FOLLOW UP REPORT
TO THE
ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY
AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

By

Grossmont College
8800 Grossmont College Drive
El Cajon, CA 92020

October 15, 2008

GROSSMONT COLLEGE
FOLLOW UP REPORT FOR OCTOBER 15, 2008
STATEMENT OF FOLLOW UP REPORT PREPARATION

In January 2008, Grossmont College received seven recommendations from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) based upon the college's self-study and the October 2007 site visit. The first follow up report addressing recommendations 1, 2, 3, and 7 were to be addressed and formally submitted by October 15, 2008. Following receipt of the report, ACCJC will conduct a modified site visit. Grossmont College President, Dr. Sunita Cooke, and the Accreditation Liaison Officer, Dr. Pamela Amor, organized a series of teams, consisting of faculty, staff and administrators from Grossmont College, including District and Governing Board representatives to begin work. Teams were immediately deployed to work on the two separate reports due in 2008 and 2009 in response to the Commission's Recommendations and College's self-identified planning agendas. Dr. Bonnie Price, an independent consultant, was hired to integrate and edit all drafts.

The college climate since early spring 2008 until late August 2008 was challenging due to a collective bargaining impasse between the District and the United Faculty. In mid-spring the United Faculty Union initiated a Work to Contract labor action which resulted in faculty only participating in "asterisked job functions". These functions were limited to classroom teaching and direct instructional support activities. Thus, faculty were unable to participate in committee work, accreditation meetings or other functions. Through the efforts of those faculty given formal release for faculty leadership, coordinator or chair responsibilities, the college was able to proceed, despite the circumstances, to make tremendous progress towards the recommendations and planning agendas. Fortunately, both sides accepted the recommendation from the independent Fact Finder and Work to Contract was called off in late August 2008.
The collegial consultation process moved ahead as faculty returned to the fall 2008 semester. A draft document developed by the teams was reviewed by the Steering Committee, circulated through collegial consultation committees and councils: Student Services Council, Academic Senate, President's Cabinet, Associated Students of Grossmont College Board, Leadership Council, Instructional Administrative Council, District-wide Educational Council, Classified Senate, Planning and Resource Council, and Governing Board.

The Steering Committee deliberated over suggested changes to the draft document and made final edits based upon constituent group input. The Follow Up Report was reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees, Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District on September 16, 2008. Appropriate additional shared governance final approvals are reflected in the signatures below.

GROSSMONT COLLEGE SHARED GOVERNANCE APPROVALS

_____

Sunita V. Cooke, Ph.D., President

_____

Pamela Amor, Ed.D., Accreditation Liaison Officer

_____

Chris Hill, Ph.D., President, Academic Senate

_____

Dave McDade, Vice President, Classified Senate

_____

Tokuin Hankins, President, Associated Students of Grossmont College

DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVES

_____

Omero Suarez, Ph.D., Chancellor

_____

Bill Garrett, President, GCCCD Board of Trustees

Table of Contents

The Follow Up Report Steering Group

Pamela Amor	Accreditation Liaison Officer
Devon Atchison	Professor of History
Luke Bandy	Student, Communication Director and Associated Students of Grossmont College Board member
Jerry Buckley	Dean, Math, Natural Science and Exercise Science
John Colson	Vice President of Student Services
Sunny Cooke	President of Grossmont College
Tim Flood	Acting Vice President of Administrative Services
Sue Gonda	Professor of History
Kats Gustafson	Dean, Learning and Technology Resources
Bob Hertel	Interim Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic, Student, Research & Planning Services
Chris Hill	President of Academic Senate
Ben Lastimado	Vice Chancellor of Human Resources
Dave McDade	Vice President of Classified Senate
Shirley Pereira	Professor of Mathematics
Tina Pitt	Vice President of Academic Affairs
Dana Quittner	Associate Vice Chancellor of Intergovernmental Relations, Economic Development, and Public Information
Omero Suarez	Chancellor, Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District

The four teams' participants responding to those recommendations due October 15, 2008

RECOMMENDATION 1: Kats Gustafson, Ben Lastimado

RECOMMENDATION 2: Tina Pitt, Devon Atchison

RECOMMENDATION 3: Jerry Buckley, Shirley Pereira, Chris Hill, Tim Flood

RECOMMENDATION 7: Sunny Cooke, Sue Gonda, Chris Hill, Dave McDade, Dana Quittner, Omero Suarez, and Deanna Weeks (Task Force Member)

Focused Follow Up Report

Recommendation 1:

In order to satisfy the standards on diversity, the college must establish policies and practices with the district to ensure equity and diversity are essential components of its human resource planning. The district must regularly assess its record in employment equity and diversity and communicate that record to the college community. (I.A.1, III.A.4.a, III.A.4.b)

Response to Recommendation 1:

Key Issues Related to the First Sentence of Recommendation 1: The key issue is the establishment by the college of policies and practices that ensure equity and diversity in human resource planning, in accord with accreditation standards.

Description of Steps Taken to Resolve the Issue: Since the college human resource function is managed by the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District (GCCCD), the college has collaborated with the district staff to initiate resolution of this issue. The collaboration built on work in progress initiated by the new vice chancellor for human resources (VC-HR) when he assumed his position in 2004. Using the GCCCD Staff Diversity Plan adopted by the Governing Board in 1994 (B2), the VC-HR had begun revising and updating the plan to reflect changes in affirmative action rulings. The original plan included references to equal employment opportunities, where equal employment is governed by law. Staff diversity, however, is not, and therefore requires local definition. The college collaboration aimed at addressing the recommendation made by the accrediting commission took shape through employee participation in a Staff Diversity Committee (SDC) that was formed to review the 1994 plan and to develop another plan that specifically addresses staff diversity (D36). The members of the SDC include staff from both district colleges and the district, representing classified staff, faculty, and administrators (D123). The committee is chaired by the VC-HR.

The first meeting of the SDC representing all college constituent groups was held in October 2007. Subsequent meetings produced a Vision Statement and a Mission Statement (D37, D38). Strategies to communicate the vision and mission statements were developed once the statements were finalized. In addition, the first draft of the new Staff Diversity Plan was almost completed. However, a work-to-contract condition initiated by United Faculty (UF) beginning in March 2008, slowed the process, and development of a timeline for completion was postponed until September 2008 when the SDC meets again.

The SDC held another meeting on July 10, 2008 and discussed plans to provide a "boxed lunch" session on diversity for anyone interested in attending (D88). The goal was to have at least one session during the fall semester. The committee also planned to have

bookmarks available for students in the bookstore that reflect the district's vision and mission statement with respect to diversity. Additionally, interview questions about diversity will be sent to the academic and classified senates and given to hiring committee chairs with encouragement to incorporate appropriate candidate questions into the hiring process. Faculty members of the SDC also worked to create a role play involving diversity issues that could be utilized during the faculty hiring process.

The efforts above are consistent with Standard III.A.4.a that furthers the understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity. Once the Staff Diversity Plan is completed, appropriate programs, practices, and services will be identified and instituted to support the institution's diverse personnel.

Analysis: The college has worked within the district structure to address the identified issue. Much progress has occurred toward the establishment of policies and practices on equity and diversity in human resource planning that will meet accreditation standards. Even though these measures have yet to be completed, substantial initial steps have been taken toward meeting the relevant accreditation standards.

Additional Plans:

It is anticipated that the following plans to complete this process will be implemented during the Fall of 2008:

1. Continue to communicate the vision and mission statements to the college community.
2. Develop a timeline for the completion of the Staff Diversity Plan
3. Develop a training program for staff awareness of diversity.

Key Issue Related to the Second Sentence of Recommendation 1: The key issue is the requirement that the district routinely assess its record in employment equity and diversity and share the findings with the college community.

Description of Steps Taken to Resolve the Issue: The college is collaborating with the district to address this issue through participation in a committee formed by the VC-HR that allows review of the hiring processes. The Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee (EEOAC) began meetings during the 2008-2009 fiscal year (D39). Part of its responsibility will be to ensure that the hiring process includes data-driven hiring information. The work of the SDC will inform that of the EEOC.

The EEOAC is chaired by the director of employment services. At its first meeting on July 1, 2008, three sub-groups of the Advisory Committee were formed:

Group A:
1. Develop and assist in the monitoring of the EEO Plan,
2. Serve as a medium for transmission of the EEO related information to district employees,
3. Help set priorities for and assist in promoting the development of the Plan,
4. Promote EEO activity that will enhance achievement of the EEO goals and objectives.

Group B:
1. Develop a method of delivery for training,
2. Develop EEO training verbiage to be presented to screening/interviewing committees,
3. Develop process for checking compliance for training delivery,
4. Make future recommendations as necessary.

Group C:
1. Work in conjunction with the SDC to make sure that GCCCD sponsors events and activities that are diverse and all inclusive in nature,
2. Contact groups and organizations at the campuses to keep track of the types of events sponsored (D75).

The three groups have held separate meetings. Group A held its meeting on August 6, 2008 (D76), Group B on July 23, 2008 (D77), and Group C on July 14, 2008 (D78). All groups have separate minutes on file and will be posted on the district's website.

In addition to the work being performed by the SDC and EEOAC, the district Human Resources Department (HRD) has developed a quarterly, electronic newsletter to disseminate information regarding hiring practices as well as staff diversity (W3, W7). The HRD quarterly newsletter will include statistics on equity and diversity that have typically been given to the president of each college. The newsletter is distributed via email to staff as well as electronically. Additionally, the HRD will include statistical information on its web page.

Analysis: Through collaboration in two district committees established by the VC-HR, the college has begun to address the issue of assessing the district record in employment equity and diversity, as well as to share the findings with the college community. The VC-HR has also led efforts by the HRD to inform the college community of the hiring processes that lead to employment equity and diversity. While the efforts made represent only the initial steps toward full implementation of the accreditation standards, they are substantial foundations for complete compliance with them.

The separate EEOAC will address equity issues as well as any diversity issues that may bar employment considerations. The formation of an EEOAC provides for the regular assessment of employment equity and diversity and addresses Standard III.A.4.a.

Additional Plans:

No further plans are required, since the college, in collaboration with the district, intends to meet the accreditation standards using the described means.

Related College Self-Study Planning Agenda Status Reports

III.A.1.a

The college will work with the district to establish a system to collect, analyze, and disseminate data reflecting actual campus diversity, as compared to state and national averages and as compared to district goals set forth in the District Staff Diversity Plan, and use the information in hiring processes. The college will urge the district to create a functional system by the Fall Semester of 2010.

Response to Planning Agenda III.A.1.a

As described in the Response to Recommendation 1, the college and the district have initiated work to address this planning agenda through creation of an SDC and EEOAC, as well as systematic planning and processes to guide performance.

This planning agenda is on schedule for completion as stated.

III.A.2

1. **The college will work with the district to determine why applicant pools are limited.**
2. **The college will develop a plan to address the AB1725 recommended levels of full-time faculty to part-time faculty.**

Response to Planning Agenda III.A.2

As discussed in the Response to Recommendation 1, the college has collaborated with the district to respond to all issues regarding employment access. Specific attention to the two items identified in this planning agenda resulted in the following remedies:

1. The district HRD engaged in a process to determine why the time from job posting to hiring of an employee appears to be prolonged within GCCCD. A list of recommendations to facilitate and streamline the process was made and circulated. These recommendations included that the search committee set fixed meeting dates and times in advance and that all participants commit to these. If a participant is unable to attend, the process continues. Additionally, the district HRD is updating the current application process and will implement online software to facilitate the application process. This should help to reduce applicant frustration with an unwieldy process that may have resulted in abandonment of the process. As the new system proves to be effective, more viable applicants should aggregate within pools.

2. The GCCCD Governing Board has committed to increase the number of full-time faculty members over a multi-year period (D92). In each academic year starting in 2006-2007, this commitment has been realized (D99, D100, D101). The college, through its collegial consultation process, moved forward in 2006-2007 and in 2007-2008.

This planning agenda is being implemented as stated.

III.A.3.a

The college will collaborate with the district through the shared governance process to begin to develop a human resource plan that is integrated with diversity information obtained from the research office.

Response to Planning Agenda III.A.3.a

As noted in the Response to Recommendation 1, shared governance processes are devising a plan that meets the requirements of this planning agenda.

This planning agenda is being implemented as stated.

III.A.4.b

The college will work with the district Employment Services to more frequently collect, analyze, and disseminate data reflecting actual college personnel diversity as compared to state and national averages and as compared to district goals set forth in the District Staff Diversity Plan, as well as to achieve objectives associated with the college Strategic Plan.

Response to Planning Agenda III.A.4.b

As discussed in the Response to Recommendation 1, the separate EEOAC will address equity issues as well as any diversity issues that may bar employment considerations. The EEOAC will regularly assess employment equity and diversity in terms of the statistical data described in the planning agenda.

This planning agenda is being implemented as stated.

Recommendation 2:

The college establishes a specific timeline for producing student learning outcomes at the course level and the program level; incorporate student learning outcomes into the curriculum and program review processes; identify systematic measurable assessments; and use the results for the improvement of student learning and institutional effectiveness. (Standards I.B.a, II.A.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.B., II.B.3.f, II.C.1.b., III.A.1, III.D.1.a, IV.A.1, IV.B.1.b)

Response to Recommendation 2:

Key Issues Related to the First Segment of Recommendation 2 : The two key issues are that the college will establish a specific timeline for producing student learning outcomes (SLOs) at the course level as well as at the program level.

Description of Steps Taken to Resolve Issue 1: In order to address the issue of the creation of SLOs for all courses according to a specified timeline, Grossmont College faculty and administration have collaborated to identify resources to support the effort. This resulted in the production of course-level SLOs for 38.6% of all courses by September 2008 (D2) This compares to 0.08% reported to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) in 2007 (D73).

Because the progress reported did not achieve completion of SLOs for all courses by the end of the Spring 2008 semester, much of the Professional Development Week (PDW) of August 2008, was dedicated to academic department SLO workshops (W1). During these workshops, department members wrote SLOs, identified assessments, and developed shared assessments for specific SLO studies at the course level. As a result of these workshops and subsequent department-level work, by the end of the Spring 2009 semester, each academic course will have developed course-level student learning outcomes, as well as identified assessments to measure whether students have achieved the learning outcome or not.

Progress made and planned for SLOs at Grossmont College has been heavily dependent on leadership provided by the college-wide SLO coordinator. Institutional support for this position began in January 2008. To ease the transition to the next coordinator, a 50% SLO coordinator was also appointed for the second half of spring 2008. Additionally, departmental retreats were supported to facilitate the involvement of adjuncts in the process of identification of SLOs as well as assessment methodologies. A team of five SLO experts was identified as the "SLO Rapid Response Team" to immediately provide support and advice to departments engaging in SLO work during the Spring 2008 and Fall 2008 Flex Weeks (D93).

Due to budget constraints in 2008-2009, a more creative approach will be required to apply available funds from campus professional development funds as well as basic skills funds (where appropriate) to promote this endeavor.

In working to streamline the college's planning process and make it more effective as required by Recommendation 3, the college identified SLO work as one of three priority areas for 2009-2010 to ensure that the work of assessment and continuous improvement progress rapidly through one complete cycle.

Analysis: Since the required specific timeline has been developed, this issue related to the recommendation has been met.

Additional Plans: No further plans are required, since the specific timeline has been developed for producing SLOs for all courses at the course level.

Description of Steps Taken to Resolve Issue 2: In order to address the issue of the creation of SLOs for all programs according to a specified timeline, Grossmont College faculty and administration have collaborated to identify resources to support the effort. This resulted in the production of program-level SLOs for 81% of all programs by the April 2008 report to the ACCJC (D1). This compares to 0.08% reported to the ACCJC in 2007 (D73).

The college has committed fiscal and human resources to the development and maintenance of the student learning/service outcome assessment cycle, including defining course and program-level outcomes and assessments, identifying college-level outcomes developing a data collection plan, and reporting on the results of the assessment projects. A noteworthy example of how the college has demonstrated its commitment is the dedication of most of the PDW in January and August 2008 to the development of program-level SLOs and assessments as well as the identification of a gateway course in each discipline which will be studied in Fall 2008 (W1, W2). By the end of the 2008-09 academic year, all academic programs will have identified SLOs to be assessed in SLO studies; during subsequent years, programs will conduct SLO studies, report the results, and use the results for continuous improvement. By the end of the 2008-2009 academic year, each academic program will have identified program-level SLOs and course-level SLOs and assessments, including mapping course and program SLOs to the institutional SLOs. These data and improvement plans will be reported in the educational master plans, program review reports, as well as all accreditation reports (D3).

Analysis: Since the required specific timeline has been developed, this issue related to the recommendation has been met.

Additional Plans: No further plans are required, since the specific timeline has been developed for producing SLOs at the program level for all programs.

Key Issues Related to the Second Segment of Recommendation 2:   The two key issues are that the college incorporates student learning outcomes into both the curriculum and the program review processes.

Description of Steps to Resolve Issue 1: The Grossmont College SLO coordinator attended the March 4, 2008 Curriculum Committee meeting to discuss inclusion of SLOs in the curriculum review process. During that meeting, the Curriculum Committee agreed that the template for the Course Outline of Record should be modified to incorporate SLOs (D4). The Curriculum Committee will make this change and send the proposed modified template to the Academic Senate for approval during the Fall 2008 semester. The Student Services Program Review Committee has also agreed to modify the program review document template to include student service outcome studies which will be used to develop recommendations for continued improvement.

Analysis: Since initial steps have been taken to include SLOs in the curriculum process, this recommendation is partially resolved. Getting the new template for the Course Outline of Record approved through Academic Senate will take the Fall Semester of 2008 to complete.

Additional Plans: No further plans are required, since the issue will be resolved by the conclusion of the Fall Semester of 2008.

Description of Steps to Resolve Issue 2: Grossmont College updated the *Program Review Handbook*, in Fall 2006, to incorporate student learning outcomes into the program review process. Section 2 of the handbook references Curriculum, Academic Standards and Support Services and Section 2.2 asks programs under program review to answer the following: *Describe how your department makes decisions related to the following: a) Identification of student learning outcomes; b) Methods to demonstrate achievement of these learning outcomes; c) How do you use this information for course and program improvement?* (B1)

Analysis: This issue was resolved prior to the issuance of the recommendation.

Additional Plans: No further plans are required because the issue was resolved.

Key Issues Related to the Third Segment of Recommendation 2: The only issue involved in this segment is the identification of systematic measurable assessments related to SLOs.

Description of Steps to Resolve the Issue: Historically, Grossmont College has always linked the creation of course-level objectives with the identification of measurable assessments within the course outline of record. Using these precursors, faculty identified systematic measurable assessments for SLOs for 38.6% of courses (D2). During the Professional Development Week (PDW) in August 2008, each academic department held SLO workshops in which they further expanded the percentage of SLOs completed, identified currently-used assessments, and developed shared assessments for

specific SLO studies for each course. As a result of these workshops and subsequent department-level work, by the end of the 2008-2009 academic year, each academic course will have identified shared assessments that will be used systematically in SLO studies.

With regard to instructional-support service outcomes, 75% of the instructional-support services have identified systematic measurable assessments. By the end of the 2008-2009 academic year, each instructional-support service area will have identified SLOs and measurable assessments (D1). Student services programs are currently engaged in their first SSO studies. Results, analysis, and recommendations will occur at the end of the 2008-2009 academic year; these recommendations will be published in the EMPs, program review documents, and all accreditation reports.

With regard to student service outcomes (SSOs), systematic measurable assessments have been identified and timelines for implementing these assessments have been established for all Student Service areas (D5). Assessment surveys will be administered in October; results of these surveys will determine changes needed in programs.

Grossmont College has also started creating administrative service outcomes (ASOs). These ASOs and their identified assessments will be completed by the end of September 2008.

Since Grossmont College does not have exit tests or capstone courses, all institutional, general education, and program-level outcomes will be assessed at the course level. As stated, SLO assessment studies will begin throughout the college in Fall 2008. By the end of the 2008-2009 academic year, each GE SLO and program-level SLO will have been mapped to identified measurable assessments.

Analysis: This recommendation is partially resolved. Identified assessments for all course-level SLOs, all instructional-support and administrative service outcomes, all GE SLOs, and all program-level outcomes, as stated above, will be completed by the end of the 2008-2009 academic year. All student service outcomes have identified assessments and will report results and recommendations in Fall 2009.

Additional Plans: No further plans are required, since plans described will fully resolve the issue by the end of the 2008-2009 academic year.

Key Issues Related to the Fourth Segment of Recommendation 2:   The single issue involved is use of the results for the improvement of student learning and institutional effectiveness.

Description of Steps to Resolve the Issue: To date, Grossmont College has completed a few pilot SLO studies and has used the results of assessments to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness (D1, D6). Grossmont College has also created a six-year SLO plan template; the template indicates the coordinator of the course-level study, when each course will go through the assessment process, when the study data will be

produced, and when the analysis and recommendation based on those data will take place. This template will be completed by all academic departments by the end of the Spring Semester 2009 (D7). At the same time, at least one assessment study for each discipline will begin in Fall 2008 or Spring 2009.

With regard to SSOs, each outcome has an identified timeline for assessment. After the initial assessment, benchmarks will be established for the purpose of measuring progress annually thereafter (D5).

Grossmont College has focused specific attention on achieving the four stages of SLO Progress, as laid out by ACCJC. Progress since the October 2007 visit has been marked; Grossmont has completed Step One (Awareness), is in the process of completing Step Two (Development), and has started making progress in Steps Three and Four (Proficiency and Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement) (D91).

Analysis: The initial phase of resolving this recommendation will occur within the period outlined. As stated above, the template will be completed by the end of the Spring 2009 semester, and at least one assessment study for each discipline will begin in Fall 2008 or Spring 2009. Data will be gathered and analysis and recommendations for improvement will be made for the initial courses studied during Spring 2009 or Fall 2009. Simultaneously, the next assessment will begin, and so on, according to the six-year SLO assessment plan.

Additional Plans: No plans are required, since plans described will begin the cycle to resolve the issue within the targeted time period.

Related College Self-Study Planning Agenda Status Reports

I.B.1

Staff and faculty in each college program will continuously identify, articulate, and publish student learning or service outcomes, develop assessment procedures, and study how well each outcome is achieved. They will then report the findings in mutually agreed upon planning documents, program review, and on the SLO website. See the planning agenda in II.A.1.c. for more details.

Response to Planning Agenda I.B.1

As articulated in the Response to Recommendation 2, the college is actively engaged in executing the six-year SLO assessment plan (D7). The college has greatly increased the number of program and course SLOs and assessments developed. Between the last academic year and this, the college has increased the number of course-level SLOs from .08% to 38.6%, and will have all course-level SLOs written by April 2009 (D73, D2). Additionally, with regard to publishing student learning outcomes, faculty now have web access to all course, program, and GE SLOs as well as all SSOs at the website http://www.grossmont.edu/devonatchison for inclusion of the SLOs into their syllabi (W8).

This planning agenda is being implemented as stated.

II.A.1

See II.A.1.c: The Student Learning Outcome Assessment Initiative (SLOAI).

II.A.1.a

See II.A.1.c.

II.A.1.c

The college will commit fiscal and human resources to the development and maintenance of the student learning/service outcome assessment cycle, including defining course and program-level outcomes and assessments, identifying college-level outcomes and assessments, developing a data collection plan, and reporting on the results of the assessment projects. By the end of the 2008-09 academic year, all academic programs will have identified SLOs to be assessed in SLO studies; during subsequent years, programs will conduct SLO studies, report the results, and use the results for continuous improvement. By the end of the 2008-09 academic year, each academic program will have identified program-level SLOs and the

assessments, including how course and program SLOs fit with the institutional SLOs. These data and improvement plans will be reported in the 2013 accreditation document and in any midterm reports.

Response to Planning Agenda II.A.1.c

As reported in the Response to Recommendation 2, Grossmont College has committed substantial and varied human and fiscal resources to the development, implementation, and assessment of SLOs campus-wide. The application of these resources to the development of SLOs for all academic programs, has resulted in progress reported in the responses to Recommendation 2, as well as to Planning Agenda I.B.1.

In regard to the human resources commitment, both the entire college community and district staff have been involved. First, the college has a SLO coordinator who focuses on all aspects of the SLO and SSO process. Second, the Office of Districtwide Academic, Student, Planning and Research Services (the research office), has provided and will continue to provide assistance regarding assessment development, data gathering, as well as determinations of validity, reliability, and bias. Third, the college vice president for academic affairs, among many others, dedicates a considerable amount of time and effort as the leader of the SLO Rapid Response Team, which was designed to offer immediate, personal assistance to departments along with students and institutional service areas regarding SLOs, ASOs and SSOs (D93). Fourth, the college Instructional Computing Services Department has assisted and continues to assist in the creation of the SLO website and its maintenance. Fifth, Grossmont has committed to having an SLO track in every semester's professional development plan, dedicated solely to developing, implementing, and assessing SLOs and SSOs. Sixth, and most importantly, the college has the commitment of full-time and part-time faculty members and staff to continue to work on SLOs and SSOs as a part of professional development activities.

The fiscal resources commitment Grossmont has made to SLOs and SSOs is also considerable. In the summer of 2008, the vice president of Academic Affairs offered departments eight hours of adjunct pay for SLO development, allowing adjuncts to become a bigger part of the development and implementation process. The SLO coordinator receives 0.4 release time, allowing her to commit much of her time to assisting departments and areas with the creation of SLOs and SSOs and their assessments. The college has also committed to funding assessment calibration and grading sessions, and continued funding to adjunct professors to maintain their continued support of the SLO assessment cycle. The college has also allowed for various classrooms and meeting rooms to be used continually for SLO and SSO discussions. In addition, department retreats have been funded, allowing for departments, such as Foreign Language, to gather large groups of instructors from various disciplines to collaborate on program and course SLOs. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, for the 2009-2010 academic year, the college has created a more streamlined fiscal planning process which puts SLOs and SSOs first along with funding basic skills and community outreach/workforce development. According to the new fiscal planning process, all proposed activities will be approved via a departmental action plan which includes SLO

activity proposals and funding requests evaluated and prioritized based on criteria found in an agreed upon formula ([D79](#), [D81](#)).

Because of the availability of institutional resources, the development of SLOs has occurred on all levels, on a basis that relates course, program, and institutional SLOs.

A notable example of how a large department has progressed on SLO development is the Exercise Science and Wellness Department (ESW), which offers the largest number of distinct courses in the college (111 different courses). The department adjuncts and full-time faculty met to discuss how best to tackle this task and decided upon a template model for each course that can be modified as needed. Since that start, SLOs were developed for 65 different activity courses that serve the general student population and are used to meet the Fitness/Wellness requirement in the general education package for an associate's degree at Grossmont College. The remaining courses are in the intercollegiate area and health education, and those SLOs will be worked on during the Fall 2008 semester. The ESW department is nearing completion of the assessments in the gateway course and will be conducting the first pilot of that assessment in Fall 2008.

Other departments have conducted SLO studies, as well, with the results used to either modify the assessment or the instruction. For example, English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) has studied how well students write in-class timed essays during week 13 of the semester. Pass rates have remained consistent since teachers instructing core ESL classes have standardized how students were prepared to write the in-class essay. ESL will continue to conduct this study in Fall 2008 with all core classes, in addition to SLO studies of all other ESL courses, including reading and vocabulary development, listening and speaking, and pronunciation improvement ([D6](#)).

Another example of how SLO studies have enhanced instruction is in Child Development ([D6](#)). In the gateway Child Development course, CD 125, Child Growth and Development, the instructors collaboratively developed a grading rubric for a common observation assignment done by all CD 125 students. The standard grading rubric gives both CD 125 students and teachers clear criteria on how the assignment is graded. Using the standardized grading rubric, Child Development is now working to calibrate grading among CD 125 teachers. Having a clear standard and more consistent grading has led to improvement in both teaching and learning.

Additional examples of departments that have performed studies include Communications, English, Library, and Mathematics. Communications did two SLO studies in their COMM 122 course. English conducted studies on ENG 098 beginning in Fall 2007. The Library did studies on English 200. Mathematics conducted four SLO studies on MATH 090 beginning in Spring 2006 through Fall 2007. Over the past year, by engaging part-time faculty as well as the 18-member full-time department, the Mathematics Department has identified SLOs for 6 high volume math courses, three of which will be assessing student attainment of outcomes in Fall 2008.

The foregoing examples are illustrative of the trend that work on SLOs is taking at Grossmont College. Related activities completed during the Fall 2008 Professional

Development Week, as well as those planned for the future, will ensure that the planning agenda will be implemented as scheduled (W1).

II.A.2.a

SLO Assessment Initiative. See II.A.1.c.

II.A.2.b

See II.A.1.c

II.A.2.c

See II.A.1.c

II.A.2.d

See II.A.1.c.

II.A.2.g

For programs and courses using faculty-generated standardized tests, faculty will work with the research office to develop and implement means to assess the validity, reliability, and potential bias of faculty-generated standardized tests in the next three years.

Response to Planning Agenda II.A.2.g

The research office has evaluated SLO studies done by Mathematics and Communications. The research office advised both departments on validity, reliability, and potential bias. Beginning in Fall 2008, the research office will evaluate the SLO studies of gateway courses done by each academic discipline and SSO studies done by each student service program. The college and the research office plan to follow the schedule stated in the planning agenda.

This planning agenda is being implemented as stated.

II.A.2.h

See II.A.1.c

II.A.2.i

See IIA.1.c.

II.A.5

By the end of Fall 2010, the college will establish a system for collection of employment data regarding students who complete certificate and degree programs in the vocational and occupational areas.

Response to Planning Agenda II.A.5

To follow legal mandates regarding student privacy, the completion of degree and certificate programs in vocational and occupational areas at Grossmont College are measured through a collection of aggregate data from the California State Chancellor's Office. This data reflects and compares completion rates for these degrees and certificates with other colleges within the state. All available state provided data is used in this assessment.

The college has achieved this planning agenda.

II.B

The college will commit fiscal and human resources to the development and maintenance of the student learning/service outcome assessment cycle. Student Services programs will implement SSO studies into their regular yearly review process by the end of the 2007 and 2008 academic year. Results of SSO studies performed in one academic year will facilitate improvement in the subsequent year. The SSO assessment cycle will continue annually, and results will be reported in the EMP. These data will also be analyzed and used for continual improvement by student service programs going through program review. These data and improvement plans will be reported in the 2013 accreditation document and in any midterm reports.

Response to Planning Agenda II.B

As reported in the responses to Recommendation 2 and the II.A.1.c Planning Agenda, the college has committed significant fiscal and human resources to the development and maintenance of SSOs. SSOs and assessments are universal for the Student Services Division, with studies being conducted (D5).

This planning agenda item is being implemented as stated.

II.B.3.a

See Planning Agenda for II.B.

II.B.3.b

See Planning Agenda for II.B.

II.B.3.c

See Planning Agenda II.B.

II.B.3.d

See Planning Agenda II.B.

II.B.4

See Planning Agenda II.B.

II.C.1.b

The librarians will increase their efforts to achieve student learning outcomes related to information competency through the use of electronic tutorials and assessments by the end of Spring 2009.

Response to Planning Agenda II.C.1.b

LIR 101 and LIR 110 are the only library courses. Accordingly, both LIR 101 and LIR 110 have Student <u>Learning</u> Outcomes. The LIR 101 SLOs are in development and will be completed, with identified measurable assessments identified, by the end of the Fall 2008 semester. The LIR 110 course created the following SLOs: Students will be able to: Effectively perform research using recognized search tools as well as accurately cite and evaluate information sources on an appropriate topic. They began assessment of these SLOs in the Spring of 2008, as shown in the LIR 110 SLO study ([D83](#)).

Library services fall under Student <u>Service</u> Outcomes; the library has created SSOs for all tutorials and services. All SSOs can be found on the following webpage: http://gclib.pbwiki.com/SSO ([W5](#)).

The library began assessment for the online tutorial (LUCI) and bibliographic instruction (BI)—both hour long classes offered by the library—in the Spring of 2008; assessment results can be found in the Library Tutorial (LUCI and BI) Assessment Results document ([D82](#)).

This planning agenda has been implemented as stated.

II.C.1.c

The library will enhance evaluation of online access and use of library resources by an electronic monitoring system by the end of Fall 2008.

Response to Planning Agenda II.C.1.c

The library has created SSOs regarding access and availability of various in-house services as shown on the following webpage: http://gclib.pbwiki.com/SSO. (W5). Additionally, statistics on student use of the Circulation Desk, Inter-Library Loan (ILL), Technical Services, and Library Instruction can be found in the Library Statistics spreadsheet (D84).

The library will begin studying the data regarding these assessments via tracking numbers and, for Circulation, via survey questions, in the Fall of 2008.

This planning agenda has been implemented as stated.

III.A.1.c

At this time, there is no mechanism for student input into the appropriateness and validity of both outcomes and assessment as they take advantage of the opportunity to evaluate the various aspects of course content and instructional delivery. The college will develop a mechanism for student input as well.

Response to Planning Agenda III.A.1.c

The college uses a student opinionaire type survey for instructor evaluation based on a 5 point Likert scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree (OM2). Through this instrument, students have the opportunity to comment on various aspects of course content and instructional delivery; this information is shared with instructors. However, the method for student input into SLO development and assessment has been addressed by each academic department on bases deemed appropriate by individual instructors who invite such participation. The college is currently investigating and discussing a mechanism that students can use to evaluate the effectiveness of outcomes and assessments.

This planning agenda will be implemented as stated.

Focused Follow Up Report

Recommendation 3:

In order to satisfy the standards on planning, the College must review and revise as necessary its institutional planning processes and make the timing, processes, and expectations of all staff in the institutional planning process more widely known and understood. (Standards I.B, I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, IV.A.2, IV.A.3)

Response to Recommendation 3:

Key Issues Related to Recommendation 3: The two key issues in the recommendation are requirements that the college review and make necessary revisions in the institutional planning processes and make the timing, processes, and expectations of all staff in the institutional planning process more widely known and understood.

Description of Steps Taken to Resolve the Issues: When the college learned of the recommendation from the accrediting commission, college leaders moved rapidly to address it. Authorization was sought and granted to form a planning task force at the January 2008 meeting of the Grossmont College Planning and Budget Council. Membership was identified by the Administrators and Senate Officers Council (ADSOC). The Integrated Planning Task Force (IPTF) consisted of the following:

1. Dr. Tina Pitt, Vice-President of Academic Affairs
2. Dr. Chris Hill, Academic Senate President
3. Kats Gustafson, Dean of Learning and Technology Resources
4. Jerry Buckley, Dean of Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Exercise Science and Wellness
5. Shirley Pereira, Faculty Co-Chair of the Planning and Budget Council.

The following steps were proposed to address the accrediting commission's recommendation:

Step 1. Review strategic planning, program review, and all long range planning activities to identify a common cycle that reduces or eliminates multiple planning efforts.

Step 2. Review annual planning and budget development cycles to optimize efforts by campus personnel to research and prepare planning and budget-related documentation.

Step 3. Review WASC Standard III community college planning model and language. Perform literature review of strategic planning and community college integrated planning models.

Step 4. Perform site visit to a California community college that is successfully utilizing an integrated planning model.

Step 5. Integrate planning activities and methods with accreditation standards.

Step 6. Discuss revised planning model at college-wide planning retreat.

Step 7. Develop implementation plan to include informing and training stakeholders in new planning process for fall 2008.

During task force sessions, reviews of the planning processes, committee structure, and meeting schedules occurred. Based on these reviews, draft revisions to Grossmont College planning procedures were developed, with emphasis on the integration of strategic planning and cycle length with existing accreditation and program review activities. Simplification of the overall planning process as well as consolidation and simplification of the committee structure were included in proposed revisions.

Weekly meetings of the IPTF began on January 28, 2008 and continued through the end of May, 2008 (D34). A timeline of all meetings appears in the table below, showing both the exact date of each meeting and the corresponding activity addressed at each meeting.

Integrated Planning Task Force
Meeting Time Line

Date	Meeting Emphasis / Topics
10/4/07	Concept discussions to revise planning processes (D8, D10)
1/28/08	Established planning task force, meeting intervals, identified documents for review
2/4/08	Reviewed existing planning documents and time frames; diagrammed planning process (D9)
2/11/08	Discussed revision to annual planning cycle (D12)
2/25/05	Drafted a revised 5 year planning cycle (D13, D18)
2/28/08	Mira Costa College site visit – reviewed planning methodology and SPOL software. (D11)
3/3/08	Revised planning process model integrating departmental planning cycle (D14, D15, D16, D17)
3/12/08	Distribution and review of literature search results on integrated planning methods (OM1)
3/27/08	Initial discussion and planning for April 11th leadership retreat (D19, D20)
3/28/08	Continued discussion and planning for April 11th leadership retreat (D21, D22)
3/31/08	Continued discussion and planning for April 11th leadership retreat agenda (D23, D24)
4/7/08	Reviewed April 11th leadership retreat agenda, assigned individual tasks to facilitators (D25)
4/11/08	First leadership planning retreat – addressed planning cycles and committee structure (D26)
4/14/08	First joint meeting of Academic Affairs, Student Services and Administrative Services
4/21/08	Discussed 5 year and annual planning cycles, ISLO's, community advisory councils
4/28/08	Proposed a revised committee structure; reviewed Foothill DeAnza model (D27)

5/5/08	Revised 5 year cycle components, planning for second leadership retreat, May 16 (D28, D29)
5/12/08	Revised planning cycles; discussed sample criteria for May 16 leadership retreat (D30, D31, D32)
5/16/08	Second leadership planning retreat addressing institutional foci and evaluation criteria (D33)
June 2008	Refined criteria and develop allocation matrix, developed planning forms and discussed electronic delivery methods
July 2008	Discussed proposed funds to be included in process, developed planning process committee structures, refined planning scoring matrix
August 2008	Refined the annual planning timeline, developed the 5-year strategic planning timeline, created a short version of planning forms

Upon completion of five months of study, discussion, and revision, the IPTF proposed a revised planning model for Grossmont College at the annual leadership retreat held on April 11, 2008 (D26). The model consists of a five year planning cycle that integrates the college's accreditation cycle, college-wide strategic plan, and program review mechanism (D116, D117, D118, D120). Annual planning occurs after the identification of an institutional focus that is linked to the strategic vision established during the five year planning cycle.

An institutional focus (or foci) is (are) developed each year at the college's annual leadership retreat meeting in spring. Activities are developed at the department level each year to address both needs within each department or division, but also to support the institutional focus each year. These activities are reviewed at division councils and planning task forces, then incorporated into an annual college plan of action. An Institutional Review Committee will conduct a criteria-based prioritization of activity proposals and explore cost estimates. The prioritized activities will be forwarded to the Planning and Resource Council. The Planning and Resources Council recommends to the college president which activities should be funded from general fund monies, versus those that should be referred to the Resource Development Committee for identification of alternate funding.

Outcomes are evaluated each year at the departmental, division and college level. The Institutional Excellence Steering Committee will assess indicators identified within each activity, along with program review, student learning and service outcomes are assessed. Other institutional effectiveness indicators, such as success rates, are also evaluated to assess impact of activities on college-wide performance. The Planning and Resources Council and participants at the spring Leadership Planning Retreat will review annual progress reports.

A five year strategic cycle allows the Institutional Excellence Steering Committee to develop survey instruments and assess results from both internal and external stakeholders of the college. These data are incorporated into the five year college strategic plan. Similarly, the college's mission and vision statements are reviewed and updated, incorporating changes requested by stakeholders. Accreditation guidelines are

also considered during the revision to the strategic plan. During this cycle the committee also assesses outcomes reported during the study of annual college activities, combining these results with other indicators of institutional effectiveness to produce both an accreditation self-study report every six years and a mid-term report.

The committee structure resulting from this revised planning process reduces the overall number of standing committees by making better use of the administrative structure of the college for the review of planning activities. Some committees have been re-configured as task forces which have specific outcomes assigned to them, holding a limited number of meetings each year. The Planning and Resources Council is the over-arching shared governance committee that guides study and implementation of an annual college plan. The Institutional Review Committee prioritizes and costs out planning activities for possible funding by the Planning and Resources Council.   The Resource Development Committee serves as an enhanced arm of the Planning and Resources Council that will more aggressively identify and develop external financial resources for strategic initiatives and activities. The annual leadership planning retreat remains a vital part of the planning process where institutional foci are developed each year, along with selection criteria to assess and prioritize annual planning activities. The Institutional Excellence Steering Committee is the group that takes responsibility for collecting data that supports development and implementation of the five year strategic plan. Within this five year strategic cycle is another leadership planning retreat that develops long term goals and assesses institutional outcomes. This revised structure reduces the total number of standing committees, while integrating planning with available resources (D117).

As this new planning process is intended to incorporate aspects of continuous improvement, surveys will be performed at the conclusion of each planning cycle that will create a sample of opinion from faculty, staff and administration as to satisfaction with the process and also serve as a method of gathering suggestions for improving the process during the following cycle. As part of the institutional effectiveness evaluation cycle, results of the approved planning initiatives will also be assessed with regard to their impact on departmental, divisional, and college-wide outcomes. Survey data and activity outcomes will be evaluated at the annual college leadership retreat.

Analysis: In addressing this recommendation, the college engaged in a thorough review of the full range of institutional planning processes, from strategic planning through resource development. By dedicating significant staff time to consideration of all of the issues involved, mainly through the work of the IPTF, the college determined that revisions in planning processes were warranted. These revisions resulted in the development of structural changes in planning that reduced the number of governance groups involved, reinstituted the functionality of the organizational structure as a means to address issues, and increased the rationality of institutional planning by creating tighter linkages between planning cycles and resources dedicated to the implementation of plans. Through the newly designed system, staff awareness of the planning processes will become more apparent, since their involvement is dependent on its operation (D127).

Additional Plans:

No further plans are required, since the college meets the accreditation standards using the described means.

<u>**Recommendation 3: Institutional Planning**</u>

<u>**Related College Self-Study Planning Agenda Status Reports**</u>

<u>**I.B.2**</u>

The college will state future EMP and Strategic Plan objectives whenever possible in measurable terms, as they are reviewed. The EMP objectives are identified annually; the Strategic Plan goals will be renewed in 2010.

Response to Planning Agenda I.B.2

As explained in the Response to Recommendation 3, the revised integrated planning process has been designed to include measurable outcomes as part of the activity proposal process. Planning processes require applicants to state proposed outcomes and link the activity to an annual college focus or foci identified at the annual planning retreat

Efforts to coordinate Grossmont College planning activities with the district and Cuyamaca College have occurred through discussions at the District Strategic Planning and Budget Council (DSP&BC). Through these efforts, it has been determined that district and college-level strategic planning at both district colleges will start in a coordinated manner in January 2009, with anticipated completion in 2010 of the updated version.

This planning agenda has been implemented.

<u>**I.B.3**</u>

The college will improve constituent group awareness of the regular cycle of planning via workshops during Professional Development Week. The college will improve planning processes under the leadership of the Planning and Budget Council.

Response to Planning Agenda I.B.3

The revised planning cycle and integrated planning process were shared with college constituencies at the spring 2008 annual planning retreat and its followup session, Academic Senate meetings, Council of Chairs and Coordinators meetings, and President's Leadership Council, as well as the Planning and Budget Council (D57). An informational web page will augment verbal presentations to constituency groups. Announcements will also be posted in campus publications such as *Campus Scene* and *eGrossmont* starting in Fall 2008.

This planning agenda is in progress.

I.B.6

The college Planning and Budget Council will develop a cyclical process for periodic review and improvement of planning and resource allocation.

Response to Planning Agenda I.B.6

As described in the Response to Recommendation 3, throughout the 2007-2008 academic year, a small group of faculty and administrators engaged in brainstorming and researching processes that would result in a streamlined planning process and committee structure capable of driving resource allocation. In April and May of 2008, two separate planning retreats were held whereby all college constituent groups were involved in responding to draft planning processes, prioritization, evaluation, and communication mechanisms. As a result of these retreats, a five year planning cycle and evaluation were approved and the college foci for the 2009-2010 year were determined. These three foci were SLOs, Basic Skills and Workforce Development/Community Partnership formation.

This planning agenda has been implemented.

II.A.2.f

See Planning Agenda I.B.3.

II.B.1

See III.B.2.a. Planning Agenda 2

II.C.1.a

The library will pursue provision of a line item in the library and instructional media budget in order to maintain and expand the current library collection and instructional classroom equipment by the conclusion of Spring 2010.

Response to Planning Agenda II.C.1.a

According to the plans developed by the ITPF as described in the Response to Recommendation 3, the "Blueprint for planning" and annual cycle of planning and implementation will include identification and allocation of additional financial resources to enhance existing budgets, such as library collections and instructional classroom equipment. Beginning in Fall 2008, the Planning and Resources Council will begin allocation of funds for prioritized activities and referral of unfunded needs for resource development.

This planning agenda item is in progress.

III.A.5.a

Develop funding sources to implement plans made by the Professional Development Committee.

Response to Planning Agenda III.A.5.a

In the last year, the Planning and Budget Council set aside $50,000 at the end of the budget year from the ending balance, for Professional Development and $8,000 for support of Professional Development Week activities (D125).

This planning agenda item has been implemented.

III.A.6

The college will engage the district in beginning the process of developing a common human resource plan that is integrated with district-wide planning and research, through the shared governance system.

Response to Planning Agenda III.A.6

As a result of the development of a new integrated planning process, Grossmont College and the district office are in the process of merging their planning calendars to address local and district-wide strategic planning activities. As reported in the Response to Recommendation 1, the Governing Board has established, though the shared governance process, a funding allocation each year to support faculty and staff hiring that addresses human resources needs at both campuses. The Districtwide Strategic Planning and Budget Council (DSP&BC) is currently updating the district's strategic plan which will include human resource and staffing considerations.

This planning agenda is in progress.

III.B.1 and II.B.1.b

1. **The Facilities Committee will reconstitute the Campus Safety Committee during Spring 2007, requiring bi-monthly meetings, regular meeting minutes, and reports to the Facilities Committee.**
2. **The Facilities Committee will identify and secure approval for a process to ensure off-campus sites are safe and sufficient to meet the needs of the program or service by the end of Fall 2008.**
3. **The college will pursue full implementation of the Grossmont College Facilities Master Plan by seeking additional funding for construction through placement of a second Proposition 39 bond measure on the ballot by 2012.**

Response to Planning Agenda III.B.1 and II.B.1.b

1. Beginning in Fall 2008, the Grossmont College Facilities Committee will assume the role of the Campus Safety Committee to address campus safety issues and their resolutions. Having the Facilities Committee adopt this role is consistent with the accrediting commission's recommendation that Grossmont College reduce the number of committees and task forces to improve the efficiency of shared governance processes. Up to this point, Grossmont College's Emergency Operations Center has had regular meetings that have also addressed campus-wide safety issues.

2. The Off-campus Site Offerings Committee has been established to develop procedures and check-off lists to ensure that off-site offerings meet the needs of programs and services that operate at locations other than the central campus.

3. The first step of this process has been completed. An estimate of existing needs has been shared and discussed with the Facilities Committee so that there is an understanding of funding requirements and identification of challenges, which the college currently faces. Several options are under consideration to fund facilities through the existing and future Facilities Master Plans.

A future bond measure would be based on each college's needs expressed in a compelling vision to the GCCCD Governing Board and the community within the district boundaries. Due to the change in district leadership within the 2008-2009 academic year, it is unlikely that such an effort will be initiated within the next two years. However, when the new chancellor has been employed, the college will pursue the matter as stated in the planning agenda.

This planning agenda is in progress.

<u>III.B.2</u>

The college will identify a consistent annual funding source and prioritization plan for the replacement of furnishings for existing classrooms and office spaces by Fall 2010.

Response to Planning Agenda III.B.2

As noted in the responses to Planning Agendas II.C.1.a and II.A.5.a, as well as in the response to Recommendation 3, additional financial resources will be identified and considered annually for planned campus projects, such as classroom equipment and furniture replacement, faculty office renovation, and general campus maintenance.

The process used for funding campus projects is the following: the college Facilities Committee recommends each year to the Planning and Resources Council, the use of college scheduled maintenance funds, state matches for scheduled maintenance, and Proposition R (Prop R) bond funds that can be applied to projects (D106, D107). Two

recent examples of how these funds have been maximized and used to renovate classroom and other instructional areas are the Exercise Science and Wellness facility, which just celebrated its grand opening in August 2008. It was a mix of Prop R funds, as well as scheduled maintenance funds. In December 2008, one of the largest lecture rooms will be renovated through the use of scheduled maintenance and Prop R funds based upon a recommendation from the Facilities Committee to Planning and Resources (formerly Budget) Council.

This planning agenda is in progress.

III.B.2.a

1. **The Director of Campus Facilities, Operations, and Maintenance will head college efforts to develop a total cost of ownership definition and integrated process to identify the funding required to sufficiently staff, equip, operate, and maintain new college buildings prior to their approval and construction and secure approval thereof by the end of Fall 2009.**

2. **The college will complete the planning and initiate the construction of the Student Services Building by the end of Fall 2008.**

Response to Planning Agenda III.B.2.a

As seen in the responses to Planning Agenda II.C.1.a and III.A.5.a, as well as the Response to Recommendation 3, the strategic planning cycle will address all issues related to funding needs. These include facilities planning tasks that address total cost of ownership (TCO) estimates for both new and remodeled campus buildings, starting in fall 2009 (D98, D109, D110, D111). TCO estimates will be developed to include the exercise science and wellness complex, health/physical sciences building, parking structure and public safety building, and the student services and student center projects.

The Final Project Plan for the Student Services/Student Center Renovation Projects was approved by the GCCCD Governing Board August 20, 2008 (D108). Continued planning and state architect approval timelines imply an anticipated groundbreaking on these projects by spring 2010, rather than the date stated in the planning agenda.

This planning agenda is in progress.

III.B.2.b

1. **The college will develop a process to ensure that the facility and equipment needs identified in the Educational Master Plan updates are used in the planning and budgeting process by the end of Fall 2009.**
2. **The college will institute a process to ensure that adequate funding is available for furnishings, fixtures, and equipment (FF&E) by the end of Fall 2010.**

Response to Planning Agenda III.B.2.b

As seen in the responses to Planning Agendas II.C.1.a and III.A.5.a, as well as the Response to Recommendation 3, resource allocations will be considered for all campus needs, including unmet FF&E requirements for all future building projects, starting in fall 2009.

This planning agenda is in progress.

III.C.1.b

The college will conduct periodic general assessments of the technology training needed starting by the end of Fall 2008.

Response to Planning Agenda III.C.1.b

The college has conducted limited assessments of the technology training needed for faculty and staff over time. At the time the 2007 Accreditation Self-Study was developed, Grossmont College had already collected information regarding faculty information technology needs in two surveys conducted for the Title III Project. These surveys were named identically, *Faculty Incorporation of Technology into Instruction*, but conducted several years apart (W6). In Spring 2008, the college reorganized its Instructional Computing Committee into the Technology for Teaching and Learning Committee (TTLC) and appointed a Distance Education Coordinator (D119, D121). Surveys will continue to be conducted to assess faculty and staff needs in the area of instruction.

In addition, the college operates the Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL) under the auspices of the Library, which offered training for faculty and staff. Routine evaluations conducted after each workshop secured information about technology training needs as well as assessment of the workshop content. CATL also secures such information through programs offered during Professional Development Week and throughout each semester (D86).

With regard to student training, the Library has created student service outcomes (SSOs) for all tutorials and services. All SSOs can be found on the following webpage: http://gclib.pbwiki.com/SSO (W5).

The library began assessment for the online tutorial (LUCI) and bibliographic instruction (BI)—both hour long classes offered by the library—in the Spring of 2008; assessment results can be found in the Library Tutorial (LUCI and BI) Assessment Results document (D82).

Additionally, the LIR 110 course created the following student learning outcome (SLO): Students will be able to: Effectively perform research using recognized search tools as well as accurately cite and evaluate information sources on an appropriate topic. They began assessment of this SLO in the Spring of 2008, as shown in the LIR 110 SLO study (D83).

The Learning and Technology Resource Center offers tutoring to students using computers in the Tech Mall. Faculty and tutors assist students in learning to use the technological aids there (D96). They routinely anticipate student needs through advance preparation to ensure that they can assist them in the use of new or upgraded hardware, software, and Web applications for class work and for college registration via the Web. They also consider student suggestions to improve their capacity to provide assistance.

While these assessments are directed at specific constituencies rather than the general college community, they appear to provide sufficient information to ensure that staff and students are adequately trained to use technology.

This planning agenda has been implemented.

III.C.2

By Fall 2009, the college will develop a general fund supported plan for technology so that it is not dependent on block grant funds.

Response to Planning Agenda III.C.2

Both the response to Recommendation 3 and the responses to Planning Agendas II.C.1.a and III.A.5.a provide affirmative responses to this planning agenda.

This planning agenda is in progress.

III.D.1.a

By the conclusion of the Spring Semester 2008, the college will establish means to better inform faculty and staff of the linkages between institutional planning and expenditures.

Response to Planning Agenda III.D.1.a

As described in the Response to Recommendation 3, the IPTF worked throughout the spring of 2008 to revise the planning system at the college. Having devised the new system then, IPTF members began dissemination of information related to the integrated planning process, beginning with presentations at the Fall 2008 division meetings. Information sharing and training will continue through the Academic Senate, Council of Chairs and Coordinators, Leadership Council, Instructional and Student Services Administration Council, as well as the Planning and Resources Council.

This planning agenda has been implemented.

III.D.2.b

1. **The college will work with the district administration to eliminate delays in processing financial data by the end of the 2008 fiscal year.**
2. **The college Planning and Budget Council will provide current financial information regarding college operations on an Intranet website by the end of the 2008 fiscal year.**

Response to Planning Agenda III.D.2.b

1. A district-wide administrative calendar has been developed to improve processing and dissemination of financial data at the end of each fiscal year (D102, D103). In addition, a process for communicating vacation balances has been developed (D104, D105). Also, the district and college have worked collaboratively to develop and provide training to department chairs and coordinators regarding the district's online financial records system (IFAS). This training has facilitated access to the budget

detail reports and provided the opportunity for individuals to review their financial and budget information in real time. The first training sessions occurred during flex week, with additional training to be scheduled.

2. District budgets and general financial statements are now available via the intranet. Additionally, more detailed financial information is available through the district's online financial records system (IFAS) at any time.

A task force was formed in August of 2008 that is addressing the re-design of the college and district web sites to include and better communicate vital campus information, including financials. The district has engaged the consulting services of Stamats to conduct research and conduct focus groups in fall 2008 (D97). This group will make recommendations and point to best practices for issues needing to be resolved (D128).

Both of these planning agenda items are in progress.

IV.A.2.a

See I.B.3 Planning Agenda.

By Spring 2008, the college will improve timely distribution of information for campus constituents to participate fully in governance processes.

Response to Planning Agenda IV.A.2.a

College leaders have acted to improve the flow of information to campus constituents by several means. Most importantly, meeting minutes of all collegial consultation groups are made available to members; members have also been reminded of their responsibility to report to the groups they represent. Minutes of governance groups operating at the district level are posted on the district website at www.gcccd.edu/district-wide.minutes/ (D70). In addition, the chancellor issues periodic updates when appropriate to keep the college informed of important events, potential security threats, and the dynamic state budget situation.

Governing board meetings are taped and made available through the college libraries, meeting updates are sent out each month via an electronic newsletter called *The Courier*, and Governing Board minutes are posted on the website at http://www.gcccd.edu/governingboard/ (D65 and D71)**.**

This planning agenda item has been implemented.

IV.B.2.b

The college will request that the new president facilitate a process to review the current resources committed to the development of SLOs and techniques for assessment with a goal of recommending any needed enhancements to these resources. The process will identify resources for the Academic Senate to develop assessment measures for the Institutional Student Learning Outcomes recommended by the senate in Spring 2007. The president will garner the assistance of the Office of Districtwide Academic, Student, Planning, and Research Services (the research office), within the district, to assist any departments or areas wanting more data about student learning outcomes.

Response to Planning Agenda IV.B.2.b

As reported in the Response to Recommendation 2, the college has supported the SLO initiative, including assessment, with human and fiscal resources. Even through difficult budget times are anticipated, the importance of this work is evident and more innovative approaches to funding will have to be tapped. During a district-wide travel freeze, professional development funds may be used to augment SLO identification, assessment, and calibration. Also, whenever possible, basic skills funds may be applicable to SLO work.

The research office also supports SLO research, as evidenced by meetings with mathematics, communication, and other departments that are now progressing to the assessment phase. The SLO coordinator, vice president of academic affairs, and research office staff are working together to support the assessment needs of departments.

Focused Follow Up Report

Recommendation 7:

The College, the Chancellor, and the District must improve relations among their various constituency groups in order to assure effective discussion, planning and implementation. The entire College community must work together for the good of the institution.

Response to Recommendation 7:

Key Issues Related to Recommendation 7: The two key issues are improved relationships between the college, the chancellor, the district, and constituent groups, and collaborative processes involving stakeholders that result in effective outcomes of benefit to the college.

Description of Steps Taken to Resolve Issue 1: Since 2007, a number of initiatives have been taken toward achievement of improved relationships between the college, the chancellor, the district, and constituent groups. These initiatives fall into two categories, those that began prior to the site visit and those that were started after receipt of Recommendation 7. These efforts are described in the following sections:

Pre-Visit Initiatives

As a result of the revelations, findings, and planning agendas included in the 2007 Accreditation Self-Study, college and district leaders decided to address certain communication and relationship issues identified as needing improvement between and among affected constituencies. To ensure that all constituencies shared a common understanding of a basic concept of institutional governance, collegial consultation, the first effort to address these issues was the Districtwide Collegial Consultation workshop by Diane Woodruff and Ian Walton, sponsored by the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District (GCCCD) Governing Board on March 27, 2007 (D41, V1). The videotape was posted on the Web and made available to all employees. A workshop that built on this foundation was conducted by Grossmont College's administration, students, and constituent group leaders on August 31, 2007 (D42).   The objectives of this workshop were to not only broaden understanding of collegial consultation campus-wide but also to promote mutual understanding and enhanced communication across all college constituencies. This program held at the beginning of the new academic year was essential given the new leadership at three college levels: administrative, Academic Senate, and students; these changes in college leadership provided new dynamics and opportunities for improved dialogue and decision-making procedures between the college and district, as well as with the other district college, Cuyamaca College.

An additional effort to address a variety of issues, including those identified through the self-study, began in Spring 2007 with the review and update of the District Governance Structure document. This review included identifying and clarifying the roles and responsibilities of constituent groups and their involvement in district committees. Heightened attention to key board policies and procedures also took place in Spring, 2007, with the ongoing review of board policies by constituent groups, with particular attention to the roles of faculty, staff, student and administrative roles in the district governance structure (D72).

Another initiative designed to promote districtwide collaboration, planning, and participation for the good of the entire district is the Leadership Training and Development Committee (D62, V3). This group of 11 individuals from all GCCCD sites met and planned a series of training events to be launched over the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 academic years. The objective of the training series is to align core values (trust, loyalty, integrity, courage and fairness) of individuals and each site with those of the district. These efforts promote an environment that supports the development of faculty, staff, and students, creating a community where people are valued. The inaugural event was held at Cuyamaca College and attended by administrators and confidential support staff all across the district. Topics of this leadership training series include: leadership style, innovation, mentoring, communication, team building, motivating employees, aligning district values, and connecting with the community (D62, V3).

Post Visit Initiatives

To specifically address Recommendation 7 and its underlying issues, several approaches were adopted. Primary among them was a taskforce that convened to identify and resolve sources of tension and disagreement between Grossmont College constituents and the district (D55). The district membership of this Taskforce on Excellent Working Relationships is made up of the chancellor, a member of the Governing Board, and the associate vice chancellor of intergovernmental affairs, economic development and public information. College participants include the college president, the president and vice president of the Academic Senate as well as the college's highest ranking officer (vice president) of the district-wide Classified Senate. The taskforce met during May and June and agreed to continue meeting throughout the summer of 2008 (D55).

At the first meeting, all seven members made a commitment to create effective, positive, and productive solutions to improve college-district relations. They set the following ground rules for discussions that reflect that commitment:

Productive taskforce participation
- requires a high level of trust between participants;
- requires that all members have a commitment to understand other perspectives;
- requires honesty, questioning, modeling positive behavior and striving to understand;
- may require that some issues are conceded at the table with confidentiality and honesty;
- must be free from personal attacks as well as personalization of issues;

- requires participants to separate themselves from tension going on at any given moment on campus or within the district;
- requires that all members be a part of the solution.

To develop a basis for discussion, taskforce members discussed the history of a variety of issues that created tension at approximately the same time between various constituents a few years ago. It appeared that decision processes are not widely understood and that there is a need for more open and widespread communication mechanisms. Finding new avenues for sharing decision-making processes will make governance across the district more transparent to all.

Parameters for raising issues in taskforce meetings included information from any accreditation documentation, including the college's self- study document, the site team findings, and the ACCJC recommendations. Historical perspectives also help identify sources of misunderstandings and tensions.

The taskforce discussed the site team finding that trust between college constituent groups and district leadership was at the heart of the matter, and that it had a historical context. The group agreed to find concrete steps to lead to new trust between college constituents, the district, and trustees. It was noted that the climate of the relationships had already changed a bit with new board, college, and faculty leadership; however issues remain and a proactive approach is important.

The site team also raised the issue of "interminable dialogue without results." To that end, the following questions were, and continue to be, explored by the taskforce:

- How can the current model of communication be made more effective?
- How can the point be reached where both sides can agree to disagree?

Answers to these questions may involve new language to reframe an issue, continually summarizing the evidence for decisions, or new language that leads to closure of the issue rather than continuous disagreement. The taskforce will also explore written procedures for the role of representatives on committees. Some committees have formal minutes, but the information is not disseminated. The informal role of a committee member, that of sharing timely and thorough information about committee work with represented constituents, is critical in effective governance structures.

After exploring the more generalized underpinnings of the institutional problems in its first few meetings, the taskforce began to identify specific issues and mechanisms for resolution. A mechanism for closure and communication when parties cannot agree to a solution will be recommended by the taskforce and circulated widely to all constituents for the best decisions on behalf of the institutions and students (D55).

Other new formal and informal channels to promote mutual understanding and productive relationships have also been created. Topics of discussion at these smaller gatherings include budget, classified participation on screening committees, the

application of salary increases to the salary schedule, parking structure, and participation on the Classified Staff Development Committee.

One of these new informal channels is the vice president/vice chancellor (VP/VC) monthly lunches. These lunches provide an opportunity for the three VPs from each college to talk informally with VCs and associate VCs (AVCs) about issues of concern or other items requiring discussion (D50).

In addition, to foster districtwide dialogue with faculty, the monthly meeting of the chancellor, the AVC of Districtwide Academic, Student, Planning and Research Services (the research office) and the two Academic Senate presidents was reconstituted. These meetings bring together the faculty leadership of both colleges (D51). The chancellor is also accessible between these meetings as needed. Additionally, in an effort to encourage dialogue with college constituents, since the Spring 2008 semester, the monthly Chancellor's Open Office Hour is conducted from the Grossmont College conference room as opposed to the Chancellor's conference room at the District Office (D63).

To foster monthly district-wide dialogue with classified staff, the chancellor continues to meet with the Classified Senate president and California School Employees Association union (CSEA) president and vice president monthly (D52). The chancellor also continues to meet monthly with the four student leaders – college student government presidents and student trustees.

Collaboration between the two colleges within the GCCCD now occurs on a regular basis. These examples include Academic Senate collaborations, such as joint resolutions. A recent example of such a resolution is one that indicates movement toward plus/minus grading at both colleges (D53). The presidents and vice presidents of both academic senates also have been meeting regularly for the past two semesters to collaborate and discuss common issues.

It is important to note that all of these initiatives prompted by the self-study and Recommendation 7 augment a robust array of district-wide collegial consultation systems that have been in place for a number of years. Several of the more prominent ones are as follows: The primary collegial consultation body across the GCCCD is the Districtwide Executive Council (DEC) (D47); the membership of DEC includes representation from each college and the district, representing all levels of the organization. The Chancellor's Cabinet meets weekly and consists of district-wide participation at the executive level from both colleges and the district (D43). The Districtwide Planning and Budget Council (DSP&BC) meets monthly and consists of all representative constituent groups from both colleges (D45). The Districtwide Coordinating Educational Council (DCEC) aligns educational decisions and curriculum matters district-wide through monthly meetings of all district constituencies (D46). The VP/Dean Think Tank is a mechanism by which innovations impacting the entire system are brainstormed or discussed by college administrators and the district AVC of the Office of Districtwide Academic, Student, Planning and Research Services (D49).

While many positive efforts to improve dialogue and relationships between colleges, the district, and trustees have been made, unresolved union contract negotiations with the Governing Board caused discord for a time.   Because of these unresolved issues, the faculty union (United Faculty, UF) declared a Work- to- Contract condition in March 2008 (D54). This significantly impacted the college's progress in accreditation response development as faculty were directed by UF leaders to not participate in non-contract-mandated committee, governance, or other work outside of the classroom. Because contract negotiations were concluded following the acceptance of a fact-finding report by the Governing Board and UF on August 19, 2008, the UF ended the Work-to-Contract condition (D95, D113, D122).

Analysis: Through both self-initiated efforts and those prompted by Recommendation 7, the college, district, and constituent leaders and groups have begun to address the issue of improved working relationships. Both formal and informal systems have been consciously created to focus on the problematic issues that have divided the college from the district, ranging from the meaning of collegial consultation to the extension of trust and respect for all who engage in the collaborative process. Because changes in leadership have occurred and because all have adopted a positive approach to improving the rendered relationships, both formal and informal systems have shown progress in a manner supportive of the reconstitution of trust. While the work to repair relationships has not yet been completed, all participants have committed to that end, allowing the college to make significant progress towards improved collaboration, dialogue, and working relationships across the college and district.

Additional Plans: The taskforce will make its work known to college community.

Description of Steps Taken to Resolve Issue 2: Since the ultimate test of collaborative systems is their capacity to generate effective outcomes of benefit to the college, several representative results are described in the ensuing paragraphs. They range from those of great complexity involving multiple years of district-wide effort to those that have less complexity and have resolved over a shorter time period.

The degree to which the capacity of district-wide collaborative systems to generate outcomes of benefit to the college may best be demonstrated by the launch of the student information system, Colleague, by Datatel, in 2008. This project has required many people at multiple levels within all district locations to work together for nearly a decade in aligning courses, pre-requisites, training, and other efforts to ensure a smooth and effective initiation of this new system. The district-wide Administrative Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC) group has been primarily responsible for overseeing the project (D48). While this multi-year endeavor was progressing even without additional efforts to improve working relationships across the district, the thrust to overcome inter- and intra-institutional impediments in general has helped minimize relationship issues that might have complicated the successful launch of this complex project.

A totally different type of endeavor that required collaboration between the district and the college to benefit the college is represented by the routine review and revision of the college and district governance systems. Both the governance structures at the college and at the district levels are scheduled for annual review to ensure their continued functionality. During review sessions, the charge, mission, and membership of each council and committee undergo reconsideration. The college governance structure was last reviewed in May 2008 and is currently being revised as part of the response to the 2007 Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Recommendation 3 (B3). Improved interaction between Grossmont College and the district depends upon effective college planning and communication of these plans and resource requirements to the district through coordinated structures and processes.

College leaders understood that the number of committees and the timing of yearly planning events needed streamlining based upon input from college constituents as well as a recommendation from the ACCJC visiting team. With the full support of the district leadership, Grossmont College leaders embarked upon a pilot study and a college-wide streamlining endeavor during 2007-2008 to ensure that the college's planning process and committee structure were broadly understood and were effective (D57). The new draft of this planning process and committee structure will be circulated to college constituent groups in fall 2008, through the efforts of the team addressing ACCJC Recommendation 3 (See Responses to Recommendation 3).

Another example illustrative of collaboration involving district-wide participation that has benefited the college is demonstrated by the collaborative training program offered to Student Services personnel at all three sites (both district colleges and district office) during 2007-2008. The National Association of Student Personnel Administration (NASPA) training was collaboratively designed and implemented, and afforded 30 employees within the GCCCD the opportunity to attend six, distinct, day-long training sessions. Topics included Student Services – history and development; current legal issues – speech, threat assessments, and student discipline; and diversity (D60, V2). This training program provided Student Services personnel with the kinds of skills needed to enhance their success in assisting students.

A further instance of the effectiveness of collaborative relationships that has emerged over this past year is represented by a significantly modified board policy approved by the Governing Board on July 15, 2008. Board Policy 3840 regarding allowing children on campus was crafted with full participation by all constituent groups to better meet the needs of students and employees in fulfillment of the college's mission (D67).

A situation involving the creation of a new approach to defining the college and district organizational roles and responsibilities provides another example of how the college and the district have collaborated for the benefit of the college. The new approach was embodied in a portion of the *2007 Grossmont College Accreditation Self-Study* called the "mapping document." There was concern at the college that this document may not have been as collaboratively written as it could have been. As a result of this expressed concern, the college, through its collegial consultation process, reviewed and modified

the document to update and clarify certain sections. The college's Planning and Budget Council, consisting of representatives of all constituent groups, reviewed the mapping document over a one month period between March and April 2008 ([D61](#)). Edits were compiled and the college accepted modifications in April. At that point, the Chancellor's Cabinet (including the Cuyamaca College president) reviewed the document because of its districtwide impact. At its June 16, 2008 meeting, the revised mapping document was reviewed and accepted by the cabinet ([D69](#)). To ensure districtwide awareness of the mapping document, it was again distributed and shared informationally at the July 7, 2008 meeting of DEC ([D90](#)).

An example of another contested issue that was resolved for the benefit of the college, involved the joint efforts of the Academic Senate officers at both colleges and the chancellor, to design a confidentiality statement that was required by the district. The confidentiality statement mandated that all members of employee search committees sign a document that explicitly stated the potential for personal liability for anyone who violated disclosure of committee proceedings. This controversy was underway, and tensions were displayed most acutely, when the ACCJC site team visited in October, 2007. However, within two weeks of that visit, through effective dialogue and compromise, a result that was acceptable to all sides was crafted, accepted at DEC, and implemented ([D64](#)). Since then, all hiring committees have used the statement without disagreement, thereby facilitating the expeditious employment of new staff.

Analysis: These examples demonstrate how collaborative systems across the district are assisting faculty and staff with resolving issues in a manner that benefits the college; they also reveal the degree to which both the college and the district have committed to remedying past divisiveness that prevented such results. While there have been instances where disagreements have occurred, the issues described above, have been resolved. In general, leadership committed to collaboration, improved structures for dialogue, positive experiences of cooperation, appropriate compromises, clear, streamlined channels of communication, and consistent focus on positive results are ensuring that benefits to the college are accruing.

Additional Plans: Future collaborations will require careful and consistent attention so that communication is effective and desired outcomes are achieved.

Recommendation 7: Improve Working Relationships Between the Governing Board, District, and College

Related College Self-Study Planning Agenda Status Reports

I.B.5

As a follow-up to the Office of Districtwide Academic, Student, Planning and Research Services (the research office) presentations to selected shared governance groups during Spring 2007, the college will arrange for them to offer workshops during Professional Development Week to all faculty and staff to inform them of how to use their services, including Data on Demand and other web-based applications.

Response to Planning Agenda I.B.5

The research office offered training on August 16, 2007, during Professional Development Week, prior to the ACCJC visiting team visit of October 2007 (W4).

This planning agenda has been met. The college plans to schedule more workshops for faculty and staff during future Professional Development Weeks.

III.A.1.d

College governance groups will review existing documents on ethics, develop them for groups not covered by them, and compile the information into one document for reference and distribution to all campus constituencies by the Fall Semester of 2010.

Response to Planning Agenda III.A.1.d

While the 2007 Self-Study noted that the faculty and the Governing Board have had comprehensive statements regarding ethical requirements of their group members for some time, the administrative staff, classified staff, and students have not had such statements covering their actions (D89). Instead, they have been guided by memoranda, professional and other training programs, and situational advisories (D112). The college has identified all extant policies, procedures, documents, and campus training programs regarding ethics, to use as the basis of comprehensive statements and will compile them in accordance with the requirements of the planning agenda (D112, D126).

This planning agenda will be completed by Fall 2010 as noted in the planning agenda.

<u>**III.A.4.c**</u>

College administrators and faculty will meet with district administrators to share concerns and develop common approaches to problem solving.

Response to Planning Agenda III.A.4.c

The Taskforce on Excellent Working Relationships, described in greater detail in the foregoing Response to Recommendation 7, has worked diligently over the past three months to share concerns, look at past conflicts and learn from them how to improve communication and transparency, and come to closure on issues. There has been productive discussion, listening, and understanding within this group made up of college, district, and governing board members. College representation on the taskforce includes faculty, classified staff, and administration Discussion topics and recommendations can be found in Taskforce summaries (D55).

This planning agenda item has been implemented as stated.

<u>**IV.A.2.b and IV.A.3**</u>

By Fall 2008, the Grossmont College will pursue with the district the creation of documents that establish protocol addressing how best to ensure shared governance with district constituents.

By Fall 2009, the college will pursue with district leadership the establishment of processes that define communication channels. Subsequently, faculty and instructional administrators will be surveyed to measure whether communication has improved between these employee groups.

By Fall 2008, the college will explore and propose clearly defined solutions to the college and district difficulties, one of which could include support for the Academic Senate's request for Technical Assistance between Grossmont College and the District.

Response to Planning Agenda IV.A.2.b and IV.A.3

As outlined in the foregoing response to Recommendation 7, the college and the district took a number of steps to address the issues identified in these planning agendas, both before the visit of the accrediting commission representatives and thereafter. Pre-visit initiatives included a Governing Board-sponsored workshop on collegial consultation, followed by one limited to college employees laid the foundation for addressing these issues. Processes were begun to review: Board Policies 2510, 2515, and 2520, related to faculty, staff, and student participation in governance, the Joint Statement of Grossmont and Cuyamaca Academic Senates and United Faculty on their Roles and Relationships: and the Memorandum of Understanding: CSEA, Chapter 707, Classified Senate, and GCCCD. These processes were operationalized when the most recent version of the

District Governance Structure was prepared; this document lays out the council and committee structures supporting collegial consultation. It is posted to the district web site at www.gcccd.edu/district-wide.minutes/District-Governance-Structure-July-07.pdf (D72).

Post-visit actions taken by the college, included the establishment of the Taskforce on Excellent Working Relationships, as described in the response to Recommendation 7. It has undertaken efforts to address issues defined by these planning agendas and has begun to identify specific problems and potential means for their resolution, including how to reach closure when agreement has not been achieved (D55).

Other actions of both formal and informal character, as described in the response to Recommendation 7, have resulted in the conclusion of both complex and simpler projects by the college in cooperation with the district and Cuyamaca College. These successful projects reveal that delineated processes are effective, even as they are being written.

Through all of these initiatives, the college has progressed toward achieving the objectives contained in the planning agenda items according to the schedules set forth.

IV.B.1.b

During the regular review process for board policies as described in IV.B.1, the college will recommend that board policies be amended where appropriate to include a reference to the college mission statement.

Response to Planning Agenda IV.B.1.b

The district and colleges, through collegial consultation, amended the district's mission statement to include both colleges' mission statements. Thus any board policy referencing the district's mission statement automatically includes the colleges' mission statements. One example of where the college mission statement was added to a board policy is BP 1200 – District and College Mission Statements (D87).

This planning agenda item has been met to date, but continuing efforts will occur.

IV.B.1.d

By Fall 2007, the college leadership will inform the college community of (1) where Board Policies, Administrative Procedures, and Operating Procedures may be found; (2) how to access them; and (3) the difference between these three types of documents.

Response to Planning Agenda IV.B.1.d

A memorandum distinguishing these policies and procedures was circulated via campus e-mail on September 21, 2007 (D74). A reminder will be sent to employees annually to ensure that access to this important information is broadly understood. The information has been posted to the web for continuous access at
http://www.gcccd.edu/governingboard/policies/

This planning agenda has been implemented as stated.

IV.B.1.e and IV.B.3.f

By Fall 2008, the college will seek cooperation from the chancellor and the board that focuses on the improvement and restoration of a positive relationship with respect to understanding and implementing policies, procedures, and practices.

Immediately, the college will pursue with the district improved communication among the faculty, staff, administrators, and students of the college and the district. The college will propose the development of metrics to monitor improvement in the communication through surveys and other means. The college will provide to the district a periodic report on progress made and suggested areas for improvement.

Response to Planning Agenda IV.B.1.e and IV.B.3.f

As the response to Recommendation 7 demonstrates, the college has sought cooperation with the chancellor and board to achieve the objectives stated in these planning agenda items. Among the initiatives taken to achieve them are workshops on the meaning of collegial consultation, revision of policies and procedural guides to describe changed understandings of shared governance, and establishment of the Task Force on Excellent Working Relationships. Collaborative ventures using new practices and perspectives demonstrate improvements that have been achieved. The college will measure progress by survey and in addition, the new college planning process will incorporate measures for continuous and sustainable improvement in many areas including communication. These results will be reported to the district.

The college has progressed toward achieving the planned objectives.

IV.B.1.i

During the months following the delivery of the ACCJC recommendations and action, the college will provide workshops for the board with key college leaders to review the accreditation self-study from 2007, including the college-identified planning agendas, along with all recommendations from the visiting team.

Response to Planning Agenda IV.B.1.i

The Governing Board reviewed and accepted the Grossmont College self study prior to its submission in 2007. In lieu of workshops held by the college for board members, the ACCJC final report in summary form was sent in an email to the college community. Copies of the report in its entirety were distributed to district colleagues at the Chancellor's Cabinet level and to all Governing Board members. In lieu of workshops, both college presidents addressed the self-study reports in an open Governing Board meeting summarizing the site visit and the recommendations in the November 13, 2007 meeting (D68). Additionally, a representative of the Governing Board was appointed to the Taskforce on Excellent Working Relationships and has been working with college representatives to address issues raised in the self study, planning agendas as well as site team recommendations.

The college has achieved this planning agenda item.

IV.B.3.a

By the end of the Fall 2007 Semester, the college will begin reviewing the district and college mapping document through its shared governance processes, and then will add to the District Executive Council agenda an item for review and approval of the college final draft of the mapping document.

Response to Planning Agenda IV.B.3.a

In accordance with the planning agenda item, the college initiated review of the mapping document through the governance processes. Participation at all levels resulted in acceptance of an updated and clarified document that was considered and accepted by the Chancellor's Cabinet in June 16, 2008 (D69). The mapping document was also distributed, discussed and no objections were raised at the July 2008 DEC meeting (D114).

This planning agenda item has been implemented as stated.

IV.B.3.g

By Spring 2008, the college will recommend a process to the district for regular review of its governance processes used for decision making.

Response to Planning Agenda IV.B.3.g

As described in the Response to Recommendation 7, the college engaged in revision of its own governance processes and produced its annual updated model (B3). A process currently exists at the district for councils and committees to annually review and evaluate the continuing need for their operation and make recommendations for any necessary changes in the governance structure. This was done collegially in Spring 2007

and is an ongoing process (D115). The college has reiterated the importance of this review by the district with the involvement of constituent groups from the college.

The Taskforce on Excellent Working Relationships described in the Response to Recommendation 7 determined that there appeared to be forums and channels through which recommendations and decisions were made involving collegial consultation between the college and the district. In historical times and in situations that have led to conflict or misunderstanding, the group agreed that the following were critical:

· A written procedure for the role of representatives on committees may be needed to codify that in addition to formal minutes, each committee member taking back information to the constituent group is an essential component of good governance structures (D55).

· A focus on communication "overkill" will be needed to assist in clarifying decision-making within the district and making it more transparent to all (D55).

· Improving the manner, clarity, consistency and documentation of how budget recommendations and decisions are made (D124).

This planning agenda item is in the process of being addressed.

EVIDENCE LIST

B = bound material

Identifier	Official Printed Name
B1	Program Review Handbook
B2	1994 Staff Diversity Plan
B3	Governing Structure Booklet 08/09
B4	"Give Us Your Feedback" Survey

W = web URL

Identifier	Official Printed Name
W1	Professional Development Week Fall 2008
W2	Professional Development Week Spring 2008
W3	Human Resources Web Site
W4	Flex Week Fall 2007.
W5	Library Student Service Outcomes
W6	2007 Self-Study, Section III.C.1.b
W7	http://www.gcccd.edu/hras/hr-pulse-newsletter.asp
W8	http://www.grossmont.edu/devonatchison

D = word documents, unbound

Identifier	Official Printed Name
D1	ACCJC Annual Report 2007-2008, submitted in April
D2	Course SLO Matrix
D3	Title III Faculty Technology Survey Results
D4	Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes, 3/4/08
D5	SSO Matrix
D6	Assessment Studies Matrix
D7	6-Year Template
D8	Planning concept notes – discussed 10/4/08
D9	Linking Planning Documents – discussed 2/4/08
D10	Grossmont College 2007-08 planning calendar – discussed 2/4/08
D11	Mira Costa site visit "Strategic Planning On-Line" (SPOL) training – 2/28/08
D12	First draft – revised planning process – 2/11/08
D13	Second draft – revised planning process – 2/25/08
D14	Third draft – revised planning process – 3/3/08
D15	Sample strategic planning process- 3/3/08
D16	Sample planning flow chart – 3/3/08
D17	Draft of yearly planning process – 3/10/08
D18	Revised large-scale planning cycle – drafted 2/25/08 (Parts A and B).
D19	Revision to yearly planning process – 3/24/08
D20	Blueprint for planning – 3/27/08
D21	Proposed revision to annual planning cycle – 3/28/08
D22	Blueprint for planning – 3/28/08
D23	Proposed revision to annual planning cycle – 3/31/08
D24	Proposed revision to annual planning cycle – 3/31/08
D25	Draft agenda –leadership planning retreat – 4/7/08
D26	Leadership planning retreat – handouts and results – 4/11/08
D27	Draft of revised planning committee structure - 4/28/08

D28	Resource material for planning discussions: foci, criteria and structure – 5/5/08
D29	Revision to planning cycles / discussion of first planning retreat results – 5/5/08
D30	Final draft "Blueprint for Institutional Planning" – 5/12/08
D31	Draft agenda – second leadership planning retreat – 5/12/08
D32	WASC rubric for evaluating institutional effectiveness – planning – 5/12/08
D33	Second leadership planning retreat – institutional focus and activity proposal selection criteria - 5/16/08
D34	Summary of planning task force meeting minutes – 5/28/08
~~D35~~	Unassigned
D36	Email from Dr. Lastimado dated June 11, 2007
D37	Staff Diversity Committee meeting notes
D38	Vision and Mission Statement on Staff Diversity
D39	Email from Gloria Reyes dated May 27, 2008
D40	HR Pulse
D41	Governing Board Special Meeting Workshop (3/27/07 Agenda and Minutes)
D42	Collegial Consultation Workshop Scenarios (August 31st)
D43	Chancellor's Cabinet (membership and charge)
D44	Chancellor's Extended Cabinet (Membership and Charge)
D45	Districtwide Strategic Planning and Budget Council (membership and charge)
D46	Districtwide Coordinating Educational Council (membership and charge)
D47	Districtwide Executive Council (membership and charge)
D48	Administrative Technology Advisory Committee (membership and charge, meeting agenda and summaries)
D49	Vice President-Dean Think Tank Luncheon
D50	VP/VC Monthly lunches
D51	Academic Senate Presidents monthly meeting with Chancellor and Associate Vice Chancellor
D52	CSEA President and VP monthly meetings with Chancellor – agendas, summaries, etc.

D53	Academic Senate Resolutions in Support of "Plus" and "Minus" Grades
D54	Academic Senate support of United Faculty's call for work to contract resolution
D55	Taskforce on Excellent Working Relationships (All Agendas and Summaries 2008)
~~D56~~	~~Unassigned~~
D57	Leadership Planning Retreat Agendas (April 11th and May 16th)
D58	Flex Week Materials
D59	Board Policy 6620 – Naming of Facilities AP 2410 – Preparation and Revision of Board Policies and Administrative Procedures (1st reading, 2nd reading, final) BP 2105 – Election/Appointment of Student Members (1st reading, 2nd reading, final)
D60	NASPA Training (schedules, programs)
D61	Planning and Budget Council – (3/27/08 and 4/24/08 agendas and minutes)
D62	Leadership Training and Development (brochure)
D63	The Loop – Grossmont College Staff Bulletin
D64	Confidentiality Statement
D65	The Courier
D66	Board Policy 2510 – Participation in Local Decision Making-Academic Senates
D67	Board Policy 3840 – Children on Campus
D68	President's Board Report, 11/13/07, Commendation and Recommendations, Governing Board Minutes 11/13/07, and The Courier, 11/13/07
D69	Chancellor's Cabinet – 6/16/08 Minutes
D70	www.gcccd.edu/district-wide.minutes
D71	www.gcccd.edu/governingboard
D72	District Governance Structure July 2007
D73	Annual Report Update on Student Learning Outcomes 2006-2007
D74	Board Policies, Administrative Procedures, and Operating Procedures, September 21, 2007
D75	EEOAC Minutes, July 1, 2008

D76	EEOAC SubGroup A Minutes, August 6, 2008
D77	EEOAC SubGroup B Minutes, July 25, 2008
D78	EEOAC SubGroup C Minutes, July 14, 2008
D79	Dept./Program Action Plan
~~D80~~	~~Activity Proposal Unassigned~~
D81	Figure 2: Annual Institutional Planning Review and Implementation Cycle
D82	Library Tutorial (LUCI and BI) Assessment Results
D83	LIR 110 Study
D84	Library Statistics spreadsheet
D85	Tech Mall tutoring services data
D86	CATL Training Survey Data
D87	Board Policy 1200 – District and College Mission Statements
D88	Staff Diversity Minutes, July 10, 2008
D89	Report of Institutional Self-Study for Reaffirmation of Accreditation October 2007 III.A.1.d.
D90	DEC Meeting Minutes – July 7, 2008
D91	ACCJC SLO Rubric
D92	GCCCD Governing Board Staffing Commitments
D93	Email from Devon Atchison dated August 15, 2008
D94	ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness
D95	Email from United Faculty dated August 20, 2008
D96	Email from Kats Gustafson dated July 23, 2008
D97	Website Review Stamats Visit Teams 8-28-08
D98	Email from Tim Flood, September 2, 2008
D99	Email from Sunita Cooke, September 4, 2008
D100	Governing Board Minutes of the Regular Meeting Tuesday, June 19, 2007

D101	Governing Board Minutes of the Regular Meeting, Tuesday, September 18, 2007
D102	Email from Sue Rearic, September 4, 2008
D103	GCCCD Year End Closing Deadlines, 2007/08
D104	Email from Sue Rearic, September 4, 2008
D105	GCCCD District Business Services Quick Reference Vacation Balances
D106	Grossmont College Planning and Budget Council, Thursday, May 22, 2008, Meeting Summary
D107	Grossmont College Facilities Needs Estimates 2/25/08
D108	Governing Board Final Project Proposal Grossmont College Student Services/Student Center Renovations/Expansions
D109	Grossmont College Facilities Committee Agenda, March 4, 2008
D110	Facilities Committee Meeting Minutes, March 4, 2008
D111	Total Building Cost Worksheet
D112	Email from Sunita Cooke dated August 20, 2008
D113	Governing Board Minutes of the Regular Meeting, Tuesday, August 19, 2008
D114	Districtwide Executive Council Meeting Notes, Monday, July 7, 2008
D115	Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District Governance Structure
D116	Grossmont College - Blueprint for Institutional Planning (7/8/08)
D117	Grossmont College Institutional Planning Review and Implementation Cycle (7/8/08)
D118	Department/Program Action Plan Activity Proposal
D119	Technology for Teaching and Learning Committee
D120	Planning Process Implementation Timetable

D121	Distance Education Coordinator
D122	Email from Zoe Close dated August 15, 2008
D123	Email from Marci Jahn dated September 3, 2008
D124	Task Force on Excellent Working Relationships Minutes July 7, 2008
D125	Collegewide Professional Development Committee Meeting Minutes – 2/7/08
D126	Fall 2008 Workshops/Seminars
D127	President's News Burst Email – June 2008
D128	Engagement Contract Between Stamats, Inc. and Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District

V = video

Identifier	**Official Printed Name**
V1	GCCCD Board Workshop CD
V2	NASPA Training (schedules, programs, CD)
V3	Leadership Training and Development (brochure and CD)

Om = other media

Identifier	**Official Printed Name**
OM1	Literature review (CD) of integrated planning articles and dissertations – 3/12/08
OM2	Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District Instructor Evaluation Form