

Follow-Up Report Campus Meetings

Meeting Purpose

- Provide a brief overview of the report
- Answer questions
- Seek feedback
 - Accuracy
 - Additional examples and/or evidence
 - Clarity

Purpose of Follow-Up Report

- To provide the Commission with information, evidence, and analysis on the resolution of issues
- To demonstrate full resolution of issues
- To address the 7 recommendations

Overview of Report

Resolution by Oct 2010

(Extensions beyond 2009)

- Rec 1: Integrated Planning
- Rec 2: Data Reliability, Access & Training
- Rec 6: Participation in Planning
- Rec 7: District Program Review
- Rec 8: Program Review (DE)
- Rec 10: Fiscal Plans
- Commission Rec 1: Allocation Process

Resolved (per commission)

- Rec 3: SLOs
- Rec 4: Governance

Resolution of Recommendation 1: Integrated Planning

- Educational Master Plan (p. 7 – 10)
 - Four cycles of feedback
 - Now implementing and monitoring
- Planning & Program Review Cycle (p. 10 – 15)
 - Check examples and provide further evidence of cycle completion
 - Status report on prioritization list is forthcoming
- Both processes incorporate continuous improvement through measurement, analysis, and reflection

Resolution of Recommendation 2: Data Reliability, Access, and Training

- Summary of work coming out of ORP (p. 18) – completed 79% of 126 research requests in first six months
- Data for EMP and P&PR (p. 18) – completed QEIs and all unit data for P&PR units
- Data access and reliability (p. 18 – 19)
- Surveys (p. 19)
- Training (p. 19 – 20)

Resolution of Recommendation 6: Participation in Decision-Making & Planning

- Committee representation (p. 21 – 22)
 - Area representation being tracked
 - Better overall
 - Continue analysis and monitoring
 - Improvements in classified and student participation
 - Sustain communication and involvement efforts (Rec 4)
- Eleven examples (p. 23)

Resolution of Recommendation 7: District Program Review and Plans

- Each section describes the process, the result(s), and future steps for continuing the cycle and making improvements
- Program Reviews for District Services (p. 25-32)
 - Almost all District Services have completed program review for the first time
- Strategic Plan for the District (p. 30 – 39)
 - The District has completed its first strategic plan, approved by the Board in July
 - It is aligned with Valley's and CHC's plans
 - The DSPC had faculty, administrator, classified, and student representation from both campuses

Resolution of Recommendation 7: District Program Review and Plans

- Strategic Plan for Technology (p. 39 – 43)
 - New Plan approved by Board in July of 2010
 - Designed to support instruction and student services at both colleges
 - Executive Committee had representation from faculty, administrators, classified, and students from both campuses
- HR Plan (p. 43 – 45)
 - Final expected in early September
 - Purpose is to assist the colleges in planning and prioritizing full-time hiring needs

Resolution of Recommendation 8: Program Review of DE

- ETC Developed and implemented revised certification process (p. 47)
- ETC implemented the revised Course Readiness Checklist (p. 47)
- The ETC created a new Web Portal (p. 47)
- ETC administered the Online Course Evaluation in Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 (p. 47)
- Retention and success rates are similar to face-to-face courses when term, course, and instructor are controlled for (p. 48)

Resolution of Recommendation 10: Fiscal Planning

- Long-term fiscal planning (p. 49)
 - Long-term fiscal plans were made available to the entire College community in Spring 2010
 - CHC Long-Range Financial Plan and Forecast presents both conservative and optimistic financial scenarios for revenues
- Financial 2000 access and training (p. 49)
 - All college staff have access to District-wide and College-specific budget and expenditure figures
 - Online instruction for EduReports is now available for all users

Resolution of Commission Recommendation 1: District Resource Allocation Process

- Budget Allocation Model (p. 51 – 53)
 - Feedback from colleges was solicited on the draft Resource Allocation Model
 - The new approved Resource Allocation Model was used to make allocations for the 2010-2011 fiscal year
 - Model will be reviewed annually for continuous improvement

Questions and Feedback

- Are there errors in the report? If so, how would you suggest they be corrected?
- Do you have suggestions for additional evidence?
- Are there points that should be clarified? If so, what clarifications would you suggest?