

G R O S S M O N T  
C O L L E G E



**ACCREDITATION FOLLOW UP-REPORT**

*Submitted by:*

Grossmont College  
8800 Grossmont College Dr.  
El Cajon, CA 92020

*To:*

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

October 2014

**Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District Governing Board Members:** Greg Barr, Bill Garrett, Edwin Hiel, Debbie Justeson, Mary Kay Rosinski ♦ **Student Trustees:** Jocelyn Estrada, Zack Gianino ♦ **Chancellor:** Cindy L. Miles, Ph.D. ♦ **Grossmont President:** Sunita V. Cooke, Ph.D.

## CERTIFICATION OF THE FOLLOW-UP REPORT

**Date:** October 2014

**To:** Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges

**From:** Grossmont College, 8800 Grossmont College Dr., El Cajon, CA 92020

This Follow-Up Report is submitted to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges for the purpose of assisting in determining the resolution of deficiencies identified during the 2013 Self Evaluation.

We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community in the preparation and review of the Follow-Up Report and believe this report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

---

**Cindy L. Miles, Ph.D.**

Chancellor, Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community  
College District

---

**Bill Garrett**

President, Governing Board, Grossmont-Cuyamaca  
Community College District

---

**Sunita V. Cooke, Ph.D.**

President, Grossmont College

---

**Chris Hill, Ph.D.**

Accreditation Liaison Officer

---

**Susan Gonda, Ph.D.**

President, Academic Senate

---

**Linda Daley**

Classified Senate Vice President, Grossmont College

---

**Rafael Navarrete**

President, Associated Students of Grossmont  
College

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>CERTIFICATION OF THE FOLLOW-UP REPORT</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>REPORT PREPARATION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>College Recommendation 1 – Institutional Effectiveness</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>College Recommendation 2 – Student Services</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>College Recommendation 3 – Human Resources</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>College and District Recommendation 4 – Human Resources</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>College and District Recommendation 5 – Leadership and Governance</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>College and District Recommendation 6 – Leadership and Governance</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>MASTER EVIDENCE LIST</b> .....	<b>15</b>

## GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

Acronym	Words Associated With Initials
ACCJC	Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
AFT	American Federation of Teachers
AP	Administrative Procedures
ASGC	Associated Students of Grossmont College
BP	Board Policies
CCLC	Community College League of California
CSEA	California State Employees Association
DACC	District Accreditation Coordinating Council
DEC	District Executive Council
DSL	District Services Leadership Council
DSP&BC	District Strategic Planning and Budget Council
ESL	English as Second Language
GC	Grossmont College
GCCCD	Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District
IEC	Institutional Excellence Council
IRPC	Institutional Research and Planning Committee
KPIs	Key Performance Indicators
P&RC	Planning and Resources Council

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The following people were involved in the initial writing of the report:

### **Recommendation #1**

Bonnie Ripley – Program Review Data Liaison  
Chris Hill – Sr. Dean, College Planning & Institutional Effectiveness  
Tate Hurvitz – Faculty, English

### **Recommendation #2**

Peter White – Interim Vice President, Student Services  
Victoria Kerba Miller – Associate Dean, Student Affairs  
Sara Glasgow – Director, Student Affairs  
Lorena Ruggero – Director, College & Community Relations  
Lisa Maloy – Faculty, Nursing  
MaryAnn Landry – Administrative Assistant, English, Social/Behavioral Sciences Division

### **Recommendation #3**

Sunny Cooke – President, Grossmont College  
Tim Flood – Vice President, Administrative Services  
Barb Rogerio – Classified Staff Co-Chair, Classified Staffing Committee  
Steve Baker – Administrative Co-Chair, Classified Staffing Committee

### **Recommendation #4**

Sunny Cooke – President, Grossmont College  
Sue Gonda – President, Academic Senate  
Tim Corcoran – Interim Vice Chancellor, GCCCD Human Resources  
Joel Castellaw – Chair of Chairs & Coordinators Council

### **Recommendation #5**

Tim Flood – Vice President, Administrative Services  
Jennifer Danks – Supervisor, Chancellor/Governing Board Office

### **Recommendation #6**

Chris Hill – Sr. Dean, College Planning & Institutional Effectiveness  
Genie Montoya – Interim Supervisor, Business/Communication Services  
Lorena Ruggero – Director, College & Community Relations  
Caroline Althaus – College Cashier

Recognition also goes to the many college constituents (faculty, staff and students) who reviewed the report and provided feedback; Lorena Ruggero and Bernadette Black for their editing expertise; and the Printing Department who produced the final version of the report.

## **REPORT PREPARATION**

Grossmont College (GC) submitted a Self Evaluation Report and received a visit from an Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) evaluation team in October 2013. The College received its letter of reaffirmation in January 2014, which detailed one recommendation to correct a deficiency and five for improvement of institutional effectiveness. The letter required all six of the recommendations to be addressed in a Follow-Up Report due in October 2014. In addition to the requirement of a Follow-Up Report, the College would receive a site visit from a small ACCJC team. Following receipt of the letter of reaffirmation, the College began work immediately to address the recommendations.

The work was coordinated primarily through the College's Institutional Excellence Council (IEC) which assigned each recommendation to a writing team. Writing teams were responsible for either directly addressing the recommendation or communicating with the College and/or district groups who were doing so.

First drafts of the report were completed and presentations on the highlights of the work were made to the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District (GCCCD) Governing Board and the GC Academic Senate in mid-August 2014. The draft report was also posted on the College intranet for review and feedback by the faculty, staff, and administrators. During September, the report was presented to the following college constituent groups for their endorsement:

- Institutional Excellence Council;
- Planning and Resources Council;
- Leadership Council;
- Academic Senate;
- Classified Senate GC officers; and
- Associated Students of Grossmont College.

The Governing Board approved the Follow-Up Report at their September 2014 meeting in preparation for the submittal of the report to the ACCJC in October.

## RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS

### College Recommendation 1 – Institutional Effectiveness

*In order to increase effectiveness and to measure progress toward achieving specific goals, the team encourages the College to identify future benchmarks or targets based upon their data analysis (i.e., develop specific measurable benchmarks or targets for the dashboard) and other institutional metrics, so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. (I.B.2, I.B.3)*

### Response to Recommendation 1

#### Description of Steps Taken to Address Recommendation:

With the development of the current College Strategic Plan in 2010, GC identified a set of key performance indicators (KPIs) that it wanted to measure to track progress on strategic plan goal completion (1.1). Each year, in both the Institutional Excellence Council (IEC) (1.2) and during the College Planning Forum, those KPIs are reviewed, both to observe trends in the data that would inform college-wide planning and decision-making, and to evaluate the validity of those measures in assessing performance and improvement.

As might be expected, those KPIs have been refined over time and, in the spring of 2013, the College began the development of a set of standards for some of the KPIs that were subsequently reported in the College's Self Evaluation Report (1.3). The College considers standards to be the "C" grade for performance with the expectation that it cannot go below that number and consider our performance successful. In addition, the College had plans to develop aspirational targets (data points that are considered an "A" grade).

In October 2013, the visiting team commended the College (as well as the Governing Board and the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District [GCCCD]), stating, "The team commends the Governing Board, District, and College for intentionally developing a culture focused on improvement through the dissemination and reliance on data. The College has made over-arching efforts to use data, make it available and train all stakeholders to access data," but recognized that we would indeed benefit from the development of targets (1.4).

In spring 2014, the IEC began discussion of the standards for KPIs in addition to those already identified, and an even broader audience considered the data and shared suggestions for both standards and targets during a breakout session at the annual College Planning Forum (1.5). The work of evaluating baseline data and developing standards and targets continued in the IEC (with input from members of the English, math, and English as Second Language [ESL] departments) through the month of May, resulting in the current set of standards and targets for student success (1.6).

As mentioned earlier, the College's student success KPIs have been evaluated and refined over time. Most recently, the district Institutional Research and Planning Committee (IRPC) (1.7) reviewed the metrics in an effort to standardize the KPIs where possible between the two colleges for better and more consistent data collection. The current student success KPIs are divided into two types: 1) annual trend data that represent the entire population of students; and 2) cohort data derived from the College's Student Success Scorecard. Because the annual

data are representative of the entire student population at a point in time and trend changes as a result of environmental conditions can be more easily detected, the standards and targets for those data were based on longitudinal trends, taking into consideration the economic conditions under which the College was operating from 2008 to 2013. Student Success Scorecard data represents six-year cohort data, in which change may lag behind environmental conditions. Therefore, the College developed its standards and benchmarks for those metrics by comparing its cohort trend data with other colleges in San Diego County and with statewide averages. In most cases, the cohort standards were based on attaining statewide averages, while targets were set based on meeting or exceeding numbers based on current conditions, both economically and academically.

As part of its annual data evaluation and planning discussions, the College will review its progress toward achievement of the established standards and targets. In addition, GC will continue to refine its KPIs for other strategic plan goals and work to develop both standards and targets for each metric.

Self Evaluation:

While the College had a set of identified KPIs and some standards established at the time of the October 2013 site visit, the team recommended that the College develop additional measurable standards and targets in order to better measure achievement of the College's goals. The College began those discussions in earnest during the spring 2014 semester, reviewing existing standards and developing new standards, as well as targets, for all of its student success KPIs. Based on these actions, the College has addressed the recommendation. The College will continue to review its progress toward achieving all standards and targets during its annual evaluation and planning discussions.

Additional Improvement Plans:

No additional plans are required since the actions described above address the recommendation.



## **College Recommendation 2 – Student Services**

*In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College maintain consistency in providing information on all the Major Policies Affecting Students in its catalogue, schedule of classes, and website. Specifically, the information, processes, rules and internal practices for complaints surrounding student grievances, student discipline, claims of unlawful sexual harassment and/or discrimination contain accurate, precise and current information that is organized and easily accessible on the College website. (II.B.2.c)*

### **Response to Recommendation 2**

#### Description of Steps Taken to Address Recommendation:

In response to Recommendation 2, college personnel, led by the Associate Dean of Student Affairs, reviewed the most recent catalog language regarding student complaints and grievances, student discipline, and unlawful sexual harassment and discrimination to ensure accuracy, consistency, and ease of access. Minor modifications were made to the 2014-15 catalog in line with that review. The 2014-15 catalog now includes accurate information regarding processes, rules and internal practices for (2.1):

- Student Code of Conduct and Grounds for Disciplinary Action;
- Student Grievance and Due Process;
- Final Grades (i.e., grade challenge procedures); and
- Sexual Harassment and Discrimination.

For the 2015-16 catalog, a more significant restructuring is planned in which this information will be drawn together in one location within the catalog instead of being placed in different sections as is currently the case. This consolidation will make finding and using the printed information easier for students, and it will include a paragraph that explains the GC Complaint Process with directions on how to submit a complaint. Additionally, the 2015-2016 College catalog will be augmented with descriptions of how to file Financial Aid complaints and Sexual Assault Reporting. The latter is still evolving, as the federal requirements were not finalized in time for the 2014-15 catalog (2.2). The 2015-16 catalog description will also point students to the updated College website for more detailed information.

More importantly, for student access to these policies and how students may address complaints about any of these issues, the College website is currently (summer and fall 2014) undergoing a complete redesign that will be available to the public in December 2014. In the meantime, the College has created a single landing page that draws together in one location – “Student Complaints and Due Process” – all the College’s various processes for student complaints and grievances (2.3). On this webpage, each complaint and grievance process has, in turn, have its own link (where applicable) to a description of the respective policy or procedure, a step-by-step description of the process(es), the correct form to complete to initiate the complaint or grievance, and contact information for college staff who can assist the student in understanding and using the process. This same “Student Complaint and Due Process” link will also appear on the College’s homepage, to ensure that students can access it quickly and without having to know its placement on the Student Affairs website.

GC students are encouraged to refer to the catalog and the website for college information and resources; therefore, the information regarding major policies and complaint processes will be included in these two venues. The printed class schedule, which is also available in .PDF format on the College website (2.4) is used less frequently by students for information. That document will be reviewed prior to the next publication to determine whether the policy and process information should be included.

Student complaints that are centrally stored in the Office of Student Affairs include the following:

- any complaint filed online;
- any complaint that has involved a Vice President or the President to resolve the matter;
- any complaint reported that involves sexual assault;
- any final grade challenge that results in a formal grievance hearing;
- any formal grievance hearing;
- any Student Code of Conduct violation that was formally adjudicated by the Office of Student Affairs; and
- any student complaint involving another student regarding discrimination or sexual harassment.

Complaints that are not centrally located in the Office of Student Affairs include the following:

- financial aid complaints that are not made online;
- complaints involving staff or faculty regarding discrimination or sexual harassment;
- resolved complaints that were made directly to an instructor, department chair, or instructional dean that were then forwarded to Student Affairs; any complaints that were informally resolved will remain at that department; and
- complaints that involve specific types of harassment that begins at the Office of Student Affairs and are then referred to GCCCD Office of Human Resources for further investigation and resolution.

The Office of Student Affairs will conduct regular complaint processes trainings for college staff members and student peer leaders throughout 2014-15 and in each semester thereafter. The trainings will include the procedures that should be followed if a complaint is made in person at a specific department and the reporting steps that should be followed. It will also define when a complaint should be reported to the Office of Student Affairs for documentation and compliance purposes and when it should remain within a department. The training will include guidelines on completing the appropriate form(s) for documentation and compliance purposes.

The Office of Student Affairs will conduct an annual review of policies and procedures to ensure that the processes meet the needs of the students and are seamless for staff to comply. This annual review will include faculty, staff, and student input.

Self Evaluation:

Information provided to students regarding complaints and grievances was reviewed in all the locations where it appeared. This review, and the resulting actions described above, has brought consistency and clarity to communication of major policies affecting students. On the college website, where changes could be made immediately, the College developed a landing page where all the processes and procedures could be provided in one location, making it easier for students to access the information. Based on the timing of certain publications, work will occur in the next cycle to make sure that the verbiage related to these processes is accurate and consistent across all sources.

Additional Improvement Plans:

No additional plans are required since the actions described above address the recommendation.

### **College Recommendation 3 – Human Resources**

*In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College assess and analyze the level and stability of its future workforce requirements. It further recommends that the College use the results of that assessment to ensure that necessary conditions exist into the future for a stable and sufficient number of faculty, staff, and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution's mission and purposes, and assure the integrity and quality of its programs. (III.A.6, IV.B.2.a)*

### **Response to Recommendation 3**

#### Description of Steps Taken to Address Recommendation:

In spring 2014, the GCCCD selected a consulting firm to analyze and assess the staffing levels at each of the three sites (district services and each college within the two-college district). The GCCCD Governing Board ratified the contract with the Collaborative Brain Trust at its May 20, 2014, meeting (3.1, 3.2). The two consultants leading the project are Dr. Walt Packard, former Chancellor of the Kern Community College District, and Dr. Jean Malone, former Vice President of Human Resources at Citrus College. On April 28, 2014, the consultants met with the Chancellor's Extended Cabinet, the executive leadership team of the district, including:

- Chancellor
- President, Cuyamaca College
- President, Grossmont College
- Vice Chancellor, Business Services
- Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
- Vice President, Administrative Services, Cuyamaca College
- Vice President, Administrative Services, Grossmont College
- Vice President, Instruction, Cuyamaca College
- Vice President, Academic Affairs, Grossmont College
- Vice President, Student Services, Cuyamaca College
- Vice President, Student Services, Grossmont College
- Associate Vice Chancellor, Business Services
- Associate Vice Chancellor, Communication and Advancement
- Director, Employee and Labor Relations
- Resources as needed: Sr. Dean, Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness; and Director, Communications and Public Information

The Extended Cabinet group was joined by the members of the District Accreditation Coordinating Council (DACC) to discuss the approach the consulting firm would use and to seek input (3.3). DACC consists of the following representatives from each college:

- President
- Accreditation Liaison Officers
- Vice Presidents of Instruction/Academic Affairs
- Academic Senate Presidents

It also includes the GCCCD chancellor, vice chancellors, Classified Senate representation and the Sr. Dean of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness.

Following the initial meeting with the district leadership group and the accreditation coordinating group, the consultants spent approximately two hours on each of the three sites to meet with the executive team of that site and also the college governance council responsible for making recommendations to the college president regarding resources (including human resources). In April 2014, the pair met with GC's President's Cabinet (President Sunny Cooke, Vice President Tim Flood, Vice President Katrina VanderWoude, Interim Vice President Peter White, Senior Dean Chris Hill, Director Lorena Ruggero, and Administrative Assistant Bernadette Black). This group represents all direct reports to the College president. Following an hour of discussion, comments, and questions, the consultants then met with the College's Planning and Resource Council (P&RC) (3.4). During that time, the approach to be undertaken was presented and the phases of the project were discussed.

The consultants identified three benchmark institutions that would be used for comparison of each site. The three benchmark institutions were selected based upon similarity of size and general characteristics. GC was compared with Cypress College, Moorpark College, and Bakersfield College, and benchmarking with these sites used current staffing levels in areas across the college. An attempt to obtain comparison data that reflects a historical staffing level (prior to GCCCD's two early retirement incentives offered) was made. The analysis was intended to help identify where GC compares in various areas with staffing levels of other similarly sized colleges within multi-college districts in California.

The initial benchmarking project was completed by August 22, 2014, and results were discussed by Chancellor's Extended Cabinet on August 25, 2014. The College's P&RC discussed the report at its regularly scheduled meeting on August 28, 2014. The College P&RC members include representatives from various constituency groups as follows:

- President's Cabinet
- Divisional faculty and administrators
- Academic Senate
- Classified Senate
- California State Employees Association (CSEA)
- American Federation of Teachers (AFT)
- Students

The report was made available to the broader college community on the college planning and accreditation websites (3.5).

In fall 2014, following analysis of the benchmarking results, the College will consider best practices and successful approaches, as well as utilize current processes where appropriate (e.g., reclassification and reorganization of positions) to devise its long-term staffing priorities and develop a corresponding plan. The same consultants will be available to assist the College with the development of its staffing plan.

#### Self Evaluation:

In spring 2014, the GCCCD engaged an outside consultant to conduct a staffing study in which the staffing levels at GC were compared to three similar community colleges in California. Based on the results of that staffing study, as well as information from internal

staffing processes and reviews, the College will develop a long-term staffing plan by spring 2015. These actions will result in a data-informed and thoughtfully created staffing plan to ensure the College has adequate faculty, staff, and administrators to carry out its mission.

Additional Improvement Plans:

In fall 2014, the College will begin discussions with college constituents on the development of a long-term staffing plan with an anticipated completion date of spring 2015.

#### **College and District Recommendation 4 – Human Resources (Correct Deficiency)**

*In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the District and the College include, as a required component of the formal evaluations of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student-learning outcomes, a means to evaluate effectiveness in producing those outcomes. (III.A.1.c)*

#### **Response to Recommendation 4**

##### Description of Steps Taken to Address Recommendation:

Student learning outcomes are an ongoing part of the dialogue at GC. Departments across the College (instructional, student services, and administrative services) identify, assess, and reflect upon the achievement of student learning and service outcomes and use this information to drive improvement and institutional effectiveness. The planning and outcome data, as well as documented improvements, are stored within the TracDat system. The mission of the College acknowledges the work of all employees in this effort by stating that they work together to provide an exceptional learning environment. The values of the College put learning and student success, creativity and innovation, and continuous improvement in pursuit of excellence at the center of the value system of the College. As a result, all employees responsible for learning are participating in dialogue about the assessment of learning outcomes and are involved in determining how best to enhance learning. Thus, a component of their evaluation also reflects this engagement.

Starting at the top of the organization, the Board of Trustees regularly evaluates itself and seeks input from internal and external constituents. A portion of the board evaluation also includes their review of and focus on quality educational programs and student success. The Board's 2014 goals (4.1) also include a focus on student success. The board policy on chancellor and president evaluation both state that a component of their annual evaluation (4.2, 4.3) includes their contributions to improving student learning (4.4, 4.5).

As a portion of their feedback, vice presidents are evaluated on their ability to promote a learning-centered organizational culture (4.6). As part of their evaluation, educational managers have a component that includes impact on students and this is the section under which efforts to engage in and promote student learning are stated (4.7). Further, their self-reflection related to progress towards their annual goals is another place where student learning impact is seen. The College is currently working with the Administrators Association to more closely align this educational manager evaluation component with the wording within the standard.

The District is currently in negotiations with the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) as part of the comprehensive contract negotiations. The proposed contract language has within it self-reflection verbiage that allows faculty to comment on their involvement in departmental efforts to improve student learning and achievement of outcomes (4.8). This component is to be completed by all faculty (full-time and part-time) during their regular evaluation cycle. The language in this self-reflection was initially drafted as a collaborative effort between the AFT and the GCCCD Academic Senates. The wording proposed was strengthened by GCCCD to ensure that this is not an optional self-reflection but rather one completed by each faculty member each time the faculty member was evaluated.

Self Evaluation:

The recommendation is met for all those educational managers, executives, and governing board members responsible for student learning. Negotiations with AFT are intended to result in the inclusion of a self-reflection component to include the faculty member's contribution to student learning outcome assessment and departmental discussions about teaching and learning.

Additional Improvement Plans:

The GCCCD chief negotiator and team will work to conclude negotiations on the comprehensive contract with AFT.



## **College and District Recommendation 5 – Leadership and Governance**

*In order to meet the standard, the team recommends the District and the Governing Board regularly evaluate its policies and practices, and revise them as necessary along established timelines. (IV.B.1.e)*

### **Response to Recommendation 5**

#### Description of Steps Taken to Address Recommendation:

The Governing Board and GCCCD have been proactive in adopting policies as required by law or determined by the Board to be necessary for the efficient operation of the district. Administrative procedures are developed in a manner consistent with Board Policy (BP) 2510 (5.1), *Participation in Local Decision-Making*, and are consistent with the intent of the board policy.

The District and Governing Board are committed to regularly reviewing and updating policies and procedures. A systematic review of Governing Board policies and procedures has been ongoing, and significant progress has been made over the last three years. BP and Administrative Procedure (AP) 2410 (5.2, 5.3) outline the process for review and revision of BPs and APs. BP and AP 2410 were amended in 2013 to include a review process that ensures policies and procedures are evaluated on a six-year cycle.

The review process can be initiated: 1) at any time by a trustee or District employee; 2) by receipt of updates from the Community College League of California (CCLC) Policy and Procedure Update Service which provides bi-annual updates (spring and fall); and 3) within a documented cycle of review to occur every six years – one chapter per year with chapters one and two combined. The six-year review cycle was added in February 2013 to ensure thorough review of all BPs and APs every six years in the event they are not included in either of the two reviews noted above.

As of the end of summer 2014, the District and Governing Board had reviewed 61 board policies and 33 administrative procedures. Another 39 are on council agendas as part of the review process, with only 22 board policies remaining to be reviewed within the six-year cycle with expected completion and board adoption by December 2014 (5.4). Regular communications on updated BPs and APs are sent to the GCCCD constituents via email (5.5).

#### Self Evaluation:

The GCCCD has a developed process for regular review of board policies on a six-year cycle. Since the October 2013 site visit, the District Executive Council (DEC) and District Strategic Planning & Budget Council (DSP&BC) have identified and reviewed all board policies and administrative procedures that had review dates greater than six years. As a result, all of those policies and procedures will be up-to-date and included within the regular six-year review cycle. Based on these actions, the College has addressed the recommendation.

#### Additional Improvement Plans:

No additional plans are required since the actions described above will address the recommendation.

## **College and District Recommendation 6 – Leadership and Governance**

*In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the District and College clearly, consistently, and broadly communicate the delineation of the operational responsibilities and functions of the District and the colleges. Additionally, the District and the College should ensure that all information provided to constituents and the public regarding the functions of the District and the college is aligned and consistent. (IV.B.3.a)*

### **Response to Recommendation 6**

#### Description of Steps Taken to Address the Recommendation:

In the course of its most recent self evaluation, GC, in conjunction with members of DACC, developed a district functional mapping document (6.1). In that document, the functional responsibilities were outlined by accreditation standard and were identified as functions that are primarily the responsibility of the College, District Services, or are the shared responsibility of both. As stated in the recommendation above, during the site visit, some concern arose about whether the operational responsibilities and functions of the District and the College were clearly delineated and whether those functions were consistently communicated to college constituents and the community.

In order to address part one of the recommendation, the College subsequently prepared a GCCCD supplement to the functional mapping document that outlines the operational areas of responsibility that are shared between the College and District Services and the functions that each provide for a given area (6.2). The supplement was reviewed by a number of constituent groups including individual members of the areas involved, including President's Cabinet, the GC Leadership Council, the chancellor, and District Services Leadership Council (DSL). In addition to operational functions, the mapping document outlines the parallel committee or council structures at both the College and district levels in which collegial consultation occurs.

In order to address the second portion of the recommendation, the College began by sharing the final mapping document with the Leadership Council, which is composed of representative leaders from all constituent groups on campus (with the exception of student government) (6.3). Following that, the mapping document was shared with various constituent groups, including the Academic Senate and GC Classified Senate members, as well as the Associated Students of Grossmont College (ASGC), as they all use the services provided by the College and participate on many of the collegial consultation committees or councils at both the College and district levels (6.4, 6.5). Finally, the document was posted on the College's website on the organizational structure, planning, and accreditation webpages (6.6, 6.7, 6.8).

#### Self Evaluation:

In order to address the recommendation, the College produced a supplement to the GCCCD functional mapping document that addresses the shared operational and collegial consultation functions and responsibilities at both the college and district levels. The supplement was shared with a number of representative constituent groups and posted in several locations on the College website. Based on these actions, the College has addressed the recommendation and meets the referenced accreditation standard.

Additional Improvement Plans:

No additional plans are required since the actions described above will address the recommendation.

## MASTER EVIDENCE LIST

No.	Name
<b>RECOMMENDATION 1</b>	
1.1	Strategic Plan Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)
1.2	Institutional Excellence Council (IEC) Charge and Composition
1.3	KPIs from Grossmont College Self Evaluation Report (p. 39)
1.4	External Evaluation Team Report (p. 9)
1.5	2014 Planning Forum Agenda
1.6	Table of KPIs With Standards and Targets
1.7	Institutional Research and Planning Committee (IRPC) Charge and Composition
<b>RECOMMENDATION 2</b>	
2.1	2014-15 College Catalog
2.2	2015-16 Catalog Draft Language for Student Complaints
2.3	Student Complaints and Due Process Webpage
2.4	Class Schedule Webpage
<b>RECOMMENDATION 3</b>	
3.1	Board Meeting Minutes – Staffing Study Consultant Approval, 5/20/14
3.2	Collaborative Brain Trust Contract
3.3	Collaborative Brain Trust Staffing Study Presentation
3.4	Email Invitation – Special P&RC Meeting – Staffing Analysis
3.5	Staffing Study Report
<b>RECOMMENDATION 4</b>	
4.1	Board Self Evaluation Survey Instrument
4.2	AP 2435 – Evaluation of Chancellor
4.3	AP 7112 – College President Evaluation
4.4	Chancellor Feedback Questionnaire
4.5	President Feedback Questionnaire
4.6	Vice President Feedback Questionnaire
4.7	Educational Manager Evaluation Form
<b>RECOMMENDATION 5</b>	
5.1	BP 2510 – Participation in Local Decision-Making
5.2	BP 2410 – Board Policies and Administrative Procedures
5.3	AP 2410 – Board Policies and Administrative Procedures
5.4	BP/AP Status of Review Log
5.5	Email Update on BP and AP Reviews, 8/28/14
<b>RECOMMENDATION 6</b>	
6.1	2013 GCCCD Functional Mapping Document
6.2	2014 Functional Mapping Supplement
6.3	Leadership Council Charge and Composition
6.4	Academic Senate Meeting Agenda – Functional Map Supplement, 9/29/14
6.5	Associate Students of Grossmont College Meeting Agenda – Functional Map Supplement
6.6	Organizational Structure Webpage
6.7	Accreditation Webpage
6.8	Planning Webpage