

Preliminary Findings Concerning the Perceptions of the Progress towards Satisfying the Accreditation Recommendations

Prepared by Giovanni Sosa

Purpose of Brief

The purpose of this brief is to illustrate the findings stemming from a brief survey designed to gather feedback from campus constituents concerning the progress that both the college and the district have made in meeting the various accreditation recommendations.

Summary of Findings

- Seventy-one percent or more of respondents agreed or strongly agreed on seven of eight scaled survey items inquiring about the progress made on college-level recommendations.
- Sixty percent or less of respondents agreed or strongly agreed on all six scaled items inquiring about the progress made on district-level recommendations.
- Open-ended feedback was generally positive with regards to the college-level recommendations. Such feedback was more variable with respect to the district-level recommendations.

Overview

Both Crafton Hills College (CHC) and the San Bernardino Community College District (SBCCD) have made an effort to address the various recommendations received from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). To examine the perceptions of campus constituents concerning such progress, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning developed a brief survey to obtain feedback with regards to both college and district-level recommendations.

The resulting findings indicated the following among the 25 respondents:

- With respect to college-level recommendations, respondents were generally satisfied with the progress that has been made. This conclusion is based upon evidence gathered via scaled and open-ended items.
- With respect to district-level recommendations, findings stemming from the scaled survey items generally pointed to less than favorable perceptions of the progress that has been made. However, findings stemming from corresponding open-ended questions demonstrate greater variability, and in part, suggest a more favorable view of such progress as compared to scaled item findings.

Possible Implications

These findings offer a preliminary examination of the perceptions concerning the efforts to address the accreditation recommendations. Such evidence is largely positive with regards to CHC's progress but less so with respect to SBCCD's recommendations. Additionally, at least 20% of responses to four of the six SBCCD scaled items were *Don't Know*; such findings suggest that the district needs to place a greater emphasis on communicating to campus constituents the progress it is making towards addressing its recommendations.

Limitations

On the other hand, such findings are also based on a limited sample; as a result, they should not be taken to be representative of the broader campus community. A broader implementation – one targeting multiple campus constituents – is necessary to increase our confidence that the resulting findings are indeed generalizable across campus.

Methodology

The survey was organized along two sections: One section contained questions that were specific to CHC recommendations, and a second contained questions specific to SBCCD recommendations. Each section contained scaled items asked on the basis of a four point scale (1 – *Strongly Disagree* and 4 – *Strongly Agree*) and multiple open-ended items that asked participants to comment on the progress made with regards to the recommendations. The section specific to CHC was made up of eight scaled items and four open-ended items, and the section specific to SBCCD was made up of six scaled items and three open-ended items. Lastly, one demographic item asked respondents to report their affiliation with the college (e.g., student, staff member, or faculty member). The survey was offered in both paper and [online-based](#) formats.

Findings

A total of 25 surveys were completed and submitted. Of the 25 submissions, 13 were paper-based survey submissions and the remaining 12 were online-based submissions. As illustrated in Table 1, 67% of respondents identified themselves as faculty members, followed by classified staff (20%) and management staff (13%). No students submitted a completed form.

Table 1

The College Affiliation of Survey Respondents

College Affiliation	Number of Respondents	Percent
Faculty	16	66.7
Classified Staff	5	20.0
Management Staff	3	12.5
Total	24	100

Note. One respondent did not answer this question.

College-Level Findings (CHC). Table 2 illustrates the percentage of responses for each response choice by scaled survey item, and it also identifies the corresponding mean (or average) response on the aforementioned 1-4 scale. Findings generally indicate that respondents reported agreeing that CHC had made progress towards meeting the various college recommendations. Specifically, 92% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that CHC's catalog is published in a timely manner (*Mean* = 3.52). On the other hand, 57% agreed or strongly agreed that CHC's program elimination policy does not negatively affect students (*Mean* = 3.00).

Another noteworthy finding is with respect to the percentage of respondents offering *Don't Know* or *N/A* responses. At least 16% of respondents offered such responses on three of the eight scaled items (e.g., distance education and program elimination). Notwithstanding the earlier point about negatively-worded items, it suggests that CHC can possibly do more to inform campus constituents about the progress the college is making in those areas.

Table 2

Crafton Hills Scaled Item Findings: The Percentage of Responses Per Response Choice and the Mean for Each Scaled Survey Item

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know / N/A	Mean
The College uses student learning outcomes (SLO) assessment results to make improvements to courses and programs	52.0%	32.0%	4.0%	4.0%	8.0%	3.43
The College uses SLO assessment results for college-wide planning	44.0%	36.0%	4.0%	4.0%	12.0%	3.36
The College's distance education plan supports the needs of current and future students	40.0%	32.0%	8.0%	4.0%	16.0%	3.29
The College's program elimination policy addresses when programs are eliminated or significantly changed	43.5%	34.8%	4.3%	0.0%	17.4%	3.47
The College's program elimination policy does not negatively affect students	22.7%	36.4%	13.6%	4.5%	22.7%	3.00
The College's catalog is published in a timely manner	68.0%	24.0%	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%	3.52
The College evaluates all employees in a systematic manner	41.7%	33.3%	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%	3.18
The College evaluates all employees at regularly scheduled intervals	41.7%	29.2%	8.3%	8.3%	12.5%	3.19

Note. The responses for each item were recorded on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree) scale. Between 22 and 25 responses were offered per item. *Don't Know / N/A* responses were not included in the calculation of the mean.

Tables 3 through 6 detail the specific open-ended feedback offered by respondents to questions about the college-level recommendations. With respect to the question concerning the extent to which SLO assessment results are used for course, program, or college-wide planning (Table 3), the majority of responses point to examples in which SLO findings are used for college-wide planning.

Table 3

Open-Ended Feedback Concerning the Extent to Which SLO Assessment Results are Used for Course/Program Improvement or College-Wide Planning

Response Number	Response
1.	Tremendous progress. There has been a great emphasis on making sure SLOs reflect course objectives and college-wide planning. There has been several workshops for evaluation reviews of existing SLOs
2.	The college has made a concerted effort to create a sustainable process to routinely access outcomes and include them in planning documents + processes.
3.	SLOs are done within areas in isolation and have no impact on programs above the discipline level.
4.	Our dept. has used them much more now that they are so easy to access with the cloud. I see they are used at the college level as well ... workshops etc.
5.	I can only speak about my academic area.
6.	Flex days to evaluate gaps and [unknown] of [unknown] + for SLOs.
7.	CHC has college-wide discussions that aggregate course-level improvement plans to inform Institutional changes that should occur. Also, SLO assignments is used in PPR and to inform objective prioritization and resource requests. Lastly, the assessment rate is over 97%!
8.	Addressed with instructors while seeking their input for ways to improve during the SLO process and the end of the semester.

Note. Responses were not altered; as a result, they may contain misspellings.

When asked about the extent to which the Distance Education Plan supports the needs of students (Table 4), the majority of respondents point to the need for distance education offerings and/or acknowledging that a distance education plan is under development.

Table 4

Open-Ended Feedback Concerning the Extent to Which the Distance Education Plan supports the Needs of Current and Future Students

Response Number	Response
1.	Students are not being asked what they want or desire in distance education. The 'leaders' of distance education are winging it.
2.	Not sure.
3.	Lots of DE classes have been added due to demand. I hear plans of online programs now as well.
4.	It will meet the needs of the students who are unable to attend class on campus. It provides another way to capture students who cannot attend classes here on campus. We can open up our DE to all students that we normally could not capture if they're only option is to attend classes here on campus.
5.	In process with new plan and support.
6.	I do know about this, and we are delivering high quality courses.
7.	Greatly.
8.	As a classified professional, the Academic Senate requested and accepted my input to help improve the plan. It truly feels like a campus-wide student-centered plan.

Note. Responses were not altered; as a result, they may contain misspellings.

With regards to the program elimination policy (Table 5), two of the six responses specifically acknowledge that a policy is either in place or in process. The remaining responses largely focus on the benefits or drawbacks associated with such a policy.

Table 5

Open-Ended Feedback Concerning the Extent to Which the Program Elimination Policy Addresses When Programs are Eliminated or Significantly Changed

Response Number	Response
1.	We're trying to grow but cutting courses and programs...seems counterintuitive.
2.	There have not been any recent instances of this happening. But it's good we have the policy finally!
3.	The program viability process is addressing this issue.
4.	Not sure.
5.	It's a clear process that makes an otherwise difficult decision more objective and fair to students and discipline faculty.
6.	I have helped develop the policy but cannot report on any specific examples of its implementation.

Note. Responses were not altered; as a result, they may contain misspellings.

Table 6 illustrates the responses addressing the evaluations of all employees. While five of the seven responses reflect the sentiment that evaluations are done regularly and systematically, two of the responses point to a less than satisfied perception with the current process.

Table 6

Open-Ended Feedback Concerning the Extent to Which All Employees are Evaluated Systematically and at Regularly Scheduled Intervals

Response Number	Response
1.	Yes employees are evaluated systematically and regularly
2.	The district and CHC have consistently missed scheduled evaluations of employees in all areas, including tenure reviews, which is just one of the ongoing, systemic failures of leadership on the campus.
3.	I've always been evaluated systematically and regularly.
4.	I haven't been given the opportunity to complete an evaluation for my manager in several years. While staff and faculty are regularly evaluated, management evaluations never seem to be a priority.
5.	I have noticed that HR does send emails when an evaluation needs to be done for probation or annual evaluations.
6.	Every semester I am evaluating full time and part time faculty as well as staff and managers.
7.	As far as I know at our college employees are evaluated fairly and at regular intervals.

Note. Responses were not altered; as a result, they may contain misspellings.

District-Level Findings (SBCCD). Table 7 illustrates the percentage of responses for each response choice by scaled survey item, and it also identifies the corresponding mean (or average) response on the aforementioned 1-4 scale. In contrast to the findings reported for the college-level recommendations, such findings generally indicate that respondents were less than satisfied with the progress made on the district-level recommendations. For instance, the average (or mean) ratings for all items was less 3.00, indicating that – on average – respondents did not agree that progress was being made with regards to the various district-level recommendations. In addition, less than 10% of respondents reported strongly agreeing to any of the scaled survey items, and at least 12% of respondents reported strongly disagreeing on five out of the six scaled items.

Table 7

SBCCD Scaled Item Findings: The Percentage of Responses Per Response Choice and the Mean for Each Scaled Survey Item

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know / N/A	Mean
The Board of Trustees understands its role in developing district policies	4.3%	39.1%	21.7%	8.7%	26.1%	2.53
The Board of Trustees acts in a manner consistent with established policy	0.0%	39.1%	21.7%	13.0%	26.1%	2.35
The Board of Trustees seeks the input of faculty, staff, and students in developing and revising policies	4.3%	34.8%	26.1%	17.4%	17.4%	2.32
The District is responsive to its staffing needs	4.2%	54.2%	8.3%	16.7%	16.7%	2.55
Human Resources (HR) consistently interprets policy pertaining to hiring processes and collective bargaining agreements	8.0%	52.0%	8.0%	12.0%	20.0%	2.70
The District is transparent and inclusive in matters pertaining to financial planning and budget development	4.2%	37.5%	25.0%	12.5%	20.8%	2.42

Note. The responses for each item were recorded on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree) scale. Between 23 and 25 responses were offered per item. *Don't Know / N/A* responses were not included in the calculation of the mean.

Tables 8 through 10 detail the specific open-ended feedback offered by respondents to questions about the district-level recommendations. With respect to the question concerning the extent to which the Board understands its role in developing and revising policy (Table 8), the responses indicate wide-ranging sentiment concerning the matter – from a lack of knowledge to outright support.

Table 8

Open-Ended Feedback Concerning the Extent to Which the Board Understands its Role in Developing/Revising Policy and Makes Decisions in Accordance with Such Policies

Response Number	Response
1.	Too many instances where this has not occurred.
2.	The Board understands it's role, but fails to understand that it's ability to get good information has diminished dramatically due to reliance on unreliable sources.
3.	The Board seems to better understand their role as a policy body.
4.	I think the District has done a good job at addressing the deficiencies of HR processes and procedures.
5.	I don't know what they understand
6.	I believe it is making great progress

Note. Responses were not altered; as a result, they may contain misspellings.

Table 9 reflects the responses concerning the extent to which Human Resources (HR) consistently interprets policies pertaining to hiring processes and collective bargaining. While only five responses were offered, the majority offer positive feedback about the progress being made in this area.

Table 9

Open-Ended Feedback Concerning the Extent to Which Human Resources (HR) Consistently Interprets Policies Pertaining to Hiring Processes and Collective Bargaining Agreements

Response Number	Response
1.	Making continuous progress
2.	I don't know how consistent they have been.
3.	HR tries to implement effectively, but has not had a strong leader, nor support for years. This is changing and it is apparent that the VC is on top of things and moving in a good direction.
4.	HR has added the necessary positions and resources to be a more effective and consistent support to the colleges and district.
5.	Great

Note. Responses were not altered; as a result, they may contain misspellings.

Table 10 illustrates the responses offered in response to the question about the extent to which the district engages campus constituents when it comes to matters of financial planning and budget development. While at least five responses seemingly reflect a positive view on such progress made in this area, the remaining responses suggest a less than favorable view concerning district practices in this area.

Table 10

Open-Ended Feedback Concerning the Extent to Which the District Engages Faculty, Staff, and Students in Matters Pertaining to Financial Planning and Budget Development

Response Number	Response
1.	We receive excellent new and regular emails about the state, college, and the district budget and financial processes. I feel much better informed!
2.	They send out updates through emails to let us know the state budget and how that will impact the District.
3.	The process still feels very top down. Though the District might think it getting good info from groups like the Senate and the unions, those groups are not communicating well with their constituents yet claim to know what those constituents want.
4.	Staff have very little, if any, real input in what happens in this district. While we are often allowed to speak and give opinions, those opinions are rarely listened to, particularly if they are contrary to what faculty has to say. And students have even less of a voice in what's happening.
5.	Seems to be much improvement lately in this area.
6.	I see how the college does it but I am unaware at the district level.
7.	I am new and like to hear about all the news that affects Crafton. It's never too much. I like details.
8.	Great extent
9.	Good

Note. Responses were not altered; as a result, they may contain misspellings.

For more information please contact Gio Sosa, Interim Dean, Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning at gsosa@craftonhills.edu or at 909-389-3206.