks in interior maintenance may be a result of the increase in square footage with recent new construction on campus. The District is in the process of identifying funding for additional custodians to match the growth in new construction. Survey results will be monitored in future years to ensure that levels of facilities services are maintained. (PA7-3, PA7-4)
In addition to the Employee and Student Satisfaction Surveys, a special survey, the 2013 Facilities Services Voice of Customer survey, was conducted to specifically rate the services provided by Facilities Services district wide. Results were average, rating the college at a level of 2.5 on a scale of 1 to 5. (PA7-5)
Planning Agenda #8: Under the leadership of the college Vice President of Instruction, the college, in conjunction with the district Information Technology staff, will modify the college’s Information Technology Plan by June, 2011 to include the design, funding, implementation and assessment of systems to address disaster recovery of information, privacy, and reliability of technology.

San Diego City College’s Institutional Technology Council (ITC) lends oversight to the development and investment of Information Technology resources that support excellence in teaching and learning. In collaboration with the office of the Dean for Information and Learning Technology and the office of the District’s Director of Information Technology, the ITC also recommends technology-mediated systems and solutions that enable users to efficiently and effectively leverage academic and administrative support services.

The ITC has developed an Information Technology Plan to support the college’s mission with regard to technology decisions (PA8-1). The Information Technology plan affirms district-wide protocols for disaster recovery of informational assets, privacy, and the reliability of technology. The District’s informational assets are backed up on tape and safely stored at a secure “off-site” location (contracted with Iron Mountain). Both the District and the College take proactive steps to safeguard the privacy of our campus community. Moreover, the District’s network architecture leverages redundancy and rules to ensure safe and reliable access to informational assets and services.

The Information Technology plan also includes ITC’s recommendations for improving the campus’ technology acquisition processes, along with the scheduled replacements and re-allocation of computer equipment. In addition, the ITC recommends staffing levels, maintenance protocols for technology, and provides leadership for developing guidelines for computer-assisted instruction, including curriculum and assessment of instructional computer use.

The ITC identified and incorporated into the Information Technology Plan the following guiding principles as determinants of successful application of technology at the college:

- **Access to Technology**: Provide stable and reliable access to technology resources without economic and physical barriers
- **Student Success**: Increase student academic success through the use of technology in instructional and support services
- **Resource Allocation and Procurement**: Allocate institutional resources to ensure delivery of effective instructional technology and administrative technology services
- **Technology Support Services**: Employ and train appropriate technical support staff as new technology resources and programs are adopted
• **Appropriate Use of Technology-Mediated Resources**: Encourage the application of technological tools and solutions to facilitate productivity within instructional and administrative areas

• **Professional Development**: Provide ongoing training for faculty and staff to effectively use technology

• **Culture of Inquiry**: Cultivate, monitor, and evaluate creative and innovative applications of technology

The ITC recognized the potential to positively influence student success outcomes as the institution strives to be technologically current and viable. Access to ample instructional technology and informational resources are essential as the college embraces the changing paradigm of technology-mediated student engagement and its impact on student success.

While the purpose of the IT Plan is to identify and document the goals and direction of technology to be implemented at San Diego City College, the IT Plan also provides a framework for responsible use by the campus community. Specifically, an Appropriate Use Guideline/Policy (under development) will delineate end-user responsibilities and address privacy considerations. Through its process and procedures the ITC will remain nimble and responsive to rapid changes in technology and new opportunities as it provides recommendations for the continued technological growth of San Diego City College.
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