

**San Bernardino Community College District**

**Accreditation Services, Phase I  
Report and Recommendations**

**July 6, 2009**

**Matthew C. Lee, Ph.D.**

## Table of Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Summary of Principal Observations and Findings .....  | 3  |
| Background: Accreditation Sanctions .....   | 6  |
| Background:<br>Sound Practice in Completion and Integration of Planning Cycles.....                                   | 7  |
| Review and Analysis Process .....   | 9  |
| CHC Responses to Commission Recommendations.....  | 11 |
| CHC Team Recommendation 1: Integrated Planning .....  | 14 |
| CHC Team Recommendation 2: Data.....  | 17 |
| CHC Team Recommendation 3: SLOs and Other Outcomes .....  | 19 |
| CHC Team Recommendation 4:<br>Administrative and Governance Evaluation.....   | 23 |
| CHC Team Recommendation 8:<br>Integration of Program Review; Distributed Education .....                              | 25 |
| CHC Team Recommendation 10:<br>Long-term Fiscal Plans and Financial Information.....                                  | 26 |
| Accrediting Commission Action Probabilities .....   | 27 |
| Responses to Commission Recommendations on District Operations .....  | 28 |
| CHC Team Recommendation 7:<br>District Program Review, Strategic Plan,<br>Technology Plan, Human Resources Plan ..... | 28 |
| CHC/SBVC Commission Recommendation 1:<br>District Resource Allocation Process .....                                   | 31 |
| Status and Direction of SBVC Educational Master Planning .....  | 32 |
| Consolidated List of All Consultant Recommendations.....  | 34 |
| Accrediting Commission Recommendations for Crafton Hills College .....  | 42 |

**Accreditation Services, Phase I  
Report and Recommendations  
Matthew C. Lee, Ph.D.  
July 6, 2009**

**Summary of Principal Observations and Findings**

1. Probation is a very serious Commission sanction that requires immediate and sustained corrective action.
2. Completion and integration of planning cycles is sound practice and will help the District and Colleges become more effective at everything they do. That outcome is at least as important as complying with Commission recommendations.
3. Planning is *never* finished. The cycle of planning, implementation, and evaluation should be part and parcel of the culture, embedded in its operations and institutional conversations.
4. Crafton Hills College (CHC) has made progress in several areas since the evaluation team's visit, but must accomplish a great deal more in order to receive full reaffirmation of its accreditation.
5. CHC administrators, faculty, and staff are fully capable of doing the necessary work with appropriate guidance, but everyone must pull together over the next 15 months to make it happen.
6. Strong and inspiring leadership from the CHC President will be crucial to the College's success in gaining full reaffirmation.
7. Despite the existence of certain shared governance structures and processes, CHC perceives itself to plan and make decisions largely on the basis of personal relationships rather than well-defined, formal, documented structures and processes. Improving CHC's institutional effectiveness will require the establishment and enhancement of such documented structures and processes in many areas.
8. Further improvement in the transparency of decision-making by the CHC President and other CHC leaders will facilitate continued smooth relations between administration and all constituency groups.
9. The CHC President, the CHC Vice Presidents, and the vast majority of other CHC administrators, faculty, and staff have not served on an accreditation evaluation team since the new accreditations standards went into effect in 2002. Such service would have been extremely valuable in the self-study process.
10. The CHC accreditation self-study process was problematic, and corrective steps should be taken before the next cycle.
11. CHC requires a participatory educational master planning process and structure that is fully cognizant of all other major planning-related processes and structures on campus.
12. Broad quantitative measures of institutional effectiveness, which need not be particularly complicated, must be developed for CHC.
13. The CHC Vice President of Administrative Services is developing a model for long-range fiscal projections. Once the model is approved through appropriate channels and implemented, it can be used to inform the CHC Educational Master Plan (EMP), and it should also help units in their annual planning processes.

14. CHC has recently broadened access to financial data to include more employees, though software license restrictions might constrain further improvement in that direction.
15. The CHC Vice President of Administrative Services, in consultation with the CHC President and the Vice Chancellor of Fiscal Services, is nearing completion of a Budget Allocation Model Summary that describes in concise form the existing District resource allocation process. A draft will be distributed to all members of the Chancellor's Cabinet soon for review, discussion, revision, and approval. Once the Model Summary is approved, it will be updated and widely disseminated annually, and will represent a major advance in transparency and communication for the District and its Colleges.
16. The CHC Planning and Program Review Committee has formulated meaningful, integrated planning at CHC in its new program review, planning, and resource allocation process for 2009-10.
17. The new District Executive Reporting Information System (ERIS) is not yet ready. Reports and reference materials have to be constructed, training is needed, and there are some questions about its handling of important data that must be resolved, before it can be used with confidence across the District.
18. Training in the interpretation and application of data in planning and related processes is an ongoing need at CHC.
19. The accuracy of MIS data is increasingly important to the District for many reasons. A systematic check of recent data files for completeness and accuracy would help inspire confidence in those data.
20. The process of developing and assessing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and analogous outcomes, and implementing changes based on analysis of the results, is incomplete in Instruction, Student Services, and, to a lesser extent, Administrative Services at CHC. The evaluation team's Recommendation in this area actually exceeds the Commission's expectations, as described in the Commission President's letter of September 9, 2008.
21. Evaluation of administrative and governance processes and structures at CHC has begun with summaries of applicable survey data, but no evidence of further action has come to my attention.
22. When the new CHC *Organizational Handbook* is finished, it will bring greater clarity on governance roles and responsibilities to CHC.
23. Participation in CHC governance activities by classified staff and students has improved in some areas, but still requires attention.
24. The CHC Planning and Program Review Committee's plan for assessing Distributed Education (DE) classes in comparison with corresponding classes offered in traditional modes, when implemented, promises to resolve concerns about the DE program's effectiveness.
25. In my judgment, full reaffirmation of CHC's accreditation is unlikely to come before January 2011, and receiving full reaffirmation even then will require intense, sustained effort across the College, beginning immediately.
26. District Business Services, Human Resources, and Distributed Education and Technology Services have undertaken evaluation processes that will serve as a useful

starting point for developing and implementing program review for all District operations.

27. Much work is needed to develop and implement an effective District Strategic Plan and a useful Human Resources Plan in timely fashion.
28. The recent reorganization of District technology services in accord with the District IT Strategic Plan and the PlanNet study looks promising, but will require evaluation.
29. Development of a San Bernardino Valley College (SBVC) Educational Master Plan that meets the SBVC evaluation team's specifications will be challenging.

#### *Consultant Recommendations*

My recommendations are listed in each applicable section of this report. A consolidated list of all my recommendations appears near the end of this report.

## **Background: Accreditation Sanctions**

At its January 2009 meeting, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges reaffirmed the accreditation of San Bernardino Valley College (SBVC), but placed Crafton Hills College (CHC) on Probation. The Commission made its decision largely because of certain serious issues that CHC has failed to address adequately since the 2002 accreditation visit, but also because additional issues related to District processes must be addressed in order for the College to meet accreditation standards. The Commission reiterated the requirement to address those District issues in its action letter to SBVC.

As noted in the Commission's *Accreditation Reference Handbook*, the Probation sanction is the second step along the road to losing accreditation, after Warning. It indicates that the institution "deviates significantly from the Commission's eligibility requirements, standards, or policies." The next step, in the absence of adequate, timely corrective action, is an order to the institution to "show cause why its accreditation should not be withdrawn." An institution under Show Cause has the burden of proof "to demonstrate why its accreditation should be continued." A college under any of these first three sanctions does retain its accreditation.

The final sanction, again in the absence of sufficient corrective action, is termination of accreditation. The Commission is "required by the U.S. Department of Education not to allow deficiencies to exist for more than a total of two years. Consequently, institutions may remain under sanction [i.e., Warning, Probation, and/or Show Cause] for a cumulative total of no more than two years. If concerns are not resolved within this period, the Commission will take action to terminate accreditation." Termination of accreditation, of course, would be a tragedy for any community college, because it would lose access to all federal financial aid, and any credits a student earned after the college's loss of accreditation would not be transferable to other schools. An institution in such straits might have to close its doors, although alternatives to outright closure do exist; for example, one college in a multi-campus district could become a satellite campus of another college in that district, or the college could be absorbed by another district, until it corrected its deficiencies enough to reapply for accreditation.

I wanted to be very clear about all these Commission sanctions, not to frighten anyone, but to highlight the severe consequences of inadequate action, to call attention to the fact that the clock is ticking, and to convey a sense of urgency. As the reader will see below, CHC has made progress since February, but much more work is needed in numerous areas before the College is back in the Commission's good graces.

## **Background: Sound Practice in Completion and Integration of Planning Cycles**

Every sound planning process is cyclical, and includes three primary elements: Planning itself, Implementation of the plan, and Evaluation of the results, or PIE for short. If the results of the evaluation indicate that changes are needed, the next step is planning for those changes, and the cycle begins again. Integration of resource allocation means inserting that step between Planning and Implementation. These general steps apply equally well to program review, annual planning, and application of SLOs and other outcomes. See the examples below:

### *Effective Program Review*

- Document every step.
- Identify the appropriate measures of program effectiveness.
- Assess program effectiveness by applying the measures.
- Analyze results of the assessment.
- Plan specific changes to maintain or increase effectiveness (if the results warrant them).
- Implement planned changes.
- Begin cycle again.

### *Effective Annual Planning and Resource Allocation*

- Document every step.
- Assess status of previous goals and objectives.
- Analyze results of the assessment.
- Plan Stage 1: Set specific goals in priority order based on analysis results, to maintain or increase effectiveness.
- Plan Stage 2: Formulate objectives and activities needed to achieve the goals.
- Plan Stage 3: Identify any resources required to carry out activities and achieve objectives and goals.
- Allocate resources in priority order to the limit of available funds.
- Implement Plan, using resources as needed.
- Begin cycle again.

### *Effective Application of SLOs and Analogous Outcomes*

- Document every step.
- Develop sound outcomes and identify appropriate assessment methods and criterion levels for them.
- If appropriate, implement program or service improvements to facilitate achievement of specified outcomes.
- Assess achievement of outcomes at the appropriate time.
- Analyze results of the assessment.

- Identify and plan for specific improvements needed to facilitate achievement of outcomes, and/or modify outcomes, as the analysis suggests.
- Implement planned improvements and/or modified outcomes.
- Begin cycle again.

Because all three processes above share certain fundamental elements, integrating them is conceptually straightforward, as the reader can see in the example below:

*Effective Integrated Program Review, Annual Planning, and Resource Allocation with Outcomes*

- Document every step.
- Identify the appropriate measures of program effectiveness, which include but are not limited to achievement of outcomes, with appropriate measures and criterion levels.
- Implement program or service improvements to facilitate achievement of specified outcomes, if those improvements are not already underway.
- Assess program effectiveness by applying the measures, including achievement of outcomes.
- Assess status of previous goals and objectives.
- Analyze results of the assessments.
- Modify outcomes if analysis results warrant it.
- Plan Stage 1: Set specific goals in priority order based on analysis results, to maintain or increase effectiveness; goals include improvements to facilitate achievement of outcomes if analysis results warrant such changes.
- Plan Stage 2: Formulate objectives and activities needed to achieve the goals.
- Plan Stage 3: Identify any resources required to carry out activities and achieve objectives and goals.
- Allocate resources in priority order to the limit of available funds.
- Implement Plan, using resources as needed, and/or implement modified outcomes.
- Begin cycle again.

If plans or warranted changes are not implemented, or if they are implemented but not re-evaluated, then the cycle has broken down. Moreover, the institution must clearly document every step of each cycle to demonstrate its effectiveness.

These characteristics of effective planning processes are entirely consistent with the Commission's standards and its Recommendations to CHC and indirectly to the District. (See *CHC Responses to Commission Recommendations: Observations* below.) Those Recommendations are naturally helping to push the College and the District toward sound integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and evaluation processes and structures. But the most important reason for the tasks at hand is that doing these things right will help CHC, the District, and SBVC, too, carry out all their essential functions better with every passing year.

## **Review and Analysis Process**

For Phase I of this project, the Chancellor and the College Presidents asked me to carry out the following tasks and report on my conclusions.

- Evaluate the progress to date and make recommendations on the direction of work to resolve each of the six most urgent CHC Evaluation Team Recommendations.
- Evaluate the progress to date and make recommendations on the direction of educational master planning at both Colleges.
- Evaluate the status of the District with respect to CHC Evaluation Team Recommendation 7 and Commission Recommendation 1, and make recommendations on the next steps the District should take to resolve those Recommendations in ways that contribute to meeting the needs of both Colleges.

This report is based on my review and analysis of over 250 documents, primarily though not exclusively from CHC, including the following:

- Self-Studies and Evaluation Team Reports for both Colleges, along with prior CHC midterm and progress reports to the Commission
- Program review, annual planning, and resource allocation process descriptions, reports, samples, rubrics, program efficacy evaluations, needs assessments, and related documents
- Minutes, meeting summaries, and related documentation of the Crafton Council and its recommendation-focused teams, the CHC Educational Master Planning Committee, the Distributed Education and Technology Services Executive Council, and other groups
- Strategic and master planning documents, such as the CHC Educational Master Plan, the SBVC Strategic Plan, the Facilities Master Plans, oversight committee reports, the CHC Enrollment Management Plan, the CHC Distributed Education Plan and Distributed Education Strategic Plan, the CHC Basic Skills Plan, the District and College IT Plans, the PlanNet evaluations of IT services, and the CHC Professional Development Plan
- Research and outcomes-related documents, such as program and service outcomes, general education outcomes, outcomes worksheets, rubrics, surveys, forms, and reports

In addition, with the expert logistical help of Jackie Buus and Kelly Bingham, I conducted structured interviews ranging in duration from one hour to over three hours with the following people:

District  
Noelia Vela  
Bob Temple  
Renee Brunelle  
Ron Gerhard  
Glen Kuck

CHC  
Gloria Harrison  
Cheryl Marshall  
Charlie Ng  
Joe Cabrales\*  
Kirsten Colvey\*  
Rick Hogrefe  
Catherine Pace-Pequeño  
Ted Phillips  
Cidhinnia Torres Campos

SBVC  
Debra Daniels  
Troy Sheffield  
Rick Hrdlicka

\* Mr. Cabrales and Ms. Colvey kindly stepped in when the Vice President of Student Services was unable to meet at the appointed time.

I also met twice with the CHC Planning and Program Review Committee at the Co-Chairs' invitation, and assisted members with the refinement of new forms and instructions for program review, annual planning, and resource allocation. Finally, I met once with the Crafton Council at the CHC President's invitation.

## CHC Responses to Commission Recommendations

### *Overall Observations*

1. In recent years, the Commission's action letters have moved toward stronger language than in the past, particularly when placing a college on Warning or Probation. Rather than writing, for example, "The progress report should demonstrate the institution's substantial progress on the recommendations," the Commission President is more likely to write, "The report should demonstrate the institution's resolution of the recommendations." In CHC's case, the Commission went farther, requiring that the October 15, 2009 Follow-Up Report demonstrate "complete resolution" of the six most urgent recommendations. That is a very tall order indeed, particularly given the limited time we have left.
2. The nine most urgent CHC accreditation Recommendations all relate to the completion of formal processes and structures related to decision-making, planning, resource allocation, implementation, and/or institutional improvement. (All the CHC Recommendations appear at the end of this document for reference.) In distinct contrast, CHC decision-making operates to a large degree (though not exclusively) on the basis of personal relationships. That characteristic is typical of small or young organizations—especially those that are relatively unconstrained by external pressures—and can work very well for a long time. But community colleges are increasingly constrained by external forces, from funding limitations to tightening regulations to accreditation standards. Moreover, CHC in its fourth decade is embarking on a period of planned growth: it is no longer young, and soon will no longer be small. Under the circumstances, improving the College's institutional effectiveness will require the establishment and enhancement of well-defined, formal, documented structures and processes in many areas, including planning, resource allocation, evaluation, and communication.
3. The CHC President and other College leaders have taken steps in recent years to improve the transparency of their decision-making, for example by informing units about the disposition of their annual resource requests. Nevertheless, the campus perception reportedly remains widespread that important decisions are made largely behind closed doors, and that even when the results are made public, the rationales remain murky at best. The most recent example is the reorganization of CHC instructional divisions, which many faculty reportedly viewed as a step backward in transparency.
4. The Commission's first and arguably most important Recommendation requires CHC to "complete the implementation of a cycle of systematic integrated planning," with all that entails. Other Recommendations require CHC to complete the SLO process at all levels, and to integrate program review in all areas of the College. All these processes are cyclical, of course, but the Commission is seeking essentially the same end result in every context: Actual, documented implementation of institutional improvements based on the results of formal evaluation processes. See *Background: Sound Practice in Completion and Integration of Planning Cycles* above.
5. The CHC President, the CHC Vice Presidents, and the vast majority of other CHC administrators, faculty, and staff evidently have not served on an accreditation

evaluation team since the new accreditations standards went into effect in 2002. Service on an accreditation team is an excellent way to gain perspective on one's own programs, services, and operations, and to gather ideas on best practices. It also provides invaluable insight on the evaluation process itself. I have no hard data to support the assertion, but in my view, colleges with a significant number of people who have served on teams in the recent past are almost inevitably more effective in their own accreditation self-studies and more successful in demonstrating their adherence to the standards to visiting teams than colleges, like CHC, that lack such experience.

6. The CHC self-study process was problematic in several respects. Although the College began the process in timely fashion and provided training for participants, some subcommittees received less guidance and less monitoring than they needed. As a result, according to several interviewees, the initial draft of the self-study was poorly done. The College had to scramble to assign new writers and rework most of the self-study before the submission deadline. The final draft was better than the first, but still suffered from a lack of clarity and consistency, as the evaluation team noted. Such problems must be avoided in the next self-study.
7. The Crafton Council will review each draft of the Follow-Up Report. After the Council's second meeting in September, it will make available to the College community in its minutes the latest draft of the Report. The Council will request feedback specifically on errors of commission or omission, and ask that each reader who has any such feedback to send it to the representative of the applicable constituency on the Council. Corrections will be incorporated as appropriate, and the final draft of the Report will be brought to the Board for approval at its October 8, 2009 meeting.

#### *Consultant Recommendations*

1. The Chancellor and the College Presidents, after sharing this report with the Board, should consider making it available to all personnel.
2. It is crucial for the CHC President to employ her skills to help all members of the campus community recognize the urgency of the problems the Commission has identified, and to inspire and lead them to contribute actively to the solutions. Other senior managers, Academic Senate leadership, and Classified Senate leadership at CHC should join her in these efforts.
3. In the interests of clear communication and in accord with shared-governance principles expressed in Title 5 and Board policy, the CHC President and other CHC administrators should make clear the rationale for each of their major decisions (e.g., resource allocation priorities), especially when those decisions are at variance with the recommendations of shared-governance bodies charged with considering the applicable issues. Such transparency, which is consistent with the Local Practice section of the new CHC *Organizational Handbook*, will become both easier and more important as the formal structures and processes recommended below are implemented, and will facilitate smooth relations between administration and all constituency groups.

4. The District should require every senior manager, including the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, College Presidents, and Vice Presidents, to volunteer for service on a Commission accreditation team, and to participate in formal accreditation training, at least once and preferably twice per six-year cycle.
5. Because of the urgency of the CHC Team Recommendations, the Chancellor should require the CHC President and CHC Vice Presidents to volunteer for and serve on a Commission accreditation team as soon as possible, preferably during 2009-10.
6. The District should urge all managers, supervisors, tenured faculty members, and senior staff members at both Colleges, for the good of the institutions, to volunteer for service on a Commission accreditation team, and to participate in formal accreditation training, at least once per six-year cycle.
7. The Crafton Council, with appropriate input from constituencies, should draft a formal accreditation procedure, to take effect immediately upon approval, that contains at least the following elements, all of which are crucial contributors to success in gaining full reaffirmation:
  - a. The life cycles and charges of the CHC accreditation self-study committee and its subcommittees
  - b. The selection method for and responsibilities of members and co-chairs of the CHC accreditation self-study committee and subcommittees, with selection preference given to people with recent experience on a Commission accreditation team
  - c. The system for monitoring ongoing CHC accreditation self-study committee and subcommittee progress
  - d. The process for providing assistance, or replacing CHC accreditation self-study committee or subcommittee chairs or members, if progress is insufficient at specified milestones
  - e. Training of all CHC accreditation self-study committee and subcommittee members and resource persons on their duties and on organization, monitoring, reporting, writing, Commission standards, and Commission expectations for the report (Note that Commission training can be useful, but is not sufficient.)
8. I recommend that in my consulting capacity, I assist the CHC Accreditation Liaison Officer in preparation of each CHC Follow-Up Report by drafting sections as needed, incorporating feedback as appropriate, and editing each document as a whole.

CHC Team Recommendation 1: Integrated Planning

1. Introduction

In many respects this Recommendation is the team's most important. According to the Commission's *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness*, every college already should have been at the top level of implementation in integrated planning—Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement—by September 2007. As the team recognized, CHC is not there yet, despite some progress made since 2006.

Recommendation 1 requires CHC to take the following steps (I have paraphrased the Recommendation and added emphasis; see the last page of this document for the actual language of all the Commission Recommendations.):

- **Integrate** all planning into a **comprehensive, long-range** institutional plan tied clearly to its **mission** and vision.
  - **Complete** a **full** integrated planning cycle: **evaluation** (or assessment), **planning, prioritization, resource allocation, and implementation** (or improvement), followed by re-evaluation, which begins the cycle anew.
  - Incorporate **quantitative effectiveness measures**, determine the **baseline** for each, and establish institutional **goals for improvement** in each.
  - Add **consideration of long-term resource allocation** to the Educational Master Plan.
- **Integrate** this plan into a **District strategic plan**. (Note: Responding fully to this portion of the Recommendation requires the formulation of the District strategic plan; see below.)

See *Effective Integrated Program Review, Annual Planning, and Resource Allocation with Outcomes* above for examples of the type of planning that the Commission is seeking. The language of this Recommendation makes clear that the College's program review, annual planning, and resource allocation processes must be integral to comprehensive and educational master planning. It is also clear that, although the standards and the *Rubric* require the application of both qualitative and quantitative measures of effectiveness, the team is emphasizing the quantitative side here.

The College has made an implicit decision to construe the Educational Master Plan (EMP) as the primary "long-range institutional plan" called for in Recommendation 1, rather than creating a College strategic plan and an EMP separately. This approach is certainly workable, but the College should recognize that the resulting plan will likely carry strategic and operational implications beyond those of most educational master plans.

2. Observations on Progress

- a. In Spring 2006, the CHC President convened an Educational Master Plan Committee with shared-governance representation to develop the elements of an

- EMP. From Spring 2006 through Spring 2007, the Committee, with information from an environmental scan and broad input from campus forums, developed a mission statement, a vision statement, institutional values, and a set of five overarching goals for the EMP. A campus-wide workshop was held in August 2007 to develop action plans for the EMP, but the results evidently went no further. Additional work was planned for January 2008, but those plans reportedly did not come to fruition. So the CHC EMP remained incomplete from Spring 2007 through early Spring 2009, when the College was placed on Probation.
- b. In February 2009, the Crafton Council assigned an instructional Dean to lead the effort to address Recommendation 1. He convened and coordinated the work of an ad hoc group that met weekly from late March to June. The group, taking the Goals of the Spring 2007 Educational Master Plan as their starting point, worked hard to identify objectives and benchmarks for each EMP Goal, composed a Glossary, and began the development of key performance indicators. This group is to be commended for their passion and dedication, which were evident in the meeting summaries, and for wrestling constructively with several difficult issues.
  - c. However, I have two serious concerns about the approach CHC has taken on Recommendation 1:
    - (1) The group charged with formulating the College's response was ad hoc, with no shared-governance representation and indeed little stable membership. The lack of formal representation in the development of what is arguably the most important plan at the College is a fatal flaw, both for responding to the Commission and for developing an EMP that will have to elicit College-wide buy-in to be effective.
    - (2) A related concern is that the group's work was not integrated sufficiently with other College processes and prior work. For example, their objectives under Goal 2 included needs assessments for staffing, facilities, infrastructure, technology, and funding, but most of those needs are already considered in the program review and annual planning and resource allocation process to be implemented in 2009-10 (see below) or in other master plans. Moreover, I saw no evidence that the group was aware of or used the results of the August 2007 workshop, or the preparation for the January 2008 update. Had the College chosen instead to constitute a shared-governance EMP Committee with at least one representative from the Planning and Program Review Committee, the two groups would have been able to keep each other informed systematically, and the integration problem would not have arisen.
  - d. In its Recommendation, the team used the phrase "key performance indicators" (KPIs) in a parenthetical elaboration of "quantitative effectiveness measures." The use of the term KPIs led the ad hoc group toward proposed measures that are tied explicitly to its proposed objectives under each EMP Goal. This approach, in my judgment, is unnecessarily complex. Commission standards do call for the application of quantitative measures to institutional effectiveness in planning. But in this portion of Recommendation 1, I judge that the team was seeking a relatively small number of broad institutional measures—mostly of the sort that have been in common use in most community colleges for several years (e.g.,

- retention, persistence, success, degrees and certificates, resource efficiency, transfer readiness, student satisfaction), but perhaps also other measures of similar scope the College chooses to employ in its quest for improvement (e.g., community standing). The emphasis here is on baseline data and institutional goals for improvement on each chosen measure.
- e. The CHC Vice President for Administrative Services, in consultation with District Fiscal Services, is developing a model for projecting revenues and expenditures two years beyond the tentative budget, based on assumptions that will be specified at the District level. When he has completed an initial draft, he will distribute it to the appropriate groups and individuals at the District and in the Colleges for review, discussion, revision, and approval. Once this model is documented and approved, it will be updated and disseminated annually, and can be used to inform planning processes across the District, including the CHC EMP.
  - f. See CHC Team Recommendation 8 below for integration of program review, planning, resource allocation, and implementation/improvements.

### *Consultant Recommendations*

9. CHC should establish or reconstitute the CHC Educational Master Planning Committee (EMPC) with appropriate shared-governance and cross-committee representation, and charge it with the development of a full Educational Master Plan that is integrated with all other major CHC planning processes, that includes consideration of long-range resource allocation, and that will serve explicitly as the primary “long-range institutional plan” called for in CHC Team Recommendation 1. Certain College personnel have suggested that the Crafton Council, which does have shared-governance representation, could serve as the EMPC. That approach has the advantage of efficiency, because the Council already functions, many of the Council’s members would likely serve on the EMPC, and the proliferation of committees, especially at a relatively small college, is problematic. However, it would be highly unusual for a President to chair a master planning committee, in part because such a committee ordinarily makes recommendations to the President, and thence to the Chancellor and the Board. So I suggest that the CHC President delegate those duties to another Council member if and when that body acts as the EMPC.
10. I recommend that in my consulting capacity, I serve at least as a resource person on the CHC EMPC during 2009-10. If the Chancellor and the CHC President prefer, and if the District’s shared-governance policies and practices permit it, I can act as co-convenor and facilitator instead, to expedite progress.
11. The CHC EMPC should use as the starting point for discussion the Spring 2007 CHC EMP, with the drafts of the CHC Recommendation 1 Team and the products of the August 2007 CHC EMP workshop as inputs.
12. The CHC EMPC, with appropriate input from the CHC community, should develop and formally adopt a relatively small number of practical quantitative measures that, taken together, provide an acceptable gauge of the institution’s overall effectiveness, and establish baselines and annual goals for each. I recommend that in my consulting capacity, I serve as a coordinator of that process while serving on the CHC EMPC.

13. The District should complete the development, documentation, and implementation of the model for projecting revenues and expenditures two years beyond the tentative budget. The District should also provide timely training for planning process participants at both Colleges in the interpretation and application of the projection model.

#### CHC Team Recommendation 2: Data

1. Introduction

In Recommendation 2, the team called on the College to provide **easy access to reliable data**, and provide **training on accessing, interpreting, and using** those data. The Commission recognizes that without access to information and a clear understanding of how to use it, most College personnel will be unable to evaluate their operations as rigorously as they need to, much less plan appropriate improvements.

2. Observations on Progress

- a. The CHC Office of Research and Planning each year provides a set of standard reports for instructional program review and planning. It also provides reports on periodic student and employee surveys related to campus climate, satisfaction with programs and services, and other topics related to evaluation and planning.
- b. The CHC Office of Research and Planning offered two workshops in Spring 2009 on data access and interpretation for planning and program review. Self-selected managers, faculty members, and possibly classified staff attended.
- c. Reliable information from the District Datatel system is still not widely available directly to end users, with the principal exception of financial data (see Recommendation 10 below). The Executive Reporting Information System (ERIS), which is designed to provide such direct access, is not fully operational, pending vendor development of additional reports and reference material (including a useful data dictionary) by October 31, 2009. Until then, I am not in a position to do a thorough evaluation of the system.
- d. In the pilot version of ERIS, apparent discrepancies between ERIS and the older Executive Information System (EIS) reports have not been reconciled to the satisfaction of the institutional researchers and other power users.
- e. The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office tightened its standards last year on MIS submission error rates, which has necessarily improved the syntactical accuracy (i.e., correct formatting and acceptable values) of the MIS data submitted by District staff, who reportedly are spending more time on the submissions than in the past. However, syntactical edits do not ensure the substantive accuracy of MIS data, and at least one annual submission from 2007-08 contained errors that have not yet been corrected. Moreover, the process for checking the substantive accuracy and integrity of MIS submissions, as it was explained to me, does not appear to be systematic enough to provide full confidence in the files. Such confidence is essential when the "data noose" is tightening more with every passing year.

- f. District standards intended to reduce the incidence of errors and inconsistencies in data entry are reportedly under development by Distributed Education and Technology Services. I have not seen any documentation of those standards.
- g. Other sources of data related to Commission Recommendations are also problematic for various reasons. For example, the SARS system that permits student services staff to track contacts with students reportedly does not contain student demographic and academic data, so a proper analysis of service effectiveness is not feasible without reliance on a linkage to Datatel data. eLumen software is used for SLO tracking by some instructional departments, others use their own software systems, and still others use paper; without a standardized method, it is difficult to compile authoritative information on the status of the SLO cycle overall.
- h. CHC has already lost a research assistant, and will lose its Director of Research and Planning at the end of July. The institutional research function is crucial to sound planning, so these losses certainly complicate the College's responses to several Commission Recommendations.

#### *Consultant Recommendations*

- 14. The District should provide comprehensive training for all institutional research staff at both Colleges on the specifics of the ERIS system, to the point that they understand precisely how the system makes its calculations for mission-critical reports.
- 15. The CHC Planning and Program Review Committee, in consultation with the CHC Office of Research and Planning, and as part of its orientation process for unit personnel engaged in planning or program review in each upcoming cycle, should require those personnel to participate in a brief refresher in data access and interpretation.
- 16. The CHC Office of Research and Planning, after the new Director is hired, in consultation with the CHC Planning and Program Review Committee and other groups or offices as appropriate, should provide additional training in data interpretation for those who require or desire it. Possibilities for such training include, but certainly are not limited to, the following:
  - a. A reasonable number of more in-depth training sessions or workshops during each cycle for units engaged in planning or program review
  - b. Training of a small number of faculty and staff in each division, who could then provide their expertise to their colleagues in the division
  - c. Production of a brief user handbook on data interpretation, with reference to the ERIS data dictionary (assuming that it does prove clear, accurate, and comprehensive)
- 17. The Chancellor, through the College Presidents, should ask all custodians of the data in each MIS file submission from Spring 2008 Term-End through Fall 2008 Term-End, along with both College offices of institutional research, to review with care the standard reports of the data in those files for completeness and accuracy. If the data custodians and the researchers agree that the data are sufficiently complete and accurate, then the District will enjoy some assurance that the current MIS data review system is adequate. If, on the other hand, the data custodians or researchers uncover

problems, then the District should establish a Data Integrity Committee with appropriate representation from both Colleges and the District to determine the sources of the problems. The Committee should then recommend improvements in the review system or other links in the data production and monitoring chain, which should be implemented as soon as possible. I recommend that in my consulting capacity, I serve as a resource person on this Committee, should its establishment prove necessary.

18. Distributed Education and Technology Services should complete the development of District data entry standards, and provide training to all applicable personnel in the application of those standards.

### CHC Team Recommendation 3: SLOs and Other Outcomes

#### 1. Introduction

- a. This Recommendation requires the College to **complete the SLO cycle at every level**—course, program, and institution-wide. That translates to the following steps:
  - (1) Document every step.
  - (2) Develop sound SLOs or analogous outcomes for every course, every program, and the institution as a whole.
    - a) The term “program” includes not only instruction, but also student services and administrative services. True Student Learning Outcomes may be developed for many student services and even some administrative services, but in these areas service or administrative outcomes or objectives are more commonly used to measure effectiveness. In this report, I use the term “SLO” to refer to all these effectiveness measures, and the term “students” to include whatever group is targeted to achieve the outcome or objective, whether it be students, employees, community members, or other beneficiaries of institutional efforts.
  - (3) Identify appropriate assessment methods for each SLO at every level and make any necessary preparations to apply them.
  - (4) If feasible, establish a criterion for each SLO, achievement of which demonstrates the desired degree of effectiveness (e.g., “At least 85% of Biology 1 completers, given a hypothesis, can design an experiment to test it in accord with the scientific method”; “At least 93% of survey respondents who received the service will report that they were satisfied or very satisfied with it.”).
  - (5) If appropriate, implement course, program, or service improvements to facilitate achievement of SLOs.
  - (6) Assess achievement of SLOs at every level, at the time most suitable for each (e.g., end of course or program, end of targeted workshop or other service, nearing completion of degree requirements), and analyze the results.
  - (7) Identify and plan for specific course, program, or service improvements needed to facilitate achievement of SLOs, and/or modify SLOs, as the analysis of assessment results suggests.
  - (8) Implement planned improvements and/or modified SLOs.

- (9) After implementation of improvements for a reasonable time, re-assess and continue the cycle.
- b. At present, CHC is at the Development level of implementation of SLOs overall, based on the Commission's *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness*, as updated in September 2008. The Commission expects all institutions to be at or above that level now, and institutions are not expected to be at the Proficiency level until Fall 2012, according to Commission President Barbara Beno's September 9, 2008 letter accompanying that update. However, in Recommendation 3, the Commission is requiring CHC to accelerate its progress, and satisfy the criteria for Proficiency by October 2009. It is my understanding that the College could have questioned a requirement that appears to exceed the Commission's own published expectations prior to the January 2009 meeting, but did not do so. Under the circumstances, I believe the College is bound by the Recommendation, unless the Commission can still be persuaded otherwise.

## 2. Observations on Progress

### a. Instruction

- (1) The CHC Vice President for Instruction has taken on the daunting task of compiling information on the status of the instructional SLO cycle, and has produced more authoritative figures than were available for the self-study. She plans to validate those figures, which at present are based largely on self-report, by gathering the course and program SLOs themselves from all instructional departments this Fall.
- (2) According to the Vice President's figures as of June 30, 2009, just over half of all active courses have SLOs, and assessment has taken place in less than one-third of those. Faculty have reportedly implemented improvements in a few courses based on SLO assessment results, but documentation of those improvements, which is necessary, is evidently scarce.
- (3) Sixty percent of programs have SLOs, but none has undergone assessment, so none has been improved based on SLO assessment results.
- (4) General Education (GE) SLOs have been developed and adopted. The Office of Instruction construes them as the institutional SLOs, but whether that view is widely shared at the College is unclear. No assessments of the GE SLOs have been done, and so no improvements have been made on that basis.
- (5) Learning Resources has developed seven SLOs, of which three have been assessed. I have seen no documentation of planned or implemented improvements based on those assessments.

### b. Student Services

- (1) Five of the eight units within Student Services (Counseling, DSPS, EOPS, Health and Wellness, and Student Life) have developed SLOs per se, and three of them have also developed Service Area Outcomes (SAOs). The other three units (Admissions, Financial Aid, and Matriculation) have developed SAOs. Thus all units within Student Services have identified at least one SLO or SAO.
- (2) Assessment of one SLO is complete in EOPS; no other assessments have been completed as of mid-June, and the extent to which any are underway is

unclear. I have seen no documentation of planned or implemented improvements based on SLO or SAO assessments.

- (3) Systematic support for development and assessment of SLOs and SAOs in Student Services has been somewhat problematic, for reasons that are unclear. Some units appear to have forged ahead without much support.
- c. Administrative Services
  - (1) The CHC Vice President of Administrative Services has spearheaded outcomes work in all the units under his authority, and that area of the College is closer to completing its outcomes cycles than Instruction or Student Services.
  - (2) As of June 9, 2009, outcomes and/or objectives have been defined for seven of the nine Administrative Services units.
  - (3) Assessments are one-third complete; another half were due by the end of June, and the rest are due by the end of September.
  - (4) Analysis of nearly 90 percent of assessment results will be complete by the end of July, with the rest done by the end of September.
  - (5) I have already advised the CHC Vice President that Administrative Services must document planned improvements based on the analysis, along with implementation timelines, actual implementation, and reassessment schedules.

#### *Consultant Recommendations*

19. The CHC President should ask the Commission President whether any appeal regarding the deadline for meeting Recommendation 3 (SLOs) requirements may be registered at this late date, in light of the expectations set forth in Dr. Beno's letter of September 9, 2008. If it can, then the CHC President should request at a minimum that Recommendation 3 be removed from the list of "complete resolution" requirements for October 2009, and moved to the October 2010 deadline with a "substantial progress," rather than "resolution," requirement.
20. The CHC Vice President for Instruction should follow through on validating the status of the instructional SLO cycle as early in the Fall as possible.
21. Based on the findings of the CHC Vice President for Instruction, and assuming the Commission relents on the SLOs deadline as suggested above, CHC should adjust the published schedule for the instructional SLO cycle to ensure that by June 2010:
  - a. Every active course and program has at least one sound SLO for which at least one appropriate assessment method (with an effectiveness criterion, if feasible) has been identified.
  - b. Achievement of at least one SLO in every active course, and of at least one program SLO in every program, has been assessed; the results have been analyzed; and needed improvements or SLO modifications, if any, have been identified.
  - c. Plans and schedules for implementation of all improvements and SLO modifications have been formulated.
    - (1) Implementation of all SLO modifications, and of a significant proportion of planned improvements, should be scheduled for Fall 2010, with the rest of the planned improvements scheduled for no later than Fall 2011.

- (2) If the Commission does not relent as suggested above, implementation of all planned improvements as well as SLO modifications will have to be moved up to Fall 2010.
  - d. A documented system for monitoring implementation and ensuring that it takes place as scheduled is in operation.
  - e. The schedule for reassessment of those SLOs associated with all planned or implemented improvements has been published, to continue the cycle.
  - f. Every step is documented.
22. The CHC Office of Instruction, in consultation with appropriate groups and offices, should establish a schedule for completing the General Education/Institutional SLOs cycle, to include the following elements, no later than Fall 2010:
- a. Make any necessary preparations to apply the assessment methods already chosen for the institutional SLOs.
  - b. Establish a criterion for each institutional SLO, achievement of which demonstrates the desired degree of institutional effectiveness (if that has not already been done).
  - c. Assess achievement of each institutional SLO, analyze the results, and identify and plan for needed course, program, or service improvements or SLO modifications, if any.
  - d. Implement identified course, program, or service improvements, and/or modified institutional SLOs, beginning in Fall 2010.
  - e. A documented system for monitoring implementation and ensuring that it takes place as scheduled is in operation.
  - f. Publish the schedule for reassessment, which should occur in Spring 2011, to continue the cycle.
  - g. Document every step.
23. The CHC Vice President for Instruction and the CHC Vice President for Administrative Services (who have temporarily assumed the management duties of the now-vacant Vice President for Student Services position) should establish and publish a firm schedule for completing the outcomes cycle for all units in Student Services, to ensure that by June 2010:
- a. Every unit has completed development of all its SLO/SAOs and has identified at least one appropriate assessment method (with an effectiveness criterion, if feasible) for each.
  - b. Achievement of all SLO/SAOs in every unit has been assessed; the results have been analyzed; and needed improvements or SLO/SAO modifications, if any, have been identified.
  - c. Plans and schedules for implementation of all improvements and SLO/SAO modifications no later than August 2010 have been formulated.
  - d. A documented system for monitoring implementation and ensuring that it takes place as scheduled is in operation.
  - e. The schedule for reassessment of those SLO/SAOs associated with all planned or implemented improvements has been published, to continue the cycle.
  - f. Every step is documented.

24. In CHC Administrative Services, to permit reporting the completion of at least some outcomes cycles in the October 2009 Follow-Up Report:
- a. The CHC Vice President should complete the analysis of outcomes assessment results as scheduled.
  - b. All units for which the analysis is complete by the end of July 2009 should:
    - (1) By the end of August 2009, identify and document needed improvements and/or outcomes modifications based on that analysis, and formulate plans and schedules for implementation of both.
    - (2) By the end of September 2009, implement as many of the improvements and outcomes modifications as are feasible.
    - (3) Implement the remainder of the improvements and outcomes modifications no later than August 2010.
    - (4) Document every step.
  - c. All other units should, as soon as the analysis of their assessment results is complete:
    - (1) Identify and document needed improvements and/or outcomes modifications based on that analysis, and formulate plans and schedules for implementation of both.
    - (2) Implement all improvements and outcomes modifications.
    - (3) Document every step.
  - d. The CHC Vice President should institute and document a system for monitoring implementation and ensuring that it takes place as scheduled.
  - e. The CHC Vice President should publish the schedule for reassessment of those outcomes associated with all planned or implemented improvements no later than August 2010, to continue the cycle.
25. I recommend that in my consulting capacity, I serve as a resource person for CHC staff who need assistance in the completion of the outcomes cycle, particularly in the noninstructional areas.

#### CHC Team Recommendation 4: Administrative and Governance Evaluation

##### 1. Introduction

This Recommendation has several components. It requires the College to:

- a. **Evaluate** the **effectiveness** of both **administrative** and **governance structures, processes, and services**.
- b. **Communicate** the results to **all constituencies**.
- c. Make **improvements** based on the results.
- d. **Define** the **roles and responsibilities** of each governance structure.
- e. Increase **participation** in governance by classified **staff** and **students**.

##### 2. Observations on Progress

- a. The CHC Office of Research and Planning (ORP) includes governance and administrative issues in campus climate employee surveys. Results of the Fall 2007 survey indicated that at least in the eyes of the respondents (most of whom were classified staff or full-time faculty), there was substantial room for improvement in numerous areas. (Results of the Fall 2008 survey were not

- available to me.) An executive summary of the Fall 2007 survey is available on the ORP website. However, I have seen no indication of planned or implemented improvements in administrative or governance structures or processes that are based on analysis of those survey results or similar evidence.
- b. A new *CHC Organizational Handbook* is under development. If the final approved version is substantially similar to a recent draft I have examined, and if it is effectively publicized, the *Handbook* will do an excellent job of defining governance roles and responsibilities in keeping with this Recommendation.
  - c. The Crafton Council was originally charged with coordinating responses to the accreditation Recommendations, but appears also to have become a clearinghouse for the discussion and proper routing of issues related to shared governance. Questions about its makeup and purpose arose in Recommendation 1 Team meetings during Spring 2009.
  - d. Classified participation in governance has fallen off and then risen again in recent years, but reportedly remains relatively low overall. Several reasons have been cited for this low participation, but the most common is that too many managers are reluctant to release their staff members for meetings and other duties.
  - e. Student participation in governance has improved since the new Student Life administrator arrived. Discussions of how best to replace student appointees who no longer can serve have begun. However, as in every community college with which I am familiar, retaining consistent student representation on committees remains problematic.

#### *Consultant Recommendations*

- 26. CHC should develop and implement a systematic cyclical evaluation of governance and administrative structures, processes, and services; communicate the results; and implement improvements, all in accord with Recommendation 4. I recommend that in my consulting capacity, I provide coordination and technical assistance for developing the structure and process, with the aim of implementing them by October 15, 2009. CHC should complete the initial cycle by July 1, 2010.
- 27. Once the final version of the *CHC Organizational Handbook* is approved and posted on the CHC website, the Senates and management team should publicize it to their members, and the CHC President should request in the appropriate forums that all personnel become familiar with it.
- 28. The Crafton Council, under the President's leadership, should reexamine its purposes, carefully define its role(s) in governance, revise its charge accordingly if necessary, and communicate that charge effectively to the campus community.
- 29. If it can be done in a manner consistent with the applicable collective bargaining agreement, the CHC President, in consultation with the CHC Classified Senate and the management team, should issue guidelines to all managers that will have the effect of increasing and sustaining classified staff participation in governance activities, and should require managers to adhere to them.
- 30. The Crafton Council should continue discussions on how best to retain student appointees on governance structures and to replace student appointees who no longer can serve; identify the most promising approaches; communicate those approaches to

all governance structures and applicable personnel with the request to implement them; evaluate the results; and implement improvements as needed.

### CHC Team Recommendation 8: Integration of Program Review; Distributed Education

#### 1. Introduction

Recommendation 8, which requires the **integration of program review in all College areas** into institutional evaluation and planning, is tied very closely with the integrated planning in Recommendation 1 (see above). It also calls for a particular focus on **ensuring effectiveness in Distributed Education** classes.

#### 2. Observations on Progress

- a. Roughly half the instructional departments have gone through a program review process; the rest are scheduled to complete their process in 2009-10. A similar distribution applies to Student Services. All Administrative Services units have gone through a program review process.
- b. Among units that have gone through program review, the proportion that have identified and actually implemented improvements based on the results of their self-assessment is unclear. Documentation of such improvements, which is necessary, is reportedly uneven at best.
- c. The CHC Planning and Program Review Committee has formulated a meaningful, integrated program review, planning, and resource allocation process in its revised forms and instructions for 2009-10:
  - (1) Both program review and annual planning now require in all units (in Instruction, Student Services, and Administrative Services) identification or update of goals in priority order, objectives, actions, timelines, responsible persons, and required resources with cost estimates. Goals and objectives are to be formulated explicitly to maintain program strengths or address identified weaknesses.
  - (2) Both program review and annual planning now require in all units the reporting of program effectiveness measures, including achievement of SLOs and analogous outcomes.
  - (3) The Committee co-chairs are developing a handbook for the entire process, to help respondents complete their process properly. Effective dissemination of the information in this handbook will be crucial to the success of the revised process.
  - (4) The Committee has published a revised schedule to ensure the completion of all remaining program reviews by mid-November 2009. Target dates for plans and program reviews are now phased, to even out the workload of the Committee, which reviews all plans and program reviews.
- d. The CHC Planning and Program Review Committee has decided to undertake an annual review of Distributed Education (DE) classes to ensure their effectiveness. The review will entail analysis of key effectiveness indicators (e.g., retention, success) in DE classes compared to those in corresponding classes with traditional delivery modes. The Committee will share the results of the analysis with

applicable departmental faculty and Deans, recommend improvements if needed, and evaluate the effects of those improvements in a continuing cycle.

### *Consultant Recommendations*

31. The CHC Planning and Program Review Committee should proceed with implementation of the new program review, planning, and resource allocation procedures for 2009-10.
32. I recommend that in my consulting capacity, I serve as a resource person on the CHC Planning and Program Review Committee in 2009-10, to assist them in completing the handbook, implementing the new procedures, and monitoring progress to ensure completion of all program reviews and plans according to the schedule.
33. The CHC Planning and Program Review Committee should complete the first cycle of its annual review of Distributed Education classes no later than summer 2010.

See also CHC Team Recommendation 1 above.

### CHC Team Recommendation 10: Long-term Fiscal Plans and Financial Information

#### 1. Introduction

This Recommendation requires CHC to develop **long-term fiscal plans**, and to provide employees with **financial information and training** in how to use it.

#### 2. Observations on Progress

- a. As noted under CHC Team Recommendation 1 above, the CHC Vice President for Administrative Services, in consultation with District Fiscal Services, is developing a long-term fiscal model for projecting revenues and expenditures two years beyond the tentative budget, based on assumptions that will be specified at the District level. When he has completed an initial draft, he will distribute it to the appropriate groups and individuals at the District and in the Colleges for review, discussion, revision, and approval. Once this model is documented and approved, it will be updated and disseminated annually, and can be used to inform planning processes across the District, including the CHC EMP.
- b. In response to my suggestion, the CHC Vice President requested that each year's adopted budget and monthly budget summaries be available on the District website. At last report, the summaries were available, but the budget was not.
- c. EduReports, the reporting tool for the Financial 2000 system, was recently made available to all department chairs; it has been available to cost center managers for a longer period. The recency of the data available through EduReports is unclear, as is the extent to which training in using the software and interpreting the data has been provided. Also unclear is whether the site license for EduReports would permit broadening access to include additional employees, and if it does not, what the cost would be for adding users.
- d. A rudimentary but up-to-the-minute accounts lookup feature is also available to managers.

### *Consultant Recommendations*

34. The CHC Vice President for Administrative Services, in consultation with other offices as appropriate, should provide documentation of and training in EduReports to all users who are not already fully acquainted with the software. The documentation should clearly indicate the recency of the reported data.
35. In the interests of transparency, CHC, in consultation with appropriate District and SBVC individuals and groups, should consider broadening employee access to financial data through EduReports.

See also Recommendation 13 under CHC Team Recommendation 1 above.

### **Accrediting Commission Action Probabilities**

Making predictions about Commission actions is a dangerous enterprise at best, because of uncertainties inherent in its processes. However, based on my analysis, the amount of work that remains to be done is such that the chances for CHC to receive full reaffirmation on the basis of the 2009 Follow-Up Report are zero. Indeed, if the College's progress over the next 12 weeks or so is insufficient, the Commission could see fit to move it to Show Cause. On the other hand, if all the leadership and most others at the College recognize the urgency of action and contribute accordingly over the next 12 weeks, it is possible that the Commission will reward those efforts with a move from Probation to Warning. I see that as unlikely, because the Commission has not been disposed to reward effort in recent years—the members want results—and there is too little time to reach completion on most of the urgent Recommendations, even with our best efforts. In my opinion, given those best efforts, the most probable outcome of the January 2010 Commission meeting is continuation on Probation. If my reasoning is sound, then the most productive approach will be to press firmly ahead through the 2009-10 academic year to complete work on all nine applicable Recommendations and aim for full reaffirmation in January 2011, based on the October 2010 Follow-Up Report. The alternative to full reaffirmation—termination of accreditation—is simply unacceptable. My recommendations in this report are consistent with this approach.

### *Progress to Date: Action Required in Time for Follow-Up Report of October 15, 2010*

1. CHC Team Recommendation 7: District Program Review, Strategic Plan, Technology Plan, Human Resources Plan
2. CHC/SBVC Commission Recommendation 1: District Resource Allocation Process

See *Responses to Commission Recommendations on District Operations* immediately below.

## Responses to Commission Recommendations on District Operations

### *Observations*

Because of the urgency of the other CHC Team Recommendations, as I discussed with the Chancellor, I have devoted less attention to District issues in my analysis of documentation and interview responses. I will undertake more detailed analyses as the need arises in the work on CHC Recommendation 7, and make further recommendations along the way accordingly.

*Current Status: Action Required in Time for Follow-Up Report of October 15, 2010*

### CHC Team Recommendation 7: District Program Review, Strategic Plan, Technology Plan, Human Resources Plan

#### 1. Introduction

This Recommendation is straightforward in composition, but will be time-consuming and labor-intensive to implement.

It calls on the District to **implement program review** for all its operations. It also requires the District to develop a **District strategic plan** aligned with College educational master plans, a **strategic plan for technology** that helps the Colleges manage their functions, and a long-range **human resources plan** that helps them plan properly for full-time faculty and staff needs.

#### 2. Observations on Progress

- a. There is no District-level institutional research function to support program review or strategic planning.
- b. District program review
  - (1) The former Business Manager and the Vice Chancellor for Human Resources each implemented a type of program review for the units under their supervision, based primarily on quantitative but also on qualitative information.
    - a) In an annual Business Services retreat, staff members looked at their challenges and identified efficiencies and correctives, and determined performance goals and objectives. They updated quantitative measures of their progress on a monthly basis. The analysis I saw for July-October 2008 would serve as an excellent basis for implementing improvements and evaluating the results. Units reportedly implemented operational improvements on the basis of these assessments, but I have not yet seen any documentation of such improvements.
    - b) Human Resources reportedly does an annual planning report, but I have not seen documentation of the report or of any improvements that might have been implemented as a result.

- (2) Distributed Education and Technology Services (DETS)
  - a) DETS collects evaluative information on its technology services primarily through Help Desk feedback emails. The Executive Director has plans to develop feedback forms for the larger technology projects that do not go through the Help Desk.
  - b) For printing services, no systematic evaluation tool has been used in the past, but the move toward a centralized contract for all printing services in 2009-10 includes a provision for tracking and therefore evaluating those services.
- (3) In other District operations, no systematic effectiveness review process has begun.
- c. Strategic Plan
  - (1) No District Strategic Plan exists at present.
  - (2) In lieu of goals that would appear in a District Strategic Plan, the District has used Board Imperatives, structured along the lines of the Commission's Accreditation Standards, with annually updated "Institutional Goals" under each. The extent to which these Imperatives and Goals actually inform program review, planning, resource allocation, and improvements at the unit, division, and College levels is unclear.
  - (3) In accord with this Recommendation, the Chancellor has said that the District Strategic Plan must support the educational master plans of the Colleges. Conversely, she has also stressed the importance of having strategic and/or educational master plans at the Colleges that are sufficiently similar in structure that they will smoothly integrate with the District Strategic Plan yet to be developed. In my judgment, as long as the applicable College plans both have sound strategic goals and objectives or the equivalent, a District Strategic Plan that aligns with and supports the College plans, and at the same time serves as a guide for the next cycle of College strategic and master planning, can be constructed with no more than the usual difficulty associated with strategic planning.
  - (4) Work on the District Strategic Plan has not commenced, pending progress reports on the Colleges' EMPs. However, depending on the structure and process chosen for District Strategic Planning, it is probable that considerable progress could be made in this area well before the College plans are completed.
- d. Technology Plan
  - (1) A comprehensive District Information Technology Strategic Plan was adopted in 2007, and is in force through 2010. In addition to goals and implementation strategies, it contains IT directives that tie to five of the Goals under the Board Imperatives. Since this Plan clearly existed when the evaluation team visited the campuses, I must assume that the team's intent in this part of the Recommendation was to emphasize the necessity of responsiveness and assistance to the Colleges in the implementation of the Plan.
  - (2) The District contracted with PlanNet to assess both District and College IT services, and as of July 1, 2009, DETS reorganized its technology service

structures and associated committee structures consistent with the findings of that assessment. The new organization is intended to improve clarity of roles and responsiveness and quality of service, and to save money that can be allocated to the computer replacement plan. Assuming that the Colleges have bought into the new structures and that members of each DETS committee understand their charge and actively participate in executing it, the reorganization looks very promising.

e. Human Resources Plan

- (1) No Human Resources Plan exists at present.
- (2) The Vice Chancellor for Human Resources discussed with me some possible approaches to long-term HR planning. We concluded that staffing ratios and hiring history could be used to formulate an initial three-to-five-year global projection of staffing needs based on College growth projections. Once the revised program review and planning process at CHC gets well underway, HR could use unit growth and staffing projections from both Colleges to produce more detailed projections at the divisional, College, and District levels annually.
- (3) The Chancellor's Cabinet, beginning in 2008-09, reviews and approves all position requests that have gone through the Colleges' planning and resource allocation processes.

*Consultant Recommendations*

36. The District, with my technical assistance, should design and implement a cyclical model for systematic program review and improvement of District operations that will accommodate the evaluative processes already in place. Work on design should begin in October 2009, and the initial cycle should be completed no later than August 1, 2010.
37. The District, under the leadership of the Chancellor and with my active technical assistance on appropriate participatory structures, processes, and content, should develop and adopt an effective District Strategic Plan that takes into consideration the Board Imperatives and meets the requirements of Recommendation 7 no later than August 2010. If the District's shared-governance policies and practices permit it, I can act as co-convenor and facilitator of this process, to expedite progress. The process should begin in October 2009.
38. The Executive Director of DETS, in consultation with both institutional research offices, should assess the effectiveness of technology services in light of the reorganization, with particular attention to responsiveness to the Colleges' needs. Assuming that the reorganization is fully implemented by early Fall 2009, the assessment should take place by late Spring 2010. If analysis of assessment results indicates the need for improvements, those improvements should be scheduled for implementation as soon as feasible, and then reassessed in a continuing cycle.
39. The Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, with my technical assistance if the Vice Chancellor wishes it, should formulate an initial three-to-five-year global projection of District staffing needs, to be completed in October 2009. When information becomes available from the SBVC Needs Assessment process and the revised CHC

program review and planning process in late Fall 2009 or early Spring 2010, she should refine the projections.

40. The District, under the leadership of the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources and with full participation by representatives of the appropriate constituencies, should develop and adopt an effective District Human Resources Plan that helps the Colleges plan and set priorities for full-time faculty and staff needs no later than August 2010. The development process, in which I can serve as a resource person, should begin in October 2009.

#### CHC/SBVC Commission Recommendation 1: District Resource Allocation Process

##### 1. Introduction

This Recommendation is both straightforward and relatively simple to execute: Document and communicate the **District's resource allocation process**.

##### 2. Observations on Progress

- a. The CHC Vice President for Administrative Services, in consultation with the CHC President and the Vice Chancellor of Fiscal Services, took the lead in documenting existing District practices in allocating resources to District operations and the Colleges. He is nearing completion of a draft two-page Budget Allocation Model Summary that will be distributed to all members of the Chancellor's Cabinet during the week of July 13, 2009 for review, discussion, revision, and approval. The Model Summary clarifies the following elements of District resource allocations:
  - (1) Allocation of ongoing base unrestricted funds to District operations
  - (2) Allocation of ongoing base unrestricted funds to each College based on a rolling three-year average of FTES
  - (3) Allocation of one-time State funds, such as those for instructional equipment or scheduled maintenance
  - (4) Allocation of COLA and growth funds
  - (5) Allocation of restricted funds
- b. Once the Model Summary is approved, it will be updated and widely disseminated annually, and will represent a major advance in transparency and communication for the District and its Colleges.
- c. With the annual dissemination of the Model Summary, the requirements of Recommendation 10 will have been met, well ahead of schedule.

#### *Consultant Recommendation*

41. The District should complete the development of the Budget Allocation Model Summary, and take steps to ensure that it is accurately updated and widely disseminated annually.

## Status and Direction of SBVC Educational Master Planning

Note: For the progress and direction of CHC educational master planning, see CHC Team Recommendation 1: Integrated Planning above.

### *Progress to Date*

#### 1. Introduction

The SBVC accreditation evaluation team concluded that strategic planning at the College—despite the obvious educational thrust of four of the six strategic initiatives in the SBVC Strategic Plan (see below)—had emphasized facilities too much and education too little. Therefore it required in SBVC Recommendation 1 that the College “**enhance its strategic plan with a focused educational master plan that encompasses program review and the elements of instructional, student services, technology, and facilities planning.**”

#### 2. Observations on Progress

- a. The SBVC Strategic Plan, which was evidently adopted by the College in 2006 and has been updated periodically since then, contains strategic initiatives, goals, desired outcomes, and benchmarks beginning with what is now a 2007-08 baseline. Evaluation of progress on the Strategic Plan is clearly data-driven.
- b. The SBVC President and the SBVC Dean of Institutional Research, Planning, and Development have evaluated the designs of a number of existing community college educational master plans, but have found that none quite fits the needs of the College. The one that comes closest, in their view, is from West Hills College Coalinga; I have requested but have not yet received specifics on what they find most useful in that plan. They seek a plan model that will integrate well with the existing SBVC Strategic Plan, and at the same time will meet the specifications of SBVC Recommendation 1 above.
- c. There is substantial overlap between the contents of the SBVC Strategic Plan and the contents of a typical educational master plan. Of the six strategic initiatives in the SBVC Strategic Plan, up to four could serve as overarching directions for an EMP: Access, Campus Culture and Climate, Student Success, and Technological Advancement. Moreover, almost all the goals under those four strategic initiatives could serve as goals in an EMP. In my judgment, it would be possible to use the applicable portions of the SBVC Strategic Plan as the starting place for development of the SBVC Educational Master Plan.

### *Consultant Recommendations*

42. I recommend that in my consulting capacity, I facilitate a series of about three meetings with the SBVC President and the SBVC Dean of Institutional Research, Planning, and Development, preferably before the beginning of the Fall semester, for the following purposes:
  - a. Determine those structural and process elements of the West Hills College Coalinga Educational Master Plan (and other such plans, if they so choose) that

- they find most useful for and applicable to the needs of the College, and that fit the integration requirements of SBVC Recommendation 1.
- b. Identify additional structural and process elements that they regard as crucial, important, or desirable for the SBVC Educational Master Plan, particularly in relation to the SBVC Strategic Plan and other planning processes and structures at the College, including the following:
    - (1) Program Efficacy
    - (2) Needs Assessment
    - (3) Resource allocation
    - (4) Goals/objectives at the unit level and above; year-end reports
    - (5) The roles of the Program Review, Budget, Technology, and Facilities Committees and the College Council
    - (6) Outcomes assessment
    - (7) Technology planning
    - (8) Facilities planning
    - (9) Other major plans, such as Enrollment Management, Basic Skills, and Professional Development
  - c. Identify any constraints on educational master planning structures and processes.
  - d. Share and refine sample scenarios that fit all the elements together in an integrated whole.
43. The SBVC College Council should have the opportunity to provide input in these discussions. For example, members could comment on initial scenarios, or I could present alternative scenarios in a Council meeting, from which they could adopt one as the basis for further development.
44. The SBVC College Council should use the adopted scenario as the map for development of the full-blown SBVC Educational Master Plan. The schedule for completion and implementation of that Plan depends on many factors. Nevertheless, the Council should aim to complete the plan in time to implement it in Fall 2010.

### *Consolidated List of All Consultant Recommendations*

1. The Chancellor and the College Presidents, after sharing this report with the Board, should consider making it available to all personnel.
2. It is crucial for the CHC President to employ her skills to help all members of the campus community recognize the urgency of the problems the Commission has identified, and to inspire and lead them to contribute actively to the solutions. Other senior managers, Academic Senate leadership, and Classified Senate leadership at CHC should join her in these efforts.
3. In the interests of clear communication and in accord with shared-governance principles expressed in Title 5 and Board policy, the CHC President and other CHC administrators should make clear the rationale for each of their major decisions (e.g., resource allocation priorities), especially when those decisions are at variance with the recommendations of shared-governance bodies charged with considering the applicable issues. Such transparency, which is consistent with the Local Practice section of the new CHC *Organizational Handbook*, will become both easier and more important as the formal structures and processes recommended below are implemented, and will facilitate smooth relations between administration and all constituency groups.
4. The District should require every senior manager, including the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, College Presidents, and Vice Presidents, to volunteer for service on a Commission accreditation team, and to participate in formal accreditation training, at least once and preferably twice per six-year cycle.
5. Because of the urgency of the CHC Team Recommendations, the Chancellor should require the CHC President and CHC Vice Presidents to volunteer for and serve on a Commission accreditation team as soon as possible, preferably during 2009-10.
6. The District should urge all managers, supervisors, tenured faculty members, and senior staff members at both Colleges, for the good of the institutions, to volunteer for service on a Commission accreditation team, and to participate in formal accreditation training, at least once per six-year cycle.
7. The Crafton Council, with appropriate input from constituencies, should draft a formal accreditation procedure, to take effect immediately upon approval, that contains at least the following elements, all of which are crucial contributors to success in gaining full reaffirmation:
  - a. The life cycles and charges of the CHC accreditation self-study committee and its subcommittees
  - b. The selection method for and responsibilities of members and co-chairs of the CHC accreditation self-study committee and subcommittees, with selection preference given to people with recent experience on a Commission accreditation team
  - c. The system for monitoring ongoing CHC accreditation self-study committee and subcommittee progress
  - d. The process for providing assistance, or replacing CHC accreditation self-study committee or subcommittee chairs or members, if progress is insufficient at specified milestones

- e. Training of all CHC accreditation self-study committee and subcommittee members and resource persons on their duties and on organization, monitoring, reporting, writing, Commission standards, and Commission expectations for the report (Note that Commission training can be useful, but is not sufficient.)
8. I recommend that in my consulting capacity, I assist the CHC Accreditation Liaison Officer in preparation of each CHC Follow-Up Report by drafting sections as needed, incorporating feedback as appropriate, and editing each document as a whole.
9. CHC should establish or reconstitute the CHC Educational Master Planning Committee (EMPC) with appropriate shared-governance and cross-committee representation, and charge it with the development of a full Educational Master Plan that is integrated with all other major CHC planning processes, that includes consideration of long-range resource allocation, and that will serve explicitly as the primary “long-range institutional plan” called for in CHC Team Recommendation 1. Certain College personnel have suggested that the Crafton Council, which does have shared-governance representation, could serve as the EMPC. That approach has the advantage of efficiency, because the Council already functions, many of the Council’s members would likely serve on the EMPC, and the proliferation of committees, especially at a relatively small college, is problematic. However, it would be highly unusual for a President to chair a master planning committee, in part because such a committee ordinarily makes recommendations to the President, and thence to the Chancellor and the Board. So I suggest that the CHC President delegate those duties to another Council member if and when that body acts as the EMPC.
10. I recommend that in my consulting capacity, I serve at least as a resource person on the CHC EMPC during 2009-10. If the Chancellor and the CHC President prefer, and if the District’s shared-governance policies and practices permit it, I can act as co-convenor and facilitator instead, to expedite progress.
11. The CHC EMPC should use as the starting point for discussion the Spring 2007 CHC EMP, with the drafts of the CHC Recommendation 1 Team and the products of the August 2007 CHC EMP workshop as inputs.
12. The CHC EMPC, with appropriate input from the CHC community, should develop and formally adopt a relatively small number of practical quantitative measures that, taken together, provide an acceptable gauge of the institution’s overall effectiveness, and establish baselines and annual goals for each. I recommend that in my consulting capacity, I serve as a coordinator of that process while serving on the CHC EMPC.
13. The District should complete the development, documentation, and implementation of the model for projecting revenues and expenditures two years beyond the tentative budget. The District should also provide timely training for planning process participants at both Colleges in the interpretation and application of the projection model.
14. The District should provide comprehensive training for all institutional research staff at both Colleges on the specifics of the ERIS system, to the point that they understand precisely how the system makes its calculations for mission-critical reports.
15. The CHC Planning and Program Review Committee, in consultation with the CHC Office of Research and Planning, and as part of its orientation process for unit personnel engaged in planning or program review in each upcoming cycle, should

- require those personnel to participate in a brief refresher in data access and interpretation.
16. The CHC Office of Research and Planning, after the new Director is hired, in consultation with the CHC Planning and Program Review Committee and other groups or offices as appropriate, should provide additional training in data interpretation for those who require or desire it. Possibilities for such training include, but certainly are not limited to, the following:
    - a. A reasonable number of more in-depth training sessions or workshops during each cycle for units engaged in planning or program review
    - b. Training of a small number of faculty and staff in each division, who could then provide their expertise to their colleagues in the division
    - c. Production of a brief user handbook on data interpretation, with reference to the ERIS data dictionary (assuming that it does prove clear, accurate, and comprehensive)
  17. The Chancellor, through the College Presidents, should ask all custodians of the data in each MIS file submission from Spring 2008 Term-End through Fall 2008 Term-End, along with both College offices of institutional research, to review with care the standard reports of the data in those files for completeness and accuracy. If the data custodians and the researchers agree that the data are sufficiently complete and accurate, then the District will enjoy some assurance that the current MIS data review system is adequate. If, on the other hand, the data custodians or researchers uncover problems, then the District should establish a Data Integrity Committee with appropriate representation from both Colleges and the District to determine the sources of the problems. The Committee should then recommend improvements in the review system or other links in the data production and monitoring chain, which should be implemented as soon as possible. I recommend that in my consulting capacity, I serve as a resource person on this Committee, should its establishment prove necessary.
  18. Distributed Education and Technology Services should complete the development of District data entry standards, and provide training to all applicable personnel in the application of those standards.
  19. The CHC President should ask the Commission President whether any appeal regarding the deadline for meeting Recommendation 3 (SLOs) requirements may be registered at this late date, in light of the expectations set forth in Dr. Beno's letter of September 9, 2008. If it can, then the CHC President should request at a minimum that Recommendation 3 be removed from the list of "complete resolution" requirements for October 2009, and moved to the October 2010 deadline with a "substantial progress," rather than "resolution," requirement.
  20. The CHC Vice President for Instruction should follow through on validating the status of the instructional SLO cycle as early in the Fall as possible.
  21. Based on the findings of the CHC Vice President for Instruction, and assuming the Commission relents on the SLOs deadline as suggested above, CHC should adjust the published schedule for the instructional SLO cycle to ensure that by June 2010:
    - a. Every active course and program has at least one sound SLO for which at least one appropriate assessment method (with an effectiveness criterion, if feasible) has been identified.

- b. Achievement of at least one SLO in every active course, and of at least one program SLO in every program, has been assessed; the results have been analyzed; and needed improvements or SLO modifications, if any, have been identified.
  - c. Plans and schedules for implementation of all improvements and SLO modifications have been formulated.
    - (1) Implementation of all SLO modifications, and of a significant proportion of planned improvements, should be scheduled for Fall 2010, with the rest of the planned improvements scheduled for no later than Fall 2011.
    - (2) If the Commission does not relent as suggested above, implementation of all planned improvements as well as SLO modifications will have to be moved up to Fall 2010.
  - d. A documented system for monitoring implementation and ensuring that it takes place as scheduled is in operation.
  - e. The schedule for reassessment of those SLOs associated with all planned or implemented improvements has been published, to continue the cycle.
  - f. Every step is documented.
22. The CHC Office of Instruction, in consultation with appropriate groups and offices, should establish a schedule for completing the General Education/Institutional SLOs cycle, to include the following elements, no later than Fall 2010:
- a. Make any necessary preparations to apply the assessment methods already chosen for the institutional SLOs.
  - b. Establish a criterion for each institutional SLO, achievement of which demonstrates the desired degree of institutional effectiveness (if that has not already been done).
  - c. Assess achievement of each institutional SLO, analyze the results, and identify and plan for needed course, program, or service improvements or SLO modifications, if any.
  - d. Implement identified course, program, or service improvements, and/or modified institutional SLOs, beginning in Fall 2010.
  - e. A documented system for monitoring implementation and ensuring that it takes place as scheduled is in operation.
  - f. Publish the schedule for reassessment, which should occur in Spring 2011, to continue the cycle.
  - g. Document every step.
23. The CHC Vice President for Instruction and the CHC Vice President for Administrative Services (who have temporarily assumed the management duties of the now-vacant Vice President for Student Services position) should establish and publish a firm schedule for completing the outcomes cycle for all units in Student Services, to ensure that by June 2010:
- a. Every unit has completed development of all its SLO/SAOs and has identified at least one appropriate assessment method (with an effectiveness criterion, if feasible) for each.
  - b. Achievement of all SLO/SAOs in every unit has been assessed; the results have been analyzed; and needed improvements or SLO/SAO modifications, if any, have been identified.

- c. Plans and schedules for implementation of all improvements and SLO/SAO modifications no later than August 2010 have been formulated.
  - d. A documented system for monitoring implementation and ensuring that it takes place as scheduled is in operation.
  - e. The schedule for reassessment of those SLO/SAOs associated with all planned or implemented improvements has been published, to continue the cycle.
  - f. Every step is documented.
24. In CHC Administrative Services, to permit reporting the completion of at least some outcomes cycles in the October 2009 Follow-Up Report:
- a. The CHC Vice President should complete the analysis of outcomes assessment results as scheduled.
  - b. All units for which the analysis is complete by the end of July 2009 should:
    - (1) By the end of August 2009, identify and document needed improvements and/or outcomes modifications based on that analysis, and formulate plans and schedules for implementation of both.
    - (2) By the end of September 2009, implement as many of the improvements and outcomes modifications as are feasible.
    - (3) Implement the remainder of the improvements and outcomes modifications no later than August 2010.
    - (4) Document every step.
  - c. All other units should, as soon as the analysis of their assessment results is complete:
    - (1) Identify and document needed improvements and/or outcomes modifications based on that analysis, and formulate plans and schedules for implementation of both.
    - (2) Implement all improvements and outcomes modifications.
    - (3) Document every step.
  - d. The CHC Vice President should institute and document a system for monitoring implementation and ensuring that it takes place as scheduled.
  - e. The CHC Vice President should publish the schedule for reassessment of those outcomes associated with all planned or implemented improvements no later than August 2010, to continue the cycle.
25. I recommend that in my consulting capacity, I serve as a resource person for CHC staff who need assistance in the completion of the outcomes cycle, particularly in the noninstructional areas.
26. CHC should develop and implement a systematic cyclical evaluation of governance and administrative structures, processes, and services; communicate the results; and implement improvements, all in accord with Recommendation 4. I recommend that in my consulting capacity, I provide coordination and technical assistance for developing the structure and process, with the aim of implementing them by October 15, 2009. CHC should complete the initial cycle by July 1, 2010.
27. Once the final version of the CHC *Organizational Handbook* is approved and posted on the CHC website, the Senates and management team should publicize it to their members, and the CHC President should request in the appropriate forums that all personnel become familiar with it.

28. The Crafton Council, under the President's leadership, should reexamine its purposes, carefully define its role(s) in governance, revise its charge accordingly if necessary, and communicate that charge effectively to the campus community.
29. If it can be done in a manner consistent with the applicable collective bargaining agreement, the CHC President, in consultation with the CHC Classified Senate and the management team, should issue guidelines to all managers that will have the effect of increasing and sustaining classified staff participation in governance activities, and should require managers to adhere to them.
30. The Crafton Council should continue discussions on how best to retain student appointees on governance structures and to replace student appointees who no longer can serve; identify the most promising approaches; communicate those approaches to all governance structures and applicable personnel with the request to implement them; evaluate the results; and implement improvements as needed.
31. The CHC Planning and Program Review Committee should proceed with implementation of the new program review, planning, and resource allocation procedures for 2009-10.
32. I recommend that in my consulting capacity, I serve as a resource person on the CHC Planning and Program Review Committee in 2009-10, to assist them in completing the handbook, implementing the new procedures, and monitoring progress to ensure completion of all program reviews and plans according to the schedule.
33. The CHC Planning and Program Review Committee should complete the first cycle of its annual review of Distributed Education classes no later than summer 2010.
34. The CHC Vice President for Administrative Services, in consultation with other offices as appropriate, should provide documentation of and training in EduReports to all users who are not already fully acquainted with the software. The documentation should clearly indicate the recency of the reported data.
35. In the interests of transparency, CHC, in consultation with appropriate District and SBVC individuals and groups, should consider broadening employee access to financial data through EduReports.
36. The District, with my technical assistance, should design and implement a cyclical model for systematic program review and improvement of District operations that will accommodate the evaluative processes already in place. Work on design should begin in October 2009, and the initial cycle should be completed no later than August 1, 2010.
37. The District, under the leadership of the Chancellor and with my active technical assistance on appropriate participatory structures, processes, and content, should develop and adopt an effective District Strategic Plan that takes into consideration the Board Imperatives and meets the requirements of Recommendation 7 no later than August 2010. If the District's shared-governance policies and practices permit it, I can act as co-convenor and facilitator of this process, to expedite progress. The process should begin in October 2009.
38. The Executive Director of DETS, in consultation with both institutional research offices, should assess the effectiveness of technology services in light of the reorganization, with particular attention to responsiveness to the Colleges' needs. Assuming that the reorganization is fully implemented by early Fall 2009, the assessment should take place by late Spring 2010. If analysis of assessment results

- indicates the need for improvements, those improvements should be scheduled for implementation as soon as feasible, and then reassessed in a continuing cycle.
39. The Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, with my technical assistance if the Vice Chancellor wishes it, should formulate an initial three-to-five-year global projection of District staffing needs, to be completed in October 2009. When information becomes available from the SBVC Needs Assessment process and the revised CHC program review and planning process in late Fall 2009 or early Spring 2010, she should refine the projections.
  40. The District, under the leadership of the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources and with full participation by representatives of the appropriate constituencies, should develop and adopt an effective District Human Resources Plan that helps the Colleges plan and set priorities for full-time faculty and staff needs no later than August 2010. The development process, in which I can serve as a resource person, should begin in October 2009.
  41. The District should complete the development of the Budget Allocation Model Summary, and take steps to ensure that it is accurately updated and widely disseminated annually.
  42. I recommend that in my consulting capacity, I facilitate a series of about three meetings with the SBVC President and the SBVC Dean of Institutional Research, Planning, and Development, preferably before the beginning of the Fall semester, for the following purposes:
    - a. Determine those structural and process elements of the West Hills College Coalinga Educational Master Plan (and other such plans, if they so choose) that they find most useful for and applicable to the needs of the College, and that fit the integration requirements of SBVC Recommendation 1.
    - b. Identify additional structural and process elements that they regard as crucial, important, or desirable for the SBVC Educational Master Plan, particularly in relation to the SBVC Strategic Plan and other planning processes and structures at the College, including the following:
      - (1) Program Efficacy
      - (2) Needs Assessment
      - (3) Resource allocation
      - (4) Goals/objectives at the unit level and above; year-end reports
      - (5) The roles of the Program Review, Budget, Technology, and Facilities Committees and the College Council
      - (6) Outcomes assessment
      - (7) Technology planning
      - (8) Facilities planning
      - (9) Other major plans, such as Enrollment Management, Basic Skills, and Professional Development
    - c. Identify any constraints on educational master planning structures and processes.
    - d. Share and refine sample scenarios that fit all the elements together in an integrated whole.
  43. The SBVC College Council should have the opportunity to provide input in these discussions. For example, members could comment on initial scenarios, or I could

present alternative scenarios in a Council meeting, from which they could adopt one as the basis for further development.

44. The SBVC College Council should use the adopted scenario as the map for development of the full-blown SBVC Educational Master Plan. The schedule for completion and implementation of that Plan depends on many factors. Nevertheless, the Council should aim to complete the plan in time to implement it in Fall 2010.

## *Accrediting Commission Recommendations for Crafton Hills College*

### **Action Required in Time for October 15, 2009 Follow-Up Report**

- a. Recommendation 1 [Integrated Planning]: As was noted in recommendations 1 and 2 of the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report and in order to meet the standards, the college should integrate all planning processes and documents into a meaningful, comprehensive, long-range institutional plan to accomplish its mission and realize its vision. Additionally, the college plan should be integrated into an overall district strategic plan. (Standards I.A.4, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.6, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.D.1.a) The college should move immediately to:
  - (1) Complete the implementation of a cycle of systematic integrated planning, evaluation, prioritization, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation.
  - (2) Identify quantitative effectiveness measures (key performance indicators), gather baseline data and establish institutional planning goals.
  - (3) Revise the Educational Master Plan to include long-term resource allocation.
- b. Recommendation 2 [Data]: As was noted in recommendations 2 and 7 of the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report and in order to meet the standards, the college should develop processes that produce reliable data, provide employees with easy access to data, and provide training on how to access, interpret and utilize data. (Standards I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.5, II.A.1.a)
- c. Recommendation 3 [SLOs and Other Outcomes]: As was noted in recommendation 4 of the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report and in order to meet the standards, the college should complete the development, implementation, assessment and review of course, program and institution wide student learning outcomes and utilize the assessment results to make continuous program improvements. (Standards I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.f, ER 10)
- d. Recommendation 4 [Administrative and Governance Evaluation]: In order to meet the standards, the college should develop and implement procedures to evaluate the effectiveness of administrative and governance structures, processes and services; communicate evaluation results to constituencies; and utilize the results to make improvements. The college should also define the roles and responsibilities of each governance structure and establish more widespread participation by classified staff and students. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.5, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3)
- e. Recommendation 8 [Integration of Program Review; Distributed Education]: As was noted in recommendation 6 of the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report and to meet the standards, the college should complete the integration of program review for all academic, student services and administrative services units into institutional evaluation and planning. In particular, the college should develop processes and procedures to ensure program effectiveness of distributed education courses. (Standards II.A.2.e, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.D.2.g, IV.A.5, ER 19, 21)
- f. Recommendation 10 [Long-term Fiscal Plans and Financial Information]: As was noted in recommendation 9 of the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report and in order to meet the standards, the college should develop long-term fiscal plans. Employees should be provided with adequate financial information and training in the use of such data. (Standards III.D.1.c, III.D.3)

### **Action Required in Time for October 15, 2010 Follow-Up Report**

- g. Recommendation 6 [Participation]: In order to improve the quality of the institution, the college president should ensure that all areas, including academic, student, and administrative services, are actively participating in the decision making and planning processes. (Standards I.B.4, IV.A.3, IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.b)
- h. District Recommendations:
  - (1) Recommendation 7 [District Program Review, Strategic Plan, Technology Plan, Human Resources Plan]: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees, and the chancellor, in consultation with the leadership of the college campuses, develop a strategy for addressing some significant issues raised by each college and verified in interviews with staff in the following areas; namely:
    - a) The development of an appropriate and clearly communicated process for reviewing all district functions and processes using a Program Review model. (Standards IV.B.3.a, b)
    - b) The development of a formal and regularly evaluated district strategic plan that both acknowledges input and aligns with the colleges educational plan and serves as a guide for planning at the college level. (Standards I.B.3, IV.B.3.g)
    - c) The development of a coordinated strategic plan for technology that is responsive to the colleges and assists them in the daily management of the college functions, including the monitoring, assessing and use of financial information. (Standards I.B.2, 5, 6, IV.B.3.b, III.C.1.a, c, III.C.2, III.D.2.a)
    - d) The development of a long range Human Resources Plan to assist the colleges in planning and prioritizing the need for full-time faculty and staff. (Standards I.A.4, III.A.6, III.B.2.b)
  - (2) Commission Recommendation 1 [District resource allocation process]: The district's resource allocation process needs to be clarified and communicated to both colleges within the district. (Standard III.A.6, III.B.2.a, b, III.C.2, III.D.1.d, III.D.3, IV.3.a, c, d, f, g)

### **Action Required in Time for October 15, 2011 Midterm Report**

- i. Recommendation 5 [Communication]: In order to improve, the college administration should strengthen communication with faculty, staff and students, and between the college and the district. Processes should be established for regular, timely sharing of information and decisions. (Standards I.B.5, II.A.6.c, III.D.2.a, III.D.2.b, IV.A.3)
- j. Recommendation 9 [SLOs as Evaluation Component]: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.1.c)