

**FOCUSED MIDTERM REPORT
TO THE
ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY
AND JUNIOR COLLEGES**

By

Cuyamaca College
900 Rancho San Diego Parkway
El Cajon, CA 92019

October 15, 2010

CUYAMACA COLLEGE
FOCUSED MIDTERM REPORT FOR OCTOBER 15, 2010
STATEMENT OF MIDTERM REPORT PREPARATION

In January 2008, Cuyamaca College received four recommendations from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) based upon the college's self-study and the October 2007 site visit.

A follow-up report addressing Recommendations 1, 4, 5, and 6, was submitted to the Commission in October, 2009. In January 2010, the Commission notified the college that it had accepted the report, eliminated the requirement for the college to respond to 2001 Team Recommendation 4, and requested a focused midterm report with emphasis on Recommendation 1 and Recommendation 5.

Preparations for the Midterm Report were initiated in September 2009 by reconvening the Accreditation Steering Committee. The committee was co-chaired by the Academic Senate President and the Vice President of Instruction/ALO, and composed of representatives of classified, faculty, and administration, instruction, student services and administrative services. Steering Committee members devised teams and ensured that all segments of the midterm report were addressed.

Draft documents developed by the teams were reviewed by the Steering Committee, posted on the college intranet for constituent group review and input, and circulated through collegial consultation committees and councils: Academic Senate, Classified Senate, President's Cabinet, Administrative Council, Innovation and Planning Council, and District Executive Council.

The Focused Midterm Report was developed, reviewed and endorsed by the college's governance leadership, as the following signatures attest. This Midterm Report was reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees, Grossmont Cuyamaca Community College District, on September 14, 2010.

SHARED GOVERNANCE APPROVAL:

Robert Garber,
President (Interim)

Robin Steinback, Ph.D.,
Vice President, Instruction/ALO

Michael Wangler,
President, Academic Senate

Maggie Gonzales,
Vice President, Classified Senate

Jacqueline Luis,
President, Associated Students

DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVES:

Cindy Miles, Ph.D.,
Chancellor

Bill Garrett,
President, Board of Trustees

The Focused Midterm Report Steering Committee

Michael Wangler	Co-Chair, President Academic Senate, Professor of Geography
Tim O'Hare	Co-Chair, Vice President Instruction/ Accreditation Liaison Officer
Joseph Marron	Vice President, Student Development & Services
Arleen Satele	Vice President, Administrative Services
Henri Migala	Executive Dean, Institutional Advancement
Teresa McNeil	Articulation Officer, Counselor
Angela Nesta	Librarian
Maggie Gonzales	Vice President of Classified Senate, Student Services Specialist
Debi Miller	Project Assistant and Recorder

Additional participants in preparation of the Focused Midterm Report:

Student Learning Outcomes & Assessment Committee

Curriculum, General Education, Academic Policies & Procedures Committee

Basic Skills Committee

Instructional Technology Council

Student Services Advisory Council

Instructional Council

Administrative Council

Innovation & Planning Council

Table of Contents

Statement of Midterm Report Preparation.....iii

Accreditation Steering Committee Membership.....iv

2007 TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: Student Learning Outcomes..... 1

Recommendation 2: Program Review..... 4

Recommendation 3: Resources..... 7

Recommendation 4: Communication..... 9

Recommendation 5: Dialogue..... 12

Recommendation 6: Leadership and Governance..... 16

INSTITUTIONAL OVERARCHING PLANNING AGENDAS

RESOURCES.....19-22

Faculty Resources.....19

Technology Resources.....20

Support Service Resources.....21

Staffing Resources.....22

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES.....22-24

STANDARD-SPECIFIC PLANNING AGENDA ITEMS (Organized by Accreditation Standard)

STANDARD I: MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS

Planning Agenda #1.....25-27

Planning Agenda #2.....28

Planning Agenda #3.....30

STANDARD II: STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Planning Agenda #4.....31

Planning Agenda #5.....32

STANDARD III: RESOURCES

Planning Agenda #6.....33

STANDARD IV: LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

Planning Agenda #7.....34

Planning Agenda #8.....35

EVIDENCE ARRANGED BY SECTIONS.....E1-E8

2007 Team Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Student Learning Outcomes

The team recommends that the college complete the process of identifying Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees, identify SLOs for student services and other areas of the college, and develop and implement methods for assessing student achievement of those outcomes. The assessment results should be used to guide improvement. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.7, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.f, II.A.3.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.c, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.1.c)

Status: Cuyamaca College has achieved the Development level on the ACCJC SLO Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, and is currently working towards the Proficiency level. The college has established an institutional framework for defining SLOs for all courses, programs, certificates, and degrees, including SLOs for general education, basic skills, transfer, career technical education, student services, and library & learning resources.

Response: The college launched its SLO Initiative in 2003-04 with the Academic Senate's adoption of two resolutions regarding the integration of measurable student learning outcomes into Curriculum and Student Services ([Academic Senate Minutes Dec 4 2003/ Academic Senate Minutes Mar 11 2004](#)). The Academic Senate later adopted SLO implementation processes developed by the Curriculum and Program Review Committees ([Academic Senate Minutes May 13 2004](#)). In fall 2004, the faculty began the process of writing SLOs and accompanying assessment methodologies into all course outlines.

To aid faculty with this initiative, the college developed an Instructional Faculty Handbook that includes a description of the SLO approval process and technical criteria requirements, instructions for incorporating SLOs into the curriculum, and before and after examples of course outlines with SLOs. This handbook was updated in 2006, and remains an important reference guide for the college's ongoing commitment to review and update course level SLOs as part of the regular curriculum cycle ([SLO Handbook](#)).

The Curriculum Committee established a Student Learning Outcomes Technical Review (sub)Committee (SLOTRC) to review SLO submissions and make recommendations to the Curriculum Committee regarding SLOs and accompanying assessment methodologies written into all course outlines ([Curriculum Committee Minutes September 6 2005](#)). As of fall 2010, the college has written SLOs and accompanying assessment methodologies into the official course outline of record for 77% of all courses ([SLO Assessment Wiki: Progress Report](#)). The Curriculum Committee continues to review SLO submissions for new courses and modifications to existing courses.

In 2005, faculty began to write program level SLOs for their disciplines, including all certificate and degree programs offered through their departments. The Instructional Program Review Committee was charged with monitoring the development and assessment of program level SLOs, and revised their reporting requirements to include a departmental/discipline-level review as well as a committee-level review of SLO progress every 5 years ([Instructional Program Review Charge \(p.53\)/ Instructional Program Review Template](#). Login is required). As of fall

2010, the college has written program level SLOs for 65% of all instructional programs/disciplines ([SLO Assessment Wiki: Progress Report](#)).

With the launch of the assessment phase of the SLO Initiative, the college established a 1-year faculty SLO Coordinator position in fall 2007 at 40% reassigned time ([IPC Minutes Oct 9 2007](#)). In spring 2008, the SLO Coordinator position was extended through fall 2010 ([IPC Minutes April 7 2008](#)). The SLO Coordinator serves as a resource for faculty in writing and implementing their SLO Assessment Plans. The SLO Coordinator serves as the co-chair of the college's Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (SLOAC), which is charged with the coordination of all SLO assessment activities at the college, including the assessment of all course, program, and institutional SLOs ([SLOAC Charge](#) (p. 63)).

The college has a well-established planning culture that links planning to budget. SLO Planning & Assessment has been integrated into the institutional planning processes at both the program review and master planning levels. The Program Review Process is used to analyze department goals, objectives, and outcomes through the lens of long-term planning and institutional effectiveness. The Master Planning Process informs short-range planning and budgetary decisions on an annual basis.

In 2009, the college's Student Services Division finalized its assessment plans, including the development of SLOs, identification of assessment methodologies, establishment of goals and criteria for assessment activities, and a planning mechanism for closing the loop and using assessment results to improve student learning ([2009-10 Student Services Master Plan](#)). These assessment plans and resulting outcomes will be used to inform both the Student Services Program Review (5-year cycle) and Student Services Master Planning (annual cycle) processes.

To facilitate the incorporation of SLO assessment outcomes into divisional & departmental planning cycles, the Student Services Program Review Committee has added reporting requirements specific to SLO assessment outcomes, and the Student Services Master Plan Committee has added SLO specific criteria to their evaluation process for prioritizing department needs ([Student Services Program Review Template](#) see p.18 / [Student Services Master Plan Template](#)). As of spring 2010, Student Services departments have initiated their first assessment cycles and have incorporated the results into the Student Services Master Planning process ([SLO Pilot Results](#)). This process prioritizes department activities for the following year and includes funding priorities. Ongoing assessment activities will continue with refinement of SLOs and accompanying assessment methodologies occurring as needed based on analysis of prior year results.

In 2008-09, the college's instructional division also established a process for departments to develop SLO Assessment Plans that link program and course level SLOs, and include the same elements as the Student Services process of identifying assessment methodologies, establishing goals and criteria for assessment activities, and developing plans for closing the loop and using assessment results to improve student learning ([AMP SLO Assessment Plan Template Fall 2009 form](#)). This process has recently been revised to include the development of one-year SLO implementation plans to inform short-range planning and budgetary decisions on an annual basis

(*SLO Assessment Wiki: [SLOAC Processes & Procedures/ SLOAC Criteria for Reviewing One-Year Plans](#)*).

As with Student Services, the instructional assessment plans and resulting outcomes will be used to inform both the Instructional Program Review (5-year cycle) and Academic Master Planning (annual cycle) Processes. To facilitate the incorporation of SLO assessment outcomes into divisional & departmental planning cycles, the Instructional Program Review Committee has added reporting requirements specific to SLO assessment outcomes, and the Academic Master Plan Committee has added SLO specific criteria to their evaluation process for prioritizing department needs (*[Instructional Program Review Template](#)*, Login is required/ *[Academic Master Plan Template](#)*). As of fall 2010, 27% of all academic departments have completed their one-year SLO Implementation Plans and assessment activities have commenced for the 2010-11 Academic Year (*[SLO Assessment Wiki: Progress Report](#)*).

In 2009, the college began the process of developing its college-level SLOs as well as its institutional-level outcomes. As indicated in the college's Institutional & College Level Outcomes diagram, the college mission statement informs the institutional-level outcomes (Instructional Services, Administrative Services, Student Services, and Institutional Advancement) which in turn support the college-wide SLOs—General Education, Transfer Degree, Learning Resources, Basic Skills, Career Technical Education, and Continuing Education (*[SLO Assessment Wiki: Institutional & College-Level Outcomes](#)*).

In fall 2009, the Basic Skills Committee developed college-wide Basic Skills SLOs, which were approved by the Academic Senate on February 11, 2010 (*[SLO Assessment Wiki: College-wide Basic Skills Outcomes](#)*). Additionally, detailed assessment plans were developed for the college's basic skills programs and services and ongoing assessment activities started in spring 2010 for the college's coordinated basic skills model (*[SLO Assessment Wiki: Math Basic Skills Detailed Assessment Plan](#)*). The college's General Education SLOs, originally established in 1998, were jointly reviewed and updated by the Curriculum Committee and Student Learning Outcomes & Assessment Committee, and will be sent to the Academic Senate for approval in fall 2010 (*[SLO Assessment Wiki: College-wide General Education Outcomes](#)*). The Career Technical Education SLOs were developed and approved by the Workforce Development Committee on May 17, 2010 and have been forwarded to the Academic Senate for approval in fall 2010 (*[SLO Assessment Wiki: College-wide Career Technical Education Outcomes](#)*). The remaining college and institutional-level outcomes will be completed in fall 2010 with assessment activities beginning in spring 2011.

Ongoing discussions continue between the President's Cabinet, the Innovation & Planning Council (college shared governance body), and the Student Learning Outcomes & Assessment Committee (SLOAC) to develop and implement processes and procedures which ensure linkages between all SLO and assessment levels. For example, during the 2009-10 academic year, the college developed a plan to more fully integrate and evaluate its coordinated basic skills model, and assessment activities began in spring 2010. The plan includes a well-defined set of college-wide basic-skills student learning outcomes; a.k.a. the Basic Skills SLO Grid, which map to outcomes at both the course-level (instruction) as well as the activities-level (student services) (*[SLO Assessment Wiki: College-wide Basic Skills Outcomes](#)*).

By mapping course-level and activity-level student learning outcomes to the Basic Skills SLO Grid, a chi-square gaps-analysis will be performed within and between each of the basic skills programs. Within each program, the gaps analysis will be used to determine which interventions are significantly more or less effective. At the institutional-level the gaps-analysis will be used to conduct a needs assessment between the basic skills programs. Additionally, the gaps-analysis at all levels will be used to inform the budget process.

In conclusion, significant progress has been made since the college's 2007 Self-Study in moving towards the Proficiency level on the ACCJC SLO Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness. The college expects to be at the Proficiency level and moving towards the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level by 2012, which will be reflected in the college's 2013 self study.

Recommendation 2: Program Review

The team recommends that the college complete the program review process for all student services and other areas of the college. The college should provide evidence that the program review process evaluates the achievement of student learning outcomes, along with other assessments that yield quantitative and qualitative data for analysis, and use the results of these evaluations as the basis of improvement. (Standards I.B, II.1.a, II.B.1, II.B.4)

Status: Cuyamaca college has completed the program review process for student services, instruction and the library. The program review process for each of these areas evaluates the achievement of student learning outcomes, and uses the results to improve the areas. The process for each area is detailed separately below.

Response:

Student Services Program Review

Student Services Program Review is on a five-year cycle at Cuyamaca College. Every year, the Student Services Program Review Committee conducts an in-depth review of 2-3 student services areas using standards developed by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). The program review process requires a thorough assessment of each area's Mission, Program, Leadership, Organization and Management, Human Resources, Financial Resources, Facilities, Technology and Equipment, Legal Responsibilities, Equity and Access, Campus and External Relations, Diversity, Ethics, and Assessment and Evaluation. Final reports and/or executive summaries going back to 1990 may be found on the student services program review website: www.cuyamaca.edu/ssprogramreview.

The program review process is completed every year just prior to the Student Services Master Plan. Thus, the 2-3 areas under review are able to include any needed improvements, changes, and activities into their subsequent master plan. A budget request accompanies staffing, supply and/or technology needs, hourly assistance, etc. Indeed, the planning and the budgeting for the ensuing year is built upon the outcomes of the program review process, and are included in the department plan the following year. This ensures a cycle of continuing evaluation, planning and improvement for each area.

The identification and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) have been integrated into the program review process for Student Services. The SLOs for each area are clearly identified in two places on the document: (1) Part 2, Program; and (2) a separate SLO Form ([Student Services Program Review Template](#) see p. 18/ [Student Services SLO Template](#)). The SLOs are directly related to the CAS Standards for the following Student Learning and Development Outcome Domains: *Intellectual Growth, Effective Communication, Enhanced Self-Esteem, Realistic Self-Appraisal, Clarified Values, Career Choices, Leadership Development, Healthy Behavior, Meaningful Interpersonal Relationships, Independence, Collaboration, Social Responsibility, Satisfying and Productive Lifestyles, Appreciating Diversity, Spiritual Awareness, and Personal and Educational Goals.*

Student Services areas select those domains that are deemed most appropriate. For example, Financial Aid chose to address *Intellectual Growth* in its 2008-2009 Program Review, and identified the following SLO, “Students who pass the Financial Aid and Academic Planning class will identify the two major components of Satisfactory Academic Progress to maintain Financial Aid eligibility.” The Financial Aid goal was for 75% of students to be capable of making this identification. At the end of the year, Financial Aid measured how many students achieved the goal. Based on the results, follow-up strategies were devised and a new goal was set ([2008-09 Student Services Program Review Report](#)).

In 2009-2010, all student services areas were charged with evaluating the achievement of at least one SLO. The district’s Research Office provided assistance to student services areas to pilot the assessment of the SLO. The results of the pilot to assess the SLO were submitted with each area’s department Master Plan for 2010-2011. [Results of each area’s pilot study](#) are published on the [student services program review website](#).

In light of the need to evaluate SLOs on an annual basis, it was decided by the Student Services Program Review Committee that a “mini-review” of each program would be beneficial. Beginning 2010-2011, each area will go through a mini-review that will be done on an annual basis except for the year that the area undergoes its in-depth review. The mini-review will ensure that each area evaluates the achievement of their SLOs on an annual basis and includes the results in their subsequent year’s Master Plan and accompanying budget request. Each area will therefore be in a position to make sound changes and better decisions because those decisions will be based on the most up-to-date data and information. This will lead to an enhanced cycle of evaluation, planning and improvement for each area.

There is an effort focused on strengthening the connection between the results of program review and that area’s subsequent Master Plan. A survey has been developed by Institutional Research to determine the extent of the relationship and to see if the program review process is useful in evaluating the effectiveness of a student services area. The survey was administered in Summer 2010, and recommendations will be instituted to improve both the instrument and the process ([Student Services Program Review Survey](#)).

Instructional Program Review

The purpose of Instructional Program Review is to generate a “big picture” view of the program to support planning and budget development. This process is data-driven and outcomes-based to ensure that the results are relevant for each program. It is a year-long process that includes statistical analysis, departmental and student feedback, report, and summary. Instructional Program Review is intended to contribute in a positive way toward the college goals, particularly "Academic Excellence," by having each program evaluate its successes in achieving its intended goals and outcomes. The Institutional Research Office assists the faculty members in the compilation of data and completion of their reports.

Instructional Program Review, which has received commendations in prior accreditation evaluations, is updated, modified, and enhanced on a regular basis. The Instructional Program Review report itself has been revised each year since 2005-2006 in response to the accreditation emphasis on Student Learning Outcomes and as the college refined its processes and procedures. Program-level SLOs are now required for each degree and Certificate of Achievement. Programs are now asked to provide their Program Outcomes in the process of program review. When a discipline does not have a degree or Certificate of Achievement, discipline-level SLOs are required, which may reflect primarily GE-related SLOs.

Beginning in 2008-09, each department was asked to report their program-level SLOs and include an Assessment Plan as part of the Instructional Program Review as well as part of the Academic Master Plan process. Departments are asked to indicate an anticipated completion of the SLO Assessment Plan. (The SLO Assessment Plan should be completed within a five-year cycle.) Departments are also asked to explain their progress in detail, including a description of assessment methodologies, an analysis of assessment results, and an account of the subsequent changes that were made to pedagogy to improve learning.

The college's website for the Instructional Program Review process is as follow:
<http://www.cuyamaca.edu/programreview06/>. Login is required. The website contains the report template, instructions to authors, the survey, and links to a number of resources. The website also contains the final reports from 2001-02 to 2008-09.

Learning Resources (Library) Program Review

The Cuyamaca College Library completed its first program review in 2006-2007. The Program Review Committee's report and recommendations to the Library may be found at <http://www.cuyamaca.edu/programreview06/>. Login is required. The Library program review described Library SLOs at the program level and the course level.

The Library has identified its Program SLOs. The mission of the Library SLOs is to develop student information competency skill, which is defined as the ability to find, use and evaluate information. Rather than giving students answers and sending them away, the Library staff shows them how to find, use and evaluate information so they can become better critical-thinking researchers.

In 2007-2008, Library staff identified five Library program-level SLOs which can be found at <http://www.cuyamaca.edu/slo/default.asp>. The Library has also identified course-level SLOs for its stand-alone course called LIR 110, Research Methods.

The Library has designed its assessment tools for program-level SLOs. In 2008-2009, the Library began a pilot assessment of its Library Instruction Program. The Library worked closely with the district Institutional Research Office to develop two reliable assessment tools. Both assessment tools measured student learning as a result of exposure to library instruction. The first tool measured student learning after a reference interview with a librarian. The second tool measured student learning as a result of a library orientation given by a librarian (*Library Assessment Tools: [Library Orientation Quiz](#) and [Reference Desk Survey Card](#)*).

In fall 2009, both assessment tools were implemented in a pilot study. The librarians distributed and collected the reference desk survey cards and library orientation quizzes throughout the fall 2009 semester.

The Library has implemented assessment and continues to gather data. Both assessment tools were designed to measure student learning as a result of exposure to library instruction. Use of the first tool, focused on student learning following a reference interview with a librarian, produced data indicating that students (100%) agreed that they did learn some information competency skills after exposure to library instruction at the reference desk. Application of the second tool, designed to measure student learning after a library orientation, produced inconclusive results and a need to revise the assessment tool (*Library Assessment Findings*).

The Library has analyzed the results of its assessment of the effectiveness of library instruction and library usage. The anticipated outcomes were not universally realized during this pilot study. Several factors may have obscured the actual influence of library instruction on student library usage and skill development. For example, the results indicate a need for improvement to the assessment tools. The district Institutional Research Office has recommended that the Library rewrite the second assessment tool questions, clarify test directions, and select different questions so as to avoid miscommunication and produce more reliable data. Therefore, the Library will be refining its assessment tools and introducing the revised products to students by fall 2011 (*Assessment Tools: [Library Orientation Quiz](#) and [Reference Desk Survey Card](#)*).

In conclusion, since the accreditation site visit in 2007, Cuyamaca College has completed its program review process for Student Services, Instruction and the Library. Each process now includes an evaluation of the achievement of student learning outcomes and uses the evaluation results to improve both performance within the area and the review instrument itself. As more areas move toward completion of the SLO cycle and more assessment results become available, program review processes will become increasingly more evidence-based and increasingly effective in leading to productive change.

Recommendation 3: Resources

The team recommends that the college and the district ensure that the number of full-time faculty and staff is adequate to support the instructional needs and student support services to improve student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission of the institution. (Standard II.C.1.a, II.A.2)

Status: Ongoing

Response: Over the past decade the college has experienced rapid growth in both head count and Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES). During this time period, the college's FTES increased 45% from 4320 FTES in 2000-01 to a high of 6242 FTES in 2008-09 ([2000-01 FTES Data](#) & [2008-09 FTES Data](#)). In 2002, the college and district led a successful campaign to pass a local bond measure to fund phase 1 of the college's Facility Master Plan ([Facilities Master Plan 2000](#)). As a result, the college has completed 4 new buildings, greatly expanding its capacity to serve the growing instructional and student services needs of the community ([GCCCD Facilities Fact Sheet](#)).

In 2006-2007, the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District (GCCCD) Governing Board pledged to financially support the human resources needs associated with the new buildings at both colleges in the district. The Governing Board allocated \$400,000 a year for 3 years to each college to hire full-time faculty and staff in support of the new buildings. By 2008-2009, Cuyamaca College had received a total of \$1,200,000 in ongoing funds for faculty and staff positions ([2010-11 Adoption Budget Ongoing Staffing Commitment](#)).

With these funds, the college was able to hire 14 faculty positions in various disciplines, including Art, Astronomy, Biology, Business, Chemistry, Computer Aided Drafting & Design, English, English as a Second Language, Exercise Science, Mathematics, Music, Ornamental Horticulture, and Sociology. Over and above the Board commitment, the college hired two counselors in 2007-2008 and an additional counselor was hired the following year. All positions were recommended through the academic and student services master planning processes ([Academic Master Plans for 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10](#); [Student Service Master Plans for 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10](#)). The percentage of full-time faculty employed by the college over this period (the Faculty Obligation Number (FON)) increased from 42.2% in 2006 to 45.3% in 2008 ([2009 FON Report](#)). The college also funded several classified staff positions with the Governing Board allocation, including several instructional lab aides and custodians, a grounds maintenance worker, and a general maintenance worker.

In 2009-10, due to a shortfall in the state budget, the college had to reduce its operating budget by 9.5%. To help balance the budget, district employees were offered an early retirement incentive. Twelve college employees took advantage of the incentive, including several long-time faculty members ([2009-10 Adoption Budget Workshop](#)). As a result, the college's Faculty Obligation Number decreased to 43.5% in 2009, which is considerably below the state mandate of 50.9% ([2009 FON Report](#)).

The number of full-time faculty and staff has not kept up with the college's instructional and student service needs, and the college continues to struggle with finding adequate resources to fund its strategic plan and carry out its mission. The college remains committed to hiring additional full-time faculty and staff positions as funding becomes available. The college will continue working with the district to identify additional funds through traditional and alternative means to ensure that the number of full-time faculty and staff is adequate to support the instructional and student services needs of the college.

In conclusion, the college's ability to maintain an adequate number of full-time faculty and staff has been hampered, especially in very recent years, by budget cuts, by retirements, and by a lack of sufficient resources from state and local sources. Nevertheless, our planning processes move forward with vigor and our Governing Board retains its resolve to strengthening the ranks of those who serve our constituents. As funding conditions improve both at the state level and within the district, Cuyamaca College will emerge in an even stronger position to ensure that its faculty and staff numbers are sufficient to improve student learning and enhance the achievement of its mission.

Recommendation 4: Communication

The team recommends that the college improve communication with classified staff by engaging in dialogue that contributes to increased participation in planning and decision-making. This dialogue must include formal and informal communications links leading to equally accessible information and contributions by classified staff to plans and decisions leading institutional change and improvement. (Standard I.B.1, I.B.4, III.A.4, IV.A.1, IV.A.3)

Status: Ongoing

Response: Recommendation 4 led to a markedly increased effort on behalf of the college administration to improve communication with the classified staff. Immediately following the 2007 Self-Study and accreditation site visit, then president, Dr. Geraldine Perri, began to work closely with Classified Senate leaders to examine how communication with classified staff could be enhanced. It was clear that the college had ample shared governance structures and avenues of participation in place for classified staff. The key was to find ways to make staff more aware of opportunities to be involved and to have their voices heard.

In collaboration with the leadership of the Classified Senate, the following activities have been identified as formal mechanisms for promoting involvement by and improving communication with the classified staff:

- Cuyamaca College Committees with classified representation include College Facilities Master Plan Council, Innovation & Planning Council, Instructional Technology Council, Bookstore and Food Services Advisory Committee, Budget Committee, College Accessibility Committee, College Policy & Procedure Committee, Emergency Preparedness Committee, Facilities Committee, Online Teaching & Learning Committee, Scholarship Committee, Student Services Master Plan Committee ([*College Governance Structures Handbook*](#)).
- District Committees with Classified Representation include District Executive Council, District-wide Strategic Planning & Budget, Americans with Disabilities Act Committee, Parking Committee ([*District Governance Structures Handbook*](#)).
- The Classified Senate and CSEA leadership are currently working on communicating more effectively with the district and colleges through attendance at district and college

level leadership meetings ([*Classified Senate-CSEA Leaders Meeting Agenda & Notes August 21, 2009*](#)).

- The Classified Staff holds an Annual Retreat and invites the Governing Board as well as district & college administrators to attend and engage in open and interactive dialogue. These sessions are always very collegial and informative ([*Classified Senate Retreat Sept 19 2008 Agenda*](#) / [*Classified Senate Retreat Aug 7, 2009*](#)).
- The Classified Senate reports at monthly Governing Board meetings about its previous month's activities ([*GCCCD Governing Board Courier*](#)).
- Due to the consistent reporting at the monthly Governing Board meetings by the Classified Senate leadership, the GCCCD Classified Senate President, who is employed on the Cuyamaca college campus, was included in the Governing Board Prep Meetings for Cuyamaca College. The Governing Board prep meetings serve to include all constituency groups in reviewing the docket and an opportunity to ask questions concerning areas on the agenda that might affect classified staff.
- The college will continue to gather input from the classified constituency group in an effort to gauge their involvement with shared governance at both the college and district levels. This information gathering will occur at regular classified meetings as well as at dedicated events. Currently and at future fall and spring convocations, the Classified Senate leadership at Cuyamaca College will continue to be given an opportunity to address the college and share information about this constituency group.

In addition, the classified leadership has worked to promote greater awareness among the staff about college shared governance processes through other, less formal, mechanisms, including, but not limited to, the following:

- A "Spirit Day at Cuyamaca College" was held on January 8, 2008 to educate classified staff on the shared governance structures and processes at the college. The event included a Jeopardy game-show format, which provided prizes to those who knew the answers to the shared governance questions. There were approximately 35 classified staff members in attendance at this event ([*Spirit Day Jan 18 2008 Agenda, Power Point, Jeopardy game instructions & answers*](#)).
- The GCCCD Classified Senate and CSEA Executive Boards approved an internal process ("Shared Governance Committee Internal Process and Selection/Hiring Committee Internal Process") for handling requests for classified representation on shared governance committees. From June 19 through August 31 of 2009, proposals for adoption of this process were presented successively to Chancellor Miles, Cuyamaca College Interim President Chiriboga, Grossmont college President Cooke, and Vice Chancellor Rearic ([*CSEA internal process and agenda from meetings/ Classified Senate-CSEA Joint Letter to Vice Chancellor of Human Resources August 31 2009*](#)). All acknowledged the importance of including classified staff in shared governance and all pledged support for and widespread promulgation of the "Internal Process." Following

the retirement of Interim President Chiriboga, the GCCCD Classified Senate President, Debi Miller, shared the process with the newly appointed Interim President, Mr. Ron Manzoni, who brought the information to the President's Cabinet and the Administrative Council. The "Internal Process" has been posted on the GCCCD Classified Senate website ([Classified Senate website](#)). The increased volume of requests for classified representation from chairs of committees has provided evidence that the request has been communicated and understood. This process will also be shared with the new Interim President (Fall 2010), Mr. Robert Garber, and with the permanent President as soon as he or she is hired.

- In an attempt to comprehend more fully the underlying factors for the staff's reported perceptions and noteworthy neutral response levels to the Self-Study survey issued in 2007, the Accreditation Steering Committee created a new survey (composed of those specific statements/questions from the 2007 Self-Study survey that addressed opportunities for participation and dialogue) to determine if efforts at increased communication with staff had improved their levels of understanding and involvement. The new survey was presented at a professional development workshop open to all classified employees across the district at Cuyamaca College on January 21, 2010. The workshop included an overview of shared governance and the roles of Classified Senate and CSEA in the district. To ensure that as many responses as possible were received, the survey was also e-mailed to every classified staff member at Cuyamaca College. Of potential 83 staff responses, 18 were received. The results of the survey can be found at: [Classified Senate Survey Results Jan 31 2010](#).

The results of this survey and the opinions expressed in the written comments are being taken very seriously and are in process. First, following review of the criteria utilized by the Cuyamaca College Academic Senate, new criteria for appointment of classified representatives to serve on shared governance committees will be explored. Additionally, the Interim College President, Academic Senate President, and the Vice President and President of GCCCD Classified Senate will conduct a joint review of the college shared governance handbook to determine if classified representation on shared governance committees is proportionate to that of other relevant constituency groups and to recommend additional classified representation on such committees if appropriate. This review is anticipated to occur during the 2010-11 academic year.

- Finally, the college community recently ended a 15-month process to complete its new 2010-2016 Strategic Plan. The plan has five Focus Areas and under the Focus Area entitled "Value and Support of Employees," the highest rated goal is to "increase professional development for faculty, staff and administration." The key performance indicator for this goal will be the "number of staff participating in professional development events," which includes those activities that enhance classified staff's understanding of college processes. In a similar vein, the college administration has acknowledged the need for training, involvement, leadership, and vision to foster enhanced participation by classified staff in key college processes and has pledged to work with staff to fulfill these needs.

In conclusion, since the last accreditation site visit a variety of formal and informal mechanisms dedicated to improving communication and dialogue with classified staff have been implemented. Classified representation within the shared governance process has received increased emphasis and the college's new Strategic Plan includes the "Valuing and Support of Employees" as one of its primary priorities. The college and district are and will remain committed to maintaining and enhancing open dialogue with the classified constituency.

Recommendation 5: Dialogue

The team recommends that the college, the chancellor, and district develop and implement strategies for the improvement of dialogue among the various entities in the district, leading to improved relationships and collaboration among and between the colleges and the district. (Standard IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.3, IV.B.2)

Status: The colleges, Chancellor, and District Services have implemented strategies for improvement of dialogue that have led to better relationships and collaboration throughout the District.

Response: The following are examples of topics where collaborative dialogue has taken place:

1. Open Chancellor Forums—numerous open Chancellor Forums were held in 2009 and 2010 to provide a welcoming public venue in which employees could talk with the Chancellor regarding district concerns, issues, and problems.
2. Confidential Communications with the Chancellor—a form for comments to the Chancellor was created and linked as follows: Conversation with the Chancellor http://www.gcccd.edu/research/gcccd_feedback/conversationwiththechancellor.htm
3. An Employee Intranet site was created for key communications at: <http://www.gcccd.edu/intranet/> Login is required.
4. Budget
 - a. **Chancellor Budget Messages**—in 2009, the Chancellor began publishing regular budget updates to all district employees via email and the district Intranet site. These updates continue in 2010 and provide both general and specific information about state and local budget decisions and their impacts on students, faculty & staff: <http://www.gcccd.edu/intranet/NewsUpdates/ChancellorMessage.htm> Login is required.
 - b. **Budget Suggestion Box**—In May 2009, the Budget Suggestion Box was posted online for employees to send messages to the Chancellor with cost-cutting/saving ideas and suggestions. From May to July 8, 2009, three hundred twenty-eight (328) messages were received. The suggestions received in the Budget Suggestion Box were analyzed and considered by Chancellor's Cabinet and District Strategic Planning & Budget Council (DSP&BC) for making decisions on how to deal with the

2009-2010 budget crisis. The top budget-saving suggestions were: ([Budget Suggestion Documents](#))

- Miscellaneous academic considerations including, cutting intersession, non-credit, college for kids, combine schedules, shorten semester
- Personnel/staffing reductions, consolidations, sharing, use of volunteers
- 4/10 work days—close on Fridays
- Salary considerations—reductions, cap, deferral, step/column
- Electricity Consumption—power down
- Freeze on hiring, travel, and overtime
- Furloughs, close district for winter break/end of summer break
- Paper considerations—paperless, 2-sided copying, online class schedules

The following cost-cutting/savings ideas have been implemented as of spring Semester, 2010: ([Budget Suggestion Documents](#))

- Reduction in electricity consumption at all sites
 - Reduction in paper usage at all sites—paperless meetings, 2-sided copying, on-line document sharing, electronic copies for students
 - 4/10 work days for Summer 2010—all sites will be closed Friday-Sunday
 - Class section reductions—DSP&BC has set an FTES goal for 2010-11 of 5% over cap (5% above the number of full-time students funded by the state), which is a reduction of nearly 2000 FTES from 2009-10; this measure includes the elimination of intersession, a 50% reduction in the number sections for Summer 2010, and an 80% reduction in non-credit offerings
 - Hiring & travel freezes remain in effect for 2010-11—only critical positions will be filled and only essential travel will occur
 - Significant reduction in administrative staff, including a reorganization of the district offices, and combined positions at the colleges
- c. DSP&BC Budget Task Force—Membership on this task force consisted of District-wide Strategic Planning & Budget Council (DSP&BC) members. The task force was convened to analyze the budget system, which included the following components: ([Budget Task Force Report](#))
- Accuracy of budget information/data
 - Budgeting and allocation formula
 - 50% Law
 - Equalization funds
 - Ending balances

- d. Outside Consultant Review—Joe Newmyer, an outside consultant, was hired to conduct an externally based, unbiased review of the budget process and to respond to questions raised by Budget Task Force members, as well as district employees. Mr. Newmyer’s subsequent report was widely viewed as a validation of the District’s budget process. Since the publication of the report, District-wide communications have improved with 12 budget messages sent by the Chancellor in 2009. In addition training for managers was conducted, budget forums were held at Grossmont College, Cuyamaca College, and District Services to respond to employee budget questions and concerns, and a list of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) regarding the budget has been posted on a district web page. ([FAQs on Intranet](#))
5. Strategic Planning Process—through collaborative dialogue, the process was improved and strengthened in 2009 with much greater participation and integration between the colleges, students, District Services, Chancellor’s Office and the Governing Board. Activities included:
 - Governing Board/DSP&BC Workshop—On July 20, 2009, a joint meeting of the Governing Board and DSP&BC was held to engage in a discussion on strategic planning and goals.
 - Writing Team—the writing team created at the Governing Board/DSP&BC Workshop lead by Grossmont college Academic Senate President Chris Hill, met several times and prepared a draft of the Strategic Areas of Focus.
 - Integrated 6-Year Strategic Plan—the outcome of the writing team’s efforts was an integrated (Grossmont College, Cuyamaca College, and District Services, and District) 6-year strategic plan with goals, objectives, and activities applying to both colleges, to District Services, and to the district that were collectively agreed upon and that align District-wide. The plans were approved by the Governing Board on December 15, 2009. ([GCCCD Strategic Plan 2010-2016](#), [Grossmont College Strategic Plan 2010-2016](#), [Cuyamaca College Strategic Plan 2010-2016](#), [GB Minutes 12-15-09](#))
6. Student Success Initiative—Another example of dialogue which engages the entire district including students, faculty, staff, administrators, and Trustees is the recently initiated and ongoing effort to look openly at our student success data as well as current projects in place to promote student success in the district and to explore ways to use data to inform our decisions about improving student retention, student completion of basic skills sequences, and student graduation and transfer rates across all demographics. In this endeavor, the Governing Board is hosting monthly, open public meetings to discuss student success.

Topics discussed to date will be included on the district internet site and include:
([Governing Board \(GB\) Minutes 10-20-09](#), [GB Minutes 03-17-09](#), [GB Minutes 02-16-10](#))

- Presentation on state and local student success initiatives, a demonstration of the Cal-PASS SMART Tool, and an overview of the CLASS Initiative
 - The Class of 2006
 - Grossmont College's Project Success Program
 - Grossmont College's Community Service Learning Program
 - Cuyamaca College's Personal Development Counseling Program
 - Cuyamaca College's Developmental Math Program
7. Preventive Issues Meetings—Meetings have been established to discuss concerns and issues in the early stages before they become personnel grievances. They are held on a monthly basis with the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, and labor organization leaders (AFT, CSEA, and the Administrators Association). These meetings have already proven to be successful in numerous instances by avoiding potential grievances and litigation. The meetings reinforce the open-door policy, open communication, and provide a confidential venue for discussing employee issues and concerns.
 8. District Services Survey—A District Services Survey was administered in spring 2009 to obtain open feedback from employees in the district regarding their satisfaction with the services and information provided by the various District Services departments (Business Services, Intergovernmental Relations, Institutional Research, Chancellor's Office, Human Resources and Employee and Labor Relations). The survey results were compiled and analyzed. From the report, each department created an Action Plan to address the survey responses and make improvements. The [Action Plans](#) (Login is required) have been posted on the employee intranet site.
 9. Chancellor Email Communications—Improvement in frequency of the Chancellor's communication with constituencies has been accomplished with 50 emails sent District-wide in 2009 and posted to the district intranet/internet. Good feedback and positive responses have resulted.
 10. Senate Leaders Meetings—Monthly meetings with the Chancellor and Academic Senate Leaders and Classified Senate Leaders to discuss issues pertinent to each group are now scheduled. The Academic Senate Leaders meetings are a continuation of past practice, but the Classified Senate Leaders meetings are newly implemented in 2009-10 academic year, providing Classified Staff an important leadership voice in the district's shared governance structure.

In conclusion, especially since the seating of a new chancellor, dialogue among the various entities within the district and collaboration between and among the colleges and the district has been significantly enhanced. Communication from the chancellor to all district entities as well as interchanges between those entities and the district leadership have grown at virtually every level. The creation of new strategic plans for both the colleges and the district was a thoroughly collegial and cooperative process. Movement toward the formation of the 2010-2011 district

budget has been challenging, but characterized by highly productive interaction between the two colleges and the district as well as by significant input from all constituency groups. A spirit of open communication and shared responsibility is now clearly evident within the district.

Recommendation 6: Leadership and Governance

The team recommends that the district, using appropriate consultation, develop and implement policies and procedures that lead to effective leadership and governance throughout the district. Specifically, the Board of Trustees must:

- establish and implement a formal process for consistent and regular self-evaluation for inclusion in its policies and by-laws (Standard IV.B.1.g).
- establish and implement formal policies and procedures for the selection of and regular evaluation of the college president (Standard IV.B.1.j).

Status: A response to this recommendation was submitted to ACCJC on October 15, 2009 under the title of fall 2009 [Follow-Up Report](#). The Follow-Up Report subsequently received formal acceptance by the ACCJC ([ACCJC letter of 1-29-10](#)). The college will continue efforts that support meeting the standard.

Response:

The response to this recommendation will be divided into three parts:

- (1) Establishment and implementation by the Board of Trustees of a formal process for consistent and regular self-evaluation.
- (2) Establishment and implementation by the Board of Trustees of formal policies and procedures for the selection of the college president.
- (3) Establishment and implementation by the Board of Trustees of formal policies and procedures for the evaluation of the college president.

For each part of this recommendation, appropriate consultation was achieved through the involvement of the District Executive Council (DEC), the body which gathers and crystallizes input from the relevant constituency groups (Associated Students, Classified Senate & CSEA, AFT, Administrators Association, and Academic Senate) and then makes recommendations to the Chancellor. Because each of the constituency groups has representation on DEC, the activities and recommendations undertaken and approved by DEC have the force of activities and recommendations proceeding from and expressing the will of those district constituency groups.

Part 1 of Recommendation #6: The Board of Trustees is to establish and implement a formal process for consistent and regular self-evaluation for inclusion in its policies and by-laws.

The Board of Trustees addressed this first part of Recommendation #6 by approving the creation and/or revision of the following Board Policy and Administrative Procedure: [Board Policy \(BP\) 2745, Board Self-Evaluation](#), and [Administrative Procedure \(AP\) 2745, Board Self-Evaluation](#).

Prior to the [Fall 2007 Evaluation Report](#) (filed by the visiting team subsequent to its fall 2007 review of the [Cuyamaca College Self-Study](#)), the Board of Trustees had, at its June

2007 meeting, revised an earlier version of BP 2745 ([Governing Board \(GB\) minutes 6-19-07](#)).

Following receipt of the [Fall 2007 Evaluation Report](#) and in reference specifically to Recommendation # 6, further revisions to Board Policy 2745 and the establishment of an accompanying Administrative Procedure 2745 (including a [Self-Evaluation Form](#)) were recommended by DEC in July 2008 ([District Executive Council \(DEC\) minutes 7-7-08](#)) and accepted by the Board during that same month ([GB minutes 7-15-08](#), [Docket item 201](#)).

Finally, additional revisions to Board Policy 2745 were recommended to the Board by DEC in September 2008 ([DEC minutes 9-8-08](#)); those revisions were accepted and approved by the Board at its September 16, 2008 meeting ([GB minutes 9-16-08](#)).

The Board of Trustees, using the adopted Board Policy 2745 and Administrative Procedure 2745, conducted an initial self-evaluation in summer 2008. The results of that evaluation were placed on the Board Agenda on September 16, 2008 and have become a matter of public record ([GB minutes 9-16-08](#); [Self-Evaluation Form](#); [2008 Board Self-Evaluation Summary Report](#)). The Board completed its second self-evaluation on March 16, 2010. Results of that evaluation were placed on the Board [Agenda on April 20, 2010](#) and have become a matter of public record. ([2009 Governing Board Evaluation Annual Cumulative Appraisal](#); [2010 Board Self-Evaluation](#), [Governing Board 2010-11 Goals](#), [GB minutes 03-16-10](#))

The formulation, review, and approval of BP 2745 and AP 2745 were undertaken according to the shared governance processes of the colleges and the district, thereby assuring widespread input and support.

Part 2 of Recommendation #6: The Board of Trustees is to establish and implement formal policies and procedures for the selection of the college president.

The Board of Trustees addressed this second part of Recommendation #6 by revising and/or creating the following Board Policy and Administrative Procedure: [Board Policy 7111, College President Selection](#), and [Administrative Procedure 7111, College President Selection](#).

In response to Recommendation # 6, Board Policy 7111, which addressed the selection of the president of one of the district's colleges, was recommended by DEC in July 2008 ([District Executive Council \(DEC\) minutes 7-7-08](#)) and approved by the Board during that same month ([Governing Board minutes 7-15-08](#)). In similar fashion, Administrative Procedure 7111, which outlined the methodology for selection of a college president, was recommended by DEC at its December 1, 2008 session ([DEC minutes 12-1-08](#)) and was subsequently accepted by the Board at its December 9, 2008 meeting ([GB minutes 12-9-08](#)).

The formulation, review, and approval of BP 7111 and AP 7111 were undertaken according to the shared governance processes of the colleges and the district, thereby assuring widespread input and support. The approved policy and procedure will be used in all future searches for presidents of the district's colleges.

Part 3 of Recommendation #6: The Board of Trustees is to establish and implement formal policies and procedures for the evaluation of the college president.

The Board of Trustees addressed this final part of Recommendation #6 by revising and/or creating the following Board Policy and Administrative Procedure: *Board Policy 7112, College President Evaluation*, and *Administrative Procedure 7112, College President Evaluation*.

In response to Recommendation # 6, Board Policy 7112, which addressed the evaluation of the president of one of the district's colleges, was recommended by DEC in December 2008 ([District Executive Council minutes 12-1-08](#)) and approved by the Board during that same month ([Governing Board minutes 12-9-08](#)). In similar fashion, Administrative Procedure 7112, which outlined the methodology for evaluation of a college president, was recommended by DEC at its February 2009 session ([DEC minutes 2-9-09](#)) and was subsequently accepted by the Board at its February 17, 2009 meeting ([GB minutes 2-17-09](#)).

The formulation, review, and approval of BP 7112 and AP 7112 were undertaken according to the shared governance processes of the colleges and the district, thereby assuring widespread input and support.

The Board of Trustees will implement the approved policy and procedure when it, through the district chancellor, conducts annual evaluations of the presidents of Cuyamaca College and Grossmont College. Currently, the chancellor is preparing an instrument with which district constituencies can provide feedback on the performance of the college presidents. That feedback instrument and other evaluation tools will be completed in the near future and an evaluation of the college presidents will then be conducted.

In conclusion, the Board of Trustees has developed and implemented policies and procedures that lead to effective leadership and governance (1) by establishing and implementing a formal process for regular self-evaluation and (2) by establishing and implementing formal policies and procedures for the selection and evaluation of the college president. Each of these new or revised policies and procedures has been successfully implemented in the district within the past 15 months.

**CUYAMACA COLLEGE
FOCUSED MIDTERM REPORT**

**PROGRESS REPORT ON OVERARCHING
and
STANDARD-SPECIFIC PLANNING AGENDA ITEMS (2007 Self Study)**

Since Cuyamaca College's accreditation review in 2007, the college's self-identified issues have been diligently reviewed and significant progress has been made in implementing action plans to address these areas. The college's progress to date is reported in this section using the four accreditation standards.

Responses to each of the following self-identified Planning Agenda items are described in terms of accreditation standards.

I. INSTITUTIONAL OVERARCHING PLANNING AGENDAS

RESOURCES: Although the college currently functions within its budget allocation, the college does not receive sufficient funds to fully implement its Strategic Plan Initiatives (IV.B.3.c). The college is committed to working internally and within the district to identify additional financial resources to address deficiencies in the following areas:

Faculty Resources: To ensure access to quality instruction and student services, the college will explore strategies to obtain funding to increase full-time faculty hiring in discipline areas identified through the academic and student services master planning processes. (II.A; II.A.2, III.A.2)

Status: Ongoing

Response: In 2006-2007, the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District (GCCCD) Governing Board pledged to financially support the human resources needs associated with the new buildings at both colleges in the district. The Governing Board allocated \$400,000 a year for 3 years to each college to hire full-time faculty and staff in support of the new buildings. By 2008-2009, Cuyamaca College had received a total of \$1,200,000 in ongoing funds for faculty and staff positions ([2010-11 Adoption Budget Ongoing Staffing Commitment](#)).

With these funds, the college was able to hire 14 faculty positions in various disciplines, including Art, Astronomy, Biology, Business, Chemistry, Computer Aided Drafting & Design, English, English as a Second Language, Exercise Science, Mathematics, Music, Ornamental Horticulture, and Sociology. Over and above the Board commitment, the college hired two counselors in 2007-2008 and an additional counselor was hired the following year. All positions were recommended through the academic and student services master planning processes (*Academic Master Plans for [2006-07](#), [2007-08](#), [2008-09](#), [2009-10](#); Student Service Master Plans for [2006-07](#), [2007-08](#), [2008-09](#), [2009-10](#)*). The percentage of full-time faculty employed by the college over this period (the Faculty Obligation Number (FON)) increased from 42.2% in 2006 to 45.3% in 2008 ([2009 FON Report](#)).

In 2009-10, due to a shortfall in the state budget, the college had to reduce its operating budget by 9.5%. To help balance the budget, district employees were offered an early retirement incentive. Twelve college employees took advantage of the incentive, including several long-time faculty members ([2009-10 Adoption Budget Workshop](#)). As a result, the college's Faculty Obligation Number decreased to 43.5% in 2009, which is considerably below the state mandate of 50.9% ([2009 FON Report](#)).

The number of full-time faculty and staff has not kept up with the college's instructional and student service needs, and the college continues to struggle with finding adequate resources to fund its strategic plan and carry out its mission. The college remains committed to hiring additional full-time faculty and staff positions as funding becomes available. The college will continue working with the district to identify additional funds through traditional and alternative means to ensure that the number of full-time faculty and staff is adequate to support the instructional and student services needs of the college.

Technology Resources: The College will expand its planning process to examine the full range of funding sources—not limited to technology block grants—that are earmarked for technology and that would support the total cost of ownership. (II.C; III.C.1.c; III.C.1.d)

Status: Ongoing

Response: Since 2007-2008, the Technology Plan Committee has been able to satisfy all requests that received a number 1 ranking by the Academic Master Plan (AMP) Committee (*Academic Master Plans for [2008-09](#), [2009-10](#)*). This ongoing capacity for responding to highest ranked requests was made possible through state block grants, the Basic Skills Initiative, new building funds for the Communication Arts Building, the Science & Mathematics Building, and the Business & Technology Building, Career Technical Education funds, and careful analysis of how replaced computers might continue to serve elsewhere.

One of the long-term goals that the Technology Plan Committee has been working towards for many years has been to provide “smart” technology in all classrooms. Smart technology implies a computer connected to a data projector, a DVD/VCR, and sound. Last year, the committee added an additional component to this list, a document camera ([2008-09 Technology Plan](#)). By fall 2009, all of the classrooms at Cuyamaca College had smart technology.

In addition, the Technology Plan Committee focused on instructional computing needs. One of the goals was to keep computers in use as long as they are able to serve a function in instruction. In 2008-2009, state block grant funds were used to upgrade memory in recycled P4 computers campus-wide so that, by May 2009, all computers on campus were P4s or better with a minimum of 1GB RAM to support Office 2007.

Beginning in 2008-2009, the Learning and Technology Resource department has taken on the responsibility of maintaining a campus-wide inventory of technology. As a result, the largest monetary requests within the Technology Plan now arise from this department, because its

campus-wide inventory frequently includes funding for items that have also been requested by the specific academic departments.

In 2009-2010, Cuyamaca College's participation in iTunes University allowed the college to provide a variety of learning modules via iPhones (and other similar cell phones), computers, iPods, as well as other emerging delivery devices. These modules may be audio, Power Points or other text documents, audio combined with text documents, or video clips ([Cuyamaca iTunes University Website](#)). This initiative is being funded primarily by new building funds. Many faculty members are planning to assign the creation of learning video clips as student projects in their classes.

This year, the Learning Resource Center (LRC) will be undergoing construction to expand by an additional 3,600 sq feet ([Governing Board Minutes Approving LRC Expansion](#)). The LRC expansion project will finance a faculty workroom that will contain both PC and Apple platforms and all necessary software to support audio and video editing. This workroom will augment the student work area containing both computer platforms and necessary software for editing which became available in January 2010 with the completion of the Business & Technology Building (the E Building). The expansion project will also fund the purchase of portable microphones for faculty to use for audio taping lectures that can be easily uploaded into iTunes.

For the next three years, the college is expected to have an ample number of very functional computers, as the CIS department will slowly be replacing its lab computers with new ones funded by E Building dollars. The department's used – but very high-end – computers will be distributed campus-wide so that all computer needs will be satisfied. Additionally, Continuing Education and Workforce Training grants have replaced 37 good computers to create a workforce readiness lab to serve its students. These 37 computers will also be distributed by fall 2010.

Support Service Resources: To support student learning and college instructional programs, the college will seek additional funds to enhance the scope and quality of support services, including the library book collection, electronic and video materials, and general tutoring and discipline-specific tutoring (such as tutoring in the Communication Arts Building and the STEM Achievement Center). (II.C.1.a.)

Status: Ongoing

Response: Due to the major budget shortfall in recent years, additional funds to enhance the scope and quality of support services – including the library book collection, instructional materials, and tutoring – have been scarce. The Cuyamaca College Foundation has been generous in its allotment of funding for additions to the library's collection, specifically to the reserve collection. This allows students to borrow copies of texts to which they might otherwise have no access. The other major source of funds for these activities has been the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI), which commenced in 2006-2007 as a statewide project to enhance the scope and quality of support services for underprepared students. The BSI was integrated into the California Community College's strategic planning process and is re-evaluated and renewed annually. Its goal is to improve student access and success. The BSI is a product of the CCC

System Strategic Plan Goal Area 2 – Student Success and Readiness

(<http://strategicplan.cccco.edu/>). The project addresses credit and noncredit basic skills as well as adult education and programs designed to help underprepared students. All community colleges throughout the state receive annual supplemental funding to specifically address basic skills needs. This funding is guided by locally developed action plans documenting usage of the funding. The general and statistically expressed outcomes of the BSI will be tracked using the Accountability Report for Community Colleges (ARCC), specifically the [ARCC Basic Skills Report](#).

Basic Skills funding supplements instruction, tutoring, instructional materials, student support services, and staff development. ([BSI Activities for 2007-10](#)). Assessment of the outcomes of these activities on student retention and success is ongoing.

Staffing Resources: To ensure adequate staff support for college learning programs and services and to provide support for college facilities as these expand with the addition of new buildings, the college will continue to explore strategies to fund these planning priorities. (III.A.2.)

Status: Ongoing

Response: Since 2006-2007, the college has opened four new buildings, a Student Center, Communication Arts Building, Science and Mathematics Center, and Business & Technology Building. The four buildings total over 220,000 square feet. In 2006-2007, the Governing Board made a commitment to set aside ongoing funds to address staffing needs to support the new buildings. The initial year funding was for \$100,000 and the same amount was set aside the two subsequent years, totaling \$300,000 to date for new classified staff positions. Since fall 2007, the college hired a number of staff positions including instructional lab aides, custodians, and grounds and general maintenance workers. Over and above the Board commitment, the college was able to hire additional classified staff in 2007-2008 and 2008-2009.

In 2009-10, due to a shortfall in the state budget, the college had to reduce its operating budget by 9.5%. To help balance the budget, district employees were offered an early retirement incentive. Twelve college employees took advantage of the incentive, including several long-time classified staff members ([2009-10 Adoption Budget Workshop](#)). Due to the reductions, Cuyamaca college has not been in a position to replace lost positions or hire new staff positions; only a very limited number of critical staffing positions were replaced ([2009-10 and 2010-11 College Staffing Plans](#)). Master planning processes continue and the college is committed to hiring additional staff positions as funding becomes available. The college continues to investigate alternate sources for increasing and stabilizing its income.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES: In view of the progress achieved thus far in developing and implementing Student Learning Outcomes, the college recommends the implementation of a systematic cycle for evaluating the effectiveness of SLO evaluation measures in assessing course and program-level learning outcomes.

- The Curriculum Committee will continue to work with individual departments to ensure that all courses are updated with SLOs and all new submissions to the Curriculum Committee will include SLO's (II.A.1.c.)
- College Services, primarily the Library and Student Development Services, will continue to pursue SLO assessment activities. Selection of assessment instruments and development of assessment procedures comprise elements of this SLOs plan. (II.C.2)
- The Academic Senate in conjunction with the Instructional Council and Academic Departments will establish a procedure for the inclusion of SLO's into course syllabi as well as a syllabus review process (II.A.1.c.)

Status: Ongoing

Response: As indicated in the response to Recommendation 1, Cuyamaca College has achieved the Development level on the ACCJC SLO Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, and is currently working towards the Proficiency level. The college has established an institutional framework for defining SLOs for all courses, programs, certificates, and degrees, including SLOs for general education, basic skills, transfer, career technical education, student services, and library & learning resources.

The college has continued to work with individual departments to ensure that all new and existing course outlines are updated with SLOs. The SLO Coordinator works directly with departments and individual faculty to help develop course-level SLOs and accompanying assessment methodologies. Once the course outlines are submitted to the Curriculum Committee, the Student Learning Outcomes Technical Review (sub)Committee (SLOTRC) works directly with departments and individual faculty to review, and if necessary, revise all SLO submissions to ensure that all course-level SLOs and accompanying assessment methodologies are written in active language and are measurable.

SLOTRC then makes recommendations to the Curriculum Committee regarding SLOs and accompanying assessment methodologies for final approval by the Curriculum Committee. As fall 2010, the college has written SLOs and accompanying assessment methodologies into the official course outline of record for 77% of all courses ([SLO Assessment Wiki: Progress Report](#)). The Curriculum Committee continues to review SLO submissions for new courses and modifications to existing courses.

In 2007-2008, the Library identified five Library program-level SLO's and accompanying assessment methodologies which are posted on its [website](#). The Library has also identified course-level SLO's for its stand-alone course called LIR 110, Research Methods. In 2009, the college's Student Services Division finalized their assessment plans, including the development of SLOs, identification of assessment methodologies, establishment of goals and criteria for assessment activities, and a planning mechanism for closing the loop and using assessment results to improve student learning ([2009-10 SSMP](#)).

As of spring 2010, Student Services departments have initiated their first assessment cycles and have incorporated the results into the Student Services Master Planning process ([SLO Pilot Results](#)). This process prioritizes department activities for the following year and includes funding priorities. Ongoing assessment activities will continue with refinement of SLOs and accompanying assessment methodologies occurring as needed based on analysis of prior year results.

In fall 2007, the Academic Senate, working with the Instructional Council (Vice President of Instruction, Academic Deans and Department Chairs & Coordinators), established a procedure for the inclusion of SLOs into course syllabi, as well as a syllabus review process. Department chairs and coordinators provide faculty with instructions and examples of incorporating SLOs into course syllabi at department meetings, and provide individual training for faculty as needed.

The Academic Senate will be updating its Faculty Handbook in fall 2010 to include instructions and examples of incorporating SLOs into course syllabi. This handbook will be available on the [Academic Senate Website](#) and is highlighted by the Academic Senate President during the new faculty orientation at the beginning of each semester.

Each semester, course syllabi are collected by department chairs and coordinators, as well as division deans, and kept on file for reference. All course syllabi are expected to include course-level SLOs. A review of an instructor's course syllabus is part of each faculty evaluation, and the inclusion of SLOs, as defined by the Faculty Handbook, is considered an important component of a comprehensive syllabus.

In conclusion, significant progress has been made since the college's 2007 Self-Study in moving towards the Proficiency level on the ACCJC SLO Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness. The college expects to be at the Proficiency level and moving towards the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement Level by 2012, which will be reflected in the college's self-study the following year in 2013.

II. PLANNING AGENDAS FOR SPECIFIC STANDARDS

STANDARD I: MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS

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

I.B.1. The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.

Planning Agenda #1: In a number of the Accreditation Self-Study Survey items, differences were noted in the response results between faculty and staff: specifically, lower levels of agreement and higher levels of neutral responses and, in some cases, disagreements were noted. The college proposes to work with the Office of Institutional Research to conduct further assessment of underlying factors for staff's reported perceptions and for such noteworthy neutral response levels. Based on the results of this additional research, the college proposes to work collaboratively with the classified staff leadership to address issues as appropriate. (I.B.1)

Status: The standard is met and the college will continue efforts that support meeting the standard.

Response: Following the results of the survey conducted in conjunction with the fall 2007 Self-Study, then college president Dr. Geraldine Perri worked very closely with classified senate leaders to examine how the college could enhance communication with classified staff. The college has ample opportunities and shared governance structures in place for classified staff to participate, but many staff are unaware of such opportunities.

In collaboration with the leadership of the Classified Senate, the following activities – all dedicated to improving communication with the classified staff – have been identified as opportunities for participation by classified staff in shared governance:

- Cuyamaca College Committees with Classified Representation include College Facilities Master Plan Council, Innovation & Planning Council, Instructional Technology Council, Bookstore and Food Services Advisory Committee, Budget Committee, College Accessibility Committee, College Policy & Procedure Committee, Emergency Preparedness Committee, Facilities Committee, Online Teaching & Learning Committee, Scholarship Committee, Student Services Master Plan Committee ([College Governance Structures Handbook](#)).
- District Committees with Classified Representation include District Executive Council, District-wide Strategic Planning & Budget, Americans with Disabilities Act Committee, Parking Committee ([District Governance Structures Handbook](#)).
- The Classified Senate and CSEA leadership are currently working on communicating more effectively with the district and colleges through attendance at district and college-level leadership meetings ([Classified Senate-CSEA Leaders Meeting Agenda & Notes August 21, 2009](#)).
- The Classified Staff holds an Annual Retreat and invites the Governing Board as well as district & college Administrators to attend and engage in open and interactive dialogue. These sessions are always very collegial and informative ([Classified Senate Retreat Sept 19 2008 Agenda / Classified Senate Retreat Aug 7 2009](#)).
- The Classified Senate reports at monthly Governing Board meetings about its previous month's activities ([GCCCD Governing Board Courier](#)).

- Due to the consistent reporting at the monthly Governing Board meetings by the Classified Senate leadership, the GCCCD Classified Senate President, who is employed on the Cuyamaca College campus, was included in the Governing Board Prep Meetings for Cuyamaca College. The Governing Board prep meetings serve to include all constituency groups in reviewing the docket and an opportunity to ask questions concerning areas on the agenda that might affect classified staff.

In addition to supporting the standard formal mechanisms for improving communication with classified staff, the classified leadership has worked to promote awareness among the staff about college shared governance processes through other, less formal, mechanisms:

- A “Spirit Day at Cuyamaca College” was held on January 8, 2008 to educate classified staff on the shared governance structures and processes at the college. The event included a Jeopardy game-show format, which provided prizes to those who knew the answers to the shared governance questions. There were approximately 35 classified staff members in attendance at this event ([*Spirit Day Jan 18 2008 Agenda, Power Point, Jeopardy game instructions & answers*](#)).
- The Classified Senate and CSEA E-Boards approved an internal process for handling classified representation requests concerning shared governance committees. The process has been presented to, accepted by, and announced widely by all levels of college and district executive leadership. The internal process is currently posted on the [GCCCD Classified Senate website](#).
- The Classified Senate leadership, the CSEA President and the College President will continue to work collaboratively on a dedicated event during Professional Development week giving the classified an overview of CSEA and Classified Senate responsibilities to shared governance. The college will continue to gather input from the classified constituency group about its knowledge of shared governance at both the college and district levels and the college will continue to respond in an appropriate manner to the input received. Additionally, during each future Cuyamaca College Convocation, the Classified Senate leadership will address the college and share information about their constituency group.

With respect specifically to the fall 2007 survey results, the Accreditation Steering Committee, with the assistance of the Institutional Research Office, re-surveyed the college’s classified staff, employing statements/questions that specifically addressed participation and dialogue to determine if the increased communication efforts noted above had improved their levels of understanding and involvement.

Five statements (one actually a question with two parts) were included on the survey (see below). Each statement/question was followed by a Likert scale of 5 potential responses: from “5” -- “Strongly Agree” to “1” -- “Strongly Disagree” (2 through 4 were intentionally left unlabeled to allow respondents greater flexibility). Additionally, an option of “Don’t Know” was provided, as was an opportunity to give specific written comments after each statement/question and

general comments at the end of the entire survey. The survey, complete with responses and comments, can be found at: [Classified Senate Survey Results Jan 31 2010](#). The statements/questions that made up the survey are listed immediately below.

1. *As a classified staff member, I have the opportunity to be informed of financial planning and budget processes for the college.*
2. *I am given the opportunity to participate in the college's planning processes, either directly or through my shared governance representatives.*
3. *I am given the opportunity to participate, either through dialogue with colleagues or through the shared governance process, in how to improve college systems.*
4. *Appropriate efforts are made to maintain dialogue with classified staff.*
5. *Have you ever served on a screening/hiring committee at GCCCD?*
 - 5a. *The college adheres to the GCCCD written policies for screening/hiring and employment procedures.*

The survey was administered to classified staff in attendance at a professional development workshop at Cuyamaca College on January 21, 2010. The workshop was open to all classified across the district. It presented overviews of shared governance and the roles within the district of Classified Senate and the CSEA. To ensure that as many responses as possible were received, the survey was also e-mailed to every classified staff member at Cuyamaca College.

Of a potential 83 staff responses, 18 completed surveys were returned. The survey results, complete with responses and comments, can be found at: [Classified Senate Survey Results January 31, 2010](#).

The written comments following each statement in the survey expressed concern regarding the college's efforts to improve communication for classified staff. Each statement received one or two comments and all comments were critical of the current procedures (but not policies) and the administrators responsible for managing those procedures.

The written comments at the end of the survey were primarily recommendations for improvement, with a mixture of both positive and negative general remarks. The recommendations found at the end of the survey were forwarded to appropriate campus and district offices for evaluation and implementation.

In conclusion, since fall 2007 a variety of mechanisms dedicated to improving communication and dialogue with classified staff have been implemented. Classified representation within the shared governance process has received increased emphasis and the college's new 2010-2016 Strategic Plan includes a major focus dedicated to the "Value and Support of Employees." The college and district have demonstrated and will continue to demonstrate their unwavering support for maintaining a collegial and participative relationship with the classified constituency.

I.B.6 The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

Planning Agenda #2: Although the standard is met, and the college will continue efforts that support meeting the standard, the college commits to assessing its planning and resource allocation process by initiating a review of all component planning cycles, such as the Academic Master Plan, Student Services Master Plan, Technology Master Plan and Annual Implementation Plan.

Additionally, to be considered, are evaluating components such as:

- Research that informs each cycle in order to assess linkage to student outcomes
- Assessing the workflow and coordination of all cycles to coincide with budget allocation
- Analysis of planning results in light of the mission of the institution.

Status: The standard is met and the college will continue efforts that support meeting the standard.

Response: The college's six-year Strategic Plan is formulated with the benefit of intense participation from all sectors of the campus. Initial elements of the Strategic Plan are created by the Innovation and Planning Council (IPC) at its annual retreat. IPC is the college's highest level shared governance structure and includes representatives from all constituency groups throughout the institution ([*Innovation and Planning Council \(IPC\) Charge* p.29](#)). These initial elements of the Plan are then distributed for comment and ranking to all constituencies by means of a presentation and discussion at the college-wide convocation which opens each academic year (in August) and then electronically on the college's web site. Results of the comment and ranking processes are collated and become the basis upon which an appointed Writing Team creates the first draft of the Strategic Plan. That initial draft is circulated to representational bodies – the Associated Students, the Classified Senate, the Academic Senate, and the Administrative Council – for a second round of constructive comment and then is returned to the Writing Team for fine-tuning. Responsibility for final approval of the Strategic Plan is vested in the Academic Senate, the IPC, and the President of the college. The approved Strategic Plan for the college is then submitted to the district for inclusion in the district-wide strategic plan.

The college's Annual Implementation Plan (AIP) is derived immediately from its Strategic Plan and is initially created by the President's Cabinet via input from the Instructional, Student Services, Administrative Services, and Institutional Advancement divisions of the college. Following its formulation, the AIP is presented to IPC and to the Academic Senate for their endorsement. Activities included in the AIP are then assigned to the appropriate departments and offices within the college for action. A mid-year analysis of progress on assigned activities is created by President's Cabinet and reviewed by IPC. At the end of the year, utilizing an analysis prepared by the President's Cabinet, the IPC conducts a final review and report on the progress of each specific activity related to the AIP ([*AIP Final Report 2009*](#)).

All elements – specifically the Academic Master Plan (AMP), the Student Services Master Plan (SSMP), and the Technology Master Plan (TMP) – which feed into the college’s annual planning cycle are developed by the appropriate shared governance committees ([Academic Master Plan \(AMP\) committee charge p. 38](#); [Student Services Master Plan \(SSMP\) committee charge p. 64](#); [Technology Plan \(TP\) committee charge p.66](#)). Each master plan is based on and includes specific reference to the college’s overall Strategic Plan. Once these master plans are completed, they are presented to the Academic Senate and to the IPC for review and endorsement.

Including as it does multiple activities which affect the institution as a whole and whose implementation cannot be limited to specific offices and departments, the AIP sets the yearly action agenda for the college generally. In contrast, the Academic and Student Services Master Plans have somewhat more limited agendas. The activities proposed within those plans are typically the business of the specific departments and programs which created the plans; implementation of these plans is by and large considered the responsibility of the specific departments and programs which formulated them. The Technology Master Plan shares characteristics of both the AIP and the AMP/SSMP: on the one hand, general institutional technical needs, as determined by the Technology Resources dean and staff, are listed in the plan; on the other, specific departmental and programmatic technical needs, taken directly from requests included in the AMP and SSMP, are likewise listed. As indicated elsewhere in this report, there are occasional overlaps between these two sets of technology needs, but, in all cases, it is the campus technology team that bears responsibility of their implementation. All planning activities detailed above eventually find their way to the IPC and subsequently to the president of the college – who is charged not only with the creation of the annual college budget, but also with imbuing that budget with the needs and aspirations which are given voice in the academic, student services, and technology master plans as well as in the general Strategic Plan. Working collegially with the Budget Committee, the President’s Cabinet, and the Vice President for Administrative Services, the president fashions an annual budget that responds as faithfully as resources permit to the needs which the college has identified as preeminent.

Near the end of their yearly cycles, in the spring of each academic year, all planning committees (AMP Committee, SSMP Committee, and Technology Plan Committee) conduct internal reviews and evaluations of their own processes. The results of these reviews and evaluations (including any revisions of committee charges, operational processes, ranking methodologies, etc.) are presented to the IPC for its consideration and approval ([AMP Minutes May 6, 2010 with relevant material highlighted](#)). The IPC examines and assesses these yearly reviews, looking not only to their impact on the operation of the sponsoring committees, but also to their effect on the general relation between planning and budget at the institution. The IPC then returns its analyses to the originating committees, which alter their processes in light of the advice they receive.

The college has very well established review procedures that result in continual alteration of its planning processes. However, the primary focus of these reviews in recent years has been to consider the merits of the academic, student services, and technology master plans and their outcomes, rather than the effectiveness of the processes that produce the plans and the processes that link the plans to the institutional budget. Clearly, the evaluation of the effectiveness of institutional planning processes and of the relations between those processes and the creation of the annual budget is the responsibility of the Innovation and Planning Council and, thus,

ultimately the responsibility of the president. According to the Innovation and Planning Council's official charge: "The President is accountable for the implementation and evaluation of the planning process."

During the fall semester 2010, the IPC will turn its focus toward the effectiveness of its planning processes and their link to the allocation of resources and, in conjunction with the development of SLO related college-level and institutional-level effectiveness outcomes, will begin to lay the groundwork for the following:

- Development of: specific measurable outcomes related to the review of all planning processes (instructional, student services, support services, etc. – as detailed above) as well as mechanisms for assessing those outcomes and for using assessment data to improve the planning processes
- Establishment of a methodology for annually comparing all master plans collectively to the Strategic Plan and to institutional resource allocation details so as to determine whether the college's top priorities are being funded.
- Establishment of procedures for assuring that all master planning committees have evaluated their own internal processes and their effectiveness in communicating priorities to IPC and the College President as well as into the college's resource allocation system.

I.B.7 The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

Planning Agenda #3: Although the standard is met, the college will continue efforts that support meeting the standard even further. The institution commits itself to designing a formal evaluation system to assess whether decisions, based on various institutional planning and approval processes, have positively impacted institutional effectiveness and learning outcomes. The evaluation mechanism will review internal assessment processes in instruction, student services, library and student support services, to ensure that student learning outcomes are positively impacted.

Examples of positive student outcomes may include:

- Instruction: student retention and persistence data
- Student Services: participation rates in counseling programs, orientation activities, etc
- Library/Learning Support Services: use of library and tutoring support services as well as enrollments in library orientation sessions.

Status: The standard is met and the college will continue efforts that support meeting the standard.

Response: The primary "internal assessment processes" at the college are the academic and student services program reviews which involve all the departments and programs within

instruction and student services and which inform decision-making at virtually every level of the institution.

Already within instructional program review, yearly analyses of the specifics in the form of the program review document itself; of the process whereby that document is constructed, presented, and assessed, and of the procedures as well as the charge of the Program Review Committee are conducted ([Instructional Program Review website](#)). Login is required. Student services program review will be initiating similar yearly analyses beginning in the very near future.

These annual analyses, combined with the end-of-the-year reviews undertaken by the academic, student services, and technology master planning committees, will provide the foundation for the college's establishment of a broader formal evaluation system which will assess and revise as needed the overall decision-making apparatus of the institution. Following the SLO model which now assesses the college's activities in terms of relevant learning outcomes, this formal evaluation system will link (map) decision-making at the specific and general levels to appropriate outcomes established for those levels and will culminate in the gathering of evidence which will allow the college to determine how effective it has been in achieving its collegially determined broad-based institutional goals – i.e., whether it has been successful in producing those outcomes identified as the key components of “institutional effectiveness.”

As with Planning Agenda #2, leadership of, and progress in, this assessment of the efficacy of decision-making at the institution will depend significantly on broad constituency input, as represented by the Innovation & Planning Council, and on the college president. Annual review processes presently in place as well as learning outcomes being identified at all levels of the college will provide a firm foundation for the achievement of this planning agenda item.

STANDARD II: STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

II.B.1 The institution assures the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, support student learning and enhance achievement of the mission of the institution.

Planning Agenda #4:

Cuyamaca College will monitor the implementation of the Student Services Master Plan and program review process to ensure that planning initiatives are in sync with each other, carried out and evaluated on a regular basis, and improvements to student support services are made as a result of this regular planning and review cycle.

Status: The standard is met and the college will continue efforts that support meeting the standard.

Response: The Student Services Master Plan and program review processes are monitored to ensure that planning initiatives are interrelated, completed, and evaluated on a regular basis. The process of regular planning and review led to improvements in student support services.

The Student Services Program Review process is monitored throughout the year through published agendas and minutes of meetings ([Student Services Program Review website](#)). Upon completion of the process, a document is produced. This document contains the results of the program review of three student services areas. The document is disseminated widely. In addition, oral reports on the results are made to the following groups: Academic Senate, Innovation & Planning Council, and President's Cabinet. A similar process of monitoring occurs with the Student Services Master Plan. At the end of the year, following the production of the plan for the ensuing year, reports are made to the Academic Senate, Innovation & Planning Council, and President's Cabinet. The final document is disseminated to appropriate individuals.

It is evident that the process of regular planning and review leads to improvements to student support services. For example, as a result of the Financial Aid Program Review, the need for a Financial Aid Director became apparent. This position was included in the Financial Aid Master Plan, and the following year, a Director was hired. DSP&S identified the need for a full-time Coordinator of the High Tech Center in its program review; this position was put in its master plan, and is now a reality. Part-time positions were added to student services as a result of the need being identified in the program review and the positions then being prioritized in the ensuing plan. Other needs such as computers and office supplies are identified through the program review process, are included in the master planning process, and then become a reality the following year.

II.B.4 The institution evaluates student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations for the basis of improvement.

Planning Agenda #5: Cuyamaca College will monitor the implementation the Student Services Program Review using CAS standards to ensure that evaluations are carried out as planned and information forwarded to the Student Services Master plan, and that improvements to student support services are made as a result of this regular planning and review cycle.

Status: The standard is met and the college will continue efforts that support meeting the standard.

Response: Cuyamaca College monitors the Student Services Program Review process to ensure that evaluations are carried out regularly. Every year, the Student Services Program Review Committee conducts a review of three student services areas using national standards developed by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). Student Services is on a five-year cycle of program review.

There is a clear connection between the results of the program review process for each area and that area's subsequent master plan. The Student Services Program Review process is completed every year just prior to the completion of the Student Services Master Plan process. The areas under review are thus able to incorporate any desired improvements, including personnel needs, into their subsequent master plan. A budget request accompanies staffing needs, supply and/or

technology needs, hourly assistance, and the like. Thus, the planning and the budgeting for the ensuing year is built upon the outcomes of the program review process and is included in the department plan the following year. This close interrelationship ensures a cycle of continuing evaluation, planning and improvement for each area.

The process of program review is monitored by the Student Services Program Review Committee and the Vice President of Student Development & Services throughout the year. Minutes and agendas are produced and kept on the college website: [Student Services Program Review website](#). At the end of each academic year, a report is given to the Academic Senate, Innovation & Planning Council and President's Cabinet. The Final Report is produced and the document is disseminated.

STANDARD III: RESOURCES

III.A.1. The institution assures 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.

III.A.1a. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority. Criteria for selection of faculty include knowledge of the subject matter or service to be performed (as determined by individuals with discipline expertise), effective teaching, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Institutional faculty play a significant role in selection of new faculty. Degrees held by faculty and administrators are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.

Planning Agenda #6: In a number of the Accreditation Self Study Survey items, differences were noted in the response results between faculty and staff: specifically, lower levels of agreement and higher levels of neutral responses and in some cases, disagreements were noted. The college proposes to work with the Office of Institutional Research to conduct further assessment of underlying factors for staff's reported perceptions and for such noteworthy neutral response levels. Based on the results of this additional research, the college proposes to work collaboratively with the classified staff leadership to address issues as appropriate. (III.A.1)

Status: Ongoing

Response: Planning Agenda #6 repeats verbatim the text of Planning Agenda #1 (please refer also to the response to that planning agenda item), but is designed to speak specifically to concerns about the district's hiring policies and procedures (which was the topic of Question #36 on the fall 2007 survey). In order to address the issues of high levels of neutral responses from classified staff and significant differences between faculty and staff in understanding the hiring processes and procedures, two questions (#5 and #5a) directly related to hiring procedures were

included in the survey recently distributed to the classified staff. The first question (#5) asked if the respondents had served on a district hiring committee. Of the 18 responses received to this survey, 14 indicated that they had served on a hiring committee. The second question (#5a) asked for levels of agreement or disagreement with the statement that the college adheres to the written policies for hiring and employment ([*Classified Senate Survey Results Jan 31 2010*](#)).

As with other statements in the current survey, respondents were given the opportunity to comment following Question 5a. Two written comments were received, each expressing concerns about the current implementation of district hiring policies. The criticisms focused on a perceived lack of opportunity for all interested staff to serve on hiring committees and on the perceived restrictions on freedom of expression in some hiring committee processes.

The responses to, and comments about, the question focusing on the hiring/employment policies and procedures will be taken seriously by the college. Any evidence that hiring policies are inappropriate or are not being correctly implemented will be investigated and appropriate responses will be proposed. Input from the classified constituency and involvement of that constituency in shared governance at the college will continue to be solicited and valued. Progress that has been made, especially recently, in integrating classified staff more fully into the decision-making processes of the college will be solidified and maintained into the future.

STANDARD IV: LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

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

Planning Agenda #7: The College recommends that the District Executive Council refine the process for reviewing, updating, and evaluating board policies to allow all constituency groups to provide input in a timely manner (Standard IV B.1.b)

Status: Ongoing

Response: In collaboration with DEC, a revised procedure has been implemented to streamline the review of Board Policies and Administrative Procedures. The new process includes:

- Preparation/draft of the proposed new or revised board policy and/or administrative procedure.
- Chancellor Review
- Chancellor's Cabinet review
- DEC consideration with a 60-day review period
- Board approval of policies/Chancellor issuance of procedures

The process assigns to staff members of the Chancellor/Governing Board Office the responsibility for shepherding new and revised policies and procedures through the review

process by: initiating discussions with key stake holders; maintaining a tracking system on policies and procedures under review; placing those policies and procedures on the DEC agendas and prioritizing them according to “legally required,” “legally recommended,” or “suggested as good practice”; then forwarding policies to the Governing Board for approval and procedures to the Chancellor for dissemination. ([DEC Minutes 06-08-09](#); [DEC Minutes 11-09-09](#))

Planning Agenda #8: The College recommends that the Board develop, formalize, and make available to all district constituency groups the processes for: orientation of new board members, self-evaluation of the Board members, violations of the code of ethics by Board members, and evaluation of the Chancellor and President. (Standard IV B.1.e.f.g.h.j)

Status: Ongoing

Response: The Board has developed and made available to all district constituency groups the processes for orientation of new board members, self-evaluation of the Board members, violations of the code of ethics by Board members, and evaluations of the Chancellor and President. As a result of the 2007 Self-Study and subsequent ACCJC recommendations, the following occurred:

- BP 2745 Board Self-Evaluation was updated on June 19, 2007, and again on July 15, 2008, and September 16, 2008. The policy is currently going through another review. A new administrative procedure, AP 2745 Board Self-Evaluation was issued on July 15, 2008 ([BP 2745/AP 2745](#)).
- BP 2715 Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice was updated on April 17, 2007 ([BP 2715](#)).
- BP 2435 Evaluation of the Chancellor was updated on June 19, 2007, and again on May 20, 2008. A new administrative procedure, AP 2435 Evaluation of the Chancellor, was issued on May 16, 2008 ([BP 2435/AP 2435](#)).
- BP 7112 college President Evaluation was adopted on December 9, 2008, with the corresponding administrative procedure (AP 7112) being issued on February 10, 2009 ([BP 7112/AP 7112](#)).