LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

Accreditation
Follow-Up Report

Submitted to the
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

October 2010

LAS POSITAS
COLLEGE

3000 Campus Hill Drive
Livermore, California 94551

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATION OF LAS POSITAS COLLEGE FOLLOW-UP REPORT

Date:

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

From: Las Positas College
        3000 Campus Hill Drive
        Livermore, CA 94551

This Follow-Up Report certifies that there was broad participation by the campus community and that the Follow-Up Report accurately responds to the Accrediting Commission's two recommendations that require follow-up reporting.

Signed

_____

Dr. Joel L. Kinnamon, Chancellor, Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

_____

Mr. Donald L. Gelles, President, Board of Trustees, Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

_____

Dr. Guy F. Lease, Interim President, Las Positas College

_____

Ms. Sarah Thompson, President, Las Positas College Academic Senate

_____

Ms. Sharon Gach, President, Las Positas College Classified Senate

_____

Mr. Daniel Nenni, President, Associated Students of Las Positas College

Statement of Report Preparation

The Las Positas College Self Study Report was completed and submitted to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) for its site visit that occurred October 19 - 22, 2009.

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges – at its meeting January 6-8, 2010 – took action to reaffirm accreditation for Las Positas College, with a requirement that the college complete a Follow-Up Report by October 15, 2010. The Commission required that the Follow-Up Report demonstrate resolution of College Recommendation 3 and College Recommendation 4 as follows:

College Recommendation 3:
Program Review
To meet the Commission's 2012 deadline in the assessment of student learning outcomes, and to achieve a level of proficiency in program review for all efforts, the team recommends that:
   A. The college fully integrate its processes for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its processes for program review and planning. (I.B.1, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b)
   B. The college fully implement a program review process for all administrative programs and services. (I.B.3, III.A.6, III.B.2, III.D.3)

College Recommendation 4:
Information Competency
To meet the standard the team recommends that the college use campus-wide dialog to develop the ongoing instruction for users of library and learning support services to ensure students develop skills in Information Competency. (II.C.1.b)

Following receipt of the accreditation report, Las Positas College shared the comprehensive accreditation evaluation team report at a campus-wide Town Meeting on February 3, 2010 (RPE 0.1). Subsequent to the all-college meeting, the report and the Commission's action letter were widely distributed on the college homepage (RPE 0.2). A subsequent report out to the Board of Trustees was given on March 2, 2010 (RPE 0.3). The recommendations were discussed at several participatory governance committees or groups including College Council, Academic Senate, and Administrative Council, as well as by the Chancellor's Cabinet at the district (RPE 0.4).

Throughout Spring 2010, Las Positas College worked on responses to College Recommendation 3 and College Recommendation 4. The Academic Senate provided faculty leads for each recommendation response, with an ad hoc Follow-Up Report team developed through the College Council (RPE 0.5). The College Council was the collegial participation committee charged with the final report review and approval (RPE 0.6). Members of the ad hoc accreditation follow-up report team represent constituent groups across the college and are listed below:

Accreditation Follow-Up Ad Hoc Committee:

Name	Constituency
Dr. Laurel Jones	Administration/ALO
Dr. Amber Machamer	Administration
Elena Cole	Faculty
Lauren Hasten	Faculty
Cheryl Warren	Faculty
Chris Armson	Classified
Elizabeth Noyes	Classified
Jeff Sperry	Classified
Alexander Blue	Student

The college leveraged many of its original Self Study resources to assist in the writing and editing process. The Accreditation Liaison Officer developed templates for written review. To facilitate open communication and contribution, the College utilized its Wiki web site which allows open editing of shared documents; the online document repository was used for evidence gathering and storage.

In February/March of 2010, lead faculty and staff appointed to Recommendation 3 and 4 developed tentative plans to facilitate and accelerate progress in student learning outcomes assessment and integration into program review; additionally, plans for information competency were developed (RPE 0.7). The ad hoc accreditation team facilitated these plans by shepherding the process, creating timelines for completion and ensuring written documentation and evidence (RPE 0.8).

On March 3, 2010 a Town Meeting was dedicated to disseminating the revised Instructional Program Review Self Study, with the inclusion of student learning outcomes assessment and an analysis worksheet (RPE 0.9). Follow-up training for faculty was held on three successive occasions (RPE 0.10). Faculty also met directly with the Director of Institutional Research and Planning.

In March and April 2010, the library staff held on-campus meetings to dialogue about information competency and attended the Distance Education Committee to garner input regarding information competency for students enrolled in online courses (RPE 0.11).

In May 2010 a draft report outlining the recommendation activities completed during the Spring 2010 semester was disseminated to the college at large through the Wiki, with feedback opportunities available throughout the summer (RPE 0.12). The draft was also given to the College Council for review and comment at its final committee meeting in May 2010 (RPE 0.12).

The 2010 finalization of the strategic planning process, program review planning and writing, and the development of an instructional program review validation structure were designed for Fall implementation (RPE 0.13). In August 2010, all recommendation activities were updated,

disseminated and reviewed by the College at large through Wiki (RPE 0.14). The report was based on progress made from Spring to early Fall; the final Follow-Up Report draft was sent to the College Council for review and approval at a special meeting on August 31, 2010 (RPE 0.15). This approved college Follow-Up Report draft was sent to the Board of Trustees for review at its Study Meeting on September 7, 2010, with action taken for approval at its Regular Meeting on September 21, 2010 (RPE 0.16).

Evidence for Report Preparation (RPE)

RPE.1	President's Town Meeting presentation; February 3, 2010
RPE.2	ACCJC letter to President; January 29, 2010
RPE.3	Board of Trustees Agenda; March 2, 2010
	President's Action Plan to Board of Trustees; March 2, 2010
RPE.4	College Council Agendas; February 18 and March 18, 2010
	Academic Senate Agenda; February 10, 2010
RPE.5	Memos from Vice President of Academic Services to College Council; March 11 and March 15, 2010
RPE.6	College Council minutes; September 17, 2009
RPE.7	SLO Committee minutes; February 1, 2010
RPE.8	Ad Hoc memo and templates; October 15, 2010
RPE.9	Program Review outline; February 22, 2010
	SLO analysis worksheets; Spring 2010
	Town Meeting presentation; March 3, 2010
RPE.10	Memo and Workshop dates; March 16, 2010
RPE.11	Information Competency Ad Hoc minutes; March 26, 2010
	Dialogue Summaries; March 30 and 31, 2010
RPE.12	Email to LPC Wiki access and report draft; June 15, 2010
RPE.13	Institutional Plan 2015 Goal map; January 13, 2010
RPE.14	Email to LPC Final Report draft Wiki postings; (pending)
RPE.15	September College Council Agenda and Minutes; (pending)
RPE.16	September Board of Trustees Agenda; (pending)

Program Review
To meet the Commission's 2012 deadline in the assessment of student learning outcomes, and to achieve a level of proficiency in program review for all efforts, the team recommends that:

    A. The college fully integrates its processes for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its processes for program review and planning. (I.B.1,II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b)

Descriptive Summary
In January 2010, the college began its integration of student learning outcomes into its program review. This process had to include several steps related to College Recommendation 1B which asked that:

    Las Positas develop and implement on-going, systematic, college-wide processes to evaluate the effectiveness of its program review, planning and governance systems. (I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, IV.A.5).

Because the student learning outcomes process is coordinated with both program review and its place within the systematic planning, the college has chosen to include activities in overall planning as part of the summary.

At the direction of the College President, the college held a "Common Ground" meeting on January 13, 2010. Comprised of ad hoc participatory governance representatives the group discussed, reviewed and agreed to common components involved in the institutional process for conducting strategic planning that leads to institutional effectiveness. Ad hoc membership is delineated below.

Name	Constituency
Pam Luster	Administration
Amber Machamer	Administration
Philip Manwell	Administration
Teri Henson	Faculty
Mike Sato	Faculty
Sarah Thompson	Faculty
Bill Eddy	Classified
Natasha Lang	Classified
Jeff Sperry	Classified
Janneice Hines	Student
Takeo Hiraki	Student
Masi Quorayshi	Student

The goals of the ad hoc one-day meeting included: reviewing an Institutional Effectiveness model; reaching agreement on the institutional planning process; defining coordination between institutional planning, program review, and accreditation (CE3a.1). The recommendations developed at that meeting were sent to the President on January 31, along with visual diagrams designed to demonstrate the institutional strategic planning process resulting in the *Institutional Plan – 2015*.

At the February 3, 2010 Town Meeting, a presentation entitled *Reaching Common Ground* was made to the college at large (CE3a.2). As a follow up to the ad hoc recommendations, the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee met to review an appropriate assessment model at two meetings, February 1, 2010 and March 1, 2010 (CE3a.3). The committee discussed and forwarded the draft to the Academic Senate for its review and approval on February 10, 2010. A meeting between a representative of Program Review, the committee chair for Student Learning Outcomes, the Director of Institutional Research and Planning and the Vice President of Academic Services took place on February 17, 2010. At this meeting, the assessment model was reviewed and discussed in terms of its relevance to the current program review process and its inclusion into the Self Study narrative. It was agreed that the Student Learning Outcomes assessment would be inserted into page 6 of the Self Study/Program Review and that the Director of Institutional Research and Planning would develop an accompanying tool for student learning outcome assessment analysis. This tool is called the assessment analysis worksheet (CE3a.4). This group also prepared for the March 3, 2010 Town Meeting, where the integration of student learning outcome assessment and analysis into the program review model was discussed with the campus at large.

The March 3, 2010 Town Meeting was dedicated to a collaborative presentation for all faculty regarding the integrated student learning outcomes assessment and analysis into program review (CE3a.5). The President of the Academic Senate, the Director of Institutional Research and Planning, the chair of the Student Learning Outcomes Committee and a faculty representative from Instructional Program Review presented these new processes. Options for garnering student learning outcomes assessment data were reviewed both through eLumen and with the assistance of the Director of Institutional Research and Planning, who provided eLumen data for all disciplines with the exception of MSEPS (Math, Science, Engineering and Public Safety). Members from the MSEPS Division either used their own data or requested it from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. The process of data analysis and insertion of analysis into the program review Self Study was discussed and reviewed by all instructional faculty and their respective deans, as well as the Student Services faculty and coordinators. Three follow up staff development opportunities were allotted for disciplines to work with the SLO chair or Director of Institutional Research and Planning on the analysis of outcomes assessment data.

Each program review model (instructional, student services, and non-instructional) will be validated through a committee or organizational review process that funnels into a *"Common Tool"* (CE3a.6).

The *"Common Tool"* is used for institutional tracking and program review submittal of program review goals. This ties the institutional program review models into larger strategic planning, resource allocation and institutional effectiveness (CE3a.7). The timelines for completion of the instructional program review process, its validation, summary for institutional planning and effectiveness and inclusion into the *Institutional Plan 2015* is December 2010; this process includes the validation of all instructional program reviews with the SLO assessment included in the Self Study. This validation occurs through the Instructional Program Review Committee which begins its work in Fall 2010 (CE3a.8). To ensure systematic leadership, the Office of Academic Services – in collaboration with the Academic Senate – selected an Instructional Program Review Coordinator to lead the committee process and act as liaison to other program

review processes and to other committees affected by program planning (CE3a.9). Summaries of Program Reviews and Common Tool development are set for November to December, with the creation and implementation of the Institutional Plan 2015 in December 2010 or January 2011. The completion of the instructional program review process through the Institutional Plan 2015 provides an integrated process for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its process for program review and planning as recommended through the Evaluation Report submitted by the visiting team in October 2009.

Analysis of the Results Achieved to Date
The college has completed its integration of student learning outcomes assessment into the Instructional Program Review model. Results of that integration will be codified through the work of the Instructional Program Review Committee. This should bring the college SLO assessment to the level of proficiency in program review expected by the Accreditation Commission.

The college has an approved, revised program review procedure that fully incorporates the SLO assessment into the instructional program review process. The timeline for program review integration into college-wide strategic planning has been set and produces the *Institutional Plan 2015* in the Spring 2011. Validation measures for instructional program review and institutional planning have been set to begin in Fall 2010, through both the Instructional Program Review Committee and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee.

The Academic Senate provided leadership in ensuring the instructional program review committee becomes the primary driver for all instructional program review timelines, documentation and forms, and review and summary responsibilities. Training for the instructional program review committee will begin with the first committee meeting in Fall 2010. Because this is a new committee, the Program Review Coordinator provides responsible leadership in fulfilling the mission and committee responsibilities as well as providing coordination with other college committees integral to the institutional planning process. Specific achievements linked to this recommendation include:

1. Formal integration of SLO assessment into the instructional program review model
2. Approved planning process model, timeline and common tool for program review models used throughout the institution (Common Ground outcome; Common Tool outcome; Academic Senate outcome; Student Learning Outcomes Committee outcome; Flex Day outcome; College Council Committee outcome)
3. Formal creation of the oversight Instructional Program Review Committee
4. Formal approval of the Program Review Coordinator position
5. Formal approval of the Strategic Planning document
6. Formal creation of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Additional Plans
Please see action plan / timeline for program review (appendix recommendation Evidence for College Recommendation 3a (CE3a).

Evidence for College Recommendation 3a

Program Review
To meet the Commission's 2012 deadline in the assessment of student learning outcomes, and to achieve a level of proficiency in program review for all efforts, the team recommends that:
> B. The college fully implement a program review process for all administrative programs and services, (I.B.3, III.A.6, III.B.2, III.D.3)

Descriptive Summary:
The Office of Institutional Research and Planning is responsible for the implementation of the Administrative Unit (Non-Instructional) Program Review. Discussion over the approach, the process and the implementation began in the Administrative Council meeting of December 9, 2009 (CE3b.1). Models and non-instructional program review intents were shared with the administrative group, where direction was given to the Director of Institutional Research and Planning to move forward.

A pilot of three administrative units (President's Office, Teaching and Learning Center, Technology Department) began in Fall 2009 (CE3b.2). This pilot was completed by the end of Spring 2010. The process included the dissemination of the administrative unit program review template and multiple meetings with each unit for discussion of the pilot and feedback for process improvement.

The pilot process included a campus-wide survey for each unit (CE3b.3). The surveys were created through the collaborative discussion held with each unit and with the inclusion of best practice models. Results from the Fall 2009 survey were disseminated to each pilot unit. Unit self studies were completed in June 2010 and action plans and the common tool will be completed by December 2010. The evaluation of the Administrative Unit Program Review pilot process included interviews with the pilot units over the Summer 2010. (CE3b.4)

With the completion of the interview process, the Director of Institutional Research and Planning redesigned the template and the review process based on the feedback noted in the above paragraph (CE3b.5). Continued Administrative Unit Program Review for all administrative units, began in Fall, 2010 with completion scheduled for December 2010.

Included in the completion of Recommendations 3a and 3b is noted work with both the "Common Ground" and "Common Tool" task forces. The process and outcomes for each of these task forces was included in the descriptive summary for 3a and in the Follow-Up Report Abstract on institutional planning. The completion of all Administrative Unit Program Reviews in Fall 2010 will provide planning inclusion for administrative unit goals and needs into the Common Tool tracking mechanism, into the college wide resource allocation process, and into the *Institutional Plan 2015* (CE3b.6).

Analysis of the Results Achieved to Date

The three pilot Administrative Unit Program Reviews have been completed and serve as the evaluated process that began for all administrative unit reviews in Fall 2010. This demonstrates resolution of Recommendation 3B made in the visit team's 2009 Evaluation Report.

Planning goals and needs from the Administrative Unit Program Reviews take their place alongside the instructional program review plans and goals and the student services program review plans and goals as part of the *Institutional Plan 2015* and as part of the demonstrated proficiency level of all program review efforts.

Additional Plans

Following the template and process changes noted in the descriptive summary, the revised Administrative Unit Program Review process will need to be time-lined every four years as are the other program review processes. Possible staggered reviews for all institutional programs (instructional, student services, administrative) will be discussed upon completion of this first four year integrated cycle, which ends in 2015.

Evidence for College Recommendation 3b (CE3b)

CE3b.1	Administrative Council Agenda
CE3b.2	Non-Instructional Program Review Pilot; Fall 2009
CE3b.3	Pilot Process Survey; Spring 2010
CE3b.4	Pilot Unit Interviews; Summer 2010 (not available yet)
CE3b.5	Pilot Template and Review process; Fall 2010 (not available yet)
CE3b.6	Institutional Plan 2015 Goal map; January 13, 2010

Information Competency
To meet the Standards the team recommends that the college use campus-wide dialog to develop ongoing instruction for users of library and learning support services to ensure students develop skills in Information Competency (II.C.1.b).

Descriptive Summary
In response to this recommendation, the college library faculty developed a team that included librarians and designated faculty members from college disciplines. The accreditation ad hoc lead from this small group is the Library Coordinator (CE4.1). The recommendation response group also developed a website
(http://libraryguides.laspositascollege.edu/informationcompetency)
as a part of the institutional record of events and action steps taken throughout the process. Included in the website is a Home Page with team information and upcoming events; an Information Competency Tab noting resources, standards and General Education/SLO Core Competencies; and a tab for Committee Documents (CE4.2).

Name	Position/Division	Constituency
Philip Manwell	Dean	Administration
Cheryl Warren	Library Coordinator	Faculty
Frances Hui	Librarian	Faculty
Nan Ho	Biology/MSEPS	Faculty
Robin Roy	Psychology/BCATSS	Faculty
Elizabeth Hopkins	Health/PEHWA	Faculty
Angela Amaya	Librarian	Faculty
Tina Inzerilla	Librarian	Faculty
Karin Spirn	English/A&C	Faculty

Using an adapted definition of Information Competency taken from the Association of College and Research Libraries, the group developed a timeline, summary information and action plans for the recommendation response (CE4.3). The response team met on the following dates: March 2, 2010; March 16, 2010; April 20, 2010; and May 4, 2010. The ad hoc committee summary report was written on May 14, 2010.

The ad hoc response committee meetings were held to develop dialogue materials, present information messages for division meetings and develop variable flex opportunities for dialogue sessions. The following elements were included in the meetings following the dialogue sessions: review of dialogue forums, review of information competency draft statements, and discussion of pilot projects determined from dialogue sessions and timeline events for continued recommendation response in the Fall 2010 (CE4.4).

These campus-wide dialogue sessions took place on March 30, 2010, and March 31, 2010. A special information competency session was also held for the Distance Education Committee meeting on March 26, 2010 (CE4.5). Included in these dialogue sessions were an overall common understanding of information competency college-wide, ideas, concerns and other

issues related to the topic of Information Competency and the completion of recommendation four. Dialogue summaries were developed for the meeting discussions on March 30, 2010 and March 31, 2010 (CE4.6).

Following campus dialogue and review, the response team met to discuss summaries and next steps for the development of information competency within the institution. As reflected in the minutes from April 20, 2010, there were several ideas generated through campus-wide dialogue that will be part of the Fall 2010 timeline. The ad hoc committee reviewed and agreed to finalize the Las Positas College Statement on Information Competency and review its placement and process within the campus. The committee also agreed to pilot projects being the next step in institutionalizing and codifying the information competency response to recommendation 4 (CE4.7).

The summary report submitted on May 14, 2010 finalized the work of the recommendation response ad hoc committee. Finalized projects from the Spring 2010 semester include the Information Competency Statement and the Information Competency Standards (CE4.8). The summary report noted specific meeting results for each meeting, and included follow up goals for the group to enact through December 2010 (CE4.9).

Analysis of the Results Achieved to Date
The Recommendation 4 ad hoc committee achieved several things that address and complete the information competency recommendation to use dialogue to develop instruction for users of library and learning support as they develop skills in information competency.

Demonstrated outcomes include:
- Completed dialogue sessions with the college campus
- Completed web page on Information Competency
- Completed timeline for recommendation response through December 2010
- Completed Information Competency Statement
- Completed Information Competency Standards
- Approved faculty survey for Fall 2010
- Approved pilot projects for Health 1 and English 1A courses

Additional Plans
The next step in the recommendation response is launching pilot projects using two courses that many students take before graduation or transfer is. With the dialogue sessions and best practice literature as part of the follow up, the library staff and pilot instructors will incorporate a sequence of information competency skills within the content and context of the selected courses. The intent is to identify and build upon the relationship of information to the critical thinking process, and to provide hands-on application and practice in the development of information competency skills.

The pilot results will be used to further review additional models for information competency; with the ad hoc committee reviewing the faculty survey results in Fall 2010, the pilot results, and the current information competency skills courses in place within the library curriculum, follow

up discussion on the model or format to follow as the finalized response to Recommendation 4 will be decided at the end of Fall 2010 or the beginning of Spring 2011.

Evidence for College Recommendation 4 (CE4)

CE4.1	Information Competency Ad Hoc Committee minutes; May 4, 2010
CE4.2	Information Competency Home Page
CE4.3	Information Competency Ad Hoc Committee minutes; March 2, 2010 and March 16, 2010.
CE4.4	Dialogue Summaries; March 30, 2010 and March 31, 2010 Committee Approved Draft 4, Description, Standards, Forum dates
CE4.5	Distance Education Committee Meeting report; March 26, 2010
CE4.6	Dialogue Summaries; March 30, 2010 and March 31, 2010
CE4.7	Information Competency meeting minutes; April 20, 2010
CE4.8	Information Competency Standards report; May 4, 2010
CE4.9	Information Competency Summary report; May 14, 2010

Planning Abstract

(Institutional Effectiveness, Program Review)

Las Positas College received its evaluation report in January 2010. The report reflected the recommendations of the evaluation team determined from the team site visit conducted October 19-22, 2009. Two of the recommendations were noted as needing a Follow-Up Report and site visit. One of these Follow-Up recommendations is for a college effort towards information competency and is discussed within the Follow-Up Report; the other is for an integrated effort in program review and planning and is considered part of the institutional response to several of the recommendations put forth from Standard I. This program review/planning recommendation reads:

Recommendation 3:
Program Review

To meet the Commission's 2012 deadline in the assessment of student learning outcomes, and to achieve a level of proficiency in program review for all efforts, the team recommends that:

    A. The college fully integrate its processes for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its processes for program review and planning (I.B.1, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b)

    B. The college fully implement a program review process for all administrative programs and services (I.B.3, III.A.6, III.B.2, III.D.3)

Standard I evaluation by the team included an additional recommendation that is not part of the Follow-Up Report mandate, but is intrinsically connected to Recommendation 3. It reads:

Recommendation 1:
Institutional Effectiveness

To improve to a level of sustained continuous quality improvement the team recommends that:

    A. The college increase its capacity for conducting research, fulfill its planning agenda with respect to institutional research and institutional effectiveness, and integrate institutional effectiveness research into planning through regular systemic evaluation of its progress toward achieving institutional goals. (I.B.3, I.B.4)

    B. The college develop and implement on-going, systematic, college-wide processes to evaluate the effectiveness of its program review, planning and governance systems. (I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, IV.A.5)

Because of the integration and interdependence of Recommendations 1 and 3, it is imperative that the Follow-Up Report abstract delineate the college's response to overall systematic planning as well as documenting the college's response to specific recommendations. The purpose of this abstract is to codify the institutional response to Institutional Effectiveness, Program Review and Planning, and to provide a chronological context for this institutional effort. In doing so, the college proposes that in its response to the mandated October 15 Recommendation3 response, the work also being done on Recommendation 1 must be acknowledged. The abstract provides that institutional context for the review of the Follow-Up site visit team.

Institutional Planning, Strategic Planning, Program Review Planning and integration of planning into college process and systems is an integrally linked system. No single planning cycle or system exists without the other. As such, this abstract describes the overall college planning and the framework for Recommendation 3 responses. The abstract description is chronological in its approach.

On January 13, 2010 the Academic Senate, Classified Senate and Administrative Council sent representatives to the *"Common Ground"* meeting.

Common Ground Team:

Name	Constituency
Pam Luster	Administration
Amber Machamer	Administration
Philip Manwell	Administration
Teri Henson	Faculty
Mike Sato	Faculty
Sarah Thompson	Faculty
Bill Eddy	Classified
Natasha Lang	Classified
Jeff Sperry	Classified
Janneice Hines	Student
Takeo Hiraki	Student
Masi Quorayshi	Student
Jim Gioia	Ex-Officio
Todd Steffan	Ex-Officio
Heidi Ulrech	Ex-Officio

This meeting set the following goals:
- Review the draft Institutional Effectiveness model
- Identify areas needing clarification and areas of concern
- Develop solutions to the areas needing clarification and areas of concern
- Reach agreement on the institutional planning process
- Define coordination between institutional planning, program review, accreditation, and the proposed Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) and Planning and Budget Committee (PBC)
- Develop committee recommendations
- Report and gather input from recommendation with constituency groups
- Provide committee recommendations to the President by January 31, 2010

This meeting developed the following agreements and recommendations:

Agreements
- New models for:
  - Strategic Planning Process
  - Institutional Planning Process
  - Institutional Effectiveness Model
- New timeline for planning processes (through Fall 2010)
- Dedicate March 12 Flex Day to continuation of Strategic Planning Process and identification of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)
- Develop *Common Tool* for Program Reviews this spring; use process similar to *Common Ground* group

Recommendations
- Look at Student Learning Outcomes and how they integrate into new Institutional Effectiveness model
- Establish an "Assessment Day" to take place annually, at the end of the Spring semester
- Integrate Accreditation feedback earlier on in the Institutional Effectiveness model; separate and clarify the Planning Agendas (self-created) and Recommendations (from ACCJC)

Each of the recommendations and agreements noted in the *Common Ground* meeting were reviewed by constituency groups. The summary of *Common Ground* events was given at the February 3, 2010 Town Meeting. From there, subgroups worked together to plan for:
- Flex Day – "Dialogue to Action: Developing Strategies and Measures of Success for Our Strategic Plan"; March 12, 2010
- Program Review Self Study and SLO Assessment and Analysis integration (Instruction and Student Services); March 2010
- Common Tool Development and Agreement for all Program Review models (Instruction, Student Services, Administrative/Unit); May 2010
- Program Review Timelines: Institutional (all completed by the end of December 2010)
- Instructional Program Review Committee development and start up (Fall 2010)
- Institutional Effectiveness Committee development and start up (Fall 2010)

Outcome for all of the above subgroup plans and processes:
Institutional Plan 2015 (IP 2015): December 2010

In February 2010, the Student Learning Outcomes Committee reviewed the student learning outcomes assessment model provided by the chair of the committee and agreed to send it forward for review by the Academic Senate. In conjunction with the Senate review, the Instructional Program Review representative, the Chair of Student Learning Outcomes committee, the Vice President of Academic Services, and the Director of Institutional Research and Planning met to develop a student learning outcomes analysis worksheet as part of the student learning assessment model. In addition, the program review Self Study was revised to

include the student learning outcomes assessment/analysis step within the program review process.

At the March 3 Town Meeting, the faculty were introduced to the revised Program Review Self Study and the student learning outcomes assessment/analysis worksheet. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning provided disciplines with eLumen data, as well as training on running the outcomes program report directly.

There were three follow up trainings available to faculty members throughout the Spring 2010 semester; these occurred on March 3, 2010, March 25, 2010 and May 5, 2010. Both instructional program review and student services program review models include student learning outcome assessment, discipline action plans and input into the *"Common Tool"* for institutional planning and resource allocation; both the instructional program reviews and the student service program reviews are due by the end of Fall 2010.

On March 12, 2010 a mandatory Flex Day was held for college-wide participation in the strategic planning process. The outcomes for the day included discussion and understanding of each college strategic goal and its relation to the mission and vision of the college; crafting impact statements associated with the strategic goal; developing strategies for completing the strategic goal; identifying key performance indicators for each strategy; and a cross-constituent discussion of college planning and resource allocation.

On April 30, 2010 the *Common Tool* ad hoc met to review, discuss and revise the common tool.

Common Tool Team:

Name	Constituency
Laurel Jones	Administration
Pamela Luster	Administration
Amber Machamer	Administration
Rajeev Chopra	Faculty
Elena Cole	Faculty
Teri Henson	Faculty
Cindy Balero	Classified
Heidi Ulrech	Classified
BRIC members	Non voting, observers

This is the institutional tracking tool designed for all institutional program reviews to use that assists the college in linking the process of program review into institutional planning and resource allocation. The group was assisted by the Bridging Research Information and Culture (BRIC) team, who were participating with the college on data review/analysis opportunities on campus and lent their expertise to the meeting as well. BRIC is a state-wide project funded by

the Hewlett Foundation designed to assist colleges to integrate inquiry and evidence based planning and processes in California Community Colleges.

The Common Tool was agreed upon with page one (A-K) cells developed by the ad hoc committee. Further agreement included the need for the *Common Tool* ad hoc committee to meet again in January 2011 to develop page two of the tool, which looks at institutional dissemination and program review author tracking. The Common Tool was presented at the College Council meeting on May 20, 2010 and was approved by the Academic Senate at its final meeting of the semester in May 2010.

At the last two College Council meetings, the efforts of the all-college Flex Day were reviewed and approved. The strategies and key performance indicators were developed at the mandatory Flex Day, and provided the strategic plan framework for the IP 2015. Completed by the end of Spring 2010 semester were the following:

- Instructional Program Review model with SLO assessment integration
- Instructional Program Review, Student Services Program Review and Administrative Unit Program Review models all developed and underway
- Common Tool developed for all program review plans (institutional tracking method)
- Strategic Plan approved by College Council
- Instructional Program Review Committee developed and approved; Program Review Coordinator approved
- Institutional Effectiveness Committee developed and approved

Summary:
The college is poised for a comprehensive integrated planning cycle that completes the response to Recommendation 3 and is well on the way to completing Recommendation 1 as well. The framework for planning has provided the college resolution and improvement of college practices based on the observations of the evaluation team at the time of its visit. It is within this context that the college provides its response to Recommendation 3 (3a and 3b).