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Statement of Report Preparation

Gavilan College’s Midterm Report of March 2010 responds to the recommendations of the Accreditation team following their visit in 2007, as required by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. The focus of the Midterm Report is to demonstrate an ongoing, systematic, and cyclical process that includes evaluation, planning, resource allocation, implementation and re-evaluation. The continuous improvement philosophy forms the foundation by which the college approaches all academic and administrative tasks. The Midterm Report also speaks to the two recommendations made by the evaluation team that had not been fully implemented at the time the follow-up report was submitted in October 2007.

Recommendation #3, Adjunct Faculty Evaluation, has now been fully implemented. Gavilan College continues to make progress on the implementation of Student Learning Outcomes and is currently on track to complete course-level assessment requirements by 2012. All the activity occurring at the college—formal and informal gatherings, Board meetings and workshops, shared governance committees and department meetings, web postings, blogs and emails—demonstrates an understanding of the accreditation standards as well as the continuous improvement approach adopted for planning, evaluation and program review. Building on the Self Study and Progress Report of 2007, this report illustrates progress on the planning agenda items with specific activities and reflection. Initial drafts were distributed to all campus departments in Spring 2009 and feedback compiled during the summer. To assist in this process, an editing group was formed with representatives from all constituent groups who refined the draft during Fall 2009. A succeeding draft version of the Midterm Report was presented to the Board of Trustees at its December 2009 meeting.

The final version of the Midterm Report was submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval on February 9, 2010.

Individuals contributing to this required Midterm Report to the Accrediting Commission:

- Steve Kinsella, Superintendent/President
- Kathleen Rose, V.P., Instruction
- John Pruitt, V.P. Student Services.
- Joe Keeler, V.P., Administrative. Services
- Fran Lozano, Dean - Liberals Arts & Sciences
- Sherrean Carr, Dean - Career Technical Education
- Anne Ratto, Associate Dean - EOPS
- Rachel Perez, Assoc. Dean - Community Svcs./Grants
- Fran Lopez, Assoc. Dean – Disability Resources
- Candice Whitney, Director-Admissions & Records
- Cindy Starr, Senior Program Specialist
- Ken Wagman, Math instructor
- Debbie Klein, Anthropology instructor
- Deborah Hampton, CSIS instructor (PT)
- Dije Ndreu, Chemistry instructor (PT)
- Lisa Franklin, Workability III Counselor
- Nicole Cisneros, ESL Instructor
- Sandy Bumgarner, Astronomy Inst. (PT)
Review of the Midterm Report

This midterm report is submitted per the requirements of the Accrediting Commission.

This midterm report has been reviewed with broad participation of the campus community. We believe that it accurately reflects our responses to date to the recommendations of the 2007 Accreditation Visiting Team.

Deb Smith, B.S.  President, Board of Trustees

Steven M. Kinsella, D.B.A.  Superintendent/President

Kathleen Rose, Ed.D.  Vice President of Instructional Services

Debra Klein, Ph.D.  President, Faculty Senate

Diana Seelie  President, CSEA

Rigoberto Lopez  Student Trustee
Planning Overview and Introduction

The March 2007 accreditation team visit at Gavilan College resulted in reaffirmation of accreditation with a requirement that the college complete a progress report by October 10, 2007. The team acknowledged the strength of the college in a number of areas including (1) the College of Choice initiative; (2) making the strategic plan central to all levels of planning; (3) the human resource office organization and methods for maintaining records; (4) the quality of the Disability Resource Center; and (5) the College President’s pursuit of widespread dialogue that promotes a positive spirit of optimism and camaraderie on campus.

The team also made a recommendation with several sub-sections. The primary recommendation, Planning Evaluation, and Program Review, was addressed in the October 10, 2007 Progress Report:

Planning, Evaluation, and Program Review

In order for the college to ensure an ongoing, systematic, and cyclical process that includes evaluation, planning, resource allocation, implementation and re-evaluation, the visiting team recommended the following evaluation and improvement steps:

- The college formally structure and document all aspects of the planning process by which budget requests connect to program reviews and their accompanying unit plans and ensure the consistent application of the planning procedures throughout the college.
- The college regularly evaluates and documents the college’s progress on the achievement of goals outlined in the strategic plan and individual unit plans and use the results of this evaluation to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness.
- The college develops mechanisms to evaluate regularly all of the college’s planning and resource allocation processes.

Additional recommendations made by the team were not included in the October 2007 Progress Report. They are:

Student Learning Outcomes

- The team recommended that the college identify assessment methods and establish dates for completing student learning outcomes for all of its courses, programs, and services. This process should also include the development of performance measures to assess and improve institutional effectiveness of all programs and services. The college should disseminate the outcomes widely and use these results in the strategic planning and resource allocation process.

Adjunct Faculty Evaluation

- The team recommends that the college Human Resources Office regularly evaluate adjunct faculty and that a schedule and record of completed adjunct faculty evaluations be kept.
Response to the Recommendations of the Commission

This Midterm Report addresses the three major recommendations requested by the Accrediting Commission after the March 2007 accreditation visit. It includes the corrective action taken on Recommendation 1 (as submitted in the Progress Report dated October 2007) along with the progress made on Recommendations 2 and 3.

This section of the report has three distinct parts:
- Recommendation 1: Planning, evaluation, and program review
- Recommendation 2: Student learning outcomes
- Recommendation 3: Adjunct faculty evaluation

This Midterm Report reflects work completed in these areas, provides an update to the 68 corresponding planning agenda items and provides an update on substantive changes as requested by the accrediting commission.

Overall, the college is engaging in a continuous improvement model that allows for ongoing, systematic and transparent review of all areas of institutional effectiveness with multiple opportunities for campus dialogue. Dialogue typically takes place during department meetings, shared governance meetings, campus-wide staff development days, focus groups, on-line discussion boards using Moodle course-management software and round table discussions.

Recommendation 1: Planning Evaluation and Program Review

In order for the college to ensure an ongoing, systematic, and cyclical process that includes evaluation, planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation, the team recommended the following evaluation and improvement steps:

- The college formally structure and document all aspects of the planning process by which budget requests connect to program reviews and their accompanying unit plans and ensure the consistent application of the planning procedures throughout the college.

Response

Program review processes and guidelines have been expanded to include connection to the allocation of resources with a newly-developed budget request form (Attachment 1 – Unit Plan Budget Request Form). The form is now used in conjunction with the unit plan during the program review self study completed by each department. Programs are reviewed every three to five years, and unit plans, with related budget requests, for all programs are updated annually.
The model developed in response to the 2007 Visiting Team Recommendations and required Progress Report was accepted by the follow-up Visiting Team; The attached flow chart illustrates the relationships among strategic planning (Strategic Planning Committee), program review (IEC), and the budget process (Budget Committee) (Attachment 2 – Budget Request Flow Chart – Program Review to Final Budget).

A revised Unit Plan template was developed that coordinates the institutional Strategic Plan and Goals with the supporting activities and budget required to carry them out. These forms go to both the IEC and the Budget Committee for their consideration and budget recommendations.

As part of our continuous improvement efforts, the IEC examined and improved its method for reviewing programs. The new process generates more complete and useful information from the departments under review and provides for a more orderly evaluation of these Program Review reports than was accomplished in the past. Specific templates have now been developed for Instructional Program Review, Non-instructional Program Review and Student Services Program Review. During the 2008-09 academic year the Student Services Program Review template was created, and the Instructional Program Review template was revised to be better organized, more specific in the information required, and clearer in the purpose and expectations of what is to be included in each section of the report. The forms were reviewed again in Fall 2009. This annual revision will produce more informative reports, leading to continuous improvement in institutional decisions, particularly concerning the budget.

- **The college regularly evaluates and documents the college’s progress on the achievement of goals outlined in the strategic plan and individual unit plans and use the results of this evaluation to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness.**

**Response**

In response to the 2007 Visiting Team Report and Recommendations, the college refined its processes for strategic planning and program review. A flow chart was developed, showing the linkages between program review (Institutional Effectiveness Committee-IEC), Unit Plans and Budget Requests (Budget Committee) and Strategic Planning (Strategic Planning Committee) (Attachment 2 – Budget Request Flow Chart – Program Review to Final Budget). As noted earlier, an Annual Planning Calendar was developed (Attachment 3 – Annual Planning Calendar) that establishes a timeline for submission of program review reports and updates to unit plans.

Each program is reviewed on a regular rotational basis. Each department under review submits a Program Review Report to the IEC providing a comprehensive analysis of its strengths, weaknesses, and areas of intended improvement. Unit Plans, submitted with each Program Review, lay out program goals and proposed activities to achieve those goals. All goals and activities refer to the institutional Strategies and Goals as laid out in the Strategic Plan (Attachment 4 – Strategic Plan). The Program Review Report and
accompanying Unit Plans specify short-term and long-term goals, with proposed activities and budget requests (as appropriate) for the forthcoming three-year period (short- to medium-term).

Each year, all programs that are not submitting Program Review Reports must update their Unit Plans (thereby keeping those plans current) including a review of the short- to medium-term goals and activities. Two years following the submission of its most recent Program Review Report, each program must submit a Progress Report to the IEC, thereby ensuring regular monitoring of progress on department activities and goals. The Strategic Planning Committee annually reviews all Unit Plans to identify trends in department activities and goals, which then become the basis of this committee’s recommendations for modification of the strategic plan to best reflect the current priorities of the college.

In the tradition of shared governance, decision-making committees (including the Budget Committee, Institutional Effectiveness Committee and President’s Council) include representatives from each campus constituency: students, faculty, professional support staff, supervisors/confidentials, and administrators. Each committee member accepts responsibility for disseminating information to his or her respective constituent group and soliciting input for the decision-making processes of the college. Gavilan College is committed to fostering active participation by all constituencies in the planning and decision making processes of the college, including the program unit level, governance committee level, and staff development activities.

- The college develop mechanisms to regularly evaluate all of the college’s planning and resource allocation processes.

Response
The college has worked aggressively to develop a systematic method for regular assessment of the effectiveness of planning and resource allocation processes. Changes to the IEC guidelines now require that assessment data elements be included as part of resource allocation requests (Attachment 5 – Student Services Review Template, Attachment 6 – Instructional Review Template). The Strategic Planning Committee By-Laws (Attachment 7 – Strategic Planning Bylaws) have been modified to include a yearly evaluation of college planning processes. Ad hoc committees have been successful in responding to urgent operational and fiscal challenges and will continue to be the preferred method used for these situations. The college is consistent in providing an opportunity for campus-wide dialogue on important issues through shared governance, department meetings, focus groups, Moodle discussion board, and round table discussions.

During the implementation phase of the overall planning process, including strategic planning, program review (IEC) and budget planning, it became apparent that the annual calendars for the three processes were not well coordinated. Accordingly, an Annual Planning Calendar (Attachment 3 – Annual Planning Calendar) was developed and
implemented during the 2008-09 academic year. The new calendar and deadlines were presented at fall and spring staff development days, illustrating the relationships among the various processes. In addition, a planning day in Spring 2009 was devoted to the strategic planning process. Following an overall presentation by the college president, faculty worked within their departments to suggest changes to the institutional Strategic Plan, as well as completing their own Unit Plans.

The greatest challenge to the implementation of the Annual Planning Calendar during the 2008-2009 academic year was training the campus community to use the new forms and adhere to timelines for their completion. Although it was necessary to extend deadlines several times before all documents were submitted, the program review, budget allocation, and strategic planning processes worked much better than they had in the past. After the IEC had received the Program Review Reports and discussed them with the departments, the Unit Plan Budget Requests were submitted to the Budget Committee for funding consideration, and the Unit Plans were forwarded to the Strategic Planning Committee for consideration in the update of the Strategic Plan. It is expected that as familiarity with the process improves, the required reports will be submitted in a more timely fashion in the current and future years.

Recommendation 2:
Student Learning Outcomes

- The team recommends that the college identify assessment methods and establish dates for completing student learning outcomes for all of its courses, programs and services. This process should also include the development of performance measures to assess and improve institutional effectiveness of all programs and services. The college should disseminate the outcomes widely and use these results in the strategic planning and resource allocation process.

Response
Gavilan College has provided training and support for both instructional and student service programs on methods for collecting program-level Student Learning Outcome (SLO) data. For instructional programs, this was done in Spring 09. Faculty were provided training, support and guidance in creating assessment plans. The plans outline how program-level SLOs are to be assessed. Most programs have completed these plans and have begun to collect assessment data. As institutional SLO effort expands and becomes more sophisticated, there will be greater use of these data to strengthen programs and courses. For instructional support programs and student service programs, data has already been collected, analyzed, and reported (Attachment 8 – Sample Data). These findings have been used to inform delivery system adaptations.

During the 2008-2009 academic year, a number of studies were conducted which examined the efficacy of different delivery systems. These studies have been presented and are posted on the college website: http://www.gavilan.edu/research/reports/. The college has also refined its program review process (Attachment 9 – Program Review Process), which uses a variety of data to closely examine the functioning of each program.
A systemic approach has been used to refine, assess, and report course- and program-level SLOs. The first phase, now completed, was to have all courses and programs outline and publish their SLOs. In Winter 2007, an SLO advisory committee was established and an SLO Coordinator was identified. The SLO Coordinator and the Vice President of Instruction developed a plan to train and support the institution on program-level SLO assessment. In Spring 2009, SLO consultant Mary Allen, Ph.D. conducted a training session and then provided support (along with the SLO Coordinator and the Vice President of Instruction) for departmental working sessions. Though these efforts, departments developed and submitted assessment plans, outlining the assessment method for each program-level SLO. Additionally, the SLO Coordinator has provided ongoing individualized support and encouragement.

For instructional departments, course- and program-level SLO training is complete, with supplemental training to be provided as needed. As detailed above, program-level SLO training has been completed and the subsequent assessment findings and analysis were submitted in Fall 09 (Attachment 8 – Sample Data). While training and support have been extensive, work is still in progress for some programs.

For student support programs, much of the work has been completed. One hundred percent of support programs have assessed, analyzed, and reported multiple SLOs. The final group of non-instructional programs to be assessed is those of the administrative units. Work with these units, to develop and use assessments, began in Fall 2009.

Approximately 20% of SLO assessments are complete. The department chairs have provided a list of courses to be assessed for each semester. As programs and faculty gather more data, they will be able to provide more accurate analyses of the effectiveness of delivery systems. From the Institutional Research perspective, a series of comparative studies have been completed to assist programs in examining both impact and function. For example, a study was conducted to examine student performance through the basic skills math sequence. The findings from this study suggested the need to modify the sequence and were the basis for a series of collaborative discussions on this topic. Additionally, studies have been conducted for First Year Experience, Basic Skills, Service Learning, along with a series of Student Service and Instructional support programs. These studies have employed both qualitative and quantitative methodology, with the purpose of providing information for course and program improvement.

In addition, a series of round table discussions began in Fall 2009 to encourage faculty to discuss the instructional modifications implemented as a result of the assessment of student learning outcomes. Faculty designed and led, the round table discussions have been very successful, generating participation by both full and part time faculty. A number of improvements have been made to the SLO website to allow for ease of reporting and input of assessment information (https://mail1.gavilan.edu/slo/index.html). At this site, users can submit outcome data, view past data, and access a report of which courses and programs have been assessed, making the process both user-friendly and transparent.
The capacity of the college to conduct this type of research will be greatly expanded by the implementation of an Executive Information System, which will utilize a data warehouse to populate a highly sophisticated user-friendly interface. This system, developed at another community college, is being mapped to the Gavilan College data system. The program review process also offers an opportunity to examine effectiveness of approaches and how SLOs impact the continuous improvement of Gavilan College degrees and certificates.

**Recommendation 3:**

**Adjunct Faculty Evaluation**

- The team recommends that the college Human Resources Office regularly evaluate adjunct faculty and that a schedule and record of completed adjunct faculty evaluations be kept.

**Response**

During the 2007-2008 academic year, the administration entered negotiations to develop a written evaluation procedure for adjunct faculty with the faculty union, GCFA (*Attachment 10 – Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Process*). Administration presented a draft procedure proposing, in part, that tenured faculty complete classroom visits and report back to the dean, who would include the information provided along with student evaluations and the instructor’s written course materials to develop the final evaluation report; critical to the proposal (from the perspective of the administration) was that the deans would not have to make classroom visits for continuing adjunct faculty, as workload considerations would be significant. GCFA did not accept the provision that full-time faculty evaluate part-time faculty, and countered with a proposal that required the deans to visit the classrooms of every adjunct faculty member under evaluation; this proposal was not acceptable to administration, and negotiations broke down. The college proceeded to conduct adjunct faculty evaluations (without the participation of permanent faculty) for those adjuncts that had not been evaluated within the past three years, by using qualified outside evaluators to make classroom visits.

This recommendation is fully implemented: the college developed a new process providing that new adjunct faculty members be evaluated in their first semester by the dean of the area in which they are teaching, or the Vice President of Instruction. Continuing adjunct instructors are evaluated every three years. The district has hired outside evaluators to conduct the classroom observations and complete evaluations for continuing adjunct faculty. The evaluators consider student evaluations, classroom observations, syllabi information, course materials and examples of exams and quizzes. The evaluation process includes assessment of performance and encouragement for improvement. Follow-up classroom visits and/or meetings are conducted in a timely manner and as needed. This system has brought consistency and comprehensive review to the adjunct evaluation process.
RESPONSE TO PLANNING AGENDAS:
ACTION, PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:

STANDARD I
Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

PLANNING AGENDAS 1, 2, 3, and 4

• Develop a model that will be utilized college-wide and by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) that defines accountability, reporting procedures, and evaluation of the unit plans and program review process.
• Implement improved follow-up procedures for linking short-term, long-term, and departmental/program goals.
• Implement the Institutional Effectiveness Committee’s new model that defines accountability, reporting procedures, and evaluation of the unit plan and program review process.
• Assess the planning cycle timelines to ensure that cycles continue to be appropriate for the needs of the institution and educate the college community about the overall planning process and the linkages between the major planning documents.

ACTION:
A model was developed in response to the 2007 Visiting Team recommendations and Progress Report. The model was accepted by a follow-up Visiting Team and includes a flow chart that demonstrates the sequence of events connecting strategic planning (Strategic Planning Committee), program review via the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC), and the budget process (Budget Committee) (Attachment 2 – Budget Request Flow Chart – Program Review to Final Budget). In order to align the activities of the three shared governance committees, the planning cycle timelines were analyzed and an Annual Planning Calendar was developed (Attachment 3 - Planning Calendar) that established timelines for submission of program review reports and updates to unit plans. The IEC continues to modify the program review process as appropriate, and to solicit feedback on the impact of report documents on instructional practice.

During the 2007-2008 academic year, the forms for submitting Unit Plans were revised. Each section of the Unit Plan now indicates support for one or more of the college’s Strategic Plan Strategies and Goals. Activities to be completed and methods of assessing outcomes under each plan have been incorporated into the Unit Plan document. Budget Requests are connected to specific unit planning activities. The forms are submitted to both the IEC and the Budget Committee for budget allocation prioritization. (Attachment 1 – Unit Plan Budget Request Form). The IEC examined its method for reviewing programs and improved the process to be more systematic and to improve the quality and informational content of reports. A new template was developed for Student Services Program Review, (Attachment 5 – Student Services Review Template) and the
Instructional Program Review template was revised to be better organized and more specific in the information required (Attachment 6 – Instructional Review Template.) The revisions have produced reports that are more informative to guide institutional decisions, particularly those concerning the budget allocation process.

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:

The program review cycle has been strengthened, and a well-defined process now links program review, budgeting, and strategic planning. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee improved the program review process with new program review templates, new forms to submit Unit Plans and linked Budget Requests, a master calendar for program reviews, and defined relationships among the IEC, District Budget Committee, and Strategic Planning Committees. As the college community becomes more familiar with the new documents and procedures these connections should grow even stronger.

Each program, whether instructional, student services, or administrative services, is reviewed on a regular rotational basis every three to five years. The Program Review, a report submitted to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC), makes a comprehensive analysis of each program’s strengths, weaknesses, and areas of intended improvement. Unit Plans submitted with each Program Review state the program’s goals and proposed activities for achieving those goals. All goals and activities are linked to the college’s Strategies and Goals, designated in the Strategic Plan (Attachment 4 – Strategic Plan). The Program Review report and accompanying Unit Plans propose the program’s short-term and long-term goals. The Unit Plans are submitted along with Budget Requests for those activities that require additional funding.

All programs that are not submitting Program Reviews must update their Unit Plans on an annual basis. This includes a review of the short-term, long-term, and departmental/program goals and activities. Two years following the submission of its most recent Program Review, programs must submit a progress report to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC), to ensure regular monitoring of progress. Each year, the Strategic Planning Committee reviews all Unit Plans to look for trends across departments in goals and objectives. The committee then may make recommendations for modification of the institutional Strategic Plan to best reflect the priorities of the college as a whole.

After the 2007-2008 review cycle, when all Administrative Services Programs were reviewed, it was clear that they needed better direction to produce well-documented, data-driven analyses. The IEC formed a subcommittee to revise the templates used by programs undergoing review, with greater clarity of data required. As the 2008-2009 academic year approached, it became clear that the Non-Instructional Program Review template would not meet the needs of the many student services programs that were to be reviewed. Accordingly, a new Student Services Program Review template was
developed with an awareness of the weaknesses that had appeared in the previous year’s Administrative Services reports. At the same time, the Instructional Program Review template was revised to be equally sensitive to those deficiencies and to improve the evaluation processes impacting institutional effectiveness. The revised templates improve organization and consistency by adding requirements for both quantitative and qualitative data in support of each report. These improvements enable a more systematic review by the IEC (Attachment 6 – Instructional Review Template). Revision of the Administrative Services Review template, (formerly named Non-Instructional Program Review), is currently in progress. Thanks to the use of the new templates, reports that were submitted by the Student Services Division programs and reviewed in 2008-2009, were easily extracted into a summary document of the committee’s findings. (Attachment 12 – Program Review Summary Report 2008-2009)

In the 2007-2008 academic year, the forms for submitting Unit Plans were revised to link each section of the Unit Plan with one or more of the college’s Strategic Plan Strategies and Goals. Activities to be carried out and methods of evaluating outcomes under each plan were listed and Budget Requests were connected to specific activities (Attachment 1 – Unit Plan Budget Request Form). Implementation of the new forms required campus-wide education. When the plans were received, the attached budget requests were forwarded to the Budget Committee for the budget allocation prioritization process.

Several challenges became evident when the subcommittee studied the IEC’s operating model during the 2007-2008 academic year. First, the rotational cycle of programs needed revision. It made sense to have programs of a similar nature grouped together, which had not been past practice. Thus, all of the Administrative Services programs were reviewed during the 2007-2008 academic year, and all Student Services programs were reviewed during the 2008-2009 academic year. In each case, programs under review completed their reports during the fall semester, and then the IEC reviewed the reports and met with the program representatives during the spring semester. The IEC subcommittee created a master calendar (Attachment 11 – IEC Master Meeting Calendar) to guide the committee’s work for the 2008-2009 academic year; it created a realistic timeline to accomplish all of the scheduled reviews, in addition to the committee’s ongoing business. The resulting (and very ambitious) calendar enabled the committee to review eighteen Student Services programs during the spring 2009 semester and plan for the review of eight programs and departments in 2009-2010, including four instructional credit programs, Noncredit Instruction, Community and Contract Education, Community Development and Grants Management and the Public Information Office.

Analysis of the overall planning process, which includes the processes for strategic planning, program review (IEC) and budget planning, revealed that the annual calendars for the three processes were not synchronized. Accordingly, an Annual Planning Calendar was developed (Attachment 3 – Planning Calendar) and implemented during the 2008-2009 academic year. The new calendar was presented at fall and spring Staff Development Days, with delineation of deadlines, and explanations of how the processes should coordinate with one another. In addition, an optional planning day in Spring 2009 was devoted to the strategic planning process. Following a general presentation by the
college President, faculty worked within their departments to complete their Unit Plans and to suggest changes to the college’s Strategic Plan. The next challenge was educating the campus community about the documents included in the planning process and providing training in the use of the new Unit Plan/Budget Request forms (Attachment 1 – Unit Plan Budget Request Form). Even though deadlines were extended in some cases, the review cycle (i.e. program review, budget allocation, and strategic planning) ran more smoothly it had in the past, thanks to the synchronization of the planning calendars. The IEC received all of the Program Review reports in time for discussion with the departments, and the Budget Committee received most of the Unit Plans requesting new funding in time for consideration. The Strategic Planning Committee was able to review the Unit Plans in order to update the Strategic Plan. As the campus community becomes more familiar with the planning calendar and documents, it is anticipated that reports will be submitted by their deadlines in 2009-2010.

The IEC also developed new internal procedures for reviewing the many documents it received. The committee itself became far more organized than it had been previously, and the quality of its work improved proportionately. Committee members better understood the required work and how to support and achieve the goals and objectives of the committee. IEC teams of two or three individuals were assigned to each program undergoing review to provide guidance and support in the development of the reports. This strengthened the quality of the reports prior to submission. Once the initial report was submitted, the IEC committee met with each program, discussed the content and made recommendations before the final report was submitted and approved.

Finally, the IEC conducted its own self-evaluation during Fall 2008 by surveying all programs that had participated in program review the previous year. The results of the survey were generally positive, but several specific suggestions prompted modification. For example, it was suggested that more information be provided to program review representatives on the procedures and timeline of the review process. As a result, the orientation was modified to include a detailed description of the procedures and a timeline.

During the 2008-2009 academic year, the IEC worked to improve tracking and monitoring of progress on departmental goals. During the Spring 2008, the Strategic Planning Committee reviewed all of the Unit Plans, looking for common themes that the campus community identified as institutional priorities. The Strategic Plan was updated accordingly, with most of the strategies and goals remaining intact. Strategies that had been achieved were removed. New priorities took their place. (Attachment 4 – Strategic Plan). As the college gains experience with the new forms and procedures, commensurate improvements in the reviews are expected to be realized, with strengthened relationships among the review, planning, and budgeted processes.
STANDARD IIA:
Student Learning Programs and Services – Instructional Programs

PLANNING AGENDAS 1, 4, 5, and 7
- Complete assessment techniques for all program learning outcomes.
- Complete the program learning outcomes assessment devices.
- Train departments on evaluating learning outcome assessments.
- Develop assessment tools for the program learning outcomes.

ACTION:
The Gavilan College SLO Assessment Plan (Attachment 48 – SLO Assessment Plan) has been developed to guide the institution in getting 100% of programs assessed by 2012. The first phase has been completed: having all courses and programs outline and publish their SLOs. Program-level student learning outcomes (SLOs) have been written for all instructional programs and are continually being refined. Approximately 5 instructional degree or certificate programs have been assessed, representing six percent of the total California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO)-recognized programs at Gavilan College. Data was collected in Spring 2009 and reported in Fall 2009.

In Winter 2007, the SLO Advisory Committee was established and an SLO coordinator was identified. SLO Consultant Mary Allen, Ph.D. provided workshops during the 2007-2008 academic year covering assessment implementation and using the data to evaluate and modify curriculum and pedagogy. The SLO coordinator and the Vice President of Instruction developed a plan to train and support the college on program-level SLO assessment. The SLO coordinator provided support to both instructional and non-instructional departments. Each department was assisted a minimum of once per term to discuss assessment and SLO issues. A data summary tool was developed and made available to staff and faculty. The SLO coordinator conducted training workshops for groups that had not been included in previous trainings. For example, trainings were provided for part-time faculty, non-credit instructors, apprenticeship and Police Academy staff and instructors.

In Spring 2009, Dr. Allen provided training and subsequent support for departmental working sessions, in conjunction with the SLO coordinator and the Vice President of Instruction (Attachment 14 – Agenda for Staff Development Day). Departments developed and submitted assessment plans outlining the assessment method for each program-level SLO. The SLO coordinator continues to provide ongoing individualized support.

Both instructional support programs and student service programs have refined and assessed program-level SLOs. All instructional support programs and student service programs have collected, analyzed, and reported findings for at least two program-level SLOs. These assessments are being used to improve student learning and program effectiveness.
PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
A considerable amount of training has been completed to teach departments how to collect and use SLO data. SLO consultant Mary Allen, Ph.D. was invited to the January 2009 Staff Development Day to provide background on program level student learning outcomes (SLOs). The presentation was followed by a working session with each academic department whereby faculty refined and developed an assessment plan for collecting program-level assessment data. The trainer, the Vice President of Instruction, and the SLO coordinator provided support for this work. As a result, most departments developed and submitted program level SLO assessment plans. Departments were asked to collect program-level data during Spring 2009. During the course of the term, the SLO coordinator provided support and information to departments. The SLO coordinator continues to work with programs that need assistance in developing appropriate assessment methods.

As the result of training and support, all instructional support programs and student services programs have collected and reported upon a minimum of two program-level SLOs. Future work in this area will focus on improving and expanding assessment.

For instructional programs, course- and program-level SLO training has been largely completed, with assessment findings and reflection submitted in Fall 09. While training and support have been extensive, additional work is necessary to complete assessments for all remaining courses and programs.

For student support programs, much of the work has been completed. Most support programs have assessed and reported upon more than one program-level SLO, and all have begun the process. The remaining non-instructional programs, the administrative units, are beginning to develop and use assessments in the current year.

In Fall 2009, an SLO assessment reporting and tracking website was implemented. The site allows a user to view SLOs and assessment results for courses, programs, and the institution. The user is able to enter data on the SLO, the assessment measure, and record both the results and the use of results. A user can also generate a report detailing when each course or program last reported assessment data. The site is increasingly the foundation of the SLO assessment system. Some departments, such as Noncredit Instruction, were not involved in the initial training; however, the SLO coordinator has begun to provide individualized training and support to these programs to assist them in developing assessment tools.
PLANNING AGENDAS 2 and 6

- Initiate dialogue about delivery systems at department chairs and other appropriate department and college-wide forums.
- Initiate a college-wide discussion and research into best practices regarding online, hybrid, enhanced, and telecourse methods of delivery.

ACTION:
Dialogue concerning delivery systems occurs in five primary venues: (a) Distance Education Committee; (b) Academic Senate; (c) Curriculum Committee; (d) Department Chair Committee; and (e) department meetings. The Distance Education Committee receives input from the other four committees and reviews the input and returns recommendations to the committees. Discussions are ongoing, as the need to align delivery systems with the objectives of the curriculum and the availability of resources is dynamic and changing over time.

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
The recommendations and agenda items that are discussed at the Distance Education Committee are reported at the Academic Senate meetings. Items discussed include: online teaching and learning pedagogy, technology and course management systems, and processes for delivery. Best practices are discussed and include compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Also discussed are current recommendations from the California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) as they apply to distance education.

Methods of instruction are discussed whenever the Curriculum Committee approves new courses. Discussion at this level is of a highly practical nature, specific to the particular course or program under discussion. Dialogue about delivery systems and modes of instruction is more general in the department chair meetings. The department chairs address their needs for delivering instruction within the disciplines in their departments. Similarly, department meetings address systems of delivery for the courses and programs within the department. Whereas the department chair meetings involve discussions that help establish direction for the college as a whole, department meetings are more focused.

Distance education has been the area of greatest change in recent years. The number of courses approved for delivery via distance education is constantly increasing and the percentage of class sections offered online, either as the sole method of delivery or as a hybrid course, is also increasing.

For Fall 2009, the number of online course offerings was initially set to increase from Spring 2009. However, due to state budget cuts, 13 sections had to be eliminated. Requests from instructors to teach online have risen to record numbers. 205 sections were offered in Fall 2009 (including cross-listed, online, hybrid and supplemental courses), as compared to Fall 2008 at 145 sections.
Among the discussion topics in the Distance Education Committee, Curriculum Committee and Department Chair Committee is offering a complete A.A. degree via distance education. Online courses in Communications, Economics, Sociology, History and hybrids in Anatomy and Physiology have been added to the list of available courses, with the result that students can almost fulfill every area of General Education requirements online (Attachment 13 – Fall Online Courses). Currently, the college is three courses away from being able to offer a complete online A.S. degree in Computer Programming. (A Substantive Change Application will be filed in advance of offering such a program.) Distance Education is working with the department chairs to determine if courses in the area of Oral Communications, Physical Education and a science course with a lab are feasible for online delivery at this time.

Prior to Fall 2008, discussions about the role and development of distance education took place at Academic Senate and Department Chairs meetings. Beginning Fall 2008, with the hiring of a Distance Education Coordinator, the Distance Education Committee (referenced above) was created. Members are drawn from the entire body of Gavilan College staff, including instructors, administrators, and classified staff. Significant functions, such as the Disability Resource Center (DRC) and Management Information Systems (MIS), are represented on the committee. One of the primary tasks of the committee has been the development of guidelines for distance education in the form of a “best practices” document. The draft of this document was completed during Fall 2009. The committee meets both in person and online to provide quality control, via standardized training and evaluation, for the college’s distance education program.

PLANNING AGENDA 3

- Use program learning outcomes and/or perform comparative studies so that faculty can evaluate the effectiveness of various delivery systems.

ACTION:

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of different delivery systems, the college has provided training and support for instructional and student services programs on designs and methods for assessing achievement of program level SLOs. For instructional faculty the training and subsequent development of plans took place in Spring 2009. Most programs have completed these plans and have begun to collect assessment data. As the college SLO effort expands and becomes more sophisticated, there will be additional opportunities to use assessment to strengthen programs and courses. For instructional support programs and student services programs, data has already been collected, analyzed, and reported. These findings have been used to inform delivery system adaptations.

During the 2008-2009 academic year, a number of studies were conducted that examined the efficacy of different delivery systems. These studies have been presented and posted on the college research website. The college has also refined the program review process, which uses data to comprehensively examine and evaluate each program’s effectiveness. In particular, during the 2009-2010 academic year the Math Department
has been examining its success rates to determine modifications to the course sequence. Studies were generated which directly led to a change in the math course requirements.

**PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:**
SLO assessment at Gavilan College has begun. As programs and faculty have more information available, they will be able to better address the issues of delivery effectiveness. The institutional researcher has completed a series of comparative studies to assist programs in examining their impact and effectiveness. For example, a study was conducted to examine student performance through the basic skills math sequence. The findings from this study suggested the need to modify the sequence and were the basis for a series of collaborative discussions on the topic. Additionally, studies have been conducted for First Year Experience, the Basic Skills Initiative, and Service Learning, along with a series of student services and instructional support programs. These studies have employed both qualitative and quantitative methodology, with the purpose of informing course and program improvement. The capacity of the college to conduct this type of research will be greatly expanded by the implementation of an Executive Information System (EIS), which will utilize a data warehouse to populate a highly sophisticated user-friendly interface. In a reciprocal agreement, this system is being exported from another college and is in the process of being mapped to the Gavilan College data system.

The program review process also offers an opportunity to examine the effectiveness of different approaches and how the programs operate overall. The Instructional Program Review process has been greatly enhanced and is now more useful in assisting a program to examine, plan, and modify its work. The program review process is also encouraging programs to critically examine aspects of their operations and make data supported modifications.

**PLANNING AGENDAS 8 and 9**
- Encourage widespread faculty discussion on how to adjust teaching to the new 16-week calendar in order to maintain high-quality instruction.
- Evaluate the block schedule and the 16-week calendar for impacts on student achievement.

**ACTION:**
The faculty has engaged in a discussion of the impact of the 16-week semester (adopted in 2006) on instructional planning and delivery, through a series of roundtable discussions. For student achievement, although persistence and retention data have been tracked and analyzed it is difficult to separate these factors from others, such as increased basic skills support over the same time period. Additional data from CalPASS, expected in 2010, will add insight.
PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
The development of a 16-week semester calendar (which replaced the earlier 18-week calendar) followed campus-wide discussions, meetings, senate dialogue, and reflection on the challenges and strategies of moving to a compressed calendar. A survey was administered to a significant portion of the staff and faculty, and workshops were offered during the staff development day to focus on the instructional impact of this change. Following the change, the college instituted a regular assessment of the 16-week calendar based on data collection, regular review of curriculum at the department level, and increased communication with counselors on student preparedness and assessment. A series of round table discussions have been developed to provide faculty with the opportunity to discuss the impact of curriculum, SLO, and calendar changes on instructional practices.

Data has been collected and analyzed to determine the impact on the calendar shift on student success. A review was begun in Summer 2009; however, one data element (contained in a student linkage study that was requested from the CalPass organization) was not yet available. Once the data is received (expected Summer 2010) the report will be made available to the campus community.

PLANNING AGENDA 10

• Review degrees and certificates to ensure that they are up to date as part of the Curriculum Committee process and in addition to the IEC process.

ACTION:
The college has amended an Administrative Procedure (AP 4020: Program, Curriculum and Course Development) to delineate the steps required for the approval of all degrees and certificates (Attachment 15 – AP 4020). The process begins at the department level, moves to the Curriculum Committee, then to the Board of Trustees. For programs that require Chancellor’s Office approval, the process continues with application to the Chancellor’s Office, following their procedures. The new section includes a delineation of how the various parties to course and curriculum development are kept abreast of the progress of a degree or certificate proposal as it moves through the process. These procedures will help ensure that all degrees and certificates are approved at the required level prior to being offered.

The Curriculum Committee relies on the work of the Curriculum Specialist, who serves as the college’s liaison with the Chancellor’s Office and maintains the various databases required for proper inventory of all courses and programs offered by the college. The Curriculum Specialist maintains a list of courses that need to be reviewed and updated, in accord with the regular review required by the Chancellor’s Office. Annually, departments are notified of those courses in their areas that need to be updated during the coming year.
PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
Changes in Title 5 that occurred during the 2007-2008 academic year required colleges to update some of their majors and categorize many of their certificates with prescribed designations, such as Certificate of Achievement for credit certificates approved by the Chancellor’s Office. In the course of reviewing all of the college’s offerings, a detailed analysis was made of all degrees and certificates that appeared in the college catalog and those that appeared on the Chancellor’s Office Inventory of Approved Programs for Gavilan College. It was discovered that the catalog listed a number of certificates and degrees that were no longer being offered. In some cases, the name of the program used in the catalog differed from the name on the Chancellor’s Office Inventory, others did not appear on the Chancellor’s Office Inventory.

With the guidance of Chancellor’s Office staff, the college began the process of reviewing program inventory and applying to the Chancellor’s Office for a series of non-substantial changes and substantial changes, where options for a particular approved major did not appear on the Chancellor’s Office Inventory. The review and updating of degrees and certificates inspired several departments to rethink their degrees and certificates and make significant updates to their curricula. In addition, the routine generation of new degree options and certificates added to the list of applications submitted to the Chancellor’s Office for approval.

As of the end of the 2008-09 academic year, applications for all non-compliant degrees and certificates had been made to the Chancellor’s Office. All applications were processed by the end of the fall 2009 semester, resulting in an accurate Chancellor’s Office Inventory for the college.

PLANNING AGENDA 11
• Work to develop measures for the learning outcomes at the course level.

ACTION:
As of Fall 2007, all Gavilan College course outlines included learning outcomes (Attachment 16 – ANTH 3 – Sample Course Outline). Assessments of course-level outcomes began during the spring 2008 semester and are on-going (Attachment 8 – Sample Data).

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
During the mandatory staff development day in January 2008, Dr. Mary Allen, a consultant and expert in the assessment of learning outcomes, was hired to present a hands-on training session on the assessment of course-level learning outcomes (Attachment 17 – Handouts from Dr. Mary Allen Presentation January 28, 2008). In preparation for the workshop, Dr. Allen reviewed a sample outline from each discipline complete with course level outcomes. This enabled Dr. Allen to ensure that each department knew how to write measurable outcomes prior to creating a plan for their assessment. In general, she found that most of the outcomes reviewed were properly written, and she was able to suggest improvements to others. Her presentation to the
faculty focused on how to write an assessment plan. Following her oral presentation, the faculty assembled by departments to work on their assessment plans. Each faculty member was asked to write an assessment plan for at least one course (Attachment 18 – Sample Course Level SLO Assessment Plan). Many departments worked as a group on a single course. The assessment plans were collected either at the end of the day or within the next few weeks. The January workshop was followed by another hands-on workshop presented by Dr. Allen in April 2008 (Attachment 19 – Handouts from Dr. Mary Allen Presentation April 4, 2008) in which she presented faculty with the tools to write scoring rubrics.

Using their assessment plans, the faculty collected data during Spring 2008. This data was summarized in a report submitted early in Fall 2008 (Attachment 20 – Sample Course Level SLO Assessment Results Report). This initial round of submissions yielded data from approximately 12% of the active courses.

Faculty were asked to create a matrix for their respective departments, delineating a rotation of courses to be assessed and indicating the semester and year that each course would be scheduled for assessment (Attachment 21 – Sample Assessment Rotation Matrix). All courses must be assessed at least once by 2012, (the time of the next accreditation self-study) in accordance with the requirements of the WASC.

The college has now shifted its attention to program-level learning outcomes. In January 2009, Dr. Allen returned to campus to conduct a workshop similar to the one presented in January 2008, but focusing this time on the assessment of program learning outcomes (Attachment 22 – Handouts from Dr. Mary Allen Presentation January 27, 2009). Faculty were asked to assess at least two of their program outcomes during Spring 2009. The results were analyzed, summarized and reported during Fall 2009. Faculty will continue to assess additional program learning outcomes each year with the goal of assessing all program outcomes by 2012. The college will begin to address General Education learning outcomes in Spring 2010.

**PLANNING AGENDA 12**

- Review compliance with IEC recommendations using quantitative and qualitative evaluation.

**ACTION:**

In the 2007-2008 academic year, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) made a series of modifications to collect more useful information to aid in both program review and planning. Additionally, new review procedures were implemented to streamline the process and improve its efficacy, using data to identify needs and trends. Through the review process, programs address these trends with goals and related Unit Plans detailing activities, expected outcomes, and corresponding budget requests. Approximately two years after a program is reviewed by the IEC, it produces a status report to determine progress on its plans and IEC recommendations. A brief form was developed that guides programs in detailing their progress and identifying the factors that have affected it. Programs are encouraged to provide both a narrative and data to illustrate any
progress. The completed forms are reviewed by the IEC, with an emphasis on demonstrated progress.

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
During the 2007-2008 academic year, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee instituted a Status Report, through which programs document their progress on department/program plans or IEC recommendations. The first programs to use the new Status Report were those that had been reviewed in 2006-2007, prior to the IEC policy and procedure modifications. In the 2008-2009 academic year, the Status Report form was improved to obtain more useful information and to be aligned more closely with the revised program review process. As status updates become institutionalized through the IEC process, the qualitative and quantitative data will be a useful tool for continuous program improvement. Since the process is still new, the format will be reviewed by the IEC and adjusted as needed over the next few years.

PLANNING AGENDA 13

- Validate the English department exams.

ACTION:
The English Department changed its student assessment tool from a department-wide exam to a portfolio in Spring 2008. This change will be analyzed to determine whether the quality of assessment is improved by the new method.

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
The English Department began to use portfolio assessments in Fall 2007. The department determined that the portfolio gives a more accurate representation of a student’s overall writing and revision skills than the English Department Exam. The correlation between the course grade and the final department assessment has risen from 65% for the writing exam to 80% for the portfolio. Because the portfolio measures process as well as product, ESL student capabilities are easier to assess. Finally, portfolio compilation better prepares students for the long-term commitment that is needed in students’ future efforts.

PLANNING AGENDAS 14, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 20

- Evaluate the use of student learning outcomes as guides for qualifying courses for GE credit.
- Examine all programs and degrees regularly to ensure that they include up-to-date GE requirements
- In modifying and developing curriculum, include the GE learning outcomes and identify the specific content and methodology associated with each GE area.
- Update existing GE course outlines and require proposed GE courses to include appropriate GE learning outcomes, area content, and methodology.
- Include all program learning outcomes in the 2007-2009 catalog.
- Provide training for faculty to ensure all syllabi have the appropriate course learning objectives that follow the approved course outline.
ACTION:
Qualification of courses for GE credit is the purview of faculty content experts and the Curriculum Committee, who consider course content and other factors as criteria. Faculty, deans, and counselors regularly review curriculum. The Curriculum Committee revised its course outlines to include a listing of the GE learning outcomes satisfied by each course. The 2007-2009 and subsequent 2009-2011 catalogs include program learning outcomes for all programs (Attachment 26 – College Catalog pages 71, 73, 76, 89) and the college’s general education learning outcomes (Attachment 23 – General Education Learning Outcomes (2007-2009 College Catalog pages 45-46, Attachment 2009-2011 catalog, pages 46-47). Syllabi are monitored for course learning outcomes by academic deans and returned to instructors for modification if needed.

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
Evaluation of student learning outcomes (SLOs) is occurring on a continuous basis. Monitoring of the GE requirements occurs in the Curriculum Committee for programs and degrees in an on-going review process and during catalog development. Instructors must include learning outcomes in their course syllabi, which are reviewed by their supervising dean or associate dean.

New curriculum forms, which include General Education Learning Outcomes, are now in use (Attachment 24 – Curriculum Forms with General Education Learning Outcomes). All new and revised curricula for the 2008-2009 academic year had General Education Learning Outcomes included. As new courses are developed and as curriculum goes through its revision cycle, all courses will have integrated General Education Learning Outcomes.

The 2009-2011 college catalog includes learning outcomes for all programs. Program descriptions in the catalog have been improved with greater emphasis on the options offered within each program including the course of study and career opportunities that exist for students who complete a specific degree or certificate (Attachment 27 – 2009-2011 Catalog Descriptions).

PLANNING AGENDA 18
• Integrate ethics, citizenship, cultural diversity, and civic responsibility values into program learning outcomes.

ACTION:
The college offered a workshop on “Culturally Responsive Teaching” in August 2008 (Attachment 25 – Fall 2008 Optional Training Program), attended by approximately 30 faculty members and administrators. Several instructors in Social Science, Communications, English, and Natural Science have worked over the past two years to make Service Learning a key part of selected classes. The classes are going well and research has shown high student, faculty, and agency satisfaction. The Chancellor’s
Office has approved a key component of the Service Learning initiative, an AA degree in Social Science with emphasis on Community Studies. The Service Learning Advisory Board raised money to provide several new service learning scholarships, and awarded these in Spring 2009. The Service Learning Advisory Board continues to meet to aid in implementation of the program’s strategic plan.

**PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:**
A growing number of faculty members are developing an interest in service learning. It is anticipated that the program will develop and expand to the extent that the budget permits.

**PLANNING AGENDA 21**
- *Evaluate articulation staffing and workload to fulfill student transfer needs.*

**ACTION:**
Discuss with Articulation Officer the need to survey faculty and students regarding how articulation efforts meet their needs.

**PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:**
Surveys were developed and conducted in Fall 2009 by the Articulation Officer with assistance from the Institutional Researcher. Data analysis will be reported and available during Spring 2010.

**PLANNING AGENDA 22**
- *Develop a website that lists all Gavilan College classes in an easy-to-use format, and clearly communicates the articulation status for each class.*

**ACTION:**
The website exists. A link to assist.org has been placed on the counseling department webpage and is publicized in the Schedule of Classes each semester.

**PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:**
The Gavilan College website includes updated and comprehensive information on all transfer services, transfer admissions agreements, articulation agreements and additional resources that includes links to other websites including the Gavilan College Career/Transfer Resource Center, ASSIST, Lower Division Transfer Program, UC Transfer and “Ease Your Transition”. The website is user friendly for students to easily access transfer and course articulation information. The information is also linked to the Gavilan College online counseling website.

A summary of articulation activities is published and disseminated to the Curriculum Committee, Department Chair Committee and other appropriate college groups by the Articulation Officer each spring. The summary includes updates on existing CSU and UC agreements, new articulation agreements with private and public institutions, curriculum updates and any updated education patterns (Attachment 28 – Summary of Articulation Activities).
PLANNING AGENDAS 23 and 24

- Notify students in a timely manner via letter, email, through instructor in person, and by phone (if other methods fail) when course changes are made after students have registered.
- Inform counselors early in the process about any course, certificate, or degree changes within any department.

ACTION:
Students are contacted via telephone in the event of a canceled class. If phone calls are not answered and no message is received from a student, a follow-up letter is sent. Students may also be contacted by email. These efforts have priority status and the division administrative assistants ensure that every student is contacted (Attachment 29 – student letter). Counselors are notified in a timely manner when the instructional departments make changes to the schedule.

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
In a recent example, when forty Summer 2009 and eighty Fall 2009 sections were canceled, a team of staff members phoned each student in the canceled classes. Each student was also sent a follow-up letter. Students expressed appreciation for the timely notification. Full implementation of the new Enterprise Resource Planning system, Banner, will provide greater capabilities to contact students in a timely manner when course changes are made. The system has the capability to interface Emergency Alert software, which will be added in 2010.

Division offices inform the Enrollment Services Specialist and counseling staff of any changes in certificate or degree requirements via an email list. Meeting minutes from the Curriculum Committee are distributed to the Counseling Department chair and to the Enrollment Management office regarding course, certificate or degree changes. The counseling department chair makes the change a formal discussion item for the counselors. The Enrollment Service Specialist notes any changes for catalog and schedule production purposes and for schedule change addendums.

PLANNING AGENDA 25

- Update and expand information on the research website.

ACTION:
The Institutional Research webpage has been expanded and enhanced to provide more information on college efforts on SLO trends and evaluative research. The SLO webpage includes information and samples of course and program level SLOs, as well as forms and computational tools. The college’s guidelines for SLOs are available for download, along with minutes from the SLO Advisory Committee. An annual SLO newsletter, highlighting the college SLO efforts is posted on the site.
The Office of Institutional Research updated the basic college data section on the research web page. Comparative research and program evaluation reports were produced that are now available on the Institutional Research website as well as a comprehensive college Factbook, which is downloadable: http://www.gavilan.edu/research/ (Attachment 30 – Factbook). The researcher notifies staff and faculty when major updates occur.

**PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:**
The Institutional Research website was updated during the 2008-2009 academic year. Research Office policies were updated to define research priorities, detail how requests are to be made and the criteria used for prioritization. A new series of pages was added on student learning outcomes that included examples of institutional, program, and course student learning outcomes.

In addition to these new web pages, the basic college data tables that include commonly requested information are continuously updated. A Staff Development Day workshop will be scheduled to explore the college Factbook and other college data. The number of studies completed by the research office greatly increased in the past two years. These are available on the Institutional Research website. As a new Executive Information System (EIS) becomes available and as the capacity of the Institutional Research office increases, more data and studies will be shared on the website.

**PLANNING AGENDAS 26, 27, 28 and 29**
- Complete a comprehensive booklet outlining student conduct, academic freedom, and rights and responsibilities.
- Disseminate District policies concerning personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline during the orientation for new faculty, both full-time and adjunct.
- Train full-time and adjunct faculty and appropriate support staff to prevent, recognize, and respond to cheating.
- Distribute an Academic Honesty Policy widely and frequently to students, and enforce it fairly throughout the college.

**ACTION:**
A Student Rights, Responsibilities and Academic Standards Handbook has been developed which includes The Academic Honesty Policy (Board Policy 5500: Academic Honesty Procedures (Attachment 33 – BP 5500). One thousand copies were produced in printed form and the publication is also available online. The Academic Honesty Policy is also published bi-annually in the catalog and included in the Schedule of Classes, printed twice annually.

The district’s policy on academic freedom is included in the college catalog (Attachment 31 – BP 4030), and the Code of Ethics of the Education Profession is reprinted in the Faculty Handbook (Attachment 32 – Code of Ethics of Education Profession). Faculty have begun to use Turn It In software to detect plagiarism in student work.
PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
The Student Rights, Responsibilities and Academic Standards Handbook has been distributed widely throughout the campus community. It is reviewed at student orientation, serves as a guide for student discipline issues, grade disputes and all processes related to students rights and responsibilities. The Academic Honesty Policy is included in the handbook, the Schedule of Classes, and the Gavilan College Catalog (published every two years, and available in print and online.) The Academic Honesty Policy is available in both English and Spanish languages. Dissemination of the Academic Honesty Policy occurs at both the new faculty orientation and at the Professional Development Day for all Gavilan College staff. In addition, many faculty members are now including this information on their course syllabi in order to provide uniformity and consistency in shaping positive student behavior.

Gavilan College continues to establish policy with regard to cheating. In 2009, the college purchased Turn It In, a software package for identifying plagiarized work. Funding for the software was provided by the Social Sciences Department through a Title V grant that is supporting campus use of the software during the 2009-2010 academic year on a pilot basis. Potential consequences for students who are found to be guilty of plagiarism are limited by a legal advisory from the Chancellor’s Office (Attachment 34 – Plagiarism Advisory) A workshop entitled “Teacher Inquiry Circles: Practices with Plagiarism” was offered on the Optional Faculty Training Day for Fall 2008. A workshop entitled “Plagiarism: Legal Perspectives and Student Rights” was offered on the Optional Training Day in 2009.

Policies concerning academic honesty will continue to be presented during new faculty orientations, and the Student Rights, Responsibilities and Academic Standards Handbook is available to all Gavilan College staff and students. The plagiarism issue continues to be a topic of discussion at the Academic Senate and Department Chairs, specifically with regard to the increasing numbers of online courses. Under discussion are specific procedures for instructors to use when they suspect plagiarism, with the goal of consistency and uniformity in handling consequences. Dissemination of the information on cheating will be ongoing. Periodic workshops covering issues surrounding student cheating will be incorporated into faculty staff development activities as we continue to receive direction from the Chancellor’s Office through legal advisories.

Faculty training in Academic Freedom is provided by the Vice President of Instruction during orientations for new faculty.
STANDARD IIB
Student Learning Programs and Services – Support Services

PLANNING AGENDA 1

• Develop assessment methods for the division’s student learning outcomes.

ACTION:
An assessment plan has been developed for all student services units. Data collection was completed in Fall 2008.

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
During the academic year 2008-2009, the Student Services Division participated in program review through the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC). The IEC developed a new Student Services Program Review template to assist in evaluating each of the service delivery areas of Student Services. Each unit of student services completed a thorough self-study that included respective mission statements, program descriptions, goals, and scope of programs. The template included assessment methods for gauging program or student learning outcomes and whether these activities supported student learning and enhanced achievement of the mission of the college. Each program developed a matrix that included institutional outcomes linking the strategic plan, program/student learning outcomes, assessment and measurement, data/results and use of the results. Included in this process was the development of Unit Plans and Budget Requests. Final recommendations for each student services unit are included in the IEC Report. This information is available on the Gavilan College website: http://www.gavilan.edu under faculty/staff, intranet, regularly scheduled meetings, IEC. The entire report is available through the Office of the Vice President of Student Services and the IEC Committee. The Student Services Division is demonstrating continuous improvement by addressing community and student needs as identified in these assessments.

PLANNING AGENDAS 2 and 3

• Publish the policy statement regarding Acceptance of Transfer Credits in the next printed catalog (2007-2009).
• List the locations or publications where other college policies may be found in the published catalog.

ACTION:
This information was published in the 2007-2009 Catalog and was again included in the 2009-2011 Catalog. Included is information about transfer of credit from institutions fully accredited by regional accrediting agencies, from foreign institutions, and the process for ordering Gavilan College transcripts.

The following statement is included in the printed catalog to indicate where, in addition to the printed catalog, students may find policy and procedure information:
“Policies and procedures are subject to Board review and may change. Students are invited to review current policies and procedures by visiting the Gavilan College website at [www.gavilan.edu](http://www.gavilan.edu).”

**PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:**
The college catalog is reviewed and published every other year. The catalog contains general information, certificate and degree requirements, major policies and web site links. The Gavilan College website contains an electronic catalog, plus information on students rights and responsibilities, as well as code of conduct materials. In addition, the Degree and Certificate Oversight Group (DCOG), meets throughout the year to insure that the degree and certificate inventory is accurate and will be reflected both on the web and in future catalogs.

**PLANNING AGENDA 4**
- Develop a student evaluation of off-site support services and improve the services after the survey is analyzed.

**ACTION:**
Several student services to the off-sites have been expanded within the last year and evaluated. A survey was administered in Fall 2008 as part of the assessment of Program Learning Outcomes to more globally address the effectiveness of these additional services.

**PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:**
The following programs have expanded service delivery to both the Morgan Hill and Hollister sites: EOPS, DRC, Career Services, Tutoring, Financial Aid and Assessment. EOPS has expanded services for both EOPS/CalWORKS programs by placing two different staff at each location. DRC has also expanded services that include counseling one evening per month. In addition, tutoring services, financial aid workshops and placement/assessment testing are being offered at the off-sites. These student services programs have expressed an interest in providing more comprehensive services and offer “One-Stop” centers at the off-sites but are limited by staffing and current budget constraints.

The Institutional Researcher developed a student evaluation survey for use at both off-sites. The surveys were conducted in December 2008. Students were queried about specific student services that they had or had not received. Data was collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of these additional services and whether students found them useful. Students were also asked for comments. The results for both the Morgan Hill and Hollister sites indicated that the majority of the students who received the services found them either “Useful” or “Very Useful” and comments from the students indicated that they were generally satisfied with the information that they had received. Results of the surveys can be found on the Institutional Research Website [http://www.gavilan.edu/research/Surveys.html](http://www.gavilan.edu/research/Surveys.html).
PLANNING AGENDA 5

• Assess the need for an earthquake recovery plan.

ACTION:
As of October 2009, our plan includes eventual offsite storage of electronic backup data. Some of the necessary hardware and software for this effort have been acquired, and MIS staff has begun training in their use. Additional resources are necessary to complete this item. The MIS department plans to have all needed equipment, software, and procedures for off-site backup in place by Spring 2011.

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
The college has assessed the need for an earthquake recovery plan along with a disaster recovery plan for electronic data specifically related to student records. The plan includes off-site storage of electronic backup data by Spring 2011, at one of the off-site locations. The option of using an outside vendor for disaster recovery was investigated and found to be cost prohibitive for the college.

STANDARD IIC
Student Learning Programs and Services -
Library and Learning Support Services

PLANNING AGENDAS 1 and 5

• Assess staffing needs and equal access for all students, while developing more online training modules and alternative methods for delivery of library services.
• Explore ways of bringing library services to the off-sites.

ACTION:
Library staffing needs are assessed through an annual Staffing Review and compared with staffing levels at other community college libraries. Staffing is also evaluated through the IEC (Institutional Effectiveness Committee) process. The library staff presents library orientations to students at the Gilroy, Hollister and Morgan Hill sites and to evening students. Orientations for online classes are delivered in person. The Hollister site has added a library room with access to the online catalog.

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
In Fall 2008 the library staff inaugurated the “Ask a Librarian” online reference service. Students log onto an interactive chat window during real time reference librarian hours and receive responses to their research questions. The college is also planning to implement “Captivate and Camtasia” software to create videos that mirror face-to-face orientations. The library has augmented its off-site presentations by reallocating staff and using grant funding to hire adjunct reference librarians. In off-campus locations, the Library web site becomes the venue for the “tour.”
PLANNING AGENDAS 2 and 4

- Use the collegiate process to determine and plan for all tutoring center staffing needs.
- Determine annually whether the current lab hours are adequate for students.

**ACTION:**
The college hired a full-time Learning Center coordinator Spring 2008 to oversee the tutoring center. This coordinator determines the need for tutors using the FTES report. A student survey has been developed and is administered annually (and every semester starting in 2009)

**PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:**
The task of developing a survey to assess the adequacy of lab hours was assigned to the Learning Center coordinator in 2007-08, and surveys have been conducted on a regular basis since that time. The college is currently developing a program for students to access tutoring services in the Computer Place, which is located in the library (in addition to the traditional services offered in the Tutoring Center.) This will augment learning support services and provide an opportunity to develop and improve information competency skills.

PLANNING AGENDA 3

- Develop a communications plan to make more staff, especially adjunct, weekend, and evening faculty, aware of the Staff Resource Center (formerly called “media center”) and its services.

**ACTION:**
At the beginning of each semester, all adjunct, weekend, and evening faculty receive a hard copy of the SRC webpage listing the resources available to them. The Staff Resource Center (SRC) provides training to faculty and staff on software and technology to enhance classroom instruction. The SRC web provides access to staff who work off-campus or evenings, providing a guide to the SRC resources:
http://www.gavilan.edu/src/ (Attachment 35 – staff center resources).

**PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:**
In addition to the webpage and the flyer distributed each semester, the Staff Resource Center is often used or promoted during Staff Development Days. The full-staff presentation for Spring 2010 will include a referral to the Staff Resource Center for hands-on experimentation with the new Luminis portal and social media tools.
PLANNING AGENDAS 6 and 7

- **Support students at the off-sites with tutoring.**
- **Explore ways of supporting evening, weekend, and off-site classes. Explore ways to support weekend and evening students**

**ACTION:**
The college recognizes the need to provide services to our offsite, evening and weekend students. While our weekend course offerings are minimal, our evening offerings are substantial and as funding becomes available, more services should be developed for this population.

The Basic Skills Initiative provided math tutors for Math 205 and 233 during Summer 2008. Tutoring services are now offered two days per week at both off-site locations.

**PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:**
The Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math grant (STEM) funding and the inauguration of flexible hour requirements for adjunct staff have allowed expansion of math tutoring at the off-sites during fall and spring semesters to cover Math 205 and Math 233. In Summer 2009, a tutor at the Hollister site was scheduled to accommodate students from both Math 233 and Math 205 to use tutoring services.

All students, including those who attend in the evening and weekends have benefited from access to web-based services implemented in the past year with the launch of Self-Service Banner. Students can register for classes, pay their bills, check financial aid status, retrieve their schedules and grades, and accomplish a host of other tasks. Online counseling services are available and have been provided for the past four years.

Evening students are perhaps best served at our off-site locations, Hollister and Morgan Hill. Personnel are available until 8pm on Mondays through Thursdays to support student’s needs in registration, use of labs, and other support services. The EOPS office offers extended hours of service at the off-sites. The DRC makes available evening counseling appointments as well. The bookstore services evening students at the off-sites at the beginning of each semester with a book sales program.

On the main campus in Gilroy, counseling appointments have been offered Mondays through Thursdays until 8pm for evening students during the fall and spring semesters. Extended hours of operation for the Admission and Records Office and Cashier are generally offered during peak and late registration. Access to various labs, the library and tutoring services are available, though sometimes limited, for evening students. The DRC has extended the hours of operation in the High Tech Center and the Learning Skills Lab into the early evening. State budget reductions in 2009-10 forced the temporary reduction in some of these hours.
Counseling, EOPS, DRC, Career Services and Financial Aid have expanded their services but on a limited basis. Although their Unit Plans and Budget Requests for 2009-2010 indicated plans for more comprehensive services, recent state budget reductions to these programs have delayed implementation of these plans.

PLANNING AGENDA 8

- *Explore methods of technical coordination among television, digital media, and journalism to facilitate collaboration.*

**ACTION:**

During the 2008-2009 school year the journalism program and GavTV were housed in the same building, and, as a result, the two were able to share expertise. For example, the journalism instructor presented a workshop on ethical standards in journalism to media students. Journalism students have produced stories for GavTV by interviewing and videotaping subjects in addition to their printer coverage. Although the journalism program has since returned to its renovated building, the relationship formed between the two programs is expected to continue. Digital media routinely provides content for GavTV. Students move easily among the three disciplines. In the future, classes may be scheduled at the same time to facilitate shared instruction.

**PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:**

Informal collaboration has been effective; more formal structure will enhance the connections between the disciplines.

PLANNING AGENDA 9

- *Measure E bond funding includes the renovation of the library building. Security design issues will be carefully planned in consultation with the library faculty and staff.*

**ACTION:**

Measure E bond funding includes the local match for the renovation of the library building, with the balance to be provided by state funds. An Initial Plan Proposal (IPP) has been submitted for state funding of this project. The IPP was developed through user group meetings (Attachment 36 – Library User Group Meetings) that included library faculty and staff. The IPP was approved by the Gavilan College Board of Trustees and then forwarded to the state. After the IPP was accepted the college developed and submitted a Final Project Proposal (FPP) for the library renovation.

**PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:**

On June 9, 2009, the Board of Trustees approved Resolution No. 907 (Attachment 37 – Resolution 907) authorizing the submission of a Final Project Proposal (FPP) (Attachment 38, #1 and #2 – Final Project Proposal) to the state for the renovation of the Library/Media Building. The FPP addresses security issues among other considerations.
PLANNING AGENDA 10
  •  *Measure E funding will provide air conditioning throughout the campus.*

ACTION:
Measure E bond funding includes providing air conditioning throughout the campus in those facilities being renovated as outlined in the Facilities Improvement Plan.

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
As of October 2009, the following buildings have had air conditioning either added or upgraded: Multipurpose Building (formerly Occupational Education), the three science buildings, the Humanities, Art, and Music Buildings, Security and Facilities (formerly Maintenance and Security) and all of the buildings in use as interim housing and swing space. Over the next two years, air conditioning will either be upgraded or added to the Cosmetology, Business, and Social Science Buildings. All other new or renovated building projects submitted to the state include air conditioning.

PLANNING AGENDA 11
  •  *Identify needs to provide adequate staffing support and computer lab security.*

ACTION:
The Library, Computer Place, classroom and adjacent Digital Media, Computer Graphics, Design and High Tech Center computer labs are protected by alarm systems that are set nightly. Campus Security provides frequent monitoring of all library facilities.

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
A new inventory control program is being implemented to ensure tracking of high-value equipment.

PLANNING AGENDA 12
  •  *Clarify the relationship between Community Media Access Partnership (CMAP) and GavTV with regard to the building, equipment, and maintenance.*

ACTION:
Improved communications between staff at GavTV and CMAP has resulted in better coordination of studio usage and equipment maintenance issues. CMAP regularly provides a percentage of repair funds for the Gavilan College television studio.

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
The terms of the MOU created between CMAP and GAV-TV in August of 2003 continue to guide the relationship with regard to equipment, maintenance, and the original division of the TV Studio hours. The understanding continues to guide studio use. When scheduling changes are needed, CMAP and GavTV personnel meet to make adjustments. The CMAP Program Director participates in the GavTV Committee to facilitate regular communication.
STANDARD IIIA
Human Resources

PLANNING AGENDA 1

• **Develop a written evaluation procedure for adjunct faculty that includes frequency of evaluation.**

**ACTION:**
During the 2007-2008 academic year, the administration and GCFA entered negotiations to develop written evaluation procedures for adjunct faculty. A draft procedure was presented by the administration which included a provision that tenured faculty complete classroom visits and report back to the dean. Student evaluation and written course materials would also be considered in the final evaluation report. Key to the process was that the deans would not have to personally visit all classes of continuing adjunct faculty, as workload considerations would be significant. GCFA did not agree to have full-time faculty evaluate their peers and countered with a proposal that would require the deans to visit the classroom of every adjunct faculty member to be evaluated. Citing workload consideration for the deans, the administration rejected this proposal and negotiations were suspended. The college developed and implemented a process which uses qualified outside evaluators to make the classroom observations.

**PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:**
New adjunct faculty members are evaluated by their deans during their first semester teaching: continuing adjunct faculty are evaluated every three years. The college hired a qualified outside evaluator on a year-to-year contract to evaluate continuing adjunct faculty using the same procedure currently used for new adjunct faculty. Evaluation includes an administrative classroom visit, a student evaluation, self-evaluation and a review of written materials such as syllabi, exams, quizzes and other course handouts. Follow up classroom visits and/or meetings are conducted in a timely manner and as needed. The evaluation process includes assessment of performance and feedback to guide improvement. This system has brought consistency and comprehensive review to the adjunct faculty evaluation process.

PLANNING AGENDA 2

• **Develop an evaluation plan for administrators modeled after the process that is used for the President.**

**ACTION:**
In the fall of 2008, the Human Resources (HR) department, in collaboration with the Institutional Researcher, developed an online evaluation instrument for administrators. It was piloted in March 2009. The survey gathered information about administrators from all constituent groups and provided valuable information to the Vice Presidents for their performance evaluations of their management employees. While the President’s evaluation includes an “in person” interview with employees (chosen at random), the
online feedback for administrators provided through the pilot process adds a collaborative, inclusive element to the administrators’ evaluations.

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
The online Supervisor Feedback Survey (Attachment 39 – Supervisor Evaluation Survey) was launched in March 2009. Prior to that, from October 2008 to February 2009, the HR department, in collaboration with the Institutional Researcher, conducted several pilot surveys with cross-sections of employees to gather input on the survey design and process. Suggestions gathered during the pilot trials were incorporated into the final design. Overall, 92% of staff participated in the pilot process. Final data was collected and used by administration for supervisors’ 2009 evaluations. The next step will be additional training for all managers in the interpretation and use of online evaluation data. Once a permanent Human Resource Director is in place, this training will be conducted on a regular basis.

PLANNING AGENDA 3
• Use the collegial process and negotiations to determine methods and procedures for the evaluation of staff effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes.

ACTION:
In Fall 2007, the Student Learning Outcomes Advisory Committee (SLOAC) was established, made up of representatives from all the college divisions, in addition to the Vice President of Instruction and the SLO coordinator. The committee is a subcommittee of the Academic Senate. The SLOAC produced a Gavilan College SLO Guidelines document (Attachment 49- Student Learning Outcomes Guidelines) that details how SLO efforts will be defined and implemented at the college. The document was approved and signed by the College President, the Vice President of Instruction, and the faculty senate chair. The document is accessible on the Gavilan College SLO website.

The SLO Guidelines specifically state that SLO results will not be used as a faculty or staff evaluation tool. While the SLO assessment is intended to provide information on which to make informed decisions about course and program improvements, using this data to determine faculty effectiveness would be fraught with ethical and methodological problems.

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
The college is currently implementing comprehensive SLO assessment and reporting procedures. An SLO coordinator has been identified, and the formation of the SLO Advisory Committee, SLO Guidelines, and a SLO website are complete. A series of training and support sessions has been conducted. Forms for reporting and a submission cycle have been established. So far, staff and faculty participation has been at a moderately high level. An online submission and tracking system will allow for the identification of those courses and programs that may need additional support. The institution has made much progress in encouraging staff and faculty to complete SLO
assessment and use it to modify courses and programs. Complete implementation will require ongoing effort and discussion.

PLANNING AGENDA 4
• Develop an evaluation process for off-campus professional activities.

ACTION:
After a permanent Director of Human Resources is hired, The Human Resources Department will determine a method to evaluate the effectiveness of off-campus professional activities, and will implement as needed.

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
This item is not yet complete. After the hiring of a permanent Human Resource Director, a simple survey or evaluation instrument will be developed for use by participants of both off-site and on-site conferences and professional development activities. Survey results will provide data to inform continuous improvement.

STANDARD IV
Leadership and Governance

PLANNING AGENDA 1
• Develop a communications plan to educate all employees on the planning and budgeting process.

ACTION:
The following flowchart summarizes the steps of the planning and budget process. This flowchart is posted on the Gavilan College website:
PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
Investigation has revealed that past inconsistency in the treatment of budget requests emanating from program reviews has led to a lack of understanding about the budgeting process. Some college personnel who were not directly involved in preparing Unit Plans and Budget Requests were unaware of the process. The process for budget development has now been widely disseminated and discussed in every major committee on campus. Adding the information to the college’s website, and information about budget development in the campus newsletter, should result in more awareness of the budget process. Board Policy and Administrative Procedures clearly describe the process that is followed.
Program reviews are completed by each department every three to five years and include a Unit Plan. Where additional financial resources are needed to achieve Unit Plan objectives, these are included in an attached Budget Request Form, which is then incorporated into the budget allocation process for the next three years. The diagram above shows that budget requests are created in support of unit plans and then considered for inclusion in the Tentative Budget. Additionally, Gavilan College has incorporated assessment of resource allocation decisions into the planning process. Departments that request resources must indicate what desired outcome is expected as a result of those additional resources.

PLANNING AGENDA 2
• Employ the college’s participatory process for all institution-wide decisions.

ACTION:
The college uses the process as outlined in the flowchart below to address all proposed changes in operations at the college.

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:
The college uses the shared governance process outlined in the flowchart above to address all proposed changes in operations at the college. When urgent circumstances so dictate, the college President may be required to act in order to protect the interests of the college district. No events have bypassed the outlined governance process since 2004. Because the college is expanding into new areas, it cannot be foreseen in all cases where events may require an immediate response. As a general rule, all changes that require
approval by the Board of Trustees are fully vetted on campus prior to being presented to the Board of Trustees for consideration.

Board Policy 2510 and Administrative Procedure 2510 describe participation in local decision-making. These processes accurately describe the practices used at the college.

President’s Council agendas identify what is expected of the council through use of a designation of “R” for an item requiring a recommendation from the council. Other designations are “I” for information items where a person lists a topic and a presenter who will provide information about a topic. Many recent information items have focused on budget development and the impact of the state’s actions on Gavilan College’s budget. The Tentative Budget and the Final Budget are presented to the council prior to submission to the Board of Trustees. Council members are given an opportunity to ask questions and provide input on the budget. The Academic Senate is also provided an opportunity to make recommendations on the budget and to be involved in the development of the budget via the Budget Committee of President’s Council.

A campus survey conducted in January 2008 revealed that the vast majority of survey respondents (58.3%) did not feel their group was adequately represented at President’s Council. Another 68.9% of participants responded negatively to a closely related question asking whether decision-making is shared by all groups. They did not feel involved in the decision-making process. To address this concern the college has focused on involving all employees in the department-level development of Unit Plans. Participation in the process itself can illustrate how decisions made by departments are used as the basis for development of the Strategic Plan. Common themes developed in Unit Plans form the foundation for strategic planning. This process was fully implemented during 2008-2009 in development of the 2009-2010 through 2014-2015 Strategic Plan.

A second survey will be conducted during 2009-2010 to determine the extent to which participation in Unit Plan development has changed the perceptions of campus personnel regarding their involvement in shared decision-making.

PLANNING AGENDA 3

- **On an annual basis, the college should reaffirm its shared decision making model and identify any changes that may be appropriate to improve the effectiveness of the process.**

**ACTION:**
The college is now annually evaluating its shared governance process. The process for the evaluation was discussed in October 2007 ([Attachment 50 - Evaluation of Governance Process, Presidents Council, October 2007](#)).

**PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS:**
Since Fall 2007, the college President has provided an orientation to President Council for council members. At the start of the academic year new members are typically
assigned as representatives to the council. The College President reviews Board Policy 2510 and Administrative Procedure 2510 during the orientation to President’s Council. A survey of the campus community to determine their understanding of President’s Council was conducted in the fall of 2007. The following is a summary of survey results:

**Survey Participation:**
Approximately 22% of the staff and student representative population participated in the study. Administrators and part-time faculty were not as well represented as other groups. Any interpretation of the findings must include the understanding that survey respondents represented only a small proportion of the total staff and student population.

**Communication:**
There is clearly a lack of knowledge about the President’s Council and how it operates. A majority of respondents reported knowing nothing or very little about most aspects of the President’s Council (percentages ranged from 60-75%). Several suggestions were made to improve communication, such as send out a summary before and after the President’s Council meetings. Most preferred to receive this information via email but several respondents suggested that the information could be shared through departmental meetings and at Staff Development Day.

**Shared Governance:**
According to a majority of participants, there is a need to improve shared governance procedures and/or perceptions. Sixty-nine percent of respondents reported that they thought college decision-making is shared by all groups “not at all” or “a little.” Some comments echoed this finding. Suggestions for improving participation in shared governance included improved communications and posting of agenda’s prior to meetings so individuals can get more involved in the process.

The information from the survey reveals a gap between perceptions of shared governance and the shared governance activities actually occurring. The process itself is defined and codified in both Board Policy and Administrative Procedure. The defined process is followed in practice and is an accurate description of what occurs when and how decisions are made on campus. Specific suggestions made by survey respondents are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey respondents’ preferred methods of receiving information about the President’s Council.</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departmental meetings</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the item, suggested improvements of information dissemination (64 responses), below were the clustered themes:
Send information out through the Department Chairs and Departmental representatives;
Send out brief email summary about the meetings;
Send out the agenda with items prior to the meeting;
Have information presented at the Staff Development Day;
Have a President’s Council liaison who is responsible for distributing information;
Provide more information.

**For the item, suggested improvements of operation (35 responses), below were the clustered themes:**
- More shared governance is needed;
- Better communication;
- A part-time departmental representative is needed;
- Once a year, send out explanation of the President’s Council’s processes;
- Be sure to share information and seek input before decisions are made.

The comments received from the Fall 2007 survey were discussed with President’s Council at the beginning of Academic Year 2008-2009. Communication is the most significant problem noted in the surveys. Several of the suggestions for improvement are, in fact, already occurring. Specifically, President’s Council agendas and minutes are posted to the college’s website. The President’s Executive Assistant is the primary point of contact for information coming from President’s Council.

Communication will be increased to inform the college community the intent of President’s Council and how it operates. The role and objectives of President’s Council are appropriately stated in Board Policy and Administrative Procedure. The use of the term “shared governance” is a major source of confusion. Accreditation Standards require that dialogue occur and that college constituencies be involved in decision making processes. Some have interpreted the phrase “shared governance” to mean the decision-making authority rests with a committee. That is not the case. President’s Council is an advisory body to the President who in turn makes recommendations to the Board of Trustees. The authority, responsibility and accountability for all decisions rests with the Board of Trustees as a matter of law. Better communication about the expectations of activities of President’s Council should increase the level of understanding about the role of President’s Council.
Update on Substantive Change in Progress

Gavilan College had a Substantive Change Application approved by ACCJC at the November 20, 2009 meeting of the Substantive Change Committee. Gavilan College, in cooperation with the Carpenter’s Training Committee for Northern California, conducts a Carpenter Apprentice Program that leads to a Certificate of Achievement or Associate of Arts Degree. The Gavilan College Board of Trustees approved the Carpenter Apprentice Program in June 2008. The fulfillment of each of the accreditation standards is outlined in the application and includes supportive documentation illustrating the sustainability of the program.
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