LOS MEDANOS COLLEGE

Responses to 2008 Visiting Team Recommendations

★

"**LMC has provided a stable environment that has taught me valuable life lessons** that have not only helped me in my academic career, but my professional career as well. I have experienced the student and staff perspective and I believe that the opportunities I have received through both have contributed to my success."

- Michael Simpson
Associate of Arts in Liberal Arts: Arts and Humanities and in Acting
Associate in Arts Degree for Transfer in Theatre Arts

Responses to 2008 Visiting Team Recommendations

In the summer of 2008, Los Medanos College submitted its "Institutional Self Study Report in Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation". The subsequent accreditation site visit, conducted in October 2008, and the Commission action taken in January 2009 resulted in three College Recommendations and four District Recommendations. The College then addressed College Recommendation 1 and District Recommendation 1 in a Follow-Up Report, submitted in October 2009. Further evidence of the institution's work to resolve District Recommendation 1 was included in an October 2010 Follow-Up Report. LMC's Focused Midterm Report, which was submitted in October 2011, addressed College Recommendations 1, 2, and 3, as well as District Recommendations 2, 3, and 4. The narrative that follows incorporates information from the 2008 accreditation report, the two follow-up reports, the focused midterm report, and other progress to date.

College Recommendation 1: Although the college has made significant strides in developing institutional and program SLOs, the team found that approximately 75 percent of the college's courses do not have SLOs as part of the course outline of record. Therefore, the team encourages the college to accomplish what it set out to do in meeting its timeline for reaching proficiency in its course-level SLOs by 2012. Furthermore, the team recommends that that process be implemented so that by 2012 the college will have developed and implemented methods for assessing those SLOs and use the results of those assessments to improve student learning in all its courses. (Standards IB1, IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2a, IIA2b, IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2g, IIA2i, IIA3, IIA6, IIA6a, IIB4, IIC1a, IIC2, IIIA1c)

Response to College Recommendation 1

All courses at Los Medanos College now have student learning outcomes (SLOs) clearly documented in every official course outline of record. Early in 2009, the president of the College appointed a taskforce to oversee the process to update 100 percent of the College's course outlines, while incorporating SLOs for the course and documenting the alignment of course SLOs with program SLOs in the official outline of record. All course outlines continue to be updated at least once every five years (CR-1, ER-25). All new and updated course outlines must include SLO and assessment information in order to be approved by the Curriculum Committee.

Since the last accreditation site visit in 2008, the College has spent substantial time and effort in reviewing, revising, and improving its SLO assessment model. In 2010-2011, LMC was selected as one of 15 colleges in the state to receive technical support from the Research and Planning Group's Bridging Research, Inquiry and Cultures (BRIC) Initiative to build institutional capacity in assessment. The three areas that the College selected for this technical support were Student Learning Outcomes

Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness Assessment, and Turning Data into Meaningful Action. Members from a variety of College groups - including the Shared Governance Council, the Teaching and Learning Project (TLP - the College's assessment committee), the Curriculum Committee, the Distance Education Committee, and the Academic Senate - were invited to participate. This initiative enabled the College to re-evaluate, redefine, and streamline its assessment cycles at all three levels of student learning outcomes: course, program, and institutional. As part of this process, General Education SLOs were re-defined as institutional SLOs.

In order to improve assessment processes, the TLP surveyed full-time and part-time faculty during the 2010-2011 academic year regarding assessment issues and processes (CR-2). Ninety-seven full-time and ninety part-time faculty responded to the survey. As a result of survey responses, the TLP determined that the SLO assessment model at that time was too complex and cumbersome. During the 2010-2011 academic year, the faculty SLO lead worked extensively with faculty, staff, and managers to synchronize the assessment cycles at the course- and the program-levels with program review and the cycle for updating of course outlines. The responsibility for the development and assessment of course- and program-level student learning outcomes lies with department chairs, based on the *United Faculty Contract* (ER-36). The structure and membership of the assessment committee – re-named the Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC) – was modified to include more faculty and department chairs, effective fall 2012.

The revised model for SLO assessment was approved by the Academic Senate and the Shared Governance Council in spring 2012 and the model was implemented beginning in fall 2012 (CR-3, CR-4). In particular, General Education SLOs became the only institutional-level SLOs. Course-level and program-level assessment is aligned with the five-year cycle for comprehensive program review and the annual program review updates. The new model also supports the five- year review and updating of course outlines of record. The five-year assessment cycle includes four years of course-level assessment (with 25 percent of the courses within an instructional program in the same cohort year); the fifth year is for program-level assessment. All courses offered at LMC were grouped into assessment cohorts beginning in fall 2012. New courses are added to cohorts as they are created and this information is included in the course outline.

Within the previous years' program assessment cycles, 100 percent of degree and certificate granting programs had completed program-level student learning outcomes assessment projects. As outlined in the assessment model implemented in fall 2012, program-level student learning outcomes in all degree, certificate, and skills certificate granting programs are scheduled to be assessed by spring 2017 (CR-5, ER-57). As of May 2014, 435 of the 625 courses listed in the College Catalog have been assessed. Included in the remaining courses are:
- courses that have not been offered due to budget and schedule reductions (approximately 50 courses);

- courses that have been assessed in cohort year 1 (2012-2013), but have not yet reported the results of assessment;
- courses scheduled for assessment in cohort year 2 (2013-2014); and
- new courses added to the catalog and scheduled to be assessed in the coming years.

Assessment results are compiled by program faculty and department chairs and reported using a Word document. The TLC has created recommended templates for both course-level and program-level assessment reporting, which are used by the majority of programs. Prior to November 2013, assessment reports could be submitted to the SLO coordinator or uploaded directly to the department's assessment folder on the "public drive" of the College (CR-6). Beginning in December 2013, course-level assessment reports can be uploaded directly to the College's Program Review Submission Tool (PRST) and are stored in the tool's data repository folders (ER-55). The assessment section of the PRST allows departments to view the course assessment cohorts and schedule that they have established, allowing for better tracking of assessments. Beginning in February 2014, program-level assessment reports can also be uploaded to the PRST. An executive summary of program-level assessment results is also uploaded to the College website for students (current and prospective), as well as for the community to access easily (CR-7).

Both the annual update and five-year comprehensive program/unit review include questions about program and course assessment. Assessment results are used to identify areas in a course and/or program that should be included in departmental planning. Through the program review process, departments are asked to identify objectives and activities that support the mission and goals of the District, College and/or department. Planning objectives also address areas of improvement identified as a result of assessment. These areas could be in pedagogy, assessment instruments, technology, inclusion of more hands-on learning, etc. Programs that require funds to make improvements as a result of assessment or other information document these needs in the program review prior to requesting resources through the Resource Allocation Process (RAP). Results of the CSLO and PSLO assessments are reviewed by a combination of the chief instructional officer, Office of Instruction, and the leadership of the TLC in order to identify areas where College wide discussion or professional development is required. As the College moves through year two of the five year assessment cycle, some programs are implementing new strategies to address previously identified needs through course and/or program assessment.

LMC has responded to this recommendation by including student learning outcomes in all course outlines, by streamlining and systematizing its assessment process, by using assessment results to improve student learning, and integrating assessment into the program review process and resource allocation requests.

College Recommendation 2: The team recommends that the college develop mechanisms to ensure the closer alignment of the Brentwood Center with college operations, services and practices. (Standards IIB3a, IIC.1.c, III.C.1.c, IVA.1)

Response to College Recommendation 2

Los Medanos College has made significant progress since the last accreditation site visit in 2008 to align its two locations: the main campus in Pittsburg and the Brentwood Center. Although coordination existed previously, the College has taken a number of concrete steps to improve alignment, since the visiting team's recommendation was written. These steps are outlined in the sections below:

Center Management Structure

For a number of years, administrative oversight for the Brentwood Center was exercised by a faculty coordinator with 100 percent reassigned time. The faculty coordinator reported to an academic dean located at the Pittsburg campus. While this structure worked for the interim, alignment between the two locations was not always optimal. Additionally, the College needed to create a formal management presence in Brentwood in order to meet the state requirements to achieve "center status", a designation granted by the Board of Governors (BOG) at its March 2012 meeting.

In 2011, in collaboration with the chancellor and the president of Diablo Valley College (DVC), the interim president of LMC arranged for the executive dean of the DVC's San Ramon campus to have management responsibility and oversight for both the San Ramon Center and the Brentwood Center. Following a transition in spring 2011, the executive dean assumed his duties in June 2011. For his Brentwood responsibilities, the executive dean reported to the LMC president and served as a member of the LMC President's Cabinet. This management structure remained in place through August 2012. LMC hired a permanent president in July 2012. In September 2012, the individual serving as the executive dean was hired as the LMC vice president for instruction and student services. The new vice president retained temporary responsibility for the Center to provide continuity during the 2012-2013 academic year. During the 2012-2013 academic year, the management structure of the College – including the Brentwood Center – was reorganized.

As a result, the senior dean of student services was designated to serve as the on-site administrator for the operations of the Brentwood Center. The vice president retained responsibility for the instructional programs offered at the Center and responsibility for community development in the Center's service area. The senior dean of student services and Brentwood Center focuses on the day-to-day operations of the Center, including all student services provided at that location – thus facilitating closer alignment of student services practices at both locations (INT-6).

Student Services Staffing

Student Services has been expanded significantly in the Brentwood Center in order to better serve those taking classes at that location. In order to coordinate those services and to serve as a liaison with the Pittsburg campus, a 1.0 FTE student services and instructional support coordinator (SSISC) was hired in fall 2009. Additionally, a 1.0 FTE tenure-track faculty position (counselor) was hired and assigned to the Center. The counselor conducts workshops and teaches counseling courses, in addition to counseling students by appointment and on a drop-in basis.

Budget reductions experienced during the 2011-2012 fiscal year resulted in the reduction in time base of the SSISC to .50 FTE, and one of the Admissions and Records staff was reduced to .75 FTE. Most of the hourly assistance available for supplemental staffing in Admissions and Records was eliminated. The individual serving in the reduced .50 FTE SSISC position transferred to a different position within the District resulting in a vacancy, which created an opportunity to once again reorganize available resources to provide services in these areas.

Overall staffing and operating budget reductions, due to reduced revenue to the District and College from the state, were proportional at both the Pittsburg and Brentwood locations.

Starting in the 2012-2013 academic year, the responsibility for the staff coordination of student services was assigned to the satellite center business services coordinator. The Admissions positions were reconfigured to create a higher level position (lead admission & records assistant) that enabled additional services to be offered at the Center (such as transcript analysis) and provide improved communication between the Admissions and Records Office in Pittsburg and the Center (CR-8). The current student services staff consists of:

> 1.0 FTE Satellite Business Services Coordinator
> 1.0 FTE Lead Admission & Records Assistant
> 1.0 FTE Admission & Records Assistant I/II
> .75 FTE Admission & Records Assistant I/II

In addition, beginning in fall 2013, Police Services staffing was expanded into the evening to provide coverage during all of the hours that the Center is open to the public.

There are other expanded student services in Brentwood, which have been implemented in collaboration with the Pittsburg campus:
- Financial Aid services are available one day per week.
- DSPS counseling is also available one day per week, and as-needed by appointment.
- Expanded information/outreach is offered to Brentwood students, including "Welcome Days" and student services information tables.

- The Transfer Center has arranged for university representatives to visit the Brentwood Center.
- The Career Center has offered classroom workshops, information tables, and career consultation appointments.
- The Employment Center provides job referral information and workshops.
- Assessment services for both math and English are available at the Center and are coordinated and facilitated by the satellite business services coordinator.
- The Bookstore opens a temporary outlet at the Center at the beginning of each semester to sell books for all the courses offered at the Center, as well as miscellaneous supplies. The temporary store is re-opened at the end of each semester to facilitate book buy back. In fall 2013, a new supplies vending machine was installed at the Center for necessary supplies (such as blue books, Scantrons, etc).

Scheduling Instructional Programs and Sections

A reorganization of the instructional management team in 2012-2013 resulted in more efficient schedule development for the Brentwood Center. The vice president, as the chief instructional officer, provides direct supervision to the three instructional deans overseeing all academic programs at the College. In fall 2013, the vice president and the three instructional deans collaborated closely to finalize a more balanced spring 2014 schedule for the Brentwood Center, providing additional review of draft department schedules submitted for approval. Students taking classes only at the Brentwood Center are now able to complete all associate degree requirements at the Center.

Instructional support and instruction has also increased and improved at the Center. Brentwood's first 1.0 FTE classified math lab coordinator was hired in August 2009. The first 1.0 FTE tenure track English faculty member was hired and assigned to the Center in fall 2012. New space for the math lab and for tutoring was added in January 2010. Tutoring and reading/writing consultations, delivered in conjunction with the Center for Academic Support at the Pittsburg campus, are now available eight hours per week at the Brentwood Center. Both the math lab and tutoring services are heavily used by students. Several smart classrooms, equipped with the latest instructional technology, were also added. The computer lab for instruction and for student use has also been upgraded – the computers are now as good, or better, than those at the Pittsburg campus. Several other student-use computers have been added at various locations in the Center. Brentwood Center computers have now been placed on the same replacement rotation cycle as those at the Pittsburg campus.

The library established a reserve book system for faculty and students to utilize at the Center. Reserve books are now available for students on-site at the Center, similar to the arrangement at the Pittsburg campus. Students may also request library books be delivered to the Center for check out. Finally, students taking classes at the Brentwood Center also have access to the library's vast array of electronic resources.

LMC has also demonstrated its commitment to the Brentwood Center in terms of facilities. Since the last accreditation site visit, the College has added four classrooms and a tutoring lab to the facility, which used to be a super market in a small strip mall prior to the extensive remodeling. Of greater long-term importance, the CCCCD Governing Board, at its November 2010 meeting, authorized $4.8 million to purchase a 17-acre property south of the city of Brentwood, funded by local bond revenues, for the construction of a permanent Brentwood Center (CR-9, CR-10). The land acquisition was completed in July 2011. The District and College have completed a needs study, an initial project proposal, a final project proposal (summer 2011), and an environmental impact report for the proposed new facility and location (CR-11, CR-12, CR-13, CR-14). The Governing Board seeked funding to build the permanent Brentwood Center facility through a June 2014 local bond measure. The 2014 local bond measure was approved and will provide the necessary funds to build and occupy the facility in 2017-2018 (CR-15, CR-16).

Finally, LMC continues to strengthen collaboration and communication with the Brentwood Center. Since 2009, the chancellor and the LMC president have met numerous times with employees at the Brentwood Center to share information and discuss items of mutual interest, particularly budgetary issues. The Academic Senate has an official Brentwood representative, a Brentwood classified staff member served on the Shared Governance Council for a two-year term, and a faculty member from the Brentwood Center serves on the Curriculum Committee. In addition to these specific positions, more general discussions continue on how to facilitate the participation of Brentwood Center employees' in College governance processes. In May 2011, a 10-year celebration of the Center (at its current location) was held with extensive participation by employees from both locations and significant community participation.

In summary, Los Medanos College has developed and implemented mechanisms to align the Brentwood Center and Pittsburg campus operations, services, and practices.

College Recommendation 3: In order to increase effectiveness and respond fully to the previous recommendation, the team recommends that the college implement an integrated professional development plan to ensure that employees have regular structured training on information technology and instructional design.

Response to College Recommendation 3

Los Medanos College has made substantial progress in implementing an integrated professional development plan. Aspects of this plan ensure that employees have regular structured training on information technology and instructional design through the intentional planning, design, and continual expansion of the professional development program at LMC. Each of these aspects is outlined in the following sections:

- Professional Development Advisory Committee
- Technology Workshops, Trainings, and Resources
- Distance Education – Best Practices in Pedagogies
- Continuous Improvements

Professional Development Advisory Committee

During fall 2007, the Shared Governance Council (SGC) authorized the creation of a Professional Development Task Force to analyze needs and recommend improvements for the professional development program on campus. This task force, comprised of 12 active members representing faculty, classified staff and managers, presented its proposal to the SGC in May 2009. The SGC and the College president accepted the proposal, which included a professional development Mission Statement and related values, outcomes, guidelines, and operational procedures (CR-17).

As a result of this proposal, the Professional Development Advisory Committee (PDAC) was established in spring 2010. Due to funding cutbacks in the California Community College System at that time, full staffing as recommended in the proposal was not possible. However, per the president's decision, modified staffing was provided through the Office of College Advancement for PDAC and its various programs and activities. The senior foundation director provides management oversight and direction to PDAC and professional development activities on campus, and the Office of College Advancement administrative assistant fills the role of the campus wide professional development coordinator, providing day-to-day leadership and support to the program. These two staff persons are PDAC co-chairs and collaboratively facilitate planning and continuous improvement for the campus wide professional development program and plan (CR-18).

PDAC's mission is "to strengthen and support a dynamic learning environment that promotes and enhances the personal, professional, and organizational development for all employees with the ultimate goal of student success". As a shared governance committee, PDAC receives its charges from the SGC annually (CR-19, CR-20). PDAC membership is comprised of representatives from each of the campus constituencies, including students (CR-21), and the committee structure includes six standing sub-committees: Conference Review, Health and Wellness, Leadership, Orientation, Teaching and Learning, and Technology. Additionally, in an effort to further integrate professional development planning, PDAC has included LMC's Local Planning Group (the group contractually responsible for planning and approval of all faculty Flex activities) as an integral part of PDAC (CR-22).

In spring 2013, PDAC completed a two-year strategic plan (2013-2015), which includes goals and objectives, to focus the work of the committee. Several resources were used to guide the development of this plan, including SGC's charges, the District's *Strategic Plan*, LMC's *Educational Master Plan* and *Interim Strategic Priorities*, PDAC's self-assessment, the District's professional development survey results, LMC's Flex evaluations, and the 2008 Accreditation Visiting Team's Recommendations. Two focus areas of the visiting team's third recommendation -

"structured trainings regarding technology and instructional design" - are addressed in these goals and objectives and in the related activities' design (CR-23).

PDAC has made it a priority to connect and collaborate with other professional development initiatives on campus. There has been an intentional "cross-pollination" between PDAC's membership on other campus committees in order to support a network of professional development communications reaching across the campus. Additionally, PDAC's integrated approach is enhanced by inviting non-PDAC members to participate on PDAC sub-committees. As a result of this on-going professional development network, PDAC has been able to support other campus committees by publicizing their professional development activities, assisting with online registrations and evaluations, and in making appropriate professional development linkages. By identifying these areas for collaboration, PDAC is creating more effective and efficient use of resources and is helping to break down "silos". Examples of such collaborations include:

- Collaborative Learning: In response to information about the need for technology trainings from various campus departments and programs, PDAC co-sponsored activities with other committees, and to address these needs.
- Joint Planning, Program Development and Implementation: PDAC worked closely with the LPG, the IDEA Committee, and with members of the General Education Committee to create the on-going campus wide professional development initiative, "Looking In – Looking Out Initiative: A respectful and inclusive exploration of cultural humility, unconscious bias, and competence at LMC".
- Conference Review Team: This group works closely with grants, committees and departments, resulting in consistent procedures for conference funding requests, recommendations, and approval processes.
- PDAC reaches out across the campus, identifying faculty, staff and managers to facilitate workshops and other professional development activities throughout the year.

Professional development activities on campus, including technology-related trainings and activities, are provided through various delivery modes, such as employee- and consultant-facilitated workshops, peer mentoring, inquiry groups, teaching communities, and off-campus workshops and conferences. Professional development activities are regularly scheduled during pre-semester Flex days and throughout each semester. Additionally, links to professional development resources are available online on PDAC's websites and the websites of several campus committees and departments. The Office of College Advancement also regularly shares professional development resources, such as reports and articles, and professional development opportunities like webinars, conferences, and trainings. This information is shared on the Professional Development website (CR-24), through e-mail or one-to-one communications, as appropriate.

Continuous improvement, as a result of on-going assessment, is an important value and practice for LMC's professional development program. PDAC and the Office of

College Advancement contribute to a participatory culture of institutional learning through regular assessment, documentation, and building on lessons learned from all of its professional development activities (CR-25, CR-26, CR-27, CR-28).

Technology Workshops, Trainings and Resources

Since the establishment of PDAC in 2010, there has been a concerted effort to determine LMC's campus-specific technology professional development needs. These needs are determined through an annual employee survey (CR-29, CR-30) – conducted by the District and disaggregated by each campus and by constituency needs – and through PDAC's campus wide network. The identified needs for technology professional development trainings and activities are shared by PDAC and by the professional development staff with PDAC's Technology Sub-Committee or with the Academic Senate's Distance Education Committee. The professional development staff in the Office of College Advancement works closely with LMC's technology systems manager as well as the distance education coordinator, who reports to the Office of Instruction. This new 25 percent faculty reassigned-time position was instituted in fall 2013, along with funding for increased distance education trainings, based on needs identified through professional development surveys, the campus program review process, and a proposal submitted by the Information Technology Department through the resource allocation process (ER-56). The new reassigned-time position and increased training greatly assisted with the start-up of the District's new learning management system, Desire2Learn, and LMC's focus on creating a thoughtful and strategic *Distance Education Plan*. PDAC, the Distance Education Committee, and related staff work collaboratively in the planning and implementation of all professional development related to online education.

Since the last accreditation visit, there have been regular and focused efforts to address the desk-top technology training needs of all LMC employees and the specific in-class and online technology training needs of faculty. Workshops on Microsoft Office programs, LMC's web-design software - Contribute, and trainings on the District's Colleague software and reporting functions, program review online submission tool, and other LMC-utilized software programs have been offered at various times throughout the semesters. Additionally, there have been faculty peer-to-peer workshops on how to use classroom and student support services technologies, including curriculum and student services focused software, social media, blogs, podcasts, and learning management systems (CR-31, CR-32).

In order to emphasize the importance of technology-related professional development, Goal #3 of the PDAC Strategic Plan states: "Faculty, staff and managers are using current technologies to support student success". Two activities under this goal are: 1) "LMC employees will participate in technology trainings which will result in increased job efficiency and competencies"; and 2) "All faculty who teach fully online or hybrid classes, or who use a learning management system as a supplement for their face-to-face classes, will be trained to use the District's new learning management system, Desire2Learn" (CR-23).

Professional development activities and trainings on desktop technologies are conducted during pre-semester Flex days and regularly throughout the year for all employees. Professional development for technology-related activities and trainings are provided through various delivery modes, including employee- and consultant-facilitated workshops, peer mentoring and off-campus workshops and conferences. A majority of the workshops provide Flex credit for faculty. Online resources are also available through distance education (CR-24, CP-5).

PDAC requires participant evaluation of each training/workshop – evaluations of technology sessions have been overwhelmingly positive (CR-27).

Distance Education – Best Practices in Pedagogies

Professional Development is offered to all faculty who desire to teach fully online or hybrid (face-to-face combined with online) classes, and for those who want to use a learning management system as a supplement to a face-to-face class. Training sessions focus on effective online teaching practices. Faculty are taught how to utilize various learning management system (LMS) tools in order to design online courses that enhance interaction between faculty and students. Best practice emphasizes the constant involvement of the instructor with students and course materials through the use of these technological tools. Distance education training also exposes faculty to the benefits and the pitfalls of teaching online. Workshops are offered about accessibility and Section 508 compliance and include such topics as distance education accessibility guidelines and updated information from the Center for Assistive technology and Environmental Access (CR-33, CR-34).

Additionally, the CCCCD Teaching Academy, a collaborative project of the Academic Senates of the three colleges, has offered an online course, "Web-based Retention/Persistence Strategies for Online and Face-to-Face Classes". This no-cost course, which offered one unit of District-only, upper-division credit upon successful completion, covered such topics as best practices for online teaching, useful software and approaches to developing pedagogically sound online content, creating flexible methods of offering contact hours with students, and increasing online retention and completion (CR-35, CR-36, CR-37).

To supplement face-to-face and online trainings, an extensive "best practices" document is posted on the LMC Distance Education Committee webpage (CR-38). In addition to formal training, experienced online faculty mentor other faculty who are beginning to teach online, working with them from the design of the online classroom though all aspects of instruction. Additional trainings are available through the state Chancellor's Office Telecommunication and Technology Infrastructure Program and other online teaching resources. Links to these resources are available on the PDAC and the Distance Education Committee websites.

Continuous Improvements

While Los Medanos College has made substantial advancements in the implementation of an integrated professional development plan, College employees

understand that professional development is not a one-time activity with an end point, but rather it is an ongoing activity to promote student success. In order to teach and learn new job skills and approaches to student success, there is the need for a sustained approach to professional development. In this spirit of ongoing and continuous professional growth and learning, LMC is exploring additional program improvements, which include additional staffing, a dedicated space for professional development, and more focused outcomes-based assessment processes for professional development.

Los Medanos College has addressed this recommendation through its progress to implement an integrated professional development plan and its focus on technology training.

District Recommendation 1: The team recommends that in order to improve its resource allocation process, the District should expedite development of a financial allocation model, including the following (Standards III.C.1, III.D.1a, III.D.2a, III.D.3, IV.B.3c):

a) **the model as a whole;**
b) **funding for adjunct faculty in a way that will support the District and college intentions to increase student enrollment; and**
c) **technology funding.**

Response to District Recommendation 1

In response to the team's recommendation to expedite development of a financial allocation model, the District began a modification of its allocation process using the Chancellor's Cabinet as the task force working with the District Finance Department. The visiting team clearly suggested that an overall fiscal resource review and allocation process be formalized by the college and linked into the District process and that the District improve its resource allocation processes.

For many years, the District had determined the level of funding for each of the colleges through the use of separate classified, adjunct faculty, and operating funding formulas. However, formulas were not used for the allocation of management, full-time faculty positions, District Office and District wide services. Additions and reductions for positions in all employee groups were determined by the Chancellor's Cabinet.

Realizing that more consistency, equity and transparency were needed in the allocation formulas, District leadership began to review and revise the budget policies and procedures, including funding formulas, for the 2005-2006 academic year. In 2006, SB 361 was passed by the state legislature; it provided a base allocation for each college and center, as well as per FTES funding by credit, non-credit, and CDCP FTES (Career Development College Placement). Following the implementation of

SB 361 in 2007, the formulas for college operations and classified staff, other than what was covered in the original Business Procedure 18.03, were codified (DR-1). The District codified college operations in Business Procedure 18.02 (DR-2) and other operational staff (Business Procedure 18.03, now incorporated into Business Procedure 18.01). Not since the late 1990s had the District undertaken a comprehensive review of the allocation formulas.

With the change in leadership of the finance area at the District Office, work on the allocation formulas resumed in the fall of 2008. The following areas were identified as problems because the allocation model at that time was:

- difficult to understand due to the number of formulas;
- not transparent;
- patriarchal in approach, with the District bearing all responsibility;
- not funding colleges appropriately in the adjunct faculty allocation; and
- lacking in management and maintenance and operations funding formulas.

In renewed efforts to develop an improved allocation model, the Chancellor's Cabinet took into consideration those areas addressed in the accreditation Standards at that time:

- technology support (Standard III.C.1);
- integration of financial planning that supports institutional planning (Standard III. D.1a);
- appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services (Standard III.D.2a);
- assessment of the effective use of financial resources and use of the results as a basis for improvement (Standard III.D.3); and
- fair distribution of resources that support effective college operations and the strategic directions of the District and the colleges (Standard IV.B.3c).

The Chancellor's Cabinet reviewed various principles and fundamentals for allocation models and chose the following guiding principles for development of its new allocation model:

1. simple and easy to understand;
2. fair;
3. predictable;
4. consistent;
5. uses quantitative, verifiable factors;
6. minimizes internal system conflict;
7. efficient to administer;
8. provides for financial stability;
9. protects the integrity of base funding;
10. provides for appropriate reserves;
11. responsive to planning processes, goals and objectives;
12. recognizes cost pressures;

13. efficient use of District resources and provides sensible use of public funds;
14. flexible enough to allow for decisions to be made at the local level;
15. allows for colleges to initiate, implement, and be responsible for new program initiatives;
16. provides transparency for District Office and District wide expenditures in support of college operations;
17. matches resources with service levels using objective standards or measures;
18. adequate and sufficient to sustain operations;
19. does not adversely impact any college; and
20. recognizes individual contributions of the colleges and District wide services to the overall mission to serve of all the communities in the CCCCD.

After reviewing a presentation and concepts of how other multi-college districts allocate resources, the Chancellor's Cabinet chose a "College First" approach that links a whole model to revenues, with an emphasis on a clear delineation between college and District roles. This model was selected as most appropriate based on the autonomous culture of the colleges and historical funding patterns. Further, this model allows for the financial decisions at the college level to meet student and community needs, while taking advantage of the centralization of services where economies of scale can be achieved.

After modeling the SB 361 allocation funding for all three colleges for fiscal years 2007-08 and 2008-09, it became clear in May 2009 that adopting a pure SB 361 model would not meet the principles adopted by the Chancellor's Cabinet, in particular the principle of not having an adverse impact on any college. Variations of SB 361 were explored, with the intent that a revenue-driven SB 361 model to allocate growth, coupled with considerations for student population and historical funding patterns, would best serve all three colleges. Using SB 361 as the metric would acknowledge any subsidies or shortages for all the colleges.

During April 2009, budget forums were conducted throughout the District during which the concept of SB 361 funding and a College First model were presented. The budget forums were held at all three colleges and the two centers, and at the District Office. All employees were invited to attend the forums -- participation ranged from approximately 45 participants at Contra Costa College to 70 participants at Los Medanos College. On April 29, 2009, the Governing Board's annual study session on the budget focused on "Considerations for a New Allocation Model".

The Chancellor's Cabinet developed a strategy to complete work on the model as a whole (District Recommendation 1a) during 2009, with a planned implementation date of fiscal year 2010-11. During 2009-10, the existing allocation formulas were adjusted to better fund the colleges by creating management, maintenance, and operations formulas, in addition to addressing a phased-in approach for stable technology funding. The adjunct faculty formula documentation and issues were addressed through:

1. Reflecting the actual cost of adjunct faculty payroll hours per FTEF from the existing 540 hours per FTEF to 605 hours for CCC, 589 hours for LMC, and 571 hours for DVC;
2. adjusting FTES/FTEF productivity assumptions to match targets; and
3. formalizing the elements for calculating the adjunct faculty formula noted in Business Procedure 18.02 (DR-2).

A presentation on the allocation model was given to the District Governance Council on August 25, 2009. It included a discussion about the progress on the allocation formula at that time in a paper on "Revenue Allocation in Multi College Districts" and a paper called "Allocation Model – August 18, 2009." The information contained in the "Allocation Model" provided the DGC with the background on the work to date, as well as the principles developed by the Cabinet for creating a new allocation model. Dates were set at the September 1, 2009, DGC meeting for expanded meetings for October and November 2009 to provide input on the Allocation Model.

During the October 13, 2009 DGC meeting, a presentation was given outlining community college funding in relation to the entire state budget process. This led into a discussion about collaborative working relationships between constituencies and finally into goals and principles specific to the proposed new SB 361 allocation model. The principles of fairness, equity and transparency were discussed at length and the definitions for these principles were articulated. It was determined that future meetings would be needed to further understand the process and the principles that would guide the SB 361 allocation model.

On November 10, 2009 DGC met again during an expanded session to discuss the SB 361 allocation model. The goal of the meeting was to develop four to five principles to guide the model. A list of principles previously discussed at the Chancellor's Cabinet was presented to DGC for review and refinement. With approximately 20 individuals participating from management, classified, faculty and students, DGC developed a list of 17 principles to be discussed and combined into higher-level principles in further meetings. The meeting concluded with a presentation from management on why a revenue-based model was preferred. Discussion and questions about this presentation were eventually halted due to time constraints; it was then decided to incorporate future discussions of the SB 361 model into the regular DGC agendas in order to maximize attendance.

The December 1, 2009 DGC meeting resulted in agreement on the values and principles of the model: transparency, flexibility, accountability, local control, simplicity and shared governance. With the goal of implementing the new model by July 2010, it was agreed that DGC's role would be to provide input and feedback on the model as it developed. Also, with several individuals at DGC having missed last meeting's presentation on the rationale behind developing a revenue-based model, it was presented again for everyone's benefit.

The agreed upon budget principles were reviewed and passed by motion in the January 26, 2010 DGC meeting. Notwithstanding the approval, DGC's various constituencies also brought up a number of issues that were of concern. Since many of these issues were yet to be resolved or were still being considered at the Chancellor's Cabinet, it was agreed that the DGC meeting in May would have a report addressing the concerns.

After receiving input from all constituencies regarding the principles and values the SB 361 revenue allocation model should adhere to, the Chancellor's Cabinet and college business directors worked on fine-tuning the model within the approved framework. Thus, in February 2010, administration began the process of creating and/or amending policies and procedure to codify the new funding model. This resulted in Business Procedure 18.01, *The Contra Costa Community College District General Fund Budget*, being approved on July 28, 2010, and Business Procedure 18.02, *Parameters for Budget Development and Preparation*, being approved on June 22, 2010. Both procedures went through the shared governance process for approval.

Over the next few months, Chancellor's Cabinet and the college business director's worked on implementing the SB-361 model for fiscal year 2010-11. Giving updates to DGC at each of their next four meetings (March 2010 through June 2010), administration was able to keep all constituencies aware of, and involved with, how the new funding model was taking shape.

As hoped, the model was ready to be utilized for fiscal year 2010-11 and was ultimately approved by the Chancellor's Cabinet, DGC, Faculty Senate and the Board of Governors through Business Procedure 18.01

The final rendition of the model for fiscal year 2010-11 ultimately achieved success in including all five principles:

- Transparency – This was achieved in the process leading up to the formulation of the model and within the model itself. The numerous meetings that were held and the openness of administration in not only explaining what was happening but also in asking for feedback and guidance during the developmental process was critical for District wide buy-in. In addition, the inner workings of the model were easy to understand and were explained to each constituency's representatives on an on-going basis.
- Flexibility – The model itself provided great flexibility to the colleges. District wide costs -- such as utilities, legal, technology and the District Office operations itself -- were taken off the top before any allocations were made to the colleges. This allowed the colleges to receive their annual allocations and make all local decisions without having to set aside monies for unavoidable costs. The decisions on how best to utilize their allocation were up to the colleges to make.
- Accountability – Alongside the flexibility to make decisions comes the accountability to live with them. There were incentives built into the model to make certain that colleges would meet their FTES goals; not meeting those goals could result in loss of funds to a sister college. Moreover, the colleges

were allowed to carry forward their own fund balances which incentivized rational spending and got rid of the "use it or lose it" mentality which had existed previously.

- Local control – Perhaps the greatest change brought by the revenue allocation model was the local control that the colleges now had with their budget and decision-making. The model allowed for the colleges to be responsible for their actions and to make decisions quickly when opportunities arose. This change created a sense of entrepreneurialism at the colleges.

- Shared Governance – The implementation process was done through shared governance from beginning to end. In addition, unlike most business procedures, Business Procedure 18.01, *The Contra Costa Community College District General Fund Budget*, requires consultation at all shared governance levels in order for any changes to be made. This means that any future revisions to the model will necessitate approval of Chancellor's Cabinet, DGC, Faculty Senates Coordinating Council and the Governing Board. The procedure has a built-in shared governance mechanism.

The District and colleges have responded to the visiting team's recommendation to expedite development of a financial allocation model to address the model as a whole (District Recommendation 1a), funding for adjunct faculty in a way that will support the District and college intentions to increase student enrollment (District Recommendation 1b); and funding for technology (District Recommendation 1c).

The District developed a strategy to implement the whole model in 2010-11. The whole model linked the following elements with the revenues received for apportionment funding:

- classified funding formula;
- adjunct faculty funding formula;
- operating funding formula;
- management funding formula;
- buildings and grounds funding formula;
- technology funding formula; and
- full-time faculty funding.

During 2009-10, the District provided an adjunct faculty formula which was more equitable for funding the colleges, implemented a management formula and addressed maintenance and operations funding. The adjunct faculty formula was reworked to adjust hours per FTEF and productivity assumptions. The elements of the formula were also documented in the proposed revisions to Business Procedure 18.02.

The District also implemented a phased-in approach to stabilizing funding for District wide technology. A multi-year budget was created to identify all technology-projected costs that is being implemented over several years through adding money each year to the budget. The first phase of this approach began with the added allocation of $982,133 in the unrestricted general fund in budget year 2009-10, which

included $276.285 for all Microsoft licensure costs, Datatel Colleague hardware maintenance fees, Wide Area Network (WAN) frame relay costs and an additional portion of the Datatel Colleague software licensure costs. These costs had previously been funded with one-time monies. The budget reduction noted between fiscal years 2008-09 and 2009-10 is the result of one-time funding for hardware replacement resulting in server virtualization in 2008-09. Total annual funding projections across the multi-year technology budget fluctuate based on planned needs for replacements and upgrades.

Through the shared governance process, it was decided that the revenue allocation model would incorporate all the various funding formulas into one allocation methodology. Thus, the formulas that had been used previously for funding various positions (adjunct, management, full-time faculty etc.) as well as District wide technology and several other District wide costs were eliminated. In its place were "assessments" taken off the top to pay for regulatory, contractual or committed costs. After these obligations were met, all sites would receive an allocation and would have to cover its personnel costs with it -- no more separate formulas, just an overall annual allocation with which to cover its commitments.

The Chancellor's Cabinet continued to work to condense the various funding formulas into one formula based upon revenue received by the District. The expectation is that new policies and procedures reflecting a one-formula allocation model based upon revenues received were approved through the shared governance process and put in place for fiscal year 2010-11.

The following chart summarizes the action agenda that was approved by the Chancellor's Cabinet and reported previously to ACCJC:

Time Period	Process
Fall 2009	• Explore and dialogue appropriate centralized services. • Begin to build assumptions and develop a new allocation model, based on revenue received, that best reflects the culture of Contra Costa Community College District. • Develop assumptions for appropriate expenditures for District Office/District wide and college size. • Test assumptions against established principles for new formula.
Winter 2009-10	• Vet proposed allocation model through accepted shared governance processes.
Spring 2010	• Write appropriate policies and procedures and initiate the shared governance approval process for District policies and procedures.
Summer 2010	• Submit for Governing Board Approval
Fiscal Year 2010-11	• Implement new allocation model District wide.

The planning agenda listed above was all completed. The District used the participatory governance process in 2013 to recommend revisions to Business Procedure 18.01, *The Contra Costa Community College District General Fund Budget,* which was adopted by the Governing Board in 2014.

Since the District has responded fully to this recommendation, no additional action plans are necessary.

District Recommendation 2: In order to meet the standard, the district should establish a written code of professional ethics, which includes managers. (III.A.1.d)

Response to District Recommendation 2

The District drafted a proposed Board policy to create a code of ethics that included managers. The new policy followed the participatory governance approval process – it was presented to District Governance Council (DGC) and to employee groups (Local 1, United Faculty and Management Council) for input. Following consideration of all the input, the new Board policy was submitted to the Chancellor's Cabinet and then to the Governing Board for final approval.

The Governing Board adopted new Board Policy 2056, *Code of Ethics*, at its October 21, 2009 meeting (DR-3). The policy applies to all members of the District community, including managers. In addition, Human Resources Procedure 1040.08, *Employee Code of Ethical Behavior*, previously adopted by Chancellor's Cabinet on April 5, 2005, covers all District employees, including administrators (DR-4).

The policy calls for the "District to apply the highest ethical principles and standards of conduct to all members of the District community." It stipulates that the District is committed to the principles of "trustworthiness, respect, responsibility and stewardship."

The new policy is included in the Board Policy Manual in hard copy and is easily accessible on the District website.

Additional plans: This recommendation has been addressed and resolved.

District Recommendation 3: In order to meet the standard, the district should integrate student learning outcomes into the evaluation process for those who have a direct responsibility for student progress toward achieving student learning outcomes. (III.A.1.c)

Response to District Recommendation 3

Faculty have a direct responsibility for student progress toward achieving the stipulated student learning outcomes (SLOs) so the District has incorporated assessment of SLOs into the faculty self-evaluation process. To that end, 15 distinct self-evaluation forms, tailored to instructor status and method of instruction, have been developed: Classroom Faculty (adjunct, tenure track, tenured, repeated for each instructor classification), Counselors, Learning Disabilities Specialists, Librarians and On-line Classroom Faculty. As part of the self-evaluation process, faculty evaluate themselves on the following two measurements related to this recommendation:

- I use appropriate and varied tools for evaluating and assessing student learning outcomes.
- I participate in department committees/tasks (i.e. curriculum development, SLOs, Course Outline/Title 5 rewrites/Content Review) (DR-5).

Once the faculty member completes the self evaluation, the results are incorporated into the evaluation packet by the evaluation review team. The evaluation for full-timers occurs annually for non-tenured faculty and every three years thereafter once the faculty member is tenured.

The evaluation of student learning outcomes criterion was implemented as part of the faculty evaluation process during the fall 2010 semester. All faculty evaluated since that time responded to the queries on his/her progress in the two required areas.

In a related change, the United Faculty and District agreed to modify Article 6.2.3.2 of the UF Contract to add to department chair duties to "oversee and facilitate the development and assessment of course and program-level student learning outcomes." (DR-6)

Additional plans: This recommendation has been addressed and resolved.

District Recommendation 4: In order to meet standards, the district should develop a policy and implement procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of the district's administrative organization, the delineation of responsibilities of the district and the colleges, and the governance and decision making structures. The results should be widely communicated and used as a basis for improvement. (IV.A, IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.3, IV.B.E, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.e, IV.B.3.f, IV.B.3.g)

Response to District Recommendation 4

The District has developed policies and implemented procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of its administrative organization, college and District roles/responsibilities and decision-making structures. The District's administrative organization is referenced in the Rules and Regulations of the Governing Board and the roles and responsibilities of the colleges and District are included in the same document. The governance and decision-making structure as a whole is now defined in the revised Board Policy 1009, *Institutional Leadership and Governance* (DR-7).

The District delineates the operational responsibilities and functions of the District and colleges in the document *District and College Roles, Responsibilities and Service Outcomes* (DR-8). The document was developed in 2010 by college and District personnel with responsibility for the functions listed in the document. Every major function performed in the District is listed and the role of the colleges and District Office for each function is stated. The document was updated in 2013 as a result of additional centralization due to downsizing of the District. The document accurately reflects the roles and responsibilities of the college and District and is followed in practice. Every four years, as part of the administrative services review process, each department at the District Office meets with its college counterpart(s) to review and update the document.

The recommendation also asks the District to develop a policy and implement procedures for this evaluation process. The District already had two policies in this area, but needed to revise them in order to provide clarification regarding institutional leadership/governance and institutional effectiveness. Those two revised policies, Board Policy 1009 (with related Administrative Procedure 1009.01) and Board Policy 1012 (with related Administrative Procedure 1012.01), are evidence (DR-7, DR-9, DR-10, DR-11). The policies/procedures provide for a regular cycle of review for assessing the effectiveness of the delineation of roles and responsibilities of the District/colleges and the governance and decision-making processes. In addition, the District Governance Survey has been developed and implemented to solicit feedback from stakeholders on the effectiveness of the governance and decision-making process. The survey was administered in 2010, 2011 and 2012. The District Governance Council reviews and shares the results of the survey with all constituency groups. The Chancellor's Cabinet also conducts an annual self evaluation.

Each department at the District Office also conducts an administrative review every four years. The review includes a survey of users, the Department/Unit Services Assessment Survey, which is used to determine the extent to which clients who make use of the services are satisfied with the services they receive. The results of the surveys are used to make improvements designed to ensure continuous improvement and that the colleges are provided with the support necessary to meet students' educational goals.

The chart below summarizes actions taken to satisfy District Accreditation Recommendation 4:

Policy/Procedure/Survey	Action
• Board Policy 1009, *Institutional Leadership, Governance and Decision-Making*	Revised (1/11) to include institutional leadership and alignment with the governance and decision-making structure
• Administrative Procedure 1009.01, *Participatory Governance*	Revised (11/10) to acknowledge the "participatory" governance structure; it also includes management in that structure.
• Board Policy 1012, *Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment, and Continuous Improvement*	Revised (1/11) to address institutional effectiveness and broaden the scope to include assessment, continuous improvement and a linkage to budget allocations
• Administrative Procedure 1012.01, *Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment, and Continuous Improvement*	Developed (11/10) new procedure which delineates roles and responsibilities and addresses assessment and continuous improvement activities
• District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment Report	Developed assessment survey through District Governance Council to solicit feedback from District stakeholders in order to assess effectiveness of District's governance and decision-making structure.

Survey was administered District wide on February 24, 2011 and results were shared first with Chancellor's Cabinet on May 4, 2011 and then with DGC on May 17, 2011 and June 14, 2011. DGC then developed an initial set of recommended actions which were vetted and shared with Chancellor's Cabinet for final review prior to implementation.

Additional plans: This recommendation has been satisfied – there are no additional plans.

Responses to Recommendations - Evidence List

CP-5	Distance Education Webpage Screenshot of D2L
CR-1	LMC List of LMC Approved Courses-29Apr2014
CR-2	Appendix V-Survey Instrument Summary of SLO New Assessment Model
CR-3	SGC 11Apr2012 Minutes-Approval of SLO Assessment Model
CR-4	Academic Senate Minutes 12Mar2012-Approval of SLO Assessment Model
CR-5	List of 2012-2013 Cohorts Courses Assessed
CR-6	Public Drive Course Level and Program Assessment Folder Screenshot
CR-7	Program Assessment Results Executive Summary Webpage Screenshot
CR-8	2014 LMC Brentwood Center Organizational Chart
CR-9	CCCCD Governing Board Meeting Agenda 10 Nov 2010-Brentwood Center
CR-10	CCCCD Governing Board Meeting Minutes 10Nov2010-Brentwood Center
CR-11	CCCCD Governing Board Meeting Agenda and Minutes 28Mar2012
CR-12	Brentwood Center Needs Study 2011
CR-13	CCCCD Governing Board Approval of Environmental Impact Report-25 May 2011
CR-14	CCCCD Governing Board Minutes 25May 2011-Approval of Brentwood Center Project
CR-15	CCCCD Governing Board Minutes 26Feb2014-June 2014 Bond Approval
CR-16	E-mail Governing Board Approves Local Education Bond Measure on June 2014 Ballot
CR-17	PDAC Report to SGC 01May2009
CR-18	PDAC Plan B Report December 2009
CR-19	PDAC Charges 2011-2012
CR-20	PDAC Charges 2013-2014 and 2014-2015
CR-21	PDAC Membership Roster 2012-2013
CR-22	LPG Membership Roster 2013-2014
CR-23	PDAC 2013-2015 Goals and Objectives Approved May 2013
CR-24	Professional Development Webpage Screenshot
CR-25	Flex Workshop Evaluation Form Template-spring 2012
CR-26	Survey Monkey E-mail-Focused Flex spring 2014
CR-27	Final Evaluation Summary of PD Flex Activity Looking In Looking Out-Jan 2013
CR-28	Overall Flex Evaluation Summary by Theme September 2012
CR-29	LMC-District wide Survey on Professional Development Results 2013
CR-30	LMC Brentwood Center-District wide Survey on Professional Development Results 2013

CR-31	Flex Technology Trainings spring 2012
CR-32	List of Flex Technology Related Workshops
CR-33	Workshops on Section 508 Compliance
CR-34	DSPS Faculty Handbook-508 Compliance Webpage Screenshot
CR-35	CCCCD Spring 2013 Teaching Academy
CR-36	CCCCD Fall 2013 Teaching Academy
CR-37	CCCCD Teaching Academy Web-based Retention Strategies spring 2013
CR-38	Distance Education Best Practices Webpage Screenshot with Guide
DR-1	Business Procedure 18.01, *Contra Costa Community College District Budgeting System*
DR-2	Business Procedure 18.02, *Guidelines for College Operating Budget Allocations*
DR-3	Board Policy 2056, *Code of Ethics*
DR-4	Human Resources Procedure 1040.08, *Employee Code of Ethical Behavior*
DR-5	United Faculty Revised Evaluation Forms
DR-6	United Faculty Contract-Department Chair Duties
DR-7	Board Policy 1009, *Institutional Leadership and Governance*
DR-8	*District Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment Report*
DR-9	Administrative Procedure 1009.01, *Participatory Governance*
DR-10	Board Policy 1012, *Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment and Continuous Improvement*
DR-11	Administrative Procedure 1012.01, *Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment and Continuous Improvement*
ER-25	Sample Course Outline of Record-JOURN 010
ER-36	*United Faculty Contract 2011-2014*
ER-55	Program Review Submission Tool-Course and Program Assessment Repository Screenshot
ER-56	RAP Proposal for Technology and Training Development Coordinator 2012-2013
ER-57	*Student Learning Outcomes: A New Model of Assessment spring 2012*
INT-6	2014 LMC Administration Organizational Chart

listed in alpha-numeric order