

EVALUATION REPORT

San Diego City College
San Diego, California

A confidential report prepared for
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
San Diego City College from October 11—14, 2010

Dr. Greg Chamberlain
Chair

Visiting Team Roster, October 11-14, 2010

Dr. Greg Chamberlain (Chair)
President
Bakersfield College

Mr. Marc Beam
Institutional Research

Dr. Carole Bennett
Faculty & Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator
Santa Rosa Junior College

Dr. Joseph Carrithers
Professor of English
Fullerton College

Dr. Janis Caston
Accounting Professor
Cosumnes River College

Ms. Krista Goguen
Librarian
Pasadena City College

Ms. Deborah Ikeda
Vice President of Instruction and Student Services
North Centers, State Center CCD

Mr. Randall Lawrence
Superintendent/President
College of the Siskiyous

Dr. Elizabeth Miller
Associate Superintendent/VP, Administrative Services
Allan Hancock College

Ms. Kate Pluta (Assistant)
Professor, English
Bakersfield College

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: San Diego City College

DATES OF VISIT: October 11—14, 2010

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Greg Chamberlain

A ten-member team visited San Diego City College from October 11 through 14, 2010, for the purpose of evaluating how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes, analyzing how well the college is meeting the Commission standards, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the status of the college.

In preparation for the visit, nine of the ten team members attended an all-day training session on September 9, 2010, conducted by the ACCJC and studied Commission materials prepared for the visiting teams. The tenth member attended training on October 1, 2010. Team members read carefully the college's self study report, including the eight recommendations from the October 2004 visiting team, and assessed the evidence provided by the college.

Prior to the visit, team members completed written evaluations of the self study report that was prepared for the fall 2010 visit and began identifying areas for further investigation. On the first day of the visit, the team members spent the afternoon discussing their views of the written materials provided by the college and reviewing evidence provided by the college, as well as other materials submitted to the commission since its last comprehensive visit.

During the visit, the team met with numerous faculty, staff, administrators, members of the governing board, and students. The team chair met with members of the governing board, the president of the college, the district chancellor, and various district administrators. The team also visited classes and conducted two open meetings to allow for comment from any member of the campus or local community. In addition, the team interviewed and took virtual tours with faculty and students participating in online classes.

The college was well prepared for the accreditation team visit. The visiting team was welcomed by a friendly and engaged college community. College and district staff members were very accommodating to team members and available for interviews and follow-up conversations.

The team felt that the self study report was an accurate assessment of the college's educational quality as set forth in the ACCJC Four Standards of Accreditation and the Commission policies. Those who attended the open forums with the visiting team spoke highly about the quality of educational opportunities and the dedication of faculty, classified staff, and administrators.

Recommendations

After carefully reading the self study report, examining evidence, interviewing college personnel and students, and discussing the findings in light of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges 2002 Standards, the team offers the following recommendations to San Diego City College.

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).

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).

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).

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).

ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT FOR SAN DIEGO CITY COLLEGE

Introduction

San Diego City College is a public, two-year community college, one of three administered by the San Diego Community College District. The college was first established in 1914 and moved to its current campus site in the 1950s. Additional property was made available in the 1970s through the City Redevelopment Project. Its location is in downtown San Diego and is easily accessible by public transportation, as well as by private motor vehicle.

The San Diego City College service area is located in downtown San Diego, yet more than one third of the students live outside the San Diego Community College District. The college serves and embraces the diverse human and cultural variety that characterizes its geographic location. For fall 2009, Latinos were the largest single ethnic group on campus, about 35 percent of the overall student population. White non-Hispanic students form the next-largest contingent, at 28 percent, while African American students make up 13 percent. Women represent 54 percent of the student body. Half the students are in the 18-24 age group. Over eighty percent of all San Diego City College students are enrolled in fewer than twelve units, and 71 percent are employed.

San Diego City College is the second largest of the three San Diego Community College District colleges, with an annual unduplicated end-of-term headcount for 2009-2010 of 30,626. Enrollment has increased steadily since the last accreditation visit in 2004, with fall term unduplicated headcount going from 14,919 in Fall 2004 to 18,763 in Fall 2010. The college provides training and career development in a variety of certificate programs and short-term courses and offers associate degrees in liberal arts and science fields. Many of its graduates go on to four-year schools, especially the local campuses in the University of California and California State University systems.

The San Diego Community College District was officially formed in 1970. The mission of the San Diego Community College District is to provide accessible, high quality learning experiences to meet the educational needs of the San Diego community.

The members of the accreditation visiting team commend San Diego City College and the San Diego Community College District for their earnest engagement in the accreditation process and especially for their cooperation with the visiting team members. The team identified several noteworthy accomplishments and makes the following commendations:

Commendation 1.

Even in these difficult budgetary times, the college is to be commended for maintaining its focus on how to help students achieve their educational goals and for developing innovative ways to assist students in being successful. The team observed that dialogue and decision-making at every venue was focused on how students could best be served.

Commendation 2.

The college is to be commended for the outstanding commitment of its students who have provided more than 30,000 hours of free community service through the Student Service Learning Program.

Commendation 3.

The college is to be commended for its governance model, which provides extensive opportunities for participation, is transparent and understood by constituencies, and engages broad-based dialogue around issues of college concern. The college environmental sustainability initiative is an outstanding example of effective governance.

Evaluation of Institutional Responses to Previous Recommendations

The Accreditation Evaluation Team confirmed that San Diego City College and the San Diego Community College District have appropriately addressed the recommendations made in 2004 through 2009. The 2004 visit concluded with eight recommendations based on four standards to assess institutional quality and effectiveness. Accreditation was reaffirmed with a Focused Midterm Report in 2007. During the last six years, San Diego City College worked intently to meet the expectations of ACCJC.

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Recommendation 1.1

The college should complete its work on the development of student learning outcomes and review its master planning and resource allocation process to insure that the learning outcomes, in addition to more traditional student achievement data, are utilized consistently in the planning process. (I.A.4; I.B.7; II.A.1.c)

The college self study provides much to consider in the response to this recommendation. There has clearly been dialogue on the issue and recent activity to move the institution toward the ACCJC deadline for achieving proficiency. According to the self study (p.18), the college is “on track” to reach proficiency in both student learning and administrative outcomes by 2012. The response asserts SLOs are “used consistently” in planning, program review and requests for funding of staff and equipment (p.18).

The college dialogue established the Institutional Assessment Committee (IAC) as an Academic Senate subcommittee in May 2003. There were presentations, training, and rich discussion regarding academic freedom, ownership of the process, faculty evaluation, and workload across the multi-college district. The college administration has great respect for faculty and works collegially with them to support this faculty-driven process. In 2006 the IAC co-chairs created an Assessment Handbook and continued SLO development over the next three years. The Academic Senate adopted a Philosophy Statement in May 2009; the faculty reassigned time increased from 20 percent to 40 percent in the fall to support this effort. The college purchased an assessment tracking software, TaskStream, to help accomplish its goal. According to the Timeline for Proficiency 2012 (evidence 1B-14), the college states it is already at proficiency. College faculty and staff indicate that they can provide examples to support almost all of the criteria for proficiency on the ACCJC rubric; however, the team believes the institution is still in the development level of implementation because the college cannot demonstrate using outcomes assessment comprehensively or consistently.

Furthermore, the team is less certain the college has met all of the requirements of the prior recommendation—specifically the use of outcomes beyond the traditional student achievement data still being used in program reviews. Many of the instructional SLOs use a course objective with an outcome of grade C or better. The data for course assessments is not in TaskStream and when asked how and where it is stored, the team discovered it is in computer desktops and desk drawers across the college. Interviews confirm that course level

assessment does occur and in some cases leads to changes in curriculum; however, no evaluation of the change has occurred, as revisions are too new to assess a second time.

There are examples of learning assessment in student services, but again not in all programs and areas. The team reviewed evidence of assessments at the program level in TaskStream dating prior to 2009 and found little to document the assertions of the self study. The amount of dialogue far exceeds the amount of assessment, and there is only recent evidence of connections to planning councils (for discussion) but no evidence of links to budget based on SLOs.

The college has not yet fully responded to this recommendation, though significant progress has been made.

Recommendation 1.2

The college should develop a process to evaluate and report to faculty and staff on the effectiveness of major changes that it undertakes in areas such as master planning, governance, and the academic calendar. (I.B.2; I.B.5)

The self study asserts the college has responded to this through the President's Council, their primary governance group. It is a very short response.

The team observed council meetings with normal agenda during the visit. The college demonstrated a great deal of communication and collegiality, verified through interviews across constituent groups.

Recommendation 1.3

In order to build upon their efforts to strengthen institutional effectiveness and to foster a "culture of evidence" throughout the district, the district office and the colleges should cooperate in the development of an enhanced research function with both strong district and strong college components. (I.B.3; IV.B.6; IV.B2.b)

Based on the response and the self study, the college has significantly addressed this recommendation. The response is lengthy and well documented. It explains the history of developing a culture of evidence within a multi-college district, followed by expanding the research capacity to each college. The college asserts this is working very well (p.19).

The college has grown in its use of data for decision-making, especially with the support of district institutional research. There are excellent data resources at the district, including labor market and institutional data warehouses that the college does not use. The college uses a campus-based researcher who reports to the district office, yet has limited access to these tools.

The addition of a researcher on campus is recognized as an asset; however, the President and Vice President of Instruction do not work with her directly. The Vice President of Student Services co-chairs the research committee and this may explain, in part, why student services have stronger assessments. The campus-based researcher works with faculty in Math and

Basic Skills, as the college research agenda has prioritized projects for the year. Overall, there seems to be great but unrealized potential in this model. The combined district and college research offices provide excellent reports, even when the sample size is small or there are research design problems. There have been excellent presentations at the district, but these are less effective at the college because the data is not disaggregated by discipline (e.g., Online Success Report) or presented in ways the college needs to answer specific questions.

Recommendation 1.4

In order to coordinate the master planning efforts already established at the colleges, the district should continue its work to formulate an overall strategic plan that will provide a vision for the future development of the district based upon extensive conversations among faculty and staff, students, college and district leaders, board members, and the community. (I.B.3; I.B.4; II.A.2.f; IV.B.1.b)

The San Diego Community College District 2009-2012 Strategic Plan was refined in 2008-09 and then published in fall 2009 (self study, p. 24). The college aligns its planning with the district.

Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

Recommendation 2.1

The college should develop a consistent funding model that supports the need of the Learning Resource Center for both human and fiscal resources. (II.C.1.a)

The college has continued to support its Library and Learning Resource Center, but it has not yet developed the consistent funding model recommended in the previous accreditation report and by Planning Agenda #2.

Standard III: Resources

Recommendation 3.1

The district, in cooperation with the colleges, should explore new efforts and initiatives to identify the barriers that limit the diversity of their workforce and to ensure that faculty and staff reflect the rich diversity of their student body. (III.A.4)

The district has the primary oversight for the hiring processes that would lead to a more diverse workforce, and the district and the three colleges have worked collaboratively since the last accreditation visit to develop an Equal Opportunity Plan, which has recently been approved by the Board of Trustees. The plan contains twelve actions that will assist the college in diversifying its workforce when the district's hiring freeze, imposed due to a state financial crisis, is lifted. Some of those actions are the responsibility of the district, others are primarily college level actions, and some will require the cooperation of both district and college.

1. A commitment to a formal diversity program that will be funded and supported by the district and campus leadership. Each college and Continuing Education will be responsible for advancing the diversity and cultural competency on their campuses.

2. Recruiting and hosting guest speakers from underrepresented groups and diverse cultural backgrounds who may inspire students and employees.
3. Emphasizing the district's commitment to equal employment opportunity, diversity, and cultural competency in job announcements and in its recruitment, marketing, and other publications.
4. Conducting diversity forums and cross-cultural events and promoting cultural celebrations on campus.
5. Encouraging the faculty and student services programs to integrate diversity and multiculturalism into their instruction and programs.
6. Ensuring that all district institutions' publications and other marketing tools reflect diversity in pictures, graphics, and text to project an inclusive image.
7. Recognizing and valuing staff and faculty who have promoted diversity and equal employment opportunity principles.
8. Providing EEO/diversity workshops which promote diversity and cultural competency.
9. Ensuring that the district's equal opportunity and diversity goals and objectives are fulfilled by cabinet level administrators.
10. Establishing an "Equal Opportunity and Diversity" online presence by highlighting the district's diversity, equal opportunity, sexual harassment, and nondiscrimination policies, procedures, and programs on the district's website. The website also lists contact persons for further information on these topics.
11. Establishing awareness of sensitivity to diversity and cultural competency as a required skill and qualification for district employees.
12. Ensure that all levels of administrative staff support equal employment opportunity and diversity objectives and that the responsibility for equal opportunity and diversity is maintained at a cabinet- or other high-level administrative position.

The plan also clarifies the duties and responsibilities of several advisory committees at the district level that may be useful in future hirings. Given that the plan was adopted by trustees early in the fall semester of 2010, the district and the college have yet to realize any significant changes in the diversity of the workforce.

In addition to the EEO Plan, the district trustees adopted Board Policy 7100 on Commitment to Diversity in 2007 and adopted a revised version using input from the Trustee Advisory Council and the District Governance Council in 2009. The recent hiring of an Equal Employment Opportunity officer has led to more emphasis on training members of screening committees to ensure greater sensitivity to issues of diversity and to emphasize the district's commitment to cultural competency as an element of the hiring process. At the request of the Board of Trustees, the Vice Chancellor for Human Resources provides regular updates to trustees on the diversity of the workforce throughout the district and of the student body.

The college has also identified two areas in its planning agendas for the self study that address the adjunct faculty. The first planning agenda item calls for the creation of an

orientation, training, and professional development program for the adjunct faculty and the development of methods for the greater inclusion of adjunct faculty in the institutional culture. This first item also calls for formal training of the full-time faculty who evaluate adjunct faculty. The other planning agenda item addresses the diversity of the adjunct faculty, and it calls for the college to develop methods for the outreach, recruitment, mentoring, and support of a more diverse adjunct faculty pool, particularly for departments that have had difficulty maintaining diversity among their faculty. Both plans could assist the college in creating more diverse candidate pools among its own adjunct faculty.

Based upon the actions taken since the last accreditation visit, the team feels that the district and the college have responded appropriately to this recommendation.

Recommendation 3.2

The college should develop a comprehensive Information Technology Plan, addressing such issues as network development, equipment replacement schedules, support staff and funding for all instructional and administrative technology. This plan should be fully integrated into the annual planning process. (III.C.1; III.C.2)

The college has substantially met the obligation to fully integrate the Information Technology planning process, including governance decision-making and coordinating with district-level technology.

According to the Master Plan Update for 2009-2010, the President's Council approved the IT Plan on May 8, 2010 (III.C).

The college still needs to integrate fully the IT plan into the master planning process. Consideration needs to be given toward the relationship between college and district technology support to improve planning and resource allocation for both administrative and instructional computing.

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

Recommendation 4.1

The district should build upon its efforts to clearly delineate the functions of the district and the colleges and to communicate more effectively with faculty and staff throughout the district, paying additional attention to coordinating and integrating services and activities within the district office and regularly evaluating the effectiveness of the delineation and the quality of services provided to the college. (IV.A.5; IV.B.3)

The college and district have responded to the previous recommendation. As stated in the self study, the delineation of function has been formalized and included in the annual publications, *District Governance and Administration Handbook* and *Campus Handbook*. Assessment of governance at the district level is done by the district and college councils and committees.

While two-way communication may not always be effective or occur, the delineation of function between district and college is in writing and clear to the college constituencies. Regular evaluation of effectiveness of district and college services is done within the specific service or activity. Based on assessments of effectiveness, several changes have resulted, including hiring a campus-based researcher to serve as a liaison with district institutional research while primarily supporting college efforts to assess learning, support program reviews, and complete college-determined research priorities.

Eligibility Requirements For Accreditation Certification of Continued Compliance

The members of the accreditation visiting team affirm that San Diego City College continues to be in compliance with the eligibility requirements for accreditation. Compliance with these requirements was validated during the visit to San Diego City College, October 11 through 14, 2010.

1. AUTHORITY

San Diego City College is a public two-year community college, established in 1914 under the authority of the State of California, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the Board of Trustees of the San Diego Community College District. The college is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

2. MISSION

The San Diego City College mission statement was last revised and approved by the Board of Trustees in November 2008. Revisions to the Mission Statement are based on input from diverse segments of the college and are formally recommended by the Master Planning and Resource Oversight Council (MPROC) to the President's Council for college-level approval.

3. GOVERNING BOARD

The district is governed by an elected five-member Board of Trustees and one non-voting student trustee. Trustees are elected in even-numbered years to four-year terms by the voters of San Diego. Trustee candidates first run in district-only elections. The top two vote-getters in each district run citywide in the general election.

The governing board is an independent policy-making body and operates in accordance with California Education Code. The board is responsible for the quality and integrity of the institutions that comprise the three college district. The Board has adopted a Code of Ethics and conducts a self-evaluation at regular intervals.

4. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

The president of San Diego City College is appointed by the San Diego Community College District Board of Trustees and reports to the district chancellor. The chancellor is appointed by and reports to the Board of Trustees. The incumbent president was appointed in 2001. The incumbent chancellor was appointed in 2004. There is not a Board Policy evident for the selection and evaluation of the president.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

San Diego City College has a sufficient number of academic and support-services administrative staff with appropriate preparation and experience to deliver the administrative services necessary to support the college's mission and purpose.

6. OPERATIONAL STATUS

San Diego City College currently enrolls between 18,000 and 19,000 students each semester in a variety of courses leading to the associate degree, occupational certificates and degrees, basic skills, and/or university transfer.

7. DEGREES

San Diego City College serves about 18,000 students. Most are pursuing associate degrees, transferring to four-year institutions, or seeking career technical education certificates. The college offers Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degrees and two types of certificates. The college awarded 428 certificates and 628 associate degrees for the academic year 2009—10.

8. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The San Diego City College degree and certificate programs support the mission of the college; comply with state laws and regulations; have a coherent design; and are characterized by appropriate length, breadth, depth, and course sequencing. Associate degree programs require a minimum of 60 units, including 18 units in general education. Most degree programs are designed for completion within two years of full-time study. The college's programs and services adhere to levels of quality and rigor appropriate to the degrees and certificates offered.

9. ACADEMIC CREDIT

San Diego City College awards academic credits based on accepted practices. Information about academic credits is published in the college catalog and class schedules. Criteria for the evaluation of student learning and the awarding of credit are stated in official course outlines and course syllabi. The college uses the Carnegie Unit of credit, which is consistent with standard practice in American colleges and universities.

10. STUDENT LEARNING AND ACHIEVEMENT

Each program at San Diego City College has its student learning outcomes listed in the college catalog. Student Learning Outcomes appear on both course outlines and course syllabi and further ensure assessable student learning and achievement.

11. GENERAL EDUCATION

All degrees require a minimum of 18 units of general education, which includes courses from the following areas: language and rationality, natural science, humanities, and social and behavioral sciences. In addition, one unit in computer literacy is also required. Students must demonstrate competency in reading, written expression, and mathematics to receive an associate degree. All courses identified as fulfilling general education requirements are approved by the San Diego City College curriculum committee, the district Curriculum Instructional Council, as well as the Board of Trustees.

12. ACADEMIC FREEDOM

San Diego City College faculty and students are free to explore and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as determined by the wider academic and educational communities. District policies exist that address Academic Freedom and Freedom of Information, and are printed in the catalog.

13. FACULTY

San Diego City College has qualified faculty members with full-time responsibility to the institution sufficient to support the institution's educational programs. Faculty meet the teaching and minimum qualifications for the discipline they teach and the area they serve. Faculty has primary responsibility for curriculum and other academic and professional matters.

14. STUDENT SERVICES

San Diego City College provides a comprehensive array of services and student development programs such as Counseling, Health Services, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), CalWORKS, Disabled Students Programs and Services, Financial Aid, and Student Employment Services.

15. ADMISSIONS

San Diego City College adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission as a public California community college and in compliance with state laws and governing board policy.

16. INFORMATION AND LEARNING RESOURCES

San Diego City College provides sufficient print and electronic information and learning resources through its Learning Resource Center to support its mission and educational programs.

17. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

San Diego City College, in conjunction with the San Diego Community College District, publicly documents its funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to support the college's mission and educational programs and to assure financial stability. The college's budget allocation is derived primarily by enrollment measured in full time equivalent students (FTES). The district maintains reserves above the level recommended by the California Community College system office.

18. FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The San Diego Community College District regularly undergoes and makes available an external financial audit for the district and its colleges by a certified public accountant. The audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and government auditing standards issued by the comptroller general of the United States. The financial audit and management responses to any exceptions are reviewed and discussed in public sessions.

19. INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION

San Diego City College has an ongoing planning process. Program review and academic plans are carried out systematically and form part of the master planning process. The college and district have a comprehensive planning process with all of the components of a master plan.

20. PUBLIC INFORMATION

San Diego City College publishes in its catalog, on its college web site, and in other appropriate places accurate, up-to-date information that describes its purposes and objectives, admission requirements and procedures, rules and regulations that directly affect students, programs and courses, degree offerings and requirements, costs and refund policies, grievance procedures, academic credentials of faculty and administrators, and other items relative to attending the college and withdrawing from it.

21. RELATIONS WITH THE ACCREDITING COMMISSION

The San Diego Community College District and San Diego City College provide assurance that San Diego City College adheres to the eligibility requirements and accreditation standards and policies of the commission, describes the college in identical terms to all its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accredited status, and agrees to disclose information required by the commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities.

STANDARD I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.

A. Mission

The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution's broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

General Observations

The college has the mission statement posted online and published in the college catalog as well as several locations on campus (I.A.2). The college is undergoing a revision of signage and could take advantage of this opportunity to display the mission more prominently.

San Diego City College is a multicultural institution which has as its highest priority student learning and achievement. City College is committed to providing open access to all who can benefit from instruction and to meeting the diverse and ever-changing educational, cultural, and economic needs of the urban core and surrounding communities of San Diego. As City College prepares world citizens in the twenty-first century, we recognize that the aim of education is the development of the whole person, one who is prepared to be an active citizen and to participate in a global community. We are committed to the tradition of academic freedom and responsibility and to maintaining a climate that promotes learning, understanding and respect for students, faculty, staff, community and the environment (SDCC Mission Statement).

As outlined above, the college offers courses and programs in general education, career technical education, and basic skills using on-campus and online instruction. The mission is inclusive of the broad educational purposes of California community colleges and includes specific references to the “priority of student learning and achievement” (I.A.1).

The college defines its intended student population as “residents of the urban core and surrounding communities of San Diego.” Additionally, the college provides a statement of general education philosophy and commitments to academic freedom, multiculturalism, and the environment (I.A.1).

The self evaluation sections throughout Standard I.A state the college meets the standard with limited analysis and no planning agendas.

Findings and Evidence

The self study reports the mission statement was last approved by the Board of Trustees in November 2008 (I.A.2). The mission statement is reviewed annually and revised when “major changes in campus priorities are identified through shared governance” (I.A.3). The review process begins with the Master Planning and Resource Oversight Council (MPROC) (I.A.4).

The adoption of a six-column-model to assess student learning helps the institution focus on its mission for all assessment activities (course, program and institution)—when assessment occurs. The mission statement is prominent in planning documents that are current, clear, and understood across the college constituents. It is also part of the curriculum approval process and program review. The evidence supports the college’s assertions (I.A.4).

Conclusion

The college meets the requirements of Standard I.A. Institutional Mission.

Recommendation

None

B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

General Observations

The self study points to dialogue and awareness activities in the first five years since the last team visit. Within the last academic year the college adopted a Philosophy Statement on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in fall 2009, increased released time for faculty working on assessment, and implemented new software (TaskStream). The response asserts SLOs are “used consistently” in planning, program review, and requests for funding of staff and equipment (self study, p.18). The college’s Institutional Assessment Committee (IAC) for the last decade has been central to the dialogue and improvement efforts regarding student learning (self study, p.87). The college assures that ongoing, inclusive dialogue has taken place regarding institutional processes and student learning (I.B.1).

The college has identified a series of “institutional competencies” that are considered to be the SLOs for the campus, and there are similar campuswide SLOs for general education and

the transfer program. It has also identified SLOs for many of its programs, and these SLOs are listed in the catalog. Course level SLOs are in the syllabi (I.B.2). The self study does not identify how the course-level SLOs are being assessed across the campus although it does mention that several departments have revised courses and/or adopted new methods of determining student competency.

The college has recognized course objectives in the formal course outline of record as being equivalent to student learning outcomes, which has enabled them to state that 100 percent of the course-level student learning outcomes have been identified. Given that the outcomes have all been identified, there should be ample evidence that dialogue is happening at the assessment phase (I.B.2).

The use of learning outcomes in program reviews, planning, and resource allocation is unclear. The self study asserts that as of spring 2009 substantially all instructional and student support programs had developed student learning outcomes. Of these, approximately 73 percent of instructional and 100 percent of student support programs had implemented ongoing assessment. The college asserts that it has made substantial progress in utilizing assessment of outcomes in planning, and further attests that it is on track to reach proficiency in student learning and administrative outcomes by 2012 (I.B.3).

The college asserts that the master planning and resource allocation process ensures learning and administrative outcomes are utilized consistently in the planning process. Student learning outcomes are incorporated in the program review portion of each department's master planning document. All departments (student service, administrative, and instructional) are included in the master planning process, and their requests for staffing as well as capital equipment are reviewed and incorporated into the campus plan. The process is explained in the annual Master Plan Updates (I.B.4).

The responses in Standard I.B provide more analysis compared to I.A. The college asserts that it meets this standard although there is room for improvement regarding assessment, documentation, the types of data used, and appropriate research methods to support institutional effectiveness as shown in the first two planning agenda.

Findings and Evidence

The 2004 recommendation #1.1 stated "The college should complete its work on the development of student learning outcomes and review its Master Planning and Resource Allocation process to ensure that learning outcomes, in addition to more traditional student achievement data are utilized consistently in the planning process." Interviews and observations by the visiting team found many of the course level assessments defined as existing course objectives with criteria of a final grade of C or better as the desired outcome. These SLOs have not been entered into the TaskStream software. Furthermore, much of the outcomes data used in program reviews are traditional student achievement data measuring success and retention rates, based on grades alone (I.B.5).

The current course level assessments do not meet this recommendation as the college continues to rely upon traditional means of assessing course and program effectiveness for planning course scheduling, e.g., history of course offerings and enrollment trends. There are isolated examples of connecting SLO assessments with a decision-making process at the program planning level. There are no examples of course or institutional level assessments used in campus planning (I.B.4).

SLO development for learning support areas is not well documented. Outcomes for library instruction sessions are defined, but evidence of assessment is not shown. Learning outcomes for the other learning support service programs are not included in the self study, evidence, or catalog. The effect of the revised master planning process on student learning support programs is not adequately documented in the self study. It is unclear how effective the Master Planning and Resource Oversight Council (MPROC) process is in meeting the needs of the learning support services at the college and how funding for learning support services is determined and prioritized (I.B.4; I.B.5).

Faculty and staff have engaged in significant discussions about student learning outcomes (I.B.1); however, the contentious joint report from the AFT faculty union and Academic Senate calls into question the nature of the discussions. The report identified concerns regarding excessive implementation of SLOs, academic freedom being jeopardized, and additional workload being required. To address the workload issues, the college increased its financial commitment to Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (SLOAC) with 40 percent released time to assist with SLO development, review and input, and to assure faculty and departmental ownership of the process (I.B.4; I.B.7).

The evidence presented indicates that SLO assessment is tied to funding (Web snapshot of TaskStream); however, the examples provided had no budgetary requests. This begs the question as to what planning is done as a result of the SLO assessment (I.B.3; I.B.4).

The college is to be commended for supplying the excellent ESOL email threaded discussion among English faculty regarding their approach to teaching as a result of collaborative discussion on student outcomes (I.B.1). Dramatic changes have taken place in the English Department as a result of assessment of student learning. However, this occurred outside of a planning process and is documented only by email. It is only one course within a large department.

The college recognizes its need to continue working with student learning outcomes and administrative outcomes. The college plans to achieve the Proficiency Level in SLOs by June 2012 as addressed in Planning Agenda #1.

With the exception of Instructional Services which establishes annual goals and includes them in the annual College Master Plan update, other areas of the college do not have “goals” per se, but use institutional priorities and are developing departmental goals from summaries of annual program reviews. There is much activity related to annual program reviews, annual updates and revisions to master planning, and TaskStream implementation, but no

development of annual goals at this point. The college priorities organize institutional initiatives with the district strategic plan (I.B.2).

The college has a multi-paged web site showing resources, providing both visual and descriptive text of the assessment cycle, posting of accomplishments, tracking of meetings and minutes, and listing Institutional Assessment Committee members. In some cases, the information is limited to 2009 and needs updating (the college web site). The college states “there is not an abundance of quantitative data; there are numerous qualitative activities that are important to a well-functioning department.” The team found several data sources are available although some excellent resources are restricted to the district office, such as labor market subscription services and the data warehouse. From reviewing the evidence and interviews, the college could improve its research capacity. There is more data available than some are aware of or make use of (I.B.3; I.B.5).

The college has incorporated the “Academic Plan” into the Master Plan and requires departments to plan course section offerings two to three years into the future based on enrollment, curriculum, and economic trends. This process helps identify equipment, faculty, and facilities needs (I.B.4). The concern here is when planning will include SLO assessment.

The college has as part of its Facilities Master Plan the guiding principle that it “shall be developed and maintained through a collaborative process” (I.B.4.). Evidence and interviews verify the genuine collegial working environment at the college. There seems to be governance participation in every planning process with input from many constituents. Each year the planning cycle for program review produces the college Master Plan. The MPROC provides leadership and brings information together for the campus planning councils

However, the assessment of this process suggests otherwise. For example, the college admits that in an employee perception survey, the number of individuals feeling they had input to the planning process was relatively low. The self study does not report that the survey had a low response rate (39 percent) with even lower item response rates. The work of the institutional research office is excellent, while the use of the data does not meet the minimum standard for excellent practices. In the self study, only percentages are used to report survey results, and this can be misleading (I.B.6).

The college is commended for seeking outside funding sources to provide support for student learning. Bond measures are providing new capital outlay, and grant resources are used to supplement institutional priorities (I.B.4.).

The college procured the TaskStream software in 2009 to “collect, document, and report assessment dialogue, data, and programmatic and departmental improvements.” Program reviews have achievement data, but much of the evidence prior to 2009 is missing, unsophisticated, or seems indirectly connected to improving student success. Interviews help explain the history. For the first three years, the college focused on identifying course level SLOs (objectives). Then, with the accreditation self study approaching, the college focused almost exclusively on identifying program level outcomes in the past two years, while working on institutional outcomes (competencies) and purchasing software. Although

TaskStream was a recent purchase, there could be more evidence of assessment results prior to 2009 (I.B.5).

The college has a relatively new researcher who provides regular institutional data, makes presentations to campus constituencies, and shares data via electronic postings. Much information is readily available (I.B.6.) but not always used. Interviews and observations suggest the need for continued training of all staff to assist the campus in developing qualitative and quantitative reports at the departmental and discipline level. The college could collect user input on the usefulness of existing reports and presentations from audiences and stakeholders to discover ways to bring more areas into the culture of evidence (I.B.6).

The district centralizes many services including institutional research. The college has recently hired a campus-based researcher to support the planning processes at the college. The researcher worked for less than one year at the district office for training before reporting to the City College campus. This provides a central and common standard for data, research methods, and reporting while now having a physical presence on the campus (I.B.6).

The college has established a college research committee with similar governance representation as other planning councils. The committee develops an annual college research agenda that defines the priorities for both the research office and the institution. The researcher also started working with faculty on the assessment of student learning outcomes. The college indicates “All instructional activities and programs are assessed to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes”; however, evidence and interviews did not verify this. Instead, the team found partial completion where some programs have assessment data and even fewer examples of course level assessments (I.B.3).

There are assessment activities occurring in classrooms and across campus although documentation is sparse. It is also not systematic (I.B.5). The team found some evidence of a department or program in student services closing the loop, but this was not representative of the institution as a whole. The implementation of TaskStream is the college’s way of improving its system. However, interviews with the assessment co-chairs and a review of the evidence best fit the Developmental Stage on the ACCJC rubric for Student Learning Outcomes.

The college provides a variety of mechanisms for evaluating effectiveness and improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and learning services. The governance councils and constituent groups continually evaluate processes to improve instructional, student services, and library services on an as-needed basis (I.B.7). The team verified through interviews and observations at regularly scheduled meetings that the college collegially reflects on practices throughout the year in each council; however, the process seems informal and undocumented. The college has experienced constant change for the past six years: physically with the construction and remodeling of the campus; professionally with several changes in positions, both new hires and promotions, laterals, and changes in assignments/duties; and the annual updates of most planning documents, from the Master

Plan to program review. The frequency of activity is very high, but the quality of the assessment and evaluation used to review the college's decisions is weak, undocumented, and lacks systematic, rigorous evaluation of programs and services (I.B.6; I.B.7).

Conclusions

The college partially meets the requirements of Standard I.B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness.

The college has not yet fully met the prior recommendation #1.1 regarding SLOs from 2004. Given the ongoing work to achieve proficiency for Student Learning Outcomes, the college has identified planning agenda #1 (self study, p. 43).

The college has not yet fully met the prior recommendation #1.3 regarding a "culture of evidence" from 2004. The college clearly recognizes this need with planning agenda #2 (self study, p. 43).

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).

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).

Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

The institution offers high-quality instructional programs, student support services, and library and learning support services that facilitate and demonstrate the achievement of stated student learning outcomes. The institution provides an environment that supports learning, enhances student understanding and appreciation of diversity, and encourages personal and civic responsibility as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students.

A. Instructional Programs

The institution offers high-quality instructional programs in recognized and emerging fields of study that culminate in identified student outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs consistent with its mission. Instructional programs are systematically assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes. The provisions of this standard are broadly applicable to all instructional activities offered in the name of the institution.

General Observations

The college has a long-standing and well-deserved reputation for the quality of its instructional programs. The college has received numerous awards for its creative approaches to addressing student needs. It has also developed a wide range of methods of instruction in order to accommodate the different learning styles that its student population has. The range of offerings provides students with the opportunity to meet their academic goals whether they are transfer, vocational, or personal in nature. The college provides both on-campus and off-campus courses in order to meet student demand. The entire college community, including faculty, staff, and administrators, appears committed to student success, and the entire college engages in ongoing dialogue about the quality of its instructional program.

Findings and Evidence

The mission statement, as stated in the college catalog, identifies three types of courses and programs offered at the college: lower division and general education classes, career technical education, and basic skills classes. The mission statement encourages students to achieve their goals through degree or certificate completion or through fulfilling requirements for transfer to four-year universities. Additionally, the college currently offers 18 different career technical education programs (II.A.1).

According to the City College Fact Book, the college serves more than 18,000 students, many of them underprepared for college level work. New courses and programs are developed based upon community interest, such as a request for specific on-site training for a local business, and student need. For example, the college has recently developed several learning communities that are designed primarily to meet the needs of first-time students (FYE or First-Year Experience), Chicano/a students (Puente), and African American students

(Umoja). In addition to these programs, the college also has created learning communities to ensure the transition of students from basic skills classes to transfer level courses (City Links) and for highly motivated students wishing to focus on transferring to a four-year university (Honors). These and other programs are described in detail in the college catalog. The college ensures the quality of all of its offerings through its rigorous curriculum review process, which involves discipline faculty, technical review and curriculum committee evaluation, and coordination with the other colleges in the district to ensure course and program alignment. The six-year review process used by the curriculum committee is designed to ensure further that all courses and programs are reviewed on a regular basis. The majority of courses and programs have undergone the six-year review process, and the district Instructional Services office maintains a list of those courses which have yet to be reviewed (II.A.1.a).

The class schedule, which includes course offerings at all three colleges in the district, reveals that the college offers a wide range of delivery systems and modes of instruction: face-to-face or traditional courses, online classes, day and evening classes, classes at various off-campus locations, and classes through several special programs such as learning communities, honors, and others for designated student populations. Information from the vice president of instruction shows that, during the fall semester of 2010, the college offered 1,398 sections, most of them at the main campus. Of that total, the college offers 126 sections at various off-campus sites and has 121 online course offerings. The college also offered 79 additional sections of independent study, work experience, and individual instruction (II.A.1.b).

At the program level, the college has done a significant amount of work identifying SLOs. The college catalog includes descriptions of the SLOs for each program, the result of a multi-year process involving faculty members across the campus. The Institutional Assessment Committee (IAC) has spearheaded the efforts to identify and assess student learning outcomes, and the committee remains active in getting more programs to participate in the use of TaskStream, the system adopted by the two of the district's colleges for tracking SLO assessment. The IAC has compiled a list of all program SLOs as well, providing an opportunity to see just how differently each program on campus has approached this task, and this committee was responsible for the college's initial emphasis on SLOs at the program level. By contrast, at the course level, the college faculty spent a considerable amount of time developing learning objectives for each class included in its programs when the district began using the integrated approach to course outlines. In discussions about course-level SLOs, the college faculty determined that the learning objectives would be used as the learning outcomes for individual courses rather than develop discrete and more limited SLOs. While some courses have a relatively short list of learning objectives, a significant number of course outlines have a dozen or more, making future assessment a time-consuming task.

As the faculty assess class and course level outcomes, they will need to agree on common "over-arching" student learning outcomes collectively, rather than attempt to compare across individual classroom assessments using the standard achievement data the team found in evidence.

In the interim, the college appears to be operating under the assumption that any statement of measurable student learning can be considered an SLO and any method of assessing student learning can be a part of the assessment cycle.

A collegewide dialogue that began in 2004 led to the creation of what are called “institutional competencies.” The college decided to designate the competencies as the institution-level SLOs. There have been similar processes that led to the development of campuswide outcomes for general education and the transfer program. At this point, the college has not yet begun assessing achievement of these broader outcomes through its TaskStream software. When course level assessments and more program level assessments are incorporated into the TaskStream process, the system will allow programs to link their course level outcomes to program, certificate and degree, general education, transfer, and institutional level SLOs. The college developed a six-column form that each program used in recent years to assess how its SLOs match the elements of the college mission statement and the college’s institutional competencies as well as the means of assessment and how the results were used to make improvements. Elements of this form have been incorporated into the assessment process in TaskStream (II.A.1.c).

The Curriculum Committee, which is a standing committee of the Academic Senate, has primary responsibility for approving the creation and revision of courses and programs at the college. The committee, composed almost exclusively of faculty members, uses CurricUNET as the basis for its review process, and courses submitted for review undergo a rigorous evaluation by committee members and other relevant faculty members and administrators at the college and district. Each new or revised course submitted for approval by the Curriculum Committee is examined in terms of its course content, delivery methods, and amount or type of credit awarded. The district further ensures the quality of instructional programs and courses by working to achieve course and program alignment throughout the district. All courses taught at the various campuses in the district must follow the same course outline, which is developed through a process that begins with the faculty at the department or program level. All courses and programs undergo a six-year review process as well, which requires that all course outlines be evaluated and updated on a regular basis. Approximately 75 percent of courses have been recently updated through this process; however, approximately 25 percent of courses have not yet undergone six-year review with the last cycle, although they are scheduled to be reviewed during the 2010-2011 academic year. The program review process, under the auspices of its master planning process, provides another layer of evaluation to ensure the quality of the college’s offerings (II.A.2.a).

Under the guidance of the Institutional Assessment Committee, discipline faculty developed program SLOs. The Instructional Program Level Outcomes report for 2009-2010 reveals that some programs also developed separate SLOs for certificate and/or degree programs. Faculty were also responsible for the development of the student learning outcomes for each of the six areas of the general education program used by students wishing to transfer to four-year institutions. The district’s Handbook for Career-Technical Advisory Committees specifies that committee meetings will assist faculty in identifying competencies and industry standards for use in the instructional programs. The goal, as stated in the handbook, is to

ensure the development of characteristics needed for entry-level employment and/or career advancement (II.A.2.b).

The Curriculum Committee has primary responsibility for ensuring that appropriate breadth, rigor, sequencing, time-to-completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs. Through its review of new and revised courses and programs, the committee examines, in particular, breadth, depth, and rigor. It also determines the appropriateness of prerequisites and co-requisites as well as the appropriateness of the inclusion of courses within general education requirements. Quality of instruction is determined primarily through the instructor evaluation process negotiated by the bargaining unit and through the annual program review process. According to the 2009 Student Satisfaction Survey, 79 percent of the students who responded reported that they are satisfied with the quality of instruction they receive (II.A.2.c).

The college offers courses in a variety of formats, both at the main campus and at several off-campus centers. Courses are offered in basic skills, transfer, and career technical education programs, and faculty use such methods as online instruction as well as traditional face-to-face methods. Supplemental programs such as service learning, internships, and web-enhanced (rather than fully online) courses are also available. Under a federal Title 5 grant, the college developed a series of programs and activities on different learning styles, including an award-winning website that provides an instructor self-assessment instrument for learning style accommodation. Faculty members have also been involved in the development of learning communities across the campus, and faculty members are responsible for determining the methodology for the classes they teach. Samples of course syllabi from various departments indicate that teaching and assessment methods are commonly included in information provided to students (II.A.2.d).

The college has a well-established program review process that examines program needs and plans for the future. The curriculum process involves a thorough evaluation of the relevance and appropriateness of programs and courses, and the Institutional Assessment Committee has taken responsibility for assisting programs in determining student achievement of learning outcomes. Several programs, including Child Development, have revised their program level SLOs as a result of the use of TaskStream. Annual master plan requests are consolidated with the program review process and information on SLO achievement into the overall MPROC process (II.A.2.e-f).

The Math Department has a common final exam for two of its developmental math classes, and the results are reviewed each year to ensure fairness and accuracy and to determine success rates for students taking the exams. Nursing students are required to achieve a level of proficiency on a series of exams prepared by the Assessment Technologies Institute (ATI), and ATI is responsible for ensuring that bias is minimized. Cosmetology students are given a “mock board exam” as the departmental exit exam; students thereby gain practice before taking their state licensure examination (II.A.2.g).

Faculty members are required to include the course learning objectives in the course syllabi distributed to students in their classes. The faculty evaluation process required under the

bargaining unit agreement also includes, as one possible element of the evaluation, an examination of the instructor's course materials to determine whether or not credit is being awarded on the basis of students achieving an appropriate level of proficiency in meeting the stated learning objectives. As a result of the review conducted by the Curriculum Committee, the college awards credit by using national standards in higher education. The committee has as one of its responsibilities ensuring the appropriate amount of credit to be awarded for a class (II.A.2.h).

The college catalog includes student learning outcomes that have been developed for each program. The self study states that the awarding of degrees and certificates is based upon the students' successful completion of the learning outcomes from a required list of courses for the program, and the curriculum committee process, using the advice of discipline faculty, is the method by which courses are included or removed from a program (II.A.2.i).

The college catalog includes a statement of the college's philosophy on general education and the general education requirements for degree and certificate programs and for fulfilling transfer requirements. These requirements include study in the fields of natural sciences, social and behavioral sciences, humanities, and language and rationality. The SLOs for each of the four areas of general education are also included with the descriptions of the different fields. All students completing degree or certificate programs are required to complete courses in the different areas of general education. The offerings in the four areas are designed to include the development of skills of oral and written communication, information competency, computer literacy, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis/logical thinking, and the ability to acquire knowledge through a variety of means. The college has also developed a set of Institutional Competencies that serve as the college-level SLOs, including the areas of Civic and Environmental Responsibility, Communication and Interpersonal Skills, and Cultural Sensitivity. District Procedure 5300.2 requires that ethnic studies must be included in at least one of the major areas of knowledge that a student obtains, and the district also has instituted a multicultural requirement for students obtaining degrees. To obtain an associate's degree, a student must further complete at least 18 units of study in a specific field (II.A.3; II.A.3.a-c; II.A.4).

The college's vocational and career technical education programs use the guidance of advisory committees and external accrediting agencies as well as licensure programs to design curriculum and assess student performance. The results of the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses and the California State Bureau of Barbering and Cosmetology exam, for example, demonstrate that students completing degrees and certificates in these fields tend to succeed on these tests (II.A.5).

The college catalog provides students with clear, detailed information about courses and programs, as well as policies and procedures that apply to them. Program SLOs are included in the catalog, and each program is described in terms of its primary emphasis, faculty, and career options for majors. Information on how to complete a degree or certificate in each program is thoroughly detailed. All instructors are required to distribute a syllabus to students that includes the official student learning objectives. The college's Faculty Handbook also

provides advice to faculty on the other kinds of information that should be included in the syllabus (II.A.6).

The catalog includes information on the process students must undergo in order to have coursework completed at other institutions accepted at City College. Similarly, the catalog describes the courses that are approved for transfer to California State University and University of California campuses under general education requirements. The college has transfer agreements with 22 CSU campuses and at least six of the UC campuses. Additional information on transfer requirements and agreements is also available in the counseling center, the Career/Transfer Center, and the Learning Resource Center (II.A.6.a).

The college's MPROC developed a policy for program closure in 2008-2009. The final version of the policy includes various methods for assisting students in programs that have been identified for closure. The policy also covers students whose programs are changed substantially due to revisions in regulations, local industry needs, and/or emerging technology (II.A.6.b).

The college has recently updated its website to provide faculty, staff, and administrators the ability to update their web pages rather than having to use an outside webmaster. The new site is visually appealing. The college created a Catalog Review Committee in 2009 to review and update the college catalog. The new catalog contains useful information describing each program and including the program SLOs, degree and transfer requirements, and career options for students completing an associate's degree in each field of study (II.A.6.c).

Board Policy 4030 on Academic Freedom and Freedom of Expression was revised during the 2008-09 academic year. The academic and classified senates prepared a draft of the policy, which was then revised by representatives throughout the district and submitted to the board of trustees for approval. The new policy, which covers faculty, staff, and students, is included in the current college catalog (II.A.7).

The bargaining unit agreement includes a "Statement of Professional Ethics" that governs the behavior of faculty members with respect to the responsibility to distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline (II.A.7.a).

District Procedure 3100 outlines the expectations for academic honesty. An overview of the procedure is also included in the college catalog under "Honest Academic Conduct." The procedure identifies behaviors that would be considered cheating, including acts of plagiarism, and describes the various levels of sanctions against a student found to have cheated (II.A.7.b).

The Nursing Education Code of Student Conduct is included in the student handbook for nursing students. Otherwise, the college does not require conformity to a specific code of conduct nor does it seek to instill specific beliefs or world views (II.A.7.c).

The college does not offer classes in foreign locations to students other than U.S. nationals (II.A.8).

Conclusions

The college partially meets the requirements of Standard II.A. Instructional Programs.

The college has been very responsive to student needs and levels of preparation in its course offerings. The variety of courses offered and the different methods of instruction indicate a strong instructional program. The college has done a significant amount of work in recent years to address underprepared students, in particular.

The college catalog includes clear, important information about courses and programs, including student learning outcomes that have been developed for the different programs. The district has adopted policies in line with accreditation standards regarding the purposes of general education, academic honesty, and academic freedom, and information from these policies is included in the college catalog.

While the college has done a great deal of work in identifying and assessing student learning outcomes, it has not yet completed SLOs for every course, program, degree, and certificate. The college has identified the departments that have not yet included their program SLOs in the college catalog, and it has developed a work plan for meeting the proficiency level on the commission's rubric for evaluating institutional effectiveness in student learning outcomes by 2012. The choice of TaskStream software for tracking the progress on assessment has led to a significant amount of work on assessment in the past year, but many programs are not yet included in TaskStream. The college's Institutional Assessment Committee has taken leadership on the development of SLOs and outcome assessment, and it has additional work to do in assisting the college in achieving proficiency.

See Recommendation 2.

B. Student Learning Programs and Services

General Observations

The institution has made progress towards SLO implementation, assessment, and improvement in the student service area in most programs. The student service annual program reviews list SLOs, but not all programs indicate the extent to which the SLOs were accomplished and what improvements might be made based on the analysis. Some of the programs in the student service area do have SLO assessment and improvements based on this information. The student service area has been a campus leader in populating the SLO software, TaskStream (II.B.1).

There were annual program reviews for the past three years in the student service areas in the evidence files. The program reviews identified the institutional priorities and how each

student service area met the priorities. In addition, each student service area identified improvements made, based on the previous year's assessment results. There was little data or evidence included in the program review to substantiate the changes made. However, in interviewing staff, it is clear evidence exists in department files to explain why procedural changes were made to improve services to students. The program review reporting would be improved by including this evidence as an attachment to explain more clearly why certain changes were made (II.B.1).

A variety of student support services is provided at the college to meet the diverse needs of the students including CalWORKS, DSPS, EOPS, Student Health Services, First-Year Experience, Tutoring Services, Counseling, Transfer Center, Financial Aid, Admissions and Records, Puente, Umoja, and MESA. A new Academic Success Center was built in 2009 to provide centralized access to a variety of the student support programs. In addition to having nurses available, Health Services has a doctor on duty for ten hours per week and two nurse practitioners for sixteen hours per week. Students can get a full chemistry lab panel done for just the center's costs of \$30 where it would normally cost \$700. Some students are using the Health Service Center as their primary service contact. The remodel plans are slated to further improve the student support facilities in 2013~~2~~ (II.B.1).

The district has many centralized services including DSPS interpreters and admissions and records back-room processing activities. DSPS services at the district office provide interpreters for any students requiring that service at the college. In addition, applications for admissions, evaluations, and transcripts requests are all handled at the district office. The college has an admissions and records office to provide the necessary counter services required by students, including registration, accepting paper applications, and answering student questions (II.B.1).

Online services are provided through the district's "Student Web Services" website that includes the admission application, orientation, registration, transcript requests, class schedule, catalog, financial aid applications, and online registration. Counseling and tutoring are also provided through an online format simulating those services offered to students on-campus. These online services are evaluated for quality and effectiveness when the various programs go through program review. Students may make appointments for online counseling one week in advance. There is even a virtual waiting room for students as they wait for their online counselor to "arrive." The student can see the counselor who has a web camera attached to a computer and if the student also has a web camera, the counselor will also be able to view the student. Students may view their academic records via a secure web site as the counselor provides advice on course selection. Every completed interaction with a counselor is then assessed by the student through an online survey. The survey results are available to the counseling department chair and dean to ensure quality services are being provided. All the online services are evaluated in the 2009 Student Satisfaction Survey, and 75 percent of the students expressed satisfaction with the admissions process and 84 percent satisfaction with the online registration process (II.B.1; II.B.3.a).

The college publishes an annual catalog that includes all the pertinent information necessary for students including policies and regulations that students need to be aware of. The catalog

can be found online as well as hard copy format. The catalog is checked annually for updates and errors. A copy of the catalog is distributed to students free of charge at orientation and can be purchased at the bookstore for a nominal charge. All faculty and staff receive a hard copy of the catalog (II.B.2.a-d).

The college has an open access admission policy to assure equitable access as outlined in Board Policy 3100. The college has several off-site locations, and the process for applying either online or via hard copy application is the same at each site. San Diego High School, located directly across the street from the college, is a partner in an Early College High School Initiative, and as a result the high school received several services including application workshops, placement testing, and orientation. The college offers credit classes at the Educational Cultural Complex, a non-credit adult education center owned by the district. Even though this site specializes in offering non-credit courses, the limited credit program is supported by several student service operations. These support services include computers to provide admissions and records functions, counseling, computer lab, business services, and online resources. The college also provides basic skills courses at San Diego State University and general education courses at military installations throughout its service area. San Diego State University offers support services to their students taking developmental City College classes, and educational assistants at the military bases provide services to students at the base. Online services can be provided at all these sites (II.B.3.a).

The college has identified “personal responsibility” and “Civic and Environmental Responsibility” as two of the seven stated institutional competencies in the 2009-09 Master Plan. The college attempts to meet this goal through a nationally recognized Service Learning Program where approximately 30,000 hours of community services related to courses were donated to the community. The college also sponsors a City Works Literary Journal to publish student work in poetry, fiction, prose, and artwork. Associated Student Government (ASG) provides another avenue for students to develop leadership skills and to learn about the process of a democratic governing body. A variety of student clubs also provide opportunities for students to engage in personal development (II.B.3.b).

Counselors are available year-round at the college until 6 p.m. Monday through Thursday evenings with availability of 8 a.m. to noon on Fridays. During the summers the hours change so that counselors are available Monday through Thursday from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. Besides general counselors, categorical counselors are also available through the CalWORKS, EOPS, TRIO, DSPS, Honors, MESA, PUENTE, Umoja, and First-Year Experience programs. Bilingual counselors are available to meet student needs in Spanish and Arabic. Mental Health Services are provided through a licensed clinical social worker and student interns from a local graduate program (II.B.3.c).

The evaluation of counseling services did not have enough returned surveys (62); at least 350 were necessary for a reliable sample. The counseling department identified student learning outcomes in 2009 and is in the process of measuring outcomes. The department anticipates closing the loop by 2011. The counseling department provides live e-counseling appointments to students utilizing WebEx meeting. A total of 9,285 students were served in 2008 (II.B.3.c).

The counseling department provides an in-person orientation where students complete a first semester plan. An online orientation has also been developed for online students or any student interested in using this process. Although there doesn't appear to be a mandatory orientation, new students seeking an appointment with a counselor must attend the orientation first (II.B.3.c).

An electronic education plan is generated through use of ISIS, degree auditing software, while students meet with counselors during one-hour appointments. The college piloted a readmission program for students who were disqualified multiple times (RISE). Students were required to take an intensive one-unit, eight-week personal growth class. This program was reviewed during the annual program review, and results indicated that RISE was not as effective as desired, so it was eliminated from counseling services (II.B.3.c).

Counselors are assigned as instructional liaisons to attend departmental meetings, serve on the Chairs Council, curriculum committee, and academic standards committee. The instructional liaisons ensure that instructional departments are advised of any counseling changes, and counselors in turn are advised of any new instructional program changes (II.B.3.c).

The college has an institutional priority of "Equity, Inclusiveness, and Diversity." The college's mission statement includes delivery of services to a diverse student population. The college has several programs to support diverse student needs including PUENTE, Umoja, EOPS, and DSPS. Learning Communities are offered through a program called City Links where basic skills English classes are combined with reading classes for English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) students and native speakers. The college supports a program called Black Male Gathering where faculty, staff, and community members provide mentoring and support to African American male students. The college offered Hermanos Unidos/Brothers United (HUBU) Conference to address the achievement gap that exists among Latino and African American male students. There is clear evidence that the college recognizes the challenges of diversity and has multiple support programs to assist students from diverse backgrounds (II.B.3.d).

The college used Accuplacer for English and math, including elementary algebra placement into courses. Mathematic Diagnostic Testing Project (MDTP) is used for placement into intermediate algebra and above. Combined English Language Skills Assessment (CELSA) is used for placement into ESOL classes. These tests have been reviewed and evaluated for bias and are in good standing. The validation of assessment instruments is not due until 2011 for CELSA and 2012 for Accuplacer and MDTP. Even though the college meets the standard, there is concern about the use of the current assessment tests and their accuracy in placing students appropriately. In addition, the counselors indicated a concern with a college policy that prohibits a student from retaking the test until three years have lapsed (II.B.3.e).

All permanent student records are maintained securely in the college or district offices. All records are imaged and viewable through the use of WebXtender. Hard copies of documents are stored in a special area in fireproof storage in the district's warehouse. The system is

backed up on a nightly basis. The back-up data is picked up every morning by an outside service called Iron Mountain that stores the data in an earthquake-proof facility for safe keeping. In the event of a disaster, the back-up data can be used to restore files if necessary. The college has adopted policies for the appropriate storage and disposition of records (II.B.3.f).

Student service programs have all developed SLOs and are in the process of evaluating outcomes on an annual basis. Some programs are further along than others. The evaluation is tied to the program review process and budget and planning oversight. Student Services, Instructional Services, and Administrative Services convene on a monthly basis to discuss matters related to planning and budget. A Master Planning Update identifies divisional priority needs as well as equipment needs and priorities for each student service area. The student service deans meet with the vice president of student services to prioritize needs for the student service areas (II.B.4).

Findings and Evidence

Student Services offer an extremely broad array of services both face-to-face and online to meet the varied needs of their diverse student population. There is ample evidence that the institution has made an effort to provide services to both day and evening students. There is also clear evidence that all the student service programs have developed Student Learning Outcomes. Although some of the programs have completed the assessment cycle, many others have not. The challenge for the college will be to complete the assessment cycle for all the student service programs by 2012 (II.B.1; II.B.4).

The college catalog is very comprehensive and is offered in both hard copy and online. Both the requirements and policies included in the catalog meet commission standards. The college schedule of classes is also offered in hard copy format and online and is effective in meeting student needs. Student learning outcomes are prominently displayed in the catalog to assist students with program selection (II.B.2.a-d).

The college does a good job assessing student support and learning needs and providing services to meet those needs. A vast array of services including Counseling, Financial Aid, CalWORKS, Tutoring, PUENTE, Umoja, Hermanos Unidos/Brothers United (HUBU) Conference, City Links (learning communities), EOPS, Health Services, Admissions and Records, First Year Experience, and DSPS are provided to meet diverse student needs. The college should be commended for providing comprehensive health services to students for the cost of the \$17 per semester health fee. In addition, the college should be commended for continuing to provide quality student support services while suffering 50 percent budget cuts in areas such as counseling, financial aid, DSPS, and CalWORKS. These programs are facing larger student populations with diminishing resources but have developed creative group processes or streamlined paperwork to ensure student needs continue to be met (II.B.3.a).

Student activities and a large service learning program promote and encourage public service, and there is a wide variety of student clubs to increase student engagement and

development. Students delivered more than 30,000 volunteer hours to the community through the service learning program. The college received national recognition by receiving the President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll, the highest federal recognition a college can receive for commitment to volunteering and civic engagement (II.B.3.b; II.B.3.d).

Counseling services are adequate to meet student need and are available in the evening hours. In addition, a strong online e-counseling system is available to provide a secure online counseling environment. An online orientation has also been developed. E-counseling has extensive evaluation data that indicate students are very satisfied with the services they are receiving with 94 percent indicating they would continue to use e-counseling and 95 percent indicating that the e-counseling site is very necessary for online students. The college should be commended for providing this counseling service to online students. The college needs to develop a reliable evaluation of the face-to-face counseling services (II.B.3.c).

The placement instruments have been evaluated for reliability and validity. A variety of assessment instruments are used to place students in various classes. The college has indicated a concern regarding the current placement tests and their effectiveness in placing students. Although no formal policy exists, college practice is to require students to wait three years before retaking the Mathematics, English, and ESOL placements. (II.B.3.e).

Student records are safe in secured fireproof vaults and back-up databases. All official student records are maintained by the district office, and back-ups are maintained in a secure off-site location. Disaster recovery services are provided through contract with Iron Mountain services (II.B.3.f).

All student service programs have developed student learning outcomes. Not all the programs have completed the full assessment cycle, but all student service programs have entered program review and student learning outcomes in the TaskStream data base (II.B.4).

Conclusions

The college partially meets the requirements of Standard II.B. Student Learning Programs and Services.

San Diego City College does an excellent job in providing a broad array of services to meet the needs of the diverse student population being served. There are many examples of outstanding and creative support programs being offered including an especially strong program in e-counseling and online tutoring. The college should be commended for the broad array of online services being provided to students. The college is to be commended for the strong Student Service Learning Program offered that has provided more than 30,000 hours of free community service.

The student service areas have completed annual program reviews for several years. These program reviews are to "Measure (Cite the evidence for each area) 1. List the 2008-09 Administrative outcomes (e.g. retention, persistence, and satisfaction) for your department or

program and describe how previous year results were used for improvement.” Although the student service programs identify what activities they undertook to improve services, they do not include any evidence as to why they made these changes. The program reviews would be strengthened by citing the evidence for change or attaching evidence since the TaskStream software allows this possibility.

The student service programs are to be commended for taking the lead in populating TaskStream for the student learning outcomes and assessment process. All the programs have identified student learning outcomes and assessment measures, but not all have actually implemented the assessment process.

Placement testing is a centralized function since all the colleges must agree to administer the same tests and have the same cut scores for placement. Any change in placement tests would require a review by the entire district. The college has a planning agenda to re-establish the review cycle for all placement tests for the district since a new validation study for ESOL must be completed by fall 2011.

See Recommendation 2.

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).

C. Library and Learning Support Services

Library and other learning support services for students are sufficient to support the institution's instructional programs and intellectual, aesthetic, and cultural activities in whatever format and wherever they are offered. Such services include library services and collections, tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, and learning technology development and training. The institution provides access and training to students so that library and other learning support services may be used effectively and efficiently. The institution systematically assesses these services using student learning outcomes, faculty input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of the services.

General Observations

The self study and evidence describe the wide array of learning support programs provided for students at San Diego City College. The college's instructional and learning support programs include the college's Learning Resource Center (LRC), the English Center, the Math Center, the Tutorial/Learning Center, MESA, and the DSPS/High Tech Center. The Learning Resource Center houses the college library, the Independent Learning Center (ILC) computer labs with specialized instructional software, and the college's Multimedia Center

audiovisual collection and equipment for faculty and students. All of these programs are described in the self study and were examined for this report. The site visit, interviews, and additional evidence provided confirm the range of innovative mentoring, tutoring, supplemental instruction, and learning support resources provided by these programs. The evidence and site visit confirmed the self study's report that these programs are vibrant, consistently used, and continuing to provide valuable services for students despite reductions in hours, staffing, and funding. Since the last accreditation site visit, several of these programs have been relocated along with student services programs to the Academic Success Center (ASC) (II.C.1).

Learning support programs request funding for materials, staffing, and equipment annually through the college MPROC process. The LRC does not have an annual budget for books, learning material or equipment. In response to the 2004 accreditation evaluation recommendation 2.1 and the self-study process, the college developed Planning Agenda #2 to address the identified basic needs for consistent and sufficient funding for staffing, collections, and computer resources for the LRC and the college's learning support programs. The site visit, interviews, and additional evidence provided confirm annual participation in the MPROC planning process has not yet resulted in a "consistent funding model" for these programs (II.C.1a).

Findings and Evidence

The self study describes the facilities, equipment, and materials of the LRC and other learning support services (the English Center, the Math Center, the Tutorial/Learning Center, MESA, and the DSPS/High Tech Center). The LRC (library, ILC, Multimedia Center) and other learning support programs submit annual planning forms A, B, and T to report previous year outcomes and use and to document funding needs for materials, equipment, and staffing. The college has continued to support the technology, staffing, and collections/materials of its learning support services, but interviews confirmed these programs continue to rely on one-time and grant funding (CTEA, Title 5, Basic Skills) outside the MPROC process (II.C.1, II.C.1.a).

The site visit and evidence confirm the library collection is smaller and older than recommended for the size of the college due to "decades of inconsistent and inadequate funding," with funding limited to a small number of standing orders of library books and essential software upgrades for the ILC in some years (self study p. 228). Since the last accreditation visit, the evidence shows a large one-time infusion of funds in 2006, allocated separately from the master planning process, has helped to increase the quantity of library materials and to update the library collection with newer print materials, e-books, and expanded online resources. There is concern about continuing to fund the library's online databases that were previously paid for with state Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure Program (TTIP) funds (now eliminated). Librarians have analyzed the collection and collaborated with discipline faculty to identify subjects that have high student interest (check outs) but few materials. They solicit grant funding to support the purchase of some of these needed materials. (Evidence: *Summary of 2009-10 Basic Skill Initiative-Funded Activities*). The self study highlights the concerns for "consistent and sufficient" on-

going funding for learning support program staffing and educational materials described in planning agenda #2 (II.C.1; II.C.1.a.).

Librarians provide individual information competency instruction (reference service), collaborative course-based information literacy instruction sessions, tours, workshops, and a credit class. Data for these services is included in the self study. The site visit confirmed student learning outcomes for library instruction sessions are defined, informally assessed, and the results of the assessment are discussed regularly among the librarians to improve instruction. The other learning support services also provide and assess workshops and one-on-one instruction in the use of center facilities, equipment, and resources to support information competency (II.C.1.b).

Since the last accreditation visit, the college has improved and expanded online access to library and learning support programs. The college provides online access to the library catalog, e-books, research databases, and 24/7 reference assistance. Some online access to library materials is limited to students enrolled at City College, while other materials and services can be accessed by students at any of the district colleges and centers. The Math Center, English Center, and Tutorial Learning Center provide students the opportunity to access tutoring services online. Learning support faculty and staff collaborate with colleagues at sister colleges and off-site locations, including the Educational Cultural Center (ECC), to provide resources and learning support services to students. The English Center and the ECC are jointly seeking grant funding for an English Center satellite program at the ECC (site visit and interview). Links to learning support services information and online services are included in the Blackboard shell for online classes. Site interviews and examination of online classes confirm faculty and students of online classes are made aware of learning support services. Faculty teaching online classes learn about the learning support services available to online students at flex workshops and through the CitySITE (Support for Integration of Technology in Education) faculty and staff training center (II.C.1.c).

Interviews and evidence confirm college librarians and learning support program leaders document the ways they collaborate internally with discipline faculty and externally within the district and with colleagues at other institutions. The self study details the librarians' participation in campus committees and contact with academic divisions. Campus interviews confirm collaboration and dialogue among the learning support programs. The Instructional Learning Center and Multimedia Center collaborate with classroom faculty to ensure appropriate resources are available. Program leaders of the English Center, Math Center, and Tutorial/Learning Center collaborate on assessments and coordinate activities to avoid duplication of services. The LRC and library participate in and benefit from collaborative opportunities and consortia at the district, regional, and/or state-wide level. Collaboration enhances professional development and services and resource for students, including: a shared library catalog, inter-library loan services, collection development for online and audiovisual resources, resource sharing, cost savings, and expanded services (e.g. Question Point 24/7 consortia reference service) (II.C.1.d, II.C.1.e).

In contrast to instructional and student services programs, program outcomes for learning support services are not included in the college catalog. Examination of the annual plans for

these learning support services showed that although these programs include outcome measures of student use and administrative outcomes, student learning outcomes are inconsistently included. Point-of-use surveys assess use and evaluate student perception of these programs and services. Indirect outcome measures of student achievement (administrative outcomes) are collected for students enrolled in credit courses tied to the English and Math Centers (supplemental instruction). Head counts (FTES scans) are tracked for students using tutoring services, but so far this data is not consistently correlated to actual student achievement in the classes for which they seek tutoring. The Tutorial/Learning Center uses a survey to assess student perception of the benefit of tutoring on their confidence in subject matter (one of their defined student learning outcomes). The English Center has implemented innovative online techniques for data gathering and reporting, but ‘closing the assessment loop’ will require taking the next step to develop a system to correlate student use data with their course records to document actual course success (II.C.2).

Most of these learning support services fall organizationally under the area of instruction, but the evidence does not show these programs consistently apply the college’s “6-column model” for developing and assessing student learning outcomes. The self study describes the structure and process of the MPROC and documents the dialogue facilitated by the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (SLOAC) about student learning outcomes. The participation of the learning support program faculty in the SLO dialogue is not well documented. The evidence does not show sustained focus by the library or other learning support services on development of student learning outcomes and direct assessment techniques for these services. The evidence provided in the self study and during the site visit demonstrates learning support services focus on self-reported administrative outcomes (course success and retention) rather than systematically developing and assessing student learning outcomes. In addition to developing student learning outcomes for these programs, assessment can be strengthened by developing a system to correlate student use of these services with the student’s actual course records (II.C.2).

The self study emphasizes the value of TaskStream, the recently adopted online learning outcome system. The Institutional Assessment Committee’s *Implementation Timeline* for the *Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness in Student Learning Outcomes* (evidence: “Institutional Assessment Committee 5.12.2010 Detailed Work Plan added Fall 2010) describes the college’s plan to institutionalize SLOs in the planning process, which includes the incorporation of TaskStream into the MPROC planning process in 2010-2011. The SLO coordinators (aided by released time and a Building Research Infrastructure and Capacity Program [BRIC] award) plan to work with faculty and staff to add learning support services to TaskStream with the goal of facilitating the development and assessment of student learning outcomes by these programs and enhancing their ability to both track and systematically assess their outcome data (self-study p. 89, 142). Currently, the MESA program offers the only example in TaskStream of defined learning outcomes and documentation of formative progress reports, summative surveys, summary findings, and action plans for improvement based on analysis and dialogue of assessment data (II.C.2).

Conclusions

The college partially meets the requirements of Standard II.C. Library and Learning Support Services.

In order to meet fully this standard, the college will need to implement their planning agenda #2 to achieve the adequate and consistent funding for the LRC, library, and other learning support programs (Recommendation 2.1 of the 2004 accreditation evaluation). The college's annual MPROC planning process has not accomplished consistent and adequate funding as described in planning agenda #2 or achieved a 'total cost of operation' funding formula needed to ensure online subscription resources and learning support software and licenses are maintained (II.C.1).

See Recommendation 1.

To fully meet this standard, the college needs to make additional progress in developing and consistently and effectively assessing student learning outcomes. The evidence provided in Standard II.C.2 and during the site visit does not document that the college's learning support services systematically develop and assess student learning outcomes as defined in the *AACJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: Student Learning Outcomes*. To achieve proficiency as defined in this rubric, the college LRC and other learning support services will need to develop, document, and systematically assess student learning outcome statements related to the services provided. The annual plans for these services document their activities and heavy use by students. The English Center and Math Center consistently use indirect measures of student outcomes (administrative outcomes) for students enrolled in credit classes. Head counts and surveys are used to track walk-in tutoring service use and to evaluate student perception of these programs and services. For more effective program planning and improvement, these programs should also focus on completing the student learning outcomes assessment cycle by working more directly with the college's SLO co-chairs (self-study p. 89, 142) and the college researcher to develop and systematically apply assessment techniques based on student learning outcomes for each program. Methods for assessing the correlation between student use of services and student achievement data should also be identified and used (II.C.2).

See Recommendation 2.

STANDARD III: Resources

The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness.

A. Human Resources

The institution employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services wherever offered and by whatever means delivered, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Personnel are treated equitably, are evaluated regularly and systematically, and are provided opportunities for professional development. Consistent with its mission, the institution demonstrates its commitment to the significant educational role played by persons of diverse backgrounds by making positive efforts to encourage such diversity. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

General Observations

San Diego City College employs a qualified, energetic group of faculty, classified staff, and administrators. All college employees seem to be committed to guiding and assisting students in achieving their educational goals. While much of the responsibility for human resources resides at the district level, college representatives are active in the development of policies and procedures regarding hiring and evaluation processes and in the implementation of those policies and procedures at the campus level. Although the district has been under a hiring freeze in recent years, several years of faculty hiring during the past decade have led to a core of very involved and creative instructors, counselors, and librarians.

Findings and Evidence

The district has developed hiring policies for each employee category, and oversight of the hiring process resides with the human resources department at the district office. Under district procedure 4201.1, the college and the district determine qualifications for faculty based upon minimum standards established by the state chancellor's office. Applicants for faculty positions are screened by the district human resources department to determine which ones meet the minimum qualifications. Procedure 4201.3 describes the process for determining equivalency for faculty applicants who do not meet those minimum qualifications. In order to be considered for equivalency, the applicant must submit a separate request. Those who request consideration under equivalency are then evaluated by the screening committees. Both the hiring process and the equivalency process in district procedure rely, in large part, upon faculty to determine qualifications for potential hires. District Procedure 4200.1 gives faculty predominance in the hiring process for faculty members (II.A.1; II.A.1.a).

The district's Human Resources Instructions Manual details the process for determining the need for classified positions and the process used for filling vacancies. Board Policy 4100 requires that screening committees use the requirements for experience and other qualifications to determine which candidates to recommend for hiring (II.A.1).

Desirable qualifications, those that exceed the minimum qualifications, are developed by individual screening committees and submitted to the Equal Employment Opportunity officer and/or the Site Compliance Officer to ensure that the job announcement and any screening criteria and procedures reflect equitable practices and respect for diversity. Among the screening criteria used by most faculty hiring committees are teaching demonstrations during the interview process and statements of teaching philosophy. The district Human Resources department screens applications to ensure that all degrees are from accredited institutions, and the district recommends that applicants with degrees from non-U.S. institutions use World Education Services to verify that their degrees are equivalent (III.A.1.a).

Board policies, union contracts, handbooks, and manuals describe the various methods of evaluations for different employee groups. Under the bargaining unit contract, full-time faculty members are evaluated for four years before the decision to grant tenure is made. Every two years subsequent to receiving tenure, faculty members are evaluated for the purposes of promotion. After achieving the rank of professor, faculty members are evaluated every three years. Student evaluations are a part of the faculty evaluation procedures. The Management Employee Handbook and the Supervisory and Professional Administrators Handbook state that managers and administrators are evaluated annually during the first four years of employment and every three years afterward. Staff members are evaluated using the guidelines of the bargaining unit contract or other agreements. Adjunct faculty evaluations occur during the first year of employment and at least once every six regular semesters thereafter. All of the procedures and policies for evaluation include sections regarding follow-up actions (II.A.1.b).

The college's Academic Senate has recommended a change to the bargaining unit contract that would include "assessment" as one of the items for faculty evaluations. The proposed contract language does not specifically address the faculty member's effectiveness in student achievement of student learning outcomes, but the self study states that the change in wording from "Testing and Measurement" under the category of "Teaching (in the Classroom)" on the evaluation form will allow faculty members, through their self-appraisal in the review process, to include discussion of their work on SLO development and student assessment, among other items. Before the change can be incorporated into the faculty evaluation process, it must be endorsed by the other senates in the district and then undergo the negotiations process before being submitted for ratification (II.A.1.c).

Each employee group other than administrators has a separate code of ethics which its members must uphold. Managers are governed by a district policy regarding conflicts of interest that is applicable to all employees. Faculty members are governed by the Statement of Professional Ethics created by the American Association of University Professors and adopted by the City College Academic Senate. The Classified Senate adopted its own Code of Ethics two years ago (III.A.1.d).

Until the recent state budget crisis, the college had maintained a consistent number of full-time faculty, staff, and administrators. The district has been under a hiring freeze for the past two years due to the budget crisis, and several dozen faculty and classified positions have

remained unfilled. The college, however, continues to prioritize its hiring needs as a part of its annual MPROC processes (III.A.2).

The district is primarily responsible for ensuring that personnel policies and procedures are administered equitably and consistently. The Equal Employment Opportunity officer and Director of Employment at the district level and the Site Compliance Officer at the college provide oversight regarding the equitable and consistent application of personnel policies and procedures. District policies regarding personnel undergo the same process as other policies for review and adoption by the Board of Trustees. Proposals for new and/or revised policies and procedures typically originate with the district Human Resources department and are discussed at the District Governance Council and then Chancellor's Cabinet before being submitted for board approval. Once adopted, new and revised policies and procedures are posted online (III.A.3).

Several board policies govern fairness in employment procedures. Board Policy 4100.1 addresses Affirmative Action Employee Procedures, Policy 3410 is the district policy regarding Nondiscrimination, and Policy 7100 states the district's Commitment to Diversity. The district Equal Employment Opportunity office holds primary responsibility for ensuring that policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures are followed (III.A.3.a).

Personnel files are kept in a secure room maintained by the district payroll office, and the district maintains both hard copy and electronic versions of all personnel records. Guidelines for accessing personnel records in either format are available from the Human Resources department (III.A.3.b).

Several board policies govern fairness in employment procedures and demonstrate the district's understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity. Board Policy 4100.1 addresses Affirmative Action Employee Procedures, Policy 3410 is the district policy regarding Nondiscrimination, Policy 3430 addresses Prohibition of Harassment, and Policy 7100 states the district's Commitment to Diversity. The district Equal Employment Opportunity office holds primary responsibility for ensuring that policies ensuring fairness are adhered to in all employment procedures. The district has recently employed a new Equal Employment Opportunity/Diversity officer who is charged with ensuring equitable treatment in employment practices, and each campus has designated a Site Compliance Officer who works with the district EEO office regarding campus issues, particularly complaints of unfair or discriminatory treatment. The Board of Trustees has approved a new districtwide Equal Employment Opportunity Plan 2010-2013, and the district EEO Plan Advisory Committee has been given responsibility for developing methods for how to implement and maintain methods of ensuring that the colleges and district are responsive to the needs of the diverse students and employees. Each college in the district also has a Diversity Committee that is given responsibility for furthering the commitment to diversity at the campus level (III.A.3.a; III.A.4).

Under the guidance of the EEO/Diversity officer at the district, all members of screening committees undergo training before serving on the committees, and the recently adopted EEO Plan lists a number of areas where the district will provide leadership in the

presentation and/or coordination of activities to support and encourage diversity among the employees. The college's Diversity Committee has also presented numerous programs and workshops in recent years to raise awareness of the college and district's goals regarding diversity, and other departments and programs have been responsible for a variety of activities that demonstrate a commitment to and an appreciation of diversity. A substantial majority (77 percent) of those surveyed for the 2009 Employee Opinion Survey state that the college's policy and programs demonstrate a commitment to equity and diversity (III.A.4.a).

The college has also identified two areas in its planning agendas for the self study that address the adjunct faculty. The first planning agenda item calls for the creation of an orientation, training, and professional development program for the adjunct faculty and the development of methods for the greater inclusion of adjunct faculty in the institutional culture. This first item also calls for formal training of the full-time faculty who evaluate adjunct faculty. The other planning agenda item addresses the diversity of the adjunct faculty, and it calls for the college to develop methods for the outreach, recruitment, mentoring, and support of a more diverse adjunct faculty pool, particularly for departments that have had difficulty maintaining diversity among their faculty.

The district collects information on a quarterly basis regarding the diversity of its workforce, and the specific information about City College is included in its annual Fact Books. The college and district have as a goal the increased diversity of the workforce, but the hiring freeze in recent years has prevented much progress in this area. One of the planning agenda items for the self study states that the college intends to design and implement a plan for the outreach, recruitment, mentoring, and support of a diverse adjunct faculty pool. This plan could also address the diversity of the full-time faculty and should be aligned with the district Equal Employment Opportunity Plan 2010-2013, particularly the measures identified to further equal employment opportunities throughout the district (III.A.4.b).

In addition to the board policies described above, Human Resources guidelines and collective bargaining agreements with various employee groups ensure integrity in the treatment of administrators, faculty, staff, and students. The Equal Employment Opportunity officer at the district and the Site Compliance Officer at the college have the responsibility of ensuring integrity. The 2009 Employee Perception Survey found that 79 percent of those who responded felt they were treated with respect at the college and 77 percent stated that the policies and practices of the college clearly demonstrate a commitment to equity and diversity (III.A.5.c).

The college provides significant opportunities for professional development for both faculty and staff members. Under the bargaining unit contract, faculty receive pay-grade increases for completing staff development contracts and are eligible for promotion based, in part, upon their professional development activities. The Professional Development, Tenure, and Promotion Committee reviews professional growth and sabbatical proposals and recommendations for promotion. Classified employees can be reimbursed for tuition and fees for professional development activities, and the Classified Senate has sponsored retreats and encouraged classified involvement in other activities to promote professional development. The Instructional Improvement Committee designed professional development opportunities

for faculty, and the committee regularly distributes faculty needs surveys to determine which kinds of activities and workshops to offer during upcoming years. The 2009 Employee Perception Survey found that 73 percent of those who responded were satisfied with the opportunities for continued professional development (III.A.5; III.A.5.a)

Through its MPROC, the college has created criteria for filling vacant faculty and staff positions, and the prioritization of hiring requests in these areas is a part of the annual planning process. According to the college's Master Plan Update for 2009-2010, even though the district has been under a hiring freeze in recent years, the college has maintained a list of vacant positions and has developed a process for determining which positions will have highest priority for replacement when the hiring freeze is lifted (III.A.6).

Conclusions

The college meets the requirements of Standard III.A. Human Resources.

The district and college have in place well established policies and procedures about human resources. Many of the board-approved policies and district procedures have been reviewed and/or updated in recent years, and plans for the implementation of those policies and procedures have been developed as well.

Hiring processes for the different employee categories are well detailed in district policy, and bargaining unit agreements and employee group handbooks describe the extensive evaluation procedures, including timelines, that the colleges and district follow.

Since the last accreditation visit, the district and college have done considerable work on ensuring that equity and diversity are key components of the hiring and evaluation of all employee groups. Under the leadership of the Equal Employment Opportunity/Diversity officer, the district has completed an EEO plan that outlines a variety of ways that the colleges and district may increase the diversity of the workforce, a stated goal.

Two items on the planning agenda for the self study address the adjunct faculty, particularly the need for more training, mentoring, and support of adjunct faculty. The items listed in both planning agenda items could assist the college in meeting its goal of creating more diverse candidate pools among its own adjunct faculty.

The college and the district offer numerous opportunities for professional development, and faculty and staff are encouraged and often rewarded for their participating in staff development activities. The variety of workshops and activities available to employees suggests a strong commitment to professional development.

Recommendations

None.

B. Physical Resources

Physical resources, which include facilities, equipment, land, and other assets, support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

General Observations

San Diego City College continues to see significant improvements in its facilities and infrastructure primarily as a result of the district's passage of Proposition S, a \$685 million construction bond program in 2002, and Proposition N, an \$870 million bond program in 2006. Of this total, approximately \$485 million has been allocated to modernize San Diego City College. The college notes that the additional funding will enable the college to serve the increasing student population and to upgrade the aging infrastructure. As noted in the 2009-10 Annual FTES Report, the district has grown from 41,966 total FTES in 2005-06 to 43,467 total FTES in 2009-10, and the college has grown from 10,174 FTES to 11,447 in that same timeframe (III.B).

Findings and Evidence

The college assesses its existing infrastructure in the same manner that it plans for new construction. To ensure that each project supports student learning and related support services and is integrated with institutional planning, the college involves faculty, classified staff, and administrators in the design of each construction project. Departments have the opportunity to describe how they want or need their classrooms to function and to describe what is right for their area. Facilities and their equipment are assessed through the college's program and department annual program reviews and by the combined college and district Review of Services Committee. The college notes that the district makes an effort to know what is happening on the college campus in order to better provide support and coordination of planned projects (III.B).

At the start of each semester representatives of the College Committee, a sub-committee of the Health and Safety Committee, conduct a workplace inspection. Forms filled out during the inspection identify facilities in need of repair or improvement. The reports are first reviewed by the vice president of administrative services who coordinates the collection of data, submits requests for services using the maintenance management system, and keeps the results on file (III.B.1).

The college Health and Safety Committee and the combined college and district Review of Services committees meet monthly to discuss relevant issues that affect the physical and security aspects of the campus. The Health and Safety Committee discusses health and safety concerns related to the campus and determines action plans to resolve the concerns. The district Board of Trustees adopted an Injury and Illness Prevention Plan policy in February 1996. The policy is posted on the district's web site and the plan is overseen by the Health and Safety Committee. The college is faced with a number of security challenges as a result of a large homeless community and two large high schools within a block of the campus. The college notes that tagging activities have increased and that the college

experiences an influx of high school students when school lets out. College police are available twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week to provide services to the college (III.B.1).

The Review of Services Committee is composed of college faculty and staff and select administrative staff from the district. The committee discusses physical maintenance issues affecting the college. The college indicates that typical topics would include renovations and new buildings, custodial, grounds, campus police, technology, and gardening. Action plans are developed for items identified as needing attention (III.B.1).

In 2009, the college sponsored an employee and student survey to determine the sufficiency of classrooms, lecture halls, laboratories, and other facilities. The student survey indicates that, within a range of 62 to 74 percent, students either agree or strongly agree that there is adequate study space, that grounds and exterior features of the buildings are adequately maintained, that there is adequate lighting, and that they feel safe on campus. The employee survey indicates that, within a range of 64 to 84 percent, employees either agree or strongly agree that student learning and support needs are central to the planning, development and design of new facilities, that safety hazards are addressed promptly, that grounds and the exteriors of buildings are adequately maintained, and that exterior lighting is adequate. It is important to note that only 40 percent felt that the interior of classrooms, offices, and restrooms are adequately maintained. In response, the district hired a consultant to determine if the job of maintaining the facilities was up to industry expectations. The consultant found it to be acceptable, but the campus community did not agree. The college indicates that it is doing a follow-up to determine specifics and feels that with the renovations and new buildings the condition will improve. The survey results were disseminated to the college community, and the college feels that future planning will become more useful with the relatively new addition of a campus-based researcher (III.B.1).

The college has established a Disaster Preparedness Team, and team members have been trained in various strategies when dealing with all campus wide emergencies. Several emergency training drills were conducted in 2009-10. The drills resulted in modifications to the college's emergency response plan. The college notes that the newly implemented web site will have a section on disaster preparedness and related training courses are being developed to further enhance training activities (III.B.1).

The Facilities Master Plan was originally developed in 2002 and was reviewed and updated in 2006. The college indicates that, starting with the original master plan, all college constituent groups have had input into the direction physical resources would go. The college currently serves approximately 18,000 students (11,447 FTES) and anticipates, with the availability of Proposition S funding, an eventual increase to 25,000 (III.B.1.a).

The Academic Senate and the Proposition S Steering Committee met to determine the best method for allocating the Proposition S bond funds on the college campus. Project listings are available on the college's web site, and each project is identified showing its source of funding and current phase. A review of this site shows news articles related to the projects and an update on Proposition S and N Facilities projects. Development committees for

Proposition N projects are currently meeting. The committees are made up of end users and campus administrators. The Proposition N Steering Committee made a recommendation of which programs to house in new buildings and the order in which the existing buildings would be renovated. This recommendation was presented to the Academic Senate and the President's Council for approval (III.B.1.a).

The college also indicates that business services is currently setting up a website, to become active in 2010, which will include a facilities survey that employees can fill out when they have concerns (III.B.1.a).

A concern was noted by the college related to the Child Development Center's funding. Originally the center was to receive state funding but, like it has been for many other colleges, funding has been delayed. The college indicates that the project will go forward regardless of the availability of future state bond funding and that the project would begin in late 2010. At the time of the site visit, the project was back in the development stage and will be resubmitted to the state for funding (III.B.1.a).

The college is accessible by way of bus, trolley, and private vehicles. The college indicates that it has had an on-going parking problem that will be addressed with completion of the planned construction. The Facilities Master Plan specifies the district and college commitment to create additional parking spaces and to improve, renovate, repair, and expand campus roads, roadways, and improve campus safety. The master plan guiding principles include the statements that student services should be easily accessible from off-campus with convenient parking, that during the design stage of projects parking should be located on the periphery of the campus, and that new construction projects should consider existing parking lots. A new parking structure was completed in summer 2010 as part of the Career Technology Center, and plans are in place to construct another parking structure as part of the Math and Social Science project as well as the Business and Humanities project. Current plans reflect 824 additional parking spaces over the 2005 level. The guiding principles also note that there should be efficient and safe ways to navigate the campus including appropriate lighting and signage, that parking should be sufficient and convenient to major sites, and that there should be convenient and safe drop-off locations (III.B.1.b).

The college also notes some accessibility challenges for the physically handicapped. The district hired a firm specializing in ADA requirements to survey the campus and identify areas where planned improvements should take place. These recommendations are being used in the 2010-11 facilities planning. All new projects have taken ADA issues into consideration (III.B.1.b).

A continuing concern is the district's change in distribution of custodial resources. The college community feels that the new set of calculations has caused a noticeable decline in custodial supervision and cleaning and indicates that there is a need to evaluate the new approach (III.B.1.b).

A Campus Design Committee has been formed and one of the committee's first topics was related to upgrading of way-finding signage and identification of buildings. The Design

Committee was advised that the team reviewing the campus would return in spring 2010 with its ideas. The committee is currently reviewing the suggestions. This review was to include the off-campus site as well as the campus (III.B.1.b).

When off-campus programs at district sites have facility needs, those needs are reported following the same procedures as on-campus programs. When the college needs to offer classes on non-district owned sites, the site is evaluated to ensure that it meets college operational needs and that it meets the access, security, health, and safety requirements of the district (III.B.1.b.).

The college feels that the funding process for facilities and equipment is transparent and all constituencies are able to view budget projections and plans. Repair requests are done online or through a call center. Funding for new buildings from Propositions S and N has also provided resources for new equipment and furniture improving the level of instruction and services (III.B.2).

Future facility needs are identified first by campus constituencies. Once identified, committees are formed to follow through with the specifics of each project. The facilities master plan is a college document and identifies the guiding principles for future construction and upgrades. The committee that develops the plan is made up of faculty, staff, and administrators and meets on an ad hoc basis. Funding and resource allocation discussions are accomplished with the MPROC. The Long Range Capital Construction Plan guides each campus in the areas of land acquisition, construction of new buildings, and renovation of existing buildings (III.B.2.a).

The college identifies the components of the total cost of ownership when making decisions concerning facilities. The college indicates that the district has plans in place to support the increased staffing, maintenance, and operations costs of new and remodeled construction and that money has been set aside from each of the last several district budgets for that purpose. With installation of solar panels, the district is looking to reduce the cost of electrical service and plans to use these ongoing savings to help offset the increased costs related to the new facilities. Due to the current economic climate, these plans have not been fully implemented. The college feels that there is a clear need for better and more detailed communication on this issue (III.B.2.a).

The college indicates that it bases its physical resource decisions on the instructional and service needs of the students attending the college. The student satisfaction survey conducted in 2009 provided the college with information for future facility improvements. The needs of specific programs are addressed first by subject matter experts followed by committee discussions on facilities and resources. The college community has expressed concern about the lack of communication when changes are made at the district level to projects that have been developed by college constituencies. Equipment is prioritized through the master planning process, which leads to a prioritized list of equipment to be purchased for the next academic year (III.B.2.b).

The governance committees addressing physical resource needs include the Health and Safety Committee, Review of Services Committee, and the Campus Design Committee. If needs are not being met, steps are taken to remedy the issue and follow-up occurs at subsequent meetings (III.B.2.b).

The college recognizes the challenges that come with significant facility improvements but feels that the end result will be an expanded campus with sustainable and environmentally friendly buildings that support instruction and student services (III.B.2.b).

Conclusions

The college meets the requirements of Standard III.B. Physical Resources.

The college has taken safety, workplace conditions, and disaster preparedness issues seriously. A comprehensive plan to address these issues has been developed and implemented.

Funding resulting from the passage of Propositions S and N has enabled the college to significantly improve facilities and infrastructure. The college provides numerous opportunities for discussion and input into the project development process. Concerns have been expressed by the college related to communication and feedback from the district during this process.

Recommendations

None.

C. Technology Resources

Technology resources are used to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning.

General Observations

According to the 2008-2009 Master Plan and conversations with staff, the college has met the requirements of the recommendation in this area made by the previous visiting team. The Information Technology Plan was written in 2005, revised in spring 2010, and is integrated into the annual planning process. The plan is driven by the college mission and designed to support and assist the college in regard to the broad range of technology decisions. The college self study includes a planning agenda to address integration of technology planning into the overall college planning process using recently developed Form T (III.C.1).

According to the Master Plan Update for 2009-2010, the President's Council approved the IT Plan on May 8, 2010 (III.C).

The college has established the Information Technology planning process, including governance decision-making and coordinating with district-level technology. Capital outlay funding has provided technology resources for the district's and college's current needs (III.C.1).

The technology and equipment budget is growing as a result of the bond measures. The college has hired a dean for Learning Resources and College Technology who has established planning processes including a trickle down system of computer assignments. According to interviews, many of the formerly contracted vendors were hired as employees and work efficiently and effectively to support technology (III.C).

Earlier concerns in the self study stated that the college expressed concern over the perceived demise of Blackboard course management software. Discussions with staff confirm that the contract with Blackboard was renewed and faculty confidence has returned that there is a reliable online course software platform now in place (III.C).

Findings and Evidence

According to the District Information Technology Role and Governance overview, the college plans, acquires, maintains, upgrades, and/or replaces its technology infrastructure and equipment to meet the institutional needs through a two-tiered process that involves the college Institutional Technology (IT) Council and the District Information Technology Department. College representatives are active participants in all tasks related to the college infrastructure (III.C).

The IT Council is working towards a program to replace out-of-warranty computers and printers on a systematic basis, and to streamline the planning process to improve efficiency. Integration of the technology plan into college planning is in process (III.C).

According to the self study, in order to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness, the MPROC assists department chairs in identifying the intended usage, users, training, and support needed, as well as security requirements that are necessary to plan for the acquisition of new equipment (III.C.1).

In 2008–09 the MPROC introduced the Form T to support technology planning. This form assists department chairs in identifying the intended usage, users, training, and support needed, as well as security requirements that are necessary to plan for the acquisition of new equipment. The form also addresses assessment; e.g., how the technology fits with learning outcomes as well as a more directed process for assessing the use of the technology itself (III.C.1).

The Evaluation Report, 2004, explains that in fall 2003, the Institutional Technology Council was formed to develop a technology plan. The college worked to modify the Information Technology Plan, which was completed June 2010. This was part of Planning Agenda #8, which was a response to a previous accreditation recommendation. The district and college

were encouraged to tie together campus technology needs into one vision and plan. This plan further reported in the self study that there is design, funding, implementation, and assessment for systems to address disaster recovery, privacy, and reliability of technology (III.C.1).

In addition to the master planning process, instructional programs identify their technology needs during the curriculum development and update process. Each course and program proposal requires that the originator identify the needs of the proposed course or program including the technologies and equipment it would require (III.C.1).

Technology resource needs for personnel and facilities for all academic and student-service departments and programs are identified via the master planning process using Form T. In addition, the college evaluates the effectiveness of its technology in meeting its range of needs through the course evaluation process, surveys to college personnel, and the program review process that is embedded in the master plan process (III.C.1.a).

As reported in self study, the college assures that technology services, support, facilities, hardware, and software are identified through the master planning process and seem satisfactorily provided. Currently there are massive infrastructure projects including the construction of new buildings which provide capital outlay for technology. The Institutional Technology (IT) Council was formed in 2003 at the college level to develop a plan to ensure effective and efficient use of technology. The council work was approved again in 2005 by the president and the President's Council (III.C.1.a).

According to the self study and confirmed on web sites as well as visits with online instructors and students, the online learning environment appears accessible to all students and comfortable and supportive for faculty to develop an array of rigorous classes. As of spring 2009 the college had 4,460 online student registrations with 97 online faculty using Blackboard course management system. There appear to be abundant online resources available to both students and faculty using the Online Learning Pathways web site, which also subscribes to a 24/7 Helpdesk system (III.C.1.a).

The college offers a variety of desktop software and online pedagogical training through regular faculty and staff professional development activities, specific software and hardware training for affected employee groups when new technologies are introduced, and a wide range of computer training through course offerings for students. According to conversations with staff, the college's continuing education program offers free workshops and training to anyone in the community, and these training opportunities are available and recommended for staff to access (III.C.1.b). Further, there is a computer lab, "City Site," with 50 computers provided for a drop in basis for faculty and staff to experiment and use new software and to obtain computer-based training that complements the scheduled training provided in a workshop setting in another room.

The self study and the website recognize the regular training sessions listed on the Online Learning Pathways website. The college actively offers workshops to help online instructors as evidenced by the nine workshops on the schedule for fall 2010 (III.C.1.a).

The college contributes to the development of the Information Technology Work Plan through its membership in the district Microcomputer Advisory Group, the district Audiovisual Advisory Group, Online Learning Pathways through the district Online Steering Committee, and the district Institutional Technology Council that provide the required input during the development process of this work plan (III.C.1.c).

In the master plan, the college references change to the program review process during the 2008-09 planning cycle to develop and require identification of technology needs. Form T was developed to report equipment requests and needs at the department and unit level (III.C.1.c).

According to the self study, the college systematically plans, acquires, maintains, upgrades, and replaces technology infrastructure and equipment to meet the institutional needs through a well-developed two-tiered process that involves college stakeholders and the college Information Technology Department. In the District Information Technology Role and Governance Overview (PDF file 1_IT), there is an annually revised explanation of a rolling three-year short term work plan (III.C.1.c).

According to an email interaction between the district director of information technology and the vice president of student services on July 22, 2009, there are adequate back-up measures, antivirus and antispyware software, disk images, circuit upgrades, hardware warranties, network maintenance contracts, load balancing to minimize downtime, and optimum circuits are in place that should provide the college with the needed provisions for reliability, disaster recovery, privacy, and security (III.C.1.c).

According to the self study, the college recognizes that the Information Technology (IT) Council is developing a multi-year plan for computer technology purchases. The master plan will help prioritize the needs: “One of the current issues under the domain of distribution and utilization of resources is the lack of a true systematic approach to technology replacement.” The MPROC is to integrate fully the IT plan with other existing plans by June 2011. This was addressed in Planning Agenda #2 (III.C.1.d).

According to the self study, the college relies upon the master planning process for the identification of technologies needed and the evaluation of the technologies adopted. The master plan is a governance processes that uses assistance from the Research Office (III.C.2).

Confirmed by email between the district director of technology and the vice president of student services and on July 22, 2009, Information Technology governance is handled at each college through its Information Technology (IT) Council. The IT Council has representation from all employee groups. The district Director of Information Technology attends the meetings quarterly to discuss standards, projects, and priorities specific to the college (III.C.2).

The report entitled “Completed IT Projects – October 2009” provides a commendable listing – both in breadth and quantity – of proposed (153) and completed (90) projects for the

district's administrative computer systems for the one academic year 2009-10. Most of them were quite substantial in nature. They were identified as ranging in scope from "minimal" of less than 3 days, "low" of less than 1 month, "medium" of 1 to 3 months, to "high" of 3+ months (III.C.2).

Conclusions

The college meets the requirements of Standard III.C. Technology Resources.

The college has a commendable approach of a governance committee structure for the planning of technology needs. The new Form T is an effective approach for assessing technology needs at the department and unit level.

The college has identified its challenges with respect to technology planning, acquisition, replacement, and related training adequately. The two planning agendas cited in the self study are adequate to address these challenges.

D. Financial Resources

Financial resources are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. Financial resources planning is integrated with institutional planning.

General Observations

The college provides numerous opportunities for campus constituencies to engage in collaborative dialogue. Program reviews in academic and student services areas are well established and link to the budget development process. For many of the topics typically addressed in the financial resources standard the district is primary, therefore, a complete discussion of the topic is not addressed in the self study.

Budget allocations to the college are determined through a districtwide budget allocation formula and system. This allocation is based on credit and non-credit resident and non-resident FTES. Funding levels are established for the three colleges and continuing education centers, the district office, and districtwide support, which includes maintenance and operations, human resources, college police, and facilities services based on availability of resources. Adjustments to the college funding level are made based on approved contracts and grants and district growth estimates. Once allocated, the college determines areas of expenditure.

Findings and Evidence

The overall budget for San Diego City College was \$111.4 million for fiscal year 2008-09. Of this total, unrestricted general operating funds equaled \$37.95 million; restricted funds, including grants and contracts equaled \$19.2 million; capital construction funds equaled \$53.85 million and other funds including the child development fund equaled \$.37 million. Budget reductions imposed by the state for fiscal years 2008-09 and 2009-10 resulted in reductions to the colleges and district operations. The district was able to sustain the loss primarily as a result of a hiring freeze for all permanent positions and elimination of 400 course sections taught by adjunct faculty members. It is important to note that even with the elimination of nearly 11 percent of available course sections, the college achieved a modest growth in student enrollment. Construction continues to be a major factor and area of expenditure for the college. The \$53.8 million 2008-09 allocation is allocated for identified projects that are already underway (III.D).

The district maintains a reserve level in excess of five percent which is available to offset funding shortfalls and provide for education programs (III.D).

The self study notes that one of the district's goals identified in the 2009-2012 strategic plan is to "adapt to a changing fiscal environment with a sound fiscal strategy." An objective identified to support this goal is to "ensure maintenance of a balanced budget in line with annual state allocations." A review of the district's 2010-11 budget indicates that the district has achieved this objective (III.D.1).

In 2003-04 the then existing college Budget Development Committee was merged with the MPROC. The intent was to ensure that the responsibilities of the former budget development committee were integrated with the college mission as well as planning and prioritization activities. The college relies upon its mission and institutional priorities in conjunction with parameters defined by the district to accomplish financial planning (III.D.1).

The college indicates that the merger of the Budget Development Committee and the Master Planning and Resource Oversight Council has been successful. The council uses information provided by the Districtwide Budget Development Committee to review the impact of funding sources such as state general fund allotments, changes to categorical programs, and new grants. Managers develop plans to reflect the college's mission and departmental goals of achieving desired student learning outcomes, while working within prescribed budget allocations. The master planning process depends on the prioritization of current equipment and staffing needs, and the council discusses identified priorities before a decision is made on allocation of resources. The college master plan outlines these processes. The master plan document has proven to be an effective tool, providing direction and guidance to the college community. A challenge facing the district, particularly during a time of limited and reduced funding, is the ability to address issues related to the total cost of ownership. The ability to provide consistent on-going funding for commitments such as technology and library site licenses has been an issue on campus (III.D.1.a).

The college allocates resources by program based on the priorities identified through the MPROC. To help fund identified priorities when insufficient resources were available, the

college's foundation has provided additional resources for specific programs or projects (III.D.1.a).

The college monitors its financial status on a regular basis. Agendas from the MPROC reflect on-going discussions related to budget allocations, year-to-date expenditures, and budget variances. Open forums are held throughout the year to discuss budget issues (III.D.1.a).

Resource allocations are determined by the district for the college and are based on the number of full-time equivalent students served by the college in the prior year. During budget development and master planning activities, the college considers the impact of future programs. This allows the college to prioritize and address longer term issues (III.D.1.b).

The college notes that the district has developed a financial plan to cover the costs of health benefits, insurance costs, building maintenance, etc. The district has begun to address the issues related to other post employment benefits (OPEB/GASB 45). In December 2005 the district Board of Trustees authorized the district to join the Community College League of California Retiree Health Benefit Program Joint Powers Agency and establish an irrevocable trust for any accumulated assets set aside for this purpose. In June 2006, the board authorized \$11 million be held to begin funding the OPEB obligation. An actuarial of the OPEB obligation was performed and the March 2007 report reflected a liability of \$26.7 million. The college notes that funding the obligation would require a combination of annual contributions towards premiums plus reinvestment of investment earnings but later indicates that the main source of revenue to fund the obligation would come from investment growth (III.D.1.c).

The district's 2008-2009 independent audit report indicates that the district has a number of month-to-month lease arrangements, future bond obligations, OPEB obligations, and obligations related to compensated absences. The audit report notes that the district is in the process of structuring formal lease agreements in place of the month-to-month leases and bond obligations are being met by the taxpayers. The report confirms that the district contributed \$11 million into the health benefit JPA and is reflecting the June 30, 2009, value of that asset to be \$9.8 million. The June 30, 2008, audit report reflects the decline in asset value resulting from a loss in interest and investment income in the amount of \$885,596. The reports do not indicate additional deposits being made to meet the obligation. The 2008-09 audit report further indicates that the district has a compensated absences obligation of \$7.9 million. The district is looking to develop a plan to have employees utilize excess vacation and reduce this liability (III.D.1.c).

As bond projects are developed, the district has identified budget funding for the maintenance and utility costs of the college and the new facilities. The college indicates that the district has plans in place to support the increased staffing, maintenance, and operations costs of new and remodeled construction and that money has been set aside from each of the last several district budgets for that purpose. With installation of solar panels, the district is looking to reduce the cost of electrical service and plans to use these ongoing savings to help offset the increased costs related to the new facilities. Due to the current economic climate,

these plans have not been fully implemented. The college feels that there is a clear need for better and more detailed communication on this issue (III.D.1.c).

While the self study provides very little in terms of description of the budget process, the 2009 employee perception survey indicates that 54 percent of respondents strongly agree that guidelines and processes for budget development are clearly communicated, 45 percent strongly agree or agree that they have appropriate opportunities to participate in budget development through the governance process, and 46 percent strongly agree or agree that the resource allocation model equitably supports college programs and services. The college notes that 19-31 percent fell in the “I don’t know” category (III.D.1.d).

The district utilizes DATATEL as its financial system. The system allows the district and the college to track expenditures for the general fund, grants, and restricted funds. A component called WebAdvisor allows the user to view greater levels of detail and another system, Colleague, allows users to run summary and specialized reports depending on their need. The district notes that access to another system used to track activity related to Propositions S and N are restricted to Business Services staff only due to the nature of construction activity information housed on the system (III.D.2).

The college’s MPROC develops the operating budget and determines allocation of financial resources for the college. This process assists the college to ensure that budget allocations appropriately support student learning (III.D.2.a).

In the event that there are audit issues or findings related to the college raised as part of the district’s annual independent audit, the district notifies the college of those issues. The college then provides clarification related to the issue or takes corrective action. The district has posted audits for the past three years on its website so that faculty, staff, and the public have access to the information. The audit report for the year ending June 30, 2008, indicates that no findings were noted on the financial statement audit and that there were no findings or questioned costs on the district’s major programs. The report for the year ending June 30, 2009, indicates that there were certain deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting, but that there were no findings or questioned costs on the district’s major programs (III.D.2.a).

The district chancellor provides information about state and local fiscal conditions affecting the district on a weekly basis. This information is available to all faculty and staff. The college president and the district chancellor also hold campus forums on a quarterly basis and one-on-one question and answer sessions. These sessions are intended to provide faculty and staff the opportunity to address budget and fiscal issues that they believe have bearing on the campus planning process. Additionally, the president provides campus updates to governance groups and additional financial information in the weekly president’s News and Notes from the President’s Office bulletin. The college notes that the college is also well advised by the district on issues related to budget and keeps everyone well informed (III.D.2.b).

Financial information is posted on the district website. Included in this posting is the adopted budget, annual audits, quarterly financial reports, information on bids, and reports on the status of Propositions S and N (III.D.2.b).

District operations manage cash flow issues for the district as a whole. The college's allocation is based primarily on the college's prior year full-time equivalent student totals, and expenditures are monitored by the college (III.D.2.c).

The self study notes that the district does not have any long-term debt, yet the audit report indicates bond debt which is paid by the taxpayers and obligations for compensated absences. These debts have been disclosed for reporting purposes (III.D.2.c).

The college indicates that the 2008-09 district budget includes sufficient reserves for the district's stability and security. District financial statements indicate that the district has consistently maintained reserves in excess of the minimum recommended five percent reserve. Reductions to the 2008-09 budget have required the college to adopt different operating hours, freeze hiring, and reduce class offerings in order to maintain adequate reserves. The college's reserves have fluctuated over the past three years covered by the self study. The 2005-06 ending balance was \$511,987, the 2006-07 ending balance was (\$1,713,629) and the 2007-08 ending balance was (\$651,994). The college indicates that the negative ending balance for 2006-07 was due to increased costs associated with enrollment growth and the negative balance for 2007-08 was due to the district's requirement for the college to return funds in mid-year due to the state's fiscal crisis. It is important to note that, despite fiscal challenges presented by the state, the college ended fiscal year 2008-09 with an ending balance of approximately \$18,000. In the event that the district has a deficit in any given year, the college is expected to turn in a plan to the district outlining the number of classes to be offered and areas for reduction (III.D.2.c).

The college is encouraged to maintain a modest contingency reserve but is not held to a particular standard by the district. The district maintains reserves for cash flow and other purposes that may be utilized to benefit the college in a fiscal emergency, subject to Board of Trustees' approval. (III.D.2.c).

The district's risk management office manages programs related to group medical, vision, dental, and life insurance; the self-insured Workers' Compensation program; property/liability program; and other insurance programs. The district maintains excess insurance beyond the self-insured levels for workers' compensation and property/liability programs (III.D.2.c).

Audit reports have consistently indicated a lack of issues related to district oversight of finances including auxiliary operations. The district has a position of internal auditor, and the college operates within the guidelines set forth by the auditor's office (III.D.2.d).

The college is accountable for all funding sources allocated or earned by it. The college complies with district constraints related to grants, contracts, and the use of restricted funds. Co-curricular fundraising efforts that support programs are reviewed to ensure that they are

consistent with the mission and goals of the college. Theatre performances, athletic events, and advertising revenues are examples of these fundraising efforts. All funds are audited annually, including the San Diego City College Foundation. The college is looking for ways to develop the foundation in order to provide funding augmentations (III.D.2.e).

Reports are available electronically to managers and can be accessed when needed. These reports are used to monitor year-to-date expenditures and make projections through the year-end to determine whether corrective action needs to be implemented to stay within budget. The business services office follows up when needed (III.D.2.e).

Prior to submitting grant proposals, the requestor prepares a formal request to submit a grant application. The request includes both the purpose of the grant and any funding implications. The requestor's dean and the vice president of administrative services review the proposal, and the president makes the final sign-off after discussions with the vice presidents. Final language, budget, and spending projections are approved by the Board of Trustees (III.D.2.f).

Contracts requiring competitive bidding are processed by the district purchasing department and handled as separate board of trustees' agenda items (III.D.2.f).

The college's financial management is assessed on an annual basis by independent auditors who are contracted through the district office. The FTES budget allocation which accounts for 96 percent of the college's operating budget is reviewed by the vice president of administrative services and the Master Planning and Resource Oversight Council. The status of the budget is assessed on a monthly basis by the vice chancellor of business services, and financial reports are used for this purpose (III.D.2.g).

The college indicates that it goes through an extensive budget preparation and analysis process. The Master Planning and Resource Oversight Council's collaborative budget development process allocates funds by programs or by department. Business Services examines the actual expenditures to date. Areas of concern are assessed in more detail and presented to the oversight committee. Assessments help to make departments more sensitive of what other departments do and the impact changes to a process have on faculty, staff, and students. Results of the analysis are used to find ways to improve the effectiveness of differing budget control strategies for the upcoming year (III.D.3).

Conclusions

The college meets the requirements of Standard III.D. Financial Resources.

The college has a comprehensive and transparent budget development process that takes program review and student and institutional needs into consideration. The Master Plan document is an evolving document that provides direction and guidance through the budget development process. This document is reviewed and updated annually. Overall funding is determined by through a districtwide budget allocation formula and system and is based on the college's prior year earned full-time equivalent students. Budget information is provided

to the campus as a whole on a regular basis, and financial information is available on-line to budget managers.

Recommendations

None.

STANDARD IV: LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

General Observations

All constituencies have an opportunity to participate in decision-making and governance processes are broadly understood. The Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Associated Student Government have defined roles in governance. Faculty participate broadly on committees and councils; classified staff have representation on key committees and councils; and administrative staff participate broadly on committees and councils and have access to decision-making and information through formal reporting structures. Students participate on several committees and the President's Council through the Associated Student Government.

The delineation of functions for district-level governance activities is described in the *District Governance and Administration Handbook*, and college governance is set forth in the *Campus Handbook*. Overall, the effort to align district and college planning appears to have moved the district toward its strategic goals and better aligned district and college planning efforts.

A campus evaluation process to review major changes to governance is done periodically within each of the councils, committees, and constituency groups. The President's Council has overall responsibility for shared decision-making, and recommendations for revisions of procedures and governance structure is its purview. In practice, the council asks each council or constituency organization to do its own review of its processes and to make changes as appropriate. When changes are instituted, they are communicated to the President's Council.

Findings and Evidence.

The delineation of functions for district-level governance activities is described in the *District Governance and Administration Handbook*, and college governance is set forth in the *Campus Handbook*. Governance activities are aligned with the college mission, which focuses on student learning and is published on the college website and distributed in hard copy throughout the college (IV.A).

Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and excellence. Staff, faculty, students, and administration are encouraged to identify areas of improvement

and innovation. There is significant satisfaction with governance processes from all employee and student groups. When ideas for improvement have policy or institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation. An outstanding example of innovation is the college's effort to establish an environmentally sustainable campus. A second example involved establishment of a smoking-restricted policy on campus (IV.A.1). The governance and administrative structure includes all members of the San Diego City College community—students, staff, faculty, and administrators. The role of members is clearly defined in Board Policy 2510 (Participation in Local Decision-Making). The *Campus Handbook* contains organizational charts and describes the participatory governance structure (IV.A.2).

The governance process ensures that faculty, through the Academic Senate, as well as administrators have a substantive role that is clearly defined and have a meaningful voice in institutional policies, planning and budget, as appropriate. In addition, students and staff have established mechanisms—through the Classified Senate and Associated Students—to provide input into institutional decisions. Board policy, the *Campus Handbook*, and the district *Administration and Governance Handbook* describe the official responsibilities and authority of the Academic Senate, the Curriculum Committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about curriculum, including student learning programs and services. Since the curriculum of the three colleges in the district is aligned, final decisions on curriculum are made by the district Curriculum and Instructional Council (IV.A.2.a).

The college president, vice presidents, president of the chairs, and designated leadership from each constituency groups have seats on the President's Council, where all governance culminates. In addition, the leadership of each of the four governance councils, which address governance issues arising in key areas of college operations, is represented. These include the MPROC, Instructional Service Council, Student Services Council, and Institutional Technology Council. This integration has made campus processes more transparent and created more dialogue and a greater sense of institutional integrity across the campus (IV.A.2.b).

Convocation is held at the start of each academic year, at which time the president of the governing board, chancellor, president of the faculty bargaining unit, and the president of the college address faculty and staff and answer questions. Throughout the academic year, a summary of each board meeting is distributed online and is also available in hard copy to all faculty, staff, and student leaders. A Chancellor's Cabinet report is also issued monthly to inform the college community about decisions affecting San Diego City College, including budget. The chancellor has held several forums on the campus to discuss the current state of the district, and she regularly schedules an open office hour on each campus to meet with anyone who wishes to speak with her (IV.A.3).

The college's relationship with the Accrediting Commission has been one of integrity and honesty as shown by its history of full six-year accreditation without any citations or difficulties. Midterm reports have been accepted by the Commission without any exceptions or sanctions (IV.A.4).

The President's Council has overall responsibility for governance. The campus evaluation process to review major changes to governance is done within each of the councils, committees, and constituency groups. Each council or constituency organization is free to do its own review of its processes and to make changes as appropriate. When changes are instituted, they are communicated to the President's Council (IV.A.5).

Conclusions

The college meets the requirements of Standard IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes.

College and district governance processes are clearly defined, followed, and improved as needed. Assessment of the effectiveness of these processes is done, and necessary revisions are made on an as-needed basis. All college constituencies have defined roles and are encouraged to participate. Communication is up and down and across the college, and is available in multiple ways—print, online, convocation, agendas and minutes of college constituent groups, committees, and councils.

Recommendations

None.

B. Board and Administrative Organization

In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.

General Observations

The board has established its role in setting policy, which assures the effective operation of the institution. It is evident from the combination of board policies, the *Administration and Governance Handbook*, the *Campus Handbook*, and college procedures that the delineation of responsibilities of the district and the college are clear. Board policy also establishes the role and responsibility of both the district chancellor and college presidents.

Findings and Evidence

Board policy clearly gives responsibility for the quality of student learning, support services and financial stability to the board. Board reports show that the board is updated on all these topics regularly at board meetings. Board policy also clearly describes the process for selection and evaluation of the chancellor for the district (IV.B.1).

Board members are elected by the citizens of San Diego and pay their own election costs as is set in board policy. They are responsible for “trustee areas,” each member being responsible for one of these areas. In this way they are independent and responsive to the

citizens they represent. Board Evaluation Surveys from 2006 to 2010 confirm this. From board reports it is clear that individual members are active in the community and are advocates for the college at state and federal levels. Board policy also establishes the principle of “acting as a whole,” following ethical principles and avoiding conflict of interest. District employees have confirmed the adherence of these policies by board members in surveys conducted by the district and in the Board Evaluation Surveys mentioned above (IV.B.1.a).

The board has established a policy to monitor institutional performance and educational quality which ensures the meeting of its mission to “provide accessible high quality learning experience to meet the educational needs of the San Diego community.” Board reports illustrate that presentations, including performance data, are regularly made to the board and that they engage the college and the district in discussions for improvement (IV.B.1.b).

The board has established policy giving itself responsibility for educational quality, legal matters and financial integrity. The board regularly reviews data related to educational quality and financial integrity. The board also establishes policy on ethical and legal standards for college operations. These include an annual audit, seeking legal advice as necessary, and strict adherence to the Brown Act. The results of the district’s audits and the responses in the aforementioned surveys confirm the ethical and legal practices followed by the board (IV.B.1.c).

The board publishes its policies both in written and electronic forms. These include policies on the board’s size, duties, responsibility, structure and operating procedures (IV.B.1.d).

The board has regularly reviewed, modified (where necessary), and ratified all its policies on a regular basis. The date of adoption or modification is recorded at the end of each policy. This is not the case for reviews without changes. These policies have also been reviewed by the Community College League of California (CCLC) Policy and Procedure subscription service. The board evaluates itself annually to ensure that it is acting in a manner consistent with its policies (IV.B.1.e).

New members to the board attend the state trustee orientation workshop where they are provided a copy of the CCLC New Trustees Handbook. New student members receive training by their advisor in the summer and attend the state student trustee orientation. Continuing and new board members participate in annual retreats, are active in the Association of Community College Trustees, and are given regular updates from district and college administrators. Evidence of this can be seen in bi-monthly board reports. Board policy ensures the staggering of terms of office to provide for continuity (IV.B.1.f).

The board has established policy that clearly defines its evaluation process. This includes both self-evaluation and evaluation by campus personnel as well and a copy of the next year’s goals. It reports the results of these evaluations to the public annually at a regular board meeting as seen in the Board Reports (IV.B.1.g).

The board has a code of ethics in board policy that contains a defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates the code (IV.B.1.h).

The board was informed about the accreditation process at a special board meeting dedicated to Standard IV conducted by the Standard IV Steering Committee members from each college in the district. They reviewed and made recommendations on several drafts of the entire self study. In addition, they reviewed each of the mid-term reports. The board has established a subcommittee on accreditation to regularly review information on this topic (IV.B.1.i).

The board has policies that establish its role in hiring, evaluating and delegating authority to the chancellor. The board members are very clear in their roles when it comes to non-interference in delegated matters. This was made clear through several examples. The policies are thorough and allow for participation by district personnel. There are no similar policies concerning the hiring and evaluating of the college president. Evaluations of both the chancellor and the president are done annually and include campus input, but the results are confidential (IV.B.1.j).

The board has established policy (Policy 0010) that gives primary responsibility for the college to the president. This includes the general quality of the institution (planning, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel and assessing institutional effectiveness). His effectiveness has been confirmed by a 2009 Employee Perception Survey where he received high scores (73 percent to 79 percent) on questions of leadership and effectiveness (IV.B.2).

The administrative structure is clearly organized in the *Campus Handbook* and its effectiveness is confirmed by the 2009 Employee Perception Survey. The college is organized in a traditional fashion that would allow for appropriate delegation of duties to administrators at various levels. Administrators confirmed that the delegation is appropriate and is protected by the president (IV.B.2.a)

The Master Plan and its 2009-10 update lays out goals, priorities and values (contained in mission statement) for the college. The president led collegewide discussions in 2008 that resulted in an updated Academic Plan, including student learning outcome, linked to Master Planning and Budget Planning that has been updated in the Master Plan Update and will continue to be updated regularly. However, it is important that the cycle of assessing institutional effectiveness, and using the results in decision-making, become more consistent throughout the institution and sustained over time. Campus planning is being informed and evaluated by research produced by a full time researcher hired in 2008 and identified and prioritized in the collegewide research agenda. Since this is a new effort, the college needs to ensure that the results of this research be analyzed and improvements recommended in an on-going fashion. The college also produces an extensive 2009 Fact Book containing data and a 2009 Employee Perception Survey. However, only half of surveyed employees felt they had adequate access to research. College programs are reviewed on a regular cycle. In a 2009 Employee Perception Survey the campus agreed that the processes were effective as was the president's performance in leading them in this effort (IV.B.2.b).

In order to comply with federal and state statutes and regulations the district subscribes to a service provided by the law firm Liebert, Cassidy & Whitmore, which provides trainings on compliance and implementation in these matters. Attendance is recorded to ensure college participation. Changes in board policies or institutional mission and procedures are communicated to the President's Council and disseminated in writing to the campus through the organizational structure. Implementation and consistency are assured by the vice presidents. College employees confirm this is happening (IV.B.2.c).

The college has reduced operational costs by more than a million dollars through clearly defined control mechanisms and ended fiscal year 2008-09 with a positive ending balance (IV.B.2.d).

The president is active in the Chamber of Commerce and speaks regularly at downtown service and business clubs. He is very active with urban renewal and economic development groups. He also communicates in writing with the community in the class schedule and the "With Excellence" periodical and plans to resurrect the college's annual report. Community members say he is a great partner in downtown projects, an articulate spokesperson for the college, and opens the campus regularly for community events (IV.B.2.e).

District roles of authority and responsibility are clearly established in the District Administration Organization Chart and Board Policies 0010 and 0003.8. It also ranks well at leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence as seen in the 2009 Employee Perception Survey (IV.B.3).

The district delineates the function of the district and the responsibilities of the college in the *Administration and Governance Handbook*. Employees agreed that this delineation is followed in the 2009 Survey (IV.B.3.a).

The district provides a full set of services to support the college as specified in the *Administration and Governance Handbook*. While a majority of employees agreed that these services were effective, the majority ranged 54 percent to 62 percent depending on the service (2009 Employee Perception Survey). In addition, there have been complaints from the Academic Senate and other faculty and staff regarding some decision-making at the district level. While perceptions will differ between college groups and the District it is recommended that the district work to evaluate and improve these services and decisions in the interest of providing even better support for the college (IV.B.3.b).

The distribution of resources is a data-driven FTES-based method that is reviewed monthly by a districtwide Budget Development Committee. The college's class schedule is then sized to meet this allocation (IV.B.3.c).

The college has reduced operational cost by more than a million dollars through clearly defined control mechanisms and ended fiscal year 2008-09 with a positive ending balance. The college also received an unqualified audit with no negative findings for 2007-08 (IV.B.3.d).

Full authority and responsibility for the college is given to the president in Policy 0010. It appears from employee surveys that the district follows this policy (IV.B.3.e).

Districtwide councils and committees work to assure good communication between the colleges and with the board. In addition, a series of reports and newsletters add to this communication (IV.B.3.f).

The district uses an Employee Perception Survey to evaluate the effectiveness of its services, governance and decision-making and communicates the results out to the college. In 2009, a majority of employees agreed that district support was effective. However, as stated above, it is recommended that the district strive to increase the size of this majority as a way to serve the college even better (IV.B.3.g).

Conclusions

The college partially meets the requirements of Standard IV.B. Board and Administrative Organization.

The board policies are thorough and the documents describing district organization, planning, communications and decision-making processes are clear. The board is clear on their responsibilities and performs them assiduously. While the evaluations of district services are acceptable, they could and should be improved. Both chancellor and presidential leadership appear to be strong and consistent and their involvement in the community appears to be strong.

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.).