

Midterm Report



Skyline
COLLEGE
ACHIEVE



Midterm Report

Respectfully Submitted by:

Skyline College

San Mateo Community College District

3300 College Dr.

San Bruno, CA 94066

Submitted to:

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC),

Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)

Approved by the San Mateo Community College District Board of Trustees

October XX, 2016

Submitted to the ACCJC

October 15, 2016

MIDTERM REPORT – CERTIFICATION PAGE

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)
Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)

From: Dr. Regina Stanback Stroud, President
Skyline College
3300 College Dr.
San Bruno, CA 94066

This Midterm Report for Skyline College is submitted to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges/Western Association of Schools (ACCJC/WASC) for the purpose of fulfilling the Commission's requirements in connection with its action to reaffirm the College's accredited status. We certify there was broad participation by the campus community and believe this report accurately reflects the nature and substance of Skyline College.

Signed:


Dave Mandelkern, President, Board of Trustees


Ron Galatolo, Chancellor


Dr. Regina Stanback Stroud, President, Skyline College


Kate Browne, President, Academic Senate


Michele Haggard, President, Classified Senate


Dylan O'Shea, President, Associated Students of Skyline College


Aaron D. McVean, Accreditation Liaison Officer, Interim Vice President, Instruction (VPI)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Follow-Up Report – Certification Page | 2 |
| Skyline College Report Preparation | 4 |
| Background | 4 |
| Preparation of the Midterm Report | 4 |
| Acknowledgements | 4 |
| Response to Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letter | 5 |
| College Recommendation 1 | 5 |
| Conclusion | 6 |
| Evidence Cited | 6 |
| College Recommendation 2 | 6 |
| Conclusion | 7 |
| Evidence Cited | 7 |
| College Recommendation 3 | 8 |
| College Response | 8 |
| Conclusion | 10 |
| Evidence Cited | 10 |
| District Report Preparation | 11 |
| District Response to Commission Action Letter | 11 |
| District Recommendation #1 | 11 |
| Conclusion | 12 |
| Evidence | 12 |
| District Recommendation 2 | 12 |
| District Response | 12 |
| Conclusion | 14 |
| Evidence | 14 |
| District Recommendation #3 | 14 |
| Conclusion | 16 |
| Evidence | 16 |

BACKGROUND

Skyline College submitted its Self Evaluation Report in July 2013, which was followed by an evaluation team visit in October 21-24, 2013. On February 7, 2014, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC; 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 1

In order to meet the Standard and ensure quality instruction, the team recommends that the College adhere to its systematic and regularly scheduled process of performance evaluations for all adjunct faculty members (Standard III.A.1.b).

The College submitted its Follow-Up Report to the Commission on October 8, 2014. In its letter dated February 6, 2015, the Commission found that the College had fully resolved the deficiencies in College policies, procedures, and practices which led to noncompliance with Standard III.A.1.b.

PREPARATION OF THE MIDTERM REPORT

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 in the [Letter of Accreditation Reaffirmation](#). The preparation of the Skyline College Mid-Term Report was led by the Dean of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE) who also serves as the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO). There are three primary areas that are addressed in the report, and the ALO coordinated with the responsible administrator from each area to provide narrative and evidence of the efforts that have taken place related to the College Recommendations. Those efforts included the work of several governance committees, as well as faculty, staff, and administration from across the College.

The Midterm Report outlines the results of these efforts below and provides appropriate evidence. The report itself was vetted through the Skyline College participatory governance process. The report was reviewed by the President's Cabinet, Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC) and was accepted by the College Governance Council (CGC) to recommended approval to the President at its September 21st meeting, before being adopted by the Board of Trustees on September 28th, 2016.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 1

In order to meet the Standard and ensure quality instruction, the team recommends that the College adhere to its systematic and regularly scheduled process of performance evaluations for all adjunct faculty members (Standard III.A.1.b).

COLLEGE RESPONSE

In accordance with District policy adjunct faculty are evaluated in the first semester of service. Subsequently, adjunct faculty are evaluated at least once every six (6) semesters and the evaluation is completed by the end of the semester in which it is begun. The Division Dean facilitates and the Instruction Office monitors the adjunct faculty evaluations to assure compliance with the District policy and procedures (see Table 1 for listing of Divisions).

The adjunct faculty receive a peer evaluation by a tenured faculty and an evaluation from the Division Dean. With the peer evaluator, the Division Dean then forwards the joint evaluation recommendation to the Vice President of Instruction. At the beginning of each Fall and Spring semester, the Division Dean provides an updated “Part-Time Faculty Evaluation Tracking” spreadsheet to the Office of the Vice President of Instruction. The tracking spreadsheet provides information on which adjunct faculty have completed their evaluation or will be evaluated at the end of each semester. This tracking spreadsheet assists the Division Deans to be in compliance with the evaluation timelines. (Evidence – 1.1, 1.2)

Immediately following the Fall 2013 visit when the deficiency was noted, Skyline College addressed the issue by making current all adjunct evaluations and putting a procedure in place to ensure a systematic

Table 1 : Divisions

| |
|---|
| Business, Education, & Professional Programs (BEPP) |
| Kinesiology, Athletics, & Dance (KAD) |
| Language Arts & Learning Resources (LA/LR) |
| Science, Math, & Technology (SMT) |
| Social Sciences & Creative Arts (SS/CA) |

and regularly scheduled process of performance evaluations moving forward.

The process for collecting and tracking the information is documented as follows:

1. At the beginning of each semester, Instructional Deans and the Counseling Dean fill out PT Faculty tracking spreadsheet (standard format for all divisions).
2. Deans forward their completed tracking spreadsheets to the Instruction Office SharePoint site and upload into appropriate folders by the end of the second week of each semester. The spreadsheet indicates faculty start dates, when evaluations are due, and when each is completed.
3. The Vice President of Instruction (VPI) reviews the tracking charts during the third and fourth weeks of each semester and provides feedback to the deans.

4. At the end of each academic year, the VPI will prepare a summary report to the College President.

As described in the Skyline College Follow Up report submitted in October of 2014, by the end of the Fall 2013 semester, the Divisions had completed the evaluations at the following rates: (1) BEPP – 96% (2) LA/LR – 91%; (3) KAD – 100% (4) SMT – 100% and (5) SS/CA – 70%, for an average of 91.4% completion of evaluations by the end of the fall 2013 semester as scheduled. The deficiency has therefore been fully addressed and will be maintained in the subsequent semesters. The procedures, process, and schedules for these evaluations are now part of the Instruction Office Operations SharePoint site, available to all Division Deans. At the completion of the 2015-16 academic year, evaluations were completed at the following rates: (1) BEPP – 92% (2) LA/LR – 98%; (3) KAD – 100% (4) SMT – 100% and (5) SS/CA – 86%. (Evidence – 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5)

CONCLUSION

Skyline College has fully addressed the noted deficiency and meets the Standard III.A.1.b.

EVIDENCE CITED

1.1 – Part-Time Faculty Evaluation Tracking – EXAMPLES

(http://skylinecollege.edu/accreditation/assets/documents/midterm_report/Evidence_1.1.pdf)

1.2 – Part-Time Faculty Evaluation Process

(http://skylinecollege.edu/accreditation/assets/documents/midterm_report/Evidence_1.2.pdf)

1.3 – Faculty Evaluation Form (<http://www.smccd.edu/evaluation-procedures/>)

1.4 – Evaluation Summary Form (<http://www.smccd.edu/evaluation-procedures/>)

1.5 – Faculty Evaluation Procedures (<http://www.smccd.edu/evaluation-procedures/>)

COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 2

In order to improve and increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College complete a systematic review of its integrated planning and resource allocation cycle, in its entirety as a holistic process, and to do so in a purposeful and well documented manner to promote transparency and sustainability (Standards I.B, I.B.6, I.B.7).

COLLEGE RESPONSE

Skyline College made a significant change to its committee structure at the beginning of the 2014/15 academic year, with the formation of the Strategic Planning and Allocation of Resources Committee (SPARC), which merged the Institutional Planning Council (IPC) and the College Budget Committee (CBC) to form SPARC. The intent of this merger was to more formally integrate planning and resource allocation through structure and process. This committee, as part of its charge, took the lead in addressing this recommendation to improve effectiveness.

As part of its regular cycle of evaluation, Skyline College conducted the Employee Voice Survey, a biennial survey effort designed to assess practices, processes, and procedures related to institutional effectiveness. The survey was divided into two areas of focus: Integrated Planning and Resource Allocation Cycle (IPRAC) and Equity and Leadership. The questions on the survey were designed to assess the IPRAC addressed issues such as involvement in the process, familiarity with the process, effectiveness of the process, access to information, clarity, timing, and alignment of planning and resource allocation (Evidence – 2.1).

Results from the survey were shared with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) and the Strategic Planning and Allocation of Resources Committee (SPARC). The overall response rate was strong, with 43% of regular Skyline College employees responding to the survey. Two areas emerged that led to additional dialogue: engagement and communication. Just under half of the respondents indicated they were involved in processes directly related to planning and resource allocation. Additionally, a stronger feedback loop, in particular on resource allocation decision-making processes, was a common theme (Evidence 2.2, 2.3).

The results of the survey and subsequent discussions led to the revision and clarification of the integrated planning and resource allocation process. The Dean of PRIE, working with the Vice President of Administrative Services, first outlined all of the regular planning processes of the college and identified the points in time where it would be logical to inform resource allocation decisions. This included the program review components of Annual Program Plans (APPs) and Administrative Leadership Unit Reviews (ALURs), as well as other processes such as the Full-Time Equivalent Faculty Allocation Committee (FTEFAC) process. A draft alignment model was developed and presented to the SPARC. Following input, the IPRAC Model was revised and finalized before being officially approved by SPARC in the Spring of 2016 (Evidence 2.4, 2.5).

These efforts contributed to the College's application to the California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) for technical assistance in the areas of integrated planning and resource allocation and enrollment management. As a result of that technical assistance an implementation plan was developed that included an action item to implement software that will better automatize the submission of planning documents, aggregation of resource requests, and provide a better feedback loop after allocation decisions are made. The College received a grant for \$150,000 that, in part, will be used to identify and implement this software (Evidence 2.6, 2.7).

CONCLUSION

Skyline College has addressed this recommendation.

EVIDENCE CITED

2.1 – Employee Voice Survey – IPRAC

(http://skylinecollege.edu/accreditation/assets/documents/midterm_report/Evidence_2.1.pdf)

2.2 – Employee Voice Survey Results

(<http://www.skylinecollege.edu/prie/assets/surveyresults/employeecommunityfeedback/2015employeevoicesurvey.pdf>)

2.3 – SPARC Minutes – Survey Results Discussion

(<http://www.skylinecollege.edu/sparc/assets/agendaminutes/2015-16/20151029sparcminutes.pdf>)

2.4 – SPARC Minutes – IPRAC Model Approval

(<http://www.skylinecollege.edu/sparc/assets/agendaminutes/2015-16/20160324sparcagenda.pdf>)

2.5 – IPRAC Model

(<http://www.skylinecollege.edu/sparc/assets/agendaminutes/2015-16/20160324sparcappendixiii.pdf>)

2.6 – IEPI Letter of Interest

(http://skylinecollege.edu/accreditation/assets/documents/midterm_report/Evidence_2.6.pdf)

2.7 – IEPI Approved Implementation Plan

(<http://www.skylinecollege.edu/sparc/assets/agendaminutes/2015-16/20160324sparcappendixiv.pdf>)

COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 3

In order to improve and promote quality instruction, the team recommends that the college adhere to its policy ensuring that all Distance Education courses are effectively facilitating student learning by providing continuous, regular and substantive faculty interaction with students (Standards II.A.1.b, II.A.2, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e.).

COLLEGE RESPONSE

In response to this recommendation, Skyline College modified its organizational structure and enhanced resources devoted to supporting Distance Education.

Academic Support & Learning Technologies Division

In summer 2014, the College created the division of Academic Support & Learning Technologies and hired a Division Dean to provide leadership to Distance Education. In addition, the staffing allocation for the Center for Transformative Teaching and Learning (CTTL) was modified to provide additional support for faculty teaching Distance Education courses. Duties related to Media Services were shifted from the Instructional Technologist to allow him to focus 100% of his time in support of faculty, a .4 FTE Program Services Coordinator position was hired to support Distance Education compliance and student support services for Online Courses, a .48 FTE Accessibility Specialist was hired to work with faculty teaching online, and a 1.0 FTE Instructional Designer (Faculty) was hired.

DE Steering Committee

In Spring 2015 the College formed a Distance Education (DE) Steering Committee. The DE Steering Committee was formed in conjunction with the CTTL to enhance the already successful distance education program at the College. The Steering Committee meets monthly during the academic year and is comprised of full-time and part-time faculty representatives from Instruction and Student Services who currently teach online, the CTTL staff, and administration. The Steering Committee is co-chaired by the faculty DE Coordinator and the Dean of Academic Support & Learning Technologies. The Steering Committee has developed and reviewed the Online Course Standards document, the Distance

Education Handbook and has provided substantive feedback on the decision to work with the California Community College's Online Education Initiative to migrate to the Canvas Learning Management System and adopt other tools to support success in online courses.

Online Course Standards

In Fall 2014, the CTTL Staff began work on the development of a Distance Education Faculty Certification and Re-Certification Program in response to the ACCJC DE recommendation. This program focused on requiring initial and ongoing professional development for faculty teaching online, the adoption of a course quality rubric that assure continuous, regular and substantive faculty interaction with students, and a new program of peer review for all online courses. In November 2014 and February 2015, the Instructional Leadership Team reviewed this proposal and provided feedback. The revised proposal was presented to the Skyline College Academic Senate on April 2, 2015 with a follow up discussion on April 16, 2015. Senate feedback was addressed at the DE Steering Committee meetings in April and May 2015. The outcome of this initial discussion through the participatory governance process was a modification from a certification program to a set of Online Course Standards. The Online Course Standards revised document was presented to Academic Senate on October 1, 2015 and approved on November 19, 2015.

Online Course Review

CTTL staff regularly review online courses to assure that courses are effectively facilitating student learning by providing continuous, regular and substantive faculty interaction with students and that faculty are following the guidelines and procedures for online courses at Skyline College. If problems are noticed, CTTL staff work directly with faculty to make necessary corrections. If corrections have not been made, academic Deans and the Vice President of Instruction are notified. All online faculty are encouraged to participate in training that is focused on online course quality that includes best practices for regular and effective contact with students. The College has adopted the use of the OEI Course Quality Rubric as the design standard for all online and hybrid courses. This rubric is used as a guide for all faculty teaching online and for the regular review of online courses by CTTL staff.

DE Handbook

During the 2015-2016 academic year, the Skyline College DE Handbook was revised and modified to reflect the College's migration to the Canvas LMS and the adoption of the Online Course Standards. The DE Coordinator in the CTTL redesigned the handbook and presented the new draft to the DE Steering Committee at the March 14, 2016 meeting. The Steering Committee provided input and suggestions during the March and April meetings in preparation for the draft to be reviewed by Academic Senate at their May 18, 2016 meeting.

Professional Development

The professional development program supporting Distance Education was modified in Spring 2016 with the announcement that Skyline College would be adopting the Canvas course management system

starting in Summer 2016. The CTTL will be providing training for faculty using Canvas course materials that have been developed by @ONE in partnership with the OEI and Canvas. Training will include an orientation to course design using the OEI course quality rubric. The Academic Senate adopted the rubric as the standard for online and hybrid courses taught at Skyline College. This training integrates the application of best practices for assuring regular and effective contact in online courses. In addition to training, one-on-one consultations are available to online faculty to support course quality.

CONCLUSION

Skyline College has addressed this recommendation.

EVIDENCE CITED

3.1 – Distance Education Steering Committee – Invitation Email

(http://skylinecollege.edu/accreditation/assets/documents/midterm_report/Evidence_3.1.pdf)

3.2 – Meeting Agendas

(http://skylinecollege.edu/accreditation/assets/documents/midterm_report/Evidence_3.2.pdf)

3.3 – Online Course Standards

(http://skylinecollege.edu/accreditation/assets/documents/midterm_report/Evidence_3.3.pdf)

3.4 – Online Course Standards –Academic Senate minutes

(http://skylinecollege.edu/accreditation/assets/documents/midterm_report/Evidence_3.4.pdf)

3.6 – Update on Integration of Online Education Initiative

(http://skylinecollege.edu/accreditation/assets/documents/midterm_report/Evidence_3.6.pdf)

3.7 – DE Handbook

(http://skylinecollege.edu/accreditation/assets/documents/midterm_report/Evidence_3.7.pdf)

3.8 – Professional Development

(http://skylinecollege.edu/accreditation/assets/documents/midterm_report/Evidence_3.8.pdf)

3.9 – CTTL Canvas Training Plan

(http://skylinecollege.edu/accreditation/assets/documents/midterm_report/Evidence_3.9.pdf)

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:

| Recommendation | Contact office | Summary of Actions Taken |
|--|----------------------------|---|
| District Recommendation 1 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 <u>Appendices</u> . |
| District Recommendation 2 Develop goals for professional development & orientation of new Trustees | Office of Communication | Developed goals for professional development and oriented new Trustee. Documented actions taken. |
| District Recommendation 3 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. District Staff and faculty representatives worked together to revise faculty evaluation procedures over a period of two years. Changes 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)

DISTRICT RESPONSE

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, D.C.

[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)

In March 2016, the Board amended Board Policy 1.10 by adding item 2.i. which specifically states, "To provide a comprehensive new trustee orientation program for newly elected or appointed trustees that may include attendance at a statewide “New Trustee” orientation program; one on-one interviews with the Chancellor, Presidents and Executive Vice Chancellor; discussions with representatives of employee groups, the Academic and Classified Senates and student leaders; delivery of the Trustee Handbook prepared by the Community College League of California (CCLC); and review of the CCLC’s comprehensive online education program titled “Elected/ Appointed Trustees: Next Steps.”

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 was used for the Trustee elected in November 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 regularly 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; BØO: 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 2015 was asked to complete the following tasks:

- Meet with the President to discuss the current issues the District Board is facing. (completed, spring 2016)
- Meet the Chancellor and Executive Staff to receive an overview of District operations, budget, and governance. (completed, spring 2016)
- Meet with each of the three College Presidents to gain an understanding about the College programs, strengths, and weaknesses (in progress)
- Meet with the District Academic Senate President (ongoing)
- Attend the CCLC “New Trustee Orientation” program that is offered annually. (completed, spring 2016)
- 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. (completed, spring 2016)

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, Community Education, Auxiliary and Enterprise Services, and the Chancellor’s office were added to the Calendar. The new Calendar is as follows:

| Unit | Review Date | Responsible Individual |
|---|-------------|------------------------|
| IT | March 2016 | Vaskelis |
| Public Safety | March 2016 | Nunez |
| Emergency Preparedness | March 2016 | Nunez |
| Education Services and Planning | March 2016 | Moore |
| Accreditation Mid-term Report 2016 | | |
| HR | March 2017 | Whitlock |
| Auxiliary and Enterprise Services | March 2017 | Bauer |
| Community Education | March 2017 | Bauer |
| Chancellor's Office | March 2017 | Galatolo |
| District International Education | March 2018 | Luan |
| Administrative Services (Accounting, Payroll, Purchasing) | March 2018 | Blackwood |
| Facilities Planning, Maintenance and Operations | March 2018 | Nunez |
| IT | March 2019 | Vaskelis |
| Public Safety | March 2019 | Nunez |
| Emergency Preparedness | March 2019 | Nunez |
| Education Services and Planning | March 2019 | Moore |
| Accreditation Self Study 2019 | | |

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 Preparedness, Information Technology, Human Resources, International Education, Community Education, Education Services and Planning, Auxiliary and Enterprise services and the Chancellor's Office.

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)