

***San Diego Mesa College
Focused Midterm Report***

Submitted by

San Diego Mesa College
7250 Mesa College Drive
San Diego, CA 92111

To

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

September 25, 2007

CERTIFICATION OF THE FOCUSED MIDTERM REPORT

DATE: September 25, 2007

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

FROM: San Diego Mesa College

This Focused Midterm Report is submitted as required by the terms of the institution's 2004 accreditation. We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community, and we believe the Focused Midterm Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

Mr. Marty Block
President, Board of Trustees

Dr. Constance Carroll
Chancellor, San Diego Community
College District

Dr. Rita Cepeda
President, San Diego Mesa College

Ms. Jill Baker
Lead Writer

Ms. Mary Teegarden
President, Academic Senate

Ms. Robin Martindill
President, Classified Senate

Mr. Avery Ryder
President, Associated Students

Ms. Elizabeth Armstrong
Accreditation Liaison Officer

Table of Contents

	Page
Statement of Report Preparation	1
Timeline	3
Response to Recommendation 1.1	4
Response to Recommendation 1.2	11
Response to Recommendation 1.3	15
Response to Recommendation 1.4	18
Response to Recommendation 1.5	20
Response to Recommendation 3.1	23
Response to Recommendation 3.2	27
Response to Recommendation 4.1	33
Response to Recommendation 4.2	35
Planning Summary from Self Study	39
Evidence	46

Statement of Report Preparation

The process for the preparation of this report began in fall 2006 with the creation of a job description and announcement for the 40% reassigned faculty position of Lead Writer. The selection process was conducted by a representative subcommittee of President's Cabinet, which included the Accreditation Liaison Officer. The selection was made in early January, 2007, with the assignment commencing on February 2, 2007. The Lead Writer immediately began meeting with the Accreditation Liaison Officer to plan the methodology and timeline.

A strict timeline was created, along with a presentation on the process that would be followed. This was placed into Power Point format and presented by the Accreditation Liaison Officer and Lead Writer to all governance groups on campus. Each group was encouraged to offer guidance, direction, and information that would assist with addressing this report.

To prepare for the report, the original ACCJC evaluation report for the self study, dated October 4-7, 2004 was studied in detail. Each recommendation was examined separately within the context of the evaluation report and with direct alignment to the specific ACCJC standards that were cited. This became the framework for assessing the progress that has been made in the past three years and the standard for measuring the steps still to be taken. A similar process was used for assessing progress on the college's Planning Summary (goals), which was articulated in the self study.

Numerous meetings, interviews, and email communications were used to gather appropriate information for this evaluation. Each of these is documented in the evidence file. At each point, documentation was gathered to support information that was provided. In some cases this included a publication or plan, in other cases it consisted of the minutes of a committee, and in still others it consisted of information provided on the district or college websites. All interviews were documented in writing and placed in the evidence file.

The governance group presentations were conducted February 13-March 14, 2007; interviews and research for the first draft were conducted February 2-March 26, 2007. The report was written by the Lead Writer and Accreditation Liaison Officer, with formal publication of the first draft being uploaded to the college website on April 9, 2007. A college-wide email informed the campus community that the report had been posted and included a direct hyperlink, along with instructions on how to log in to the site and instructions for how to respond to the lead writer. The report remained on the website until April 20, 2007. At that point, all feedback was considered and a revision of the document was conducted. The first revision was completed on May 4, 2007 and republished to the college website on May 9, 2007. The revised report was discussed in detail at President's Cabinet Retreat on May 11, 2007. It was also shared with the sister colleges and the district office subsequent to this.

Revisions were completed by May 18, 2007 and again uploaded to the college website. Minor additions were made August 28, 2007 to reflect progress that had been made during the summer. The President's Cabinet approved the final report on September 4,

2007. Subsequent to campus approval, the report was sent to the San Diego Community College District Board of Trustees for approval on September 25, 2007.

The following is a list of those who were involved in the preparation, review, and approval of the Focused Midterm Report:

Elizabeth Armstrong, Vice President, Instruction; Accreditation Liaison Officer
Jill Baker, Librarian; Lead Writer
Rita Cepeda, President
Yvonne Bergland, Research and Program Review Committees
Ron Perez (Budget and Facilities Committees)
Gail Conrad (SLOs and SLOAC, Program Review, and Research Committee)
Yosh Kawahara (Research Committee)
Jodi Corliss (Research Committee)
Dina Miyoshi (Research Committee)
Joanne Hamilton (Research Committee)
Bill Grimes (Mesa and District Research Committees)
Jonathan McLeod (Research Committee and SLOs)
Rob Fremland (Program Review Committee and District Research Committee)
Chris Sullivan (Program Review and Research Committees)
Otto Lee (VTEA Administrator)
Carl Luna (Academic Senate President, District Governance Committee, District Strategic Planning Committee, and District Budget Committee)
Sondra Frisch (Site Compliance Officer)
William Craft (Mesa Information Technology Committee)
Momilani Ramstrum (Mesa Information Technology Committee)
Suzanne Khambata (Director, Student Health Center, advisor to AS on health and health service issues)
Joi Blake (Dean, Student Matriculation and Development)
Kathy Fennessey (Student Affairs)
Monica Romero (Transfer Center)
Ailene Crakes (Academic Affairs Committee, Counseling, Online Instruction)
Jonathan Aravalo (Associated Student Government President)
Troy Sanders (Associated Student Government Vice President)
Jan Ellis (Learning Communities Coordinator)
Leticia Lopez (Global Awareness Coordinator)
Judith Ross (Mathematics faculty)
Julie Pludow (DSPPS)
Susan Mun (Research)
Val Ontell (Librarian)
Robert Pickford (English faculty)
Ken Berger (Geography faculty)

Timeline

February 2, 2007: Lead writer began working with Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) to plan process and timeline for report.

February 2-March 26, 2007: Lead writer conducted research, including interviews and meetings with campus and district administrators, faculty, staff, and students, and wrote first draft of report in conjunction with ALO.

February 13-March 14, 2007: Lead writer and Accreditation Liaison Officer met with each governance group to provide detailed presentation on the timeline and process for the report; each group was encouraged to have its members contact the lead writer and ALO to provide input. Question and answer sessions were included in these presentations. Groups included:

- President's Cabinet: Feb. 13, 2007
- Deans Council: Feb. 28, 2007
- Chairs Council: Feb. 28, 2007
- Student Services Council: March 8, 2007
- Associated Students Government: March 12, 2007
- Academic Senate: March 12, 2007
- Classified Senate: March 14, 2007

April 9-20, 2007: First draft of Focused Midterm Report was posted to college website for campus review and feedback. An email was sent to all members of the campus community on April 9, 2007 informing them that the report had been uploaded and how to access it.

April 23-May 4, 2007: Lead writer and ALO revised the Focused Midterm Report based upon feedback received from campus community.

May 9, 2007: Uploaded revised version of document to college website and informed campus community via email.

May 11, 2007: First revised version of the document was reviewed at President's Cabinet Retreat.

May 18, 2007: Final revision of document uploaded to college website.

September 4, 2007: Final version of document approved by President's Cabinet.

September 25, 2007: Final version of document approved by San Diego Community College District Board of Trustees.

Recommendation 1.1 Response

The college should implement a more fully integrated process for planning and resource allocation, grounded in data from program reviews (which should include data on student learning outcomes) and student learning outcomes assessment. This process and its outcomes should be widely communicated. The college should evaluate the process regularly to assess its impact on institutional effectiveness. (I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.2.f).

Narrative

This recommendation has been thoroughly addressed in the past two years. Many processes were in place previously, but as the evaluators noted, they were not fully integrated. That is no longer the case. There are essentially eight separate components that integrate to provide the cohesive strategy for planning and resource allocation at San Diego Mesa College. They include:

- President's Cabinet
- Educational Master Plan Process
- Culture of Evidence
- Newly Formed Budget Development Committee
- New Processes for Budget Requests and Approval
- Reformulation of Existing Facilities Committee
- Integrated Program Review Process
- Faculty Hiring Priorities Process

Role of President's Cabinet: The President's Cabinet is a centralized, participatory governance council that serves as the locus for all decision making on campus. It is chaired by the college president and includes members from all governance groups, including administrators, faculty, staff, and students, ensuring that all functions of the college are represented for comprehensive and informed decision making. The determination of this group is final for all matters except those with district-wide implications. (1.1.1)

The scope of this committee is such that all matters can be addressed either internally, or by delegation to the appropriate governance group or subcommittee for review. In addition to delegating certain matters to the Dean's Council and Academic Senate for educational matters, to the Classified Senate for classified staffing issues, and to the Associated Students for student issues, the cabinet has the following committees that report to it:

- Educational Master Planning Committee (subcommittee of the Cabinet)
- Accreditation Self Study and Reports
- Facilities Committee
- Budget Development Committee
- Mesa Instructional Technology Committee
- VTEA Committee
- Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee (subcommittee of the Cabinet)
- Staff Development Committee and Flex Subcommittee

- Marketing Committee
- Research Committee
 - Campus Research Agenda
 - Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

The integration of all planning is apparent in the Cabinet’s Planning Matrix, where the ten primary planning activities of the college are listed and formatted into a matrix that includes the body that is responsible for oversight of each activity, and organized by a monthly timetable for the individual actions that must take place for the activity. These activities include the Biennial Review of the Mission Statement, College Strategic Planning Directions, College Annual Goals, Facilities Master Planning, Faculty Hiring Priorities, Block Grant Allocations, VTEA Funding, Program Review, and The Instructional Technology Strategic Plan. (1.1.2, 1.1.2.a)

Clearly, this is a comprehensive assemblage of campus responsibilities, brought together under one participatory governance decision making body. The clarity of the integration of these processes is the result of the vision for transparency in governance articulated by President Rita Cepeda shortly after her arrival on campus in summer 2005.

Educational Master Plan Process: The Mesa College Educational Master Plan Subcommittee was created May 9, 2005, by the President’s Cabinet, in direct response to Recommendations 1.1 and 1.5 of the ACCJC Accreditation Team’s evaluation report. This participatory governance group is comprised of three administrators, four faculty members, two classified staff members, and two students; it is chaired by the Vice President, Instruction. It serves as the vehicle by which all previous planning efforts are brought together into one comprehensive plan. It is a long term document that serves from 2006-2007 to 2010-2011, with annual review and revision. (1.1.3)

At Mesa College, the strategic planning process began within the context of the three colleges and continuing education division that compose the San Diego Community College District. Before individual campuses wrote their own plans, they worked together to create their district plan. In a process that was heretofore not done, entities that make up the district worked together on the District Strategic Planning Committee to create a plan that addressed their collective concerns. In a display of give and take, this effort spanned two years as it came to final fruition with the District Planning Priorities document, which has become the District-wide Strategic Plan. This plan represents the seminal overall, guiding concerns, directions, and priorities of the educational institutions that comprise this district. The Vice President of Instruction, President of the Academic Senate, and Dean of Instructional Services, Resource Development and Research sit on this committee and articulate Mesa’s concerns. (1.1.4)

It is with these district-wide communal priorities in mind that Mesa College has written its own Strategic Planning Priorities and Goals; however, the content of the plan is locally generated and focuses on Mesa’s specific priorities and needs.

The Mesa College Strategic Planning and Goals document is broken up into four separate categories, with each one grounded in a separate section of the college mission statement. The categories include Strengthening College Support Infrastructure, Strengthening College Partnerships and Collaboratives, Supporting Professional/Leadership

Development, and emphasizing Instructional Support/Student Success. Within each of these categories are several planning priorities, written with a five year scope of reference, that contain specific goals for meeting each priority. In addition, it lists the person or committee charged with lead responsibility for each goal. (1.1.5)

In addition to the Strategic Planning and Goals document, there are priority plans for the three divisions of the college: Instruction, Student Services, and Administrative Services. Within these divisions, each of the schools has its own goals comprised from the department level to the school dean's office. These goals are written by the members of the school and are based on plans contained within department program reviews. They are clearly articulated and measurable, with a timeline. They are also subject to systematic annual review, as are all documents in the Educational Master Plan. (1.1.6)

Culture of Evidence:

The culture of evidence has become well established at Mesa College in the past three years. The college Research Committee works with the newly formed district Research Committee to provide an integrated basis for the collection and analysis of data. Liaisons from the district sit on the college Research Committee and the Program Review Committee. The position of College Based Researcher was created and filled last year. This position is located at Mesa College and provides local research services; however, the position is administered by the district Office of Research. This collaboration serves to continue the shared effort of research and the rigor of the process. (1.1.7, 1.1.8, 1.1.9, 1.1.10)

One of the biggest and most collaborative activities of the Mesa College Research Committee was the creation of the Research Planning Agenda, which was approved by President's Cabinet on February 27, 2007. Of note is that this document was reviewed by all campus governance groups and their feedback was incorporated into the document prior to approval by President's Cabinet, which demonstrates the level of campus commitment to a culture of evidence. The Research Planning Agenda is based upon the primary mission statement of the college, which is to promote student access, retention, and success; and it is informed by the district Environmental Scan, which is a demographic evaluation of the region. This agenda provides the research means by which the college can carry out this mission for its constituents, with assurance that these goals are being met. The agenda consists of four Categories of Strategic Initiatives, which include: Secure Access for All Segments of the Community; Strengthen and Improve College Programs and Services to Promote Success and Retention; Support College Planning and Decision Making Concerning Access, Retention, and Success; and Develop and Promote Linkages with the Surrounding Community to Establish Relationships of Mutual Benefit. Each category includes specific strategic initiatives, the research focus for each initiative, and the timeline for the specific research. It brings together in one holistic document all research that will be conducted at Mesa College.

In addition to the Research Planning Agenda, the Research Committee has also published its Guidelines for Implementing the Research Planning Agenda (GIRPA). This companion document is essential for the integrity of the process. It begins with a Definition of Terms that informs the end users about the specific vocabulary of research, and then provides a table that addresses the levels of data access (I-III), the data security

needed for each level, the appropriate use for each level, and the data dissemination for each level. Level I is the least sensitive level of data and Level III is the highest, requiring users go through a training tutorial to ensure confidentiality. (1.1.1, 1.1.12)

Newly Formed Budget Development Committee: In order to more fully integrate the resource allocation process with the planning process, the participatory governance Budget Development Committee was created and approved by President's Cabinet on November 3, 2006. Membership includes the Vice President of Instruction, the Vice President of Student Services, the Dean of Learning Resources and Information Technology, four faculty members, two classified staff members, one student, and the Vice President of Administrative Services, who serves as the chair. In addition, the Supervisor for Business Services serves as a resource to the committee as a non-voting member. (1.1.13)

The charge of the committee is to develop a General Fund Unrestricted operating budget that carries out the college master plan (guided by the college mission statement); to develop and direct the process for long and short-term strategic planning; to review and assess the impact of budget reductions and increases; to justify the level of any additional funding in program allocations required to provide an appropriate schedule of classes and level of service; to justify the level of any reduction in funding in program allocations; and to keep represented constituents apprised of the budget development process and solicit input as needed. Decision making within the committee is done by majority vote of the committee, based on a quorum, and these decisions are brought forward to the President's Cabinet as formal recommendations by the Vice President of Administrative Services. The President's Cabinet, also a participatory governance group, makes all final decisions on resource allocation.

The creation and purpose of this committee was part of President Cepeda's vision of transparent governance, and in an effort to more closely align the planning and budgeting process, as recommended by the ACCJC evaluation team. To this end, the Budget Development Committee serves as the central location for resource allocation decision making, and includes representatives of all governance groups.

New Processes for Budget Requests and Approvals: The budgeting process for Mesa College has also changed. All annual requests for budget changes are now submitted by the individual schools using one integrated process, with the request broken down into four separate funding categories. The categories are: Equipment, Supplies and "Other Operating Expenses," Facilities Improvement, and Classified Staffing. The school must prioritize the item list by order of importance and include the following information for each line item: name of requesting department, whether it is eligible for Vocational-Technical Education Act (VTEA) funding, the item description, the rationale, and the quantity and total cost. The rationale covers seven areas: Health and Safety; Accreditation, Licensure: Mandated by Law; College-wide; Program Review; Replacement; Instructional Support; and Faculty/Students. (1.1.14)

Once the Vice President receives these requests, she creates a prioritized list and forwards it to the Budget Development Committee for action. This includes General Fund and restricted Instructional Equipment and Library Materials (IELM) resources. In the case of VTEA eligible purchases, it is first determined if they will be funded through that committee before being included on this list. The Program Review criterion is extremely important in this process and will be elaborated upon in that section.

The VTEA Committee has also embraced a new model for the allocation of funds, which includes a rubric that requires inclusion of the requested item or activity in the department's Program Review, which directly links planning with budgeting; other rubrics include recent enrollment data, local industry and workforce information, and professional accreditation reports. The VTEA Committee is a participatory governance group. (1.1.15)

Reformulation of Existing Facilities Committee: The need for revision of the role of the campus Facilities Committee became obvious with the passage of Propositions S and N for the San Diego Community College District. With the successful passage of Prop N in 2006, the membership of the Facilities Committee, a participatory governance group, has been revised; it includes the Vice President of Instruction, the Vice President of Student Services, eight academic senate representatives, two deans' representatives, three classified senate representatives, one associated student representative, the Regional Facilities Officer, the Regional Campus Police Lieutenant, the Assistant Chancellor of Facilities or his designee (non-voting), and the Vice President of Administrative Services, who serves as chair. The reformulated committee was approved by President's Cabinet on October 20, 2006.

The charge of the committee is to review a broad range of facilities issues which will impact Mesa; to review all plans and make recommendations for the construction, remodeling, and reassignment of existing facilities; to study and recommend development of future facilities, including classrooms, laboratories, faculty and staff office spaces, and grounds; to study existing facilities and recommend alterations and improvements; to review and ensure timely construction progress of Mesa College's Facility Master Plan; and to keep represented constituents apprised of the facility master plan and construction timeline. Decision making is by majority vote of the committee based upon a quorum. The chair delivers all recommendations to the President's Executive Staff and the President's Cabinet. (1.1.16)

Of particular interest is the Facilities Committee's work in updating the Facilities Master Plan, which is based on the Educational Master Plan, along with other physical plant needs. The Facilities Master Plan is the basis for the Mesa College entries in the Five-Year Construction Plan, which is submitted annually by the district to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (1.1.17)

Integrated Program Review: This process has undergone a major revision over the last year. Previously there were two separate Program Reviews, one for Student Services and one for Instruction. In the last year it was decided that these two reviews will be

combined into one integrated document that will run on a five year cycle, which will be reviewed and updated annually. The history of how this occurred is included in the Year One Program Review Report, 2006-2007, which was submitted to President's Cabinet for approval on March 20, 2007. With the decision to fully integrate the two reviews, more members from Student Services will be included on the Program Review Committee. (1.1.18)

Program Review is a participatory governance committee, co-chaired by the Dean, Instructional Services, Economic Development, and Research, along with an academic senate member from the committee. Membership includes two deans, twelve academic senate members, two classified senate members, the Campus Based Researcher, two District Research Liaisons, one student, and two ex officio members, which include the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator and the Co-Chair of the Curriculum Review Committee. This committee creates the infrastructure for the program review process by creating the forms, setting the timelines, providing direct support to lead writers, and reviewing the final document for inclusion and coverage of all report components. The committee prepares a final report on the reviews, which is presented first to the Academic Affairs Committee (subcommittee of the Academic Senate) and then to President's Cabinet for approval. (1.1.19, 1.1.20)

In addition to combining Instruction with Student Services, the Program Review process has also integrated the listing and status of Student Learning Outcomes and the six year Curriculum Revision Cycle. It asks for more data driven information and responsiveness as well. The Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Assessment portion of the review integrates the work of four committees. The Research Committee has primary responsibility for developing and guiding the process for SLOs and Assessment; however three other committees share in this effort: Program Review, which oversees the reporting of the progress on SLOs and assessment during each review cycle; Curriculum Review Committee, which collaborates on the program/curriculum development aspect of SLOs; and the Staff Development Committee, which organizes workshops and training on SLOs and assessment.

Faculty Hiring Priorities Process: Each year, Mesa College examines its needs for full-time contract faculty through an open process of review based upon the Educational Master Plan, the results of program reviews, and the specified needs certified by college schools and departments. All new contract faculty positions for instruction and student services are approved through this process, whether they are new positions or replacements of vacancies created by retirements and resignations. A prioritized list is created and approved by President's Cabinet, and then published to the entire campus for informational purposes. For a more extensive discussion of the faculty hiring priorities process, see Recommendation 3.2. (1.1.21)

Assessment and Evaluation

It is clear from the sheer size and complexity of the eight components included in this response that this recommendation that it has been taken quite seriously at Mesa College.

Simply put, planning and resource allocation are now integrated and grounded in data from program reviews and student learning outcome assessment. The two major tools that have brought these concerns together are the Educational Master Plan and the newly integrated Program Review. Data and student learning outcomes and assessment have become embedded in all planning and decision making and are reported via the Program Review document. The proactive work of the campus Research Committee with regard to SLOs and assessment, the strengthening of the relationship with the district Research Office, and the hiring of a Campus Based Researcher have put the necessary mechanisms in place in order to conduct proper research and assessment to support learning.

Examples of research that have been done on campus include: transfer information; LRC Student Satisfaction Survey; and the relationship between student success and participation in Learning Communities that link Basic Skills and Personal Growth courses..

Program Reviews have become an essential element in funding decisions, which thoroughly integrates planning with resource allocation and provides voice to those on the front line of instruction delivery and student services on this campus. It provides the locus for articulating the department's goals, curriculum, learning outcomes and assessment, and needs. It is a data driven tool that it is measurable for feedback and for adjusting direction.

The Budget and Facilities Committees have provided a new participatory governance venue for decision making. They work within the guidance of the Educational Master Plan to make informed decisions regarding resources and to advise the President's Cabinet. Ultimately it is the President's Cabinet, also a participatory governance group, that makes final determinations based upon these recommendations. The process is open and includes all governance constituencies.

The key to all of this, however, is the Educational Master Plan. The document that brings together the district planning priorities, which inform the college planning priorities, which drive the college goals, which drive the measurable college objectives, all of which are based on the guiding document of the college mission statement. Accountability is embedded in all plans, with included timelines and designation of responsible parties. The use of departmental Program Review and the creation of clearly articulated goals and measurable objectives at the school level has provided the opportunity for departments to come together collegially in a collaborative manner for resources.

The big question with all of the changes that have been made is how they will evolve in practice. There are many new, integrated practices in place, including a mechanism for planning and budgeting. Systematic review and revision will serve as a vital part of refining the efficacy of these processes. One concern is the amount of time needed to accomplish all of the planning and evaluation needed for this model, and the limited number of contract faculty available to work on it.

Recommendations

The college has completed this recommendation.

Recommendation 1.2 Response

The college should strengthen its dialogue about student learning by articulating specific goals with respect to the educational effectiveness of the college, and stating the goals (and supporting objectives) in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined, widely discussed and planning for improvement can take place (I.B.1, I.B.2).

Narrative

The issue of strengthening our dialogue about student learning has taken place on two levels. On the first level, the campus continues to address Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in measurable terms; this process is detailed and analyzed in each department's Program Review. On the second level, the college has addressed SLOs in the context of division, school, and department goals and objectives, which are an integral part of the Educational Master Plan, and elaborated upon later in this discussion.

To understand where Mesa is in its implementation of Student Learning Outcomes, it is necessary to take stock of where the college was at the time of the site evaluation visit. The college had just completed the major process of identifying the six over-arching, non-discipline specific Student Learning Outcomes that were expected of all Mesa College students at the Associate Degree level. Along with that was the drafting of the San Diego Mesa College Policy on the Genesis, Development and Application of Student Learning Outcomes, which was created by the Research Committee, and approved by President's Cabinet on May 4, 2004. The first document distilled the essential learning outcomes that a Mesa College graduate would possess; the second document clearly identified that the responsibility for the interpretation and local implementation of SLOs would remain within the purview of individual faculty departments and programs or student services units. With the first document the college created its global vision of the outcomes; with the second document the college clearly placed the responsibility and authority for department level SLOs with the faculty and student service units. Those on the front line of delivering instruction and services would determine their students' learning outcomes. (1.2.1, 1.2.2)

The step from this baseline to actual identification of program level SLOs was not easy. Departments, programs, and student services units met at length to identify *their* Student Learning Outcomes. The Research Committee, in collaboration with the Flex Subcommittee, provided workshops about outcomes, assessment, and best practices. To help facilitate the articulation of these outcomes, and to embed assessment, the Research Committee created the Student Learning Outcome Assessment Cycle (SLOAC). This three page document was approved by the Academic Senate on May 23, 2005 and by President's Cabinet on May 24, 2005. This is the document that puts forth the integration of program level SLOs, their assessment, and their reporting structure in the Program Review. It puts forth the major activities and timeline for the Student Learning Outcome Assessment Cycle, and is aligned with each year of the Program Review Cycle. (1.2.3)

To support the implementation of the SLOAC process campus-wide, a 40% reassigned position was created and filled in 2005, with the SLOAC Coordinator; this position continues to be renewed annually. The SLOAC Coordinator sits as an ex officio member of both the Research Committee (which has responsibility for SLOs) and the Program Review Committee (which guides and reviews each department's Program Review). The

Program Review has been revised to include SLOs and their assessment. An Outcomes Matrix has been created in order to better assist the faculty in determining their level of achievement in reaching these goals. The SLOAC Coordinator works with each Program Review Lead Writer to create their SLO matrix and to provide guidance and support to all faculty in the overall SLO process. (1.2.4)

Numerous FLEX workshops have been held on SLOs and their assessment, as well as individual meetings with departments, as documented in the SLOAC Meetings Log. SLO related FLEX workshops over the past two years have included (1.2.5, 1.2.6):

- SLOs and Your Syllabus;
- Developing Effective Research Questions;
- Assessing Learning Using Rubrics;
- Embedded Assessment and Portfolios;
- Student Learning Outcomes: Best Practices;
- Student Learning Outcomes for Vocational Programs;
- Instructional SLOs and College Planning;
- Program Review and Student Learning Outcomes: An Integrated Model for Instruction and Student Services;
- Campus Based Research and the Mesa Research Agenda;
- Incorporating Global Awareness Student Learning Outcome Into Your Course (which included a matrix with levels of embedded global awareness);
- A Retrospective of SLOs (offered in February, 2007, and moderated by two key faculty leaders on the status of the process and its implementation at Mesa).

There has been much discussion regarding SLOs in the context of Research Committee meetings and Program Review Committee meetings. In addition, educational researcher Norena Badway, Ed.D., from the University of the Pacific, has provided four workshops at Mesa College during the past two years to work with the faculty and administration on how to approach these outcomes and assessments. The overall theme of the four workshops has been progressive, to reflect the faculty's progression in SLOs, their articulation, their assessment, and how they drive our instruction and student services plans. Earlier workshops looked at how students learn; later workshops looked at application and assessment. These workshops have been both informative and hands-on. In addition to working with the faculty, Dr. Badway has included Mesa College's methodology in her own research. Mesa's cultural shift in making public our expectations of students is the focus of her research with Mesa. (1.2.7)

Another significant accomplishment in the area of SLOs at Mesa has been the consolidation of the program reviews for Instruction and Student Services. At the time of the evaluation visit, there were two separate program reviews, a three year cycle for Student Services, and a five year cycle for Instruction. Although similar in some ways, they were two separate documents for two separate functions on campus. After working jointly on program review, the Student Services division approached the Instruction division about combining the two processes. Student Services is in the process of integrating with the Academic Program Review Process and will begin the same five year cycle, following the same criteria in the fall, 2007. Both divisions have student learning

outcomes and assessment processes and there will simply be Mesa College Program Review, without distinction by division. (1.1.18)

With the integration of the divisions will come the full representation of Student Services personnel on the new Program Review Committee. With its uniform framework and reporting mechanism, the integrated program review will serve as the primary departmental reporting document for the entire college. As detailed in Recommendation 1.1, all departmental funding is driven by the program review, so it will be essential for each department to keep current. (1.1.20)

The new Program Review is the central locus for reporting on all student learning outcomes, their assessment, and the status and progress of the department's curriculum review cycle. By virtue of this responsibility, the Program Review has become the focal point for the articulation of student learning in quantitative terms. The cyclical nature of the Program Review embeds the constant review and measured revision of the curriculum and student learning outcomes, as the two are aligned in the beginning of the Year One Report. Although the five year cycle will begin and end, the process will continue indefinitely. (1.2.8, 1.2.9, 1.2.10)

With funding now tied to Program Review, the process has even higher stakes. To ensure that each department has support in completing its review each year, the Program Review Committee provides liaisons to answer questions and provide training. The SLOAC Coordinator sits on this committee in an ex officio status and actively participates in this support function. However, the pressure on faculty members to complete this process is significant and has caused concerns about workload issues.

As stated in the introduction, there is a second action that also addresses our dialogue about student learning. It is the creation of division, school, and department goals, which are an integral part of the Educational Master Plan. These goals contain measurable objectives that identify the personnel responsible for its accomplishment and the timeline for its review or completion. This is a massive document that was created from the department levels up to the school level and included extensive dialogue as faculty members collaborated to identify *their* communal goals and objectives within their school. The divisions of Instruction, Student Services, and Administrative Services each created goals and objectives as well. Accountability is clearly embedded in these planning documents with the identification of responsible personnel and the specification of timelines for completion. It is a key part of the Educational Master Plan. (1.2.11, 1.1.2)

Evaluation and Assessment

The SLOAC Coordinator has been instrumental in the communication of SLOs, with its requisite assessment cycle, to all stakeholders at Mesa College. Not only has this person met with numerous individuals, she has coordinated with both the Research Committee and Program Review Committee to create Flex presentations that clearly present the process and status of SLOs at Mesa. She organized the four workshops delivered by Dr. Badway, and ensured that the scope of the presentations met *Mesa's* needs, as Mesa progressed with its agenda. The collection and distribution of exemplary models of

learning outcomes and assessment created by members of the Mesa community was another of her services to the faculty.

To remain part of the larger student learning outcomes conversation, members of Mesa College and the district research office attended the “Strengthening Student Success: What Counts” Conference on October 4-6, 2006. This conference was sponsored by the California Partnership for Achieving Student Success, the Research and Planning Group of California, and the California Assessment Institute in collaboration with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, and the San Diego Community College District. This conference dealt directly with assessment and provided numerous presentations on applications. A group including the Mesa College SLOAC Coordinator, Campus Based Researcher, Dean of Instructional Services, Resource Development and Research, and district Director of Institutional Research and Planning have submitted a proposal for a presentation at next year’s conference, titled “Spanning the divide between Institutional Research and Classroom Assessment: Implementing a Campus Based Researcher program in a three college district.” Clearly, Mesa College and the district Research Office are fostering the dialogue on student learning outcomes.(1.2.12)

To ensure that all Mesa faculty can share in the dialogue, a page was created on the Office of Instruction website for the distribution of information on SLOs. To inform all stakeholders on the status of Learning Outcomes in the fall, 2006, the SLOAC Coordinator made presentations to the various campus governance groups, including the Department Chairs, the Academic Senate, The Student Services Council, the Classified Senate, and the Associated Student Body. (1.2.13)

At this point, faculty are systematically addressing courses with measurable learning outcomes for effectiveness of teaching and learning; they are systematically approaching all gatekeeper courses first, as these courses serve the greatest number of students; and they are doing this in a structured prioritized manner that is congruent with the Student Learning Outcome Assessment *Cycle*. The cycle portion of this process indicates that this will be continuous in terms of beginning and ending a process, and then beginning the process anew with information from the previous effort.

The division, school, and department goals, with measurable objectives, have been a logical consequence of the adoption of Student Learning Outcomes. Just as the college has articulated its expectations at the student level, it has articulated its expectations at the institutional and program level. That this has become part of the Educational Master Plan demonstrates that evaluation has become endemic.

Recommendations

At the last of Dr. Norena Badway’s Mesa College SLO workshops, held on March 13, 2007, there was an assessment session during the second half of the day. It reviewed the status of where the college is in its implementation of Student Learning Outcomes. Some of the recommendations from this session included:

- Establish regular meetings of a Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Steering Group, comprised of the chairs of committees responsible for different aspects of

SLOs; these committees include Program Review, Curriculum Review, Staff Development, and Research.

- Creation of an online resource and communication network for the sharing of discussion and scholarly research on SLOs; such a network would be easily managed via WebCT and could be accessed by all stakeholders.
- Continue the implementation of SLOs and their assessment for programs still to begin their Year One cycle of Program Review; there are still three more cycles before all departments are included.
- Document all assessment efforts and the changes that were made as a result of these efforts.

In addition, the college needs to review the results of external research being conducted at Mesa College, including the Community College Survey of Student Engagement and the Silver Process for implications for planning. The college also needs to integrate the state-initiated Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) and Basic Skills Initiative into its SLOs.

And finally, the division, school, and department goals and objectives need to be evaluated as they are implemented, assessed, and applied as part of the Educational Master Plan.

The status of this recommendation is that although many things have been put in place, it is still in progress and the college will continue to work on it.

Recommendation 1.3 Response

The college should develop and implement a plan to meet current and future needs for institutional research that is accurate, timely and actionable. Toward this end, the college should carefully consider how institutional research is positioned in the college so that it may support the entire institution from a fair, unbiased and informed stance, thereby strengthening various planning and institutional improvement efforts (I.B).

Narrative

This recommendation has been a recurrent theme in the last two accreditation evaluation reports. In the past two years, there has been a renewed focus to address it comprehensively at both the college and district level. It began prior to the 2004 accreditation visit with the reformulation of the campus Research Committee to address issues related to institutional research and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). It culminated with the creation of the Mesa College Research Planning Agenda and its companion piece, the Guidelines for Implementing the Research Planning Agenda. In addition, this plan is part of the college Educational Master Plan, which integrates all planning on campus.

To begin any research plan locally, there needed to be clear collaboration with the district planning level in order to ensure consistency. To this end, members of the district level Institutional Research and Planning office sit on the Mesa College Research and Program Review committees and representative members of the Mesa community sit on the

District-wide Research Committee. In addition, the newly created and filled position of Campus Based Researcher reports to both the Director of Institutional Research and Planning at the district office and to the Dean of Instructional Services, Resource Development and Research on campus. (1.1.7, 1.1.8, 1.1.10)

The Research Committee is working on a centrally documented research *plan* that is driven by the institution as a whole, rather than simply responding to day-to-day requests by various constituents. This plan is articulated in the Research Planning Agenda, which was approved by President's Cabinet on February 27, 2007. The plan is divided into four categories, with each one focusing upon a different area of the college mission statement. Within each category are specific strategic initiatives, along with the focus of the research, and the timeline for completion. The categories include:

- Secure access for all segments of the community;
- Strengthen and improve college programs and services to promote success and retention;
- Support college planning and decision-making concerning student access, retention, and success;
- Develop and promote linkages with the surrounding community to establish relationships of mutual benefit.

The Research Planning Agenda is a comprehensive and ambitious plan to address research needs for all aspects of the college. It is clearly articulated, and was made public immediately upon approval by the President's Cabinet via campus email and by placement on the campus website. (1.1.11)

Of special importance in implementing the research plan is its companion piece, the Guidelines for Implementing the Research Planning Agenda (GIRPA). These guidelines are essential to the integrity and privacy that must accompany a document such as the Research Planning Agenda. The Guidelines provide information concerning the proper access, protection, use, and dissemination of research data. The purpose of the Guidelines document is to ensure the rights of students and employees to privacy, in compliance with federal law, which is contained in the Family Educational Rights Privacy Act, with state law, which is contained in California Education Code section 76243, and with San Diego Community College District policy, which is contained in SDCCD District Policy 3001.1. In order to view protected levels of data, a campus employee will need to undergo training on data sensitivity as identified in this document. This is a safeguard that is fundamental for all stakeholders. (1.1.12)

One area of the Research Planning Agenda that has further planning implications is its support of research efforts related to Student Learning Outcomes. The corollary to this is its support of the Program Review process, which is the reporting mechanism for Student Learning Outcomes. The Program Review has become the locus for all departmental planning and assessment, and is the foundation for all funding allocations.

To achieve the goals laid out in the Research Planning Agenda, it will take a consolidated effort on the part of the campus and the district. Of particular importance in the achievement of these goals is the Campus Based Researcher position. In reviewing the Mesa research log, which is a record of research that has been processed, along with its

disposition, it is clear that there is significant interest in research on behalf of the college community. (1.3.1)

Two external research studies that have emerged as part of the plan are the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and the Silver Process. CCSSE is comprised of two surveys that address students and faculty. The student portion, which can be aligned with accreditation standards, addresses active and collaborative learning, student effort, academic challenge, student-faculty interaction, and support for learners, all of which serves to inform the college on how to better meet student needs. The faculty portion of this survey, the Community College Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (CCFSSE), addresses their teaching practices, how they spend their professional time both in and out of class, and their perceptions regarding students' educational experiences. In addition to the CCSSE, the college is working with Dr. Ken Gonzalez of the University of San Diego, on the Silver Process, which uses focus groups and research efforts to identify the SLOs, knowledge, skills, and dispositions students need to succeed at Mesa. It includes both quantitative and qualitative research methods, and has included feedback and informational sessions with students. (1.3.2, 1.3.3)

The final area of this recommendation is the “positioning” of research at Mesa so that “it may support the entire institution from a fair, unbiased and informed stance.” This was clearly considered when the reporting lines were established for the dean who administers the research function. The Dean of Instructional Services, Resource Development and Research reports to the Vice President of Instruction for the “Instructional Services and Resource Development” portion of her position; however, she reports directly to the president for the “Research” portion of her position. This clearly delineates the inclusive, un-biased nature of research at Mesa College; it is not “owned” by any one division, but rather it is provided for all, and comes under the aegis of the Office of the President. The president has made research one of her top priorities, congruent with her vision of transparent decision-making.

Assessment and Evaluation

Clearly, Mesa College has made great strides in addressing Recommendation 1.3. Using the college mission statement as its direction, the college systematically included all stakeholders in the research plan. This is the same directional approach used by the Educational Master Plan. Equally important to the Research Planning Agenda, although smaller in scale, is the companion document, Guidelines for Implementing the Research Planning Agenda. Without this piece, which clearly delineates the necessity for security with higher level, sensitive data, there would not be consistency in the use and protection of such data. There is training that must be completed prior to gaining access to this higher level data. In short, the guidelines ensure the ethical handling of private student and employee information by college employees.

The creation of the Research Planning Agenda has been a huge undertaking and its implementation will be even more substantial. It has just recently been approved and is ready for action. It has been presented to different governance groups and in Flex workshops offered over the course of the past year. Interest has become very high as the faculty and staff have become more interested in data driven decision making. One of the concerns for this agenda is the manpower that will be necessary to carry it out. With the addition of the Campus Based Researcher, there is someone in place with the credentials

to carry out this agenda; however, the breadth of the agenda is such that it may require additional personnel. This same consideration is true for the Program Review and SLO planning function being requested of the faculty; where do they fit it into their already busy workday? This has been widely communicated and is considered a workload issue by some.

The positioning of the reporting structure for campus research clearly sets the research process apart from partisan agendas. The dean assigned with the responsibility for research reports directly to the President for this function. This is akin to the reporting structure for the Campus Site Compliance Officer, which requires the same level of autonomy to have both the appearance and practice of fairness.

Recommendations

This recommendation has been accomplished.

Recommendation 1.4 Response

In order to build upon their efforts to strengthen institutional effectiveness and to foster a “culture of evidence” throughout the district, the district office and the colleges should cooperate in the development of an enhanced research function with both strong district and strong college components. (I.B.3, I.B.6, IV.B.2.b.)

Narrative

Cooperation between the district research office and the college, already strong, has become stronger in the past two years. To institutionalize this collaboration, district research personnel sit on the Mesa Research Committee, and Mesa personnel sit on the newly established District-Wide Research Committee. District personnel sitting on the Mesa Research Committee include the Director of Institutional Research and Planning and one Research Analyst. In addition, the Campus Based Researcher for Mesa sits on this committee. The nature of the reporting structure of the Campus Based Researcher position reveals the level of integration of the two offices: this position reports to both the district Director of Institutional Research and Planning and to the college Dean, Instructional Services, Resource Development and Research. Mesa College personnel sitting on the district committee include the Dean of Instructional Services, Resource Development and Research, two faculty members (one from Instruction and one from Student Services), and the Campus Based Researcher. Members from the other colleges and Continuing Education sit on this committee as well, creating a central point for the dissemination of research information and projects.

The nature of the research provided by the district has become more varied and complex with the addition of the Campus Based Researcher and with the new data needs created by the focus on Student Learning Outcomes. The Mesa Research Log reveals requests ranging from a comparison of success rates for Basic Skills students who were concurrently enrolled in a Personal Growth 127 course with Basic Skills students who did not take the support class, to a list of the top ten transfer schools by category. In addition they provide data for individual Program Reviews, and support both the Silver Process and the CCSSE instruments cited in Recommendation 1.3. Campus research also

supports the faculty hiring process with data, which is used to set the campus hiring priority list. With the integration of the Campus Based Researcher, collaboration between district and college research is seamless. (1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3)

As part of the collaboration between the district and the college, several campus Flex presentations were conducted by district research analysts (sometimes in conjunction with campus personnel) during the past year. They include the use of Pivot Tables, with district provided fields and data, which will be available for custom analysis by college personnel; how to develop a survey; and how the Campus Based Researcher is part of the Mesa Research Planning Agenda. There have also been extensive Flex presentations by campus personnel, including faculty members, administrators, and the Campus Based Researcher on how data is used to support Program Review and the Educational Master Plan. (1.4.1, 1.2.6)

The district research office has long supported enrollment management and administrative decision making, but in line with the district and campus planning priorities of improving enrollment management, it is now providing near real-time enrollment trend feedback with the weekly Tallies download that is made available to campus administrators. (1.4.2)

In terms of identifying a strong “culture of evidence,” it is expanding dramatically at Mesa College, with support from the district office. The integrated Program Review has become the instrument for planning and funding on campus; it is created at the department level and provides a thorough review of the program, including its Student Learning Outcomes, along with their assessment strategies and results, the six year curriculum review cycle, results of the environmental scan, and several other criteria for addressing program effectiveness. This is all based in data, in evidence that is recorded, analyzed, and acted upon. (1.4.3)

The Educational Master Plan relies upon evidence; using information that comes from the Mesa Strategic Planning Priorities, Program Reviews, and the Strategic Plan for Information Technology, to name a few of the resources. All of these are based on evidence and research. All of these clearly define what will happen, who will be responsible, and the requisite timetables for completion and reporting of results. (1.1.2, 1.4.4)

The research requests listed in the Mesa Research Log reflect the questions being posed by the faculty and administration; as these requests are filled, more requests will come. Access to data, along with its subsequent analysis, is in a transitional phase right now; however, it will become institutionalized with the approval of the Guidelines to Implementing the Research Planning Agenda (GIRPA), which addresses the controls that are essential in handling protected levels of data. The types of questions posed will evolve in focus and complexity as the campus community becomes even more cognizant of what constitutes “a culture of evidence.” (1.3.1, 1.1.11, 1.1.12)

Evaluation and Assessment

It is clear from the integration of committees at both the district and college levels that cooperation is taking place in the area of research. Both locally and at the district, the structure for data driven decision making is being institutionalized. The most significant evidence for this is the creation and filling of the position of Campus Based Researcher,

which supports campus research requests, but works through the district office. This position supports the evidence being required for the Educational Master Plan, department Program Reviews, and other decision making functions on campus. The position not only conducts local research, but looks at data that is compiled and organized through the larger effort of the district, and customizes it for application locally.

The term “culture of evidence” means different things to different stakeholders in the campus community. As with any collegial effort, there are differences of opinion. It will be the job of the Research Committee to review this and determine the appropriate types of evidence for the appropriate tasks being undertaken.

Recommendations

This recommendation has been completed.

Recommendation 1.5 Response

In order to coordinate and assist the master planning efforts already established at the colleges, the district should continue its work to formulate an overall strategic plan that will provide a vision for the future development of the district, based upon extensive dialogue among faculty and staff, students, college and district leaders, board members, and the community. (I.B.3., I.B.4., I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.2.f, IV.B.1, IV.B.3).

Narrative

At approximately the same time that the district’s three colleges received their self study evaluation reports, each of which recommended more communication and integration between the district and the colleges, the San Diego Community College District underwent a change of leadership. The President of Mesa College was selected for the position of Chancellor. With a strong foundation in the administration of the local college structure and its participatory governance model, the new Chancellor began revising committees and their memberships, practices, and communication at the district-wide level. One of her first actions was to reformulate the District Governance Council into a truly vital and actionable participatory governance committee that included members from all constituency groups at the colleges and continuing education. This committee meets twice monthly and provides the locus for district-wide discussion. It sets the board docket for the Board of Trustees meetings, in addition to addressing policy issues with college ramifications. An example of the issues they deal with can be evidenced in the agenda from their February 21, 2007 meeting, which included: review of the board docket; national legislative priorities; service for intellectually disabled students; student expulsion policy responses; and roundtable discussion. Members of Mesa College who sit on the District Governance Council include the President of the College, the President of the Academic Senate, and the President of the Classified Senate. Each college has representation such as this, and district representatives include the Vice Chancellors and representatives from various offices. The Chancellor chairs this committee. It has become a key vehicle for communication within the district. (1.5.1, 1.5.2)

In terms of the master plan cited in the recommendation listed above, The San Diego Community College District officially began addressing this on September 22, 2004,

when Chancellor Constance Carroll met with the district Strategic Planning Committee. The committee was reformulated to include more members, and to be a truly inclusive shared governance district-wide committee, reporting to the District Governance Council. Chancellor Carroll charged the committee to create a master plan using a method that drew upon the processes already in place at the colleges, so that college plans would be a part of the larger (district) whole; to continue with long range planning; to create a strategic planning component (i.e., respond to the needs of the community); and to meet spontaneous response needs. (1.5.3, 1.5.4, 1.5.5, 1.5.6)

This was an undertaking of great proportion. The Chancellor dedicated \$100,000 to be used for faculty release time, for new equipment, and to establish new relationships with various companies for support that year. Clearly, the new chancellor had made this district-wide, inclusive planning effort a priority for her administration.

With a district as large as San Diego Community College District, and with three separate colleges and a large continuing education component, the process was complex. However, much work went into accomplishing the assigned tasks and after several iterations, planning priorities were identified. In addition, the committee itself went through change, first with the increase in membership, and ultimately with the streamlining of membership to include three members from each of the three colleges and continuing education, and three members from the district office, including the Manager of Institutional Planning and Research and Vice Chancellor of Instructional Services, Planning, and Technology. It remains a participatory governance committee that reports to the District Governance Council.

Highlights of the committee's work include:

- Commissioning of the San Diego Regional Environmental Scan, a 126 page document prepared by ICF Consulting in 2006, which analyzed the demographic and economic considerations for the region, along with regional education trends.
- Funding of pilot projects relative to strategic planning goals across the district.
- Distillation of the essential priorities common to all of the colleges and continuing education, along with priorities from the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Instructional Services, Planning, and Technology, resulting in the creation of "The Baker's Dozen," a list of the thirteen strategic planning priorities. (The Baker's Dozen eventually evolved into the Strategic Planning Priorities.)
- Creation of the District-wide Strategic Planning Priorities document
- Agreement that, to the fullest extent feasible, there should be the concept of one multiple campus district in relation to distribution of resources, staffing and services, and collective commitment.

This District-wide Strategic Planning Priorities document became a framework for each of the colleges and continuing education to emulate in creating their own site driven Strategic Planning Priorities documents. At Mesa College this is one of the cornerstones of the Educational Master Plan. (1.1.4)

The District-wide Strategic Planning Priorities document later became the basis for the District-wide Strategic Plan. The document is titled: "A Blueprint for Achieving Student Success: Strategic Planning Priorities across the San Diego Community College District,

2007-2012,” and is in its final stages of revision. The planning goals of this strategic plan focus on these nine strategic priorities: ensuring success for all students; improving outreach and partnership opportunities; integrating planning, management and resource allocation decisions; modernizing facilities and upgrading new technology tools; working proactively to promote strength through district diversity; improving all student support systems and services; focusing concentrated attention on professional and staff development; fostering better communication and governance practices; and improving the district’s public relations and image. (1.5.7, 1.5.7a)

In addition to the redefining of the District-wide Strategic Planning Committee was the re-formulation of the District Budget Committee. This was done under the direction of the new Vice Chancellor for Business Services, who accepted this position approximately two years ago. In much the same way that planning and budgeting is done at the college now, it is also done at the district. Members of the District Budget Committee include the college and continuing education Vice Presidents for Business Services, the Academic Senate Presidents, the President of the local American Federation of Teachers, and various representatives from the district. The committee meets monthly and has become an instrument for communication between the district and the colleges, as well as between colleges. Commonalities are addressed in this forum. This has been especially useful with the passage of Propositions S and N, and the implementation of over one billion dollars in construction and equipage projects in the district. (1.5.8, 1.5.9)

Two actions by the District Board of Trustees that bear mention are the formalization into District Policy of the previously adopted Board of Trustees Code of Ethics and the creation of its self evaluation process and instrument, which are accreditation requirements. Although the Code of Ethics had been adopted previously, it had never been formally adopted as District *policy*. On May 3, 2005, the Board of Trustees formally adopted the Code as policy. This single document identifies for everyone the policy of the district in terms of conduct. It states that the Board will act as a whole; avoid conflict of interest; monitor compensation and expense accounts; avoid special interest groups in decision making; use appropriate channels of communication; exercise their authority with integrity; and appropriately handle administrative matters. This policy sets the baseline for the conduct of business in the district. (1.5.10)

The second action is equally significant, as it established the policy and instrument for annual evaluation of the Board by representatives of the academic senates, classified senates, employee organizations, and administration who regularly attend Board meetings and participate in discussions with the Board. The evaluation is used during the Board retreat to evaluate their accomplishments and to set goals for the coming year. As evidence, on July 12, 2007, the Board of Trustees docket number 191.1 requested authority to review the results of their self evaluation and set goals for the coming year. Again, this brings better communication and understanding between the Board and the stakeholders across the district. (1.5.11, 1.5.12)

Evaluation and Assessment

It is clear from all of the reformulations of existing committees at the district level in the past three years that integration and coordination of planning between the district and the colleges has been taken very seriously. The new Chancellor is committed to open participatory governance and the integration of district planning. There will always

remain a respect for the individual natures of each of the colleges and continuing education; however, the need for a central vision and plan is essential.

Recommendations

The district, colleges, and continuing education have partially accomplished this recommendation. Work needs to be continued on the overall district strategic plan with respect to setting the vision and goals for the future direction of the district, enabling us to respond appropriately to regional workforce, educational and demographic needs. This same recommendation is true for the college; it needs to look externally, not just internally for direction.

Recommendation 3.1 Response

The college should complete the work on student learning outcomes which it has begun so effectively in the areas of instruction and student services and ensure that work on student learning outcomes is undertaken in all of the areas of the college in which the standards call for it. (III.A.1.c, III.B.2.b)

Narrative

This recommendation addresses Standard III, Resources, and how these assets are being used to support Student Learning Outcomes. Within the context of this standard, numerous planning efforts have occurred to ensure that college resources, human, physical, technology, and financial, support student learning outcomes now and into the future. This recommendation is best addressed by looking at each of the discrete resource areas; however, particular attention will be given to Human and Physical Resources as they were singled out in the evaluation report. The four resources include:

- Human Resources
- Physical Resources
- Technology Resources
- Financial Resources

Human Resources: In the past three years, a change in the state apportionment rate through equalization and increases in other funding areas for California Community Colleges has led to a significant increase in the San Diego Community College District (SDCCD) budget. The state-wide effort for equalization was led by the SDCCD Chancellor and its successful passage is largely a result of her efforts. An allocation formula agreed upon by the AFT Guild and the SDCCD in 2004 prescribed the distribution of new funds resulting from equalization, state COLA adjustments, and FTES growth funds. This resulted in increases to salary for all employee groups, funding for benefits cost increases, and funding to hire new faculty. Over the past three years, Mesa has hired fifty-five new faculty including replacement and growth positions funded by equalization. (3.1.1)

Of note is that prior to filling these fifty-five positions, they were evaluated and placed in order on the Faculty Hiring Priorities list, which is part of the Educational Master Plan. This prioritized list is created annually by a subcommittee of President's Cabinet, which consists of equal numbers of faculty and administrators. The subcommittee reports directly back to the cabinet, which votes to approve the final prioritized list. For more

information on the hiring process, see the detailed response to Recommendation 3.2. (1.1.21, 1.1.2)

Faculty resources are focused on improving teaching and learning. Within the ten principles in the Faculty Hiring Priorities, the first three speak directly to teaching and learning. The first principle addresses the creation of a diverse applicant pool, which is essential; the second principle states that new faculty must be committed to best teaching practices, including innovative methods and instructional technology in order to ensure student success; and the third principle addresses the instructional competency necessary to teach introductory and general education courses to ensure student success. As a corollary to this, the new Basic Skills Initiative has provided the college with a focal point for examining and addressing those students most at risk of dropping out. A newly formed committee, the Basic Skills Task Force, comprised of about thirty faculty and administrators, has begun reviewing research on best practices and determining which practices Mesa can institute to improve basic skills success. (3.1.2, 3.1.3)

The college has addressed Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's) in terms of workload as well. This includes the hiring of new faculty members, listed above, in order to increase the overall numbers of contract faculty and to increase the ratio of contract to adjunct faculty members. This continues to be of prime importance to the campus. In its "Academic Program Review: Committee Report Years Two, Three, and Five, 2006-2007," the Program Review Committee has cited the need for more contract faculty in order to complete the added tasks of Student Learning Outcomes and its requisite assessment cycle. As stated in the response to Recommendations 1.1 and 1.2, the Program Review has become the vehicle for all reporting of SLO's, along with their assessment and the department's curriculum review status. Program Review recommendations are an important consideration in the allocation of funds on campus, so the emphasis on Student Learning Outcomes is clearly embedded here. (3.1.4)

In addition, to support the faculty and staff who are responsible for SLO's, the college created three 40% released time faculty positions. They include Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (SLOAC) Coordinator, Learning Communities Coordinator, and Global Awareness Coordinator. The first two are ongoing positions, while the latter was for one semester. The process to fill and approve these reassigned positions followed the directions set forth by the Academic Affairs Committee, requiring participatory governance review, with the recommendations approved by President's Cabinet. (1.2.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6)

The SLOAC Coordinator position was filled in spring, 2005, and has become the linchpin for coordinating the assessment of outcomes. In the past two years she has traveled to other sites and attended conferences in order to stay abreast of the latest practices in outcome assessment; subsequent to this she has worked with numerous faculty and staff from various departments to apply these methodologies. The creation of an SLO Assessment Matrix has been especially helpful to those involved in this process. For a detailed list of workshops and presentations provided by the SLOAC Coordinator, see the Response to Recommendation 1.2.

The Learning Communities (LCOM) Coordinator position was filled in fall, 2006, although Learning Communities have been offered at Mesa for several years now. In December, 2005 the Academic Senate voted to create a subcommittee for Learning Communities under the Academic Affairs Committee. Following suit, to support these efforts, President's Cabinet created and filled the coordinator's position. In January, 2007, the Coordinator held a retreat for the committee and interested faculty to examine the status and the future of linked interdisciplinary courses. The "brand" of Learning in Communities (LinC) has been created, and a web site has been designed for dissemination of information on linked classes. The curriculum process for approving linked courses has been streamlined to expedite schedule development, and the registration process for linked courses has been simplified for students. The faculty is going forward with three LinC tracks: LinC to Success (Basic Skills), LinC to Transfer (courses from the IGETC and CSU Transfer List for students who are undecided regarding their major), and LinC to Careers (courses related to career path for both transfer and vocational programs, which are scheduled for spring semester 2008). Research indicates that students earn higher grades in linked courses and have a higher rate of course completion; local research and evaluation efforts will track the effectiveness of these linked courses. (3.1.7)

The Global Awareness Coordinator position was created and filled in fall semester 2006, to set standards and goals for the integration of global awareness in the curriculum and programs offered by Mesa College. Global awareness is one of six learning outcomes at Mesa College and cannot simply be relegated to a few courses. The final report for this effort includes a thorough discussion of the proposed standards and goals, the Global Competencies Matrix, the assessment matrix for global learning outcomes, a strategic plan for implementation, the proposal for a larger study abroad program, and more; it was presented to President's Cabinet on May 15, 2007. In addition, the Academic Affairs Committee and the Academic Senate have approved the proposed name change of the Mesa International Education Committee to the Global Awareness Committee, which clearly demonstrates the level of commitment to this learning outcome. (3.1.8)

Physical Resources: The passage of a second construction bond, Prop N, in 2006 is evidence of the district's commitment to providing facilities for all district colleges and continuing education centers that meet current and future educational needs. Following passage of this bond, the Prop S and N Citizens Oversight Committee directed the district to accelerate the construction schedule to reduce the amount of funding lost to inflation over the construction period. Consequently, the Facilities Master Plan at Mesa College has been scrutinized and changes in the construction sequence have been proposed with these changes discussed at several President's Cabinet meeting as well as with individual school building committees. The Mesa Facilities Committee, a campus-wide participatory governance group, has approved all changes to the Facilities Master Plan and made recommendations to the President's Cabinet. (1.1.17)

Construction projects of new and renovated buildings each have a committee comprised of the faculty, staff, and administrator who will work in the building. The new facilities will contain comfortable teaching-learning environments, spaces to encourage collaboration inside and outside of the classroom, and a robust technology infrastructure. Particular emphasis is being placed on environmentally sound building practices; to this end, the district has achieved LEED certification at the silver level. School facilities

planning groups are working closely with architects to design buildings that best fit their needs. One school, Mathematics and Natural Sciences, was awarded a district Strategic Planning grant to assist in planning for their new building. This permitted a team of faculty and administrators to attend a weeklong workshop on the design of science buildings, as well as to visit several newly constructed buildings at other colleges. The outcome of their work is twofold: a very detailed document that provides guidance and considerations for the design process for new buildings, and documentation of the specific needs for the mathematics and science building at Mesa College. Their work resulted in a decision by the Mesa College president to contract with architects to work with the school building committee now rather than waiting to bring the architects in at a later stage of the process. (3.1.9, 3.1.10)

Space issues have led the college to remodel some classrooms and bring in portable classrooms within the past year, ahead of the construction of Prop S and N buildings. These actions have been funded by general fund resources. In support of student learning outcomes, each of these remodeled and portable classrooms has been made air-conditioned and equipped with state-of-the-art technology enhanced presentation systems. Two of the remodeled classrooms are science labs. To test out new ideas for science labs ahead of the construction of the new Math/Science building, the faculty designed these labs with an innovative layout.

The Mesa College audiovisual librarian led a district-wide effort to designate the specifications for classroom audiovisual and multimedia projection equipment so as to standardize classrooms. This process is in its second two-year cycle at the district level, and has resulted in a higher quality of classroom equipment and the ability to maintain and service this equipment more readily. Special attention has been given to best practices for higher education applications, and in some cases is discipline specific. (3.1.11)

Technology Resources: The Mesa College Technology Plan describes the college's efforts to assure that all aspects of the educational environment are well-supported by technology; this includes hardware, software, training, student and faculty access, policies, etc. The job responsibilities for the Dean of the Learning Resource Center were recently modified to give him the responsibility for all of campus technology – educational and administrative, including overall supervision for distance education offerings. His new title is Dean, Learning Resources and Technology. Through this reorganization, the college has been able to strengthen its focus on technology for all purposes campus-wide. (1.4.4)

The college continues to increase the number of distance education course offerings and services as well as supporting many more faculty who use technology enhancement in their teaching. The Technology Plan, now in its third year, is revised and assessed annually.

Financial Resources: The district and college both practice sound financial management. At the district level there is a newly reorganized District Budget Committee that includes representatives from all governance groups and all sites. It is detailed in the Response to Recommendation 1.5. There is also a district level Citizens Oversight Committee that monitors best practices for Proposition S and N funds. The creation of the Mesa Budget

Development Committee, which is a participatory governance group, ensures that sound financial practices are upheld at the college level. With the integration of planning and budgeting, decisions on the allocation of funds take into account the requesting department's Program Review, which details their Student Learning Outcomes. For more information on the work of this committee, see the Response to Recommendation 1.1, which deals with the full integration of planning and funding. (1.5.8, 3.1.10)

Assessment and Evaluation

Mesa College is making excellent progress on assuring that resources are obtained and directed towards supporting student learning outcomes. The successful passage of a second bond, Proposition N, and statewide equalization funding all speak to the vision and tenacity of the chancellor. Both will contribute immensely to the support of excellent education for students now and into the future.

The direction set by the Mesa president for transparency in governance and decision-making works to assure that resources, fiscal, human, technology, and physical are directed towards students and improving the educational environment.

The work of faculty groups in designing new and remodeled buildings, the focus on technology support for facilities, the college's annual technology plan, and the new budget process all demonstrate a strong commitment to using resources wisely in support of learning. The importance placed in the hiring criteria on the ability of new faculty to be able to teach introductory courses well also speaks to the college's commitment to student success. While the Basic Skills Initiative is in its infancy, there is tremendous enthusiasm and interest in the project that bodes very well for the outcomes.

The one area that was cited in the 2004 evaluation report that has not been addressed is the inclusion of Student Learning Outcomes in the formal faculty evaluation document. As stated in the evaluation report, faculty evaluation is a negotiated issue between AFT and the district. At the time of the site visit this was not part of the formal faculty evaluation and it has not been added at this point. However, SLO assessment and reporting has become institutionalized with the Program Review and with the allocation of resources described above.

Recommendations

The college is making good progress on this recommendation although much work remains before it is fully addressed and completed. Continuing the work underway on intentional commitment of resources, physical, technology, and human, to support student learning outcomes and success is one aspect to accomplishing this recommendation. The other is to continue the work of establishing and assessing student learning outcomes and then making appropriate instructional and service modifications.

Recommendation 3.2 Response

The district, in cooperation with the colleges, should explore new efforts and initiatives to identify and address the barriers that limit the diversity of their workforce and to ensure that faculty and staff reflect the rich diversity of their student body. (III.A.4.b)

Narrative

This recommendation is considered to be of a district-wide nature. To respond in a coordinated, orderly fashion, the District Governance Committee (DGC), at its meeting of July 19, 2006, requested that each college and Continuing Education discuss this in their shared governance meetings, with responsibility for leading the effort shared by the presidents and site compliance officers. Each college was asked to report back through the presidents to the Chancellor’s Cabinet, at a meeting augmented by the site compliance officers (SCOs). Following this, a larger group, chaired by the district SCO may then be formed to meet and review the suggestions that result. A final plan will be reviewed by DGC. However, each college will craft its own response to this recommendation based upon its own needs. The narrative that follows is based on college findings. (3.2.1.)

Mesa College has addressed this recommendation through eight major action areas:

- Faculty hiring
- Plan for establishing priorities for faculty hiring
- Administrative and classified hiring
- Modifications to job announcements
- Training and Workshops presented by the SCO
- Academic Senate *ad hoc* committee on faculty hiring procedures
- Civility Committee
- SDICCCA internship program.

Faculty Hiring: At the conclusion of each of the past two hiring seasons, 2004-05 and 2005-06, a report entitled “Report on Diversity Issues” was presented to the Board of Trustees (Board docket items 901.1 and 902.1). This report provided diversity information about the new fulltime faculty and managers hired during the past two years. Included are gender and ethnicity statistics for new fulltime faculty hires at Mesa College in the two year time period of 2004-05 to 2006-07. The report also shows the number of adjunct faculty hired into contract positions, the number of in-district transfers, as well as the number of new hires possessing doctorates. The report also contains the same information for administrative hires. For Mesa College, the reports indicate:

(2004-05):	19 new fulltime faculty
(2005-06):	23 new fulltime faculty
(2006-07):	13 new fulltime faculty
TOTAL:	55 new fulltime faculty hires

Males:	21	(38%)
Females:	34	(62%)

Total # with PhDs/EdDs: 15

African American:	4	(7.2%)
Asian:	2	(3.6%)
Hispanic:	8	(14.5%)
White:	35	(63.6%)
Unknown:	6	(11%)

Additionally, these 55 new faculty included 39 who were current or previous adjuncts at Mesa College. This total of 55 faculty hired in a 3-year period includes growth positions allocated to the college by Chancellor's Cabinet and positions filled as a result of retirement or resignation.

As a result of the chancellor's initiative to provide 30 new faculty positions to the colleges each year, Mesa is making considerable headway in filling faculty positions, although still far from the desired 75:25 ratio.

Plan for Establishing Priorities for Faculty Hiring: In fall 2004, Mesa College adopted a new process for establishing priorities for faculty hiring. This process was first used for prioritizing faculty requests for the 2005-06 academic year and minor modifications were made for the 2006-07 academic year. The process is being used for the third time for prioritizing positions for the 2007-08 academic year. (1.1.21)

The faculty hiring process was modified slightly based on the experiences with its first use. The revised process was approved by President's Cabinet and a new prioritized list of faculty positions were prioritized in December 2005; this list is effective for a 12-month time period.

The faculty hiring process requires that departments applying for a position must respond to a set of ten principles. The first principle states:

PRINCIPLE 1: The Mesa College Strategic Plan for Faculty Hiring Priorities supports the California Community College Commitment to Diversity, adopted by the Board of Governors in March 1999. This commitment to diversity serves as a foundation upon which the system's action plan for the future is built and provides an affirmation of historic commitment to diversity at all levels of the community college experience. Mesa College is committed to preserving and enhancing the diversity of students, faculty, and staff as a necessary component in serving San Diego's diverse population and maintaining the excellence of the college. Departments requesting new faculty positions should describe what steps they will take in recruitment in order to assure a diverse pool of qualified applicants from which to select.

In the ranking of applications, the committee grants more points to applications that go above and beyond the standard methods of outreach and recruitment in order to assure that there is a substantial, well-qualified and diverse applicant pool. Activities undertaken by search committees to achieve this goal include advertising in discipline-specific journals, advertising through organizations that serve specific cultural and ethnic professionals, and disseminating job announcements at professional conferences.

Administrative and Classified Hiring: There has been considerable administrative change over the past two years due to several Mesa administrators accepting promotions at other colleges or within the district.

In July 2005, the position of president of Mesa College was filled. Likewise, two vacant instructional dean positions were filled at this time: Dean of Health Sciences and Public Service and Dean of Social/Behavioral Sciences and Multicultural Studies.

In fall 2005, three administrative positions were vacated through the incumbents accepting promotions at other colleges. These positions were Dean of Student Affairs,

Dean of Student Development, and Associate Dean of Humanities. All three positions were filled by interim administrators for the 2005-06 academic year. Two of the positions, Dean of Student Affairs and Dean of Student Development, were filled permanently in July 2006. A second interim administrator is filling the Associate Dean of Humanities position for the 2006-07 year.

In July 2006, the Vice President of Student Services accepted a presidency, and this position is currently filled by an acting administrator. The intent is to fill the position with a permanent VPSS within the year.

The freeze on classified positions was lifted in July 2005 and the college is making progress on re-filling many of these positions. Now as positions become vacant, the college has the option to refill them or to refill another, more critical classified position. Starting this fiscal year, the college was granted permission to re-fill all frozen or vacant classified positions, or to reallocate them, provided that the college balances its budget. Therefore, all 1.0 FTEF positions considered essential were approved for filling; the less than fulltime positions are pending budget review at mid-year. However, the college has need for additional classified positions to support needed activities such as outreach, staffing to support increased lab classes, and additional clerical support. The current classified allocation is not sufficient to address all of these needs.

Modifications to Job Announcements: The district EEO Office and the Mesa College EEO site compliance officer have recently directed that all job announcements will carry the following statement which is a minimum qualification for employment: “The successful candidate will demonstrate experience and/or knowledge in working with students of great diversity in socioeconomic, cultural, and ethnic background, including those with different levels of academic preparation and varying physical and learning abilities.” Additionally, the site compliance officer reviews all hiring paperwork to assure that this statement is used as a screening criterion on all positions through a paper-screening or interview question. (3.2.2)

Training and Workshops Presented by the Site Compliance Officer: The Mesa College site compliance officer (SCO) now presents a workshop each year for adjunct faculty on how to apply for fulltime positions. Similarly, she provides formal training sessions on screening committee processes, sexual harassment complaints, and other compliance matters to all groups who request including screening committees, departments, schools, deans’ council, etc. The SCO visits most hiring committees to train and consult, and she serves on several hiring committees, especially those involving administrative hiring. (3.2.3, 3.2.4)

The site compliance officer reports directly to the college president and maintains an office for her SCO functions separate from her regular faculty office. This reporting status and location provide her with the autonomy and authority to perform her responsibilities with the fullest integrity. The SCO attends President’s Cabinet. Annually, she presents a report on her activities to the college president. (3.2.5)

Each year, the SCO presents a letter to President’s Cabinet on harassment and discrimination; the letter is adopted by the cabinet and disseminated to all members of the college. Furthermore, the SCO attends all faculty orientations (new faculty and adjuncts)

and gives a presentation based on this letter. On request, the SCO makes presentations to schools and departments on harassment and discrimination. (3.2.6)

Academic Senate *ad hoc* Committee on Faculty Hiring Procedures: Responding to faculty concerns about the implementation of district policy on faculty hiring processes, the Mesa Academic Senate convened an *ad hoc* committee to review this. Committee membership included faculty, classified, administration, and the site compliance officer. This committee collected anecdotal information from faculty on practices, reviewed district policies, and wrote a position paper to guide these processes. The paper was presented to the President's Cabinet in late spring 2006 and generated much discussion. The position paper was reviewed and adopted by the Academic Senate and approved by President's Cabinet, pending minor modification, in May, 2006. (1.1.21)

Civility Committee: In spring 2006, the president convened a special task force to review and make recommendations about how to address a variety of concerns being expressed on campus. These concerns included student discipline, faculty safety, planning for emergencies, and civility. The issue of civility was identified as an issue of concern between employees and/or students, both inside and outside the classroom, and encompassed issues originating from diversity of ethnicity, culture, language and other. To address the civility issue, a committee was formed and the committee has developed two actions to begin to address these concerns. The first action was to develop a civility statement and the second was to develop training on workplace civility. (3.2.7)

The civility statement is being reviewed during fall 2006 by the participatory governance groups prior to adoption at the President's Cabinet. Following adoption, the committee will consider methods of integrating it into the work of the college, perhaps through SLOs or workshops.

The workplace civility training, "M.E.E.T. on Common Ground: Respect in the Workplace," was piloted during fall 2006 and received positive reviews. Volunteers to provide the training include two classified supervisor, a counselor, a faculty member, and the site compliance officer. (3.2.8)

SDICCCA Internship Program: The San Diego and Imperial County Community College Association (SDICCCA) Internship Program has been in existence for 13 years, led by San Diego State University Professor Emeritus Bill Piland. Mesa College is an active supporter and participant in the program. Individuals preparing for community college careers may apply to intern with an instructor, counselor, or librarian mentor. Participants also agree to attend regular workshops that cover a variety of topics. The dean of the School of Social/Behavioral Sciences & Multicultural Studies at Mesa is the liaison to the SDICCCA Internship program. She recruits faculty mentors, assists in placements, and organizes the meetings when they are hosted at Mesa. Each year, Mesa has several interns. Some of our recent fulltime faculty hires started in the program.

Reference Documents:

SDCCD Board Docket 902.1 Report on Diversity Issues, 9/7/06

SDCCD Board Docket 901.2 Report on Diversity Issues, 9/6/05

2005-06 Ethnicity Breakdown (Mesa).

Evaluation and Assessment

There are several applications of Mesa's plan to address diversity in the workforce that clearly demonstrate our commitment to this process. The first is that the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Representatives who sit on personnel screening committees have full voting rights with the other committee members. They not only ensure the process as being fair and equal, they participate in the selection of the final candidates. Another example of Mesa's commitment to diversity is the actual appointment of committee members. Classified staff members are included on faculty screening committees and faculty members are included on classified screening committees; this ensures that all sectors are represented in personnel decisions.

One of the criteria included in the Priorities for Faculty Hiring is the degree to which the department proposes to recruit for a position, such that a well qualified, richly diverse applicant pool can be created. This is a very powerful tool that embeds planning for diversity at the department level. More points are given to a request that includes this recruitment strategy than to one that does not; these points help to place a hiring request higher on the priority list. This rewards good practices, and when the time for recruitment comes, the plan is already in place.

When paperwork is first submitted for the hiring process, it is evaluated by the SCO, who reviews all aspects, including questions and criteria, to ensure that process is compliant. Once it meets with her satisfaction, she approves it, and the request goes forward to district Human Resources. This is a definite hands-on checks and balances system to ensure that the recruitment is fair from its inception.

A recent action with major implications to this recommendation is the reorganization of the Human Resources Department, which is documented in the Board of Trustees docket number 680.1, dated June 7, 2007. The reorganization establishes a new Director, Legal Services and Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) position and reclassifies the previous director to Equal Opportunity and Diversity Officer. The rationale for the change is that the tasks associated with this effort have expanded greatly and require the need for an additional position. The new Director position requires the incumbent to be licensed to practice law, which reflects the complexity of these issues. The reclassified EEO and Diversity Officer will focus on issues related to creating a more diverse workforce and provide leadership to the colleges at the district level. (3.2.9)

In conjunction with this reorganization, during the 2007-2008 academic year, a district-wide EEO Council will develop plans which include: an EEO/Diversity Policy Statement; Delegation of Responsibility, Authority, and Compliance; EEO/Diversity Advisory Committee; Complaints; Notification to District Employees; Training for Screening/Selection Committees; Annual Written Notice to Community Organizations; Analysis of District Workforce and Applicant Pool; and Other Measures Necessary to Further Equal Employment Opportunity.

Recommendation

Work on this recommendation is still in progress. While the infrastructure to ensure diversity has been created with the Faculty Hiring Priorities procedure, the resultant faculty hirings have not delivered the level of diversity that the college is seeking. Of

particular assistance would be the addition of personnel and funding at the district Human Resources level to aggressively recruit underrepresented groups via association publications, college job postings, and other resources directly related to these diverse groups. (3.2.10)

Recommendation 4.1 Response

The college should identify and implement measures to increase the level of student involvement in participatory governance so that they are able to work together with the other constituents within the college. (IV.A.3).

Narrative

This recommendation has been addressed on numerous fronts in the past three years. Work has been done to increase student involvement with Associated Students (AS) governance, student clubs, campus-wide and district level participatory governance committees, and general leadership roles on campus. In addition, with the formation of the Statewide Student Senate, the current AS president has taken a statewide leadership role.

In the area of Associated Students governance, students have attended numerous student leadership functions, including trips to Washington, D.C. and Sacramento and retreats that fostered skills and helped to set agendas. In addition the student government has given voice to the students by providing platforms for them to be politically active. They have held marches, run voter registration campaigns, and provided public debate on various issues. They were extremely active in raising money for Hurricane Katrina victims and in addressing the inherent socio-economic issues that surfaced during the crisis. Students are also active in Mesa's participation in the annual Martin Luther King and Cesar Chavez parades and celebrations, as well as other civic awareness events. (4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3)

Clubs at Mesa College cut across a wide sector and include social, service, and career foci, as well as honor societies. Clubs continue to be active on campus, and new ones have been added. Of interest is the newly formed Enviro Club, which meets weekly and has begun a single-stream recycling program on campus. The club's focus on recycling actually inspired the creation of a participatory governance committee, the Environmental Stewardship Committee, which reports to President's Cabinet. Their focus is on educating the campus regarding recycling, with the ultimate intention of becoming a Zero Waste campus. To reach this goal, single stream recycling began on campus during spring 2007, through the collaboration of campus facilities, the committee, and the club. (4.1.4)

Another club that has been of service to the campus this year is the Honors Club, which has sponsored on-campus Blood Drives with the San Diego Blood Bank. There are numerous activities such as these in many of the clubs on campus.

Although not a club or an honor society, another student leadership opportunity at Mesa College is the Bridges to the Baccalaureate program, which is funded by a grant from the National Institutes of Health. Students work with established scientists in the community and present their research at various conferences.

Students sit on numerous participatory governance committees on campus, including Academic Senate, Mesa Student Services Council, President's Cabinet, Mesa Educational Master Planning Committee, Mesa Research Committee, Parking Committee, Commencement Committee, Crisis Response Committee, Scholarship Committee, Mesa College Foundation, Student Grievance Committee, ABSO (Bookstore and Cafeteria) Committee, and Student Success Day Committee, which is the major new student orientation program put forth each year. In addition, each of the three colleges' ASB Presidents sits on the district level Board of Trustees for one third of the year. (4.1.5, 4.1.6)

There are also programs on campus that provide leadership opportunities for students. One such group is the Mesa Academy Program, which focuses on African American students. This program utilizes student led committees for mentoring, recruitment, orientation, and audio visual production. Recruitment, orientation, and mentoring are coordinated and implemented so that new students to the program experience a smooth transition to Mesa. The program has a formal Peer-to-Peer Mentoring Program. In addition, Mesa Academy students had the opportunity to sit on committees for the Historically Black Colleges and Universities event and the African American/Latino Male Leadership Summit, and to participate in leadership roles in the actual events. The Puente Project co-sponsored the African American/Latino Male Leadership Summit and provides leadership opportunities for Latino students similar to those listed for the Mesa Academy Program. (4.1.7, 4.1.8, 4.1.9)

A recent achievement of the Associated Student governance group was the creation of a higher mandatory health fee, which resulted in a higher level of health care services for students. Of particular interest was the methodology they used for this change. The student government took an active outreach approach to inform the students as to the level of their health care services, and what they could be with different levels of increased funding. The event was held in front of the cafeteria; following the presentation the Associated Students held an election to determine the level of future services. The students chose to raise their own Student Health Fee, and they did it as informed citizens. (4.1.10)

In another instance, after receiving input from some immigrant students regarding the sense of racism on campus and problems with acculturation, the Family Therapist from the Student Health Center set up a film series and outreach counseling effort. This took place on two separate occasions; one video, The Angry Eye, addressed racism, the other, Monkey Dance, addressed the difficulties that immigrants face with acculturation. The presentations were standing room only; and they were initiated by a student request for help. (4.1.11)

On the grassroots level, one student driven leadership effort that was extremely successful was the movement to make Mesa College a smoke-free campus, making it the first community college in San Diego County to do so and only the third in California. This process was driven by one student who began organizing others to educate the campus on the health risks of second hand smoke, even in open places. She began by addressing the Board of Trustees on October 27, 2005, which led to the formation of the Mesa College Smoking Investigation Committee in December of that year. The participatory governance committee sponsored a health fair for the campus to educate the

public and to survey student interest in a smoke-free campus. They then made presentations to all of the governance groups, proposing a smoke-free campus, and conducting the survey there as well. The majority of the groups voted to become smoke-free; the proposal was approved by President's Cabinet and implemented in staggered manner to help people adjust. (4.1.12)

Evaluation and Assessment

Students have definitely become more involved at Mesa College. They have initiated actions, which have changed the college for the better, making its constituents better world citizens with recycling and a smoke-free environment. They are acting in a manner to care for each other. They are also participating in governance.

One problem that is always inherent with commuter colleges is the difficulty in getting students to engage in campus life and governance. Not all committees that need student representatives can get them.

Mesa College is definitely making progress in this area; however, turnover in three key administrative positions has had an effect on Student Services. One dean's position has been filled, and a second is in the process of being filled. In addition, the Vice President of Student Services accepted a President's position at another college, and that position is waiting to be filled permanently.

Recommendations

Although definite progress has been made, the college needs to continue to address this issue. The filling of the two administrative positions, especially Dean, Student Affairs, will help to provide the leadership for this area.

Recommendation 4.2 Response

The district should build upon its efforts to clearly delineate the functions of the district and the colleges and to communicate more effectively with faculty and staff throughout the district, paying additional attention to coordinating and integrating services and activities within the district office and regularly evaluating the effectiveness of the delineation and the quality of services provided to the college.

(IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.g)

Narrative

This response to this recommendation builds upon information put forward in Recommendation 1.5. Most certainly the reformulation of the District Governance Council as a truly participatory governance committee is the most significant of the changes that have taken place (see Recommendation 1.5 Response for more details). The creation of a District-wide Strategic Planning Committee that reports directly to this body reinforces the inclusive nature of leadership at the district; the very language of its name makes it clear that this is not directive driven from the district down, but district-wide, meaning equal inclusion of the stakeholders in creating this strategic plan. The inclusive nature of the District-wide Budget Committee likewise provides communication within the district/college structure. (1.51, 1.5.3, 1.5.8)

In response to the need for clarity on the functions and reporting structure of the district, the District Governance Council approved the publication titled, The District Governance

and Administration Handbook during the 2006-2007 academic year. This document describes district operations, including key contact personnel. It also includes information on each shared governance committee, its membership, and all policies related to governance. It will be updated annually. (4.2.1)

The district has undergone major changes, as have the colleges and continuing education. At the district level there is the new Chancellor and two new Vice Chancellors, all of whom have made major changes in their organizations. The new Vice Chancellor for Business Services has instituted practices such as the District-wide Budget Committee, and the Vice Chancellor for Instructional Services, Planning, and Technology has created six new divisions to better serve the functions within this area. They include: Workforce and Economic Development; Online Instruction and Distributed Learning; International Education Initiatives; Instructional Resources, Curricular Improvement and Best Practices; Grants and Resource Development; and Educational Strategic Planning, Program Analysis and Evaluation. Several of these divisions have received new leadership as well although some still have vacant or interim dean positions. Of note is Online Instruction and Distributed Learning, which has now taken its place at the district office, with a new dean who has extensive experience in Online Education. This division now has permanent staff in the positions of instructional designers to assist online faculty throughout the district, along with a more clearly defined budget to support this district-wide effort. (4.2.1a)

Also created in the last three years was the position of Director of Information Technology, which reports directly to the Chancellor. This position serves to provide a central position for the integration of technology services and practices across the district. By reporting directly to the Chancellor, there is the elimination of bias in terms of the manner in which technology supports the entire district. This position works closely with the college Deans of Learning Resources and Information Technology to ensure that college needs are being met.

There is now a revitalized district-wide marketing committee, which includes the Mesa Public Information Officer, and a district-wide enrollment management committee, which includes the college Presidents, the Vice Presidents, and the Vice Chancellors.

Presidents, vice presidents, and vice chancellors from all three colleges, continuing education and district now meet periodically to discuss enrollment management issues, agree on strategies, and create recommendations for the Chancellor's Cabinet. (4.2.2)

At the college level, there have also been changes, including new presidents at Mesa and Miramar Colleges and at Continuing Education. At Mesa College there has been some turnover in the area of administration. There are new deans in the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences and in the School of Health Sciences and Public Services. A new Dean of Student Development and Matriculation was hired last fall as well. The college is currently in the search process for a career Dean of Student Affairs and Vice President of Student Services. The Dean of Humanities and Languages and Associate Dean of Humanities are currently being filled by interim personnel; the permanent Dean is serving in an interim position elsewhere in the district and the permanent Associate Dean position is currently vacant. All new personnel have been hired with the new direction of district/college integration and coordination clearly in process.

In addition to the integration of colleges and continuing education with the district in terms of committee participation and shared priorities, the district has also addressed formal communication tools as well. Publications that keep all district employees informed of actions taken at the district level include: the “San Diego Community College District Board Report,” which is published both in print and distributed via email following each board meeting, and details board actions; “Chancellor’s Cabinet Update,” which is also delivered via print and email, and provides an overview of things covered at the cabinet, in addition to a listing of the Chancellor’s Open Office Hours, which are held monthly at locations throughout the district; and “With Excellence: WE,” a full color twelve page publication, that is published quarterly and spotlights various events and accomplishments for the three colleges and continuing education, and includes a message from the Chancellor. In addition, the Board travels to each college once a year to hold their board meeting. This gives the local colleges the opportunity to showcase their programs, faculty, staff, and students. (4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.5)

At Mesa College there are communication tools in place as well. Each week the Actions from President’s Cabinet, a record of the issues discussed and voted upon, are distributed via email to campus constituents. In addition, “President’s Cabinet Update,” a formal publication detailing these actions is published in print each month. Other publications available include “411,” which is a Student Services newsletter, “Mesa E-News,” which is a general online news magazine covering the college, and publications from both the Transfer Center and Articulation. In addition, the college publishes its “Annual Report” in August of each year; also published annually, or more frequently if needed, is the student handbook, the faculty staff handbook, the college catalog, and the schedule of classes, which is published each term. (4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8)

The Mesa College website has become a central point for the dissemination of information not only for students, but for employees as well. It was just redone to be ADA compliant at all levels, and includes a calendar of events in addition to information that is essential to matriculating at Mesa College. In the area of Governance, all campus committees are listed, along with their charges, their members, and their time and place of meeting. Minutes can be located for most of these committees and are found within the Instruction section of the website. Students can easily locate information on academics and student services within the site as well. In addition the district provides a website that serves to inform. The homepage provides multiple links for the various departments, and direct links to all of the colleges and continuing educations. Minutes for some committees are located on the site for public perusal, but not all. (4.2.9)

Evaluation and Assessment

Efforts have been made on numerous fronts by the district office to be inclusive of all college and continuing education stakeholders. Of particular interest with these new practices is the nature of collaboration rather than prescription. For example, the very powerful District Governance Council is a consensus driven committee, as opposed governing by directive. It is the point where the colleges interact with the board in terms of reviewing the docket items, where issues can be discussed in committee before going forward to the board. There is true interaction and give and take that includes the campuses. In the area of Online Learning, there is a fully representative advisory committee. In the area of technology, there is a new district level committee for

audiovisual specifications and purchases that includes a representative from each college, a representative from Disability Support Programs and Services, the Director of Information Technology, and is chaired by the Supervisor of Purchasing. Collaboration is being seen on numerous fronts.

Enrollment management meetings with district presidents, vice presidents, have been helpful in developing common approaches to enrollment issues and have promoted understanding and collaboration between district colleges and district office. As a result there is a deeper understanding of the complexity of enrollment management, increasing reliance on research to direct these efforts, and district-college collaboration on decision-making.

Turnover in Instructional Services, Planning and Technology, with several positions vacant or held by interim appointments, have slowed the ability of this office to be as responsive to college need as they might wish to be, although incumbents have made significant efforts to respond to college needs. The Dean of Workforce Development position is advertised to be filled by summer. A position as Director of Grants and Contracts has been created and is also advertised. When these positions are filled, support to the colleges will be stronger. The recent retirement of the Dean of Curriculum and Instructional Services leaves a critical leadership void in curriculum. Recruitment efforts are underway to fill the position; if the position remains unfilled for long, it will have a serious impact on curriculum issues.

Expansion of hiring in all categories of employees, faculty, classified and administrators, as well as other responsibilities have placed an increased burden on district Human Resources staff. The recent Mesa Academic Senate ad hoc Committee on Faculty Hiring was, in part, driven by concerns about processes and timeliness within the hiring process.

Recommendations

This recommendation has been partially completed but efforts need to continue. Clearly, within the past three years, the delineation of functions and communication between colleges and district have been addressed and improved in many respects. Successful outcomes include the District Shared Governance Committee, the District Budget Committee, district-written communications, and the work on enrollment management. Staffing issues in district Instructional Services, Planning and Technology and in Human Resources have limited the speed with which these organizations can respond to college need and, therefore, work needs to continue in these areas in order to meet this recommendation.

Planning Summary from Self Study

1. **Standard I: Integrating Student Services and Instructional programs to strengthen access, outreach, retention and publicity.** This process was begun this year with the integration of Student Services and Instruction for the purpose of a standard Program Review instrument. With the full integration of the document and with the expansion of the committee membership, this will be a big step forward in the process. In terms of access, outreach, and retention, the new emphasis on research and the hiring of the Campus Based Researcher have served to integrate efforts. To ensure communication, Administration and Student Services representatives regularly attend Deans' Council and have a standing place on the agenda.

The expansion of Learning Communities has also brought Student Services together with Instruction as Personal Growth 127 classes are paired with Basic Skills classes. In addition, the Silver Process, which is a student attitudinal survey, is being used to better serve struggling students both in the classroom and through Student Services. The Community College Survey of Student Engagement will likewise lead to better support for students.

Integration of outreach and retention efforts are evidenced in the Student Success Day program, which is administered by Student Services and brings together representatives of both Instruction and Student Services to ensure that students get off to a good start.

Status: The full integration of planning and budgeting is detailed in the Response to Recommendation 1.1; the integration of Program Reviews is listed in the Response to Recommendation 1.2; and the inclusion of students in leadership and participatory governance is detailed in the Response to Recommendation 4.1. *This goal has been achieved, and a long term commitment to this integration of Instruction and Student Services has become part of the campus culture.*

2. **Standard I: Expanding the development and the incorporation of institutional research in all facets of institutional planning.** This has clearly been addressed. For detailed discussion on this, see the Response to Recommendation 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4. The Educational Master Plan calls for data driven decision making. Research is embedded in the Program Review process, which includes quantitative information on Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment and on the Six Year Curriculum Review Cycle. Research has become institutionalized with the hiring of the Campus Based Researcher position. Committees at both the campus and district level address the use of research.

Status: *This goal has been achieved.*

3. **Standard IIA: Implementing Student Learning Outcomes based upon continued faculty consultation and participation.** Student Learning Outcomes

have come a very long way since their inception in 2002. They are now the driving force behind each department's Program Review. In addition, the creation of a Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (SLOAC) Coordinator position in early 2005 has been an excellent support service for the faculty engaged in this process. For more information on SLOs, see the Response to Recommendations 1.2 and 3.1.

Faculty involvement on the Research Committee, Program Review Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, Academic Senate, and President's Cabinet ensure that faculty will continue to determine their departmental SLOs.

Status: *This goal has been achieved, as faculty are and will continue to be instrumental in the implementation of SLOs.*

4. Standard IIA: Piloting a new methodology for the quantitative assessment of student learning outcomes and making available an improved data base.

This goal is related to number 3 above, and has been addressed with the hiring of the Campus Based Researcher, the SLOAC Coordinator, and the reformulation of the campus Research Committee. A tool created by the SLOAC Coordinator that has been especially useful is the Outcomes Matrix. In addition, the hiring of the Campus Based Researcher has provided the focus and expertise to make quantitative assessment a reality. The use of Pivot Tables, created by the District Office of Research, will also facilitate quantitative investigation at the department level. With security controls fully in place, this resource is available for department level use. This goal overlaps with Responses to Recommendations 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4.

Status: *This goal has been achieved.*

5. Standard IIB: Establishing a periodic administration of point-of-service surveys that include questions pertaining to specific student service programs and activities using input from these constituents.

With the hiring of the Campus Based Researcher, the support is clearly in place for proceeding with these types of survey instruments. Point of service surveys are currently being addressed for student services within the context of the integration of Student Services and Instruction for the new Program Review document. During the summer 2007 three meetings were held to begin the integration process and an inventory of information needs was created. At this point the needs are being evaluated by the Campus Based Researcher to determine the best way to go forward.

Additionally, the Learning Resource Center has recently completed a point of service survey and is using it to drive their Program Review, which is being written from the Year One base point this spring. In addition, the Work Experience program did an extensive survey with their students to determine effectiveness. Other surveys that are in place include the Silver Process Survey,

by Dr. Kenneth Gonzalez, which looks at student success strategies, particularly for students at risk, and the Community College Survey of Student Engagement, along with its companion survey, the Community College Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, which looks at numerous criteria to predict and support student engagement and ultimately success.

Status: *This goal is in progress for student services. The Campus Based Researcher is currently working on the needs assessment for this. The vehicle for these surveys will be the new Program Review document. With the hiring of a new Vice President for Student Services, the oversight and support for this effort will clearly be in place. The timeline for putting surveys such as these in place is 2009.*

- 6. Standard IIB: On-line posting so that critical information for students is more readily available. Examples include the Financial Aid Bulletin, student rights and responsibilities including Conduct and Due Process, Policy 3100 and other important information contained within the current printed Student Handbook.** The complete rebuilding of the Mesa College website is complete at this point. With a mini-Google search feature for retrieval of internal documents and information, and a very well organized menu on the homepage, students can easily locate information on topics such as Financial Aid, student rights, and Policy 3100, just to name a few of the services. A feature just added this year is the events calendar, which is clearly accessed on the homepage. This website is written in XHTML, with Cascading Style Sheets, and is considered a model website in terms of accessibility. Nationally renowned web developer Molly Holzschlag was brought in as a consultant to advise the campus web designer as he went forward with this effort.

Status: *This goal has been achieved.*

- 7. Standard IIC: Consolidating all tutoring programs under one administrator in the new Academic Skills Center to be constructed with Proposition S funds.** This has been accomplished with the consolidation of tutoring services under the direction of the Vice President, Instruction. In addition, the different tutoring services have been relocated so that they are physically located together in one central location, facilitating better service to students.

Status: *This goal has been achieved.*

- 8. Standard IIIA: Developing and implementing a strategic plan to hire faculty and staff under the current budget constraints with attention to diverse backgrounds and to conform with academic program review recommendations.** This has been addressed with the new Faculty Priority Hiring Plan, which embeds the process to recruit and create a highly diverse applicant pool. This process is part of the Educational Master Plan, and all input is department driven, which means that it is part of their Program Review. To see

more information on this, see the Response to Recommendation 3.2, which delineates the full faculty hiring process and Recommendation 1.1, which addresses the integrated master plan.

Status: *This goal is in progress, as discussed in the Response to Recommendation 3.2. The infrastructure is in place to encourage the creation of a diverse applicant pool, but the diversity of the new faculty hires does not reflect the level of diversity that the college is seeking. Added funding at the district Human Resources level is needed in order to advertise and recruit from diverse populations.*

- 9. Standard IIIA: Identifying options that would permit classified staff to attend relevant, job-related staff development activities.** This too is covered in the Response to Recommendation 3.2, where staff training is discussed. A pilot program in relevant classified staff training was conducted in the School of Learning Resources, under the direction of the Instructional Support Supervisor. This LRC Academy is unique in its bottom up, employee driven (classified and faculty both) approach to identifying training that will enable them to better perform their jobs. Workshops this year have included “MEET on Common Ground,” which is a workplace diversity workshop, Improving Customer Service, which included training on dealing with difficult patrons, and Team Building. Still to come is a workshop on Time Management. In addition, the School joined the International Communications Industry Association, which is the leading audiovisual and computer technology trade association, and provides online courses and admission to the annual trade show, InfoCOMM. The identification of the training areas was via employee survey; the Instructional Support Supervisor then identified and hired proven consultants to teach the workshops.

The success of the LRC pilot program culminated in the decision by President’s Cabinet on May 1, 2007 to create a Classified Staff Development Committee, which will implement a campus-wide program using the LRC pilot model for determination of needs and delivery of training. \$15,000 was allocated to this effort for 2007-2008.

Student Services has also provided large scale staff development training in the past year. At the center of this was the Mesa College Student Services Staff Development Committee, which represents classified staff members across the broad spectrum of Student Services. They have both a mission and shared values statement that guides their work. Their Student Services Classified Retreat was very successful, as was reflected in their evaluation tool. In addition, they scheduled monthly programs titled “Brown Bag Lunch Symposiums,” which addressed a different topic each month. Staff development in Student Services is twofold and includes topics that are job related and those that are more personally focused. Workshops included support for change, identifying training needs, stress management, collaboration strategies between departments, and team building. Faculty had two retreats with similar topics, but also included SLOs,

crisis management, and visions for counseling.

In addition, the campus Staff Development Committee provides funding for staff to attend off-campus training that is job related.

Status: *This goal is completed, in that options have been identified that would permit classified staff to attend job-related training. However, the implementation of this goal needs to continue and its success should be monitored by the appropriate divisions.*

10. Standard IIIB: Ensuring that as facilities are planned and constructed, they will support student learning outcomes. It has been clearly articulated from the start that faculty will determine what will be included in the new buildings and classrooms constructed with Propositions S and N funds. In addition, a newly reactivated Facilities Committee has been created at Mesa College, and is a participatory governance body, that oversees facility decisions. This group is chaired by the Vice President of Business Services, who reports to President's Cabinet, and who sits on numerous district-wide committees with relation to this. This goal is directly related to Recommendation 3.1 and details are provided in that response.

Status: *This goal has been achieved.*

11. Standard IIIC: Implementing the Strategic Plan for Technology to improve the process for evaluating, standardizing, clarifying, and communicating technology improvements. The Strategic Plan has just undergone its third annual review and revision, which was approved by President's Cabinet on May 15, 2007. It has been fully implemented. In addition, the Mesa Information Technology Committee, which is responsible for this plan, has expanded to include representation at the deans' level for Student Services and Instruction, and has included more diversity in terms of the disciplines represented by the faculty. This participatory governance committee has been very responsive in predicting and meeting campus needs. Most recently, with the increase in online instruction, they recommended software and hardware financial support, in addition to more training and production support.

Status: *This goal has been achieved.*

12. Standard IVA: That the District adopt appropriate staffing ratios for supervisors, department chairs, and managers to support the nature of the colleges and their individual missions. Working with a consultant, the Hay Group, the district examined ratios for classified staffing throughout the district. Mesa College was found to have the appropriate level of classified staffing for its size, determined by FTES. Therefore, the district directed the college that any additional classified staff positions must come from re-allocation of vacant classified positions. As classified positions become vacant, the Mesa Executive

Staff scrutinizes the need carefully before authorizing refilling the position. On occasion, the vacant position is re-allocated to another area.

In the AFT Contract, chair reassigned time was increased by including intersession and summer FTEF in the calculation of chair reassigned time. Chairs also now receive an increased salary supplement through additional extended service units that recognize the amount of work they perform.

Although staffing ratios for managers have not been fully addressed yet, plans are underway to review and recommend changes that would reduce the span of control assigned to managers. One such change has already been approved and recently enacted with the planned separation of the current School of Humanities and Languages into two new schools, each with its own dean and secretary. The two new schools will be the School of Humanities and the School of Languages and Arts, each with equivalent enrollment and workload. Implementation will occur during the current academic year (2007-2008). This change was approved by the Board of Trustees on 7/12/07, as docket number 681.3. (PS1)

Status: *This goal has been achieved; however, ongoing attention will be given to continuing the proper ratios.*

13. Standard IVA: Increasing student involvement in participatory governance through publicizing their role. This has definitely been addressed at Mesa over the past three years. For more information on this, see Recommendation 4.2. At this point the Dean of Student Affairs position is vacant; when it is filled, it is expected that this goal will advance again.

Status: *This goal is making great progress. When the Dean of Student Affairs position is filled, this goal is expected to be completely achieved. Timeline: 2009.*

14. Standard IVB.1: Develop a comprehensive, integrated, strategic master plan for the San Diego Community College District. The groundwork for achieving this goal began with the District-wide Strategic Planning Priorities document. It is a plan that was driven from the colleges and continuing education up to the district level. In turn, this document became the basis for the district-wide strategic plan, "A Blueprint for Student Success; Strategic Planning Priorities Across to San Diego Community College District, 2007-2012," which is being finalized in September, 2007. See Recommendations 1.5 and 4.2 for more information.

Status: *This goal has been achieved.*

15. Standard IVB.1: Implement the recently adopted code of ethics and a self-evaluation tool and use this tool on a regular basis to assess its performance. The recently-adopted Board of Trustees code of ethics is now district policy. On an annual basis, the board assesses its performance through a self-evaluation

process informed by results of a survey distributed district-wide.

Status: *This goal has been achieved.*

16. Standard IVB.3: The District Executive Council be reorganized as an effective participatory governance body to encourage enhanced participation of its membership and reaffirm its responsibilities for the discussion, debate and resolution of District-wide matters. The District Governance Council was completely reorganized and repurposed under the leadership of the new Chancellor. It is considered a truly powerful governing body by its members, which include representatives from all governance groups. Mesa College is represented by the College President, the President of the Academic Senate, and the President of the Classified Senate. It meets twice each month, usually for at least two hours, and is governed by consensus, not directive. See Recommendations 1.5 and 4.2 for more detailed information.

Status: *This goal has been achieved.*

17. Standard IVB.3: The District Budget and Development Committee continues to be called upon during both routine and emergency fiscal times. Additionally, any reorganization of the District services or personnel will be through participatory governance with a plan that includes improved allocation of resources showing a direct correlation to student success. The reformulated District-wide Budget Committee has representation by all campuses, including the Vice Presidents of Business Services and the Academic Senate Presidents. See Recommendations 1.5 and 4.2 for more detailed information on this.

Status: *This goal has been achieved.*

Evidence

- 1.1.1 “President’s Cabinet,” Governance. San Diego Mesa College website. <<http://www.sdmesa.edu/governance/committees/pres-cab/index.html>>
- 1.1.2 San Diego Mesa College Five Year Educational Master Plan, 2006-2007 to 2010-2011, along with companion piece 1.1.2.a, Outline for San Diego Mesa College Five Year Educational Master Plan, 2006-2007 to 2010-2011.
- 1.1.3 San Diego Mesa College Educational Master Planning, approved by Cabinet May 9, 2006, revised August 7, 2006.
- 1.1.4 District Strategic Planning Priorities.
- 1.1.5 Mesa College Strategic Planning Priorities and Goals for 2006-2007.
- 1.1.6 San Diego Mesa College Five Year Educational Master Plan 2006-2007, Guidelines for School Goals and Objectives.
- 1.1.7 “Research Committee,” Governance. San Diego Mesa College website. <<http://www.sdmesa.edu/governance/committees/research/index.html>>
- 1.1.8 District-wide Research Committee, June 1, 2006, Procedure 0020.1.
- 1.1.9 Preparation for On-Campus Researcher.
- 1.1.10 San Diego Mesa College Office of Instructional Services, Resource Development, and Research; Research Function, Lines of Responsibility.
- 1.1.11 San Diego Mesa College Research Committee, Research Planning Agenda, Approved by President’s Cabinet February 27, 2007.
- 1.1.12 San Diego Mesa College Research Committee, Guidelines for Implementing the Research Planning Agenda, Approved by President’s Cabinet May 15, 2007.
- 1.1.13 San Diego Mesa College Budget Development Committee 2006-2007 (description, charge, membership).
- 1.1.14 Budget Development Request Forms for Equipment, Supplies, Facilities Improvement, and Classified Staff for 2007-2008.
- 1.1.15 VTEA package, including forms and directions.
- 1.1.16 San Diego Mesa College Facility Planning Committee 2006-2007 (description, charge, membership).
- 1.1.17 Principles to Guide Changes in Sequencing and Timing of Construction of Mesa’s Prop S and Prop N Facilities.
- 1.1.18 San Diego Mesa College Academic Program Review, Committee Report for Year One, 2005-2006, presented to President’s Cabinet on March 13, 2007.
- 1.1.19 “Academic Program Review Committee,” Governance. San Diego Mesa College website. <<http://www.sdmesa.edu/governance/committees/program-review/index.html>>
- 1.1.20 Sub-committee for Integration of Academic Program Review and Student Services Program Review; Minutes dated June 18, 2007, July 11, 2007, and July 25, 2007.
- 1.1.21 San Diego Mesa College Faculty Hiring Priorities, Strategic Plan for 2006-2007 Year.

- 1.2.1 San Diego Mesa College Student Learning Outcomes for the Associate Degree, Approved by Research Committee, May 23, 2003.

- 1.2.2 San Diego Mesa College Policy on the Genesis, Development and Application of Student Learning Outcomes, dated May 4, 2004.
- 1.2.3 San Diego Mesa College Proposal: Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Cycle (SLOAC), approved by Academic Senate on May 23, 2005, approved by President's Cabinet on May 24, 2005.
- 1.2.4 SLOAC Coordinator Position Description.
- 1.2.5 SLOAC Meetings Log, 2005-2006, 2006-2007.
- 1.2.6 San Diego Mesa College Instructional Improvement Days, 2006-2007 Flex Handbook.
- 1.2.7 Packet of Handouts from Workshops Presented at Mesa College by Norena Badway, Ed.D.
- 1.2.8 Rubric for Assessment of Progress Towards Implementing a Student Learning Outcomes Framework at a Community College.
- 1.2.9 San Diego Mesa College Global Competencies Matrix.
- 1.2.10 San Diego Mesa College Six Year Curriculum Review Criteria, CurricUNET.
- 1.2.11 San Diego Mesa College Instructional Division Goals and Objectives, 2006-2007.
- 1.2.12 Strengthening Student Success Conference Proposal.
- 1.2.13 "Student Learning Outcomes," website.
<<http://www.sdmesa.edu/instruction/slo/index.html>>

- 1.3.1 Mesa College: Research Request Log (requests up through 2/26/2007); Office of Instructional Services, Resource Development, and Research.
- 1.3.2 "San Diego Mesa College: The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)," Power Point Presentation by Office of Instructional Services, Resource Development, and Research.
- 1.3.3 "District-Wide Research Committee: Mesa College Update, October 12, 2006," prepared by San Diego Mesa College Office of Instructional Services, Resource Development, and Research for use at district level committee meeting.

- 1.4.1 "Flex Day Presentations: Overview of Options," SDCCD Office of Institutional Research and Planning, for 2006-2007.
- 1.4.2 Enrollment Management graphic presentation slide adapted by Bill Grimes from document presented by Bowling Green State University at AIR 2005 conference.
- 1.4.3 Districtwide Research Committee, Agenda 2/23/07.
- 1.4.4 Status Report for San Diego Mesa College Strategic IT Plan, Presented and accepted at President's Cabinet on May 15, 2007.

- 1.5.1 San Diego Community College District: District Governance Council: Description, Function and Operating Guidelines, Procedure 0020.6, September 23, 2004.
- 1.5.2 District Governance Council: February 21, 2007 Agenda and Handouts.
- 1.5.3 San Diego Community College District: District Strategic Planning Committee: Description, Function and Operating Guidelines, revised and approved May 3, 2006.

- 1.5.4 Email from Otto W. K. Lee, Interim Assistant Chancellor, Instructional Services, Planning, and Technology to SDCCD Strategic Planning Committee, dated September 2, 2004 regarding Activities for 2004-2005 (committee charge).
- 1.5.5 “Planning for Today and Tomorrow: A Framework for Addressing Strategic Priority Needs Across the San Diego Community College District,” prepared by 2006 District-wide Strategic Planning Technical Committee, April 18, 2006.
- 1.5.6 San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee, 2006-2007 Membership Roster.
- 1.5.7 “A Blueprint for Achieving Student Success: Strategic Planning Priorities Across The San Diego Community College District; City College, Mesa College, Miramar College, Continuing Education, and District Office: 2007-2012; Districtwide Strategic Plan; Planning for Today and Tomorrow;” preliminary version reviewed by Chancellor’s Cabinet, August, 2007.
- 1.5.7a Email from Henry Ingle to District-wide Strategic Planning Committee Members, detailing status of document and convening the next meeting; dated August 20, 2007.
- 1.5.8 San Diego Community College District: Shared Governance Budget Development and Institutional Planning Advisory Committee; Procedure 0003.8, revised November 28, 2006.
- 1.5.9 San Diego Community College District: Shared Governance Budget Development and Institutional Planning Advisory Committee Membership Roster 2007.
- 1.5.10 San Diego Community College District Board of Trustees Code of Ethics, Policy 1006, March 3, 2005, docket item dated 1/26/06 No. 191.1.
- 1.5.11 San Diego Community College District Board of Trustees Evaluation Policy and Instrument, Policy 1007, dated 3/3/05 No. 194.1.
- 1.5.12 San Diego Community College District Board of Trustees Evaluation 2006-7 and Annual Goals 2007-2008, dated 7/12/07 docket number 191.1.

- 3.1.1 AFT/SDCCD Bargaining Agreement, document regarding funding allocation formula.
- 3.1.2 Email from Elizabeth Armstrong, Vice President, Instruction to President’s Cabinet regarding Basic Skills Initiative “Perennial Problem –Radical Solutions,” dated November 29, 2006.
- 3.1.3 San Diego Mesa College Basic Skills Task Force.
- 3.1.4 San Diego Mesa College Program Review, Committee Report Years Two, Three, and Five, 2006-2007, presented to President’s Cabinet, May 15, 2007.
- 3.1.5 Email from Elizabeth Armstrong to DL for Mesa College, dated June 14, 2006, regarding Reassigned Time Opportunity for Learning Communities Coordinator.
- 3.1.6 Email from Elizabeth Armstrong to DL for Mesa College, dated January 12, 2007, regarding Reassigned Time Opportunity for Global Awareness Coordinator.
- 3.1.7 “San Diego Mesa College: Learning Communities,” website.
<<http://www.sdmesa.edu/learning-communities/index.cfm>> (8/22/07)
- 3.1.8 “Global Awareness Report for San Diego Mesa College: Setting Standards and Goals,” prepared by Prof. Leticia P. Lopez, for President’s Cabinet, May 15, 2007.

- 3.1.9 “Educational Building Design Process,” Pilot Project for SDCCD Strategic Planning; Description of Project.
<http://ispt.sdccd.edu/stratplan/pilots_educational.htm> (5/22/2007)
- 3.1.10 San Diego Community College District Proposition S Citizens’ Oversight Committee Annual Report, 2005-2006.
- 3.1.11 “Analysis of Audiovisual Installations for Classrooms in the San Diego Community College System,” by Jill Baker, in conjunction with Judy Baker, Miramar College and Peggy Hayward, City College, dated August 12, 2004.
- 3.2.1 District Governance Council Minutes, July 19, 2006.
- 3.2.2 Documentation for change in Job Announcement with stronger language on diversity experience.
- 3.2.3 Email from Yvonne Bergland to DL for Mesa College, dated April 18, 2007, regarding “New Flex Workshop –Becoming an EEP Rep! Learn About the Hiring Process.”
- 3.2.4 EEO Rep Certification Training Program, 2007.
- 3.2.5 Site Compliance Officer Annual Report to President’s Cabinet, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007.
- 3.2.6 Memo on Sexual Harassment, Sent to Mesa College Faculty and Staff, from Sondra Frisch, Site Compliance Officer, dated March 20, 2007; unanimously endorsed by the President’s Cabinet on 3/20/2007.
- 3.2.7 Civility Statement, created by Committee on Campus Climate, Safety, and Security, Civility and Classism Sub-Committee, presented to President’s Cabinet on October 31, 2006.
- 3.2.8 M.E.E.T. on Common Ground: Overview of workforce respect workshop presented as part of LRC Academy Workshops, 2006-2007.
- 3.2.9 San Diego Community College District Board of Trustees Reorganization of the Human Resources Department, dated 6/7/07, docket number 680.1.
- 3.2.10 “Faculty and Non-Faculty Diversity Report,” prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning, March 19, 2007.
- 4.1.1 Hurricane Katrina documentation of efforts: Hurricane Katrina Campus Response Meeting Minutes, September 7, 2005; Slides 30-32 from Mesa College Presentation to Board of Trustees, October 27, 2005.
- 4.1.2 Martin Luther King, Jr. Parade documentation of efforts: clipping from San Diego Union Tribune, January 14, 2007; email from Lina Heil to DL for Mesa College, date January 22, 2007, regarding photo album of event <<http://s130.photobucket.com/albums/p265/mesacomunications/Martin%20Luther%20King%20Parade07/?action=view¤t=34.jpg&slideshow=true&interval=3>>; flyer from event.
- 4.1.3 Cesar Chavez Parade documentation of efforts: Email from Cesar Lopez to districtwide, dated March 14, 2007, regarding Annual Cesar E. Chavez Celebration from Mesa College; email from Paul Gomez to DL for Mesa College, dated March 7, 2007 regarding parade.
- 4.1.4 Documentation for Enviro Club and Environmental Stewardship Committee: Email from Erin Rempala Kim to DL for Mesa College, dated 4/8/07, regarding

- recycling at Mesa; Charge for Environmental Stewardship Committee; Description and Membership of Environmental Stewardship Committee.
- 4.1.5 Documentation for Shared Governance Committees with Student Members: provides copies of official committee membership rosters, listing student members, accessed on the Mesa College website on 5/23/07.
- 4.1.6 “Board of Trustees: San Diego Community College District,” website, documenting student membership. <<http://www.sdccd.net/public/district/trustees>> (5/22/2007)
- 4.1.7 Documentation for African American Latino Male Leadership Summit: includes copy of official program from event, dated March 23, 2007, and article from district publication, WE: With Excellence, dated April, 2007.
- 4.1.8 “San Diego Mesa College: Mesa Academy,” website. <<http://www.sdmesa.edu/mesa-academy/index.cfm>> (5/6/2007)
- 4.1.9 “San Diego Mesa College: Puente Project,” website. <<http://www.sdmesa.edu/puente/index.cfm>> (5/6/2007)
- 4.1.10 Email from Suzanne Khambata forwarding information on Health Fee from Jonathan Arevalo, AS President, dated April 9, 2007
- 4.1.11 “The Angry Eye: A Study Guide,” (no publication information).
- 4.1.12 “San Diego Mesa College: Smoke Free Campus,” website. <<http://www.sdmesa.edu/notices/smoke-free.cfm>> (5/6/07)
- 4.2.1 The District Governance and Administrative Handbook. San Diego Community College District, 2006-2007.
- 4.2.1a “Instructional Services, Planning and Technology,” San Diego Community College website. <<http://ispt.sdccd.edu>> (5/6/07)
- 4.2.2 “Chancellor’s Cabinet,” website including membership. <<http://sdccd.edu/public/administration/cabinet/index.html>> (5/6/07)
- 4.2.3 “Board Report,” Board of Trustees, San Diego Community College District, dated May 11, 2007
- 4.2.4 “Chancellor’s Cabinet Update,” dated May 2007, sent via email districtwide by Margaret Lamb, May 21, 2007.
- 4.2.5 “WE: With Excellence,” San Diego Community College District, April 2007.
- 4.2.6 “President’s Cabinet Update,” San Diego Mesa College, March 2007.
- 4.2.7 “Mesa 411,” San Diego Mesa College Student Services, April May June, 2007.
- 4.2.8 “San Diego Mesa College: E-news,” <<http://www.sdmesa.edu/e-news>> (5/6/2007).
- 4.2.9 “San Diego Mesa College,” website homepage. <<http://www.sdmesa.edu>> (5/6/07)

Evidence Unique to Planning Summary from Self Study

- PS1 San Diego Community College District Board of Trustees Mesa College Reorganization, dated 7/12/07, docket number 681.1.