

Key Points from Matthew Lee Gap Analysis

General Recommendations/Comments

- “Warning is a serious Commission sanction that requires immediate and sustained corrective action involving the entire campus community.... Gaining full reaffirmation of accreditation is the business of everyone at the College.”
- The College has experienced difficulty in moving planning and decision-making from their traditional basis in personal relationships and the seat of the pants toward a more formal, systematic approach. New faculty, managers, and faculty association leadership, in combination with enrollment growth and budgetary challenges, have introduced further changes in the organizational culture. One result has been an “environment that is not very conducive to unity in moving the College forward.”
- Rec 1: All College leaders should unify their efforts, help all members of the campus community recognize the urgency of the problems the Commission identified, and inspire and lead them to contribute actively to the solutions.
- Rec 2: Adopt well-defined, formal, documented structures and processes designed to improve institutional effectiveness, and then follow through with proper execution.
- Rec 3: The creation of a College Council, properly constituted, would “provide coordination, facilitation, and communication for shared-governance and other major College issues.”
- Rec 4: Evaluation of all shared-governance structures and processes on campus (including all shared-governance committees) needs to be comprehensive and regular, and the resulting recommendations should serve in part to spread the burden of participation in governance beyond the current, relatively small proportion of employees.
- Rec 5: A formal, permanent Accreditation Committee should be formed to help with training, coordination, monitoring, reporting, and ongoing campus dialogue.
- Rec 6: The college community needs to examine itself more critically and be realistic in documents submitted to ACCJC.
- Rec 7: Update the written code of ethics to include classified and management staff.
- Rec 8: Encourage all personnel to volunteer for service on a Commission accreditation team.
- Rec 9: Evaluate the resources, priorities, and operations of the Office of Grants and Institutional Research in light of the College’s ongoing research needs. Consider augmenting research capacity through a research priorities system, a research calendar, staff training, additional staff, and other measures, so that the office is able to provide more effective support to planning, program review, outcomes assessment, decision-making, and other functions.

- Rec 10: Systematically evaluate information technology resources, the method for establishing priorities for allocating them, and the process for monitoring implementation of those priorities.
- Rec 11: Make the *Gap Analysis, Report, and Recommendations* available to all College personnel.

Recommendation 1: Program Review

- Rec 12: Provide “systematic and rigorous training as soon as possible for all program review respondents.”
- Rec 13: Ensure that all program reviews include: 1) assessment of effectiveness using appropriate measures (including outcomes), 2) assessment of previously implemented improvements, 3) analysis of assessment results and implications of and for higher-level plans and outcomes, 4) specific goals based on analysis results, 5) measurable objectives, and 5) resources required to meet objectives and goals.
- Rec 14: Establish a schedule of opportunities for campus wide dialogue and training about program review results, outcomes assessment, and resource allocations in relation to improvement of student learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness.
- Rec 15: Systematize quality control of program review across the college.
- Recs 16 & 41: Formalize and document a system for periodic evaluation and improvement of all structures and processes associated with planning, evaluation, resource allocation, and decision making.
- Rec 17: Permit program assessment to include, where appropriate, not just SLO achievement, but also service outcomes and other measures relevant to program effectiveness.
- Rec 18: Develop a database that tracks and reports progress on and completion of program reviews.
- Rec 19: Develop a process to ensure consistency among the set of courses that defines an instructional program review, the corresponding set of courses listed in the Curricunet Program of Study, and the corresponding set of courses that comprise a program for purposes of defining program SLO’s.
- Rec 20: Consider adding to program review “an overall evaluation of program effectiveness, health, or viability.”

Recommendation 2: Student Learning Outcomes

- Rec 21: “Immediately make it a top campus wide priority to fulfill all requirements of the Proficiency level on the Commission’s SLO rubric.”
- Rec 22: “By the end of October 2011, create and publish a timeline for all the activities intended to support the achievement of Proficiency.”
- Recs 23, 24, & 25: Make specified improvements to SLO assessment forms and documentation of the SLO cycle, and maintain a reliable database of the status

of all SLO's. Keep the campus community informed about the status of SLO's at all levels.

- Rec 26: The Academic Senate should assume leadership in broadening the dialogue about assessment and improvement of student learning campus wide.
- Rec 27: Methods of assessing and measuring SLO's should be expanded beyond final grades and student surveys.
- Recs 28 & 29: Student Services and Administrative Services departments should consider implementation of service outcomes in addition to or instead of student learning outcomes, as appropriate.
- Rec 30: Employees utilizing surveys and data collection should utilize available resources to ensure that they are designed, analyzed, interpreted, and reported properly.
- Rec 31: The Office of Instruction, in consultation with other groups, should confirm ILO assessment methods, coordinate ILO assessment, and establish a schedule for completing the ILO's cycle.
- Rec 32: SLO structures and processes at all levels should be systematically evaluated by Fall 2012, with improvements implemented by 2013.

Recommendation 3: Integrated Planning, etc.

- Rec 33: Add activities/strategies, timelines, responsibilities, and resource requirements, and link the program review and resource allocation processes, to the Strategic Plan.
- Rec 34: Provide resources and engaging training for employees to learn about all the planning processes and their roles in them.
- Rec 35: Notify the campus community of the results of the resource allocation process every year.
- Rec 36: As many people as possible should attend the scheduled SLO assessment workshops, which should help faculty understand the relationship with other college planning processes.
- Rec 37: Middle managers and program leaders should have "well defined responsibilities in the coordination and monitoring of Program Review, SLO assessment, resource allocation and related collaborative processes." They should receive training, and in turn, share their expertise with others.
- Rec 38: Shared governance committee members and conveners should receive regular training about their responsibilities, including regular two-way communication with their constituencies.
- Rec 39: The Master Planning Committees should revise their functions, and the Handbook and other materials, so that there is more focus on improvement than resource allocations.
- Rec 40: Monitor the program review and resource allocation process to ensure that the lag time between resource request and resource allocation is not so long as to create difficulties.

Recommendation 4: Communication

- Rec 42: Establish a shared governance task force to evaluate a wide variety of modes of communication, including meetings, email, messages from the President, etc., and coordinate implementation of more effective communication structures and processes.

Recommendation 5: Governing Board

- Rec 43: The November 2011 workshop should analyze the results of the 2010 self-evaluation and plan for improvements.
- Rec 44: The November 2011 workshop should create a Board development plan.
- Rec 45: The Board of Trustees and President should develop a policy that defines the Board's role in accreditation.

Recommendation 8: Human Resources

- Rec 46: Devote the resources necessary to resolve Recommendation 8 as soon as possible. At a minimum:
 - Rec 46a: Hire a full-time, permanent Human Resources manager at an appropriate compensation and organizational level "that will attract experienced and competent candidates."
 - Rec 46b: Evaluate the current organizational structure for hiring adjunct faculty, and implement any modifications that prove warranted.
 - Rec 46c: Evaluate and determine the staffing needs and organizational structure of the Human Resources department, and implement any modifications that prove warranted to render it "fully functional."
 - Rec 46d: Provide technical support to automate as many manual tasks as possible.
 - Rec 46e: Provide training for managers and staff regarding laws, regulations, and policies related to HR.
- Rec 47: Update the Faculty and Staff Diversity Plan by March, 2012.
- Rec 48: Include management and classified hiring with resource allocation requests, and consider more fully integrated approaches to hiring.
- Rec 49: Periodically evaluate the use of human resources college wide and make recommendations for improvement.
- Rec 50: Evaluate the organizational placement of contract management functions, and coordinate them with the HR department.