



# Cañada College

---

## Midterm Report 2016





# Midterm Report 2016

*To*

**Accrediting Commission for Community and junior Colleges**

**Western Association of Schools and Colleges**

*Submitted by*

**Cañada College**

4200 Farm Hill Boulevard

Redwood City, CA 94061

650.306.3100

[www.canadacollege.edu](http://www.canadacollege.edu)

**October 2016**

## Midterm Report 2016 – Certification Page

Date: October 10, 2016

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

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

**Signed:**

---

Karen Schwarz, President, Board of Trustees

---

Ron Galatolo, Chancellor

---

XXX, College President

---

Douglas Hirzel, President, Academic Senate

---

Debbie Joy, President, Classified Senate

---

XXX, President, Associated Students of Cañada College

---

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

**Table of Contents**

**Midterm Report 2016 – Certification Page ..... 3**

**Report Preparation..... 6**

    Background ..... 6

    Preparation of the Midterm Report 2016..... 6

    Acknowledges..... 7

**Response to 2013 Team Recommendations..... 9**

**College Recommendation #2..... 9**

    Actions Completed to Fully Address Recommendation..... 9

        Course Outlines of Record (COR) Process Revision: October/November 2013 ..... 9

        All CORs Up-to-Date: January 2014..... 9

        Follow-Up Report 2014 ..... 10

        Continuous Improvement..... 11

    Conclusion ..... 11

    Evidence..... 11

**College Recommendation #1..... 12**

    Background..... 12

    Actions Completed to Fully Address Recommendation..... 12

        Reallocation of Measure G Funding ..... 13

        Prioritization of Funding New Positions..... 13

        Continual Improvement of Program Review ..... 14

        Allocation of Resources Requests ~~from Program Review~~..... 15

        Accurately Document the Process in the Participatory Governance Manual ..... 15

    Conclusion ..... 15

    Evidence..... 15

**District Report Preparation..... 16**

**District Response to Commission Action Letter ..... 17**

**District Recommendation #1..... 17**

    Evidence..... 17

**District Recommendation #2..... 18**  
Evidence..... 19

**District Recommendation #3..... 20**  
Evidence..... 22

## Report Preparation

### Background

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

#### College Recommendation 2

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

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

### Preparation of the Midterm Report 2016

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

#### College Recommendation 2

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

#### College Recommendation 1

In order to improve institutional effectiveness the College should provide evidence of the robust dialogue that exists at the College between planning councils and governance groups, particularly the exchanges that relate to planning and resource allocation outcomes and processes. (I.B.4)

#### District Recommendation 1

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

**District Recommendation 2**

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

**District Recommendation 3**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Acknowledges**

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

**College Recommendation 2**

Curriculum Committee Chair Dani Behonick, PhD, Academic Senate President/Planning and Budgeting Council co-chair Professor Doug Hirzel, Vice President of Instruction Gregory Anderson, EdD, and all members of the Curriculum Committee. (Miss anyone?)

**College Recommendation 1**

Academic Senate President/Planning and Budgeting Council co-chair Professor Doug Hirzel, Classified Senate President/Planning and Budgeting Council co-chair Debbie Joy, Instructional Planning Council co-chairs Jessica Kaven, PhD and Gregory Anderson, EdD, Student Services Planning Council co-chairs Ruth Miller and Kim Lopez, Administrative Planning Council chair Chialin Hsieh, EdD, and all planning council members. (Miss anyone?)

**District Recommendation 1**

Vice Chancellor of Human Resources Eugene Whitlock

**District Recommendation 2**

Director of Community/Government Relations Barbara Christensen

**District Recommendation 3**

Director of General Services Susan Harrison

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

---

XXX

President

## Response to 2013 Team Recommendations

### College Recommendation #2

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

---

### Actions Completed to Fully Address Recommendation

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

In late October and early November 2013, faculty leadership engaged in a series of discussions to complete the revisions that had been underway for almost two months. The draft of this revised policy: *Ongoing Review of Prerequisites, Co-requisites, Advisories, and Course Outlines of Record* was first reviewed by the Curriculum Committee on November 8, 2013. The Curriculum Committee provided revisions at this meeting and the revised draft was circulated to the faculty as part of the attachments for the November 14, 2013 Academic Senate meeting. The Senate made comments on the draft document and provided those to the Curriculum Committee. The final document was approved by the Curriculum Committee on November 22, 2013 and endorsed by the Academic Senate on December 12, 2013.

This document more clearly defined the timeframe for reviewing CORs (two years for CTE courses and five years for non-CTE courses) and described the sanctions for not completing the review and revision within that timeframe (classifying courses as inactive and not including them in the class schedule).

#### All CORs Up-to-Date: January 2014

Once the new process was adopted in late fall, all of the faculty who had CORs that needed updating were contacted and a timeline for correction was identified. All of the CORs that needed review and revision were completed and submitted to the Curriculum Committee at the December and January meetings. As of the end of January 2014, all CORs are up-to-date according to the new process.

The College has, since the time of the Team visit, revised its existing system for identifying course outlines of record that more fully ensures regular review and secures curriculum currency.

***“Review of the System [Process] for Identifying Course Outlines of Record that are Out-of-Date”***

The College has reviewed the process for identifying course outlines of record that are out-of-date. The revised process adopted by the Curriculum Committee has been included as a revision to the *Curriculum Committee Handbook*. The revised process approved on November 22, 2013 is included on pages 9-10. The following is an excerpt which outlines the process to be used to **identify CORs that are out of date**:

*Each January the Office of Instruction will generate a list of all CTE courses that have reached their two-year review cycle and a separate list of all other courses that have reached their five-year review cycle. These lists will be distributed to all faculty, the Curriculum Committee, Division Deans, and posted online no later than the third week of the spring semester.*

*Faculty will have one calendar year to update all courses that will remain active. For example, in January 2014, a list of courses will be generated that must be updated for inclusion in the 2015- 2016 catalog.*

#### **“Implementation of a Curriculum Process to Ensure Timely Review and Currency”**

In order to assure that CORs are regularly reviewed, the Curriculum Committee identified strategies for addressing those which are not reviewed within the two-year (CTE courses) or five-year (non-CTE courses) cycles. The following excerpt from the revised process provides *assurance of timely review and currency*:

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

Working closely with faculty and division deans throughout the months of November 2013, December 2013 and January 2014, the Curriculum Committee has ensured compliance of all Course Outlines of Record with this new policy as of the adjournment of its January 24, 2014 meeting. Additional policies are in development for ongoing implementation of this policy, as well as future automation of the notification process.

#### **Follow-Up Report 2014**

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

## Continuous Improvement

XXX Dani (Ask Jack)

# of COR updated, % of COR updated, 23 COR not updated, consequences—ask for extension or banked (inactivated) # of them, COR inactivated had impacted to other degree/certificate programs → process developed on notification

Results of the process → eliminated extension option

Only banked option

## Conclusion

The College has met the directive of the Team's recommendation outlined in the External Evaluation Report by making changes in the following processes:

1. COR review is no longer part of Program Review. It occurs as a process of the Curriculum Committee.
2. Curriculum Committee Handbook – revised to address CORs more specifically, and
3. Revised Course Outline of Record Review process adopted by the Curriculum Committee.

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

**The College has met College Recommendation 2 in full.**

## Evidence

See evidence for College Recommendation 2. (Website)

## College Recommendation #1

*In order to improve institutional effectiveness the college should record the robust dialogue that exists at the College between planning councils and governance groups, particularly the exchanges that relate to planning and resource allocation outcomes and processes. (I.B.4)*

---

### Background

The college sincerely appreciated the commendation made by the Team on “imbuing a culture of inclusion by fostering a high level of participation in the decision making process leading to outstanding collegiality and collaboration among the faculty, staff, students, and administration.” And, the college community recognizes that it is our responsibility to communicate the outcomes of the conversations resulting from this high level participation through minutes, postings on our website, etc. As the Team noted on page 31 of the *External Evaluation Report*, “The College demonstrated robust dialog to the Visiting Team; however providing a record of the dialog and resource decisions could be better communicated.”

Of particular concern to the Team was the communication of information in our primary resource allocation activity – the new position proposal process. In this process, the dialog among the four participatory governance groups was robust, and although we captured the comments, these were not posted or distributed campus-wide. In addition, when the President made his decision about the positions to hire, he sent an all-campus email, but this was not documented in the minutes of the Planning and Budgeting Council meetings nor posted to the website.

The college recognizes the need to improve our processes and make certain that campus conversations are recorded, circulated among the campus communities, and documented on the website. We have taken action and implemented processes which are described below and have now fully addressed this recommendation.

### Actions Completed to Fully Address Recommendation

Beginning in November 2013, the College established a new enhanced standard for documenting and communicating planning and resource allocation decisions. The College now creates dedicated web pages for discussions and decisions related to budget development, new staffing positions, and allocation of resources for equipment, research, and professional development. On these web pages, links are provided in chronological order to relevant documents including: process, timelines, discussion notes, meeting minutes, and college-wide communications. By collating documentation that exists in disparate locations we are able to show clearly the

evidence of dialogue and communication that occurs among our participatory governance groups, the campus and our community.

Below are several examples that illustrate our new documentation and communication standards.

### Reallocation of Measure G Funding

As Measure G, the San Mateo County parcel tax that significantly augmented the college's budget, neared expiration, the President asked the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) to create a transparent process for determining the allocation of carryover Measure G funds and transfer of one-time funded programs to other sources of funding including the General Fund. In order to ensure that the process and dialogue was clearly recorded and communicated, the college records detailed minutes of meetings, and posts all relevant documentation online in chronological order.

1. The process created by PBC involved requiring the affected programs to provide a report of their activities, proposals to function at reduced funding and projected impact of reduced or lost funding.
2. These reports were made available to the entire college by posting online.
3. The meeting agenda for PBC's discussion and prioritization was distributed college-wide.
4. Concerted effort was made to ensure that detailed content of the discussion and PBC's recommendation to the president was recorded in meeting minutes.
5. The President's decision was reported to PBC and shared with the entire college and our community through the Olive Hill Press (the President's weekly campus newsletter).
6. All documents and minutes were posted online in chronological order.

<http://canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/MeasureG.php>

### Prioritization of Funding New Positions

The College's Participatory Governance Manual delineates the process for proposing and prioritizing the funding of new faculty/staff/administrative positions. This process occurs bi-annually: once in fall semester, once in spring. It is based upon program review and submission of a New Position Proposal. In order to ensure the process and dialogue was clearly recorded and communicated, the college records detailed minutes of meetings and posts all relevant documentation online in chronological order.

1. The prioritization process includes posting of all New Position Proposals and Program Reviews online.
2. Representatives make college-wide presentations of their proposals. These are video recorded and posted on iTunesU for the entire campus community to view.
3. Discussion groups, consisting of members from all Planning Councils (IPC, SSPC, APC, PBC), the Academic Senate, constituent groups, and the college community at large,

identify the pros and cons of each proposal. These lists are posted on the walls during the meeting so all attending are able to review them.

4. The lists of pros and cons generated from the meeting are transcribed, posted online, and distributed as part of the agenda packet for the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) meeting to discuss.
5. PBC discusses the process and makes a final recommendation to the president. This is captured in meeting minutes.
6. The President's decision is announced to the PBC, recorded in meeting minutes, and announced via email to the campus.
7. All documents and minutes were posted online in chronological order:  
<http://canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/staffing-1314.php>  
<http://canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/staffing-1415.php>

Planning Councils evaluate the process twice a year to make sure the process is transparent and the community members had opportunities to participate in the process. Please see PBC minutes for details.

### Continual Improvement of Program Review

The Academic Senate established a goal to revise and improve the Program Review and resource request process, forms, and timeline. This process would involve dialogue with the four planning councils (IPC, SSPC, APC and PBC). To ensure that the process was transparent, inclusive, and communicated, the Senate recorded detailed minutes of meetings and posted all relevant documentation online in chronological order.

1. The Academic Senate held discussions about the strengths and weaknesses of current program review processes and recorded those in meeting minutes. Senate also conducted faculty-wide surveys, advertised by all-college emails, and posted the results online.
2. The Academic Senate and Instructional Planning Council (IPC) constructed a draft proposal, held discussions and conducted additional faculty-wide surveys to gain feedback on the proposal.
3. The Academic Senate discussed and adopted the final proposal.
4. The IPC developed and adopted a timeline for Instructional Program Review.
5. In consultation with SSPC and APC, the timeline was revised and adopted by PBC for college-wide use.
6. All documents and minutes were posted online in chronological order:  
<http://www.canadacollege.edu/academicsenate/programreview.php>

## Allocation of Resources Requests ~~from Program Review~~

A significant component of Program Review at Cañada College is the request for human, equipment, facilities, research and professional development resources. The process of reviewing these requests and decisions for allocation of funding is clearly delineated and communicated by posting all relevant documentation online.

1. The process for reviewing and allocating funds for new position proposals has been described previously in this report in the section entitled *Prioritization of Funding New Positions*.
2. The process for allocating funds for instructional equipment, information technology, facilities, research and professional development requests begins with a review of the requests by the Instructional, Student Services, and/or Administrative Planning Councils based upon the justification provided in the most recent program review Program Plan. The planning councils forward requests that are recommended for funding to the appropriate administrative units or funding committee (e.g. instructional deans council, technology purchasing committee, Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, etc.).
3. A report is prepared for PBC that summarize fulfilled requests and identifies un-funded needs. These documents are posted online on the appropriate Resource Allocation website. <http://canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/budget.php>

The College has hired a brand new position—Vice President of Administrative Services (VPAS), funded by the district. Since the VPAS is onboard, she has established clear guideline on operation budget and supported managers in monitor their budget and taking action when needed. She has also trained program review writers on the program review resource requests; therefore, the requests from program review are meaningful and not busy work.

Academic Senate Michelle training: Enrollment management

PBC, SPOL

## Accurately Document the Process in the Participatory Governance Manual

XXX

## Conclusion

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

**The College has met College Recommendation 1 in full.**

## Evidence

See evidence for College Recommendation 1. (Website)

## District Report Preparation

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

The individuals assigned to address the recommendations included:

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

## District Response to Commission Action Letter

### District Recommendation #1

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

---

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

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

### Conclusion

**The District has met District Recommendation 1 in full.**

### Evidence

See evidence for District Recommendation 1. (Website)

## District Recommendation #2

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### New Trustee Orientation

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

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

### **Conclusion**

**The District has met District Recommendation 2 in full.**

### **Evidence**

See evidence for District Recommendation 2. (Website)

### District Recommendation #3

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

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

Unit	Review Date	Responsible Individual
Administrative Services (Accounting, Payroll, Purchasing)	March 2015	Blackwood
Facilities	March 2015	Nunez
District International Education	March 2015	Luan
IT	March 2016	Vaskelis
Education Services and Planning	March 2016	Moore
<b>Accreditation Mid-term Report 2016</b>		
HR	March 2017	Whitlock
Auxiliary Services	March 2017	Bauer
District International Education	March 2018	Luan
Administrative Services (Accounting, Payroll, Purchasing)	March 2018	Blackwood
Facilities, *Public Safety and *Emergency Preparedness  *these facilities departments were added to 2018 cycle	March 2018	Nunez
IT	March 2019	Vaskelis
Education Services and Planning	March 2019	Moore

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

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

The survey tool supported by IT is NoviSurvey.

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

Program Review Process/Timeline:

**January-February:** Review/Revise Prior survey questions

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

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

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

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

Program Review Template:

1. Executive Summary
2. Unit description
3. Describe major accomplishments since last review
4. Current state of the Unit
  - a. Describe the current state of the unit (May include strengths and challenges).
  - b. What changes could be implemented to improve your unit?
5. Action plan. Describe how opportunities for improvement will be addressed

6. Needs: Equipment, Professional Development, Facilities, Staffing, Research (when appropriate)

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

## Conclusion

**The District has met District Recommendation 3 in full.**

## Evidence

See evidence for District Recommendation 3. (Website)