

EVALUATION REPORT

**San Joaquin Delta Community College District
Stockton, CA**

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 Joaquin Delta Community College District
in Stockton, California on March 10-13, 2014

Joel L. Kinnamon, Ed.D.
Chair

VISITING TEAM ROSTERS

Dr. Joel Kinnamon (Chair)
Superintendent/President
College of the Desert

Ms. Jill Board
President
Cerro Coso Community College

Dr. K. C. Greaney
Director, Institutional Research
Santa Rosa Junior College

Dr. Lynn Wright
Professor of English
Pasadena City College

Ms. Pamela Hunter (Assistant)
Executive Director, Institutional Advancement
College of the Desert

Ms. Georgine Hodgkinson
Professor of Communication Studies
Consumnes River College

Ms. Joyce Johnson
Dean, Career Technical Education
Mt. San Jacinto College

Dr. Sadiq Ikharo
Vice Chancellor General Services
Peralta Community College District

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: San Joaquin Delta College
DATE OF VISIT: March 10-13, 2014
TEAM CHAIR: Joel L. Kinnamon

An eight-member accreditation team visited San Joaquin Delta College from March 8-11, 2014, for the purpose of evaluating how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes and analyzing how well the college is meeting the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and policies of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) providing for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting a recommendation to the ACCJC regarding the status of the College and recommendations to the College to resolve deficiencies and increase effectiveness.

In preparation for the team visit, team members attended an all-day training session on February 7, conducted by the ACCJC and studied commission materials prepared for visiting teams. The team was divided into four committees, one committee for each standard. Team members carefully read the College's Self Evaluation Report including recommendations from the 2008 visiting team and assessed the online evidence provided by the college.

Prior to the visit, team members completed written evaluations of the Self Evaluation Report and began identifying areas for further investigation. On the day before the formal beginning of the visit, team members spent the evening discussing their views of the written materials provided by the college, reviewing evidence provided by the College, including the comprehensive report completed by the College in 2014, and other materials submitted to the commission since the last comprehensive visit.

During the visit, the team met with numerous faculty, staff, administrators, members of the board of trustees, the college president, and students. Team members visited the satellite campus at Mountain House. The team attended two open forum meetings to allow for comment from any member of the campus community.

During the site visit the team identified documents and other evidence available to support its findings. The team experienced difficulty in accessing evidence in a timely manner. The technology for accessing the college's website did not work for most of the first day of the visit hampering the team's ability to review evidence to validate the Self-Evaluation. However, the team appreciated the positive interactions with the student body. The team wished to express its appreciation to the institution for providing opportunities for members to interact with students served by San Joaquin Delta College.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2014, Visiting Team

As a result of its visit to San Joaquin Delta Community College District the team made four recommendations:

Recommendation 1:

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the District implement an ongoing, systematic, sustainable program review process for each program not currently in the program review process that informs integrated planning, resources allocation decisions, key processes to improve institutional effectiveness, and student achievement and learning. The team further recommends that integrated planning processes be systematically reviewed and modified as appropriate. (II.A.2, II.A.2.e.)

Recommendation 2:

In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District establish a sound infrastructure of sufficient administrative personnel to ensure a consistent level of services that support the institution's mission and purpose. The team further recommends that the district expedite the process to fill vacant and interim administrative positions. (Standards II.A.2, III.A.6, IV.B.)

Recommendation 3:

In order to increase effectiveness and to achieve consistency within educational modalities, the team recommends that the District integrate its distance education planning with institutional planning and update its policy that defines "regular and substantive interaction," and develop and implement a faculty evaluation rubric that is relevant for faculty who teach online courses. (Standards II.B.1, II.A.1.b)

Recommendation 4:

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the District ensure that evaluation processes and necessary criteria are in place and evaluations are regularly and consistently conducted for all employee groups. (Standards III.A.1.b-c, III.A.2, III.A.3.a, III.A.5.a)

Team Commendations for San Joaquin Delta Community College District

Commendation:

The team commends San Joaquin Delta College for its work with under-represented minority students in a low-income area to improve retention, completion, and transfer rates. Even in these tight budget times, the District prioritized staffing for the AFFIRM program, which aims to promote success with African American students. The district-wide dedication to equity and student success by faculty and staff was evident to the team. These efforts have also been recognized nationally and resulted in eligibility to apply for the coveted Aspen prize.

Commendation:

The team commends the District programmers' contribution to the Kauli Financial open-source system. This internal system is an efficient and effective alternative to an enterprise financial system that typically is expensive to acquire and upgrade and can be difficult to implement.

Commendation:

The team commends the District for its bold response to students on their campus who require remediation. The District responded to this demand with increased tutoring, the use of supplemental instruction, organized learning communities. In addition, the District introduced contextualized learning, such as training a workforce of psychiatric technicians, which met community workforce needs during an economic downturn.

Commendation:

The District is commended for its focused, intentional efforts in closing the gap in student course completion in their online environment and those in the standard classroom environment.

Commendation:

As the District began to emerge from the most severe depths of budget cuts, administration, faculty and staff utilized a robust and well vetted Program Discontinuance process to reallocate resources with a focus on improving core programs and services to support students. These efforts no doubt required give and take, and a willingness for some to give in order to serve a greater institutional good. The team commends these efforts.

Certification of Continued Compliance with Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, the institutional accrediting body recognized by the Commission on Recognition of Postsecondary Accreditation and the United States Department of Education, affirms the San Joaquin Delta Community College District's legal authority to operate as a degree-granting institution under Education Code 74265.5. This authority is published annually in the *College Catalog*. The District operates three educational campuses recognized by the Commission to offer more than half of its degree or certificate programs at locations in Stockton (5151 Pacific Avenue) Manteca (5298 Brunswick Road), and Mountain House (2073 South Central Parkway), California.

2. Mission: The team confirmed that the college mission is adopted by the Board of Trustees and is regularly reviewed and revised. The mission statement clearly aligns with the Vision and Values statements of the college as published in the catalog. The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

3. Governing Board: To the best of the college's knowledge, no Board member has employment, family, or personal financial interest related to the college or the District. The team affirms that the Board is an independent policy-making body and the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

4. Chief Executive Officer

San Joaquin Delta Community College District Board of Trustees appointed the college's Chief Executive Officer. Her primary responsibility is to the institution. The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

5. Administrative Capacity

At the time of the visit, San Joaquin Delta Community College District did not have sufficient administrative staff to operate areas of the college. The college has experienced turnover within the administrative hierarchy in the late 2000's and since that time, the key administrative posts at the College have been stabilized primarily through internal employee advancements and interim positions.

The college is experiencing vacancies in key administrative areas related to centralized oversight and the program review process. The lack of this leadership and accountability for the program review process has likely impacted with the elimination of the Dean of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness

The executive team has approximately two years of longevity except for the vacant Vice President of Administrative Services. The remaining two vice president positions have been filled since the summer of 2011 and the Superintendent/President since February 2012.

Management positions have declined thirty-one percent (31%) during the period 2009 through 2012. This reduction reflects twenty (20) fewer fulltime equivalent administrators, and part of the reduction is due to internal administrators moving into leadership roles.

In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the College establish a sound infrastructure of sufficient administrative personnel to ensure a consistent level of services that support the institution's mission and purpose. The team further recommends that the district expedite the process to fill vacant and interim administrative positions.

6. Operational Status

San Joaquin Delta Community College District students are enrolled in a variety of courses and programs leading to associate degrees and certificates. The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement

7. Degrees

San Joaquin Delta Community College District offers seventy-seven (77) associates of arts degrees with concentrations in academic areas and associate of sciences degrees in different majors. Over ninety (90) certificate programs are offered in various career and technical areas. The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

8. Educational Programs

San Joaquin Delta Community College District offers degree and certificate programs that are congruent with its mission, are based on recognized fields of study, are of sufficient content and length, and are conducted at levels of quality and rigor appropriate to the degrees offered. All associate degree programs are two academic years in length. The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

9. Academic Credit

San Joaquin Delta Community College District awards academic credit in accordance with the California Education Code and consistent with national standards. The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

10. Student Learning and Achievement

San Joaquin Delta Community College District defines course, program, degree and certificate student learning outcomes. The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

11. General Education

San Joaquin Delta Community College District incorporates into its degree programs required units of general education courses for transfer and vocational degree programs. The general education component is consistent with statewide and accreditation standards. The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

12. Academic Freedom

San Joaquin Delta Community College District Board Policy 6620, Academic Freedom and Responsibility, defines academic freedom for faculty and students with corresponding responsibilities. The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

13. Faculty

San Joaquin Delta Community College District is composed of 203 tenured and tenure track full-time faculty and 400 adjunct faculty. The terminal degrees for full-time faculty are listed in the College Catalog. Faculty responsibilities are published in the faculty collective bargaining agreement and in District policies and procedures. The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

14. Student Services

San Joaquin Delta Community College District provides appropriate student services and student development programs to its student body in order to facilitate access, progress, and success. The college's services and programs for students are consistent with student characteristics and the institutional mission. The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

15. Admissions

San Joaquin Delta Community College District has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission. Student eligibility requirements, including admission to special programs and services are published in the College Catalog. The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

16. Information and Learning Resources

San Joaquin Delta Community College District information learning resources and services to students are sufficient to support its mission and instructional programs. Students have access to books, newspapers, online databases, and other periodicals. Tutoring and writing assistance are also available. The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

17. Financial Resources

San Joaquin Delta Community College District financial resources are primarily from the State of California, local property tax revenues, and from other sources such as grants and federal funds. The District is fiscally sound. The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

18. Financial Accountability

San Joaquin Delta Community College District conducts annual audits of its financial operations by an independent certified accounting firm. Audit reports are presented to the Board of Trustees. The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation

San Joaquin Delta Community College District has modified its planning process to integrate resource planning and program review. The new processes include evaluation and

adjustments throughout planning. The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

20. Integrity in Communication with the Public

San Joaquin Delta Community College District publishes the College Catalog annually in print and electronic formats. These publications provide comprehensive information regarding admission, rules and regulations, degrees, grievance procedures, costs and refunds, academic qualifications of its faculty and administrators. Information is also available on the college's website. The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

21. Integrity in Relations with the Accrediting Commission

San Joaquin Delta Community College District Board of Trustees provides assurance that each Eligibility Requirement for Accreditation was reviewed and validated by reviewing appropriate supporting documentation. The institution agrees to comply with the Eligibility Requirement for Accreditation. The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

Evaluation of Institutional Responses to Previous Recommendations

Recommendation 1

The Team recommends that the Board of Trustees develops a systematic process to review and revise existing Board policies, establishes and adheres to an acceptable code of ethics (Standard IVB.1; IVB.1.a; IVB.1.b-h, ER 3).

The District has developed policies and code of ethics to address this recommendation. However, while the evidence supports development of the policies, the Self Evaluation Report and site visit suggests that adherence should be monitored. The District response in the 2014 Self-Evaluation Report stated “the self-evaluation process has revealed some concern about consistent application of the sanctions when violations take place (addressed in Standard IV.B.1.h).”

The team concludes that the College has addressed this recommendation, resolved the deficiencies, and meets Standards.

Recommendation 2

The visiting team recommends that the Board of Trustees establishes and monitors itself as a policy-making body, reaffirms delegation of operational authority to the Superintendent/President, and actively supports the authority of management for the administration of the College (addressed in Standard IVB; IVB.1.e).

The team concludes that the College has addressed this recommendation, resolved the deficiencies, and meets Standards.

Recommendation 3

The visiting team recommends that the College decisively address the development and implementation of a comprehensive Strategic Plan closely focused on assessing institutional effectiveness. A systematic, continuous cycle of feedback and evaluative improvement must be critically and deliberately developed and put into effect. This Strategic Plan must incorporate student learning outcomes within all institutional efforts, resource allocations, and be supported by program and service reviews along with research data. Educational, fiscal, technological, physical, and human resources should be considered and integrated. As a whole, the planning document should also identify short and long-term directions for the District, timelines for implementation, the individuals responsible for each area, monitoring and follow-up strategies, and expected outcomes (addressed in Standard IA; IB). This was noted in the 2002 recommendation item 3.1 and has yet to be resolved to meet Commission Standards.

The Follow-up Report March 27, 2012 acknowledged the work to address this recommendation and the strides that have been made to meet the Standard. However, San

Joaquin Delta College does not currently have a process of on-going, systematic program review. Program Review Processes are in place, but not implemented regularly throughout the College, and not all programs are held accountable for participating in the process. Without this key process in place and fully functional, the ability of the College to use sound information to inform integrated planning, resource allocation, and other important functions (such as program discontinuance) is hampered. Program Review at San Joaquin Delta College does not currently meet the Standards.

The College's nascent Strategic Planning Process appears to be functioning well. The development of an ongoing systematic program review process throughout the college should strengthen integrated planning efforts. The new annual Mini-Program Review Strategic Resource Requests, as well as other notable efforts such as Program Discontinuance, are sound evidence that the College is using data and analysis to link resources to planning. This process will be further strengthened by the development of an ongoing systematic program review process, which will provide more relevant and timely information.

It is important to note that the College's lean administrative ranks, and the lack of leadership and centralized oversight and accountability for the Program Review Process with the elimination of the Dean of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness, likely contributed to the current situation. (See section III.A).

The team concludes that this recommendation should be replaced with a new recommendation, 2014 visiting team Recommendation 1.

Team Recommendation 1:

In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District implement an ongoing, systematic, sustainable program review process for each program not currently in the program review process that informs integrated planning, resource allocation decisions, key processes to improve institutional effectiveness, and student achievement and learning. (Standards II.A.2., II.A.2.e.)

Recommendation 4

The visiting team recommends that the College meet the urgent need to establish a stable management team. Longevity of the team, particularly at the vice-presidential level, will help resolve the perceived deficiencies in effective communication, comprehensive planning, and collaborative dialogue (Standard IIIA.1 and IIIA.2). This was noted in the 2002 recommendations 7.1, 8.1 and 2.1 and has yet to be resolved to meet Commission Standards.

At the last ACCJC team visit in March 2012, the team noted that too many of the College's top administrators were new to their positions, indicating that "essentially, no top level administrator at the College has been in his or her role for more than nine months." The report went on to conclude that "the team feels that if it was evaluating Recommendation 4 from 2002 and 2008, it would not be able to describe the administration of the College as stable or as having longevity."

Since that time, the key administrative posts at the College have been stabilized primarily through internal employee advancements and exhibit two years of longevity as a team. Except for the vacant Vice President of Administrative Services, the other two vice president positions have been in place since the summer of 2011 and the Superintendent/President since February 2012.

The current Executive Cabinet consists of a team that has been in place since the start of the 2012-13 academic year. The cabinet acts in a collegial, team-oriented manner and has established strong working relationships across the functional lines of the members. However, management positions have declined thirty-one percent (31%) during the period 2009 thru 2012. This reduction reflects twenty (20) fewer fulltime equivalent administrators and part of the reduction is due to internal administrators moving into leadership roles.

The team concludes that this recommendation should be replaced with a new recommendation, 2014 visiting team Recommendation 2.

Team Recommendation 2:

In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District establish a sound infrastructure of sufficient administrative personnel to ensure a consistent level of services that support the institution’s mission and purpose. The team further recommends that the district expedite the process to fill vacant and interim administrative positions. (Standards I, II.A.2, III.A.6; IV.B.)

Commission Recommendation 1

The College should demonstrate that it has completed the identification of SLOs and begun the implementation of assessments that would bring the College to the Development level on the Rubric for Evaluating Institutions Part III. accelerated during that period, and the College is only just now establishing a consistent run of stable administrative leadership where a Cabinet has been in place and working together for longer than two years. This instability is addressed more fully below in reference to Recommendation 4.

The peer evaluation team validated that the College addressed this recommendation in full. As noted in prior communications with the Commission, the College has implemented professional training on newly added Flex Days that allow faculty and staff to conduct focused work on student learning outcomes and the assessment of them. According to the report, “Through the excellent, focused work of faculty during flex days and throughout the course of instruction, assessment of student learning has become commonplace and embedded in the College’s planning and program review cycles. Cycles of course assessment have been established and data reports are available each calendar year.” The report also states that program and discipline level assessment of learning is ongoing and results are being used to improve instruction and learning.

One direct indicator of overall improvement can be seen in the College’s strong improvement over the last two academic years in course completion rates which have raised three

percentage points since the last comprehensive site visit over the past two academic years. The improvement has occurred across all groups of students.

The team concludes that the College has addressed this recommendation, resolved the deficiencies, and meets Standards.

Commission Recommendation 2

The College should provide evidence that faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes (Standard III.A.1.c).

According to the Self-Study, late in 2010 the California Teachers Association (CTA) representing the District's faculty filled a grievance demand that administration "cease and desist" regarding the implementation of student learning outcomes and assessment (SLOA) as a component of faculty evaluation. However, an agreement was jointly reached on guidelines for SLOA's as developed by members of the Curriculum Committee. Thereafter, cycles of assessment and evaluation of data pertaining to course level learning outcomes were implemented during the 2010-11 academic year.

A "check-off" form with signatures is used during the evaluation process to ensure faculty "sign off" on the discussion and evaluation of outcomes evidence. (Standard III.A.1.c)
The team concludes that the College has addressed this recommendation, resolved the deficiencies, and meets Standards.

Commission Policies Compliance

Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education

The College does not offer correspondence education. The Self Evaluation Report states that the College operates distance education course in compliance with ACCJC policies.

Evidence supports that student success and completion is reviewed in a disaggregated fashion to ensure quality of student learning regardless of modality. Missing from the College's data set is research designed to analyze whether or not students enrolled in Distance Education (DE) programs are achieving similar stated learning outcomes as students in traditional classroom courses.

The curriculum committee is responsible for the evaluation and approval of all DE courses. All courses designated as online or hybrid are vetted through a separate tech review process by the DE committee. Based on tech review results, the DE committee makes a recommendation to the curriculum committee prior to said vote.

The College is in the process of vetting AP 4105: Distance Education. The College explained that after AP 4105 is approved, they will seek approval of an updated DE plan. However, given the lack of an updated current and comprehensive DE policy and the absence of a DE plan, it was impossible for the team to thoroughly validate effective DE policies and practices as described in the ACCJC's *Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education*. An evaluation of multiple courses taught in Etudes suggests there is inconsistency in the application of CORs between traditional classroom courses and those offered in an online or hybrid format. This inconsistency is most apparent in the area of regular and substantive contact between faculty and students.

The validation of effective DE instruction specifically, and the DE program generally, was also problematic. The team was unable to validate that the program review process is applied to the DE Program.

Faculty who teach online must meet the same minimum qualifications established for faculty teaching in a traditional mode. Additionally, evidence shows that training and support for faculty that teach online courses in Etudes is provided by the College's Professional Development Center. Faculty who wish to teach an online course in Etudes must pass the mandatory Etudes training with a "C" or better. Faculty who wish to take this training online are provided this option through Etudes Incorporated for a fee. In addition, supplemental training and support for faculty who teach online courses is offered on a regular basis. Faculty who teach online courses via an alternative platform—a platform other than Etudes--fall outside the scope of institutional training and support.

The team found that the college does not have an updated current and comprehensive distance education policy. The team also was unable to validate that the program review process is applied to the DE Program. (Standard II.A)

The College does not meet the Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education.

Recommendation 3:

In order to increase effectiveness and to achieve consistency within educational modalities, the team recommends that the District integrate its distance education planning with institutional planning, update its policy that defines “regular and substantive interaction,” and develop and implement a faculty evaluation rubric that is relevant for faculty who teach online courses. (Standards II.B.1; II.A.1.b)

Policy on Compliance with Title IV

The College policies and financial aid information is provided to students and employees and updated with any new regulation change. The College delivers comprehensive financial aid services to students. (Standard II.B)

The College meets the Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV.

Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status

The team found evidence of college wide policies regarding Advertising, Student Recruitment and Representation in print and electronic forms, a catalog that provides information sufficient to allow students to enroll in programs of study, obtain information on college policies and procedures, and the list of courses and student services available. As evidenced on page 4 of the College Catalog, an accurate representation of the college’s accreditation status is provided. Information regarding job placement rates, transfer rates and licensure examination pass rates is available in the College Catalog and electronically on the college website that links to appropriate sources of data. (Standard II.B.)

The College meets the Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status

Policy on Institutional Degrees and Award of Credit

The College is in compliance with the ACCJC policies regarding the Award of Credit, evidenced by Administrative Procedure 4020, Curriculum Development. The College ensures that credit units assigned to each course meet the higher education rigor standards and credit units match the time assigned for instruction for each course.

The College meets the Policy on Institutional Degrees and Award of Credit

Policy on Institutional Integrity and Ethics

The team found evidence that the College has goals consistent with its stated purpose. The college abides by the required reporting to the accreditation Commission and responding to requests. (Standard IV)

The board of trustees has approved and published ethics policies and policies related to academic freedom. However, while there is a Code of Ethics and Standards for Good Behavior adopted, there is evidence that some Board Members have trouble applying these to themselves and/or holding their fellow board members accountable

Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations

The team did not identify any contractual relationships with non-regionally accredited organizations.

Policy on Student and Public Complaints against Institutions

The college catalog assures that clear and accurate information is available to students including the process for how violations of student's rights and responsibilities can be resolved.

The College meets the Policy on Student and Public Complaints against Institutions

Institution-set Standards

The College has established set standards and proposed goals for course and program completion, retention, student persistence from term to term, course completion, degrees and certificates awarded, student transferring and indicators related to student achievement in remedial math, remedial English, remedial ESL, and Career Technical Education goals.

The goals and standards were developed in July 2013 and the metrics are tracked by the College. Evidence included the Institutional Indicators of Student Achievement, Instructional Program Review Report, Perkins CTE Outcomes Data and the Licensure Pass Rate Webpage.

**GENERAL OBSERVATIONS,
FINDINGS AND EVIDENCE,
CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Standard I

Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

A. Mission

General Observations:

The Self Evaluation Report for Standard I.A. (Mission) shows a dedication to revising the mission statement in such a way as to be understandable and achievable. The mission statement itself became more concise, but then was illuminated further by the addition of a vision statement and a list of guiding principles. The Self Evaluation reports that: “[t]hese principles come into action through the College’s cycles of program review, student learning outcomes and assessment, and institutional research efforts on student success.” (page 57)

The College maintains its focus on its primary goals of preparing “students for transfer, two-year degrees, or certificates that allow them to enter the workforce, and to provide basic skills instruction that leads to these purposes”. (Standard I.A.1, page 57) Enhancing these primary goals is a commitment to offering lifelong learning opportunities.

A review of the Self Evaluation Report demonstrates a commitment to the College’s mission to serve its students and community with integrity to ensure that the mission’s scope is fulfilled so that students are empowered to achieve learning that enhances their lives, whether it be personal, professional, or both.

The College’s strategic planning and program review relies on the mission statement. The vision statement, Educational Master Plan (EMP), and the president’s guiding principle work together to determine the methodology used to develop the overall strategic plan for the college.

Findings and Evidence:

The College’s mission statement, combined with its vision statement, defines its broad, well-rounded educational purposes (jobs/career advancement, degrees and certificates, transfer, arts, sports, basic skills, and equity), addresses its intended student population, and asserts its commitment to achieving student learning. There is a strong focus on learning and the teaching and assessment practices for effective learning and student achievement. The complementary vision statement emphasizes the use of data to foster a culture of continuous improvement. (Standard 1.A)

Evidence reveals that the mission statement has been revised two times in the last three years and has been expanded to include a vision statement with key guiding principles to apply during decision-making processes. The President’s Council took the lead on these revisions, including an inclusive Planning Summit and follow-up discussions on campus to ensure the process included broad constituency contributions. Particularly effective, it seems, is the “champions” concept—people appointed to support (follow through with) elements of the mission, vision, strategic plans, and Educational Master Plan (EMP).

The revised mission and more detailed vision statements illustrate a strong focus on student learning as well as the effective teaching and assessment practices needed to achieve improved learning and hence enhanced student success. The focus is well-rounded, including a concern for degrees/transfer, CTE/jobs, the Arts, competitive athletics, basic skills, equity and lifelong learning. Also noteworthy is the emphasis on data collection and analysis for the continuous cycle of improvement. (Standard I.A.1)

The College ensures that its courses and programs undergo regular review and that their relevancy is validated through curriculum review, labor market analysis (for CTE programs), and aligned with university transfer requirements, such as 12-plus “AA-T” and “AS-T” degrees that allow for seamless transfer to California state universities.

The most recent revision of the College’s mission and vision statement was formally adopted by the Board of Trustees at its June 18, 2013. The mission statement can be found online on the College’s web page; in addition, it is also published in the College Catalog and included on the letterhead used for college meeting agendas.

Since the last accreditation cycle, the mission statement has been revised and approved by the college’s Board of Trustees twice, on November 10, 2010, and more recently on June 18, 2013. The revision process included the President’s Council (consisting of leaders from various constituency groups on campus), shared governance forums with the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, and the Management Senate, and was presented and approved by another shared governance group, the Policies and Procedures Review Committee on February 12, 2013 before being adopted by the Board of Trustees on June 18, 2013. (Standard I.A.2)

In 2012 the college’s president held several planning retreats (summits) with constituent group leaders to focus attention on the college’s mission and generate appropriate strategic goals and action plans for ensuring that planned actions and expenditures fulfill the mission. “Champions” were assigned for specific 2012-13 goals to assure they were completed with integrity to the mission. Various assessment tools and guidelines (the Educational Master Plan, the President’s Strategic Guidelines, etc.) exist to aid planning and decision making, all of which are tied to the college’s mission and vision statement. However, the many different “guidelines” and “strategic plans” tied to the mission are confusing and perhaps should be streamlined and simplified for better universal understanding. (I.A.3, I.A.4)

The SJDCCD mission statement identifies the purpose of the college as preparing “students for transfer, two-year degrees, or certificates that allow them to enter the workforce, and to provide basic skills instruction that leads to these purposes” (Standard I.A.1, page 57). Enhancing these primary goals is a commitment to offering lifelong learning opportunities. The mission statement reads as follows:

San Joaquin Delta Community College District serves the needs of students and the district community by providing excellent post-secondary education to the associate degree level, general education and preparation for transfer to other post-secondary institutions, career and technical education, economic development and the development of intellectual

autonomy. To achieve this objective, the faculty and staff are committed to offering high quality instructional programs, student services, and efforts to enhance the public good.

The vision statement of the college, as published in the College Catalog, further delineates:

The faculty, staff, and students of San Joaquin Delta Community College District envision a community of lifelong learners, passionately pursuing and achieving ever-higher educational goals, and fully appreciating the diverse and dynamic world around them.

The College's student learning programs and services align with the college mission and student population. The College ensures that its courses and programs undergo regular review and that their relevancy is validated through curriculum review, labor market analysis (for CTE programs), and aligned with university transfer requirements, such as 12-plus "AA-T" and "AS-T" degrees that allow for seamless transfer to California state universities.

The College provides a broad array of transfer, vocational, developmental, and life-long learning opportunities and the student services needed to support those programs. Examples of the college's responsiveness to aligning its programs with the needs of the community include (1) the Stockton Institute for Continuous Learning (SICL), (2) the Community Education Program (which features adult community education offerings for no credit at low cost and "Kids College" activities), and (3) through the arts and entertainment offerings it provides to the community through its theatres and art gallery. (Standard I.A.1)

The revision process included the President's Council (consisting of leaders from various constituency groups on campus), shared governance forums with the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, and the Management Senate, and was presented and approved by another shared governance group, the Policies and Procedures Review Committee on February 12, 2013 before being adopted by the Board of Trustees on June 18, 2013. (Standard I.A.3)

Conclusions:

Including the mission and vision statements on college meeting agenda forms is a noteworthy practice for keeping them forefront as decisions are made. The college meets this Standard.

Recommendations:

None

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations:

San Joaquin Delta College has a large shared governance committee structure, comprised of 21 standing committees, 6 ad hoc committees, 2 adjudication panels, 6 councils, senates & cabinets, and 3 employee bargaining organizations. These committees, particularly those with representation from all employee groups and students, provide a forum for ongoing collegial self-reflective dialog about various institutional processes.

In addition, the College has held summits, open to the entire college community, on strategic planning, and more recently on accreditation (the college reports more than 120 individuals took part in the accreditation summits in spring 2013, including more than 20 students).

Other efforts requiring broad participation contribute to the continuous improvement of student learning, such as curriculum review and the assessment of student learning outcomes at the course and program levels. (see sections II.A and II.B)

There is evidence that the College sets goals to improve institutional effectiveness, and grounds those goals in the Mission. The most visible evidence is in the Strategic Plan, where goals were collaboratively developed, are being supported with specific themes derived from the Educational Master Plan, each with an assigned “Champion,” and assessed with the results being widely shared. In addition, all Mini-Program Review Strategic Resource Requests are asked to show how they support strategic and/or presidential goals.

Between 2007/2008 and 2010/2011, the Planning, Review and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE) Office produced an annual report of Institutional Effectiveness. The Team learned the College intends to continue producing this report on a bi-annual basis.

There is evidence of institution set goals for student achievement, and the PRIE Office provides copious amounts of data to track trends in student demographics, student preparedness for college, course completion rates, student progression and program completion, graduation and transfer rates, and employment outcomes for students. Many of these achievement outcomes are presented in the “San Joaquin Delta College Institutional Indicators of Student Achievement, 2013.” (Standard I.A.1)

The College has established set standards and proposed goals for course and program completion, retention, student persistence from term to term, course completion, degrees and certificates awarded, student transferring and indicators related to student achievement in remedial math, remedial English, remedial ESL, and Career Technical Education goals.

The goals and standards were developed in July 2013 and the metrics tracked by the College. Evidence included the Institutional Indicators of Student Achievement, Instructional Program Review Report, Perkins CTE Outcomes Data and the Licensure Pass Rate Webpage.

Goals are also set through Program Reviews, which unfortunately are not implemented in an on-going, systematic process. (Standard I.B.3)

Program Review

San Joaquin Delta College has three program review committees: Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative Services. In the recent past, the Dean of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness oversaw the Program Review process for the College. That position became vacant in 2011 and was eliminated in 2012. After that change, the accountability and oversight for Program Review became dispersed. Currently, all instructional programs that fall under the Assistant Superintendent/Vice President of Instruction are a part of Instructional Program Review. All student services programs that fall under the Assistant Superintendent/Vice President of Student Services are a part of Student Services Program Review. All administrative programs that fall under the vacant position Vice President, Administrative Services are a part of Administrative Services Program Review. Each of the three program review processes is different and has evolved over the recent past. (Standard I.B.3)

Instructional program reviews are now being conducted on a two-year cycle, with half of the instructional programs going through the process in one year, and the other half in the next. The format has been shortened and streamlined from the prior longer reviews that occurred on a six-year cycle, and now integrates aspects of student learning outcomes assessment. The review includes data provided by the PRIE Office (five-year trends: enrollment demographics; outcomes including success, retention and awards; and full time equivalent student and faculty numbers). In addition, the template includes sections on program goals, student and program learning outcomes, and articulation. Vocational programs provide additional information on their advisory committee(s) and labor market information. All programs are asked for “recommendations” which serve as resource requests (Physical/Facilities, Human, and/or Equipment, Technology & Supplies). The team learned that the 2013/2014 Instructional program reviews will include pre-populated data on student learning outcomes assessments so that departments can consider achievement of student learning as a part of their program evaluation. Instructional program reviews have an evaluation template that was created collaboratively, with faculty input, and was utilized most recently in the 2010-2011 year. (Standard I.B.3)

Student Services program reviews were recently implemented on a new two-year cycle as well. The most recent program review template for Student Services includes sections for mission, functions, key performance indicators, student satisfaction survey results, student learning outcomes, and an operational overview that includes resource requests in the categories of personnel, technology, budget, and facilities. Student Services program reviews have an evaluation template that was created collaboratively, and was utilized in a pilot program review conducted by Admissions & Records in 2011-2012. (Standard I.B.3)

Administrative Services program reviews are not on a regular cycle. The most recent program review template includes sections for a unit overview, administrative unit

outcomes, key performance indicators and “recommendations” which serve as resource requests. Administrative program reviews have an evaluation template that was utilized in the Administrative program reviews of 2010-2011. (Standard I.B.3)

Administrative Procedure 2430 (AP 2430) covers the Governance Committee Structure. In this section, the three program review committees and their membership are named, and committee responsibilities are laid out. Responsibilities include: assisting in the development of a regular cycle of program review and student learning assessment, providing direction to working groups completing program reviews, consolidation of program review recommendations, and making recommendations to the Planning and Budget Committee. AP 2430 was adopted in 1987 and has been amended forty-two times since then, most recently in October 2013. There is policy (6140) and procedure (6141) for Instructional Program Review, but not for other program reviews. Policy 6140 was adopted in 1985 and amended twice since then, most recently in 1989. Procedure 6141 was adopted in 1985 and amended once since then, in 1989.

Integrated Planning

In the past few years, even amidst great turnover in the senior administration, San Joaquin Delta College has developed a Strategic Plan which draws heavily from an Educational Master Plan, which is linked to a Facilities Master Plan. The Strategic Plan is comprised of five Strategic Goals, with related Strategic Initiatives that derive from the 2010 Educational Master Plan. The plan was endorsed at a Planning Summit that was open to the College community in February 2012.

Resource Allocation

San Joaquin Delta College has developed a process of annual “Mini-Program Review Strategic Resource Requests” whereby divisions and departments can request resources (human, physical, or material). The form utilized requests that each resource be identified as supporting presidential and/or strategic goal(s). Divisions and departments are asked to respond to questions around current resources and deficiencies as well as current attempts toward efficiency. The timeline for the 2013 process makes the steps clear: divisions/departments submit their requests via the Mini-Program Review Strategic Resource Requests form to the executive leader for their area (presumably Instruction, Student Services and Administrative Services). The Executive Leadership Team is then charged to “review and prioritize institution-wide and agree on budget implications,” and then forward the prioritized resource requests to the Planning and Budget Committee for its approval. The information then goes to President’s Council and ultimately to the Board of Trustees and then, once approved, is incorporated into the budget.

The College reports that the 2008 economic downturn resulted in some layoffs, voluntary retirement incentives, and vacant positions left unfilled resulting in lower district expenditures. Between 2009 and 2012, classified staff was reduced by 20%, faculty by 14%, and management by 31%. These numbers were shared in presentations to inform the Strategic Operational & Staffing Plan 2013-2014. The severe budget cuts, resulting in an austere budget and minimal staffing levels, created an opportunity for the college to use evidence and collective reflection in choosing what to build back into the budget. The

annual Mini-Program Review and Strategic Resource Requests process, which began in the spring of 2012 as the “Core Services Review,” now functions as an annual resource request and budget (re)allocation tool. This process serves to integrate planning for human, physical, technology and equipment resources as applied to annual resource allocation.

Reallocation of resources also occurred in the process of Program Remediation/Discontinuance (AP 4021, adopted in 2012). This data-based shared-governance evaluative process, with ultimate board approval, resulted in the de-activation of seven instructional programs, and those resources were then reallocated to other areas.

Further reallocation of resources occurred through the Strategic Staffing Plan, passed by the Board of Trustees in August 2013, which used the Core Services Review/Strategic Operational Planning process that occurred in spring 2013. The result was a reallocation of resources from less “core” functions to areas that were determined to be critically important.

As evidenced in the “San Joaquin Delta College Integrated Planning, Budget & Program Review Model, 2012,” the Planning & Budget Committee (PBC) plays a key role in program review and resource allocation. In part, the role of the PBC is as follows: “PBC sets priorities on an annual basis and recommends allocations or re-allocations to the Cabinet for annual budget development.” Further, Administrative Procedure 2430 states the committee’s responsibility is in part to: “develop, review, and recommend strategic and operational planning documents for the college” and to “coordinate and review program recommendations related to funding based on the regular schedule of program reviews” and to “oversee development of a recommended annual college budget”.

There is evidence that the planning process is broad-based, and that it offers opportunities for review by appropriate constituencies. The Strategic Planning forums show this, as does the shared governance committee process and the Program Review processes (including the Mini-Program Review Strategic Resource Request process). (Standards I.A.3, I.A.IV)

There is evidence that San Joaquin Delta College communicates matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies using documented assessment results. Some of these include: the Student Success Scorecard, an annual survey of graduates, gainful employment data, and reports on student learning assessment. Evaluations and data-based reports are frequently made to the Board of Trustees, and to internal committees (such as regular enrollment reporting to the Division Deans Council meetings). The PRIE Office responds to scores of ad-hoc requests annually, and also maintain an annual schedule of research and reporting, including mandated reports to state and federal agencies which in turn become public information.

PRIE provides pre-populated data into Instructional program reviews, which are now conducted using CurricUNET as a tool, to facilitate the Instructional Program Review process. The College does not currently systematically review the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes. This appears to be the purview of the Budget & Planning Committee, but that committee does not appear to be fulfilling this function. There is some evidence that the College assesses evaluation mechanisms, such as

the peer review of the Program Reviews, although this review is not consistently applied. It is clear that informal assessments occur as there is evidence that modifications are made to instructional programs, student support services, and other learning support services.

Findings and Evidence:

Some committees seem especially active, such as the Policies and Procedures Review Committee, which recommends changes to the Policies and Procedures Manual, which is 1,542 pages in length including many operational procedures that require regular updating. There is evidence that many committees do not always meet at their regularly scheduled times, which the Team learned occurs when there “are no agenda items.” Some key committees do meet regularly, such as the Policy and Procedures Review Committee and President’s Council. The Team found evidence that other committees do not meet regularly, such as the three Program Review Committees and the Planning and Budget Committee (see section I.B.3 of this report). (Standard I.B.1)

The “Committee Requirements” page on the San Joaquin Delta website outlines expected committee activities, including an annual report to President’s Council. During the 2013 year the President’s Council has not received a steady, consistent set of annual reports from the committees accountable to these requirements.

The Team learned that the College intends to revise and consolidate the committee structure, perhaps incorporating current smaller committees with narrow functions as task forces or sub-committees under appropriate broader committees. This is in line with the Actionable Improvement Plan in the Self-Evaluation Report to reform the committee structure.

The Policies and Procedures Manual seems unnecessarily lengthy. In some areas, procedures are included as policy (example: BP 2745.1 and 2745.1, which are comprised of the evaluation instruments for the Board Self-Evaluation and the Superintendent’s Evaluation, and AP 8900B which is a matrix showing which departments maintain which college-wide data sets, and AP 3100, the College organizational chart). Other procedures are so specific that they require regular updating. The College may wish to consider developing broader procedures that do not require frequent updates.

The Institutional Effectiveness Reports are strong examples of goals translated into measurable terms so the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The most recent report available to the Team is from the 2010/2011 academic year, which coincides with the timing of the Dean of PRIE position becoming vacant. (Standard I.B.2)

Program Review

The Instructional program review process has undergone many changes in recent years, and some clear improvements have been implemented, such as increasing the frequency of review to a two-year cycle and the inclusion of data (now including student learning outcomes assessment). While there has clearly been quality improvement in the instructional program review process, the changes are new. It appears the college moved from a six-year cycle of assessment approximately two years ago.

The team found that there are current instructional program reviews for most but not all programs. In particular, programs without full-time faculty seem not to have program reviews. Policy 6140 and Procedure 6164, focused on Instructional Program Review, do not accurately reflect the current process. There was no evidence that the Instructional Program Review Committee had met to date in the 2013-2014 academic year. (Standard 1.B.3)

The Student Services program review process is robust, and includes measures of student satisfaction and student learning as well as key performance indicators and other measures generally found in student services program reviews. However, only approximately half of student services programs have undergone review in the past five years. For a few student services programs, there is no record of any program review conducted in the past decade. The evaluation process developed for Student Services program reviews has not been utilized for the majority of reviews on record. There was no evidence that the Student Services Program Review Committee had met to date in the 2013-2014 academic year. (Standard 1.B.3)

The Administrative Services program review process includes all programs that organizationally fall under the (vacant) Vice President of Administrative Services. All such programs underwent review in 2010-2011, and all were evaluated. The process has not happened again since, and there is no clear schedule for on-going administrative program review. There was no evidence that the Administrative Services Program Review Committee had met to date in the 2013-2014 academic year. (Standard 1.B.3)

There are some programs and services that fall outside instructional, student services, and administrative program review processes. As this process is organized by Vice Presidential area of responsibility, programs that may report to the President do not have a program review process, nor do non-instructional programs and services within the Instructional area (academic lab, Foster Youth program, MESA, etc.). In addition, it was unclear whether some student services programs should conduct a program review, or whether they might be included in other broader program reviews. (PUENTE, AFFIRM, Outreach, etc.)

Program review is an integral part of other processes and procedures at the College that support Institutional Effectiveness. "Program Review" is cited in Board Policy 2500 (BP 2500, Academic Senate), Policy 6140 (Instructional Program Review), Procedure 6141 (Instructional Planning and Review Process), Administrative Procedure 7210 (AP 7210, Replacement of Full Time Academic Entitlements), AP 6200 (Budget Preparation), AP 4260 (Prerequisites and Co-requisites, Advisories, and Limitations on Enrollment), AP 4021 (Program Remediation/Discontinuance), and AP 2430 1 (Governance Committee Structure, Planning and Budget Committee). (Standard I.B.4, I.B.5)

Integrated Planning

The current Strategic Plan appears to be functioning well for the College. The SCJCCD Strategic Plan Progress Report of May 2013 is evidence that the College is assessing progress on plan implementation, and showing accountability in stating legitimate accomplishments. The Strategic Plan appropriately integrated parts of the Educational Master Plan of 2010 and the Facilities Master Plan. (Standard I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3)

Resource Allocation

The Planning & Budget Committee (PBC), which is a recommending body to the President's Council, is scheduled to meet approximately twice a month. In the 2013 calendar year, the team found evidence that the committee met for approximately half of their scheduled meetings. In the 2014 year up to the time of the Team's visit, there was evidence that the PBC met once, on February 10, 2014. The Team learned that in practice, PBC does not create budget priorities from program review evidence to recommend to the Cabinet, but rather the Executive Leadership Team creates the priorities and presents them to PBC for review and recommendation to President's Cabinet. This process seems to work for the College, but it is different than what is outlined in the Integrated Planning, Budget & Program Review Model, 2012. Further, the actual responsibilities of the Planning & Budget Committee appear to be more passive (review and approve) than as stated in AP2430. It does not appear that the BPC prioritizes resource requests, but rather reviews priorities presented by the Executive Leadership Team. (I.B.4.)

While on campus, the team heard various versions about the opportunity for input into the shared governance decision making process. Some seemed content if not grateful for the executive team-driven decision making process, whereby the senior administration does the work to pull together information to present to shared governance committees to review and approve, which usually happens with consensus. Others expressed a desire to be given the opportunity for input into decisions prior to information being drafted and presented. The College identified an Actionable Improvement Plan in Standard I.B.1 of the Self-Evaluation Report that calls for an improvement of the shared governance decision making process, and the Team encourages these efforts.

The Mini-Program Review Strategic Resource Requests process, about to begin its second annual cycle at the time of the Team's visit, appears to be a sound practice that allows the college timely access to resource requests that can be addressed within the annual budget process. The fact that the process asks Divisions and Departments to link their requests to strategic and presidential goals, and asks for reflection on efficiencies, strengthens this annual process. However, it is important to note that this annual process cannot substitute for Program Review. (Standard I.B.3)

The team noted a 99-page document prepared for the Self-Evaluation Report filled with disaggregated data on student demographics, enrollment, and student outcomes. This effort is more complete than many of the college's published annual fact books. The team acknowledges the work of the PRIE Office in providing relevant and timely data to inform planning and decision-making in so many areas of the College. These efforts have helped to create a culture of inquiry at San Joaquin Delta College, and have helped the institution to become more effective. (Standards I.B.5, I.B.6)

There is some evidence that the College assesses evaluation mechanisms, such as the peer review of the Program Reviews, although this review is not consistently applied. It is clear that informal assessments occur, as there is evidence that modifications are made to instructional programs, student support services, and other learning support services. (Standard I.B.7)

Conclusions:

San Joaquin Delta College does not currently have a process of on-going, systematic program review. Program review processes are in place, but not implemented regularly throughout the College, and not all programs are held accountable for participating in the process. The College would benefit from a more formal and systematic review of evaluation mechanisms. Without this key process in place and fully functional, the ability of the College to use sound information to inform integrated planning, resource allocation, and other important functions (such as program discontinuance) is hampered. Program review at San Joaquin Delta College does not currently meet the standards.

The College's nascent Strategic Planning Process appears to be functioning well. The development of an ongoing systematic program review process throughout the college should strengthen integrated planning efforts.

The new annual Mini-Program Review Strategic Resource Requests, as well as other notable efforts such as Program Discontinuance, are sound evidence that the College is using data and analysis to link resources to planning. This process will be further strengthened by the development of an ongoing systematic program review process, which will provide more relevant and timely information.

The college is experiencing vacancies in key administrative areas related to centralized oversight and the program review process. The lack of this leadership and accountability for the program review process has been likely impacted with the elimination of the Dean of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness. (See section II.A).

Recommendations:

Recommendation 1:

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the District implement an ongoing, systematic, sustainable program review process for each program not currently in the program review process that informs integrated planning, resource allocation decisions, key processes to improve institutional effectiveness, and student achievement and learning. (Standard II.A.2., II.A.2.e)

Recommendation 2:

In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District establish a sound infrastructure of sufficient administrative personnel to ensure a consistent level of services that support the institution's mission and purpose. The team further recommends that the district expedite the process to fill vacant and interim administrative positions. (Standards II.A.2, III.A.6, IV.B.)

Standard II

Student Learning Programs and Services

A. Instructional Programs

General Observations:

The College's Self Evaluation Report provides a culture of evidence that supports most areas of Standard II.A. Remedial actions taken by the College to end the Commission-designated warning status are on-going. Various methods used to assess effectiveness support appropriate changes designed to enhance student success. For example, 2008-2009 college data revealed that 85% of incoming students placed below collegiate level in math, English, or reading. In response to these low placement rates the institution applied for and was awarded several state and federal grants that focused on HSI first year and traditionally underserved students, to provide learning services to increase student achievement and completion, and to develop a workforce for a newly built prison hospital in the San Joaquin County. Evidence supports the institution made significant progress in this area as noted in the Institutional Effectiveness Report.

The College also integrated the review of curriculum to include the modalities in which courses are to be delivered.

Findings and Evidence:

The College states that it uses assessment to meet the mission and uphold integrity through the utilization of various methods beginning with the assessment of student learning outcomes at the course and program level. The Curriculum Committee reviews and verifies student learning outcomes and assessments for courses and programs to ensure alignment with Institutional Learning Outcomes. The College states that policies and procedures play a significant role in the college.

The College offers Associate in Arts degrees, Associate in Science degrees, and certificates of Achievement. Of the AA and AS degrees offered, 12 are approved AAT, or transfer model degrees. The College has six additional AAT degrees that are expected to receive Board approval in April, and an additional six ATT degrees under review by the curriculum committee. It is evident that the College's curricular offerings, both in terms of courses and programs, play a large role in the fulfillment of the college mission. It is the Curriculum Committee's responsibility to review and verify student learning outcomes and assessments for courses and programs and ensure alignment with institutional student learning outcomes as well as the methods of delivery. (Standards II.A, II.A.1, II.A.4)

DocuShare houses the assessment data used for evaluation and research in program review while CurricUNET, the College's curriculum management system, houses CORs and approved programs. Students' educational needs are assessed through the review of enrollment trends found in program reviews and Institutional Effectiveness Reports. A review of CTE Advisory Minutes indicates the college works collaboratively with employers to meet workforce needs and reviews labor market information to ensure that there is demand

for the programs offered. Evidence supports that student success and completion is reviewed in a disaggregated fashion to ensure quality of student learning regardless of modality. Missing from the College's data set is research designed to analyze whether or not students enrolled in Distance Education (DE) programs are achieving similar stated learning outcomes as students in on-ground courses. (Standards II.A.1.a, II.A.5, II.A.6)

In Spring 2014, the College offered 220 online and hybrid course sections. The curriculum committee is responsible for the evaluation and approval of all DE courses. All courses designated as online or hybrid are vetted through a separate tech review process by the DE committee. Based on tech review results, the DE committee makes a recommendation to the curriculum committee prior to said vote.

Online and hybrid courses that exist in Etudes, the institutionally recognized online course management system, include diverse subject areas. Training and support for faculty that teach online courses in Etudes is provided by the College's Professional Development Center. Faculty who wish to teach an online course in Etudes must pass the mandatory Etudes training with a "C" or better. Faculty who wish to take this training online are provided this option through Etudes Incorporated for a fee of \$75.00. In addition, supplemental training and support for faculty who teach online courses is offered on a regular basis. Faculty who teach online courses via an alternative platform—a platform other than Etudes--fall outside the scope of institutional training and support. (Standard II.2.d)

Courses taught in Etudes are equipped to effectively serve DSPS students. However, there is no way for the College to ensure this same standard for online and hybrid courses taught on a platform outside of the Etudes system. The College is in the process of vetting AP 4105: Distance Education. The College explained that after AP 4105 is approved, they will seek approval of an updated DE plan. However, given the lack of an updated comprehensive and current DE policy and the absence of a DE plan, it was impossible for the team to thoroughly validate effective DE policies and practices as described in the ACCJC's *Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education*. An evaluation of multiple courses taught in Etudes suggests there is inconsistency in the application of CORs between on-ground courses and those offered in an online or hybrid format. This inconsistency is most apparent in the area of regular and substantive contact between faculty and students.

The validation of effective DE instruction specifically, and the DE program generally, was also problematic. The faculty evaluation form used in the performance review process is designed to evaluate teaching and learning as it occurs in a traditional classroom setting (CTA Contract, p. 94). However, this evaluation form is used to evaluate instructors who teach online courses in the same way that it is used to evaluate faculty in a traditional classroom. (Standard II.A.1.b)

The Self Evaluation states that the DE program has increased by 24% every year since 2000. The College's intention to continue DE growth was confirmed during the visit. However, it does not appear that the program review process is applied to the DE Program. The College's Administrative Procedure 4020 outlines the process by which all courses and programs are reviewed and approved prior to being offered which ensures they adhere to

standards defined by California Education Code, Title 5 regulations, and Board Policy. The team validated that the College, “[R]equires that all courses should contribute to one or more of the institutional learning outcomes; fulfill demonstrable need that meets the stated goals and objectives in the region; and be of value to students as part of a program, Career Technical Education curriculum, a transfer curriculum, a specialized interest such as personal development, or basic skills.” While the originators of curriculum development, revision, and discontinuance falls to the faculty, and their work is peer reviewed by appropriate management, the Curriculum Committee, and the Academic Senate, ultimately the Board of Trustees must approve programs and courses prior to institutional adoption. (Standards II.A.1.a-b, II.A.2, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.d, II.A.3.a-c).

Community Education courses are offered by the College following state law requirements. The quality of these courses is monitored through student evaluations and surveys. These courses are offered online and in a traditional classroom setting; however, courses cannot duplicate or compete with existing College credit offerings. (Standard II.A.2.a)

The College is actively engaged in the assessment of SLOs at the institution, program and course level. While not every course and program currently offered at the College has been assessed, the majority of courses and programs were evaluated during the first year of the College’s two-year assessment cycle which ended in March 2013. The College recently completed its first SLO assessment cycle in full, but has not yet reached the proficiency level on the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness (Part III-Student Learning Outcomes). (Standards II.A.1.c, II.A, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.g)

The College has utilized mandatory flex days to support the process of SLO assessment. In addition, divisions identify a support group consisting of 3 full-time faculty, and a dean, to assist in assessment processes. This group is integral for assessment that occurs in departments that do not have a full-time faculty member. In addition, part-time faculty may choose to meet their flex obligation by participation in SLO assessment. SLO data is also used to support the program review process. The College recently added SLO data to other data sources designed to inform the program review process. (Standards II.A.2, II.A.2.a)

On January 30, 2014, the College approved AP 4020.1: *Course Syllabus/Class Information Checklist*. This recently adopted policy identifies twelve required elements for a course syllabi/class information sheet. This list includes, among other things, “Disability Support Programs and Services (DSPS) statement,” “Catalogue statement for course, which includes any requisites and a reference that course and program learning outcomes can be found on the Districts webpage,” and “If your course is web-enhanced or hybrid, an explanation of what course work will be completed online.” The team references these particular checklist items because it was noted that these are missing from many of the course syllabi reviewed during the visit. The College explained that faculty submit syllabi to their division dean at the start of every semester; therefore, starting with the 2014 summer term, the College intends to evaluate course syllabi based on newly approved criteria in AP 4020.1. The College explained that Division deans will be responsible for ensuring that course syllabi comply with AP 4020.1. (Standard II.A.1.b)

The College states in the Self Evaluation that SLOs are on CORs which are housed in CurricUNET, the College's curriculum management system. However, the team was not able to validate this claim. During the visit, the College explained that this is due to a programming delay by CurricUNET. The College expected SLOs to be uploaded to course syllabi by February 28, 2014 and expects completion of this task in the near future.

The College reviews all courses and programs. The College has curricular policies, procedures and processes which guide the development, approval, implementation, and evaluation of courses and programs. Board Policy /Administrative Procedure 4020 ensures that the "recommendations of the Curriculum Committee are reviewed by the Academic Senate, which recommends to the Superintendent/President or designee, who recommends to the Board for approval," as required by the CCCCCO. The Instructional Program Review Committee falls under the Vice President of Instruction. Policy 6140 mandates that each program be reviewed every six years, the College recently adopted a two-year program review cycle (II.A.2.b).

In the College's newly adopted two-year instructional program review cycle, half of instructional program reviews go through the process in one year and the others engage the process the next. Current program reviews also incorporate SLO data.

Administrative Procedure 4020 mandates that faculty are responsible for courses and program development, and Procedure 6141 defines the membership of a program review team to include the appropriate Dean, the Division Dean/Director, at least two faculty where appropriate, and representation from advisory committees. The course and program outcome assessments are folded into the program review and that is used to drive the College's strategic planning processes. It is unclear as to how the program review is used to demonstrate need for resource allocation in the budget development process. Currently, "mini program reviews" are more up-to-date, but these documents fail to demonstrate in-depth program analysis that drives planning and resource allocation. It is also unclear how the program review process affects students' ability to achieve the SLOs required of a course, program, certificate or degree. Finally, the team identified multiple instructional departments that have do not have a current program review (full or mini), and other programs, such as DE, that appear to fall outside the program review process. This issue is discussed in detail in Standard I.B.3 (II.A.2.b, II.A.2.f-h).

The College participates in C-ID as well as Assist to facilitate student mobility. In addition, the College regularly submits courses through the articulation database (II.A.6.a).

The College has Administrative Procedure 4021 for Program Remediation/Discontinuance. The procedure provides guidance through a defined process that requires that all students, staff and faculty be notified within ten days of the decision. It also mandates a phasing out process to allow students in the program an opportunity to complete the program if possible (II.A.6.b).

The college presents evidence of marketing itself in a clear, accurate and consistent fashion to new and continuing students. This evidence consists of reviewing the current catalog, and online schedule of classes (II.A.6.c).

The College has an adoptive Academic Freedom and Responsibility policy that is published in the College's Catalog. The faculty understands the rights and responsibilities associated with such a policy and abide by its standards. This is supported by the response in the 2013 Campus Climate Survey (II.A.7, II.A.7.a).

The College's statement on student conduct, located in the College's Catalogue communicates expectations regarding academic honesty and ethical conduct. Consequences for dishonesty are located in the Student Handbook. Likewise, the College communicates specific codes of conduct required by staff, faculty, and administrators in the Employee Handbook, on the Human Resources webpage, and District Policy 3100 (II.A.3.c, II.A.7.b, II.A.7.c).

The college does not currently offer courses or programs to students in foreign locations. (Standard II.A.8).

Conclusions:

The College works collaboratively with employers to meet workforce needs and reviews labor market information to ensure that there is demand for the programs offered. Evidence supports that student success and completion is reviewed in a disaggregated fashion to ensure quality of student learning regardless of modality. Missing from the College's data set is research designed to analyze whether or not students enrolled in Distance Education (DE) programs are achieving similar stated learning outcomes as students in on-ground courses.

The validation of effective DE instruction specifically, and the DE program generally, was also problematic. The faculty evaluation form used in the performance review process is designed to evaluate teaching and learning as it occurs in a traditional classroom setting (CTA Contract, p. 94). However, this evaluation form is used to evaluate instructors who teach online courses in the same way that it is used to evaluate faculty in a traditional classroom.

Recommendations:

See Recommendation 1

Recommendation 3:

In order to increase effectiveness and to achieve consistency within educational modalities, the team recommends that the District integrate its distance education planning with institutional planning, update its policy that defines "regular and substantive interaction," and develop and implement a faculty evaluation rubric that is relevant for faculty who teach online courses (Standards II.B.1; II.A.1.b).

Standard II

Student Learning Programs and Services

B. Student Support Services

General Observations:

The College provides students an open access admissions process. Within this process students take an assessment that determines their appropriate course placement into math and English composition. These assessments are validated through a process that includes expertise from the various English and math faculty which drives the cut scores for course placement. A Campus Climate and Student Satisfaction Survey was administered in 2013 which provided the students' ratings on various support services. Results concluded that students had a lack of knowledge of some programs that were available to them. This appropriately is leading the Division to follow up using student focus groups in order to glean specifics on where to improve services. Ongoing evaluation of services is completed through satisfaction surveys, and program reviews or mini reviews that were just completed. (Standard II.B)

The College provides student services at the main campus, the South Campus at Mountain House, and a limited amount online. At the main campus Student Services are located in a centralized fashion at the Lawrence and Alma DeRicco Student Services Center, a new one-stop building completed with Measure L Bond money. Services offered to students at SCMH are comprehensive and equitable, and are adjusted to meet the students' needs during peak times. (Standard II.B.3)

In regards to online services for students taking distance education courses, while there is access to the College Catalog, class schedule, admission application, registration, and the FASFA online, all students must be assessed through a face to face proctored process followed up by orientation and advisement. Once the students complete this process and become continuing students there is an online function where students ask general questions regarding admissions and records via "Live Chat" during the hours the college is open, schedule an appointment with a counselor utilizing eSARS, and seek information via email. However, there are not equitable comprehensive student services offered to students who are seeking a 100% online experience. (Standards II.B.3)

Findings and Evidence:

Even though the Self-Study reports that services are evaluated through program reviews every other year, evidence does not support this assertion. While it is true that all departments completed a "mini review" spring of 2013, only three areas have current Program Reviews completed, while others have very old reviews or no Program Review at all. Evidence does support a rejuvenated cycle being implemented to get Student Services back on track so they can utilize current information to feed into the Planning and Budgeting Cycle, along with requesting of resources. (Standard II.B.1)

The College catalog has been reviewed and found to adequately reflect the elements required reflecting the general information for the institution with precise, accurate and current information. Requirements for admissions, student fees and other financial obligations, as well as degree, certificate, graduation and transfer requirements are listed. Major policies that affect students such as academic regulations (including academic honesty), nondiscrimination, acceptance of transfer credits, the grievance and complaint procedures, sexual harassment, and refund of fees are provided. The catalog is well-structured and easy to understand and mirrors what is found online as well. (Standard II.B.2)

As previously mentioned, the College is implementing a cycle of program review and mini reviews to inform the programs of student support needs, in addition to its annual Campus Climate and Student Satisfaction Survey which were last administered in 2013. The various programs under Student Services utilize this data in order to identify gaps in the needed delivery of services. Student Services programs also have student learning outcomes developed with one round of assessment completed and responded to. Through this process strategies are either developed or revised to meet student needs. (Standard II.B.3)

The College does offer courses through distance education and philosophically sees its online offerings for students who do not come to any location for any part of instruction. Student Services does not provide 100% comprehensive services to new students. New students can fill out their admissions form online. However, to assess and complete orientation services they need to attend a physical site. In order to align them within the philosophy shared by the Distance Education Coordinator, services to students also need to be developed so they can be accessed 100% online. As for continuing students, there are several online applications that assist students with contacting A&R, emailing counselors quick questions, making appointments with counselors through eSARS, registration, and filling out the FAFSA for financial aid are all available at this time. (Standard II.B.3)

Evidence suggests that when it comes to providing equitable services to all students regardless of location the College hit the mark. Through visiting the Mountain House Campus, students are provided equitable student services through a full-time counselor, full-time librarian, and the support staff are well versed in answering questions and assisting students as well. At peak times, Admissions and Records and Financial Aid professionals go to the Mountain House Campus and provide expert guided services to students. Additionally, they have a dedicated police officer and a student lounge. However, as previously pointed out this is not the case for students who want to be completely online. These services are evaluated through the program review process which will be implemented moving forward every two years with a mini-review on the off year as stated. (Standard II.B.3.a)

The College's educational environment appears conducive for student learning despite reported issues regarding the reliability of Wi-Fi. It is through the established ASBG and clubs that students have been provided the avenue to display personal and civic responsibility. An example of this would be the ASBG participation in the General Session speaking out to the accreditation visiting team sharing appropriately their own experiences of what works well for them and what they believe needs to be improved. The student

government also has participated in a program referred to as the Learn Advocate Explore and Discuss program designed to train students how to participate in the shared governance process, use parliamentary procedures, apply the Brown Act, and adopt effective advocacy skills to use with elected officials. Evidence supports that the College provides social activities on campus that build community and promote diversity. Through conversations with several students there is discontent with the level of engagement in the defined governance decision making process students are afforded, especially since the Flea Market was taken away from Student Activities/ASBG, among other controversial actions that emerged. The Self-Study confirms this and has written an action item stating, “The District should conduct a focus group with student club advisors, members of Inter Club Council (ICC), and other appropriate College staff, including the director of Student Activities, to discuss concerns about student clubs and streamline operations within the department. *Responsible Parties: Director of Student Activities and PRIE*”. Evidence supports this Actionable Improvement Plan (AIP) as urgent, as is developing a better process to ensure student attendance on the multiple governance committees listed in the 2013-2014 Shared Governance Committee Book. (Standard II.B.3.b)

The College ensures it has trained counselors that are providing the students their academic advising and orientations to the college culture in the on-ground environment. The program assesses their effectiveness in several ways, one through the student learning outcomes assessment, collecting survey information in multiple venues, and completing program reviews. It is self-reported that students are unhappy with the lack of accessibility to counselors due to staffing and scheduling patterns. (Standard II.B.3.c)

The College promotes student understanding and appreciation of diversity through offering various events throughout the year. There is an Administrative Procedure 2430 that outlines a governance committee that focuses on the issues of diversity and equity entitled, the College’s Diversity Committee Cultural Awareness Programs (CAP). This culture of diversity and equity was evaluated through the Campus Climate Survey in 2013. In a gap analysis of the results it was noted that some students did not feel the campus was safe, and a small minority of student’s perceived bullying, sexism, and lack of respect for individuals of their sexual orientation as areas of concern. In response to the overall safety, the College has installed surveillance cameras strategically on both the Stockton and Mountain House Campuses which has already begun to make a difference. The Self Evaluation Report also has an Actionable Improvement Plan to address the other issue. (Standard II.B.3.d)

Admissions and Records has been engaged in constant analysis and re-engineering of its processes related to the A&R practices which has resulted in faster, more efficient services to students. Evident supports that validation of placement processes is accomplished through an evaluation of assessment instrument components to determine compliance with state law. The College has been participating in regional discussions of common assessment. (Standard II.B.3.e)

The College adheres to all FERPA regulations, Education Codes and Title 5 regulations regarding the release of student information. Records retention is completed through the

defined policy and procedures of Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 3310, Records Retention and Destruction. (Standard II.B.3.f)

Evidence reviewed supports that Student Services has student learning outcomes and assessment results completed for one full cycle. The results were analyzed and led to changes in processes where appropriate. These same outcomes are also included in the template for Program Reviews that are now scheduled every two years. (Standard II.B.4)

Recommendations:

See Recommendation 1

C. Library Learning Support Services

General Observations:

The College has demonstrated through its Self-Study, site visit and interviews that it meets the components of the Standard. The College's library and other learning support services for students are adequate and of sufficient quality to support the instructional programs.

Findings and Evidence:

The districts has two libraries, Goleman Library located on the Stockton campus and one on the South Campus at Mountain House; and five distinct learning centers that provide comprehensive academic services and learning support to its student body. This includes computer work stations and access to learning materials to support student success and attainment of educational goals. (Standard II.C.1)

The District library and learning support services are comprised of a variety of resources that serve both on-ground and distance education learners. The library supports approximately 60 online databases. These databases are available 24 hours a day. Instructional materials provided by the library interface with a wide variety of courses and reflect collaborative faculty efforts. Library research tutorial services are designed to support basic skills students and DE students although anyone can access these materials. The library staff employs a variety of methods to ensure sufficient depth and variety in its collection. One of the efficient methods is the library liaison program which allows the faculty to recommend resources for purchases. This maintains a collegial and collaborative approach to ensure adequate and quality learning support services to support instructional programs. Library tutorial services are robust and housed in the Learning Express Library as well as provided at the South Campus in Mountain House. (Standards II.C.1.c, II.C.1.d)

The College's recent renovation of the main library, Goleman, provided a significant improved learning environment for students. The College utilizes Campus Police and physical detection devices to ensure safety in the library. The library requires students to use a library card to check out library materials and RFID to track missing items for the purpose of replacement. Students have access to library materials regardless of location or modality. To access the library online, students must authenticate their identification via a log-in process that requires library card data and password. Likewise, students who access online classes are required to authenticate their identification by providing an ID and password.

Students are encouraged to update and strengthen passwords for increased security. Online authentication processes are supported through the campus server. (Standards II.C.1.c, II.C.1.d)

While the library uses both physical and virtual security measures, it was noted that if a student fails to return checked-out library materials there is no process in place to encourage compliance; there is no “hold” process in place for students who fail to return library materials. While no research exists to identify the replacement costs associated with unreturned library materials, it was estimated that the total was not significant. It was also suggested that current security processes would be improved by a shift to a “one card” system. Currently, students use a variety of cards (i.e. credit/debit credit for financial aid, ASBG for student activities, etc.) issued for a variety of purposes. (Standards II.C.1.b, II.C.2)

Students evaluate library courses, workshops, and course-integrated instruction on a regular basis and based on feedback, improvement plans are developed and implemented. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) have been developed for each course-integrated library instruction session. Based on the assessment data, success rates are high with about 98% of the students who had attended these instruction sessions indicating that they have reached their intended learning outcomes. Course-integrated library information literacy instruction is highly appreciated by faculty and students. (Standard II.C.1.b)

Evaluations of the learning centers and the campus computer services lab are also conducted. The librarians conduct regular customer satisfaction surveys and meet monthly to discuss feedback as it relates to program and service improvements.

Student feedback is used to improve instruction. Plans have been formulated and developed so students can more effectively use resources and staff more. Students enrolled in the College’s distance learning courses and those at all other instructional locations are provided electronic access to support their educational needs. (Standard II.C.2)

A student survey completed in 2013, revealed overall student ratings with high satisfactory ratings (80%) for library services, and lower ratings (46-67%) for the learning resource centers. The survey also revealed a distinct dissatisfaction with the Wi-Fi services. (Standard II.C.2)

Conclusions:

The College provides a variety of student support services at the main campus and the South Campus at Mountain house. The services are comprehensive and equitable. There are online services for students in distance education classes and access to college materials. However, there is not equitable comprehensive services offered to students who seek an entire online experience.

The evidence does not support that services are evaluated every other year through program review. Some areas have very old or no Program Reviews. While online services are not 100% the evidence suggests that the college is consistent with services on the main campus

and the Mountain House Campus. The environments are conducive to student learning, and the Library Learning Support Services are adequate and of sufficient quality to support instructional programs.

Recommendations:

See Recommendation 1

Standard III Resources

A. Human Resources

General Observations:

The college has experienced turnover within the administrative hierarchy in the late 2000's and since that time, the key administrative posts at the College have been stabilized primarily through internal employee advancements. The executive team has approximately two years of longevity except for the vacant Vice President of Administrative Services. The remaining two vice president positions have been filled since the summer of 2011 and the Superintendent/President since February 2012.

The current Executive Cabinet consists of a team that has been in place since the start of the 2012-13 academic year. The cabinet acts in a collegial, team-oriented manner and has established strong working relationships across the functional lines of the members. However, management positions have declined thirty-one percent (31%) during the period 2009 through 2012. This reduction reflects twenty (20) fewer fulltime equivalent administrators and part of the reduction is due to internal administrators moving into leadership roles.

On the other hand there has been consistency within the faculty and other classified positions. This has ensured that faculty and students have engaged in the essential duties of teaching and learning. The Self Study Evaluation Report for Standard IIIA shows a dedicated concern for the campus as well as the greater local community and a desire to assess and then address the college's staffing needs with appropriate, well-qualified employees.

Position reductions necessitated by budget cuts and the significant number of key positions currently unfilled or filled by interims has led to the collapsing of more and more duties and responsibilities onto fewer and fewer people, perhaps jeopardizing their ability to attend to all necessary duties in a timely and effective manner; this is particularly true in the administrative ranks.

The vacancy of the Vice-President for Operations leaves a void for many departments that provide essential services that support the District. These areas include Information Technology (IT), Purchasing, Facilities and Bond (\$250 million) projects implementation.

There is lack of staff evaluations in a timely manner and in some cases staff has not been evaluated for years. There is currently no automated system in place to notify managers when employee's evaluations are due, rather, a labor intensive manual processes is being utilized that is not effective.

The team acknowledges the progress of the human resources department for putting in place hiring practices, recruitment and selection procedure and using NeoGov software to analyze and determine if additional outreach efforts are necessary before closing recruitment.

Findings and Evidence:

The college has revamped its policies and procedures that assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services (Standard III.A.1).

The college has developed recruitment and selection procedures by working through the faculty members who have experience in the discipline. According to the self-study, the District's newly revised employment procedures ensure faculty play a significant role in the hiring of new faculty. The academic senate president also appoint faculty to the screening committee in accordance to AP 7120.

Evidence inspected to confirm the self-study report indicates that as of November 2013, there were a total of 129 evaluations that were overdue, twelve (12) of which were two years overdue, thirty eight (38) were more than a year overdue, and seventy nine (79) were due in 2013. The current system to alert managers that an evaluation is due is a labor intensive process leading to delays in processing these overdue evaluations in a timely manner . (Standard III,A.1.b).

According to the self-study late in 2010, the California Teachers Association (CTA) representing the District's faculty filed a grievance demanding that the administration cease and desist regarding the implementation of student learning outcomes and assessment (SLOA) as a component of faculty evaluation. However, an agreement was jointly reached on guidelines for SLOA's as jointly developed by members of the Curriculum Committee. Thereafter, cycles of assessment and evaluation of data pertaining to course level learning outcomes were implemented during the 2010-11 academic year. A "check-off" form with signatures is used during the evaluation process to ensure faculty "sign off" on the discussion and evaluation of outcomes evidence. (Standard III.A.1.c)

College personnel has decreased in all categories since 2008 as a part of the economic downturn. Between 2008-2012, classified positions dropped 20%, full-time faculty dropped 14%, part-time faculty dropped 27%, and management positions declined by 31%. The recent but slow economic recovery has provided more funds to the college, prompting the Board of Trustees to approve a Strategic Staffing Plan (September 2013) authorizing "new, restored, and replacement positions based on priorities developed through program review and a review of the District's Core Services" (171). The full-time faculty obligation number (FON set by the CCCCO) currently is 204, and with the recruitment of 12 new faculty positions currently underway, by next fall (2014), the college should have 212 full-time faculty, exceeding its obligation (Standard III.A.1.d).

The current executive administration consisting of the president and vice presidents have served in various capacities for the district for a number of years and appear to be trusted and respected permitting the college to operate relatively smoothly although short-handed and clearly requiring a thoughtful "re-growth" period now that funding is beginning to be restored.

Evidence exists that policies and procedures regarding personnel are “equitably and consistently administered” and readily accessible, thanks to an active Policy and Procedure Review Committee that enjoys high participation rates. Recruitment and selection procedures (AP 7120) recently underwent an extensive overhaul involving robust participation (Standard III.A.2).

However, even though the adopted procedures promote fairness and integrity in the hiring process, interestingly, only 50% of respondents on the Campus Climate Survey agreed that the “District adheres to written policy to ensure fairness in its employment practices” (174). While this represents an 8% increase from the 2007 survey, it still means that half the college’s personnel do not fully agree that fairness exists. (Standard III.A.3.a).

The college is in the process of increasing the security and confidentiality of personnel records by moving to a digitalization of its records, greatly reducing and perhaps one day eliminating the need for paper records. (Standard III.A.3.b.)

The college has taken a pro-active approach when it comes to diversity and inclusion. Diversity was specifically embraced in the revision of the vision statement and the college has a Diversity Committee charged with developing and promoting diversity initiatives on campus that includes all constituency groups on campus. (Standards III.A.4, III.A.4.a, III.A.4.b)

The college has hired a consultant to ensure that it properly fulfills the dictates of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), it has implemented a Safe Zone for the LGBTQQI community, and its newly revised hiring procedures emphasize the need for diversity in recruitment and hiring. The 2013 Campus Climate Survey reveals that 70% of employees agree that women and minorities “were welcomed and supported in leadership positions management and faculty.

The district’s vision statement (Board Policy 1201), code of ethics (Board Policy 2715), and its *New Employee Handbook* all contain statements of its “commitment to the integrity in the treatment of all staff and students.” (Standard III.A.4.c)

Through its 2010 EMP and more recently developed Strategic Goals, professional development needs have been recognized and are beginning to be addressed in a thoughtful and effective manner tied to identified needs via surveys and the program review process.

College-wide professional development days, known as Flex Days, have increased from two per year to five per year, providing the necessary time for personnel to meet, identify, and address needs, and Human Resources has developed a plan for implementing strategic trainings for classified staff. A Professional Development Center (PDC) exists to support faculty, classified, and managers; it offers trainings in a various formats. Necessary safety trainings are provided by the reputable Keenan Safety Modules, as is the case for many of the California community colleges. The college acknowledges that its professional development

program is still in an evolutionary process and provides two “Actionable Improvement Plans” that should indeed be implemented (185-186).

Evidence exists through the most recent Strategic Staffing Plan that the college indeed is using its Program Reviews to determine staffing needs and allocating funding. (Standards III.A.5, III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b, III.A.6)

Conclusion:

In order to improve the performance of staff and administrators, an assessment is needed to regularly evaluate staff in accordance with board policy and accreditation standards. The college needs to review and update the EEO plan to comply with new (Oct. 2013) Title V regulations.

The college should ensure that all employee evaluations are completed on time, every time; and follow through with providing the classified staff with the professional development needs identified with the new “training matrix”; and fully implement the “Strategic Operational and Staffing Plan” to rebuild the workforce that reductions occurred during the recent recession/budget cutbacks.

Recommendations:

Recommendation 2:

In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District establish a sound infrastructure of sufficient administrative personnel to ensure a consistent level of services that support the institution’s mission and purpose. The team further recommends that the district expedite the process to fill vacant and interim administrative positions. (Standards II.A.2, III.A.6; IV.B.)

Recommendation 4:

In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District ensure that evaluation processes and necessary criteria are in place and evaluations are regularly and consistently conducted for all employee groups. (Standards III.A.1.b & c; III.A.2; III.A.3.a; III.A.5.a)

Standard III Resources

B. Physical Resources

General Observations:

The college instructional programs are carried out in three different locations. The main campus is located in Stockton, with centers in Manteca and Mountain House. The Manteca center serves as mainly an agriculture lab. The college is in the nascent stages of planning for a north county center that might serve the population region of Lodi, Galt, North San Joaquin County, and the foothills.

The total land area encompasses several counties (San Joaquin, Calaveras, Sacramento and Solano) with a total land area of about 2,534 square miles. The Stockton main campus is a comprehensive instructional campus with an administrative function. This campus offers all academic subjects necessary for students to obtain their certificate and associate degrees completion. A 140 acre parcel north of Lodi was purchased in 2006 for the purpose of expansion for future growth potential.

In 2004, voters passed Measure L, a \$250 million general obligation bond measure, for the District. The main campus has five multi-story classroom and office buildings, a large lecture room and office buildings, three performing art theatres, and an array of impressive athletic complex facilities.

The College has undertaken and embraces the Facility Master Plan (FMP) through a shared governance approach. This plan, which was developed in 2005, has set the stage for five, ten, and fifteen-year development plans for the physical plant. This FMP has been updated in October 2010 after the EMP was adopted. The College utilized a shared governance approach and the Facility Planning Committee (FPC) and councils that review and make recommendations for projects that navigate through the process to obtain approval for funding and implementation. The membership composition of these committees and councils represent the diverse constituency groups represented on the campus.

The District evaluates the sufficiency of its classrooms, lecture halls, laboratories, offices and other facilities by utilizing data from the Facilities Utilization Space Inventory Option Net (FUSION). FUSION is a facility program offered and supported by the California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO).

A five-year construction plan is usually submitted to the CCCCCO which is used to calculate deferred maintenance funding and the adequacy of the District's facilities using various formulas.

The Self Evaluation Report details the development of the Educational Master Plan (EMP) that is linked to the FMP that provides safe and sufficient physical resources to support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery. (Standard III.B.1.)

Findings and Evidence:

The College maintains safety through the Safe Environment Action Team, as identified in the Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 3500. This team serves as an immediate support team to staff and students who encounter situations that may be potentially violent.

The District evaluates the safety of its facilities by monitoring the crime statistics for the Stockton campus and the off-site facilities. The District's Clery Act Report suggests that a very low level of crime occurs on campus. The District has also implemented the National Incident Management (NIMS) and Emergency Operational Center (EOC). This professional development and certification was provided by a consultant, Keenan Safe Colleges Training. (Standard III.B.1.b)

The departmental managers are responsible for evaluating and assessing department equipment needs. If the need can be fulfilled by utilizing the department budget, the normal procurement process is then followed with the District's Purchasing Department. The program review process allows departments the opportunity to request needed physical assets, equipment, furniture and other items. (Standard III.B.1.a)

Capital outlay funds are dispersed by the respective Assistant Superintendent/Vice Presidents (instructions and student services) for departmental need. This process is followed by a comprehensive review process involving the faculty, division deans, and departmental directors. The Self Evaluation Report indicates that the college plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support programs and services. (Standard III.B.1.a)

The FMP provides the basic strategy for the short and long-term schedule to modernize and construct new facilities to meet educational and service program needs. The District is addressing these needs by using bond funds. Measure L funds are leveraged with state matching funds. (Standard III.B.2.a)

Additional evidence suggests that several projects were recently completed such as the Goleman Library and Learning Resource Center, DeRicco Student Services Center, Science and Mathematics Building, Shima Equipment and Diesel expansion project, pathway (ADA Requirement) and restroom renovation.

The current Strategic Plan appears to be functioning well for the College. The SCJCCD Strategic Plan Progress Report of May 2013 is evidence that the College is assessing progress on plan implementation, and showing accountability in stating legitimate accomplishments. The Strategic Plan appropriately integrated parts of the Educational Master Plan of 2010 and the Facilities Master Plan. (Standard III.B.2)

The Planning & Budget Committee (PBC), which is a recommending body to the

President's Council, is scheduled to meet approximately twice a month. In the 2013 calendar year, the team found evidence that the committee met for approximately half of their scheduled meetings. In the 2014 year up to the time of the Team's visit, there was evidence that the PBC met once, on February 10, 2014. The Team learned that in practice, PBC does not create budget priorities from program review evidence to recommend to the Cabinet, but rather the Executive Leadership Team creates the priorities and presents them to PBC for review and recommendation to President's Cabinet. This process seems to work for the College, but it is different than what is outlined in the Integrated Planning, Budget & Program Review Model, 2012. Further, the actual responsibilities of the Planning & Budget Committee appear to be more passive (review and approve) than as stated in AP2430. It does not appear that the PBC prioritizes resource requests, but rather reviews priorities presented by the Executive Leadership Team. (Standard III.B.2.b)

While on campus, the team heard various versions about the opportunity for input into the shared governance decision making process. Some seemed content if not grateful for the executive team-driven decision making process, whereby the senior administration does the work to pull together information to present to shared governance committees to review and approve, which usually happens with consensus. Others expressed a desire to be given the opportunity for input into decisions prior to information being drafted and presented. The College identified an Actionable Improvement Plan in Standard I.B.1 of the Self-Evaluation Report that calls for an improvement of the shared governance decision making process, and the Team encourages these efforts.(Standard III.B.2.b)

Conclusion:

The team encourages the College to address the deferred maintenance needs (estimated to cost \$29 million) as Measure L Bond funding cannot be utilized for maintenance and operations and also to implement the Total Cost of Ownership for the newly built facilities through a comprehensive resource allocation planning process; otherwise, the College meets Standard III.B.

San Joaquin Delta College does not currently have a process of on-going, systematic program review. Program review processes are in place, but not implemented regularly throughout the College, and not all programs are held accountable for participating in the process. Without this key process in place and fully functional, the ability of the College to use sound information to inform integrated planning, resource allocation, and other important functions are hampered. Program review at San Joaquin Delta College does not currently meet the Standard.

Recommendation:

See Recommendation 1

Standard III Resources

C. Technology Resources

General Observations:

The College has provided the technology resources that support student learning programs and services, and to improve the institutional effectiveness. The College designed and built a new data center which was opened in 2011. This new center was built to house the District's programmers and technical support employees, and features the computer server capacity that allows the District to pursue data server hosting contracts with other outside agencies. The College currently provides data hosting to San Jose State University and the CalPASS Plus grant.

The College also designed a Technology Master Plan that has been in place since September 2011. The strategic plan implementation enabled the District to migrate Human Resources and Payroll MUNIS software to enhance home-grown software system (System 2000 – now re-named System 2020, scheduled for completion spring 2014).

Technology services and infrastructure permeate throughout the institution. Every classroom and work area at the college has access to a powerful and sophisticated high speed data network. The new buildings recently completed have network enabled security and HVAC systems.

Etudes and a variety of publisher e-platforms are integrated and supported for teaching and learning. Technological planning is integrated with institutional planning through program review, the work of governance committees including the President's Council, and institutional grants. Computer labs across the campus and center are stocked with up-to-date computers for student learning use. One key achievement in recent years has been the implementation of Kauli Finance software for college use. Kauli is an open-source solution that the college programmers contributed via programming development and testing. The College was the first community college in the country to implement the Kauli Finance and one of the pioneers in the implementation, along with major universities such as USC, Indiana University, Cornell, Colorado State and University of British Columbia.

The College uses Zimbra as its e-mail platform which contains a meeting calendar function that is used widely by District employees. One challenge that faces the College is maintaining new and active accounts for faculty and staff as they get hired or separate from the District. The implication of this flaw is that while some new faculty have no e-mail accounts other retired faculty are still on the network. However, the College maintains that

any technology support it provides is designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, college-wide communication, research and operational systems. (Standard III.C.1)

Findings and Evidence:

The College Technology Master Plan (TMP) has been instituted from 2011-2014. Some college projects, such as System 2000 and the updated 2020, have been developed in-house. In 2013, the administration contracted with the College Brain Trust to review the operational aspect of its IT department. The recommendations from the study suggested the need to strengthen the leadership in the department by back-filling the vacant management positions, “training-up” current leadership, and updating and monitoring a more comprehensive technology plan. As a result of these findings, two mid-level management positions were proposed and vetted through the appropriate shared governance committees and evidence shows that the positions were approved by the Board of Trustees on October 15, 2013.

The College has not pursued “green technologies” despite its successes in computer applications for teaching and management uses of software applications. Technology sustainability such as solar is needed to defray from the cost of energy for the HVAC systems.

The college technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution. (Standard III.C.1.a)

Students enrolling in the College are using information technology from the very first interaction with the institution. Information on how to register for classes is published in the college catalog and is readily available to students on the District’s website.

Evidence suggests that the Record and Admission webpage supports students with computer provided in an e-services lab located in the DeRicco Student Services Building for assistance with registration for classes.

The College also offers a series of web-based applications such as: DocuShare, Zimbra email and Calendar, Kauli Financial, Cognos Reports, Turnitin.com, teaching on-line with Etudes, Refresher workshops for faculty who teach on-line, iTunes U, Google Drive, You Tube, and Online ordering of supplies. (Standard III.C.1.b)

A recent climate survey on student satisfaction indicated that about 70 percent of the students polled said they were satisfied with the access to computers and computer labs provided by the College. The presumption here is that a higher level of dissatisfaction would occur if the college did not provide adequate training and support for the students. (Standard III.C.1.b)

The IT department works closely with technology implementers and end-users around the District to make certain that technology is implemented and maintained. Additionally, there are technically-minded employees in departments throughout the institution who collaborate with IT staff. Such individuals include the Career Technical Education and Workforce

Development dean, researcher in the PRIE office, faculty and staff who are “power users” of technology. (Standards III.B.1.c,d)

The College systematically assesses the effectiveness of technology resources through the program review process. In that process, faculty takes the opportunity to document a technological vision for their courses and programs, and program review recommendations that can be made related to technology resources. (Standard III.C.2)

Conclusion:

The College has adopted a Technology Master Plan (TMP) and a series of web applications that supports teaching and learning. This TMP (2011-2014) needs to be more comprehensive according to an independent consultant – Brain Trust Group. The need for mid-level managers to plan and direct the activities of the IT department is a sine qua non.

The College’s technology planning and utilization by the stake holders through the shared governance process is well documented in the Self Evaluation Report. Student accessibility and support is also evident by the climate satisfaction survey.

Recommendation:

See Recommendation 1

Standard III Resources

D. Financial Resources

General Observations:

The College is in a stable financial position despite the recent cuts in the State of California Community College work load which adversely impacted the revenue stream of the college. The stable financial position can be attributed to two major factors; a planning and budget model that addresses both short and long-term goals, and the utilization of sound fiscal practices.

As the State of California economy improves and more funding is available, the college program restorations should be carefully and deliberately aligned to complete strategic operational plans for both one-time and ongoing needs of the departments.

Findings and Evidence:

The College has a three-year budget planning model and FTES planning model that take into account its financial limitations. This budget planning is integrated to EMP and FMP. The budget development process is done through a collaborative process beginning from the faculty level during program review and the District has six guiding principles that deal with the realities of today's economy and require that the outcome be sustainable. The action plan of the College is centered on the development and the implementation of effective strategies and appropriate policies and procedures to ensure adequate funding and effective planning support of the institution's fundamental mission and goals. (Standard III.D.1)

The budget assumptions and strategic goals are also aligned with the college mission, Educational Master Plan (EMP), and Facilities Master Plan (FMP). The College has been proactive in establishing sound principles to ensure that finances are managed with integrity and stability. This is evidenced by the fact that reserves which would normally be required at 5 percent of a college annual budget are averaging between 15.9 to 12.6 percent during the last four fiscal years for this college. (Standards III.D.1.a-b)

The budget is developed and managed according to Board Policy 6200 and Administrative Procedure 6300, Fiscal Management. The budget is planned to have a rolling three-year cycle with adjustment as necessary contingent upon the State Governor's budget proposal that is adopted and any revisions. The success of the three-year rolling budget cycle is contingent upon having an effective enrollment management model and efficient faculty productivity. The model addresses both short and long-term goals. (Standards III.D.1c-d, III.D.2.c-e)

The College's financial management processes are evaluated through an independent audit. The audit result is published on the District's website, with electronic copies sent to ACCJC and the State Chancellor's Office. The College adheres to the State Contracted Audit Manual (CDAM). The audit deals with financial compliance issues such as internal controls, state and federal compliance, and material weaknesses. Recommendations are addressed to strengthen the financial position of the District. The College's recent audit was unqualified. (Standards III.D.2.a-b, III.D.3.h)

The College liquidity position has also been stable due to the utilization for a number of years of Revenue Anticipated Notes (TRANS) through the CCLC program to provide needed cash flow due to the state's deferral of apportionment payments. In addition, the College has passed an annual resolution allowing for internal borrowing as allowed under Education Code (section 42603), to plan for short-term cash shortages. (Standard III.D.3.a)

The College is self-insured for workers' compensation and liability claims are at a coverage limit of up to \$500,000 per claim of workers' compensation and up to \$150,000 per claim for property and liability claims.

The College has established a sound plan based on actuarial studies, which are maintained in the Self-Insurance Fund. The current reserve is in excess of a minimum level identified by actuarial reports and nearing 70 percent confidence level.

District liabilities include OPEB (other post-employee benefits) for the retirees. The College hired Total Compensation Systems to undertake an actuarial report in 2012 and this plan was approved by the Board of Trustees. The college funding plan began with a sizable \$4.7 million allocation for prior years and calls for increased contribution each year until 2025 when a balance of \$21.1 million will allow the college to cap annual OPEB expenditures allocation at \$7.2 million per year. (Standards III.D.3.c-d, III.D.3.e)

In 2004, the District passed General Obligation Bond Measure L for \$250 million. The District has outstanding general obligation bond debt. Every twelve to eighteen months, the District undergoes a bond surveillance rating review with one of the three major rating agencies – Fitch, Standard and Poor's, or Moody's. Fitch and Standard and Poor's rated the District's General Obligation Bond (Measure L) with affirmative outlook (Fitch AA, and Standard and Poor's A+).

Standard contractual agreements are consistent with the goals of the college and monitored through board approvals and external audits. However, the agreement between the college and the Delta College Foundation is problematic. The foundation is a non-profit auxiliary organization designed to give scholarships and assist to advance student learning and success in educational institutions. The sources of funding are usually through private donations, alumni associations, golf tournaments, dinners and other fundraising activities. The "Flea Market" was an activity used by the Associated Student Body Government as a fundraiser. Turning the District's asset over to the Foundation impacts the integrity of the original intended purpose. (Standards III.D.2.d, III.D.3.b, III.D.3.g, III.D.3.h)

The Delta College Foundation was formally registered with the California Secretary of California on November 5th, 2003. The Foundation went into hiatus thereafter and was reconstituted on December 13th, 2011. The College was engaged in a program called “Passport to College”. The program was originally targeted 10,000 5th Graders free college tuition at SJDCCD upon completion of high school. The college purports that they expect 1,250 students will qualify for the program.

The District loaned the sum of \$2,250,000 to the Foundation with the intent that these monies would be paid back based on the interest rate equivalent to what this fund would yield in the County Treasurer’s Office. On March 12, 2013, an addendum was added to the original Master Agreement that formally assigned the operations and management of the District’s “Flea Market” to the Foundation as a source of revenue generation to repay the loan for the Passport to College promise. A schedule for repayment was developed to run from June 30th, 2013 through June 30th, 2023.

The current Strategic Plan appears to be functioning well for the College. The SCJCCD Strategic Plan Progress Report of May 2013 is evidence that the College is assessing progress on plan implementation, and showing accountability in stating legitimate accomplishments. The Strategic Plan appropriately integrated parts of the Educational Master Plan of 2010 and the Facilities Master Plan. (Standard I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, III.D.4)

The Planning & Budget Committee (PBC), which is a recommending body to the President’s Council, is scheduled to meet approximately twice a month. In the 2013 calendar year, the team found evidence that the committee met for approximately half of their scheduled meetings.

As of March 10, 2014 there was evidence that the PBC met once, on February 10, 2014. The Team learned that in practice the PBC does not create budget priorities from program review evidence to recommend to the Cabinet, but rather the Executive Leadership Team creates the priorities and presents them to PBC for review and recommendation to President’s Cabinet. This process seems to work for the College, but it is different than what is outlined in the Integrated Planning, Budget & Program Review Model, 2012. Further, the actual responsibilities of the Planning & Budget Committee appear to be more passive (review and approve) than as stated in AP2430. It does not appear that the BPC prioritizes resource requests, but rather reviews priorities presented by the Executive Leadership Team. (Standards I.B.4., III.D.4)

While on campus, the team heard various versions about the opportunity for input into the shared governance decision making process. Some seemed content if not grateful for the executive team-driven decision making process, whereby the senior administration does the work to pull together information to present to shared governance committees to review and approve, which usually happens with consensus. Others expressed a desire to be given the opportunity for input into decisions prior to information being drafted and presented. The College identified an Actionable Improvement Plan in Standard I.B.1 of the Self-Evaluation Report that calls for an improvement of the shared governance decision making process, and the Team encourages these efforts.

The Administrative Services program review process includes all programs that organizationally fall under the Vice President of Administrative Services. All such programs underwent review in 2010-2011, and all were evaluated. The process has not happened again since, and there is no clear schedule for on-going administrative program review. There was no evidence that the Administrative Services Program Review Committee had met to date in the 2013-2014 academic year. (Standard 1.B.3, III.D.4)

There are some programs and services that fall outside instructional, student services, and administrative program review processes. As this process is organized by Vice Presidential area of responsibility, programs that may report to the President do not have a program review process, nor do non-instructional programs and services within the Instructional area (academic lab, Foster Youth program, MESA, etc.). In addition, it was unclear whether some student services programs should conduct a program review, or whether they might be included in other broader program reviews. (PUENTE, AFFIRM, Outreach, etc.)

The Mini-Program Review Strategic Resource Requests process, about to begin its second annual cycle at the time of the Team's visit, appears to be a sound practice that allows the college timely access to resource requests that can be addressed within the annual budget process. The fact that the process asks Divisions and Departments to link their requests to strategic and presidential goals, and asks for reflection on efficiencies, strengthens this annual process. However, it is important to note that this annual process cannot substitute for Program Review. (Standard III.D.4)

Conclusion:

The College financials are currently stable with healthy reserves and it is able to meet its short-term obligations. The budget development process through the shared governance process is effective. The accounting documentation of assets and liabilities is in accordance with the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), the audit reviews from the independent auditor shows that the District obtained an unqualified opinion.

The Team learned that in practice the Planning and Budget Committee does not create budget priorities from program review evidence to recommend to the Cabinet, but rather the Executive Leadership Team creates the priorities and presents them to PBC for review and recommendation to President's Cabinet.

This process seems to work for the College, but it is different than what is outlined in the Integrated Planning, Budget & Program Review Model, 2012. Further, the actual responsibilities of the Planning & Budget Committee appear to be more passive (review and approve) than as stated in AP2430. It does not appear that the BPC prioritizes resource requests, but rather reviews priorities presented by the Executive Leadership Team.

The team learned that the college developed a plan for its OPEB (other post-employee benefits) liabilities for the retirees. The College hired Total Compensation Systems to undertake an actuarial study and report in 2012 and this plan was approved by the Board of Trustees.

This plan began with a sizable \$4.7 million allocation for prior years and calls for increased contribution each year until 2025 when a balance of \$21.1 million will allow the college to cap annual OPEB expenditures allocation at \$7.2 million per year. However, it is unclear how the college will provide the revenue streams to support the servicing of this obligation while addressing its operational and instructional needs. (Standard III.D.3.c)

Recommendation:

See Recommendation 1

Standard IV Leadership and Governance

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations: The overall quality of leadership and governance is good, with processes in existence that ensure appropriate perspectives can be involved in college governance. However among faculty and staff there are varying perspectives, and the college appears to be at a crossroads in terms of sustaining appropriate participation in governance by all campus constituencies. There have been concerns about administrative turnover in the last few years, and there is concern about the decision-making processes and evidence-driven dialogue.

Findings and Evidence:

The College revised the mission statement twice since the previous comprehensive visit, the last time being spring 2013. Evidence reviewed supports that this process is completed on a 3-year cycle. Documentation from the College catalog, student handbook, and Board Policy and Procedures reflect the College values ethical and effective leadership, and holds employees, students, and the Board of Trustees to a code of ethics and standards of good practice. (Standard IV.A)

Evidence supports, and survey results validate, the College's expectation of employees' behavior to reflect that of the Mission and Vision. The effort of the various employee groups is evidence that college governance is transparent and participatory. All employees are given access to professional development through the Staff Development Center. Employees reported out at general forums their opportunities for input during good and hard fiscal times, and being part of the solution. (Standard IV.A.1)

The institution has various Board Policies (BP2500, 2505, 2510) that outline how the various employee Senates and students will be recognized in the governance process. The Governance Committee Structure (AP 2430) and the Basic Principles in Policy Making (BP2600) define the basic principles that govern participation in policy making. (Standards IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a)

The Planning & Budget Committee (PBC), which is a recommending body to the President's Council, is scheduled to meet approximately twice a month. In the 2013 calendar year, the team found evidence that the committee met for approximately half of their scheduled meetings. As of March 10, 2014 there was evidence that the PBC met once, on February 10, 2014.

The Team learned that in practice the PBC does not create budget priorities from program

review evidence to recommend to the Cabinet, but rather the Executive Leadership Team creates the priorities and presents them to PBC for review and recommendation to President's Cabinet. This process seems to work for the College, but it is different than what is outlined in the Integrated Planning, Budget & Program Review Model, 2012. Further, the actual responsibilities of the Planning & Budget Committee appear to be more passive (review and approve) than as stated in AP2430. It does not appear that the BPC prioritizes resource requests, but rather reviews priorities presented by the Executive Leadership Team. (Standards I.B.4., III.D.4, IV.A)

While on campus, the team heard various versions about the opportunity for input into the shared governance decision making process. Some seemed content if not grateful for the executive team-driven decision making process, whereby the senior administration does the work to pull together information to present to shared governance committees to review and approve, which usually happens with consensus. Others expressed a desire to be given the opportunity for input into decisions prior to information being drafted and presented. The College identified an Actionable Improvement Plan in Standard I.B.1 of the Self-Evaluation Report that calls for an improvement of the shared governance decision making process, and the Team encourages these efforts. (Standards IV.A.2a-b, IV.A.3, IV.A.5)

The Administrative Services program review process includes all programs that organizationally fall under the Vice President of Administrative Services. All such programs underwent review in 2010-2011, and all were evaluated. The process has not happened again since, and there is no clear schedule for on-going administrative program review. There was no evidence that the Administrative Services Program Review Committee had met to date in the 2013-2014 academic year. (Standards IV.A)

There are some programs and services that fall outside instructional, student services, and administrative program review processes. As this process is organized by Vice Presidential area of responsibility, programs that may report to the President do not have a program review process, nor do non-instructional programs and services within the Instructional area (academic lab, Foster Youth program, MESA, etc.). In addition, it was unclear whether some student services programs should conduct a program review, or whether they might be included in other broader program reviews. (PUENTE, AFFIRM, Outreach, etc.)

The Mini-Program Review Strategic Resource Requests process, about to begin its second annual cycle at the time of the Team's visit, appears to be a sound practice that allows the college timely access to resource requests that can be addressed within the annual budget process. The fact that the process asks Divisions and Departments to link their requests to strategic and presidential goals, and asks for reflection on efficiencies, strengthens this annual process. However, it is important to note that this annual process cannot substitute for Program Review. (Standard IV.A)

The Curriculum Committee is the primary committee charged with student and program learning outcomes, and is acknowledged by the Board of Trustees. The Academic Senate is primarily relied upon through arriving at mutual agreement between the Board and the

Academic Senate in matters pertaining to academic and professional issues of relevance to faculty. (Standard IV.A.2.b)

Evidence reflects cooperation with ACCJC and visiting teams over the past six years. It is such dedicated hard work that moved the College off sanctions. (Standard IV.A.4)

Even though there is documentation demonstrating the College has governance and decision making structures in place, clearly the College has recently revised the processes so much that what was documented is outdated. At this time, the College is moving into round two of its planning process which drives decisions and aligns with the budget allocation model. The latest iteration of the process is still in need of being evaluated for effectiveness. (Standard IV.A.5)

Conclusions:

The President has done an incredible job in leading the College through the much needed changes in regards to planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting, and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness. Her efforts are noteworthy and with continued persistence will arrive at the desired level of sustainable continuous quality improvement.

While on campus, the team heard various versions about the opportunity for input into the shared governance decision making process. Some seemed content if not grateful for the executive team-driven decision making process, whereby the senior administration does the work to pull together information to present to shared governance committees to review and approve, which usually happens with consensus. Others expressed a desire to be given the opportunity for input into decisions prior to information being drafted and presented. The College identified an Actionable Improvement Plan in Standard I.B.1 of the Self-Evaluation Report that calls for an improvement of the shared governance decision making process, and the Team encourages these efforts.

The Team learned that in practice the Planning and Budget Committee does not create budget priorities from program review evidence to recommend to the Cabinet, but rather the Executive Leadership Team creates the priorities and presents them to PBC for review and recommendation to President's Cabinet. This process seems to work for the College, but it is different than what is outlined in the Integrated Planning, Budget & Program Review Model, 2012.

Recommendations:

None

Standard IV Leadership and Governance

B. Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations:

Through an interview process, attendance of meetings, and the review of the Board Policy, Chapter 2 shows there is evidence of defined duties and responsibilities of the Board, as well as the delineation between the responsibilities and authority of the Board and the Superintendent/President. Also in this chapter, there are policies and procedures for evaluating the President, and the Board has implemented and is in the process of adopting the process outlined in the ACCT President Search Committee Handbook, 2010.

Findings and Evidence:

The Board does follow the procedure for evaluating the President. The Board of Trustees has the appropriate Board Policies and Procedures adopted that address its legal authority, the adopting, revising, or deletion of policies and/or procedures, a code of ethics, and standards of good practice. This said, evidence supports that Board members need to increase awareness of their own responsibility to self-govern so that conflicts of interest are avoided as is questionable unethical behavior.

The Board is elected “at-large” rather than to represent a specific Trustee Area. It does so to drive home the point that the Board is to ‘act as one’ in the best interest of the students and the entire area that the institution serves. The make-up of the Board is very diverse in both gender and ethnicity. (Standards IV.B, IV.B.1, IV.B.1.a, IV.B.1.b)

The Board acts independently with integrity on fiscal matters and its actions reflect that each member takes his/her roles seriously regarding maintaining educational quality, seeking counsel on legal matters, and keeping the College fiscally sound. The Board By-laws and adopted policies that specify the elements of the composition of the Board, along with its duties and responsibilities is available online and accessible to the public. (Standards IV.B.1.c, IV. B.1.d)

Designated in the Board Policy and Procedures, there is a regular and systematic process for on-going review of Board Policies and Procedures, and evidence supports that it is being followed. (Standard IV.B.1.e)

The Board of Trustees undergoes orientations and various trainings throughout the year that is provided by the California League for Community Colleges and by the national

organization, ACCT. The Board also brings in facilitators for offsite trainings as the need arises. A more recent facilitator that was brought in assisted in the interpretation of the Board and President's evaluation. (Standards IV.B.1.f, IV.B.1.g)

The Board has an adopted Code of Ethics which defines behavioral expectations. It is viewed as a safe process for the President to communicate to the President of the Board in order for any identified issue to be addressed. While this is currently adopted, evidence supports that it has not always previously been enforced as needed. (Standard IV.B.1.h)

It is clear that the Board of Trustees was kept apprised of the accreditation Self Evaluation process as well as previous reports i.e., Mid-Term Reports and Follow-Up Reports from prior visits; that is evidenced through minutes from meetings. The Board participates in professional development activities that focus on policies and procedures and that set expectations of the Board through the accreditation standards. The Board also has attended sessions through CCLC and ACCT that focus on accreditation standards, and were invited to participate in college-wide summits that focused on the Self Evaluation process used at the College. In regards to this specific Self Evaluation, four Board members read and provided comments back to the President and ALO. (Standard IV.B.1.i)

The Board of Trustees has adopted the process outlined in, "ACCT President Search Committee Handbook, 2010" to recruit and hire the Chief Executive Officer. These processes were established during the initial phase of hiring the recent Superintendent/President; however, the search was averted when the Board made the decision to offer the job to the current President who was filling the role in an interim capacity. It has been suggested that the Board formally adopt the process as their own Administrative Procedure in the near future.

The delegated role to the President is codified in Board Policy and is made clear. The evaluation process of the President is comprehensive and covers the appropriate breadth and depth expected for such a position. Board agendas and minutes support that work-study presentations are provided to the Board at key periods on topics of institutional performance that highlight educational quality, and provide comprehensive information on the status of fiscal integrity. Legal matters are presented in closed sessions. (Standard IV.B.1.j)

The President has demonstrated the ability to effectively lead the college in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness. Due to significant turnover and lack of leadership at various levels in the organization, the work to refocus, reinvent, and reengineer the various planning and decision making processes has been shouldered by a small number of staff, including the President.

The President's abilities and leadership are evidenced by the revised planning process that was implemented during the last academic year. The revised process required all programs to complete a "mini program review" in an effort to close the gaps in completion of the full Program Review cycle. Through this process, the reviews were used to drive the budget development process and to develop the schedule for all comprehensive program reviews. These "mini reviews" identified and justified various resource needs including; staffing,

facilities, equipment replacement, and technology. It informed the process of creating a strategic staffing plan for the college, which was needed due to the previous cuts in personnel necessitated by the economic downturn. Lastly, the Strategic Plan, which includes the revision of the mission and vision for the College, was reviewed and revised, and a three-year cycle was established. Leading the College through repairing these various elements necessary for institutional effectiveness took enormous tenacity and energy by the College President. However, ACCJC's expectation is that these processes are at a level of proficiency, if not at sustainable continuous quality improvement. The College must institutionalize these efforts in an ongoing cycle that includes the assessment of both the process and the outcomes. (Standards IV.B.2, IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.b)

Evidence supports the President utilizes the chain of command and committee structures to communicate changes in statutes, regulations, and governing board policies. (Standard IV.B.2.c)

The College is vigilant with the new money available due to the passage of Proposition 30. The President, in consultation of the College Controller, a financial consultant, and the Fiscal Services staff, stays conservative with their fiscal philosophy to keep the institution solvent. A three-year budget and expenditure model has been implemented that accommodates enrollment growth, addresses the needs of instruction and student services, reinvigorates the District's Foundation and has found a means to begin building funds to address Other Post Employment Benefit liabilities (OPEB), in addition to addressing scheduled maintenance needs. (Standard IV.B.2.d)

The President is found to be very engaged with feeder high school districts and the various communities the College serves. She reaches out to retirees of the District as well as to local agencies and service clubs. She is personally involved in various Councils, Chamber of Commerce organizations in the various communities, and the Workforce Investment Board. She serves on various Boards of Directors related to the arts and was recently selected and received the Greater Stockton Chamber's Athena Award. (Standard IV.B.2.e)

Conclusions:

The College has clearly established its Board Policy and Procedures to provide the guidance for an established governance structure that includes all employee groups and students. Processes are established for the College to implement the review or establishment of new policies or procedures.

The role of the Board and evaluation thereof is taking place appropriately, as is that of the College's President. While there is a Code of Ethics and Standards for Good Behavior adopted, there is evidence that some Board Members have trouble applying these to themselves and/or holding their fellow board members accountable. Members of the team witnessed this during a regularly scheduled board meeting. Members of the team also discussed this with the board chairman that indicated he preferred to meet individually with Trustees that are outside of the Code of Ethics and Standards for Good Behavior.

In addition, the self-study specifically stated that “Occasionally, an individual trustee may attempt to interfere in College business or with the responsibility or authority of the superintendent/president, but usually other trustees or the superintendent/president/him herself can provide correction. If the problem becomes persistent, the Board president and executive officers can and should invoke the Code of Ethics.” The team found that the board is having difficulty applying the standards within the Code of Ethics.

Recommendations:

None