

# **EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT**

San Diego Miramar College  
10440 Black Mountain Road  
San Diego, CA 92126

A Confidential report prepared for  
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the External Evaluation team that visited  
San Diego Miramar College March 13 – March 16, 2017

Glenn R. Roquemore, PhD  
Chair

## Table of Contents

I.	List of Team members.....	3
II.	Summary of the External Evaluation Report.....	4
III.	Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2017 External Evaluation Team.....	6
IV.	Introduction.....	10
V.	Eligibility Requirements.....	12
VI.	Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Related Commission policies.....	14
VII.	STANDARD I	
	a. Standard I.A: Mission.....	21
	b. Standard I.B: Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness.....	24
	c. Standard I.C: Institutional Quality.....	29
VIII.	STANDARD II	
	a. Standard II.A: Instructional Programs.....	33
	b. Standard II.B: Library and Learning Support Services.....	43
	c. Standard II.C: Student Support Services.....	46
IX.	STANDARD III	
	a. Standard III.A: Human Resources.....	50
	b. Standard III.B: Physical Resources.....	62
	c. Standard III.C: Technology Resources.....	66
	d. Standard III.D: Financial Resources.....	73
X.	STANDARD IV	
	a. Standard IV.A: Decision-Making Roles and Processes.....	80
	b. Standard IV.B: Chief Executive Officer.....	84
	c. Standard IV.C: Governing Board.....	88
	d. Standard IV.D: Multi-College Districts or Systems.....	94
XI.	Quality Focus Essay Feedback.....	97

## List of Members

Dr. Glenn R. Roquemore (Chair)  
President  
Irvine Valley College

Mr. Wes Bryan  
President  
Golden West College

Mr. Oscar De Haro  
Assist. Superintendent/VPSS  
Napa Valley College

Mr. Kelly William Enos  
Professor of Criminal Justice  
LA Mission College

Dr. Veronica Ogata  
Faculty, Student Success Coord. &  
Education Program Coord.  
Kapiolani Community College

Dr. Tammy Montgomery  
Assoc. VP of Instruction  
American River College

Dr. Christina Tafoya  
Dean, Career Technical Education  
Oxnard College

Mr. Daniel Villanueva  
VP of Admin. Services  
LA Mission College

Dr. Keith Wurtz  
Dean, Inst. Effectiveness, Research, and  
Planning  
Crafton Hills College

Dr. Mohammed Yahdi  
Faculty, Math & Activities Dir., College to  
Univ. Program  
Hartnell College

## Summary of the External Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION: San Diego Miramar College

DATES OF VISIT: March 13-March 16, 2017

TEAM CHAIR: Glenn R. Roquemore, PhD

A ten-member accreditation team visited San Diego Miramar College (SDMC or College) March 13-March 16, 2017 for determining whether the College continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and USDE regulations. The team evaluated how well the College is achieving its stated purposes, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC or Commission) regarding the accredited status of the College.

In preparation for the visit, the team chair attended a team chair-training workshop on December 1, 2016 and conducted a pre-visit to the campus on January 17, 2017. During this visit, the chair met with campus leadership and key personnel involved in the self-evaluation preparation process. The entire external evaluation team received team training provided by staff from ACCJC on January 20, 2017.

The evaluation team received the College's Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) and related evidence several weeks prior to the site visit. Team members found it to be a comprehensive, well-written document detailing the processes used by the College to address Eligibility Requirements (ERs), Commission Standards, and Commission Policies. The team confirmed that the entire College community including Faculty, staff, students, and administration compiled the ISER through broad participation. The team found that the College provided a very thoughtful self-evaluation containing several self-identified action plans for institutional improvement. The report was somewhat lengthy equaling 475 pages. In addition, several of the links to evidence did not point directly to the evidence referenced in the report.

On Monday afternoon, March 13, team members visited SDMC and were provided with a comprehensive college orientation, a tour of the main campus, and a brief reception.

During the evaluation visit, team members conducted about 37 formal meetings, interviews, and observations involving College employees, students, and board members. There were numerous less formal interactions with students and employees outside of officially scheduled interviews and there were also informal observations of classes and other learning venues. Two open forums provided the College community and members of the SDMC community opportunities to meet with members of the evaluation team.

The team reviewed numerous materials supporting the ISER in the team room and electronically, which included documents and evidence supporting the Standards, ERs,

Commission Policies, and USDE regulations. Evidence reviewed by the team included, but was not limited to, documents such as institutional plans, program review procedures and reports, student learning outcomes evidence, distance education classes, College policies and procedures, enrollment information, committee minutes and materials, and College governance structure. The team also viewed evidence and documentation through the College's intranet and electronic copies stored on a flash drive.

The team greatly appreciated the enthusiasm and support from College employees throughout the visit. The team appreciated the assistance of key staff members who assisted the team with requests for individual meetings and other needs throughout the evaluation process. Campus staff members met every request in a very timely manner.

The team found the College to be in compliance with all ERs, Commission Policies, and USDE regulations. The team found a number of innovative and effective practices and programs and issued a number of commendations to the College. The team issued some recommendations to increase effectiveness.

## **Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2017 External Evaluation Teams**

### **College Commendations**

**College Commendation 1:** The team commends the College for its vibrant, attractive, and inviting campus life that engages students, promotes student learning and creates a sense of community and belonging. (II.B, II.C)

**College Commendation 2:** The team commends the College for its Strategic Plan Assessment Scorecard, the setting of targets, and the mapping of the Strategic Plan and benchmarks to committees and plans and for helping to facilitate the use of data for planning and decision making in a way that is easily consumed by faculty, staff, and managers. (I.A)

**College Commendation 3:** The team commends the College for its commitment to continuous quality improvement, dialogue, and collaboration. As stated by many staff, faculty, and administrators, the Loss/Momentum Framework has helped to transform the culture of evidence-based decision making, integration, and continuous quality of improvement. (I.B)

**College Commendation 4:** The team commends the College for its Passport to Success program which provides a transfer pathway for students, developed by students. (I.B)

**College Commendation 5:** The team commends the College for its steadfast commitment to students and the College's willingness to collaborate and work together across disciplines, areas, and constituencies to engage and serve students. (I.B)

**College Commendation 6:** The team commends the College for its progress on improving teaching and learning for distance education students. (II.A.2)

**College Commendation 7:** The team commends the College for its diverse and successful CTE programs, strong leadership, and advisory boards as well as its focus on building infrastructure, expanding program options, developing new programs, and improving outcomes. (II.A.14)

**College Commendation 8:** The team commends the College's library, audiovisual, and learning support services for their proactive approach to identifying student needs and expanding opportunities that enrich the learning environment, access, and equity. (II.B, III.C)

**College Commendation 9:** The team commends the College's students for earning the 2016 Five Star Chapter designation for Beta Iota Lambda Chapter. (II.C)

**College Commendation 10:** The team commends the College for the RP Group Excellence in Planning Award for their *Student Success Framework for Long-Term Integrated Planning*. (IV.A.1, IV.B.4)

**College Commendation 11:** The team commends the Board of Trustees for their student-centered and student-success oriented goals that tie directly to Accreditation Standards and the District’s Strategic Goals. (IV.C)

**College Commendation 12:** The team commends the Board of Trustees for accessible, clear and concise policies that provide guidance for the effective operation of the Board. (IV.C)

**College Commendation 13:** The team commends the College president for a style of leadership that actively welcomes and engages everyone in the advancement of the College’s mission and service to the community.

### **College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance**

**College Recommendation 1 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness and better determine whether its mission directs institutional priorities, the team recommends that the College engage Administrative, Instructional Support, and Student Services programs in program review to address how well program missions align with the College mission. (I.A.2)

**College Recommendation 2 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College analyze learning outcomes assessment results by meaningful disaggregation of data by subpopulations of students, instructional and tutorial delivery methods, learning support services, and locations to enhance dialogue and prompt appropriate action. (I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, II.B.1, ER 11)

**College Recommendation 3 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College develop a procedure for evaluating its program review processes for student services, administrative services, and instructional services to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of the mission. (I.B.7)

**College Recommendation 4 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for all courses, programs, certificates and degrees using established institutional procedures. (II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.3, ER11)

**College Recommendation 5 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends the College publish two-year course sequence charts in the College catalog. (II.A.6)

**College Recommendation 6 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College improve assessment for all Student Support Services and implement annual assessment tools in addition to the three-year student feedback surveys to document support of student learning for demonstrating continuous quality improvement. (II.B.2, II.B.3, II.C.1, II.C.7)

**College Recommendation 7 (Improvement):** In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the College align its plans for technology support staffing needs with its capital improvement projects. (III.C.1, III.C.3)

**College Recommendation 8 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College follow through on its Actionable Improvement Plans and Action Project to better assess and improve its shared governance procedures and practices as delineated in the Quality Focus Essay. (IV.A.7)

### **District Commendations**

**District Commendation 1:** The Team commends the District for its organization and collaborative systems supporting an aligned curriculum across all colleges to ensure students can access courses across the District with ease. (II.A.5)

**District Commendation 2:** The Team commends the District for its robust professional development programs, especially the Leadership Development Academy series available to all employees. (III.A.12)

**District Commendation 3:** The Team commends the District on its prudent approach to establishing reserves to fund future financial obligations such as the increased pension expenses and Other Post Employment Benefits liabilities (OPEB). (III.D.12)

**District Commendation 4:** The Team commends the high level of Board engagement with the District and its high level of commitment to continued professional development around issues impacting the District as well as the California Community College System. (IV.C.5,8,13)

**District Commendation 5:** The Team commends the Board's establishment of, and participation with, the Citizen's Advisory Council that brings to the District a strong degree of public participation and contact. (IV.C.4)

**District Commendation 6:** The Team commends the Chancellor for District leadership, setting high expectations for educational excellence and integrity, assuring effective support of the Colleges, and for focused vision and persistent advocacy in advancing the California Community College Baccalaureate degree initiative. (IV.D.1)

### **District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance**

**District Recommendation 1 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness, the Team recommends that the District evaluate its support for the Colleges' capacity to assess student learning in order to improve educational programs and services (I.B.6, II.A.1, II.C.2, III.A.9, III.B.2, III.C.2, III.D.1, IV.C.13, IV.D.2)



**District Recommendation 2 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness, the Team recommends that the District complete the review and update of its policies and procedures and establish a formal schedule for their regular review and publication. (I.B.7, I.C.5, III.A.11, III.A.12, III.A.13, III.C.5, IV.C.7)

**District Recommendation 3 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness, the Team recommends that the District enhance its efforts and extend its support to the Colleges to strengthen the linkages and alignment of institutional plans. (I.A.3, I.B.9, II.A.1, III.A.14, III.B.2, III.B.4, III.C.2, III.D.2, III.D.4, IV.D.5)

## Introduction

San Diego Miramar College is one of three colleges of the San Diego Community College District (SDCCD or District). The District is comprised of San Diego Miramar College, San Diego City College, San Diego Mesa College, and seven Continuing Education (CE) campuses. The SDCCD is California's second largest community college district and serves over 140,000 students annually. As a multi-college district, the planning process is shared. Respectively, operations and services at SDMC and each of its sister institutions are conducted independently; however, the central district office provides support to its four institutions on collective district wide priorities, services, operations and needs.

San Diego Miramar College, located in the Mira Mesa/Scripps Ranch suburban area of San Diego along the I-15 corridor, offers 67 Associate Degrees and 51 Certificates of Achievement in career technical education programs as well as comprehensive transfer programs for students looking to attend University of California, California State University, and private institutions. Established in 1969, the College now serves more than 20,000 students annually, and is the 17th fastest growing community college in the nation.

Partnerships with local industry and the city and county of San Diego help SDMC prepare students for high demand, well-paying careers in a highly competitive labor market, including biotechnology, paralegal, aviation, automotive, diesel, and alternative fuels technologies. SDMC is home to the Southern California Biotechnology Center, Advanced Transportation and Technology Center, and San Diego Regional Public Safety Institute. Since its inception in 1969, the College has provided training for nearly all law enforcement officers and firefighters within San Diego County. The San Diego Regional Public Safety Institute also trains Emergency Medical Technicians (EMTs) and offers the only Open Water Lifeguard Associate Degree Program in the world. The College has also consistently produced the highest number of licensed Medical Laboratory Technicians in the state since it was approved to offer the Medical Laboratory Technology Program in 2010.

San Diego Miramar College hosts the Beta Iota Lambda chapter of Phi Theta Kappa. Four SDMC students have been recipients of the prestigious Jack Kent Cooke Undergraduate Transfer Scholarship in recent years (2013-2015). Furthermore, SDMC's Honors students have won recognition in the All-USA Community College Academic Team. As such, the College continues to participate in scholarship programs created by the All-USA Community College Academic Team, Coca-Cola Community College Academic Team, and New Century Scholars program, which is sponsored by various groups including Phi Theta Kappa.

Since 2010, the College has also undertaken extensive transformation of its physical facilities in order to meet the comprehensive instructional and student service needs of its growing student body. The following buildings have recently been completed or upgraded on the SDMC campus utilizing bond revenue from Propositions N and S: Mathematics and Business Building (2010), Arts & Humanities Building (2010), Expanded Auto Tech Building (2011), Parking Structure & Police Substation (2011), Library/Learning Resource Center (2012), Aviation Maintenance Building (2012), College Service Center (2012), Student Resources and Welcome Center (2013), Heavy Duty Advanced Transportation Center (2013), Fire

Science & Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) Training Center (2014), MTS Transit Center (2014), Student Service Center (2014), Administration Building (2014), Science Building (S6) (2015), and Science Building (S5) Renovation (2015). Better access from I-15 was established in 2014 when the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) completed an express on and off ramp on Hillery Drive leading directly into the north end of campus.

On January 4, 2010, SDMC was placed on warning. On February 1, 2012, SDMC was continued on warning. The SDMC accreditation was reaffirmed on February 11, 2013.

## Eligibility Requirements

### 1. Authority

The team confirmed that San Diego Miramar College is authorized to operate as a post-secondary, degree-granting institution based on continuous accreditation by the ACCJC of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The ACCJC is a regional accrediting body recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and granted authority through the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008.

The College meets this ER.

### 2. Operational Status

The team confirmed that the College is operational and provides educational services to approximately 20,000 students each year who are enrolled in degree applicable credit courses. Of these students, approximately 22 percent are enrolled full-time. Almost 50 percent are pursuing educational goals that relate to degree, certificate, or transfer.

The College meets this ER.

### 3. Degrees

The team confirmed that the majority of the institution's course offerings lead to a degree and/or transfer. A majority of the College's students are enrolled in the 67 AA/AS degree, or 17 Associate Degree for Transfer programs offered by the College.

The College meets this ER.

### 4. Chief Executive Officer

The District's current chief executive officer is highly qualified for the position and has served as Chancellor since 2004. Her full-time responsibility is to the District; she possesses the requisite skills and authority to provide leadership for the District.

The College President/CEO of the SDMC reports directly to the District Chancellor. The College President/CEO does not serve as a member of the Board nor as the Board president. Since the last full accreditation visit, there has not been any change in the Chancellor or College President/CEO positions.

The College meets this ER.

### 5. Financial Accountability

The evaluation team confirmed that SDMC annually undergoes and makes publicly available an external financial audit by an external audit firm. The audit is conducted in

accordance with generally accepted auditing standards contained in publications from the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA), including *Audits of State and Local Governments*, *Not-for-Profit Guide* (used for foundations), and *Government Auditing Standards*. In addition to these guides, the external auditor uses the *Contracted District Audit Manual* published by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. All audits are certified and any exceptions explained. Results of audit reports including institutional responses to external audit findings are made available to the college community via the College's website and presented in open session to the SDCCD Board of Trustees. In addition, the college adheres to all federal, state and county financial standards and regulations.

The College meets this ER.

Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with  
Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies

**Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment**

**Evaluation Items:**

The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive evaluation visit.

The institution cooperates with the evaluation team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment.

The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions as to third party comment. [Regulation citation: 602.23(b).]

**Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):**

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

**Narrative:**

The college provided ample evidence about the process for third party comment. The team found no third party comment related to this visit.

**Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement**

**Evaluation Items:**

The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. Course completion is included as one of these elements of student achievement. Other elements of student achievement performance for measurement have been determined as appropriate to the institution's mission.

The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance within each instructional program, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. The defined elements include, but are not limited to, job placement rates for

program completers, and for programs in fields where licensure is required, the licensure examination passage rates for program completers.

The institution-set standards for programs and across the institution are relevant to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement; the defined elements and expected performance levels are appropriate within higher education; the results are reported regularly across the campus; and the definition of elements and results are used in program-level and institution-wide planning to evaluate how well the institution fulfills its mission, to determine needed changes, to allocating resources, and to make improvements.

The institution analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level. [Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(i); 602.17(f); 602.19 (a-e).]

**Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):**

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

**Narrative:**

The team verified that the College has established institutional-set standards (ISS) for course completion, job placement rates and licensure passage rates for instructional programs, and in numerous other areas that are available to the College and the community in the Strategic Plan Assessment Scorecard. All programs are required to respond to the ISS in their program reviews and the plans at the college have been mapped to the most appropriate student scorecard measures. The College monitors the achievement data against the ISS. Annually, the College engages in a planning summit to review any ISS gaps and to develop action plans that are then distributed to the appropriate committees and areas.

**Credits, Program Length, and Tuition**

**Evaluation Items:**

Credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education (in policy and procedure).

The assignment of credit hours and degree program lengths is verified by the institution, and is reliable and accurate across classroom based courses, laboratory classes, distance

education classes, and for courses that involve clinical practice (if applicable to the institution).

Tuition is consistent across degree programs (or there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).

Any clock hour conversions to credit hours adhere to the Department of Education's conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice.

The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits. [Regulation citations: 600.2 (definition of credit hour); 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.24(e), (f); 668.2; 668.9.]

**Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):**

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

**Narrative:**

The college has established a protocol for the review of all courses for length, depth, breadth, rigor, course sequencing, time to completion, synthesis of learning and minimum degree requirements. The institution does not have clock hour programs. The institution is mindful of scheduling courses to meet the needs of the students in all of its programs. The Curriculum Committee has established a protocol for the review of distance education courses. The institution has an infrastructure that is sufficient to maintain and sustain its distance education. (Standard II.A.3, II.A.5, II.A.6, ER 9, ER12, [Regulation citations: 600.2; 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.24€, 668.2; 668.9], 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi);602.17(g); 668.38.)

**Transfer Policies**

**Evaluation Items:**

Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public.

Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer.

The institution complies with the Commission Policy on Transfer of Credit. [Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.17(a)(3); 602.24(e); 668.43(a)(ii).]



**Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):**

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

**Narrative:**

Awarding credit for college coursework completed at another institution requires a student to submit official transcripts showing successful completion of lower-division courses at an accredited institution. The transcript review process includes evaluation of the course description or/and syllabus from the originating institution.

**Distance Education and Correspondence Education**

**Evaluation Items:**

The institution has policies and procedures for defining and classifying a course as offered by distance education or correspondence education, in alignment with USDE definitions.

There is an accurate and consistent application of the policies and procedures for determining if a course is offered by distance education (with regular and substantive interaction with the instructor, initiated by the instructor, and online activities are included as part of a student’s grade) or correspondence education (online activities are primarily “paperwork related,” including reading posted materials, posting homework and completing examinations, and interaction with the instructor is initiated by the student as needed).

The institution has appropriate means and consistently applies those means for verifying the identity of a student who participates in a distance education or correspondence education course or program, and for ensuring that student information is protected.

The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offerings.

The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education*. [Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi); 602.17(g); 668.38.]

**Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):**

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

**Narrative:**

The college has established a protocol for the review of all courses for length, depth, breadth, rigor, course sequencing, time to completion, synthesis of learning and minimum degree requirements. The institution does not have clock hour programs. The institution is mindful of scheduling courses to meet the needs of the students in all of its programs. The Curriculum Committee has established a protocol for the review of distance education courses. The institution has an infrastructure that is sufficient to maintain and sustain its distance education. (Standard II.A.3, II.A.5, II.A.6, ER 9, ER12, [Regulation citations: 600.2; 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.24€, 668.2; 668.9], 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi);602.17(g); 668.38.)

**Student Complaints**

**Evaluation Items:**

The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online.

The student complaint files for the previous six years (since the last comprehensive evaluation) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint policies and procedures.

The team analysis of the student complaint files identifies any issues that may be indicative of the institution’s noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.

The institution posts on its website the names of associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities.

The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Representation of Accredited Status and the Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions. [Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(ix); 668.43.]

**Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):**

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

**Narrative:**

The institution has clear procedures for student complaints and has a systematic process for using this feedback for continuous improvement. The procedures are outlined in the College catalog, online, and in publications within the Student Services division. Complaints are logged (and maintained) within the Student Services division and shared appropriately with concerned parties.

**Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials**

**Evaluation Items:**

The institution provides accurate, timely (current), and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies.

The institution complies with the Commission Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status.

The institution provides required information concerning its accredited status as described above in the section on Student Complaints. [Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(vii); 668.6.]

**Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):**

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

**Narrative:**

Information about programs, locations, and policies is communicated to students and the public via the College Catalog, the Schedule of Classes, and the College website. The college has an extensive website that discloses information about research and data gathering, planning, and the status on accreditation, including annual reports. SDMC does not misrepresent program costs or job placement and employment opportunities, offer money in exchange for enrollment, or guarantee employment in order to recruit students. Scholarships

are awarded based on specified criteria to support students in the pursuit of their educational goals.

## **Title IV Compliance**

### **Evaluation Items:**

X The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program, including findings from any audits and program or other review activities by the USDE.

X The institution has addressed any issues raised by the USDE as to financial responsibility requirements, program record-keeping, etc. If issues were not timely addressed, the institution demonstrates it has the fiscal and administrative capacity to timely address issues in the future and to retain compliance with Title IV program requirements.

X The institution's student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by the USDE. Remedial efforts have been undertaken when default rates near or meet a level outside the acceptable range.

X Contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive educational, library, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required.

X The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations and the Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(v); 602.16(a)(1)(x); 602.19(b); 668.5; 668.15; 668.16; 668.71 et seq.]

### **Conclusion Check-Off:**

X The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

\_\_\_ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

\_\_\_ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

### **Narrative:**

The College demonstrates compliance with Federal Title IV regulations, and maintains its loan default rates within acceptable limits defined by the USDE.

# **STANDARD I**

## **MISSION, ACCADEMIC QUALITY AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS, AND INTEGRITY**

### **Standard I.A: Mission**

#### **General Observations**

San Diego Miramar College has a clearly defined and institutionally applicable mission statement, approved by the Board of Trustees (BOT or Board) in January 2016. The Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIEC) reviewed the mission statement in 2016 with input from all constituencies. In addition, the College Executive Committee (CEC) reviewed and approved the revised mission in December 2016. The mission statement addresses the broad educational purposes through assisting students to reach their educational of transfer, workforce training, and/or career achievement. The mission statement also indicates a commitment to student learning and student achievement by seeking to prepare students to succeed in a complex world and promoting diversity, equity, and success. All constituent groups are involved in any revision and it is evident the mission provides the overall framework in the strategic plan and is referred to often as part of planning and committee processes. Equally important, the mission and the strategic plan goals align with the program review planning processes.

The College emphasizes the role of the mission statement and vision in planning and decision-making, and they are widely publicized throughout the College via a variety of means, including displays, on the website, and in various college publications. Through interviews with College personnel, the team found the presence of a strong commitment to the engagement of students as well as strong commitment to their learning and success.

#### **Findings and Evidence**

The College's mission is appropriate for a degree-granting institution of higher education as it specifies pathways workforce training, transfer, and/or career development. The mission statement conveys the College's commitment to providing quality instruction and services, the promotion of diversity, equity, and success. The strategic plan, program review, and institutional benchmarks provide a mechanism for determining if the College is fulfilling its mission. Specifically, the strategic plan delineates the four major goals to help accomplish the mission for the college and periodic reports in program review illustrate how programs are helping to fulfill the college's mission. Moreover, action planning on campus aligns with the institution benchmarks, committees, and master plans. Namely, the Crosswalk to the Strategic Plan and Operational Definition document maps each indicator with the responsible committees and plans. As an illustration, the student completion indicator aligns with basic skills, outcomes assessment, Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), Student Equity Plan (SEP), Instruction/Student Services Program Review, the Instructional Division Plan, and the Student Services Plan. The crosswalk informs the planning of participatory governance committees. The enrollment, student success/ achievement, employee cultural climate, employee satisfaction, and student satisfaction data in these planning processes allows the College to determine the extent to which it is accomplishing the mission. The Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness, Library, and Technology

(PRIELT), in collaboration with the District research office, is responsible for providing the data in support of planning, goal setting, and decision-making. The Office of PRIELT includes key student achievement data disaggregated by delivery format and demographic characteristics including student enrollment status, educational goal, prior education level, service area of residence, units enrolled, first generation status, residency status, and DSPS and EOPS status, at the discipline, course, and institutional levels. (I.A.1, I.A.2)

The College determines whether educational programs meet the needs of its student population and support its mission through program review. The program review prompts Instructional Services to demonstrate how their mission supports the institutional mission. However, the program review does not prompt Administrative Services, Instructional Support Services, and Student Services to demonstrate how their mission supports the institutional mission. Equally important, program review prompts respondents to explain how actions support the program goals and the program or course learning outcomes, which map to the strategic plan goals and to the College mission. As part of this process, programs respond to prompts to analyze data on enrollment, course success, course retention, and learning outcomes assessment as the basis for creating goals and supporting requests for additional resources. (I.A.2)

The College mission and vision shape the College's culture. In the words of one staff member, "everything starts and ends with the mission statement." The mission and vision serve as the basis for the College's strategic plan—the College's central planning document that establishes a clear set of performance measures to guide planning efforts. Taskstream and other documents including committee meeting agendas and minutes, the Division Plans, Operational Plans, and the Educational Master Plan provide evidence that indicates that the referencing of the strategic plan goals and College mission, when making decisions, aligns with all planning at the college. (I.A.3)

The Board of Trustees approved the current mission statement on January 28, 2016 after it was vetted through the College's participatory governance approval process in fall 2015. The SDCCD adopted its mission statement on January 29, 2015. The District's mission statement contains all the required elements. Specifically, the SDCCD mission seeks to provide high-quality learning to students. (I.A.4, ER 6)

### **Conclusion**

The College meets this Standard and ER 6. The team commends the College for its Strategic Plan Assessment Scorecard, the setting of targets, and the mapping of the Strategic Plan and benchmarks to committees and plans and for helping to facilitate the use of data for planning and decision making in a way that is easily consumed by faculty, staff, and managers.

### **College Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance**

**College Recommendation 1 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness and better determine whether its mission directs institutional priorities, the team recommends that the College engage Administrative, Instructional Support, and Student Services programs in

program review to address how well program missions align with the College mission.  
(I.A.2)

**District Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance**

**District Recommendation 3 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness, the Team recommends that the District enhance its efforts and extend its support to the Colleges to strengthen the linkages and alignment of institutional plans. (I.A.3, I.B.9, II.A.1, III.A.14, III.B.2, III.B.4, III.C.2, III.D.2, III.D.4, IV.D.5)

## **Standard I.B: Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness**

### **General Observations**

The College demonstrates a commitment to continuous quality improvement. The team found evidence and examples of this in a variety of places, including the observation that assessing program level outcomes every semester, did not allow time to identify and implement improvement strategies effectively. As a result, the continuous quality improvement process led to substantial changes in the outcomes assessment process. Defined and assessed Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are in all instructional programs and student learning and support services, and managed through the Taskstream Accountability Management System. In addition, the College engages in continuous quality improvement through retreats, summits, and through the application of the Preventing Loss/Creating Momentum Framework. The College utilizes multiple methods to communicate the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities broadly. These planning efforts led to the Roadmap to Student Success. Through extensive interviews and a review of numerous committee minutes, the team validated that the participatory governance process is working as described.

### **Findings and Evidence**

San Diego Miramar College has a sustained dialog about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. The College engages in dialogue on academic quality and institutional effectiveness, using a collaborative approach to identify areas for improvement, including college wide participation in formal discussions; participatory governance committees such as the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIEC); and discussions at department, school, and division meetings. Specifically, through numerous participatory governance meetings, workshops, and summits the college developed the Passport to Student Success, which provides a roadmap for student to complete their educational goals. The College uses the Passport to Student Success to create a visual roadmap of the student experience and uses this roadmap to facilitate college wide dialogue about improving student learning and institutional processes. In addition, the College provided extensive evidence through committee meeting notes and agendas that shows how the campus has engaged in dialog about improvement of student outcomes and academic quality, student success and achievement, student equity, basic skills, and institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Moreover, prior to 2014, the College's definition of a program led to artificially broad assessment results encompassing multiple degrees and certificates. As part of the continuous quality improvement process the College reevaluated its definition of a program and revised the list of programs from 25 to 40. Equally important, through the continuous quality improvement process the college also found that assessing every course and program each semester did not leave sufficient time to implement improvement strategies and assess their effectiveness. As a result, they have now moved to a three-year assessment cycle for course and program learning outcomes. In addition, as a result of the continuous quality improvement process the College also integrated the process with the Program Review process in all divisions of the College, both instructional and non-instructional, and is linking dialogue on resource requests at the local level to Division Plans and ultimately to the College's Strategic Plan. (I.B.1)



The team confirmed that the College defines and assesses SLOs for instructional and student learning and support programs and uses the assessment results to inform planning and the implementing of program improvements. The College has established SLOs and assessments for courses, certificate and degree programs, and learning support services. The team verified that assessment has occurred in courses, program pathways, and service units at least once and are currently in the second assessment cycle. Through the continuous quality improvement process, the College adopted the Taskstream Accountability Management System to support the collection of assessment data, and the integration and alignment between course, program and institutional outcomes assessment. In addition, Student Services and Instructional Support Services have developed outcomes integrated with relevant SLOs, and assessment results captured in Program Review drive resource request in those areas.

The College identified the Institutional Set Standards (ISS) for student achievement (below) using a mixed qualitative/quantitative methodology to ensure inclusion of multiple sources of information and content expertise. In most cases, the ISS/benchmarks were set by taking the five-year average and adding half of the standard deviation to the average. The participatory governance committee, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIEC), led the benchmarking effort to set the ISS as well as develop the Strategic Plan Assessment Scorecard (SPAS), which includes benchmarks as well as the ISS. A workgroup of the PIEC developed the standards and benchmarks and communicated with the College about these benchmarks. In fall 2015, College constituencies reviewed the SPAS and the College Executive Committee (CEC) adopted them.

- Successful Course Completion Rate: 73 percent (successful completion is a grade of A, B, C, or P divided by total census enrollments)
- Student degree and certificate completion: 1,148 (annual academic year)
- Student degree completion: 633 (annual academic year)
- Student certificate completion: 538 (annual academic year)
- Student transfer to four-year colleges/universities: 788 annual academic year

The College monitors the achievement data against the ISS. Specifically, in spring 2016 the College identified two areas where the ISS were not met and developed action plans at the spring 2016 College Wide Planning Summit to address the gaps. Annually, the College engages in a planning summit to review any ISS gaps and to develop action plans that are then distributed to the appropriate committees and areas. Equally important, each instructional program addresses how their program student success measures related to the ISS for course success, course retention, and awards in order to help determine institutional effectiveness and academic quality. (I.B.2, I.B.3, and ER 11)

The College organized the institutional process of program review to support student learning and student achievement. The cyclical program review process incorporates course and program student learning outcomes assessments and service area assessments through action plan summaries and the programs use these as the basis for the development of program goals and resource requests. Program and Service Area Goals map to the College's Strategic Plan Goals in Taskstream enabling the College to identify action plans that support the

college wide student learning and achievement goals. The School of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness, Library, and Technology (SPRIELT) supports the program review process by providing standard demographic data by course and program, as well as by disaggregating achievement data for programs by enrollment status, educational goal, prior education level, service area residence, units attempted, first generation status, residency status, DSPS status, and EOPS status. In addition, the District Institutional Research provides data to the non-instructional programs. As an illustration, the District Institutional Research Office provides student services with data by student success services and enrollment status.

The College extensively analyzes and discusses student learning and achievement data within the context of program resources, services, and uses the analysis to develop goals and activities to improve student learning and achievement. Specifically, the College uses Taskstream to integrate and align student learning outcome results, action plans, assessment reports, program review, resource requests, and Strategic Plan goals. Following the State initiated SEP across the California Community College (CCC) system, the College engaged in the creation of the College's SEP, and in data disaggregation and analysis of student achievement data to develop goals and associated activities and strategies to mitigate gaps. However, it is not clear how the college is systematically mapping and integrating demographic characteristics into various SLOs through Taskstream. Specifically, the College has disaggregated institutional learning outcome data by educational goal; however, the team found that the College's culture of data-informed inquiry and decision-making should include the utilization of learning outcomes assessment data, such as disaggregated SLOs for a selected course to increase effectiveness. The College's Standard I.B.6 Action Plan 1 states that the College clearly intends to investigate potential strategies for additional levels of SLO disaggregation to identify subgroups in need of improvement. (I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6)

The College regularly evaluates its practices across all areas of the institution with regard to the governance structure. Specifically, the college primarily uses program review, SLO assessment cycle, committees, and subcommittees to evaluate its governance structure. Any subsequent recommendations go to the CGC for discussion, the Academic Senate and other constituencies to finalize recommendations, and then to the CEC for approval. An example of how this evaluation process has been effective is the recommendation by Academic Affairs to investigate and develop ideas to enhance the Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) process. Because of this recommendation, the College modified its Program Review process to highlight the critical roles of student outcomes and achievement. However, the team found that evaluating program review practices is largely informal. Moreover, in interviews with the three program review subcommittees, the team found that the evaluation of how well program review is working is largely informal except for one survey administered to the instructional programs. To that end, the College has initiated a process to evaluate all of the shared governance committees in aggregate through the development of a College Governance Assessment Tool, which was piloted in fall 2016 and is being implemented in spring 2017, as described in Standard I.B.7 Action Plan 1. The District stated that it is beginning to review all Board Policies (BPs) and Administrative Procedures (APs) on a six-year review cycle and plans to have all of these done by the 2017-2018

academic year. However, in reviewing the BPs, many had not been reviewed within six years, and some had last been reviewed prior to 2003. (I.B.7)

The institution broadly communicates the results of all of its assessments and evaluations. Specifically, the College primarily uses the website to communicate assessment and evaluation results, which include institutional research, accreditation, Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative, outcomes assessment, planning, and Student Success Scorecard results. The College also uses Convocations to present assessment results, and to elicit feedback and college wide dialogue. Because of this dialogue, the College has developed policies, practices, and processes to improve systems on campus that enhance student success. (I.B.8)

The College demonstrates a continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning process. As shown in the College's Student Success Framework for Long-term Integrated Planning, the College integrates planning and resource allocation that leads to improving institutional effectiveness, academic quality, and student success. The College's program review is a key element of its planning processes. The mission and vision, strategic plan, and links to program level plans through the establishment of the Divisional Plans drive institutional planning. The Divisional Plans include summations of the Division's programs and/or service area goals, planning themes, and resource needs, all of which align with the Strategic Plan Goals in Program Review. The team verified that systematic evaluation and planning occurs at the program level through program reviews. Through numerous interviews and extensive evidence the team verified that the program review process is used to identify resource requests, which are aligned with strategic goals and student learning outcomes. One-time resource requests are prioritized by departments, followed by the Deans, and the Budget Resource Development Subcommittee. Next, the prioritized resource requests are forwarded to the PIEC and the constituency groups. Finally, the CEC approves the prioritized resource requests. Continuous resource requests go through a different process that is heavily aligned with planning and the shared governance process. As an illustration, the College has allocated resources from the District to instruction, where the Full Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) is divided by division based on evidence and program review. The results are then vetted through the Faculty (Contract) Hiring Committee. (I.B.9, ER 19)

### **Conclusion**

The College meets this Standard and ERs 11 and 19. The team commends the College for its commitment to continuous quality improvement, dialogue, and collaboration. As stated by many staff, faculty, and administrators, the Loss/Momentum Framework has helped to transform the culture of evidence-based decision making, integration, and continuous quality of improvement. In addition, the team commends the College for its steadfast commitment to student success and the College's willingness to collaborate and work together across disciplines, areas, and constituencies to engage and serve students.

### **College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance**

**College Recommendation 2 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College analyze learning outcomes assessment results by meaningful

disaggregation of data by subpopulations of students, instructional and tutorial delivery methods, learning support services, and locations to enhance dialogue and prompt appropriate action. (I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, II.B.1, ER 11)

**College Recommendation 3 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College develop a procedure for evaluating its program review processes for student services, administrative services, and instructional services to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of the mission. (I.B.7)

### **District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance**

**District Recommendation 1 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness, the Team recommends that the District evaluate its support for the Colleges' capacity to assess student learning in order to improve educational programs and services (I.B.6, II.A.1, II.C.2, II.C.7, III.A.9, III.B.2, III.C.2, III.D.1, IV.C.13, IV.D.2)

**District Recommendation 2 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness, the Team recommends that the District complete the review and update of its policies and procedures and establish a formal schedule for their regular review and publication. (I.B.7, I.C.5, III.A.11, III.A.12, III.A.13, III.C.5, IV.C.7)

## **Standard I.C: Institutional Integrity**

### **General Observations**

The College is committed to compliance with ERs, Accreditation Standards, Commission Policies, guidelines, and requirements for public disclosure. The team found that the College strives to adhere to Commission policies, guidelines, and other requirements and is responsive to directives from ACCJC. In addition, the BOT consistently demonstrates a commitment to comply with Federal, State, and other agencies by having a subcommittee on Student Success and Accreditation where periodically the BOT reviews the progress of SDMC on meeting the Standards. Equally important, the BOT has annual goals that align with various accreditation Standards. The College also illustrates this commitment through the broad disclosure and dissemination of important information through the College catalogue, webpage, and accurate, current, and past accreditation reports.

### **Findings and Evidence**

The College provides information pertaining to the College's mission statement, learning outcomes, educational programs, and support services to the campus community and the public through a variety of means, including the College Catalog, Schedule of Classes, course syllabi, strategic plan, and program review. The College provides accurate, current, and past accreditation reports and correspondence on its webpage and the catalog contains accurate information about its accreditation status with the commission. The College provides students and prospective students with a print and online catalog that is accurate and contains information related to general College requirements regarding admission, student fees/costs, and major policies affecting students as required by ER 20.

The College has a defined process to ensure the catalog information is accurate. The catalog undergoes an extensive review each academic year in accordance with an agreed-upon production timeline developed and monitored by the District Curriculum Services department, which is responsible for the overall production of the college catalog. In addition, the Curriculum and Instructional Council's College Catalog Taskforce, composed of faculty and District and college administrators, performs a systematic review of the production of the catalog.

General information is provided to the public and students in the online and print catalog, including the official institution name, address, phone numbers, website address, and name and contact information of the College's accrediting commission. Other information presented in the catalog includes an academic freedom statement, available student financial aid, program length, requirements for admission, degrees, certificates, graduation, transfer, fees and financial obligations, and learning resources. The catalog also includes policies affecting students, including academic honesty, nondiscrimination, acceptance of transfer credits, grievance and complaint procedures, sexual harassment, and refund of fees. The names and credentials of administrators, supervisory personnel and the BOT follow the President's welcome page. The 2016-2017 print and online college catalogs contain all the required ER elements, including an academic calendar.

The spring semester schedule of classes contains an academic calendar, general information, policy information, support services, address, website address, phone numbers, and the

members of the College administration. In addition, the College's School of PRIELT and the District Institutional Research Office are responsible for providing data in support of planning, goal setting, and decision-making that relates to quality assurance. Specifically, the PRIELT publishes the Strategic Plan Assessment Scorecard as well as a mapping of the Strategic Plan and the benchmarks to committees and plans. The team confirmed that the School of PRIELT publishes numerous achievement data including key student achievement data disaggregated by delivery format and demographic characteristics including student enrollment status, educational goal, prior education level, service area of residence, units enrolled, first generation status, residency status, and DSPS and EOPS status, at the discipline, course, and institutional levels. The team also confirmed that the scorecard is accessible on the College website and published as the Strategic Plan Assessment Scorecard which includes a crosswalk to the Strategic Plan. Further, the team found that the PRIELT provides departments and programs with data on enrollment, course success, course retention, and other data for program review and learning outcomes assessment. Student services, instructional support, administrative services, and instructional division program reviews also receive data to inform planning. In addition, the team confirmed that the goals and accomplishments generated from program review for the Administrative Services, Instructional Services, PRIELT, and Student Services areas are posted on the planning website. The assessment plans, evidence of student learning, and use of evidence are also posted on the Outcomes and Assessment website. (I.C.1, I.C.2, I.C.3, ER 19, ER 20)

The College Catalog and Schedule of Classes are available electronically and in PDF format for printing on the College website. The team found that the course descriptions in the catalog align with those in the approved course outlines of record. The catalog includes all educational programs, identifying the degrees and certificates offered by each program. Student learning outcomes are published in the catalog for programs and degrees. (I.C.4)

As stated in the SDCCD's Comprehensive Policy and Procedure Review Plan, the team confirmed that the BOT reviewed and approved many of the policies and procedures directly related to accreditation in 2016. However, the plan also states that all procedures and policies will have a six-year comprehensive review cycle. Some of the policies had last approval dates ranging from 2006 to 2010. The plan also states that the College intends to begin a six-year review cycle for all policies and procedures beginning in 2016. (I.C.5)

The District informs current and prospective students of the total cost of education, as per Board Policy 3300, and in accordance with Education Code 76300. Board Policy (BP) 3300 includes up-to-date information regarding the cost of tuition for residents, nonresidents, and international students. The total cost of education, including tuition, fees, and other required expenses is included in the Colleges' catalogs, schedule of classes, and online student portal. All fees charged and collected by the District, in accordance to the fee schedule, is established and published annually in multiple mediums including in print and online. The District complies with Federal regulations on Gainful Employment as it provides the total cost of education for Career Technical Education programs under their Consumer Information link. In the District's three-year Student Feedback Survey, most students agreed they were adequately informed of the institution's total cost of education. (I.C.6)

The SDCCD has established policies on academic freedom, ethics, and freedom of speech to assure institutional and academic integrity. The policy on academic freedom makes it clear through the fundamental rights that faculty are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to the discipline even when the material is controversial. Moreover, the policy specifically states that freedom of expression is afforded to all constituencies, including faculty, staff, and students. The Academic Senate also has a Professional Code of Ethics that addresses the obligation to create a learning environment that fosters the free exchange of ideas. The Board's policy on academic freedom as well as the Academic Senate's Professional Code of Ethics specifies the faculty's right to teach and the student's right to learn. The District's faculty contract (AFT) specifies that faculty encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students and protects the academic freedom of students. The faculty contract also references the Board Policy and commitment to academic freedom.

The SDCCD also demonstrates a clear commitment to establishing and publishing clear policies and procedures that promote honesty, responsibility and academic integrity. The District has established, and routinely publishes, Board policies, procedures and administrative regulations that promote honesty, responsibility, and academic integrity that apply to all constituencies, including students taking online classes. Policies include standards of conduct, managing conflicts of interest, definitions of, and expectations for, honest and ethical behavior, and the consequences for dishonest behavior. In addition, the College also has a Code of Conduct specific to financial aid that specifically states that all employees maintain standards of professional conduct. The District also has policies and procedures for addressing student discipline and complaints. These policies and procedures are communicated in College catalogs and on the District and College websites.

The commitment to a learning environment that promotes free expression of thought and ideas as well as standards of student conduct and academic honesty, including consequences for violating these standards are published in the catalog and on the Student Web Services portal. The College also publishes the Student Code of Conduct, which includes expectations for academic honesty, throughout the campus and in classrooms. (I.C.7., I.C.8, ER 13)

The faculty are committed to providing a learning environment in which information is presented objectively. The Faculty/Staff Handbook and the Academic Senate's Professional Code of Ethics both include statements on being objective and accurate in presenting information. Both the SDCCD Faculty Appraisal and Adjunct Faculty Appraisal performance evaluations and student evaluations provide feedback on whether a faculty member is presenting the course using critical thinking and appropriate methods of instruction. The Student Feedback Surveys from 2009, 2012 and 2015 consistently indicate the majority of student respondents agree that "...instructors attempt to be fair and objective in their presentation of course material." (I.C.9)

The College does not require conformity to specific codes of conduct other than the standards of student conduct and the ethics policies noted, nor does it offer curricula in foreign locations. (I.C.10, I.C.11)

The College strives to comply with all the requirements of the ACCJC as well as other pertinent external agencies. For example, the college has a history of submitting all annual

and midterm reports within the required timelines, including the 2009 and 2016 Substantive Change Proposal Reports. In addition, the College and the District demonstrate their commitment to carrying out its accrediting responsibilities through a BOT subcommittee on Student Success and Accreditation, period reports to the Board on the status of Accreditation, the annual goal for the Board aligns with the Accreditation Standards, and the Chancellor's Cabinet agenda has a standing accreditation agenda item. The College has a link on the College website, which is one click away from the main page, to an accreditation page that includes information on its accreditation status, Commission action letters, ISERs, Follow-Up Reports, and campus communication related to accreditation updates. The College states on page four of the College catalog that it is accredited by the ACCJC. The address and telephone number of the Commission office are provided.

The College and the District describe themselves accurately and maintain honesty and integrity in its relationship with numerous external accrediting agencies. As an illustration, the College has maintained accreditation with the following accreditation bodies, to name a few: Toyota T-Ten Certification, National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), National Association of Developmental Education (NADE), and the Commission of Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST). Additionally, the March 2017 ISER includes a certification statement that the ISER accurately reflects the nature and substance of the institution. The District communicates information regarding accredited status through the SDCCD Accreditation webpage. The website includes a map of Accreditation Standards aligned with supporting evidence and hyperlinks to the evidence. (I.C.12, I.C.13, ER 21)

The team confirmed that the College does not have investors, related, or parent organizations requiring financial support, or external interests. (I.C.14)

### **Conclusion**

The College meets this Standard and ERs 11 and 19.

### **College Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance**

None

### **District Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance**

See District Recommendation 2 (Improvement)



## **STANDARD II**

### **STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SUPPORT SERVICES**

#### **Standard II.A: Instructional programs**

##### **General Observations**

The College's instructional programs, regardless of delivery mode, are offered in fields of study that align with the College's mission, are appropriate to higher education, and lead to student achievement of SLOs, degrees, certificates, employment, career advancement, and transfer. The College has clear transfer-of-credit policies and articulations agreements that certify that the learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to its own courses, and appropriate to its mission. The College ensures that graduates completing career technical certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and prepare them for external licensure or certification. The College's distinct pre-collegiate level curriculum provides students with the necessary knowledge, skills, and supports to progress and successfully complete the college-level curriculum. The College does not have department-wide courses or program examinations.

The College ensures equity in success for all students by meeting the changing needs of its diverse student populations and utilizing effective delivery modes, teaching methodologies and support services. Faculty ensure that the content and methods of instruction meet the academic and professional standards of the institution through on-going evaluation and improvement of courses, programs, and related services to assure currency, improve strategies, and promote student success.

The College supports a comprehensive approach to the development of SLOs. From the course to the program to the institutional level, student learning outcomes are established and assessed on a three-year cycle. Assessment results serve as the impetus for educational improvement. Furthermore, the SLOs are mapped so that they are in sync from course to program to institutional level. Guidelines for writing course and program outcomes are readily available on Taskstream, which is designed to lead the developer through the process of development and assessment of SLOs.

The Curriculum and Program Review processes ensure that courses and programs are reviewed cyclically. Courses are reviewed at least every six years and programs at least every three years with additional changes made when called for through the Program Review process. The Catalog, counselors, and faculty inform students of changes to courses and programs. As program requirements shift, students may retain catalog rights or petition to graduate with different requirements when a course in a program has been discontinued. Courses or programs may be identified for discontinuance when they no longer meet the requirements of the transfer institution or employment needs.

The District has implemented an Enrollment Management System to assist with scheduling classes that aligns with student needs and program pathways. The system pulls data from the official Class Schedule to help determine when best to offer courses and how to plan for student program completion in future semesters. The Strategic Enrollment Management

Guiding Principles serve as the basis for enrollment management at the College. The Academic Affairs Committee consider enrollment data and make recommendations to the College about enrollment management.

The College demonstrates quality of instruction by following practices common to American higher education and endeavors to meet the standard of evaluating and improving the quality and currency of all instructional programs offered by the institution.

### **Findings and Evidence**

The College offers 40 programs with 67 A.A./A.S. degrees, 17 Associate Degree for Transfer, 51 Certificates of Achievement, and 45 degrees and 23 certificates delivered via distance education. The College ensures GE breadth by requiring that degree programs measure students' engagement and application of knowledge in the broad areas of communication, information and quantitative competency, analytic inquiry, ethical reasoning, and diverse perspectives. In addition, the College requires that all associate degrees contain an area of emphasis, typically 18 units, that relates to the proposed degree and is accompanied by measurable competencies and student learning outcomes that are appropriate to the degree. (ER 3)

The College's complies with BP 5020 and AP 5022 on curriculum development and course approval to ensure that all instructional programs, regardless of delivery, are consistent with the College's mission. The Curriculum Committee recommends the approval of courses, degrees and certificates to the Curriculum and Instructional Council, the BOT, and the CCCCCO. Additionally, the Curriculum Committee follows curriculum-related recommendations from the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The Curriculum Committee reviews all proposed instructional offerings, including distance education, to assure alignment with district policy and satisfy Title 5 requirements. Instructional program learning outcomes are linked to the College's Institutional Student Learning Outcomes and directly align with the College's mission. Although approved locally, the College's Certificates of Performance still go through the curriculum process at the College to ensure linkage with the College's Strategic Plan and mission. The College's curriculum system CurricUNET provides a suitable organizational space for information on all courses and programs offered. (II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.5, ER 9)

Stakeholders such as faculty, students, administrators, College, Continuing Education and District councils and committees, members of the BOT, and members of the community, may initiate curriculum proposals. The College adheres to District policies (BP 5020, BP 5025) that establish the criteria for associate degrees and general education as well as certificates. In doing so, the Curriculum Committee ensures that courses, degrees, and certificates reflect high quality standards, meet the needs of the students and the community, and are evaluated regularly to maintain quality and currency. (II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.5)

All curriculum proposals must meet the five criteria established by the CCCCCO. These include program alignment with the College's mission and meeting student needs in areas of student learning outcomes, degree or certificate achievement, workforce training, or transfer. To ensure on-going evaluation and improvement of courses, discipline faculty and the

Curriculum Committee review all courses at least once every six years. Furthermore, any changes to course information such as unit values, contact hours, requisites, catalog description, objectives, and content, as required by Title 5, must be agreed upon by all the District's colleges, establishing several layers of accountability. Faculty, administrators, and Curriculum Committee members, at the college and district level, determine the selection, continuation, and termination of courses, programs/fields of study, and review the delivery modes for courses and programs before approval. (II.A.1, II.A.2)

Distance education courses are required to go through the same process and meet the same criteria as traditional courses. However, the Curriculum Committee has established a separate process which considers the frequency of contact between instructor and student, techniques utilized to deliver content and receive feedback, and to distinguish the types of contact and evaluation methods used. This process ensures that distance education courses maintain the rigor and quality of traditional courses while following the same course outline of record as the traditional version of the course would. The College does not offer correspondence education. The College adheres to the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) definition of distance education in Regulation 602.17(g) as evidenced by instructional delivery, course syllabi, and grading policy. The College verifies the identity of a student who participates in a class or program by secure log in and password in accordance with USDE Regulation 602.17(g). (II.A.5)

The College evaluates student progress and learning outcomes through assessing their Strategic Plan (as described in Standard I.B.3), which includes evaluating how well the College meets its institution-set standards/benchmarks. The College's benchmarking process involves an evaluation of indicators and measures, including transfer rates, degrees/certificates awarded, and completion rates. This process leads to faculty review of student achievement (i.e., course success rates, course retention rates, number of certificates/degrees conferred) in the College's programs and results in the setting or revising of programmatic goals and expectations, the development and application of improvement strategies (II.A.2), and the submission of resource requests to improve outcomes. The College maintains Taskstream as the repository for this data. (I.B.3, II.A.1, II.A.2, ER 11)

To support equity in success for all students, the College utilizes an array of delivery modes, learning support services, and teaching methodologies to meet the changing needs of all its students. Delivery modes are presented by the faculty developers and approved by the Curriculum Committee, which assumes responsibility for determining which delivery modes are appropriate for the student population it serves. Distance education courses must go through a separate review and approval process. (II.A.2, II.A.5, II.A.7)

Faculty utilize a variety of teaching methodologies to meet diverse student learning styles and are responsible for determining which teaching methodologies are best for the students they serve. To improve instruction and success for all students, faculty are engaged in ongoing discussions and analysis of the relationship between teaching methodologies and student success. This dialogue takes place in numerous formats and venues, including but not limited to in-service training on student learning needs and pedagogical approaches (e.g., monthly reading and writing discussion groups, math teaching seminars); student evaluations

(i.e., level of support and communication in on-line courses, opinions about instruction, perceptions of different delivery modes); and analysis of student success and course retention rates. It also takes place through the Program Review process which requires the analysis of learning outcomes data and next steps to improve teaching and learning. (II.A.2, II.A.7)

Furthermore, the Distance Education Subcommittee brings together faculty, staff and administrators to engage in dialogue about what teaching methodologies are commonly used in distance education programs and the relationship or impact these have on student performance. Such dialogue has resulted in the creation of an Online Teaching Certification Program, which instructors who wish to teach online are required to take before teaching online. This was approved by the Academic Senate, and is supported by all instructional Deans. As of Spring 2017, all instructors who teach online are required to complete the program. (II.A.7)

The College also provides a comprehensive menu of instructional and student support services to all students, including distance education students, offered at various times in a variety of settings and formats. Services include the Personal Learning Assistance Center (PLACe), the College Library, Math Lab, English Center, (Confirmed with Lou that this is not a real project), and Independent Learning Center (ILC). In addition to continuing College resources committed to instructional and student support services, the College receives funding for tutoring and many other services through the SSSP and SEP for qualified students. (II.A.7, II.B.1, II.C)

The College offers developmental/pre-collegiate programs in English, English as a Second Language, and Mathematics. Faculty are responsible for aligning pre-collegiate/developmental curriculum with college-level courses/programs, and for evaluating and measuring students' basic skills as they progress through transfer pathways. District policy on basic skills coursework development (AP 3002.3) guides the College in establishing criteria and processes for developmental or pre-collegiate curriculum. All developmental or pre-collegiate courses go through the same curriculum approval process as transfer-level courses in accordance with District policy (BP 5020). The College does not offer continuing and community education, study abroad, contract education or short-term training, or international education courses or programs. (II.A.4)

The College adheres to a cyclical Program Review process in accordance with District policy (AP 5019) to ensure that students are progressing through and achieving their goals of degree or certificate completion, transfer preparation, workforce training and/or career advancement. The Instructional Program Review (IPR) and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (SLOAC) Subcommittee, which is made up of faculty, staff, and administrators, oversees and facilitates the development and revisions of the instructional Program Review process, including the coordination of Program Review efforts and the assessment cycle of student learning outcomes. Members of this committee also serve as a resource and provide support to faculty and administrators in completing their instructional program reviews and student learning outcomes assessments and reports. (II.A.1)

The Program Review process is the vehicle by which the College analyzes its programs, makes recommendations and plans for improvement, and initiates resource requests. To ensure consistency, the Program Review process is aligned for all instructional programs, Student Services, and Instructional Support Services in Taskstream. Faculty and staff assess and evaluate course, program, and/or service learning outcomes using a variety of data, including but not limited to retention rates, achievement of student learning/program/service outcomes, and number of degrees or certificates awarded. Assessment results are logged in the analysis section of the Program Review. (II.A.1, II.A.2, ER 11)

Other data consists of student and program achievement data, aggregated and disaggregated, such as course success rates, the number of degrees and certificates awarded, retention rates. Program Review results regarding courses, programs and/or service areas, including distance education, are utilized to inform higher level planning, as they are integrated into the College's Division and Educational Master Plans. Results drive planning and budget by providing the evidence and justification for resource allocation for equipment and supplies, and the hiring of faculty, as indicated on the Budget and Resource Development Subcommittee List, the Faculty Hiring Priority List, and the Classified Hiring Priority List. Furthermore, all program/service area goals and objectives, which are included in Program Review, are linked to the College's Strategic Plan, which is directly aligned with the College's mission. Thus, they are integrated into institutional plans to improve overall effectiveness and academic quality. The College highlights several schools (i.e., The School of Liberal Arts, The School of Public Safety, The School of Business, Technical Careers, and Workforce Initiatives) in which the analysis of student learning outcomes and achievement data as led to instructional improvement (i.e., additional faculty and laboratory technicians, state-of-the-art technology and equipment, conversion of traditional classrooms into SMART classrooms) for student success. (II.A.1, II.A.2)

The College's Career and Technical Education programs are reviewed every two years as required by the state. These programs also have external accreditors and/or advisory/industry committees (e.g., Federal Aviation Administration, Automotive Service Excellence, American Bar Association, State of California Child Development Division, etc.). Through semi-annual meetings, committee members review curriculum and materials, identify competency levels and student learning outcomes, and tour lab facilities. These bodies also determine the relevancy, appropriateness, and currency of related programs to ensure programs and course offerings reflect current industry technology, procedures, and practices. Based on the input provided, faculty and administrators update their programs. (II.A.2)

The College has engaged in continuous dialogue on the improvement of the student and program learning outcomes evaluation process. In doing so, the College concluded that to evaluate instructional programs effectively, the review cycle needed to be extended to allow more time for implementation of improvement strategies and assessment of results. Therefore, in Fall 2013, the College moved from a yearly cycle to a three-year cycle to align with the three-year cycle for assessing SLOs, which was approved by the CEC. The College continued its dialogue to reexamine, modify, and develop student and program learning outcomes for deeper assessment, which resulted in the revision of instructional programs. Program assessment methods and results of student learning, reported in Program Reviews,

are input into Taskstream. Reports can then be generated to evaluate the effectiveness of SLOs and program learning outcomes and draw conclusions for improvement. Distance education course SLOs are assessed in the same way as non-distance education course SLOs. (II.A.1)

The College ensures that all students receive a course syllabus, which includes SLO statements, in every class section. The instructional school's Deans Office is responsible for ensuring that syllabi contain the approved SLOs.

While the College has a high percentage of courses (98%) and programs (99%) with defined SLOs as well as a high percentage of courses (89%) and programs (95%) with ongoing assessments, the College recognizes that further work needs to be done to improve the quality of assessment and the outcomes for students. One way in which the College works to ensure quality improvement is through utilizing outcomes assessments in its updated Program Review process, which occurs on a three-year cycle. The College believes that this shift has resulted in more measurable SLOs which will become apparent over time. Other benefits of the three-year cycle include collaboration within departments and areas over course and program offerings and the application of assessment results within goal development in the Program Review process. (II.A.3)

The College adheres to a standard two-year timeframe for degree and certificate completion. Newly proposed programs and certificates must be accompanied by a chart which outlines a student's progression over a two-year period. In cases of higher level degrees, a semester-to-semester progression must be submitted so that students can project their date of completion. Some certificates may include external requirements for certification or licensure, but they should still be accompanied by a semester-to-semester plan towards completion. (II.A.6, ER 9)

The District has implemented an Enrollment Management System to assist with scheduling classes that aligns with student needs and program pathways. The system pulls data from the official Class Schedule to help determine when best to offer courses and how to plan for student program completion in future semesters. The Strategic Enrollment Management Guiding Principles serve as the basis for enrollment management at the College. The Academic Affairs Committee consider enrollment data and make recommendations to the College about enrollment management. (II.A.6)

Relying on data and informed discussion, the College has made effective decisions on enrollment management. The results may be seen in the increasing number of degrees awarded by the College. Recent, additional funding should lead to a greater increase in the number of certificates and degrees awarded over the next few years. Data show an increase in high demand classes. This has resulted in the College's plan to "re-design" course schedules that address this demand. Thus, two-year course sequence charts will be required of all degree and certificate programs. Also, they will be published on program webpages and shared with counselors. (II.A.6)

The College does not have department-wide courses or program examinations, but should be recognized for supporting faculty (i.e., English, Chemistry) who are engaging in continuous dialogue to develop standardized, valid, and effective measures. Faculty are also creating processes to minimize biases and enhance reliability for their courses that would best support students' learning and the assessment of their learning. (II.A.8)

As detailed in the CCCCO Program & Course Approval Handbook, the College awards credit, including clock-to-credit hour conversions, which reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education, regardless of the mode of delivery for courses, degrees, and certificates. To meet this, the College abides by the Title 5, Section 51002: Standards in Scholarship; Title 5, Section 55002.5; and BP 5020: Curriculum Development. These regulations reflect the Carnegie unit model, which is the standard across all instructional programs, including career technical and education programs, as well as distance education and non-distance education courses. The College adheres to commonly accepted practices including time invested and content mastered and adheres to the Department of Education's 2011 conversion formula for clock-to-credit hours in compliance with USDE Regulations 602.16(a)(1)(vii), 602.24(e), 602.24(f), and 600.2. (II.A.5, II.A.9, ER 10)

Students applying for course credit via the credit-by-exam or credit for non-traditional education options must complete an evaluation/examination that assesses student proficiency in all learning outcomes. This alternative is in accordance with the credit-by-exam policies and procedures delineated in Title 5, Section 55050; BP 5235: Credit by Examination; BP 3900: Academic Credit for Non-Traditional Education; and AP 3900.1: Credit by Examination. (II.A.9)

In order to be awarded a degree and/or certificate, students must successfully complete all required courses in their chosen degree and/or certificate program and demonstrate achievement of all stated program learning outcomes. These program outcomes are said to be achieved when students attain all student learning outcomes of all courses within the degree/certificate program. When this is fulfilled, faculty and administrators use students' attainment of course SLOs to indicate the successful completion of program learning outcomes. (II.A.9)

In addition to the information and policies on transfer of credits from other regionally accredited institutions, the College also has district and institutional guidelines and policies in place to ensure that students, who are external to the U.S. or the higher education system, have their individual transfer needs met. Transfer mobility is dependent on several factors: (a) submission of transcripts and acceptance of credits from international colleges and universities; (b) credit for non-traditional education (e.g., Advanced Placement Examinations, International Baccalaureate), credit-by-examination, non-credit vocational courses, upper division courses, or coursework from other regionally accredited institutions; and (c) articulation and credit for non-credit continuing education courses, high school credits, and military credits. This information is published in the College's catalog and in the Student Guide to College which is available through Student Web Services, an on-line portal for students. Overall, the District will not accept transfer credits from another institution that does not meet the equivalent Standards and SLOs of an equivalent course taken at the three

associated District Colleges. All transfer-of-credit policies, procedures, and processes are regularly reviewed and updated to ensure on-going alignment with state guidelines and District policies and practices. (II.A.10, ER 10)

The College's Articulation Officer, with faculty input, handles, develops, and maintains all articulation agreements, using ASSIST, which is the official repository of articulation records and information for the state's colleges and universities. The College relies on ASSIST to provide the most current and accurate information about student transfer. Based on patterns of student enrollment between institutions, appropriateness to its mission and other factors, the College determines if articulation agreements should be created and established, in accordance with BP 5050 and AP 5050.2: Articulation. (II.A.10)

The College, district, and the state apply the same transfer-of-credit and articulation policies, procedures, and processes to distance education courses to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. The learning outcomes for transfer courses, regardless of delivery mode, are determined by the comparability of course student learning outcomes. The College ensures that all of its programs have the appropriate length, breadth, depth, course sequencing and time to completion; and faculty are responsible for developing and assessing program student learning outcomes and how well students are achieving the intended outcomes. (II.A.10, II.A.11)

As a result of on-going dialogue about which competencies are essential for all students, the College modified their Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs). Revisions included: (a) combining the ISLOs with the College's General Education student learning outcomes, and thus, creating one set of College SLOs; and (b) aligning the ISLOs with the Association of American Colleges and Universities' (AACU's) LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes. It is evident that the College's four, newly revised ISLOs, delineated in the College catalog and on the College's webpage, integrate communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, and the ability to engage diverse perspectives. (II.A.11)

Furthermore, the ISLOs meet all General Education patterns, including SDCCD GE District, IGETC, and CSU GE requirements, which are part of all the College's degree programs. This ensures that all students working toward degree completion will fulfill the areas of communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, and diverse perspectives. Students pursuing certificate programs, which prepare them for a specific workforce area/industry, will partially meet all of the College's ISLOs and GE requirements. Each certificate program only includes the stated competencies that are relevant to achieving the necessary learning outcomes and addresses workforce/industry needs. (II.A.11, II.A.12)

Through a faculty-driven collaborative process, the College assesses the competencies in information retrieval/use that it teaches students through aligning all program SLOs with these competencies (detailed on the College's Outcomes & Assessment Webpage), which are integrated in the College's ISLOs. There are a number of ways that the College assesses the achievement of these competencies and ISLOs: (a) mapping course and program SLO data



in Taskstream, (b) conducting periodic student surveys, and (c) measuring student learning. (II.A.11)

The College ensures that students who earn an associate degree have been successful in achieving the ISLOs established by the institution. In meeting these, students who complete the associate degree have gained “knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world,” “intellectual and practical skills,” “personal and social responsibility,” and “integrative and applied learning.” The SLOs for the four associate degree options are the same as those of the institution, meaning that the ISLOs inform the four associate degree options. Furthermore, all proposed degrees focus on a core area of study with competencies and SLOs that are appropriate to the degree. (II.A.12, II.A.13)

Seventeen CTE programs at the College have advisory committees which meet at least once a year to advise faculty leads on current or impending trends in the field of study and opportunities for internships and employment. Several programs are accredited through state, federal, or other professional organizations to ensure a high level of student preparation. (II.A.14)

The College is currently working on formalizing its practices for program discontinuance. This will include assessing the impact of discontinuance on students and other areas and programs at the College, developing a plan and timeline for phasing out the program, creating a plan for student completion, and providing the means for governance stakeholders to make its recommendation for discontinuance to the BOT. The College has been following an informational process for program discontinuance. The College has an action plan to formalize its process for program discontinuance. (II.A.15)

The College has a Program Review process that is faculty driven. The process ensures that all instructional programs regardless of their focus or modality are relevant and promote student success through the achievement of clearly defined student learning outcomes. Furthermore, Program Review is tied to Instruction, Instructional Support Services, Student Services, and Administrative Services through Taskstream. Program Review also drives institutional planning that leads to the fulfillment of the College mission. (II.A.16)

The College’s curriculum development process is faculty led, and all courses and programs are reviewed cyclically to ensure their effectiveness and currency. Student learning outcomes are also reviewed regularly, and student achievement data is disaggregated for the purpose of pursuing equity through redirecting resources and funding to where it is needed most. (II.A.16)

## **Conclusion**

The College meets this Standard and ERs 3, 9, 10, 11, 12. The team commends the College for its progress on improving teaching and learning for distance education students. (II.A.2) The team also commends the College for its diverse and successful CTE programs, strong leadership, and advisory boards as well as its focus on building infrastructure, expanding program options, developing new programs, and improving outcomes. (II.A.14)

## **College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance**

See College Recommendations 1 and 2 (Improvement)

**College Recommendation 4 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for all courses, programs, certificates and degrees using established institutional procedures. (II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.3, ER11)

**College Recommendation 5 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends the College publish two-year course sequence charts in the College catalog. (II.A.6)

## **District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance**

See District Recommendations 1 and 3 (Improvement)

## **Standard II.B: Library and Learning Support Services**

### **General Observations**

The College has adequate library and learning support services, as well as personnel, to support student learning and achievement and educational programs, including distance education. The College's Library and Learning Resource Center building conveniently houses a number of library and learning support services, including a state-of-the-art Miramar Library; the PLACe; the English Center (EC); and the ILC. The Math Lab (ML) is housed nearby in the Math building. All students are provided with on-campus and online library and learning support services, access to computer workstations across campus, library classrooms and collections, databases, and QuestionPoint 24/7 service through the Community College League (CCL) consortium, and other collaborative library and learning resources. Library and learning support services, as well as educational equipment and materials, undergo continuous evaluation, and changes are made based on needs identified in particular through Program Review and Instructional Support Services.

### **Findings and Evidence**

The College provides its students, regardless of instructional delivery method and location, with a state-of-the-art library and a variety of student learning facilities and learning support services (as mentioned above). Library and learning support service needs are identified by faculty and staff as well as by Instructional Program Review and the Instructional Support Services Program Review. Library services include on-Demand Library Services through Blackboard, LibGuides, eBook collection, online and subscription databases, and MLA/APA workshops. The College's library has two classrooms, equipped with appropriate management software to conduct library services instruction, serving approximately 8,500 students over a period of six years (2010-2016). The College also utilizes QuestionPoint 24/7 through the Community College League (CCL) consortium where students can remotely access and receive library assistance. The ACCJC approval of the College's Substantive Change Proposal on Distance Education, submitted March 2016, articulates that the library provides online access and on-demand support for online materials, learning and services for all students. The PLACe, ILC, English Center, and the ML provide students workshops, one-on-one, group, embedded and/or online tutoring services for math, writing, and/or college reading/study skills. The ILC houses study suites and computers with the services of staff members. In addition, the PLACe provides access to supplementary computer and learning materials, study groups, training and mentoring of tutors and Supplemental Instruction (SI) in English and Math, and student success. Overall, the SI, tutoring and online tutoring services have improved retention, performance and success. However, mixed results were obtained for a few SI embedded courses. Although not discussed in the ISER, the team found in interviews that the College offers courses at high school sites, and those students have the same access level to Library and Learning Support Services. (II.B.1, ER 17)

Instructional faculty provide course and program needs through Instructional Program Review, and those needs can inform School and Division Program Reviews for higher level planning. Similarly, equipment and material needs are identified through the Instructional Support Services Program Review process, which includes PLACe, ILC, the Audiovisual Department, the Instructional Computing Support Department, and the College Library. The

library collects usage statistics through LibGuides, the eBook collection, online databases, and the On-Demand library services. Nearly 50 percent of the library's book collection is available online in full text. The maintenance and update of the library materials is done through a standard database evaluation process with vendors, examination of faculty syllabi and/or assignments, and solicitation of faculty input on the collection development plan for the library resources and in meetings. Satisfaction with library resources is high among surveyed employees and increased by 24 percent since 2009. While the level of satisfaction with library consultation with campus stakeholders and adequacy of library materials have both improved, just about two-thirds are satisfied. The College work to select and maintain educational equipment, materials and needs is an area for further improvement, especially for student support services, through a formal and integrated process. (II.B.2)

The College library engages in the Program Review process and conducts evaluations of the library's holdings in order to improve and broaden availability of resources for students. The library has identified and measured four service unit outcomes (SUO) in meeting student learning needs. The SUOs are mapped to the ISLOs. These SUOs are analyzed, and action items are developed to measure progress on the effectiveness of library services rendered. The library engages in an evaluation of services and a needs analysis through the Program Review process, as described above under Standard II.B.2 and annual surveys for students, faculty, staff and administrators. For example, this led in 2016 to the purchase of more books and databases with help from an increase in state Instructional Equipment Library Material (IELM) funds. The Budget and Resource Development Subcommittee adopted a 5 year IELM plan for continued state funding based on the College's long-term IELM plan. Learning support services at the College are included in the campus Program Review process to assess their success, determine program needs, create dialogue, develop action plans for the next cycle, and determine the resource allocation. In the interviews, it was clear that significant efforts and time are dedicated to improve the effectiveness of learning support services. However, little evidence is offered on formal and integrated process that systematically captures those efforts. The College has started to engage in a multi-level, campus-wide discussion about ways to improve and sustain funding, effectiveness and coordination of learning support services. For example, the College states that at least the PLACe needs to be revisited and resources directed to the program, with no mention of other support services. To ensure continuous and effective services and funding, it is important that the College take and implement proper actions. (II.B.3)

The College is engaged in responsible and reliable collaboration for library resources. The Library seeks and develops collaborative partnerships to increase the breadth and effectiveness of its services and to improve student outcomes. The College gains benefits from these cooperative relationships, and ensures effectiveness and evaluation through the College Program Review process. For example, the library maintains an interlibrary loan agreement with the libraries at the two other Colleges within the SDCCD, makes use of several external collaborative relationships, which are secured via formal agreement, in order to better serve the needs of its constituents. These relationships include the San Diego/Imperial Counties Community College Learning Resources Cooperative (SDICCLRC); Community College League (CCL); and the Library Advisory Group (LAG). The Program Review process is used to evaluate these services. However, there is no

clear evidence of how other learning support services partner or collaborate with other entities inside or outside the institution and what agreements might exist. (II.B.4)

### **Conclusion**

The College meets this Standard and ER. 17. The team commends the College's library, audiovisual, and learning support services for their proactive approach to identifying the needs and expanding opportunities that enrich the learning environment, access, and equity. The team also commends the College for its vibrant, attractive, and inviting campus that engages students, promotes student learning, and fosters collaboration and student achievement.

### **College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance**

See College Recommendation 2 (Improvement)

College Recommendation 6 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College improve assessment for all Student Support Services and implement annual assessment tools in addition to the three-year student feedback surveys to document support of student learning for demonstrating continuous quality improvement. (II.B.2, II.B.3, II.C.1, II.C.7)

### **District Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance**

None

## **Standard II.C: Student Support Services**

### **General Observations**

Student Learning Programs and Support Services at the College are offered and provided both in-person and online. The Student Support Services area/programs interviewed as part of this Standard have a very strong commitment to serving students. The personnel serving students in each of these areas are well trained for their specific assignment and to address student needs and help students successfully navigate their experience at the College. This attention to detail is acknowledged by high ratings of satisfaction offered by surveyed students. Pertinent matriculation student information is prominently posted on the College and District websites.

Collaboration among the Student Services programs is evident now that they are housed in two adjacent buildings. The student support services engage in college planning and program review processes and apply a uniform method of establishing service area outcomes and assessing them. The Student Services Committee acts as the vehicle for disseminating and sharing updates and progress on the institutional integrated planning and budget allocation processes. Students seem to be pleased with the direction these services are taking. Assessment placement instrument validation is performed in a timely manner. Policy compliance requirements are in place and available in print and/or on respective websites of the corresponding and responsible office/department. Policies on student records and confidentiality ensure that student information is kept confidential and well protected.

### **Findings and Evidence**

The College regularly evaluates the quality and effectiveness of student programs, services, and delivery methods. The primary tool employed for evaluating these services seems to be the Student and Faculty Feedback Survey conducted by the district, every three years. There is some evidence of other indirect assessment tools employed, but are not consistent among the services and therefore it is recommended that all student services undergo, where appropriate, other forms of assessment to demonstrate support for student learning. (II.C.1-1, II.C.1-6, II.C.1.23, ER 15)

One hundred percent of the areas in student services have identified Service Area Learning Outcomes along with prescribed methods to assess them. Interviews and documents reviewed provide evidence that the College's student support and services programs have developed and are assessing learning support outcomes, and are using Student and Employee Feedback Surveys every three years as the primary assessment to assist with assessing quality of and improvements to services. Assessment plans are developed in Taskstream. The Student Services Program Reviews properly and accurately map to the institution's Strategic Plan, with the individual program goals identified as reasonable and doable outcomes with corresponding action plans. Monthly meetings of the Student Services Division also serve to collaborate on identifying and evaluating student support services outcomes and improving student learning. The agenda for these meetings includes an item noted as "What's working, what's not." For example, Counseling assesses students' ability to identify, address, and articulate their own needs and goals. The analysis of this learning/service outcome and

subsequent dialogue assisted counselors in reassessing their counseling sessions to place more ownership on the student for their goal. (II.C.2-1, II.C.2-6)

Interviews and documents reviewed provide evidence that the College's student support and services programs have developed and are assessing learning support outcomes, and are using Student and Employee Feedback Surveys every three years as the primary assessment to assist with assessing quality of and improvements to services.

The College identifies and assesses learning support outcomes for its student population and uses that data for a practice of continuously improving services and programs. The College Outcomes and Assessment Website, a comprehensive site for instructional and non-instructional Student Learning and Service Area outcomes is structured and organized with headings identifying location of SLO Statements, Assessment Plans, Assessment Resources, Current Activities, Evidence, and Use of Student Learning Evidence. Links are inserted for the Instructional and Non-Instructional Student Learning and Service Unit Outcomes Assessment Plans. Recent survey responses overall represent an increase of at least fifteen-percent over the previous survey.

Improvements made as a result of assessment of service area outcomes include the consolidation of Outreach and Assessment units to enhance the availability of services to feeder high schools and the public implementation of a "Super Saturday" Student Education Plan session along with streamlining the steps of matriculation and providing notification to students of these steps when they apply to the College. More assessment sessions are now offered on weekends, evenings, and at feeder high schools. (II.C.2-1, II.C.2-4, II.C.2-6)

The College provides appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students through such programs such as Admissions & Records, General Counseling services, Orientations, Assessment, Disability Support Programs and Services (DSPS), Extended Opportunity, Programs, and Services (EOPS), California Work Opportunity & Responsibility to Kids (CalWorks), Cooperative Agencies and Resources for Education, Financial Aid, International Students, Student Health Services, Transfer Center, Veterans Affairs, Outreach, Mental Health Services, Career & Job Placement Center and Student Affairs. These services are provided in person and online. The SDCCD Online Learning Pathways linked to Student Web Service include online registration through Reg-e, e-transcripts, college policies, the complaint process and the form for the consent and release of information. (II.C.3-26, ER 15)

The College provides co-curricular programs aligned with the institution's mission. The College currently sponsors five competitive athletic teams, three men's and two women's. Intercollegiate Athletics at the College are affiliated with the California Community College Athletics Association. An Athletic Program Review conducted in partnership with the Pacific Coast Athletic Conference Program Review Committee confirmed that both the Athletics' Department Mission Statement and the colleges' mission statement were in sync and supported each other. And, standards for compliance, integrity, ethics and accountability of finances were commended. They were also commended for "excellent coaches and student handbooks."

Student clubs and campus activities follow operating guidelines for student clubs and organizations as approved by the District. BP 5420 specifically states that Associated Students funds shall be deposited with and disbursed by the Chancellor. The funds shall be deposited, loaned, or invested as authorized. The funds of the Associated Students shall be subject to an annual audit. Seventy-two percent of students surveyed noted satisfied with student life such as college athletics, clubs and activities, with sixty-nine percent noting co-curricular activities (e.g. clubs, service learning), or athletic programs enhanced their educational experience at the college. Both of these responses were over fifteen percentage points from the previous survey. (II.C.4-5, II.C.4-19)

The College provides useful, timely and accurate counseling services to assist students in orienting them in requirements related to General Education, associate degree completion, and transfer to UC, CSU and private universities. General Counseling, DSPS and EOP&S counseling faculty provide educational planning, and the Transfer Center offers educational planning through workshops. Counseling services are provided in-person, via email, via phone and via Skype-like technology. Counseling services staff participate in professional development workshops including an annual District-wide Counselor gathering/meeting to share “best practices.” Bi-monthly Counseling Department and monthly Student Development and Matriculation Division meetings include discussions on changes in policies, procedures, and program/degree requirements, as identified in their respective meeting agendas. Seventy-one percent of students surveyed agreed they were accurately advised by the College on clear pathways for completing a degree, certificate or transfer. Similarly, seventy percent of staff/faculty noted that students are accurately advised on clear pathways for completing degrees, certificates and transfer. (II.C.5-1, II.C.5-11, II.C.5-15, II.C.5-25, II.C.5-26, II.C.6-28, II.C.6-30, II.C. 6.31)

The College adheres to District admissions policies consistent with its mission and state regulations and maintains an open-door admissions policy. BP 3000 “Admission of College Students offering the opportunity for admission to anyone who is a high school graduate and is at least age eighteen, special admission of part and full-time K-12 students, F-1 visa students, noncitizens, and admission to Special Programs such as the Admission for Nursing and Radiologic Technology. These are clearly delineated in the College catalog, Class Schedule, and on the College website. Students who are nearing completion for their degrees and certificates must submit a petition for graduation/completion, and the process is described in the College catalog and on the College website. (II.C.6-4, II.C.6-5, II.C 6-16, II.C.6-21, ER 16)

The College regularly evaluates assessment instruments for bias and validates them. Testing instruments used for placement in Math (MDTP), English (Companion/Accuplacer), and English as a Second language (CESLA) classes are validated on a five-year cycle for Disproportionate Impact (to determine test bias), Consequential Validation (appropriate cut scores), and content-related validity for appropriateness of the test placement into course or course sequence.

In addition to the state approved standardized instruments, the College employs a variety of multiple measures that more fully assess students’ preparation levels. Placement, assessment,



and evaluation for distance education courses utilize the same instruments as for non-distance education courses. The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office is leading a new approach to assessment tools, the Common Assessment Initiative, with which the College intends to comply.

The District provides data reports on the SSSP to assist colleges in monitoring new student matriculation mandates related to orientation, assessment, and educational planning. However, there was no direct evidence in the ISER documents that the colleges are using this information to assess and determine effective admission practices. (II.C.7-1, II.C.7-3)

Policies are in place to comply with student records permanently, securely, and confidentially with provision for secure backup of all files. The College adheres to the "Student Records, Classification, Retention, Disposition Manual" adopted by the SDCCD for 2016-17. BP 3001 Student Record, ensures that all student records are maintained in compliance with applicable federal (Family Education Rights and Privacy Act) and state (California Education Code) laws relating to the privacy of student records. Information about release of student records is published in the College Catalog, website, Student Web Services, and the District's student portal. The district uses Imagsource as records imaging system to scan, save, and search for electronic documents. The District stores images to the application server and both systems servers are backed up nightly. Student records are maintained in the centralized information system (ISIS) kept on password protected programs, and only District-authorized staff has access to this secure repository. All permanent records are securely maintained and stored in a secure off-site facility. Staff is granted access based on a "need to know" basis with approval of the appropriate manager. Faculty, supervisory and management staff is trained by the District on the handling of student records through the office of the District Vice Chancellor (VC) for Student Services. (II.C.8-1, II.C.8-5 C.8-9, II.C.8-10, II.C.8-11, II.C 8-16, II.C.8-17, II.C.6-4)

### **Conclusion**

The College meets this Standard and ERs 15 and 16.

### **College Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance**

See College Recommendation 6 (Improvement)

### **District Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance**

See District Recommendation 1 (Improvement)

## **STANDARD III RESOURCES**

### **Standard III.A: Human Resources**

#### **General Observations**

Within the SDCCD, human resources are centralized at the district level. The District has primary responsibility for payroll, employee benefits, employee contracts, positions descriptions, verification of degrees, employees qualifications, employee evaluations processes, codes of professional ethics, legal services, negotiations, risk management and workers compensation, equal employment opportunity, and the security and confidentiality of personnel records. The College has primary responsibility for employee timekeeping, absence and leave reporting oversight, employee hiring supervision, employee evaluation and discipline, and professional development. The District employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services, wherever offered and by whatever means delivered. The District employs academic faculty and administrators, classified staff, confidential and classified management employees in order to assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services.

The District's Human Resources (HR) department assumes the direct responsibility for ensuring that degrees held are from accredited institutions recognized by U.S. accrediting agencies. The HR department is also responsible for ensuring that foreign degrees or degrees from non-U.S. institutions are evaluated and meet the minimum qualifications of the position before submitting to the selection process.

The College's human resources are sufficient to meet the institution's mission and all employees possess qualifications for their positions. In addition, human resource planning needs are usually discussed in each area's Program Review. Once a position is considered through program review and selected for hire, the hiring committees are then able to tailor the job postings to specific campus and programmatic needs. The classified jobs are based on classifications that are updated every three years by the District Classification Specialist. District evaluation processes for employees responsible for student learning include a component that considers how these employees use the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning.

Since the District has primarily responsibilities for many HR functions, the District and College delineation of function is critical. The team reviewed several documents that describe function and responsibilities for the College and District.

The District has long established policies that address civility and mutual respect as well as conflict of interest. These policies pertain to all employees in support of professional ethics. However, the BOT and the AFT Guild (faculty union) have, in addition, adopted respective Codes of Professional Ethics, which are in alignment with the nature of their professional roles as a Board or faculty member.

The District provides for the security and confidentiality of personnel records and ensures each employee has access to their personnel record.

### **Findings and Evidence**

The process for the hiring of faculty is comprehensively defined in AP 4200.1: Employment of College Faculty and in AP 4200.5: Continuing Education Contract Faculty Hiring Procedure. As stated in these APs, “The objective of this procedure is to employ faculty for contract positions who are highly qualified, skilled in teaching, can serve the needs of a diverse student population, and who are sensitive the cultural and ethnic diversity of the San Diego community.” (III.A.1)

The College provides programs and services by hiring employees who have the appropriate education, training, and experience. Hiring procedures are publicly documented in both Board Policy and APs. Positions approved for hire are approved through the program planning process which is identified in alignment with the institutional mission and goals. The job descriptions are then written in support of the approved position. The District advertises for personnel with expertise and experience in the specific position and/or discipline. If a special qualification, for example experience in teaching distance education, is desired beyond the minimum qualifications, the hiring committee will contains at least one member with experience/expertise in that area. All new hires are processed through District to confirm minimum qualification to ensure District policies and procedures are being followed. As defined in AP 4001.1: Personnel Administration, all positions are created by the Board and all appointments are made by the Board. (III.A.1)

The AP 4200.2, the Employment of Instructional Staff, supports that the “the goal to hire experts in their subject area who are skilled in teaching and willing to meet the needs of a varied student population, and who are sensitive to the cultural and ethnic diversity of the San Diego community.” The faculty job announcements are developed by screening committees and include the legally required Board of Governor’s state minimum qualifications, equivalency and foreign degree process as well as criteria specifically related to the program’s needs. Job descriptions also include specific qualifications, such as licensure or certification needed in order to meet specific programmatic needs. The policies also articulate the various approaches to distribution of job announcements for advertising purposes. The District accepts applications via the District’s website and compiles a file for use by the college deans and chairs who screen the applications for program or service area needs and minimum qualifications. Once the hiring department makes the determination and recommends a candidate for hire, the District’s HR department verifies the minimum qualifications prior to employment. The process supports ensuring that faculty are qualified. (III.A.1)

BP 7120: Recruitment and Hiring reaffirms the minimum qualifications for faculty positions are established by the State Chancellor’s Office. Throughout the entire recruitment and hiring process, these minimum qualifications are upheld as the benchmark for programmatic needs and processes following AP 4200.1: Employment of College Faculty. These procedures mandate the inclusion of faculty in the assessment and screening of applicants for all faculty positions. All job announcements are developed by screening committees to

include these minimum qualifications as well as criteria specifically related to the program's needs. Requests for Equivalency follow formal protocols outlined in Education Code 87359, Assembly Bill 1725 (1988), and AP 7211: Equivalency Determination Procedure, as developed by the Academic Senates, as a means for discipline college faculty, as part of the Equivalency Subcommittee, to determine equivalency based upon a strict set of criteria. Under AP 7211, the governing Board relies on the "advice and judgment of the Academic Senate to determine that each individual employed under the authority granted by the regulations possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable minimum qualifications." Applicants are required to have foreign degrees evaluated by an agency approved by the National Association of Credential Evaluation Services (NACES). The screening committee uses the transcript to determine if the applicant meets the minimum qualifications or equivalency. (III.A.1)

During the Program Review process, the College conducts a self-evaluation and needs assessment in consideration of the College's Strategic Plan Goals. As a part of the self-evaluation, long-term planning is conducted to determine each Division's staffing needs. Instructional departments, student services, and administrative departments all consider both academic and classified staffing needs. Each Division then identifies and ranks its staffing needs. Academic staffing needs are also evaluated and ranked for the College by the Faculty Hiring Committee. Classified staffing needs from each division are evaluated and ranked by a committee of Vice Presidents. Each of the combined college-wide lists is then passed through the College's participatory governance process to the CEC. Through consensus, the CEC endorses a list that will be used to determine the next prioritized position to be hired when funds become available. (III.A.1)

The hiring of management positions is guided by BP 7120: Recruitment and Hiring and the provisions of the *Management Employees Handbook*. In addition, academic administrator positions reflect the Board of Governor's state minimum qualifications standards to ensure they meet the educational and training requirements of the position. Applications are submitted to the District's HR office and then District staff compiles a file for use by the college deans and chairs who screen the applications for program or service area needs and minimum qualifications. Applications are reviewed by a college screening committee for the selection of qualified candidates. Qualified candidates are then forwarded for a second interview by the President who makes a recommendation to the Chancellor, or designee. (III.A.1)

Classified positions are defined in BP 7230: Classified Employees. Job classifications are based on duties and responsibilities in relation to the programs and services the position serves. In direct support of the hiring process for classified positions, HR assures that qualifications for each position are closely matched to the specific programmatic needs by relying on several factors: requirements identified by the hiring manager; requirements contained in bargaining agreements; requirements of work to be performed; and requirements of the job description. As duties and responsibilities change, the position may be reviewed and reclassified. The hiring for vacant management positions is guided by District procedures and the provisions of the *Management Employees Handbook*. Like other academic positions, minimum qualifications, and equal employment opportunity principles, along with specially

developed job descriptions are used for the recruitment of qualified candidates. Applications are submitted to the District's Employment Office and then reviewed by a College screening committee. Qualified candidates are forwarded for a second interview by the President who makes a recommendation to the Chancellor, with the successful individual confirmed by the Board. All job announcements and the employment website include the minimum qualifications, as well as information related to requests for equivalency. Each recruitment process follows a comprehensive approach by providing worldwide Internet access to our online job postings. In addition, the District routinely utilizes a broad advertising campaign for each position that targets a very diverse population; advertising sources focused on employment in higher education; and niche advertising for highly specialized and hard-to-fill disciplines. Further encouragement for qualified academic applicants is provided in the form of travel reimbursement for interviewees, and potential of relocation reimbursement for selected candidates. This comprehensive approach is in support of reaching the most qualified candidates for all positions within the District. There is no difference between distance education and face-to-face faculty qualifications. (III.A.1)

Classified staffing needs by program and service areas are submitted during the annual program review process through the Classified Hiring Priority Committee (CHP), which is a subcommittee of the President's Cabinet. The CHP assesses each proposal using qualitative and/or quantitative data to review the need for the position in terms of capacity to strengthen the program or service area. The request must also address challenges, external demands, and program/service area needs that have changed over time. Proposals are evaluated using Program Review with qualitative justification and positions are ranked for funding. (III.A.1)

Once funded, classified support staff job descriptions are initially developed by the hiring manager through the submission of a position description questionnaire to HR. Following the receipt of the position description questionnaire, HR develops the job description to reflect the appropriate education, training and experience. A review of current positions reflects that position duties, responsibilities and authority of the position are clearly outlined. As duties and responsibilities change, the position may be reclassified through the District's reclassification process to ensure duties reflect contemporary needs. A review of current posted job descriptions indicate that the job descriptions contain the example of duties to be performed, responsibilities, and the authority under which positions perform and the reporting structure. (III.A.1)

The College utilizes the Program Review process to determine each department/service area's faculty hiring needs. Hiring needs are then sent to the Faculty Hiring Committee for ranking based on a set rubric. Once a faculty position has been ranked and is approved for hiring, a faculty search committee is formed, which determines the hiring criteria and faculty qualifications, including professional experience, discipline expertise, teaching skills, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Faculty are important members of the faculty search committees, as they review the applications and are an integral part of the interview process. (III.A.2, ER 14)

The District assures that hiring procedures are applied consistently at each College. Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) representatives are required on every search committee and

all committee members are required to go through EEO training every three years per EEO Plan, Policy #7120, Plan Component #7. The President certifies a Criteria Form for Screening and Interviewing document provided by District EEO. This Criteria Form for Screening and Interviewing document allows review of the committee make-up to ensure that it is representative. As defined in BP 7120: Recruiting and Hiring, all academic employees shall possess the minimum qualifications for their positions. Each faculty member regardless if classroom or non-classroom is required to meet the qualifications as prescribed in the State Minimum Qualifications Handbook and adopted by the Board of Governors and BOT. As an alternative to meeting the specific qualifications outlined in the State Minimum Qualifications Handbook, the Academic Senates developed AP 7211: Equivalency Determination Procedure. Under AP 7211, the governing Board relies on the “advice and judgment of the Academic Senate to determine that each individual employed under the authority granted by the regulations possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable minimum qualifications.” The request is reviewed for consideration by the College Equivalency Sub-committee. Approved equivalency requests are forwarded to HR for a secondary procedural review, initial salary placement determination, and placement in the personnel file. (III.A.2, ER 14)

The District has current job descriptions that include the level of assignment such as Assistant Professor, the subject matter to be taught and the minimum qualifications necessary for the assignment. Professional experience, discipline expertise, and teaching skills are found under desirable qualifications. The District has adopted a generic job description for faculty, which is inclusive of curriculum development and evaluation. The District policies and APs serve to ensure that faculty requirements are applied consistently throughout the District. The District’s AP 7211 provides that faculty equivalencies, once granted are applied district-wide. (III.A.2)

In addition, while “assessment of learning” was not referenced in the job descriptions it is in the District Faculty Appraisal Forms. (III.A.2, ER 14)

The Team reviewed evidence describing how the College administrators and other employees are responsible for educational programs and services and possess qualifications necessary to perform duties required to sustain institutional effectiveness and academic quality. The College assures the integrity and quality of its academic programs and services by employing administrators who meet the qualifications through appropriate education, training and experience for academic and classified positions. As defined in BP 7120: Recruiting and Hiring, all academic and classified employees are hired in accordance with the criteria and procedures for their positions. Each administrator, who may be an executive manager, manager, or supervisor, is required to meet the qualifications as stated in the job announcement. BP 7250: Educational Administrators specifically addresses the employment process for academic administrators, and with specific reference to academic employment contracts. BP 7260: Classified Supervisors and Managers specifically addresses the employment process for classified supervisors and managers. The process of annual performance evaluations and careful review of renewal of employment contracts is held in high regard with the goal of sustaining institutional effectiveness and academic quality. This process of evaluations and contracts is outlined in the *Management Employees Handbook*.

Similar to faculty, all administrators are encouraged to continue life-long learning and to pursue higher education, and licensure or certification, as appropriate. (III.A.3)

Job descriptions currently posted on the website for administrators and other employees responsible for educational programs included the requisite education and experience requirements. Prior to employment consideration, HR verifies candidate educational qualifications and foreign degree evaluations are consistent with the requirements of the position. (III.A.3)

As defined in BP 7120: Recruitment and Hiring, all academic and classified employees are hired in accordance with the criteria and procedures for their positions. The College provided evidence of how required degrees held by faculty, administrators and other employees are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established. An agency approved through the National Association of Credential Evaluation (NACES) services evaluates the applicant's materials from international institutions. The screening committee and Human Resources use that evaluation in the same manner as a transcript to determine if the applicant meets the educational qualifications for the position. Applications for open positions are reviewed by HR Technicians to ensure applicants meet the minimum qualifications and that degrees are from accredited institutions prior to submitting to the selection committee for review. HR further reviews degrees through the solicitation of an official transcript to ensure that degrees held are verified. (III.A.4)

The District has well-articulated and systematic processes for evaluating regular and probationary personnel and part-time faculty at stated intervals. The College provided the evaluation team descriptions of how it evaluates all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. All of the processes have written criteria for evaluating performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes assess the effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Faculty evaluations are conducted per the guidelines and timelines listed in the AFT Guild (Local 1931) Faculty Bargaining Unit agreement. Supervisors are evaluated based upon guidelines set forth in the Supervisory and Professional Administrators Association Handbook. Managers are evaluated based upon guidelines set forth in the *Management Employees Handbook*. Classified employees in Office Technical, Food Service and Maintenance and Operations positions are evaluated based upon guidelines set forth in the staff collective bargaining agreement. A random review of management evaluations supports that they are being evaluated timely. In the event that a performance improvement plan is recommended for an employee, a timeline for follow-up is documented in the plan. (III.A.5)

The College and the District use the evaluation of faculty, academic administrators, and other personnel directly responsible for student learning to assess how these employees use the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning. Evidence of the work the College has done to create a culture that embraces SLO assessment can be seen in the 2015 Employee Feedback. Sixty nine percent of respondents agree that their areas use

the results of SLOs assessment to make improvements in instruction or support services. (III.A.6)

The faculty evaluation instrument includes “assessment” under the component of Classroom Teaching. In February 2017, the District signed a side letter agreement with the AFT Faculty Guild which provides for the inclusion of comprehensive language in the collective bargaining agreement as it relates to the use of assessments to improve student learning. The side-letter agreement is to be placed on the BOT docket for ratification on March 16, 2017. (III.A.6)

The Management Feedback Survey contained in Appendix 4 of the *Management Employees Handbook* includes the following criteria for evaluation: “Considers assessment of student learning outcomes in decisions.” However, the Management Evaluation Form contained in Appendix 3 of the *Handbook* does not contain criteria related to the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning. (III.A.6)

The evaluation instrument for Classified employees in the AFT-Guild, Local 1931 – Classified Staff contract states on page 119, “Identify and evaluate each major job duty or responsibility. For this portion of the rating, refer to the District classification description (examples of duties and knowledge, skills and abilities).” The District classification description for tutors is inclusive of assessment, including the job duty “evaluate student needs and develop appropriate course of action.” (III.A.6)

BP 7210: Academic Employees requires compliance with its goals under the Education Code regarding the ratio of full-time faculty to be employed by the District with a goal of making progress toward the standard of 75 percent of total faculty work load hours taught by full-time faculty. The District’s role in maintaining sufficient numbers of qualified faculty is enacted through resource allocation. The District determines the level of staffing necessary to meet the Full Time Faculty Obligation (FON), which in turn dictates the level of funding for the hiring of faculty. HR provides an annual analysis to the Chancellor’s Cabinet using data from the FON Report. Based on recent increases in funding in the last several years, the College has begun increasing its contract faculty positions. Also, in regard to Distance Education, the College maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty including full-time and part-time to assure the fulfillment of faculty responsibilities essential to the quality of educational programs and services to achieve the institutional mission and purposes. Qualified faculty, both full-time and part-time, are assigned courses delivered via the distance education mode as appropriate within the program. (III.A.7, ER 14)

Part-time faculty are evaluated on a regular basis per the AFT Guild Faculty Bargaining Unit Contract, Article 15.1.14. An adjunct faculty member must be peer evaluated within the first year of employment within each discipline he/she holds an assignment within each college, and at least once every six regular semesters thereafter. (III.A.8)

In alignment with BP 7160: Professional Development, the College is committed to providing adjunct faculty with the skills and knowledge required to perform competently and hosts orientation meetings for adjunct faculty each semester. Oversight, evaluation, and



professional development are also provided to adjunct faculty as outlined in the AFT collective bargaining agreement, Article XV, Section 15.1. Information regarding Student Learning Outcomes, Program Review and Accreditation is disseminated to all adjunct faculty through email, adjunct orientation, convocation, flex activities and department meetings. This information is provided with the expectation that adjuncts will be evaluated regarding their knowledge and participation in these important areas. (III.A.8)

The District's role in maintaining sufficient numbers of qualified staff and administrators is through the resource allocation process, which provides the funds to the Colleges and the District for the hiring of staff and administrators. (III.A.9, III.A.10)

At the College, administrators regularly review current staff vacancies submitted by programs and service areas, requests for reorganization by administrators, and requests for reclassification and reallocation submitted by individual employees, to insure that staffing levels are sufficient to meet the evolving needs from throughout the District. If necessary, any employee may be transferred to another location at the discretion of the Chancellor, in order to balance the service needs and workload for the programs. (III.A.9, ER 8)

In August 2016, the Chancellor led the effort to articulate a systematic process for adding new positions and allocating additional resources in the District divisions. Working with the Vice Chancellors and Director of Communications and Public Relations, the process was documented and agreed upon. The process includes linking all requests for additional resources, both one time and continuous, including request for new positions, to the respective division's annual Action Plans and assessment, which is similar to the colleges' program review process. Requests are also linked to the District mission and strategic goals. In addition, requests for additional funding also must include identification of other possible funding sources, as appropriate. All requests are reviewed by the Vice Chancellors and Director of Communications and Public Relations, as well as the Chancellor's Cabinet, with final approval by the Chancellor. (III.A.9, ER 8)

The District assures the integrity and quality of its academic programs and support services by employing a sufficient number of administrators, both managers and supervisors, at the campuses and administrative offices, who meet the qualifications for the academic and classified positions. BP 7250: Educational Administrators specifically addresses the employment process for academic administrators, and with specific reference to academic employment contracts. BP 7260: Classified Supervisors and Managers specifically addresses the employment process for classified managers and supervisors. The hiring for vacant management positions is guided by District procedures and the provisions of the *Management Employees Handbook*. Similar to faculty, all administrators are encouraged to continue life-long learning and to pursue higher education, and licensure or certification, as appropriate. The District supports this quest through professional study leave and, separately, pre-authorized paid management leave for the purpose of study or other projects which would directly benefit the District's mission. (III.A.10, ER 8)

The College's administrators consist of the president, three vice presidents, eight deans and four special project managers. This group forms the Management Team of the College. All

prospective administrators are selected based not just on minimum qualifications, but on preferred qualifications, as described in each job announcement. There is a well-defined chain of leadership within this group. The Management Team also meets regularly as the Miramar Managers Group. This group meets regularly to discuss pressing issues affecting the overall effectiveness of the institution. The vice presidents oversee three critical areas of the College: Instruction, Student Services and Administrative Services. Each School within the College is represented by a dean. These deans oversee each of their School's respective programs and service areas. There are also three Student Services deans who represent Student Affairs, Matriculation & Student Development, and Equity and Success. All of these administrators work cooperatively to serve the best interest of the students. (III.A.10, ER 8)

The District is currently updating policies and procedures, vetting them through the governance process, and restructuring the website for the purpose of providing access to the full complement of policies and procedures. Many of the District's policies and procedures are outdated. For example, BP 4460: Conflict of Interest was last revised in 1998, and AP 4001.1 is dated 1978. (III.A.11)

The District provides a variety of professional development workshops focused on administrative procedures such as Sexual Harassment Prevention and Civility and Mutual Respect. SDCCD implement such activities to support fair, equitable, and consistent administration of its policies and procedures. When a policy or procedure is implemented or changed, it is consistently communicated to the college by way of notice to the Academic and Classified Senates, as well as the District's Governance Council. The District makes every effort to administer its personnel procedures equitably and consistently. In support of that, BP 3410: Nondiscrimination and AP 3410: Nondiscrimination require equity in its employment and personnel matters. Finally, BP 3430: Prohibition of Harassment and AP 3435: Discrimination and Harassment Investigations allow for faculty and staff to file complaints if they feel that they have been treated unfairly, as well as grievance procedures in the collective bargaining agreements and employee handbooks. (III.A.11)

The District maintains a multitude of programs, practices, and services in support of its diverse personnel. The District has several EEO and diversity policies which guide the District:

BP 3410: *Nondiscrimination*

AP 3410: *Nondiscrimination*

BP 3430: *Prohibition of Harassment*

AP 3430: *Prohibition of Harassment*

AP 3435: *Discrimination and Harassment Investigations*

BP 7100: *Commitment to Diversity*

BP 4110: *Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Contractors and Vendors* (III.A.12)

The District has a dedicated legal and employment opportunity office, which oversees the equal employment opportunity program for the District. The District adopted an *Equal Employment Opportunity Plan* in 2014. The plan reflects the District's commitment to equal employment opportunity and promotes practices that are nondiscriminatory. The District's goal is to create an environment that fosters diversity, promotes excellence, and is respectful

to all. The Plan includes a requirement that all individuals serving on selection committees receive training in the importance of a diverse workforce, bias awareness, and the elements of cultural competence. (III.A.12)

The District regularly assesses their records in employment equity and diversity. The College regularly reviews and analyzes the statistical data regarding the ethnic and gender diversity of its staff. The *Fact Book* annually provides staff diversity information. In addition, the Chancellor's Cabinet reviews quarterly the statistical diversity data for all of the colleges, Continuing Education, and the District Office. This information is presented annually to the Board. (III.A.12)

The District has established the Campus Diversity Advisory Council (CDAC) as a component of the District's Diversity Program. The purpose of the CDAC is to develop ways for the colleges and Continuing Education to advance diversity and cultural competency via campus events and training/workshops, as well as to track the Colleges' and Continuing Education's activity and development in the areas of diversity and cultural competency. (III.A.12)

The District offers extensive professional development opportunities, programs and training through the Employment and Professional Development department in HR. In 2009 the District established a Leadership Development Academy Series available to employees, which includes the following: Management Leadership Development Academy, Supervisor Leadership Development Academy, Classified Development Academy, and a Faculty Leadership Development Academy which was recently launched. The Academy series also offers a corresponding mentoring program for Academy graduates. (III.A.12)

The HR department offers and provides mandated training, core workshops, customized training programs, personal enrichment topics, online training and a lending library. Examples of some of the types of topics offered include: Legal Updates; Interpersonal Communication Skills; Customer Service; Respect and Positive Interaction in the Workplace; Managing Stress; Computer Skills; Health and Nutrition; Safety in the Workplace; Conflict Resolution; EEO Processes; Prohibition of Harassment; Cultural Competency; and Diversity and Emotional Intelligence. (III.A.12)

The District has adopted BP 4460: Conflict of Interest and AP 4460.2: Conflict of Interest (revised 1998). These policies and procedures apply to all District employees and specify activities which are inconsistent, incompatible, or conflicting with an employee's duties and require action by supervisory/management personnel. The District also established and adopted BP 7150: Civility and Mutual Respect, which also applies to all members of the District community. The policy describes what types of behavior are unacceptable and unethical and how it will be addressed. The AFT Guild, faculty bargaining unit agreement in Appendix 1, includes a code of professional ethics specific to all faculty members. The BOT has also adopted a code of ethics specific to its members, BP 2715: Code of Ethics/Standard of Practice. (III.A.13)

HR has drafted a general written Code of Ethics for all personnel, which is intended to replace the current BP 7150: Civility and Mutual Respect. The District will further update and elevate the principles of professional ethics through adoption of this policy. As currently written, the policy requires the inclusion of the consequences for violation. The District is currently taking the draft policy through the participatory governance review and approval process. (III.A.13)

Professional ethics are also integrated into the District's hiring processes. All screening committees include an EEO Representative who is responsible to ensure that the screening committee members engage in the screening process in accordance with appropriate professional ethical standards. In addition, all members of the screening committee must be EEO certified and have taken EEO training within the past three years. In addition, professional ethics are addressed through professional development workshops, which have included Workplace Ethics, and MEET on Common Ground: Respect in the Workplace. The College has a rich history of supporting professional ethics among all of its personnel. The College follows the District's written policies for professional ethics. The Site Compliance Officer is trained by the District and adheres to the same high standards that the District follows. Complaints of harassment, ethical lapses, and EEO violations are promptly responded to with contact of all parties and a thorough investigation. Oversight for this position is provided by the District's EEO office. (III.A.13)

Beginning in 2009 and in response to the District's 2009-2012 Strategic Plan, the District designed and sponsored a robust leadership development series of academies for its personnel. The Academies offer the participants the opportunity to learn new skills, examine current management philosophy, network with fellow colleagues and leadership professionals, and enhance their knowledge of the District's policies and procedures, mission, vision, and strategic planning goals. With a focus on the development of leadership skills and succession planning the District designed four academies which provide for the leadership development of all employees. These include:

1. Management Leadership Development Academy
2. Supervisory Leadership Development Academy
3. Classified Leadership Development Academy
4. Faculty Leadership Development Academy

The District evaluates each module of the academies and conducts an overall evaluation at the end of each academy. The data collected is used to assess and improve the program. In addition, the District could improve its professional development initiatives to further benefit the colleges through better integration and linkages to college planning. (III.A.14)

In addition to the professional development offered by the District, the College plans for and provides all campus personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on evolving pedagogy, technology, and learning needs. The College offers and supports an array of professional development programs. The professional development opportunities are announced to the campus via emails. The Budget and Resource Development Subcommittee (BRDS)

established a Professional Development fund for supervisors and campus-wide professional development activities. (III.A.14)

A dedicated file room provides for the security and confidentiality of all personnel files. The file room is secured every night by the Director of Employee Services who is the custodian of the files. Only two HR staff persons are authorized to access files. Faculty, Administrator, Supervisor and Classified evaluation files, there are no official records kept at the campus. Supervisors and managers at the College keep evaluation records in locked file cabinets in secure, private offices. Information contained within the personnel file is considered confidential and as such is shared only as required and to those with a need access to such information. Each bargaining agency within the District has a section within its contract providing for employees to have access to their own personnel records. (III.A.15)

### **Conclusion**

The District has a variety of policies and procedures relative to professional ethics, conflict of interest, and civility and mutual respect attributable to all personnel. The policies on conflict of interest and civility and mutual respect also contain the consequences for violation as required by the standard.

The Team found that the District takes their role as custodian of personnel files very seriously. The District maintains a dedicated file room with restricted access that provides for the confidentiality and security of personnel files. In addition, employees have a well-articulated process for access to their personnel file.

The College meets this Standard and ERs 8 and 14.

### **College Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance**

None

### **District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance**

See District Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 (Improvement)

## **Standard III.B: Physical Resources**

### **General Observations**

The SDCCD is comprised of SDMC, San Diego City College, San Diego Mesa College, and seven Continuing Education (CE) campuses. The SDCCD is California's second largest community college district and serves over 140,000 students annually.

The voters approved Measure S in 2002 for a total of \$685,000,000 and Measure N in 2006 for a total of \$870,000,000 to support the physical infrastructure of the SDCCD.

The District utilizes various processes to plan and evaluate its facilities and the needs of the Colleges and campuses; these include the Facilities Master Plan (FMP), the Educational Master Plan (EMP), Security Master Plan, and the Program Review process. The District also uses several mechanisms to assure the safety and security of their learning and working environments.

The College, located in the Mira Mesa/Scripps Ranch suburban area of San Diego along the I-15 corridor, was established in 1969, the college now serves more than 20,000 students annually. The campus sits on approximately 170 acres with 40 buildings, a parking structure and athletics facilities. The evaluation team toured the campus and found it to be clean, safe, and functional. The facilities function is centralized at the District with Regional Directors and maintenance staff assigned to the campus. The Regional Director reports to the District, and works closely with the Vice President (VP) of Administrative Services to ensure the needs of the College are addressed in a timely manner. The College developed a FMP in 2005 and updated it in 2014. (III.B.1, III.B.2)

### **Findings and Evidence**

The District has strategies in place to assure safe and sufficient physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and learning support services. An automated District work order process provides faculty and staff an opportunity to report unsafe facility conditions. Work orders that threaten life safety are given the highest priority and ensure proper resources are allocated to these critical issues. In addition, an annual inspection is conducted for District offsite locations. (III.B.1)

All college facilities at all locations are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment. The bond construction program delivers new building and modernization projects that are constructed to meet or exceed Division of State Architect standards which assure access, safety, and healthful environment. Additional building improvements or modifications are completed using standards for accessibility and safety. (III.B.1)

The FMPs identify the facility requirements to meet the educational mission but do not directly link to the campus EMPs. These plans, which were created with participation from faculty and staff, have provided the blueprints for the facility modernization. The plans review existing space utilization to ensure space is allocated to support programs and

services. A future goal of the District is to have the new FMP integrated with each college's EMP to assure sufficient, effective, utilization and programming needs. (III.B.1)

Responsibility for facilities and scheduled maintenance planning at the College rests with the VP of Administrative Services, in conjunction with the District Facilities Management department, Campus Facilities Committee and Campus Safety Committee. Ongoing assessment of College facilities is done primarily through visual inspections by District and College staff and an assessment by an outside consultant. The Team met with the Facilities committee and found them to be very engaged with issues on campus. The campus appears to have adequate facilities staff to maintain their facilities so as to create a positive learning environment.

The District has a security plan and annual safety report which identifies measurable metrics, processes, and procedures to be followed to ensure the safety and security of all who frequent the campuses. These plans and reports identify areas of risk to address and provide valued information that enables informed decision making for optimum allocation of resources. (III.B.1)

There are safety resources available to staff through the District safety website. The culture of safety helps to create a synergy among responsibilities and reporting across the District while at the same time recognizing the uniqueness of each campus. The District Safety Coordinator maintains and updates the website. Trainings for staff, faculty, and students are held in the area of emergency preparedness utilizing an ALICE (Alert, Lockdown, Inform, Counter, Evacuate) approach at the campuses and District office. (III.B.1)

The College has onsite law enforcement and security services which are provided by its own police department. The police department is staffed with POST-certified college police officers, campus patrols, dispatchers and student assistants under the direction of a Police Chief. As part of the Bond project, the Campus built a new police department station which is very visible throughout the Campus. (III.B.1)

Campus surveys indicate that the majority of respondents felt that the campus was both safe and well maintained. In interviews with faculty, staff, and student's they indicated that the campus is always well maintained and the Facilities Committee distributes information in a timely manner. This demonstrated the College's commitment to identifying the safety concerns of its faculty, staff, and students and its willingness to make the necessary corrections.

Blackboard, the District's learning management system has features that allow the District or Colleges to alert students in the event of an emergency. In addition, call boxes are located in all classrooms and throughout the campuses. A recent web application alert system was implemented as a pilot program at San Diego City College. This application can provide a mechanism for emergency notifications; reporting safety issues; and to provide students, faculty and staff with the ability to request assistance or escort if they are feeling unsafe. A future goal is to implement this technology districtwide for all staff, faculty, and students. (III.B.1)

The District identifies programming needs through the FMP which documents the facility requirements to meet the educational mission and to provide physical resources at its campuses. Additionally, the plan reviews existing space utilization information to ensure space is allocated to support programs and services. (III.B.2)

The District has issued approximately \$1.5 billion in bonds to build, renovate and provide equipment for facilities to support the District's mission. The bonds provide the fiscal resources, which, coupled with the FMP, enable the District to ensure that the facilities it builds and outfits with equipment comply with all codes, regulations, services and program requirements. The District's Five Year Capital Improvement Plan highlights the District's planned capital improvements over the next five years. The state scheduled maintenance program allocates state resources to scheduled maintenance requirements levied by the District. Through these resources, the District allocates funds to maintain and replace assets. The District uses the Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA) metrics and standards when evaluating its physical resources. Evaluation of the effectiveness of facilities and equipment to meet the needs of programs and services occurs through the Facilities Management Division goals and action plan. This plan outlines the goals, activities and outcomes for District Facilities to provide for sustainable and accessible environments in support of the College's mission. The District allocates the State Instructional Equipment Funds. The District's Technology Master Plan 2016-2018 (Draft) identifies the technology infrastructure needed to support distance education students and services. (III.B.2)

The College has excellent buildings, classrooms and laboratories that assure the quality of educational program and services. The College continues to plan its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services. With the help of Proposition S and Proposition N funds, the College and District have been able to fund numerous projects on campus, including Automotive Technology, Hourglass Park Firehouse, Library/Learning Resource Center, Mathematics and Business, and several other buildings that provide for a fully functional campus for a positive learning environment now and into the future. (III.B.2)

The District uses established metrics to measure its effectiveness and a process using total cost of ownership (TCO) ideals to establish the feasibility of resource allocation. This includes support for all modalities including distance education. TCO focuses on acquisition of facilities. Future infrastructure maintenance costs could be included in this process. Assessment of the use of facilities is provided by facilities task forces at the College's and monthly standards facilities meetings. (III.B.3)

The Management Services Council serves as the forum for assessment of the District's management services. This Council makes recommendations to Cabinet and other governance organizations regarding the allocation of resources to meet District requirements. Space and equipment needs, including utilization, are included in annual unit plans to align with annual planning priorities and strategic goals which are the conduit for requesting equipment necessary to support programs. These equipment requests are prioritized for consideration in the Campus resource allocation process. (III.B.3)



The District develops long-range plans utilizing FMPs to help guide resource allocation and support institutional improvement goals with a high quality student-learning environment. The EMP and FMP guide the long-range capital planning designed to meet institutional improvement goals. Utilizing these core-planning documents provides for informed decision-making regarding facilities and instructional equipment. Through the annual planning and budget process, funding requests consider and reflect a TCO that contemplates components such as staffing, supplies, equipment, maintenance, replacement, utilities, and supplies. Although the District has an established process for determining the TCO for new facilities, the methodology does not consider the resources required for ongoing maintenance or replacement costs. (III.B.4)

### **Conclusion**

The District assures safe physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs and learning support services through the utilization of quality standards for construction. The District promotes a culture of safety through ongoing training as well as the implementation of state-of-the-art notification systems for use during emergencies. Evidence of meeting the standards through varied multi-pronged strategies is represented by Management Services Council minutes, FMPs, Rainbow Report, Districtwide Security Plan and Annual Safety Report. (III.B.1)

The District has built and renovated many of its facilities for utilization in support of its Colleges. The Colleges FMPs identify facility requirements to meet the educational mission but the team has not found evidence with direct linkage to the campus' EMPs. (III.B.2)

Assessment of the use of facilities occurs at the District and College level. The EMP and FMP guide the long-range planning. The TCO is captured through the annual planning and budget process; however ongoing resources required to update or maintain equipment and facilities are not considered. (III.B.4)

The College/District meets this Standard.

### **College Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance**

None

### **District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance**

See District Recommendations 1 and 3 (Improvement)

## Standard III.C: Technology Resources

### General Observations

The District emphasizes the effective use of technology in support of teaching and learning, student success, and administrative functions. The *District Strategic Goal 2* (first bullet); “Use technology to enable innovative approaches to learning, teaching, delivery and student support” is indicative of the priority placed on technology by the District leadership in teaching and learning. The District and colleges bifurcate technology acquisition and support into Instructional Technologies which are funded and supported by the Colleges, and staffing which is funded and supported by the District. While there is inevitably some overlap between the two, this arrangement serves the District and Colleges well. The Information Technology (IT) Department provides services, support, hardware, software and training to meet the Institution’s operational and administrative functions, and uses the District IT Data network to carry instructional traffic, advancing the District’s mission of serving students. District and College IT work collaboratively on most matters to provide appropriate and adequate support for management and operational functions, academic programs, teaching and learning, and support services. There is an opportunity for closer collaboration between the groups on strategic technology planning.

The District has a functioning IT planning processes with opportunities for input from participatory governance and advisory committees. With the exception of the Executive Vice Chancellor (VC) of Business and Technology Services, the IT leadership is either interim or acting, as a result of recent concurrent retirements. The District IT staff is appropriately represented at college planning, as illustrated in SDMC’s ISER; however, the District and Colleges have not integrated the *District Technology Master Plan 2016-2018 (Draft)* with the *Colleges Technology Operational Plan*. More coordination could be beneficial. The District’s Information Technology Services Director attends college IT committee meetings to share planning information related to districtwide operational technology projects. The District also has plans to convene a districtwide Technology Committee, as described in the *District Technology Master Plan 2016-2018 (Draft)* consisting of individuals with the appropriate technology skills from the three colleges and Continuing Education. This Technology Committee will provide a mechanism by which broad based communication related to districtwide technology support and services may be addressed.

The College provides technology services and support services through the Administrative and Instructional Computing Support (ACS & ICS) departments, and the Audiovisual (AV) department supports the audio/visual needs of the campus. The College support staff provide various training resources such as online technical libraries. Identification of technology needs takes place as part of the Program Review process. All technology purchase requisitions are passed through the appropriate IT or AV department for approval, which allows the College to ensure the consistency and quality of the technology.

The College has a Technology Plan, which is reviewed by the campus Technology Committee on an annual basis. The Technology Plan contains a three-year rolling technology maintenance and replacement plan to refresh technology. The District IT Department maintains the complete inventory of all the equipment it is responsible for supporting and

refreshing. Advisory committees provide campus feedback to the District's Director of Information Technology Services. The advisory committees also serve as an informal information sharing opportunity with regard to information technology to ensure standards are established and adhered to districtwide.

### **Findings and Evidence**

The District integrates IT planning with its overall planning process through participatory governance. The information technology team develops, implements and assesses the strategic technology plan. The District IT Department is the managing body that provides the strategic guidance for all administrative and operational technologies. The District's *Technology Master Plan 2016-2018 (Draft)* provides the framework for addressing districtwide network infrastructure, hardware and software, help desk services, and related IT needs. The District IT department maintains a complete inventory of all equipment it supports, and its refresh guideline is that systems would be refreshed every four to six years depending on the useful life of the equipment. Many systems are considerably beyond the "ideal refresh cycle" guideline but are still functioning adequately for the purpose to which assigned. (III.C.1)

The quantity and quality of the technology systems deployed by the District and Colleges is adequate to meet the needs of the institution. The Wi-Fi systems are sometimes stretched in delivering the bandwidth needed and there are some areas that are poorly served, at best. This appears to have minimum impact as mobile users simply relocate to a place with better coverage. The District IT staff is aware of this and is planning suitable upgrades where and when appropriate. A review of *Bandwidth Monitoring Charts* demonstrates that the District does monitor its bandwidth usage as part of the assessment of need for improvement. (III.C.1)

The District IT department is adequately staffed with appropriately trained and/or qualified technology personnel to provide the necessary services throughout the District. (III.C.1)

The colleges review technology needs for teaching, learning and support through the integrated planning process, including programs reviews. More opportunities to review instructional technology needs comes up with various grant specific programs, such as SSSP, Equity, Title V, etc. where large, diverse groups of employees come together to review needs to help students succeed, including hardware and software needs. The District IT department reviews and manages District administrative and operational technology needs. (III.C.1)

The College provided descriptions of how technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are appropriate and adequate to support the College's management and operational functions, academic programs, teaching and learning (including specific support for distance education), and support services. In addition to computers and software for administrators, staff, and faculty, the College has 17 computer classrooms, 6 labs, and over 400 hundred laptops used in classrooms, totaling approximately 1,600 systems. The ISER reported that technology needs are identified as part of the program review process. After the annual Program Review process has concluded, departments or service areas prepare "Requests for Funding" (RFF) that are submitted to the BRDS.

Technology-related requests are then passed directly to the Technology Committee for review and prioritization. The Technology Committee's recommendations are then passed back to BRDS, where they can be integrated back into the non-technology requests and a complete recommendation for funding expenditures is then sent through the participatory governance process. The College also utilizes other sources to fund technology, such as proposition funds, grants, and assigned departmental discretionary budgets, which are not part of the program review process; however, all technology purchase requisitions are passed through the appropriate IT or AV department for approval. In this way, the College ensures the consistency and quality of the technology. Instructional technology systems are administered by the campus ICS department. The College evidence describes how technology in the SDCCD is a critical component of multiple aspects of learning, teaching and student support as well as the foundation and infrastructure for all administrative and business operations throughout the District. (III.C.1)

*The Team found that the District Technology Master Plan 2016-2018 has not been integrated with the Colleges' technology operational plan. (III.C.2)*

The District's and Colleges' IT departments update and replace technology resources through multiple planning and administrative processes to ensure technological infrastructure, quality, and capacity are adequate to support programs and services. The District plans to convene a districtwide Technology Committee, as described in the *District Technology Master Plan 2016-2018 (Draft)*, consisting of individuals with the appropriate technology skills from the three Colleges and Continuing Education. Plans were put in place to increase internet bandwidth through CENIC (California Education Network Infrastructure Corporation) and WAN bandwidth through a dark fiber infrastructure. The District makes decisions about distance education technology resources through the Districtwide Distance Education Steering Committee (DDESC). For example, the DDESC participated in a pilot of Canvas and recommended that the District begin review of the Canvas Learning Management System (LMS) in the fall of 2016. SDCCD Online Learning Pathways administers a bi-annual student satisfaction survey to ensure students' technology needs are being met. (III.C.2)

The ISER asserts that the College and District's IT departments continuously plan for, updates, and replaces technology to ensure its technological infrastructure, quality and capacity are adequate to support its mission, operations, programs, and services. They ensure that various types of technology needs are identified, updated and replaced through multiple planning and administrative processes to ensure technological infrastructure, quality and capacity are adequate to support its mission, operations, programs, and services. This occurs through several methods whereby the District IT department and colleges collaborate on technology related issues. The College has a Technology Committee with constituency representation serving on the committee to provide input for planning, budgets and timelines to address technology issues at each institution. (III.C.2)

The Team reviewed evidence that the College ensures that Distance Education also has adequate technology support. The District has primarily responsibility regarding the use and distribution of its technology resources in relation to distance education through the DDESC.

The District assures a robust and secure technical infrastructure for distance education through managed hosting with Blackboard. Blackboard uses redundant servers and does periodical maintenance upgrades to ensure reliability of services and security. Technical infrastructure is evaluated and maintained by Blackboard. Reliability of the resources are monitored through the 24/7 Help Desk, Presidium. In addition, other technological resources are subscribed to and the services are maintained by the vendor sites. The SDCCD Online Learning Pathways administers a student satisfaction survey bi-annually to ensure that the students' needs are met. Results of the survey are shared with the DDESC who, in turn, make recommendations accordingly. (III.C.2)

The College ensures that all classrooms meet a minimum standard (i.e., smart classroom) which includes access to either a projection or other display, podium with computer and "guest" laptop hookup. The AV technicians work with vendors, contractors, and end users to ensure all parties comply with ADA regulations related to AV installation. The AV department meets with end users to develop plans for new construction projects and ensures that all end user needs are met. The Program Reviews of technology service support areas such as AV and IT departments, are campus-wide in scope, and incorporate inventory information in their planning process. (III.C.2)

The District uses industry accepted cyber security measures and mission critical IT systems are outfitted with redundant power supplies and data backup disks and processors to ensure continuous operation of systems. The District also has an agreement with CCS Disaster Recovery Systems for timely replacement of hardware located in the Data Center. All District computer equipment is behind multiple firewalls. (III.C.3)

The College ensures the security and stability of its computer systems through several means that provide antivirus, data backup, and system security. The College ensures the security and stability of its computer systems through several means. All systems are protected by an enterprise-level antivirus product and other appropriate products. Instructional computing systems are further secured with DeepFreeze, which prevents any changes an end user may make or any information saved or cached locally are not present after a reboot. This creates a consistent user experience in the labs day-to-day and provides a level of privacy and security for end-users. The AV department is responsible for the maintenance and security of audiovisual equipment throughout the campus. AV ensures installed equipment is secured through lock-boxes, alarms and projector cages. Signatures are required when checking out AV equipment. The AV department performs regularly scheduled maintenance on campus projectors to ensure maximum life and performance from the equipment. (III.C.3)

New faculty are required to go through a short orientation provided by AV before being given lock-box codes to access the equipment installed in the smart-classrooms. This allows the College to ensure that all faculty have basic training on the equipment. ICS provides a standardized image for all computer systems across campus by utilizing automated deployment of software where possible. By installing software and configuration settings through automation tools, ICS ensures consistent application availability and configuration across campus and across hardware platforms. All production servers have been virtualized and are hosted on a virtual platform, which provides much greater scalability and reliability.

The District is able to provide secure firewall protection due to the centralization of Internet connectivity at the District Data Center. Anti-spam/anti-phishing protection is integrated with the district email as well. District IT systems are operational 7 days a week, 24 hours a day and outfitted with redundant power supplies, and fully redundant data disks and redundant processors. Backups are completed at least once a day, and for some critical systems multiple times a day. All backups are sent off site every day to an environmentally controlled, earthquake and fire hardened, secure facility. The District maintains various maintenance and support contracts depending on the critical nature of the systems and the impact of downtime. (III.C.3)

The District Online Learning Pathways (OLP) program provides technology training for distance education teaching, including the Online Faculty Certification Program and the on-campus faculty training program for Blackboard. The DDESC includes faculty and administrative representatives from each campus. The OLP program provides an extensive, required online teaching certification program which is facilitated and graded by instructional designers. OLP also provides faculty mentors at each campus to gather input regarding training and support needs of faculty and students. The District provides staff development and appropriate support for administrative and operational functions. Overall, the District IT staff is highly regarded by staff and faculty for their commitment to providing high quality service. Standard (III.C.4)

The College provides technology training, often as a part of the rollout of new technology. The AV Department trains all new incoming faculty and staff on the use of campus smart AV equipment and on AV Department policies and procedures. Other training related to the use of technology and technology systems is primarily done on an as needed basis via requests made through the District Help Desk. In addition, in coordination with HR, the District IT department funds a 50 concurrent-user license account subscription with the Virtual Training Company for self-paced, professional development service for all employees to remain current on over 100 products. The College provides tailored training for online instructors and students. Instructors who complete training receive an online teaching certification and students are able to take a Student Orientation to Online Learning. (Standard III.C.4)

The ISER asserts that maintaining the technology infrastructure is challenging with the technology support demands having more than tripled in many areas. ICS has responded by grouping all systems into large blocks of identical systems. This practice allows for the maintenance of a single hard-drive image, making it much easier for ICS to update an image to provide the latest software. The College requires that all computer purchases go through ACS or ICS for approval in order to ensure all systems purchased are standard, or that there is a justification for deviating from the standard. The BRDS oversee the allocation of campus wide funds such as IELM. The BRDS committee aggregates technology requests so that purchases are aggregated into single large block purchases of identical systems whenever possible. The BRDS committee has adopted a standard plan for funding technology, allocating 80 percent of IELM funds towards “technology refresh.” The BRDS adoption of an ongoing plan for the allocation of IELM resources has allowed for longer term planning by ICS. (III.C.5)

The College evidence describes how the institution follows policies and procedures that guide the appropriate use of technology in the teaching and learning process. This is seen in BP 5020: Curriculum Development and AP 5105: Distance Education. According to AP 5105, the VC of Instructional Services, or designee in collegial consultation via the District Governance Council, shall utilize one or more methods of secure credentialing/login and password, proctored examinations or new or other technologies and practices that are effective in verifying student identification. In addition, guidelines for good practice are included in the Online Faculty Certification Program. (III.C.5)

In 2015, the District implemented the PeopleSoft Enterprise Resource Planning system. Upon implementation, some business processes had not been migrated to the new system, so some pertinent reporting tools similar to what was available in the previous system did not exist. Documentation in support of this system is readily available with much being available online. Users perceive the new system as “very complex” which has “led to frustration with the new system and the inefficient use of time and resources.” Nevertheless, employees are committed to this migration based on the promised long-term benefits of a fully integrated enterprise management system. (III.C.5)

While the District and Colleges have policies and procedures that inform as to appropriate use of technologies, there is no published and readily available Acceptable Use Policy (AUP). At a time when social media and the threats of cyber-attack are growing exponentially, a full and comprehensive AUP does not exist. (III.C.5)

### **Conclusion**

The team reviewed considerable amounts of documentary evidence and conducted over 12 hours of interviews, one-on-one with District and College IT leadership and small group format with faculty and staff. Representatives of faculty and staff from all the Colleges along with District staff were included in the process to obtain a balanced 360 degree view of how the District is performing in regards to the provision of technology and support for the administrative and operational functions provided by the District.

The District meets the institution’s technology needs through services, support, hardware, and software. The District maintains sustainability of technology as part of the planning process. The District’s support of technology services and emphasis on staff professional development and certification for distance education instructors promote the effective use of technology in teaching and learning. The District and colleges have effective participatory processes for identifying and funding technology needs, including regular input from students, faculty, and staff. Technology planning could be improved with better integration of the *District Technology Master Plan 2016-2018 (Draft)* and the Colleges’ *Technology Operational Plan*.

The College meets this Standard.

### **College Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance**

**College Recommendation 7 (Improvement):** In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the College align its plans for technology support staffing needs with its capital improvement projects. (III.C.1, III.C.3)

**District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance**

See District Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 (Improvement).



## **Standard III.D: Financial Resources**

### **General Observations**

The District has strong fiscal practices as evidenced by the reports from the District's external auditors, strong reserves, high bond ratings and documented practices in place to allocate resources sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The District allocates unrestricted general fund resources through the Resource Allocation Formula (RAF) that supports the integration of financial resource planning with institutional planning. Continuous unqualified audits demonstrate that financial affairs are managed with integrity and ensure financial stability. The level of financial resources allocated and in reserves provides reasonable expectation of both short and long-term financial solvency.

The College's mission statement is *“to prepare students to succeed in a complex and dynamic world by providing quality instruction and services in an environment that supports and promotes diversity, equity, and success, while emphasizing innovative programs and partnerships to facilitate student completion for transfer, workforce training, and/or career advancement.”*

A review of evidence demonstrates that this is supported by well-managed financial resources at the District and College level. The College has made significant improvement to facilities, with new buildings and other improvements focusing on sustainability in order to minimize future costs. The College Foundation supports the College mission by providing scholarships, and financial assistance to various departments.

### **Findings and Evidence**

The Executive VC of Business and Technology Services oversees and monitors fiscal operations for the District, the Colleges, Continuing Education, financial aid allocations, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organization/ foundations, institutional investments, and assets to ensure the overall financial integrity of the District. (III.D.1)

The districtwide Budget Planning and Development Council (BPDC) makes recommendations to the Chancellor on districtwide budget and planning issues. The constituent representatives on the BPDC from throughout the District review the allocation model and budget assumptions used in the development of the annual tentative and adopted budgets. The District Strategic Plan and Colleges' EMPs provide the underlying guidelines for budget planning and development. The BPDC meets on a monthly basis to focus on aspects of the annual expenditure budget from a District perspective. (III.D.1)

Communication regarding the budget and financial affairs of the District occurs through various participatory governance councils and committees, Chancellor's Forums, and other meetings and publications distributed throughout the course of the fiscal year. The financial management and financial stability of the District is validated by the District's annual externally prepared audits that consistently receive an opinion of “unmodified” by the

independent auditors. It is further demonstrated by the District receiving the high bond ratings from Standard and Poor's. (III.D.1, ER 18)

The RAF establishes the proportional share of dollars available to each employee unit, with each unit then responsible for determining how to distribute its allocated compensation dollars to its unit membership. The RAF defines the methodology and calculations as agreed upon by all employee units. Concerning the budget preparation process, Board Policy ensures compliance with Title 5 and State Compliance matters and the California Community Colleges Budget and Accounting Manual. The District presents a balanced budget annually to the Board of Trustees for adoption. The District has consistently ended each fiscal year with financial reserve. In addition, the District consistently maintains adequate cash reserves, avoids external borrowing costs and meets all state mandated fiscal requirements such as the 50 Percent Law and the FON. The District and College plan and manage finances with integrity and in a manner that ensures fiscal stability as is represented by annual independent audits. (III.D.1)

Through the participatory governance process, the BOT and Chancellor receive information about fiscal planning that is linked to institutional planning through the Board subcommittee for Budget Study and Audit. Districtwide integrated planning includes the participation of constituent groups from all campuses that facilitates dialog and input. Through the District BPDC, District Governance Council, and the District Strategic Planning Committee, information related to financial resources is broadly discussed and recommendations made, as appropriate. The College Committees and Sub-committees are responsible for outlining plan content, establishing goals, and developing timelines for implementation. The colleges' planning could benefit from better integration with District planning. (III.D.2)

The ending balance for the District's unrestricted funds for the past three years is \$34,907,265, \$8,651,696, and \$13,377,689. This ending balance is over and above the five percent recommended reserve level by the Chancellor's office and is available for emergencies. The reserve level maintained by the District can assist to mitigate any unforeseen cash flow difficulties in the unlikely event that general fund revenue is not received on a timely basis. (III.D.2)

The ending balance for the College's unrestricted funds for the past three years is \$153,623, \$153,623, \$201,804 which is sufficient if needed for emergencies. The District retains 25 percent of non-compensation ending fund balances for the campuses with the intent of increasing it back to the 50 percent prior to the state recession years to assist the campuses in making multi-year operational plans.

The District is self-insured for losses arising from public liability, auto, and property claims. Self-insurance amounts are \$100,000 per individual claim for property and \$200,000 for auto and public liability. The District is covered for losses in excess of these amounts by outside insurance carriers and is self-insured for workers' compensation claims. Currently, the District covers claims up to \$500,000 per individual claim. The District maintains a liability insurance policy for California whereby the District pays the first \$200,000 per occurrence

with coverage up to \$20,000,000 including excess liability. The District also maintains a crime policy with a deductible of \$2,500 with a \$5,000,000 limit. (III.D.2)

The budget development process identifies available resources based on key budget assumptions. The budget is closely aligned to planning through a conscious effort to build a connection between planning and budget through the use of the RAF. The District's annual budget development process begins with the release of the Governor's annual budget in January for the following fiscal year. Using this information, the District's Fiscal Services Department, in collaboration with the BDPC, develops budget assumptions that are aligned with the annual planning priorities and categorized in areas of Fiscal Stability, Personnel, Legal Mandates, Grants, and Expenditures. Key elements used for developing the budget include projected enrollment data, the FON, cost of living adjustments, growth/ restoration factors, deficit factors applied to state apportionment, contractual obligations, and other information deemed applicable. The FTES targets for each college, including growth, are identified at the Chancellor's Cabinet. The tentative and adopted budget models are developed and disseminated to districtwide administration. (III.D.4)

The annual planning and budget process has greatly improved the College's ability to consider planning needs and incorporate the results in budget development. Planning continues to strengthen at the college level with the ongoing continuous quality improvement through the participatory governance groups. The budget development process is transparent with financial and budget information disseminated at various times throughout the year at the District and college locations to inform and provide an opportunity for input. The BOT is engaged in the process through the Board subcommittee on Budget Study and Audit. Presentations outlining current and future fiscal needs are identified by the priorities and goals of the District and its colleges. New programs, initiatives, and strategies are considered during the resource allocation through the District and College processes. The District and colleges could benefit from further integration of their planning processes. Integrated planning, institutional effectiveness, and the campus plans to ensure that resources are distributed fairly and in support of the colleges' mission and vision through the RAF. (III.D.4)

Appropriate approvals are integrated into the various processes and provide an adequate control environment for the tracking and reporting of expenses, which are periodically reviewed through external audits. (III.D.5)

The District's annual budget represents a culmination of the strategic planning and budget development processes including a campus allocation formula that ensures an appropriate level of resources is allocated to each college and Continuing Education to support student learning programs and services. Financial documents go through a complete review process to ensure a high level of transparency and accuracy in order to develop a high degree of credibility. The BPDC reviews state apportionment reports, enrollment management decisions which drive FTES targets, the annual Campus Allocation Model and budget assumptions used in the development of the annual budget. The District also shares this information at the District Governance Council (DGC) and the Chancellor's Cabinet. A Tentative Budget is presented to the BOT in June of each year and a final Adopted Budget to

the Board in September of each year. The Preliminary Budget provides an opportunity for faculty and staff to be kept informed before the end of a current academic year of some of the issues to be considered in the development of the upcoming year's Tentative and Adopted Budgets. In addition, the Chancellor regularly communicates state budget updates, beginning with the Governor's release of the State's Proposed Budget in January of each year along with communication upon the Governor's May Revise, and conducts forums each fall on the Colleges and Continuing Education campuses and at the District Office, discussing the budget and its potential impact on the upcoming academic year. (III.D.5)

The District develops budget allocations based upon FTES targets, which are converted into FTEF requirements in order to achieve the targeted FTES allocation rates as defined within the Districtwide Campus Allocation Model, and budget assumptions in accordance with the Resource Allocation Model's projected revenues. (III.D.6)

The Colleges' Budget and Resources Development Subcommittee has primary responsibility for reviewing the budget and making recommendations to the PIEC. In most cases, college discretionary funds are distributed on a one-time basis, allowing for the opportunity to address new needs in subsequent years while not putting additional continued strain on future budgets. This process allows all constituencies to participate in the development of the institutional plans and budgets, and is open, transparent, and predictable. The District's Campus Allocation Model does not appear to the Team to be integrated with the College planning processes as evidence by Action Plan II. Data is provided to the District by the College, but the Team could not find a correlation between the College program review process and future planning. (III.D.7, III.D.8)

The District regularly provides information about budget, fiscal conditions, financial planning, and audit results districtwide through its participatory governance committees, board meetings, and town hall presentations. The information provided is sufficient in content and provided in a timely manner to support institutional and financial planning and management. The District's audits have consistently been unmodified opinions. In the event findings are identified during the audit discovery process, the District reviews the items identified through random sampling methods determined by the auditors, with the appropriate management personnel to ensure that corrective action is initiated and a timely response regarding the findings and proposed corrective plan is communicated to the external auditors during field work well in advance of finalization of the annual audit. The BOT and District administration review the audit during a meeting of the Board subcommittee on Budget Study and Audit. An annual review of the audit review takes place during a public meeting of the governing board. The District has not received any audit findings or negative reviews during the last five years. (III.D.7)

All funds are audited annually by an independent certified public accountant. In the most recent audit the external auditors identified no deficiencies in internal control that would be considered material weaknesses or significant deficiencies. An independent certified public accountant performs the annual audit of all financial records. The auditors express an opinion on the financial statements and adequacy of accounting procedures and internal control. All special funds, grant expenditures, and bond expenditures are consistent with regulatory and

legal restrictions. These funds are consistent with regulatory and legal restrictions and governed by BPs and APs. (III.D.8, ER 5)

The District monitors cash flow on a daily basis and projects future cash flow requirements over a revolving twelve-month cycle and reconciles bank statements on a monthly basis. The District is fiscally independent and its cash reserve is held in the County of San Diego's treasury pool. The BOT ensures compliance with the Chancellor's Office recommendation of maintaining a minimum reserve equal to five percent of the general fund budget. The District has more than five percent of the general fund budget in a Cash Fund in addition to cash in other reserve funds well exceeding the recommended minimum of five percent. The District complies with Board policy regarding fiscal management. Board policy requires compliance with Title V requirements to maintain an unrestricted general fund reserve sufficient to provide for working capital, appropriate cash flow, state, and local funding uncertainties and future emergencies. (III.D.9)

The District's cash reserve in a restricted fund has allowed them to maintain financial stability during the recent great recession. The District's cash reserve as of June 30, 2015, is seven and one half percent of the general fund expenditures, well in excess of the recommended five percent and in accordance with Board Policy. The District's total reserve as of July 1, 2015, is \$78,171,460. The District is sufficiently protected against risk through its insurance plans. (III.D.9)

Through a conservative budget approach, and commitment to maintaining sufficient reserves, the District has been able to avoid layoffs and salary reductions with minimal impact to student programs and services. The District has maintained a healthy reserve over the past five years consistently exceeding the five percent minimum required by Board policy and has set aside funds for future PERS and STRS increases. (III.D.9)

The oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations, institutional investments, and assets are primarily at the District level with some aspects of the oversight process being the responsibility of the campuses. As a result of the review by the external auditors, all of the previously stated functions and entities are effectively operated and overseen. The District has consistently received unmodified opinions in fiscal, compliance, and performance audits. Financial oversight occurs at both the campus and District. Grant requirements are monitored by the District as well as fixed assets. (III.D.10)

The District monitors and manages student loan default rates, revenue streams, and compliance with Title IV of the Higher Education Act. The District ensures that federal funds are used appropriately and that funds are not drawn down in excess of cash received from the agencies through regular review of the student financial aid system. In addition, the District monitors proposed payments to ensure compliance with financial aid entitlements. The District and colleges monitor student loan default rates, which are consistently below the 30 percent federal limit. (III.D.10)

The District utilizes an encumbrance control system to ensure resources are allocated properly for short-term and long-term commitments. Worker's Compensation costs are reviewed every three years by an independent actuary to ensure that the proper level of financial reserves, as determined in the actuarial study report, are accounted for and budgeted on an annual basis. The District maintains reserves for vacation leave accrual, insurance costs, and building maintenance and operations costs to support those long-term obligations. The most significant debt obligations are associated with the 2002 and 2006 Propositions S & N authorized by the electorate. The bond issuance provided approximately \$425.3 million used over a period of 13 years. The District is a member of the California Retiree Health Benefit Program Joint Powers Agency (CCLC-JPA) for Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB). (III.D.11)

The BOT approved the CCLC-JPA to establish an irrevocable trust for the District for the purpose of funding the OPEB in December 2005. In June 2006, the Board authorized \$11 million in reserves of the SDCCD to be transferred into the CCLC-JPA. Actuarial studies are independently conducted and reported on a bi-annual basis in accordance with GASB requirements 43 and 45 which identify the Annual Required Contribution (ARC). The District's most recent actuarial study, as required under GASB, reported that the OPEB is funded at 83 percent of the accrued liability based upon the assets invested in the CCLC-JPA irrevocable trust. The current ARC is covered by operating funds. (III.D.12)

The District has not incurred any local debt instruments with the exception of its General Obligation 39 bond debt capital project program for Proposition S (approved in 2002 by local taxpayers) and Proposition N (approved in 2006 by local taxpayers). The general obligation bond debt is administered through the County of San Diego Auditor and Controller's office with direct payment on the debt service from property tax assessments to local taxpayers. (III.D.13)

General Obligation 39 capital bond programs approved by the District's local taxpayers as Proposition S (2002) and Proposition N (2006) are used with integrity in the manner consistent with the intended purpose of the taxpayers. This is further evidenced by both propositions undergoing annual financial and performance audits, consistent with GO 39 legislation, related to bond construction programs resulting in unmodified audits with no findings or recommendations noted by the external independent auditors. The full Citizen's Oversight Committee for both bonds meets five times per year to monitor and make recommendations on the bond activity for the District. General obligation debt is not debt of the District as the debt is paid by the taxpayers of the District as assessed by the County of San Diego. As evidenced by the results and conclusions of annual examination and analysis by an external independent audit firm, all financial resources of the District are utilized with integrity for their intended purpose. (III.D.14)

The District is in full compliance with all federal requirements including Title IV of the Higher Education Act. The District carefully monitors and manages loan default rates and revenue stream to ensure compliance. The default rates for SDCCD are below the "30% for three-year" threshold established by the U.S. Department of Education. The District monitors and manages student loan default rates, which have consistently remained well

below the 30 percent federal limit, revenue streams and compliance with Title IV. One of the methods utilized by the District to remain in compliance is through the use of a third party default prevention agency to proactively provide students with available options to avoid defaulting. (III.D.15)

Contractual agreements with external entities are governed by policies adopted by the BOT, which are consistent with the mission and goals of the District. The District maintains BPs and APs which outline the detailed process for purchasing goods and services. All contracts/agreements are monitored at the District level. Additional review is conducted by the District's legal counsel if necessary to ensure legal compliance. These agreements include personal services, lease purchase agreements, instructional programs and services, and contract education. The District distributes an updated District Signature Authority memo every fiscal year delineating the purchasing and contract authority by person/position. (III.D.16)

### **Conclusion**

The team determined that the District has sufficient revenues to support educational improvements and provide for innovation. District finances are managed with integrity as evidenced by continuous unqualified audits as well as an excellent bond rating. The RAF is utilized to allocate resources and funding improvements for the District and the colleges through a prioritization process. Reserves held for future expenditures ensure financial solvency. (III.D.1)

The District assures the financial integrity by transparency and engaging its constituents in districtwide presentations and dissemination of information that is timely and has a high confidence level. The integrity of the District financial oversight and internal control is evidenced by continuous unqualified audits with no material findings over the past several years. (III.D.5, III.D.6, III.D.7, III.D.8)

The District consistently maintains sufficient cash flow and has designated reserves in excess of the five percent as recommended by the State Chancellor's Office and in accordance with Board policy. These reserves could be used to meet financial obligations in the event of unforeseen emergencies. This level of reserve provides a reasonable expectation that both long-term and short-term commitments are accounted for and payment of future liabilities and obligations are planned for. The OPEB is funded at over 80 percent of the liability and the current ARC is funded through current operations. The Bond debt service is offset by property tax assessments to local taxpayers. (III.D.9, III.D.11, III.D.12, III.D.13)

The District meets this Standard.

### **College Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance**

None

### **District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance**

See District Recommendations 1 and 3 (Improvement)

## **STANDARD IV LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE**

### **Standard IV.A: Decision Making Roles and Processes**

#### **General Observations**

The College has a well-defined process that encourages innovation leading to institutional excellence. The shared governance committees have developed logical structure and clear purpose statements in order to support the decision-making process. Through the shared governance planning process faculty, staff, students and administrators have an opportunity to forward initiatives that improve practices, programs, and services. The College has delineated authority and the respected responsibility for faculty, staff and administrative employees.

This governance structure at Miramar College is designed to: 1. Implement the mission of the College through compliance with AB-1725. 2. Provide the opportunity for input from all college constituencies. 3. Base the decision making process on open communication and shared information. 4. Create a process to promote open communication between the constituencies. 5. Encourage all to hear and respect the needs and expectations of faculty, staff, students, and administrators in a consensus-building atmosphere.

The CEC is the decision-making body for the eleven Academic and Professional Matters as defined by Title 5 and BP 2510. Issues on which mutual agreement must be reached are brought to the CEC. On AB-1725 matters, the right to vote is given only to the Academic Senate President and the College President with the Associated Student Council and Classified Senate representatives providing input. On non-AB-1725 “All Campus” matters, each of the four constituent groups has an equal input. The CEC will make every effort to reach full consensus on non-AB-1725 “All Campus” matters, but if this cannot be achieved then the College President will decide the issue.

Dialogue is inherent in the elaborate, collaborative and seemingly collegial governance structure for decision-making, as demonstrated by the College Governance Handbook that includes sixteen governance committees at the College, together with links to their respective minutes and agendas of such committees.

The District supports effective institutional governance through well-established practices that ensure administrators and faculty exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget. The shared governance process is the primary mechanism by which all campus constituents participate in decision-making. Faculty have primary responsibility for curriculum and student learning programs and services, but administrators are appropriately involved in the curriculum process.

The SDCCD has a five-member Board that presides over three colleges serving more than 140,000 students annually. The SDCCD BOT establishes policies that are consistent with its mission statement and exercises oversight of the colleges’ educational programs by means of its BPs and APs.



The Chancellor executes policies and procedures and presides over the daily operations of the colleges. The college presidents report to the Chancellor.

### **Findings and Evidence**

The College's shared governance process allows the opportunity to create and encourage innovative ideas, practices and programs within the goals of the College and the mission. The College has developed a balanced framework for college governance that intentionally includes multiple voices in the decision-making process with generous opportunities for input and reflective discussion on the development and review of policies and procedures. One of the tools used to assist in creating their model is a published initiative by the Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges titled "Inquiry Guide – a model for Building Information Capacity and Promoting a Culture of Inquiry."

Employee feedback survey indicated 64 percent of respondents agreed the College's planning process offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies. Employee surveys also indicate wide agreement that college leaders encourage all members of the College community to take initiative in improving institutional effectiveness, exercise a substantial voice in matters related to educational programs, the hiring of faculty and other personnel, and institutional policies. The evidence points to effective collection of data, formally documenting the improvements, communication of decisions and training, and closing the loop regarding assessment and improvement. It may also be noted that the Research and Planning Group recently awarded the College a statewide distinction for its Integrated Planning Framework. (IV.A.1)

The College has established policies and procedures for broad participation in College decision-making. The Associated Student Government (ASG) constitution and by-laws outline student roles in serving on shared governance planning committees. Surveys indicate the majority of students reported they have a substantial voice in matters related to programs and services and are a valued part of the decision-making process at this campus. The ASG has designated seats on all shared governance committees.

At the District level, the participatory governance structure is also designed to provide the opportunity for constituent groups to participate in districtwide planning processes. The structure facilitates dialog and input into development and ongoing review of BPs and APs, as well as operational business processes. To accomplish broad input and dialog, the District has a two tier participatory governance structure comprised of councils, committees, and task forces that have been constructed to formalize these processes. (IV.A.2)

Faculty and administrators have many opportunities for providing input in institutional policies, planning, and budget through participation on college-level governance committees. Processes and roles are described in the Miramar College Governance Handbook, which is updated on a regular basis, communicates the changes from evaluation results, and is available on the College website. In terms of matters that affect academic and professional, the BOT at the District relies on the Academic Senates and as such identifies a standing agenda item "Call for Academic Senates' Agenda Items for Discussion," which allows

academic senate presidents to identify items on the agenda they wish to address, including policy matters. (IV.A.3)

The Handbook contains clear policies and procedures which specify the roles and responsibilities of administrators, faculty, staff, and the SDCCD collective bargaining agreements in their shared governance structure. The College has established several relevant shared governance committees for inclusion of relative perspectives in the governance of the College. There are well-defined processes for communication before internal administrative and external Board decisions are made. Recommendations from governance and contractually mandated committees are solicited before decisions are made. Interviews with staff and students confirmed roles and responsibilities were clearly understood and had ample opportunity for input in decision-making.

The College and District have well-defined rules and procedures in making recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services. BPs and governance handbooks describe the responsibilities and authority of faculty and administrators in curricular and other educational matters. Based on a survey, the majority of faculty believe they are central to the decision making involving curriculum development. (IV.A.4)

In several cases, it was difficult to determine what constituency group members of shared governance committees were representing. For example, the Student Services Committee website indicates the number of representatives from different areas of the College but no committee member names were listed or what group they represented. For instance, in the November 2, 2016 minutes of a Student Services committee meeting, members present indicated names but not their titles or what group they represented. (IV.A.5)

The College and District have policies and processes for decision making and those decisions are documented and widely reported. The BOT and Chancellor's office maintain websites, which provide summaries of all reports and actions by the BOT and discussions and decisions of the Chancellor's Cabinet. The District vice chancellors and presidents interact with employees via town hall meetings, emails and newsletters. The College did assess how it communicates decision-making processes and resulting decisions through a 2015 employee feedback survey. Fifty-one percent agreed the "processes for decision-making and resulting decisions are widely communicated across the college." (IV.A.6)

During Spring 2016, the College Governance Committee (CGC) developed a customized assessment tool for the College governance committees that was vetted by all constituency groups and approved by the CEC. The goal of this tool was to evaluate committee functions, including leadership roles, procedures and processes therein, to ensure their integrity and effectiveness. During a pilot implementation in Spring 2016, feedback was given and modifications were made to the tool. College wide implementation started in Fall 2016. A visit to the CGC meeting and later interviews with the committee chair and Senate President confirmed all shared governance committees are scheduled to submit their assessments to CGC at the end of Spring 2017 semester for analysis.

The College has also identified assessment of College governance operations and effectiveness as part of one of their action projects in the Quality Focus Essay. The College has identified responsible parties, resources, created a timeline, and desired outcomes. The evidence shows the College is on track to complete the implementation of the assessment tool, analyze the data and identify areas and strategies for improvement. The team was unable to find a single source for the status of progress made thus far. (IV.A.7)

### **Conclusion**

The interviews conducted with the faculty, staff, administrators, and students confirmed the material the College had submitted as evidence in its ISER. The College has developed standards and processes in meeting its student success mission. The College meets this Standard.

### **College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance**

**College Recommendation 8 (Improvement):** In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College follow through on its Actionable Improvement Plans and Action Project to better assess and improve its shared governance procedures and practices as delineated in the Quality Focus Essay. (IV.A.7)

### **District Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance**

None

## **Standard IV.B: Chief Executive Officer**

### **General Observations**

The President has been fully engaged in the institution for more than 12 years, providing effective leadership in budgeting, organizational structure, and change management as the College has gone through rapid transformational growth. The President reports to the Chancellor and is held accountable for the management of the College. The President has advocated for the College in the areas of growth, facilities, and additional staffing, based on a deep commitment to institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment and strategic planning. To advance these efforts across the campus, the President created the Office of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness which reports directly to the President in order to demonstrate and advance the growing culture of evidence and collaborative inquiry regarding student success. The new facilities and increased number of students and programmatic changes have re-engaged the faculty and staff with the College and the value of the work they are doing together. As someone said in an open forum, "We finally look like a college."

### **Findings and Evidence**

The President provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness. Evidence for this observation can be found in many sources, for example on the President's webpage on the College website has many links to past convocation presentations, college wide reports, institutional research data, accreditation reports, and governance council information. Additionally, the President's message in the College catalog, meeting minutes and agendas created by the President, along with other posted materials and evidence cited in the ISER, to fully support the finding that the President regularly communicates institutional values, goals, institution-set standards, and other relevant information to internal and external stakeholders.

The College reporting structure underscores the President's commitment to embedding institutional research, particularly research on student learning, into institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes which are then woven into the fabric of the College. The Dean of PRIELT reports directly to the President, and they meet weekly. The research agenda is publicly posted on the website and is linked to the President's webpage. There is ample evidence cited in the report and elsewhere that these materials are linked to institutional planning across the College and the District.

Since the writing of the ISER, the College won the 2017 Research and Planning Group Excellence in Planning Award. The President stated that, "*San Diego Miramar College has been selected as the winner of the 2017 RP (Research and Planning) Group Excellence in Planning Award for its "Student Success Framework for Long-Term Integrated Planning" submission. "Long-term integrated planning has been an ongoing focus of Miramar College," said Dr. Patricia Hsieh, President of San Diego Miramar College.*" Additionally, the College provided substantial evidence that the President advocated for and supported the development and full implementation of the College's Integrated Planning Framework in linking institutional research to institutional planning efforts and resource allocation processes. (IV.B.1)

The Map of District and College Functional Organization includes a specific reference to the President on page 75, “the President reports to the Chancellor, and that the President is responsible for the day-to-day operations for the total College program and provides leadership and coordination for the College community. The Chancellor and the President provide overall leadership and operational authority on all the functional areas.” The College’s Organizational Chart, which appears on pages 81-91, shows how these responsibilities are delegated throughout the College.

The College Governance Handbook clearly describes and delineates how decision-making works at the College. The Handbook was revised in May of 2016 and works in alignment with the District’s Participatory Governance Councils and Committees. There is sufficient evidence to conclude that authority has been delegated to the President who is held responsible for planning, overseeing, and evaluating the administrative structure. The College has been organized and staffed to reflect the institution’s purposes, size, and complexity. There is sufficient evidence that the President delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate, thereby meeting this sub-Standard. (IV.B.2)

The College Research Agenda for 2015-16 includes the following description: The research agenda supports the major activities and initiatives that serve the broader functions on campus (e.g., strategic planning, enrollment management, budget development, program review, accreditation, grant development, Basic Skills, outcomes and assessment). There are recurring research requests that have clearly defined indicators and metrics attached to them (e.g., success indicators and successful course completion rates, transfer rates, and number of awards conferred). These recurring research requests are organized by the College Strategic Goals, and linked to the College’s plans and initiatives, and indicators in the SPAS. Primary end users/responsible groups are also identified and suggested for each research request. The links are built to strengthen the integration of research into college-wide planning and overall achievement of the College. A feedback mechanism is also built in for continuous quality improvement.

### College Strategic Goals

Goal 1: Provide educational programs and services that are responsive to change and support student learning and success.

Goal 2: Deliver educational programs and services in formats and at locations that meet student’s needs.

Goal 3: Enhance the college experience for students and the community by providing student centered programs, services, and activities that celebrate diversity and sustainable practices.

Goal 4: Develop, strengthen, and sustain beneficial partnerships with educational institutions, business and industry, and our community

The Dean of PRIELT, who serves as the College’s Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) reports directly to the President who is charged with the implementation of all College planning. As stated in the planning documents, “*the College President communicates the*

*significance of a culture of evidence and collaborative inquiry with a focus on student learning and achievement through a variety of measures as outlined above.”* The College approach to planning and evaluation is data driven, as demonstrated by the College-wide Outcomes and Assessment Plan and is linked to student learning and achievement, which in turn drives resource allocation. The 2015 Employee Feedback Survey provides evidence that employees perceive that the President is providing the leadership to make necessary gains on College Goals. Specifically, item number 86 shows support that the President provides effective leadership in selecting and developing personnel. (IV.B.3)

The reporting structure clearly and directly demonstrates oversight connection. The College conducted an extensive Employee Accreditation Survey at the beginning of the process and made use of those findings throughout the ISER and in other parts of College-wide quality improvement efforts. (IV.B.4)

The President has assumed the primary leadership role for ensuring that the institution meets or exceeds ERs, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies at all times. Several actions highlight this involvement. First, the President’s personal webpage and the Accreditation webpage document includes all necessary documentation related to these tasks, third party comments regarding Accreditation and information about the process, and the standards and the eligibility requirements. Additionally, both the team assembled to write the ISER and the oversight provided by several constituent bodies, including the Academic Senate, the CEC, CGC, and a number of College-wide workshops and training sessions fully demonstrate widespread dialogue regarding all aspects of the process.

The President reports to the Chancellor, and the President is responsible for the day-to-day operations for the total College program and provides leadership and coordination for the College community. The District Functional Map describes the primary, secondary, and shared responsibilities. Leadership and governance responsibilities are clearly delineated to the President who has the primary accountability for all six of the CEO standards. In a multi-college district, the Chancellor and the President provide overall leadership and operational authority on all the functional areas. This relationship is fully described on pages 58-81 of the ISER and is consistent with the SDMC Governance Handbook and the SDCCD Administration and Governance Handbook.

The Map of District and College Functional Organization includes a specific description of the President’s reporting responsibilities. “The President reports to the Chancellor, and . . . is responsible for the day-to-day operations for the total College program and provides leadership and coordination for the College community. The Chancellor and the President provide overall leadership and operational authority on all the functional areas.” The President is held responsible for planning, overseeing, and evaluating the administrative structure and for ensuring that the College has been organized and staffed to reflect the institution’s purposes, size, and complexity. The College site compliance officer reports directly to the President and is responsible for the initial investigating, reporting, compiling and making recommendations for the resolution of both employee and student discrimination and sexual harassment complaints to the District Legal Services/EEO and Diversity Office. The College does provide substantial evidence that the President assures that institutional

practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies, including effective control of budget and expenditures. (IV.B.5)

The President's webpage includes numerous public reports including updates on Accreditation. When one reviews these documents along with those prepared by the District, which includes many items about the college, there is more than sufficient evidence to conclude that the College has made every effort to inform the community about events at the College. The President convenes an Annual Convocation where progress on the College's Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment, are presented. These reports are prepared by the College-wide Outcomes and Assessment Facilitator. The Dean of PRIELT reports directly to the President and with whom she meets weekly to review and help drive college-wide efforts towards continuous improvement. These documents are open to the public along with the College Score Card. Other examples would be found in District publications, which feature the District's colleges such as the Annual District Report. (IV.B.6)

### **Conclusion**

The President was appointed by the governing Board in August 2005 as the full-time President of Miramar College and has been delegated full responsibility for the administration of the college under the authority of board policy as delegated by the Chancellor. The President does not serve as chair of the governing board and there has been no change in the institutional chief executive officer since the last accreditation. The team has validated that the President meets all requirements of this standard as well as all other Accreditation Standards and found no reason to making any recommendations related to non-compliance. The College meets this Standard and satisfies the requirements of the ER 4. (IV.B, ER 4)

### **College Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance**

None

### **District Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance**

None

## **Standard IV.C: Governing Board**

### **General Observations**

The SDCCD is governed by a five member, locally-elected Board, and a student Board member. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. A multi-college District requires clear decision-making and accountability structures at both the District and the institutional levels. The College has these carefully outlined in their *Administrative & Governance Handbook*.

District policies provide a functional framework and clear set of expectations for the BOT. The Board's primary role of representing the public's interest is realized in its stewardship and through the Board's selection of its Chancellor and delegation of authority to the Chancellor. The Chancellor is, in turn, responsible for the effective management and development of the District and its resources and for keeping the Board apprised of the progress being made. The Chancellor's efforts, on behalf of the Board, are focused on serving students better so that they will achieve their educational goals.

The Board exhibits a keen interest in the progress and success of the District's students. It keeps itself well informed about many of the programs and services provided by the colleges. It does this by requesting regular reports and by holding a meeting on site at each college every year.

The Board participates in trainings and activities that are related to their roles as Board members and that inform them of their responsibilities to their constituents. The Board has done an admirable job in regards to their self-evaluation process. Also, through the formation of a citizen advisory council the Institution gains input from the community on the educational needs of its citizens. The Board provides clear and effective leadership and works within the boundaries of its authority.

### **Findings and Evidence**

The quality of programs and integrity of institutional actions and effectiveness are top priorities of the Board, as demonstrated by the Board-adopted annual goals. The goals are clearly mapped to the District Strategic Plan and Accreditation Standards, and are driven by the District mission statement. The BOT consistently monitors outcomes and exercises oversight over academic quality and the effectiveness of student learning programs and services. The Board receives routine reports on student outcomes and establishes goals to strengthen institutional effectiveness. Additionally, District policies carefully outline the responsibilities of the BOT in aligning its practices with the District mission and vision, further ensuring the academic quality and integrity of the student learning programs and services, as well as ensuring the financial solvency of the District. As reflected in BP 2710, BP 2715 and BP 2410, Board members support decisions made by the Board and act in a respectful manner in all interactions with the administration, the public and students. Starting in 2015 and continuing into 2016 the Board has adopted the mission statements for each of the colleges and the District. They also updated a significant number of BP's; however, there



are a number of policies that still need to be reviewed. While the report indicates that there is a goal to complete the review within six years, there is no adopted schedule or AP that ensures this will occur. (IV.C.1, IV.C.1, ER 7)

Trustees adhere to a written Code of Ethics, which unites them in representing the District in academic and fiscal matters. While each Trustee has an individual voice and vote, the Board acts as one on the decision of the majority in keeping with BP 2710: Conflict of Interest and BP 2715: Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice. The decisions of the Board are final and independent of any other entity within the District. The policies also establish clear requirements related to their authority as Trustees, using appropriate channels for communication through the Chancellor, maintaining appropriate conduct at meetings, handling of administrative matters, and their code of conduct. Included in the policy is the provision that, “Trustees refrain from involving themselves in matters they have placed under the authority of the Chancellor, except as needed for their proper oversight responsibilities.” New Board members receive training regarding the provisions to “act as a whole,” which is outlined in these policies. The policy states, “When acting as Board members, trustees speak and act on behalf of the District, not as individuals.” (IV.C.2)

BP 2431 and BP 2435 establish the role of the BOT in the hiring and evaluation of the Chancellor. The Board convenes a search committee that is inclusive of constituency groups and community members. Finalists who have been recommended by the search community are then interviewed in closed session by the Board. The Board is also responsible for evaluating the Chancellor annually using an evaluation method developed and agreed upon by the Board and Chancellor. It includes an evaluation of the Chancellor’s progress on meeting pre-established goals, feedback from constituent groups, an assessment from the Board Evaluation Subcommittee, the Chancellor’s own self-evaluation, and a review of the Chancellor’s goals and objectives for the coming year. The Board works in concert with HR and in accordance with the *Management Association Handbook* guidelines to ensure a fair and objective review. (IV.C.3)

The BOT directs the Chancellor to oversee the process of hiring a campus president as described in BP 2436. The search committee includes members of District governance groups and appropriate representatives from the community. The search committee reviews application materials, conducts initial interviews, and makes recommendations concerning all aspects of the search process. The Board interviews finalists in closed session and the final selection is announced in open session and voted on for approval pursuant to Title 5 and relevant Government Code regulations. The process for the selection and evaluation of the District’s college presidents by the Chancellor is included in BP 2437. Additional policies affecting this Standard are: BP 2431, BP 2432, BP 2435, BP 2436, BP 2437. Board minutes also describe the work of the Board in these matters. The current President was appointed in August 2005, by the BOT. (IV.C.3)

The BOT protects and reflects the public’s interest in the District through its policies and practices. The Board is comprised of five, publicly-elected members who have agreed to uphold the mission and vision of the District and adhere to the ethical standards set forth in the BPs. BP 2100, adopted in December of 2006, explains how Trustees are elected. BP 2105 describes how Student Trustees are selected and serve on a rotational basis and clarifies that

their vote is advisory. As described previously, BP 2715 clearly outlines the code of ethics and standards of practice expected of the Board. This policy also outlines procedures for dealing with perceived violation. That process starts by stating, “Behavior that is perceived to be contrary to the Code of Ethics will be brought to the attention of the President of the Board of Trustees,” and ends with, “The Chancellor and President of the Board are authorized to consult with legal counsel when they become aware of or are informed about actual or perceived violations of pertinent laws and regulations, including but not limited to conflict of interest, open and public meetings, confidentiality of closed session information, and use of public resources. Violations of law may be referred to the District Attorney or Attorney General as provided for in law.” BP 2710: Conflict of Interest states, “A Board member who has a remote interest in any contract considered by the Board shall disclose his or her interest during a board meeting and have the disclosure noted in the official Board minutes. The Board member shall not vote or debate on the matter or attempt to influence any other Board member to enter into the contract.” (IV.C.4, ER 7)

The Board has shown consistent interest in improving student learning programs and services and regularly requests reports on student persistence and completion, enrollment and demographic trends, the Student Success Scorecard, and curriculum alignment between K-12 and the District’s colleges. In addition, the Board sets its own annual goals with the intention of adhering to Accreditation Standards and the District’s Strategic Planning Goals. Overall, the Board shows its commitment to financial integrity and stability through its Subcommittee on Budget Study and Audit, by maintaining cash reserves to address imminent and unforeseen circumstances and future obligations, and by ensuring the sound fiscal management of the District through reviewing quarterly reports from the office of the VC of Business Services. The Board has also established a standing Subcommittee on Student Success and Accreditation to review measures of progress and areas of concern, including student equity and progress on transfer, state scorecard measures, and accreditation preparation. The District 2013-2017 Strategic Plan is another example of a Board-adopted plan to commit both the District and the colleges to ensuring the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them. (IV.C.5, ER 7)

BPs are readily available in print and through the District’s website under the Administration tab, including Board agendas, minutes, and recorded actions of the Board. The Board’s by-laws and policies are published on the Institution’s web site. Various criteria as required by this Standard are set forth in BP 2010, BP 2015, BP 2330, BP 2340, BP 2100, BP 2110, BP 2200, BP 2310, and BP 2510. The Board acts in compliance with these policies and has implemented a six-year review schedule for the on-going update of such policies as required by the Accreditation Standards (IV.C.6). Clear direction on the delegation of authority through the Chancellor to the District, colleges, and subsequent organizational committee structures, and responses to BPs and action items are provided in BP 2430 and BP 2510. A flow chart was developed in 2016 that outlines the steps taken to develop or modify BPs and APs. It includes the statement that, “All board policies and administrative procedures are on a six-year review cycle beginning in 2016;” however, no other documentation was provided to support that a review schedule or AP has been adopted to support this intention, the report does state that, “The Chancellor and Vice Chancellors are responsible for ensuring that the

policies and procedures under their respective areas of responsibility remain current.” (IV.C.7)

The report provides credible evidence that the “Board receives regular reports at its public meetings on various student outcomes and achievement including: transfer outcomes, annual degrees and certificates awarded, enrollment trends, student demographic trends, basic skills outcomes, student success planning, student support services including outcomes indicators, diversity, assessment and placement data, the Student Success Scorecard, Honors Program outcomes and Learning Communities.” Student Services frequently prepares special reports for the BOT. These reports are often presented during public Board meetings or distributed to the Board members in support of special projects. In May 2016, the Board adopted student success goals for the District. Board concern for student success is affirmed in their adopted Board goals, which are discussed at length during their annual Board retreat. (IV.C.8)

BP 2740, states, “The Board of Trustees is committed to its ongoing development as a Board and to a trustee education program that includes new trustee orientation. To that end, the Board of Trustees will engage in study sessions, be provided with access to reading materials, and support conference attendance and other activities that foster trustee education.” In addition to new Board member orientation with the Chancellor and other team members, Board members participate in an annual retreat, leadership development provided by the League, mandated ethics training, and regular conferences that are relevant to their roles. The continuity of Board members is ensured by the staggering of Board elections per Board policy. (IV.C.9)

The Board has a self-evaluation process which is delineated in BP 2410 and BP 2745 which is used to identify achievements and set future goals for improvement. It includes the Board members’ self-evaluation as well as input from constituent groups in the District who have knowledge of or interaction with the Board. Results of the evaluation are compiled through the Office of the VC of HR and shared with Trustees at a Board retreat. The ISER includes information and links to three years of Board self-evaluation results, including substantial review on the progress the District has made on the BOT adopted goals, which are mapped to the District plans and measures. These results are used to improve Board performance, academic quality, and institutional effectiveness. (IV.C .10)

BP 2355, BP 2710, BP 2715, BP 2716, and BP 2717 regulate how Trustees are to conduct themselves in an appropriate and legal manner, as well as follow the Brown Act. Individual trustees annually complete a Conflict of Interest form to avoid any potential conflict of interest. Board policy includes corrective action for dealing with behavior that violates the policy. None of the District Board members have employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the Institution and do not have family members working for the Institution. Should a conflict arise Board members are required to inform the Board at a public Board meeting of any interest they may have in, no matter how small or distant, any contract that the District is considering. When this is the case, then it is incumbent upon the Board member to remove him or herself from any discussion or vote on the matter. (IV.C.11, ER 7)

The Board has adopted and complies with BP 2430, BP 2432, and BP 2435 that delegate administrative and operational authority to the Chancellor and follows a process that holds the Chancellor accountable through annual performance evaluations as well as on-going communication. These BPs enable the Board to hold the Chancellor accountable for the operation of the District. It also provides the vehicle for evaluating the Chancellor's performance and setting performance goals and objectives for the upcoming academic year. Per BP 2430: Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor, the "Trustees specifically agree to participate in the development of District policy and strategies, while respecting the delegation of authority to the Chancellor and Presidents to administer the institution." This is clearly demonstrated on page 8 of the *Administrative and Governance Handbook* for 2015-16. It is further established in BP 2410, when it states, "Administrative procedures may be revised as deemed necessary by the Chancellor," and "Administrative procedures are to be issued by the Chancellor as statements of method to be used in implementing Board Policy. Such administrative procedures shall be consistent with the intent of Board Policy. Administrative procedures may be revised as deemed necessary by the Chancellor."

BP 2437: Evaluation of the President, states, "The Board of Trustees shall direct the Chancellor to conduct an evaluation of the President(s) in accordance with the scheduled sequence for evaluating management employees." This reinforces that the Board has delegated authority to the Chancellor, holding the Chancellor accountable to the Board, and the Presidents accountable to the Chancellor. (IV.C.12)

The Board's annual goals address Accreditation Standards while simultaneously addressing the District Strategic Planning Goals. Further it has established the Board Subcommittee on Student Success and Accreditation which reads and comments on all accreditation documents. The Chancellor and the Board subcommittee regularly report on accreditation and reports due to the Commission at public Board meetings.

The College provided sufficient documentation to support the report findings that, "The Board of Trustees is actively engaged in the accreditation process including evaluation of the Board's role and function in accreditation. The Board's Subcommittee on Student Success and Accreditation retreat provided systematic mechanisms for the Board's active involvement in accreditation and facilitates the Board's review of information about Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, Commission Policies and Accreditation processes to ensure that Board policies support excellence." (IV.C.13)

### **Conclusion**

The financial integrity and stability of the District are noteworthy, as the District practices fiscal responsibility and meets this Standard.

The Board's annual goals are commendable. They are student-centered and student-success oriented, and tie directly to Accreditation Standards and the District's Strategic Goals. BPs are readily accessible, clear, and concise. Those referring to the BOT provide adequate guidance for the effective operation of the Board.

**College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance**

None

**District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance**

See District Recommendations 1 and 2 (Improvement)

## **Standard IV.D: District**

### **General Observations**

The Chancellor has served as the Chief Executive Officer of the District for 12 years and the President has served in that capacity for the College for 12 years. Both have been instrumental in providing leadership in the implementation of District and College Goals, which are integrated and mutually beneficial in serving the needs of the students the District serves. At the beginning of each academic year, the Chancellor holds a retreat with the executive cabinet to plan and establish priorities and expectations for the year. The Chancellor's and President's goals consistently focus on institutional excellence and a demonstrated commitment to the effective operation of the institutions. They are reflected in the Annual Forums held by the Chancellor and presidents at the beginning of each fall term.

### **Findings and Evidence**

The Chancellor is a strong and well-respected leader and clearly communicates District goals and expectations that have both breadth and depth to establish a framework of excellence for serving students while advancing the District mission and strategic plans through the colleges it serves. The Chancellor's annual goals are clearly linked to Board goals, and subsequently to the College goals, as reflected in the goals of each college, and to the President, who has been delegated the authority and responsibility to lead that College. The *Chancellor's Cabinet Update* is a widely distributed publication providing information on District and College business. The Chancellor convenes an Annual District Forum, after which an impressive State of the District and Colleges are released. The President ensures financial resources are sufficient to support and sustain student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. The President delegates responsibilities according to the District Functional Map and the College Organizational Chart to the vice presidents based on their roles, duties, and assignments to ensure that legal requirements and BPs are met. (IV.D.1)

The District has established a clear Delineation of Function Map, which is widely disseminated and linked to the Governance Handbook. These materials are distributed in College publications widely and are used regularly in conducting College and District business. The Chancellor meets weekly with the Cabinet, (including the college presidents) to deal with operational concerns and policy matters and give and receive feedback on College and District matters. The Chancellor also holds open office hours at each site and regularly publishes the Chancellor updates. The District has a well-developed and clearly communicated budgeting process to allocate resources through a budget model to address fixed costs, enrollment targets, and other contractual commitments. There is a monthly meeting of the BPDC, which plans and monitors budget matters. (IV.D.2)

The ISER states that, *“state funding of the 72 districts is not based upon a true cost of education formula; the adequacy of the funding is tied to each district's targeted annual funded FTES.”* The District budget model funds the colleges based upon their proportional share of the districts state targeted annual funded FTES. The ISER concludes that the colleges are, *“adequately funded to support effective operations and sustainability as determined by the state.”* Surveys conducted at the College in 2012 and 2015 asked

employees to rate the allocation model and 38 percent agreed that the model distributed resources equitably among the colleges, while 30 percent disagreed and 32 percent were neutral. It appears that the District has a well-developed system that is understood by the leadership and governance structures at the College and that the colleges have adequate resources to make reasonable progress on their goals year after year. (IV.D.3)

In BP 2410: Organizational Structure and BP 2430 Job Description, the CEO has been delegated from the BOT through the Chancellor, the full responsibility and authority to implement and administer all College operations. The functional map and the *Administrative Governance Handbook* clarify those responsibilities when it states, “The President is responsible for providing leadership for the day-to-day operation of the total College program including the coordination of all programs, services, and operational matters. The Chancellor and Presidents provide overall leadership and operational authority on all of the functional areas that follow...” This list includes all District and College operational areas. (IV.D.4)

The College participates with the District in a well-developed comprehensive planning process, which is integrated with the College planning process. Both planning efforts have as a primary focus the improvement of student learning and achievement while maintaining institutional effectiveness. A District wide, constituency-based, Strategic Planning Committee evaluates these strategic plans on an annual basis. The first District goal, “Maximize student access, learning, and success through exemplary instruction and support services,” is laser focused on student improvement. (IV.D.5)

Progress on this Standard is best described in the 2016-17 Action Plans published by the District. This report includes a comprehensive analysis of all eight segments of District Office operations (BOT, Chancellor, Business and Technology Services, Instructional Services, HR, Facilities Management and Communications, and Public Relations). It reviews each Division’s mission, core values, functions, goals (including; activities, measures, and outcomes), and District Office Employee Survey. The report indicates that two-way communication is facilitated in the sharing of information through Chancellor’s Cabinet, multiple participatory governance councils and committees, and regular and annual campus presentations, including regular office hours at each site, online, and through Board reports, email and social media. (IV.D.6)

This District and this College benefit from long standing leadership. They have well established governance structures which are reviewed regularly and modified as needed. The primary way governance and decision-making processes flow between the District and the colleges is through the nine District wide participatory governance councils and committees that are divided into two tiers. *Tier one* consists of six governance councils: BPDC, Curriculum and Instructional Council, DGC, Management Services Council, Student Services Council and United Student Council. These councils have broad oversight and are each chaired by one of the VCs. *Tier two* consists of three governance committees: District Marketing and Outreach Committee, District Research Committee, and District Strategic Planning Committee. These committees are more narrowly focused and are chaired by either a Chancellor’s Cabinet member or report to one of the cabinet members.

All of the governance councils and committees have a defined set of functions and responsibilities that are consistent with BP 2510 on participatory governance. These functions and responsibilities are reviewed and reported annually in the *SDCCD Administration and Governance Handbook*. Each of these committees conducts formal self-assessments. (IV.D.7)

### **Conclusion**

The Chancellor is in her thirteenth year of service in the role with a total of twenty-four years in the District. The operational responsibilities and functions of the District and Colleges are presented in a Delineation of Function Map that undergoes regular review and revision. The District has a policy for allocation and reallocation of resources to support the effective operations and sustainability of the Colleges and District. Fiscal reserves are transparent to the stakeholders of the District and community.

District planning and evaluation is integrated with College planning and evaluation in support of improved student learning, achievement, and institutional effectiveness. The District recently engaged in a comprehensive evaluation of its integrated planning practices to ensure the connection of planning across institutions provides a holistic system in support leading to increased effectiveness.

Communication between the Colleges and District supports effective operation of the Colleges. There is broad monthly communication and immediate communication of any emerging issues of a critical nature. The Chancellor regularly reviews District and College role delineations, governance, and decision-making processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the College in meeting their ISS.

The team concludes that the District meets this Standard.

### **College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance**

None

### **District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance**

See District Recommendations 1 and 3 (Improvement)



## Quality Focus Essay Feedback

The SDMC Quality Focus Essay (QFE) appears to be a relatively well-developed document that provides a framework for identifying areas for improving institutional effectiveness via two distinct Action Projects summarized below.

The Action Projects clearly relate to Accreditation Standards, and align closely with the overarching themes that emerged from the College's examination of its own effectiveness in accomplishing its mission in the context of student learning and student achievement. Further, the focus of these Action Projects appears appropriate in that they parallel those opportunities for improvement specifically identified by the team in this report. In an effort to support the College's commitment to achieving the goals of these Action Projects, the team offers the following observations and feedback.

The first Action Project is related to the disaggregation of SLOs seek to investigate the effectiveness, methodology, and use of disaggregation of SLO data to improve student success, and to investigate potential strategies for additional levels of SLO disaggregation to identify subgroups in need of improvement. These actions identify the first steps in the process for disaggregating and analyzing student learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. The team invites the College to consider emphasizing in these Action Projects, the systematic collection and analysis of student learning outcomes data that reflects as directly as possible, the disaggregation of SLO data by College identified subpopulations as stated in Standard I.B.6. In addition, when the College identifies performance gaps in the disaggregation of SLO data, it implements strategies to mitigate those gaps and includes in the actions a process to evaluate the efficacy of those strategies.

The second Action Project indicates that the College will integrate the Program Review process with Budget and Resource development committee/process for resource allocation request for technology, facilities and human resources. The College is encouraged to continue with its action plan and meet its deadlines in the current and next fiscal year.

Lastly, the College is encouraged to carefully track and document its progress through all Phases of the Action Projects. Documentation should include documentation of which committee/group is making progress toward the goal and the current progress achieved.