AGENDA
SAN MATEO COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
BOARD OF TRUSTEES STUDY SESSION
October 14, 2009, 6:00 p.m.
District Office Board Room
3401 CSM Drive, San Mateo, CA 94402

NOTICE ABOUT PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AT BOARD MEETINGS
The Board welcomes public discussion.
• The public’s comments on agenda items will be taken at the time the item is discussed by the Board.
• To comment on items not on the agenda, a member of the public may address the Board under “Statements from the Public on Non-Agenda Items;” at this time, there can be discussion on any matter related to the Colleges or the District, except for personnel items. No more than 20 minutes will be allocated for this section of the agenda. No Board response will be made nor is Board action permitted on matters presented under this agenda topic.
• If a member of the public wishes to present a proposal to be included on a future Board agenda, arrangements should be made through the Chancellor’s Office at least seven days in advance of the meeting. These matters will be heard under the agenda item “Presentations to the Board by Persons or Delegations.” A member of the public may also write to the Board regarding District business; letters can be addressed to 3401 CSM Drive, San Mateo, CA 94402.
• Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services will be provided such aids with a three day notice. For further information, contact the Executive Assistant to the Board at (650) 358-6753.
• Regular Board meetings are tape recorded; tapes are kept for one month.
Government Code §54957.5 states that public records relating to any item on the open session agenda for a regular board meeting should be made available for public inspection. Those records that are distributed less than 72 hours prior to the meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to the members of the Board. The Board has designated the Chancellor’s Office at 3401 CSM Drive for the purpose of making those public records available for later inspection; members of the public should call 650-358-6753 to arrange a time for such inspection.

6:00 p.m.   Roll Call

Pledge of Allegiance

DISCUSSION OF THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

MINUTES

09-10-1 Approval of Minutes of the Board Meeting of September 23, 2009
09-10-2 Approval of Minutes of the Board Meeting of October 6, 2009

STATEMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

NEW BUSINESS

09-10-1A Approval of Personnel Actions: Changes in Assignment, Compensation, Placement, Leaves, Staff Allocations and Classification of Academic and Classified Personnel
Other Recommendations

09-10-1B Approval of Accreditation Follow-up Reports – Cañada College, College of San Mateo and Skyline College

INFORMATION REPORTS

09-10-1C Financing Plan for Cañada Vista
09-10-2C Fall 2009 Census Report

STUDY SESSION

09-10-3C Update on San Mateo Athletic Center

RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION

1. Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation
   A. Significant Exposure to Litigation – 1 Case
   B. Initiation of Litigation – 1 Case

2. Student Discipline Matter – 2 Cases

3. Conference with Labor Negotiator
   Agency Negotiator: Harry Joel
   Employee Organizations: AFT and CSEA

CLOSED SESSION ACTIONS TAKEN

ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was called to order at 6:10 p.m.

**Board Members Present:** President Karen Schwarz, Vice President-Clerk Patricia Miljanich, Trustees Helen Hausman, Richard Holober and Dave Mandelkern, and Student Trustee Virginia Medrano Rosales

**Others Present:** Chancellor Ron Galatolo, Executive Vice Chancellor Jim Keller, Skyline College President Victoria Morrow, College of San Mateo President Michael Claire, Cañada College President Tom Mohr and Vice President Sarah Perkins, and District Academic Senate President Patty Dilko

**Pledge of Allegiance**

**DISCUSSION OF THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA**

President Schwarz announced that Jane Hetrick requested that “Statements from the Public on Non-Agenda Items” be heard after approval of the minutes. The Board agreed to the request.

**MINUTES**

It was moved by Vice President Miljanich and seconded by Trustee Hausman to approve the minutes of the September 9, 2009 study session. The motion carried, all members voting “Aye.”

**STATEMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

Jane Hetrick said she has worked in the District for 30 years and is considering retirement. She has a two-year-old daughter whom she introduced to the Board. Ms. Hetrick requested that the Board consider adding dependent coverage to the medical plan for retirees. She said that the District and AFT have not been responsive and she is attempting to withdraw her membership from AFT Chapter 1493 under conscientious objector status. Ms. Hetrick said that she, like many other women, have delayed childbirth and she cited companies which have changed their definition of family. She said she recognizes that the District’s benefits are generous, but asked the Board to think in broader terms.

Joe Galligan told the Board he is seeking office as County Treasurer to replace Lee Buffington who is retiring. He said the Treasurer’s job affects schools, teachers and children. Mr. Galligan said he would like to come back and speak to the Board publicly or speak privately with individual Board members. He gave a brief synopsis of his experience and asked to distribute copies of his resume to the Board. President Schwarz thanked Mr. Galligan for his comments and asked that he send the resume directly to Board members rather than distributing it at the meeting.

**SWEARING IN OF STUDENT TRUSTEE**

President Schwarz administered the oath of office to Student Trustee Medrano Rosales, who is serving a second term. On behalf of the Board, President Schwarz welcomed Student Trustee Medrano Rosales back and said the Board is pleased that she is continuing for a second year. Student Trustee Medrano Rosales said it is an honor to serve.

**STATEMENTS FROM EXECUTIVES AND STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES**

Executive Reports were presented by Chancellor Galatolo, President Morrow, President Claire, President Mohr, President Dilko and Skyline College Associated Students President Denisse Gonzalez. Copies of the Presidents’ Executive Reports were available for distribution at the meeting and are attached to the official minutes of record.

Chancellor Galatolo congratulated Student Trustee Medrano Rosales and said she is a wonderful addition to the team. Chancellor Galatolo displayed a copy of College Services, the magazine published by the National Association of College Auxiliary Services (NACAS), which contains a photograph of President Mohr and information about the Cañada campus. President Mohr is one of four presidents chosen by NACAS to highlight in an advertising campaign for the current year. Chancellor Galatolo toured Building 10 at College of San Mateo yesterday and said the Board
will tour the building in the near future. Chancellor Galatolo announced the death of Chris McCarthy, President of Napa Valley College, and asked that this meeting be adjourned in his memory.

President Morrow said a second debriefing forum was held on the shooting incident at Skyline, during which the addition of new communication tools, such as electronic message boards and phone message blasts, was discussed. Two counselors also discussed issues which might be affecting students and employees. President Morrow said that Skyline will receive awards in three categories from the National Council for Marketing and Public Relations. Karen Wong, Professor of English and Skyline’s SLOCC Coordinator, and Rob Johnstone, Dean of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness, were selected for statewide awards by the Academic Senate for the California Community College/Research and Planning Group Collaborative on SLO Assessment. President Morrow said the topping off ceremony for Building 4 will take place on September 24.

President Claire said an all-college meeting on the budget was held today and was well-attended; President Claire will send the Board a copy of his PowerPoint presentation. President Claire said the President’s Lecture Series gives students a university experience with excellent speakers. He invited Board members to attend any and all of the programs. President Claire noted the launch of the President’s Blog which is proving to be a popular program site. President Claire announced that former CSM baseball player Scott Feldman is currently a starting pitcher for the Texas Rangers and former CSM football player Julian Edelman made the New England Patriots 2009-2010 roster.

President Mohr said the annual Arts & Olive Festival will be held on October 4. The summer Math Jam program has been very successful. President Mohr described events which were held to welcome students to Cañada and make their transition to college easier. Upcoming events include a Fashion Design Sale; a performance of a play written by Theater Arts Professor Anna Budd; a Session on Classroom Assessment Techniques (SCAT) Book Club organized by Biology Professor Carol Rhodes; and a special seminar on new teaching technologies being used at Cañada which will be led by Professor of Mathematics Ray Lapuz. Students in the TRIO and CBET programs have formed a partnership with the Redwood City Library and the Cañada College Library to volunteer with the Traveling Storytime program.

President Dilko said faculty are engaged in discussion across the District regarding the budget. She said a commitment was made last year that administrators would not make changes to instructional programs over the summer without waiting for faculty to return, and that commitment was honored. Faculty are looking at programs Districtwide through the Board-approved Program Improvement and Viability Program which is designed to support instructional program excellence. The three themes in this process are to study (1) the effectiveness of existing programs, (2) the structure of the budget allocation model and (3) opportunities for increased revenues not based on State apportionments. President Dilko said faculty are working on finishing revisions to the District Rules and Regulations. They have also requested that all Deans and Vice Presidents be sent faculty service areas for discussion with individual faculty members. President Dilko said that as District Academic Senate President, her primary responsibility is to report to the Board on what occurs in the three College Academic Senates as well the District Academic Senate. She meets regularly with Chancellor Galatolo and Vice Chancellor Luan. With Vice Chancellor Luan, she co-chairs the District Shared Governance Council, the District Strategic Planning Committee and the Compressed Calendar Taskforce. She sits on the District Education Advisory Committee and other committees as necessary. She also attends meetings of the AFT Executive Committee as necessary. President Dilko said she strives to keep the lines of communication open.

Denisse Gonzalez, President of Associated Students of Skyline College (ASSC), said ASSC’s goals are to advocate for and protect student rights, increase cultural awareness, develop and implement student activities, improve communication between campus and District constituency groups, develop an inclusive and responsive campus climate, and increase and improve financial resources and services for students. Plans for 2009-10 include full student participation in shared governance committees, developing new and diverse programming, creating easier access to ASSC information online, and increasing the number of books available through the textbook rental program. Ms. Gonzalez said Skyline currently has 39 recognized student groups which focus on academics, athletics and social and cultural interests. Ms. Gonzalez described ASSC activities on Welcome Day and during Welcome Week. Ms. Gonzalez said students’ concerns after the shooting incident included general safety, communication, emergency text messaging, not hearing the sound system, not understanding terminology, and being unclear on evacuation procedures. Ms. Gonzalez said all of these concerns were addressed by President Morrow during the debriefing forums. ASSC future plans include promotion of awareness against violence and the resources available to students.
President Morrow said Ms. Gonzalez attends College Council meetings and has tremendous leadership abilities. President Schwarz said Ms. Gonzalez attended the dedication of the Cañada College Facilities Maintenance Center and also serves on the Bond Oversight Committee. Student Trustee Medrano Rosales noted that Ms. Gonzalez was the recipient of a Chicano Latina Foundation scholarship.

NEW BUSINESS

APPROVAL OF PERSONNEL ACTIONS: CHANGES IN ASSIGNMENT, COMPENSATION, PLACEMENT, LEAVES, STAFF ALLOCATIONS AND CLASSIFICATION OF ACADEMIC AND CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL (09-9-2A)
It was moved by Trustee Hausman and seconded by Trustee Holober to approve the actions in Board Report No. 09-9-2A. The motion carried, all members voting “Aye.”

Other Recommendations

CONTRACT AWARD FOR SKYLINE COLLEGE THEATER AUDIO AND VISUAL EQUIPMENT UPGRADES (09-9-100B)
It was moved by Trustee Holober and seconded by Vice President Miljanich to approve the contract award as detailed in the report. The motion carried, all members voting “Aye.”

APPROVAL OF CONTRACT WITH CASEY PRINTING, INC. TO PRINT AND DELIVER 2010 CLASS SCHEDULES (09-9-101B)
It was moved by Trustee Holober and seconded by Vice President Miljanich to approve the contract as detailed in the report. Trustee Mandelkern asked if the quantity of schedules that are printed and mailed is still appropriate, given the budget situation and different means of communication available. Presidents Morrow, Claire and Mohr said the schedules are important as a marketing tool as they continue to promote awareness of and information about the Colleges as well as listing the schedules. The number of copies to print is regularly reviewed by each College. After this discussion, the motion carried, all members voting “Aye.”

MULTIPLE CONTRACT AWARDS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE FURNITURE (09-9-102B)
It was moved by Vice President Miljanich and seconded by Trustee Hausman to approve the awards as detailed in the report. Trustee Mandelkern asked if the quantity of schedules that are printed and mailed is still appropriate, given the budget situation and different means of communication available. Presidents Morrow, Claire and Mohr said the schedules are important as a marketing tool as they continue to promote awareness of and information about the Colleges as well as listing the schedules. The number of copies to print is regularly reviewed by each College. After this discussion, the motion carried, all members voting “Aye.”

ESTABLISHMENT OF SAN MATEO ATHLETIC CLUB AND AQUATICS CENTER AT COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO (09-9-103B)
It was moved by Trustee Hausman and seconded by Vice President Miljanich to approve the contract for consulting services as detailed in the report. Tom Bauer, Director of Auxiliary Services, said that while there are employees in the District with expertise in certain areas, staff believes guidance is needed from experienced professionals who have established such facilities and have done it well. Mr. Bauer said Club One is a corporation with a unique business model; in addition to corporate and branded clubs, they also run clubs for colleges and universities, including San Francisco State University and Cal Poly Pomona. They allow clients to use various areas of their expertise to establish their own clubs. Mr. Bauer said Club One will provide pre-marketing support to build memberships, advice and assistance with budgeting and operations, and guidance with Human Resources.

Mr. Bauer showed a rendering of the fitness center which will appear as the back cover of College of San Mateo’s next schedule and will include a website address for more information. Club One will also work with the District on additional marketing techniques.

Trustee Holober said it makes sense to work with professionals. He asked the status of a fee schedule for District employees and students and said he would like this issue to come back to the Board for consideration. Chancellor Galatolo said Club One will help with the fee structure, balancing the cost of operations against attracting District employees and students. He said the fee structure proposal will be brought to the Board.
Trustee Mandelkern said he was taken aback by the recommendation because while the Board has heard about the project a number of times, there was no mention that the District lacks the expertise to run or administer the facility. Trustee Mandelkern said he thought the Board had been led to believe such expertise did exist and that is why facility design and equipment purchase went forward. He said it appears this might have been “putting the horse before the cart” as the consultant could say the wrong equipment was purchased, etc. Trustee Mandelkern said this calls into question, in his mind, the basic assumptions about this being a revenue-generating opportunity.

Trustee Mandelkern said he is also concerned about the specific recommendation regarding Club One. He said there seems to be an implication that there will be a need for ongoing operations support, in which case Club One would have an advantage in that there was not a more open and competitive contracting process.

Chancellor Galatolo said that with regard to choosing a consultant, there was recognition that time was of the essence since a membership base must be built before opening the facility in order to have a revenue stream. Chancellor Galatolo said he believes it is not entirely true that the District could not run the operation, but we do lack the aptitude and ability that professionals in the industry have and so would not run it as well. He said the District’s core competency is to educate students. Running a fitness club is a very different venture and there are others with a more refined core competency in this area. Chancellor Galatolo said it is true that the contract would open a door for a possible long-term solution as well as an interim solution. Regarding the design of the facility and the purchase of equipment, Chancellor Galatolo said there are employees in the District who have experience and understand the types of equipment needed and the proper design of the space. He said that the operations side is very different matter and this is where professional experience would be beneficial.

Trustee Mandelkern said he understands the issue of timing, but believes that since it has been known for a long time that the facility would be opening in six months, there seems to have been poor advance planning in bringing this recommendation to the Board, and he does not like feeling pushed into making a decision.

Trustee Hausman asked if there is reasonable assurance that the facility will be financially successful. Chancellor Galatolo pointed to a study conducted by a consultant which found a captive audience for such a facility at College of San Mateo, along with a very high viability at Skyline.

Trustee Mandelkern noted that Trustee Holober has pointed out previously that there is much negative sentiment on the part of consumers regarding athletic clubs and he said the marketing approach should be in keeping with standards and principles that the District needs to have. Chancellor Galatolo said principles established by the Board in terms of being fair and reasonable will be followed. He said he believes the District can do innovative things to generate revenue beyond the traditional means and do so in a responsible, fair and honest manner. Chancellor Galatolo said Club One has a different philosophy than other fitness clubs and has been given very good references by other colleges with which they have worked. He said the facility will have a strong academic component and Club One believes in this concept. Mr. Bauer added that Club One will be working closely with him and others in the District and everything would be vetted through the District before any action is taken.

Trustee Mandelkern asked if it is appropriate to award the contract without an open bid process. Chancellor Galatolo said it is a professional services contract and is no different than hiring an architect or law firm. President Schwarz noted that when the bond measure was passed, the District hired Swinerton to guide it through the proper use of the funding. When the second bond measure was passed, the District used what it had learned to take over some of the positions. She added that KCSM hires professionals to market programs. She said she does not have a problem with the proposal because she understands we are trying to do something different that will benefit the community. President Schwarz said her concern will come later when it is time to hire personnel; she hopes that any employees who do not have anything available to them through the managed hiring process can be line for some of the jobs.

Trustee Holober said Trustee Mandelkern’s point regarding the process is well-taken; he said he does not mind hiring professionals to work with the District, but the board should have been told going in that soliciting professional help would be part of the project. Trustee Holober said he recognizes that no competitive bids were required and although he would have preferred to see a couple of proposals, he will trust the judgment of administrators that Club One was properly vetted. Trustee Holober said he would have a problem if this consulting arrangement to get us started leads to a permanent arrangement with Club One. He said he believes that anyone brought in to get an operation running should not be setting it up for them to actually run the operation. Trustee Holober said he has consistently opposed
contracting out, including the bookstores and child care centers. He noted that with Swinerton, the District went from an initial large-scale enterprise to one in which many positions were brought in-house. Chancellor Galatolo said this model of a transitional timeframe is one the District is looking it as a progressive solution.

Trustee Holober said he would like whatever marketing proposal is developed to be brought to the Board before it goes out to the community.

Vice President Miljanich said she is comfortable with going forward with the contract. She said she cannot say at this time whether the fact that Club One is consulting with the District should mean they cannot do something with the District later. She said she would like to see how they do and what they know before making that judgment. Vice President Miljanich said that, like President Schwarz, she hopes there is an avenue for shifting some District employees to the new facility. Vice President Miljanich said she did not interpret the report to mean that District employees know nothing about the industry, but that expertise is lacking in the areas of marketing and membership drives. Mr. Bauer confirmed that these are the areas in which District employees lack expertise.

Trustee Mandelkern said he agrees with the concept of the fitness center and also believes in the need to bring in expertise when necessary. He said his issue with this recommendation is the timing and process in which it was done.

President Schwarz said the San Mateo County Community College District is a classy organization which is respected in the community and this will be reflected by people coming to the facility and paying fees.

Chancellor Galatolo suggested using the October 14 study session to have a further in-depth discussion on the fitness center, specifically regarding the next steps in the process, and to hear the intent of the Board.

After this discussion, the motion to approve the contract as detailed in the report carried, with Trustee Mandelkern voting “No” and the remainder of Board members voting “Aye.”

**AUTHORIZATION TO AUGMENT THE DESIGN BUILD CONTRACT FOR THE COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO BUILDINGS 12/15/17/34 MODERNIZATION PROJECT, AND EXPAND THE CONTRACT TO INCLUDE RENOVATION OF BUILDING 9 (09-9-104B)**

It was moved by Trustee Hausman and seconded by Vice President Miljanich to approve execution of a change order to augment the existing design build contract, as detailed in the report. The motion carried, all members voting “Aye.”

**INFORMATION REPORTS**

**DISCUSSION OF DISTRICT RULES AND REGULATIONS SECTION 8.38, GIFTS AND DONATIONS (09-9-3C)**

President Schwarz said that at the Cañada College Facilities Maintenance Center ribbon cutting last week, a glass etching was presented to Danny Glass and the break room in the Facilities Maintenance Center was named for Mr. Glass. President Schwarz said the intent was wonderful and she wants to take nothing away from it, but it was noted that nothing came before the Board for approval and the question arose as to whether there is a policy. It was determined that the policy does exist and President Schwarz asked if everyone understands the policy and if there are problems with it that need to be discussed. Vice President Miljanich asked how the gift and naming was determined. Vice Chancellor José Nuñez said the Cañada maintenance team wanted to honor Mr. Glass because of his work at all of the Colleges, his can-do attitude and his positive leadership style. Vice Chancellor Nuñez said the decision was made only by him and the Facilities team and it was his mistake that it was not brought to the Board for approval. President Schwarz said she thinks there is a need to distribute information on the policy more widely so that people understand there is a policy.

Trustee Mandelkern said he is sure that Mr. Glass has made outstanding contributions to the District and it is wonderful that his colleagues wanted to honor him, but the policy is in place because the Board has a responsibility to make sure things are done fairly, openly and transparently.

Vice President Miljanich said the policy allows for the possibility of such an award and she believes the Board would have approved if it had been brought to them.
Trustee Hausman said it is important to not set precedent. She asked if qualifications for naming of a building should be spelled out, e.g. basing the decision on a person’s contribution to the District, the amount of a contribution, whether the person is deceased, etc. Chancellor Galatolo said there is a clear procedure which has purposeful ambiguity in terms of contribution amounts. Vice President Miljanich said she supports the current policy because it would be a mistake to tie the District’s hands by specifying dollar amounts of contributions. She said there is nothing in the policy to preclude the Board having a discussion about precedent if and when something is presented. She said she would prefer to wait rather than speculating about what the amounts should be. Trustee Mandelkern agreed with the need for ambiguity regarding financial contributions, but said for internal matters such as the one that arose recently, it is important to have a process in place that everyone understands. Trustee Holober agreed and said he is sure staff will keep it on track and inform people of the policy.

STATEMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

Trustee Hausman attended the President’s Breakfast at Cañada College and said students were full of questions. Trustee Hausman was impressed with the fitness and aquatics center during the tour at the last meeting.

Trustee Holober said Assembly Bill 48 is on the Governor’s desk for signature. The bill reauthorizes an agency that oversees private, for-profit schools and colleges. Unfortunately, the bill does not contain student rights and anti-fraud protections sought by Trustee Holober and others. Trustee Holober attended the San Mateo County School Boards Association meeting, along with President Schwarz and Chancellor Galatolo, at which Scott Plotkin, Executive Director of the California School Boards Association, provided a good but sobering presentation. Mr. Plotkin noted that during the five years of the Depression, California made cuts to education of 25%; currently, in a little more than one year, California has made cuts to education of 18%. Trustee Holober said work is occurring within the State School Boards Association and other State and local organizations to force the issue of education funding in a more positive direction. Trustee Holober suggested that Board members become more involved in working with organizations such as the School Boards Association, the Community College League of California and other local school boards. Trustee Hausman said that because of advances in technology since the Depression, the need for education is even greater than before.

President Schwarz said that after listening to and speaking with Mr. Plotkin, she believes that reform is the only way to make things better. She said she would like to be involved in working with the School Boards Association and others in the effort to move forward rather than being passive, and she would encourage other Board members to also become involved. Vice President Miljanich said she also is in favor of participating.

Trustee Mandelkern said he met with Stephani Scott, Executive Director of the San Mateo County Community Colleges Foundation, and outlined the idea for revenue-generating opportunities for programs and staff and faculty positions instead of scholarships only. Trustee Mandelkern said Ms. Scott understood the concept and will meet with the District’s executive management team. Any proposals would then go to the Foundation Board. Trustee Mandelkern said the Foundation has taken steps forward in terms of putting technology and data bases in place to help with donor lists. Trustee Mandelkern said he believes a study session on the Foundation is planned within the next few months and Chancellor Galatolo confirmed this.

Trustee Mandelkern said he researched the District’s retiree benefits program with Vice Chancellor Joel and was pleasantly surprised to see that the benefits are very generous in comparison with the private sector, especially to those with a hire date prior to 1987. Trustee Mandelkern said that dependent coverage is set by insurance companies and generally taps out at ages 23-25. He said it is his understanding that retirees can add dependents to their coverage if they are willing to pay for it.

Trustee Mandelkern referenced a newspaper article regarding a San Mateo Union High School District study on a $30 million solar power project and the savings it would provide. He will provide the article to Vice Chancellor Nuñez. Trustee Mandelkern also referenced an article in The San Matean regarding the issue of free speech. He said he sees no evidence of an attempt to stifle dissent or first amendment rights. He and other Board members asked President Claire to comment on the situation. President Claire said he is working with students to address their concerns. Since the students have hired an attorney and the District has engaged Tom Casey, President Claire offered to discuss the issue at the next Closed Session if the Board wishes.
Trustee Mandelkern attended President Mohr’s Breakfast and had an opportunity to interact with students. He heard how the fee increase has impacted students’ lives. He also heard that there are not enough books available through the textbook rental program and he congratulated Mr. Bauer on the success of this program. Trustee Mandelkern attended the initial meeting of this year’s Skyline President’s Council and the ribbon cutting for the Cañada Facilities Maintenance Center. Vice Chancellor Nuñez noted that this is the first LEED certified building in the District.

Student Trustee Medrano Rosales attended the President’s Breakfast at Cañada. She will attend the Skyline Building 4 topping off ceremony and the Chinese dance performance. Student Trustee Medrano Rosales said the Skyline Running Club will participate in the San Jose half marathon.

President Schwarz said she is happy to serve on President Mohr’s advisory committee, focusing on how to make Cañada College more visible within the community. President Schwarz said she met a five-semester student who came to President Mohr’s breakfast simply to tell the Board how much she loves Cañada. President Schwarz attended the ribbon cutting at Cañada and noted that the maintenance staff has been patient while waiting for the new facility. President Schwarz also attended the Foundation meeting at which the Donor Wall was discussed. The recommendation brought forth was very expensive and Executive Vice Chancellor Keller suggested using an electronic message board as an alternative. President Schwarz will attend the topping off ceremony at Skyline tomorrow and the Chinese dance production.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

None

**RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION**

President Schwarz announced that during Closed Session, the Board will discuss the personnel item listed as 1-B on the printed agenda.

The Board recessed to Closed Session at 8:22 p.m.
The Board reconvened to Open Session at 9:48 p.m.

**CLOSED SESSION ACTIONS TAKEN**

President Schwarz reported that, at the Closed Session just concluded, the Board considered the personnel item listed on the printed agenda and voted 5-0 to approve the action in Board Report No. 1-B.

**ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved by Trustee Holober and seconded by Vice President Miljanich to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried, all members voting “Aye.” The meeting was adjourned at 9:52 p.m. in memory of Dr. Chris McCarthy.

Submitted by

Ron Galatolo
Secretary

Approved and entered into the proceedings of the October 14, 2009 meeting.

Patricia Miljanich
Vice President-Clerk
Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Trustees
San Mateo County Community College District
October 6, 2009
San Mateo, CA 94402

The meeting was called to order at 8:38 a.m.

Board Members Present: President Karen Schwarz, Vice President-Clerk Patricia Miljanich, Trustees Helen Hausman, Richard Holober and Dave Mandelkern

Others Present: Chancellor Ron Galatolo, Vice Chancellor Harry Joel

STATEMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS
None

CLOSED SESSION
President Schwarz announced that the Board will recess to Closed Session to conduct a conference with labor negotiators. The agency designated representative is Harry Joel and the employee organization is CSEA. The Board recessed to Closed Session at 8:40 a.m.

RECONVENE TO OPEN SESSION
President Schwarz reported that, during the Closed Session just concluded, the Board conducted the conference with labor negotiators and took no action.

ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 10:25 a.m.

Submitted by

Ron Galatolo
Secretary

Approved and entered into the proceedings of the October 14, 2009 meeting.

Patricia Miljanich
Vice President-Clerk
BOARD REPORT 09-10-1A

TO: Members of the Board of Trustees

FROM: Ron Galatolo, Chancellor-Superintendent

PREPARED BY: Harry W. Joel, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources and Employee Relations
(650) 358-6767

APPROVAL OF PERSONNEL ITEMS

A. REASSIGNMENT

Cañada College

Caryn Goldman Instructional Aide II Science & Technology

Reassigned through the managed hiring process from an Instructional Aide II position (Grade 22) at College of San Mateo into this full-time temporary position at the same level, effective September 22, 2009. This position is funded by a Federal Hispanic-Serving Institution Program grant, which expires on September 30, 2010.

B. SHORT-TERM, NON-CONTINUING POSITIONS

The following is a list of requested classified short-term, non-continuing services that require Board approval prior to the employment of temporary individuals to perform these services, pursuant to Assembly Bill 500 and its revisions to Education Code 88003:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Division/Department</th>
<th>No. of Pos.</th>
<th>Start and End Date</th>
<th>Services to be performed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CSM      | Physical Education                   | 1           | 10/15/2009 - 12/18/2009 | Instructional Aide I:
|          |                                      |             |                    | Assist instructor in weight room impacted by a large number of Adapted PE and general PE students to ensure safety, progression of personal fitness programs, and enhance teaching/learning. |
| CSM      | Planning, Research, & Institutional Effectiveness | 1           | 10/16/2009 - 12/31/2009 | Administrative Analyst:
|          |                                      |             |                    | Assist with Substantive Change Report to ACCJC; data and environmental scan analyses; post data; prepare reports and analyses to PRIE website. Approximate assignment: 50% of full-time. |
| CSM      | Planning, Research, & Institutional Effectiveness | 1           | 10/16/2009 - 12/31/2009 | Administrative Assistant:
|          |                                      |             |                    | Document preparation relating to Accreditation reporting, program review, and Substantive Change Report to ACCJC. Approximate assignment: 40% of full-time. |
| CSM                  | Planning, Research, & Institutional Effectiveness | 1 | 10/16/2009 | 12/31/2009 | **Office Assistant II:**  
Assist with clerical support for Accreditation reporting. Approximate assignment: 25% of full-time. |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------|---|------------|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Skyline             | Science, Math & Technology/MESA                  | 2 | 10/15/2009 | 12/31/2009 | **Instructional Aide II:**  
Provide intermittent assistance to students in the MESA Center in physics and chemistry. Days and hours vary with student need. Combined time of both Aides will be 9 to 12 hours per week. |
APPROVAL OF ACCREDITATION FOLLOW-UP REPORTS – CAÑADA COLLEGE, COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO AND SKYLINE COLLEGE

All three colleges are required by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) to file a follow-up report by October 15, 2009, demonstrating resolution of the recommendations and concerns noted by ACCJC in its action letters dated January 31, 2008. The reports are now completed and were delivered to the Board for review on October 9, 2009.

To address the District recommendations noted in the ACCJC action letters, the Office of Vice Chancellor, Educational Services and Planning has coordinated with the three Colleges and District Office staff to document progress and draft responses, which have been included in the Colleges’ follow-up reports.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board approve the accreditation follow-up reports prepared by Cañada College, College of San Mateo and Skyline College, to be submitted to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges by October 15, 2009.
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STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

This second follow-up report builds on the 2008 follow-up report that preceded the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges’ reaffirmation of Cañada College in January 2009. The management and preparation of this report leveraged much of the college’s previously established accreditation oversight structure while making adjustments to both the composition and mission of each oversight body to reflect a shift in purpose, focusing less on new program and system development and more on effective implementation. The restructuring of the accreditation oversight process paralleled the redesign of the college’s planning infrastructure, which was implemented in December 2008 to improve the integration of college planning processes.

The accreditation oversight committee oversaw this initiative. Three separate steering committees were formed to address each recommendation made by the ACCJC. All committees had representation from faculty, staff, and administration. We are grateful for the time and energy committed to this effort.
This report was written with broad input from faculty and staff. The work was done collegially and widely reviewed by the entire college community for input prior to submission to the governing board for approval on October 8, 2009 (approval pending).
SUMMARY OF MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The body of the report describes in detail the college’s accomplishments and responses to each ACCJC recommendation. Figure #1 highlights some of the most noteworthy achievements made by Cañada College in response to each of the three recommendations identified in the ACCJC’s 2007 accreditation report.

Figure #1

Cañada’s 2007-08 achievements were dominated by responses to recommendation 2 (SLO development) and recommendation 4 (student service staffing planning). Subsequently, during 2008-09 Cañada was able to focus more extensively on recommendation 1, which directed the college to establish a fully integrated planning structure. In the next three sections we provide a detailed description of Canada’s responses to each ACCJC recommendation.
Recommendation 1

In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the college build upon its strategic planning efforts to develop an Educational Master Plan. The Educational Master Plan should incorporate recommendations from the program review process and serve as the foundation for the integration of student learning programs and services, technology, human resources, facilities and budget to support the mission of the college. The college should ensure that all plans are reviewed, evaluated, and updated on a regular basis. (Standards I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.1b, III.C.2, III.D.1.a, IV.A.5, IV.B.2, and IV.B.2.b) This issue was identified by the 2001 evaluation team.

The following four subsections describe the college’s response to recommendation 1:

- the educational master plan
- Cañada College’s new planning framework
- program review
- integrated planning
Upon notification by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges that Cañada College must develop an educational master plan, Cañada College President Thomas Mohr convened an executive level master plan steering committee composed of faculty, staff and administrators offering a wide variety of perspectives [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html) This committee facilitated the college’s creation of the educational master plan by eliciting college-wide input and effort, by overseeing data collection and plan composition, and by disseminating drafts of the plan for comment during its development.

In March 2008, the steering committee and the planning and budget committee contracted with an external consultant, Maas Company, to guide the development of the educational master plan. Maas provided national and state perspectives that complemented the extensive regional external scan completed during our strategic planning process.

The educational master plan builds upon the Strategic Plan [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html) to delineate the strategic direction of the college and to integrate the many components of institutional planning. It provides a planning process for divisions and departments that incorporates the vision and goals of the college; the information generated in program reviews; the priorities elucidated in the strategic plan; and the fiscal and hiring processes and realities of our college. As a result of this work, the educational master plan has become the springboard and guide for all institutional planning.

A key result of the development of the educational master plan was the integration of the planning components of the college and the creation of an integrated planning calendar. Unit plans are now grounded in program review which serve as the primary planning documents for resource allocation including human resources, instructional equipment requests, and facility requests. These unit plans respond to the eleven broad goals of our strategic plan.

The educational master plan also identified a need to reconsider the college’s planning infrastructure. The college’s shared governance and administrative bodies deliberated at great length on that recommendation, resulting in the development of a new college-wide planning framework. The details of that new planning structure are highlighted in the next section.
In the attention devoted to developing the educational master plan and the effort to solicit the input and support of constituents from across the college, district, and community, Cañada shows its commitment to creating a more transparent, integrated, and effective institutional planning process. The college has incorporated this process into its ongoing operation, and it has put into place checks and balances to ensure that the process remains fruitful.

We have included a link to the Educational Master Plan itself, which presents our proposed integrated planning processes and calendars.

Link to Master Plan: [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html)

**Annual Assessment of the Educational Master Plan**

The educational master plan makes clear the need to perform regular evaluations of the plan and of the college’s efforts to reach the goals it sets forth. As part of its continuous effort to improve institutional effectiveness, the college has outlined a process for the first annual assessment and update of the educational master plan. The office of planning, research and student success is working with the college master planning committee to develop a framework for that evaluation by identifying the criteria, data, and process to be used, and drafting the annual report. The initial assessment will begin this fall; subsequently the evaluation results will be presented to the college planning council and recorded as formal updates to the educational master plan.

Given the emphasis the educational master plan places on the development of the college’s planning framework, program review, and institution-wide planning integration, the next three sections of this report detail Cañada’s achievements and innovations in each of these areas.
In August 2008, upon considering the priorities identified in the educational master plan and recommendations from the ACCJC, the college council began to evaluate the efficacy of the college’s existing planning structure. Subsequently, the strategic planning steering committee began developing a proposal for a new college planning structure. In October 2008, after a thorough literature review of the planning structures of other community colleges, and with due consideration of the unique history and culture of Cañada College, the steering committee proposed a new college planning framework to the college council.

The college council and other planning bodies reviewed this proposal at several meetings, and extensive revisions to the planning framework were made based on feedback from council members, administrators, students, faculty, and classified staff. In December 2008, the college council formally adopted the new planning framework (Figure #2) and sanctioned its adoption. The new college planning council convened its first meeting in February 2009. The process and structure underlying the development of the new framework is outlined in a planning document [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html) developed by the college planning council.

**Figure #2**
This new college-planning framework considerably upgrades the college’s previous system, which had evolved unsystematically in response to what were often temporary changes in college priorities. The membership composition and formal communication channels of the new framework are designed to support three overarching goals: (1) open and participatory communication; (2) coordinated planning; and (3) regular self-assessment to ensure continued alignment with college goals.

Significantly, the new planning scheme is based on program review, which is now the primary source of information to support discussions and decision-making.

In addition, the new planning model incorporates two working groups of the college council to incubate new program and planning ideas, the Instructional Planning Council (IPC) and the Student Services Planning Council (SSPC). These ‘think tanks’ improve the rigor of program review by mentoring faculty and staff, proposing modifications to program review (detailed in the next section), and also by suggesting improvements to other institutional planning processes.

Other salient features of the new college-planning framework include:

- The inclusion of various constituencies;
- A structure that allows budget considerations to inform planning rather than define it;
- Formal communication channels linking instruction and student services;
- Regular self-assessment cycles and processes;
- Venues for incubating ideas and bringing them forward for discussion and review.

Under the direction of the college planning council, in January 2009 the Instructional Planning Council and the Student Services Planning Council agreed upon their philosophy and mission statement, a timeline for self-assessment, and priorities for the upcoming year. Included in the self-assessment is a mandate to revisit the mission of each planning body as it relates to the mission of each of the other planning bodies as well as the overall mission of the college.

Within the first six months of operation, the college planning council and its primary support bodies achieved many noteworthy accomplishments including:

- Bringing program review processes into greater alignment with college budget and planning cycles, as detailed below;
Facilitating a college-wide discussion to help prioritize the 11 strategic goals outlined in the educational master plan. This exercise resulted in a college-wide acknowledgment of the college’s four priorities: evidence-based decision-making; success in basic skills; excellence in transfer programs; and highly responsive and effective workforce programs;  
http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html
Facilitating a detailed discussion on how to align the college’s strategic goals with the district’s strategic priorities. This discussion resulted in a formal statement to the district office detailing the alignment between our two planning documents;  
http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html

Hosting a series of open forum dialogues on the impact of the recent budget reductions to the college and students. The CPC hosted discussions on the overarching philosophy that would best govern the budget reduction process; a philosophy placing priority on people and core capabilities;  
http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html

Responding to the increasing cost-cutting scenarios mandated by the state, the CPC made formal recommendations to the president’s office regarding specific line items and the scale of cuts. All recommendations were honored and became the formal policy decisions enacted by the president;  
http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html

Providing a venue for discussions on how to compliment the program review process with the establishment of formal processes for program discontinuance and new program development, and creating draft models for both processes.  
http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html

In August 2009, the college planning council convened a planning retreat to assess the effectiveness of the new planning model and to set an agenda for the upcoming academic year.

The list of recommendations developed on the retreat highlight opportunities to improve the effectiveness of the planning structure  
http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html  
The recommendations emphasize improving the coordination between planning bodies, raising awareness of the role and function of the CPC, and developing a broader understanding of how any faculty or staff member could engage the college planning bodies with an idea or planning-related proposal.
On the retreat committee members also articulated objectives for the coming academic year. In addition to the objectives and tasks necessary to the maintenance of robust and open planning processes, the CPC identified priorities that, when achieved, will highlight planning excellence:

- The CPC displays a leadership role in assessing progress against the college goals highlighted in the educational master plan;
- The CPC drives a focused agenda that, in coordination with other college activities, results in demonstrable evidence of the college’s culture of Inquiry.

The CPC has initiated the 2009-10 academic year by focusing its agenda on developing a process for synchronizing the feedback and recommendations of the retreat with the goals identified in the educational master plan.
The educational master plan emphasizes the primacy of program review in college planning. In January 2009, the IPC and the SSPC produced mission statements and guiding philosophies to provide direction to their members and maintain alignment with other college planning activities. Both bodies formally established program review as the guide to their internal planning activities and committed to reviewing their respective program review processes in order to recommend potential improvements to the academic senate.

As a first priority, these new planning bodies discussed how to improve the quality of information captured in program review and how to better use program review to stimulate reflective thinking about student learning in the classroom and within service areas.

During 2008-09, the IPC, the SSPC, and the college researcher, with administrator input, brainstormed ideas for improving program review. Suggestions included:

- Annual, rather than biannual, program review;
- More data and research support for student services;
- Regular open forums for sharing and discussing program review findings;
- Revision of the program review document to capture information related to equipment, personnel and facilities;
- Program review updates need more evidence linking department performance to student success;
- Instructional departments need better access to relevant data

Based on these and related findings, in June 2009 the academic senate mandated several important changes to program review. The most significant of these changes are summarized below.

**An Annual Calendar for Updates to Program Review**

In May 2009 the Instructional Planning Council spent several meetings discussing how to improve program review for instructional programs. It identified several possible modifications and mapped out a more effective program review process for both comprehensive and intermediate updates.

The new model improves the alignment of program review with local instructional planning and budgeting processes as well as those of the district and state. In addition, it strives to align our
calendar with that of several large grant-making agencies that may offer outside funding opportunities.

Although the six year comprehensive cycle was found to have sufficient links to long-term planning, the intermediate updates to program review were found to be too infrequent to inform, and be informed by, annual budget planning. The IPC agreed that adopting an annual cycle for program review updates and synchronizing those updates with other budget processes would allow administrators to establish more stable budgets linked more precisely to established planning priorities.

In June 2009 the IPC outlined the advantages of the annual cycle to the academic senate. On August 19, 2009, the academic senate formally adopted an annual calendar for program review [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html) as well as several structural changes to the documentation template. The adoption of the more frequent updates, as well as other structural improvements highlighted below, have given program review a more forward-looking orientation and thus the ability to anticipate future needs. To reflect this new orientation, the academic senate renamed the updates the ‘Annual Program Plan.’

**Support for Student Services**

Review of the educational master plan revealed that the student services program review process had been hampered by inadequate data, so the administration embarked on a focused effort to provide more deliberate program review support to student services. The director of planning, research and student success met individually with student service managers to outline the data needs in each program area.

As of May 2009, under the direction of an interim vice president of student services, all student service program managers completed all outstanding program reviews.

Upon completion of program review, the SSPC convened an open discussion of the program review findings from each student service program area. This forum marked the first broad discussion of the outcomes of a student services program review. It greatly expanded awareness of the unique processes and challenges associated with student services.

Building on this new momentum, student service managers engaged the director of planning, research and student success to expand data gathering and support more comprehensive analysis of program review. After detailed consultation with faculty and staff representing seven different student service program areas, the director and service program staff identified
new approaches and processes for collecting information related to program performance and student success. These new methods are currently being implemented, and the findings will be incorporated into the annual program plan for 2009-10.

**College-Wide Forums**

At the close of the 2008-09 academic year, the SSPC and the IPC both acknowledged the benefits of hosting college-wide forums to discuss the outcomes of program review. In May 2009, the SSPC devoted a meeting to the presentation and open review of all student service program reviews. The council members saw great value in this discussion and recommended that even more time be devoted to these sessions at the end of the next program review cycle.

In spring 2009, the program review findings of each program were aired for open discussion during a special meeting of the curriculum committee.

http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html

Early this academic year, the IPC will determine the open forum structure that will best support presentation and discussion of program review findings related to instructional programs. Such open discussions are part of the college’s larger agenda of establishing a tangible foundation for nurturing a culture of inquiry, as highlighted below.

As outlined in the educational master plan, the college planning council as well as other planning bodies including the academic senate and the curriculum committee are establishing a calendar for college-wide forums on the findings of program reviews and linking the outcomes of those discussions into the annual review of the educational master plan.

To expand the audience for these and related planning forums, the college has begun videotaping them to share with the larger community through itunes.

http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html

**Revised Documentation & Information Packets**

The educational master plan identifies as the college’s first strategic goal the need to more completely incorporate data and evidence into decision-making. As a first step towards this goal, the IPC facilitated a discussion on the informational needs necessary to support excellence in program review. As outlined earlier, these discussions identified several potential improvements to the program review documents that should facilitate the capture of additional information and stimulate deeper thinking about student learning and performance.
In June 2009, the academic senate, acting on advice from the curriculum committee, produced and sanctioned a new program review template. The new template emphasizes collecting information to guide equipment, personnel, and facility planning, and it is structured to elicit deeper reflection on the links between program performance and student outcomes.

During 2009-10, the SSPC will be assessing the gaps that currently exist in program review data for student services and determining how to procure the necessary information.

Furthermore, to facilitate reflection on program performance and planning, the office of planning, research and student success has developed downloadable information packets to provide each department with a comprehensive picture of program trends and student performance [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html) These packets provide detailed information on program outcomes, student performance, and operational efficiency. The packets also contain department and college level benchmarks to help administrators gauge the relative performance of program.

The information packets have been designed as an open template, which allows for the inclusion of additional information as it is measured. The current format focuses largely on summative measures; however, the director of planning is working with the IPC and the SSPC to identify a more complete set of performance metrics including indicators to support formative evaluation. These new indicators will be incorporated into the upcoming program review cycle. This formal review of metrics and potential success factors is tied to the college’s annual assessment of program review and the educational master plan.
INTEGRATED PLANNING

The educational master plan identified a need for the college to connect its planning activities. Consequently, coordinating planning was a key intention of the new college planning framework. Both the reporting structure and the membership composition across the planning bodies work to integrate planning as does the college’s alignment of planning cycles, which connect the outcomes of each planning process to inputs in the others. Additionally, the college continues in its efforts to nurture a culture of innovation that connects future-thinking ideas to current planning.

The college’s efforts to achieve these higher levels of planning integration are highlighted in performance summaries related to the following four sets of activities:

- Calendar management and planning
- Annual progress reporting
- Alignment of strategies and goals
- Culture of Inquiry

Calendar Management and Planning

With the adoption of the new planning framework and the changes in the reporting cycles of several planning processes, the college needed to coordinate its planning processes with those of the district office. Therefore, the college’s director of planning, in cooperation with the district research council, developed a five-year planning calendar that aligns the routine planning activities of the college with those of the district (figure #3).

Here on campus, the move to an annual cycle for program review allowed the college to link program level planning more closely to multiyear planning activities. Rather than having yearlong lags between various planning activities, the annual program review allows administrators to develop more timely linkages with a broader category of planning activities, so that the output of the annual Program Review now becomes the input into nearly all other college planning activities.

In addition to calendar management, the college’s new planning framework mandates progress reports on the status of all planning activities. As part of its mission to help align college
planning activities, the college planning council will incorporate a review of each planning process as part of its yearly agenda.

Figure #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cañada College Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Implementing 07-08 Strategic Plan &amp; Annual Progress Reports</td>
<td>Implementing 07-08 Strategic Plan &amp; Annual Progress Reports</td>
<td>Implementing 07-08 Strategic Plan &amp; Annual Progress Reports</td>
<td>Review/Modify Strategic Plan &amp; Annual Progress Reports</td>
<td>Implementing 11-12 Strategic Plan &amp; Annual Progress Reports</td>
<td>Implementing 11-12 Strategic Plan &amp; Annual Progress Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Program Review</td>
<td>All Instruction &amp; Student Services Programs</td>
<td>All Instruction &amp; Student Services Programs</td>
<td>All Instruction &amp; Student Services Programs</td>
<td>All Instruction &amp; Student Services Programs</td>
<td>All Instruction &amp; Student Services Programs</td>
<td>All Instruction &amp; Student Services Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Program Review</td>
<td>Staggered, 6 year recurring cycle for each department</td>
<td>Staggered, 6 year recurring cycle for each department</td>
<td>Staggered, 6 year recurring cycle for each department</td>
<td>Staggered, 6 year recurring cycle for each department</td>
<td>Staggered, 6 year recurring cycle for each department</td>
<td>Staggered, 6 year recurring cycle for each department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCCD District Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Implement Plan</td>
<td>Environmental Scanning</td>
<td>Planning Assumptions &amp; Recommendations</td>
<td>Implement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Master Plan (FMP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update FMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Technology Master Plan (TMP)</td>
<td>Adopt TMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update District TMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Resource Allocation Plan</td>
<td>Reviewed and evaluated</td>
<td>Reviewed and evaluated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Student Equity Plan</td>
<td>2005 Plan Revision</td>
<td>Implement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Plan Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Technology Plan</td>
<td>Implement Plan</td>
<td>Revise Plan</td>
<td>Implement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Progress Reporting

The educational master plan introduced a planning framework and documentation system to help connect program level action plans to each of the college’s strategic goals. The reporting system establishes a set of interrelated metrics and target outcomes that provide managers with benchmarks against which to evaluate departmental effectiveness in advancing the college’s strategic goals.

The strategic plan progress report is one of the college’s primary tools for building strong connections between strategies, goals, and actions. All annual progress reports contain a detailed description of each action plan as well as a list of desired outcomes, milestones with timelines, cost estimates, and funding sources, and they are linked to unit and program reviews. Responsibility for implementing each action plan has been assigned. The reporting system also reveals the degree of coordination between department actions and other planning processes including college budgeting and planning, marketing, facility planning, and program review.

An annual review of the progress on each goal is conducted by the administrative council and the college planning council. As of June 2009, the first annual reviews had been completed, and they are scheduled for broader review in fall 2009 [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html) Feedback from both the administrative council and college planning council will be included in the progress report itself.

Fall 2009 marks the completion of the first progress report cycle. In this short time, several process improvements and data needs have already been identified, which will be incorporated into the next cycle.

Alignment of Strategic Priorities and Goals

Perhaps the most deliberate effort to streamline broad planning activities was the effort to align Cañada College’s strategic goals with the San Mateo Community College District’s strategic priorities [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html)

In March 2009, the college council hosted an open forum discussion on the college’s strategic goals. Participants were asked to prioritize the college’s eleven strategic goals, which themselves had been determined in a campus-wide survey. Review of the survey findings and extensive discussion led to a consensus on the college’s priorities, which are the need for (1)
evidence-based decision making; (2), success in basic skills; (3), excellence in transfer programs; and (4), highly responsive and effective workforce programs. These goals have become the foundation for nearly all future college planning http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html

In March 2009, the college planning council took these four goals as the foundation from which to align our plans with those of the district. The director of planning facilitated an open forum mapping exercise at the CPC to help identify links between the college’s goals and the district’s strategic priorities. Again, the exercise was informed by the results of a college-wide survey prioritizing the district’s list of strategic priorities http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html Participants mapped the college’s four foundational goals to twenty-two district-level strategic priorities and then distilled the district’s priorities into a prioritized list of ten, which are fundamentally linked to the college’s core goals. The results of this exercise were forwarded to the district strategic planning council and incorporated into its planning agenda for the 2009-10 academic year. http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html

The district strategic planning council and the district research council are the two primary planning bodies at the district level. The Cañada College director of planning, research and student success serves on both bodies while the Cañada College president, the president of the Cañada academic senate, and the president of the district academic senate (currently a Cañada faculty member) also serve on the district strategic planning council.
Establishing a Culture of Inquiry

One of the significant outcomes of the August 2009 CPC retreat was the decision to focus on nurturing a pervasive culture of inquiry at Cañada College. Establishing an institutional culture is a daunting task, but the college has embraced this goal and outlined a series of processes, programs, and actions it believes will lead to a cultural transformation. To work toward this goal, the college is taking the following steps:

- The CPC is working with the office of research, planning and student success to develop a research agenda for the college.
- The CPC has reserved time at each meeting to discuss one research finding or data element related to the college mission.
- The college will launch a brown bag lunch series to facilitate discussion of research and learning.
- The college will establish a formal infrastructure, The Center for Excellence in Teaching Innovation to promote, support, and extend innovative pedagogy.
- The office of planning, research and student success will coach and consult with faculty and staff to help extend the college’s research capabilities to the point of student contact, i.e. the classroom and program area.

In addition, under the guidance of the new vice president of instruction, the college is embarking on an ambitious plan to develop formal structures to support innovation in teaching and learning. Undergirding that agenda is a commitment to establishing the necessary mechanisms, awareness, and resources to foster innovation in the classroom and at other points of service.
Recommendation 2

To fully meet the standards, the college should develop a collegial process for the timely completion of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) development and documentation at the institution, general education, program and course levels, and formalize the documentation of SLO assessment. The college should ensure that the process is faculty driven, broadly supported, and ultimately used as the basis to plan and implement institutional improvements to courses, programs, degrees and services. (Standards I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.h, II.B.4, and II.C.1.c, II.C.2)

Prior to receiving the letter of warning from the ACCJC in January 2008, Cañada College had a student learning outcome coordinator with 3 units of release time who had worked with faculty and divisions to develop course-level SLOs for approximately 20% of our courses. At that time the college promoted course level SLO development by requiring faculty who were updating a course outline of record to submit course level SLOs in a separate document that was posted on a website. In addition, the curriculum committee had proposed a set of general education student learning outcomes, which were adopted by the academic senate during fall 2007.

During February of 2008, immediately following the receipt of the letter of warning from the ACCJC, the college engaged in earnest and widespread faculty-centered discussions regarding how best to implement a new framework to support the development of a meaningful and efficient student learning outcome assessment cycle.

The academic senate minutes reflect the initial discussions regarding the development of a SLO committee on February 28, 2008; the final approval of the composition of the advisory committee on May 8, 2008; and the approval of both the committee members and a student learning outcome and assessment cycle (SLOAC) coordinator, with 6 units of release time, on May 22, 2008. [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html)

As reflected in its minutes, the college council began reflection regarding the warning letter from ACCJC on February 7, 2008. Discussion of the college’s response to the three recommendations occurred on February 21, 2008. On March 6, 2008, the plan for the SLO Summit days for Instruction and Student Services’ was shared with the college council. Finally, on April 17, 2008, the college council received the reports regarding the SLOAC Summits. [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html)
The planning and budget committee reviewed the plan for SLOAC institutionalization on February 20, 2008 and heard a report regarding the instructional SLOAC summit on April 16, 2008. In addition, in order for faculty and staff to have access to the necessary expertise needed for institutional effectiveness, the planning and budget committee agreed to elevate the research analyst position to that of director of institutional research and planning.

http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html

PROGRESS IN 2008-09

In response to the ACCJC recommendation that the college "develop a collegial process for the timely completion of SLOs," Cañada’s SLOAC advisory committee made a series of recommendations, which the SLOAC committee in particular and the college as a whole have acted upon. These actions, summarized and then described below, demonstrate our commitment to working within the shared-governance infrastructure to meet the recommendations mandated by ACCJC.

We have defined “program” and identified student learning outcomes for each of our campus programs. Major progress has been made in aligning course SLOs with these program SLOs in preparation for the development of a program assessment process. In addition, institutional SLOs have been created that synchronize with the college mission.

The student learning outcome assessment cycle has been incorporated into Cañada’s planning framework, including curricular work and departmental and program planning and reviews.

New resources have been made available to faculty and staff to assist with the use of SLOAC. These resources include a ‘sharepoint’ site that enables easy access to all college SLOs, personal copies of an assessment text, and more flex days to facilitate discussion of teaching and assessment.

In addition, during 2008-09 the college held a series of workshops and seminars to promote increased understanding and use of SLOs across the campus. As a consequence, the percentage of courses with SLOs on file increased to 77%, while the proportion of courses with completed SLOAC (SLOs, assessments, and reflection) increased from 11% during 2007-08 to 39% in 2008-09.
SLOAC Advisory Committee Recommendations and College Responses

SLOAC Recommendation #1:

We recommend the college revisit the SLOAC framework. That dialogue should include a new definition of institutional and program level student learning outcomes and assessments. We recommend that “program” be defined more broadly than “department” and suggest these definitions: Transfer/Basic Skills, Workforce, Student Services, and Administrative Services.

The SLOAC advisory committee recommended that “program” be defined to consist of these five units: General Education/Transfer, Basic Skills, Workforce Development, Student Services, and Administrative Services. The accompanying diagram illustrates this structure.

![Diagram of Institutional SLO's]

College-wide input was solicited and college-planning committees reviewed and approved of these definitions. [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html) By May 2009, student learning outcomes for each program had been developed by the relevant faculty and staff.

Workforce development programs articulated a general set of SLOs that apply to all departments within this program. Individual departments can further define SLOs 1 and 2 to be specific to the skills and knowledge necessary in that particular workforce discipline. These program SLOs can be found here:

[http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html)
Institutional SLOs were created to reflect the college mission and the diverse educational goals of our students. These SLOs were modified and reviewed by campus-wide planning groups, using the new campus planning structure. The approved institutional SLOs can be found here: http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html

**SLOAC Recommendation #2:**

We recommend that our GE (institutional) outcomes assessment process be re-evaluated. Course and program level outcomes should be linked to our GE/institutional outcomes.

Assessment plans for our program SLOs are being reviewed by the appropriate planning bodies; i.e. the IPC for academic programs, and SSPC for student service programs.

GE/transfer, workforce, and basic skills programs faculty aligned SLOs for individual courses with program SLOs during the flex day March 11 and following. The SLOAC committee developed and distributed forms to facilitate the process by which faculty indicated how specific course SLOs align with program SLOs.

http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html

Substantial progress has been achieved in gathering the input to create these alignment grids for each program. Note that the data in Table 1 underestimate this progress as they do not show that this alignment has been done for nearly all of the core courses within each discipline.

The evaluation process will include sampling individual student transcripts to determine if a student’s actual academic coursework met the program SLOs. Several student transcripts were analyzed using existing database programs. While potential challenges were identified (courses taken at other institutions, for example), overall the procedure was demonstrated to be feasible.

In August 2009, the district purchased TrakDat software, which is designed to enable easier collation of this information. Training and setup of the system will be done this fall, and implementation will begin in the spring of 2010.

**SLOAC Recommendation #3:**

Course level SLOAC should be a yearly process that should be linked to both program review (every 6 years, with a biannual interim review) and the curriculum committee review process (course outline of record submission is every 6 years). Program review and curriculum review processes should be revised to support student learning outcomes and assessment cycles.
Curriculum committee processes have been revised to include requirements for SLOs and assessment plans to be submitted along with CORs for new or revised courses. The process now includes review of SLOs by a department or division colleague before the COR advances to the full curriculum committee. This step assures appropriate, detailed guidance on SLOs from a colleague most familiar with the course. A new annual program planning document includes a section for reporting on the SLOAC status of each course within that department.

SLOAC Recommendation #4:

*We recommend the integration of the Student Services and Instructional SLOAC.*

All programs must demonstrate alignment with institutional SLOs, which were written in accordance with the college’s mission. Discussions are ongoing concerning how student services and instructional faculty can benefit from and help each other in devising, assessing, and revising student learning outcomes. These discussions will be facilitated by our newly-hired vice presidents of instruction and student services. In addition, the flex day on March 11, 2009 allowed for participation by both student services staff and teaching faculty, with a joint meeting and speaker midday.

http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html

SLOAC Recommendation #5:

*We recommend that the Assessment of Student Learning handbook that was developed for the first SLOAC summit be revised and updated during the 08 – 09 academic year and include the student services SLOAC.*

Faculty determined that other resources were more useful, and links to these resources have been included on the Cañada College SLOAC web site.

http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html

In addition, funds were received from the district’s trustee’s fund for program improvement to purchase 100 copies of an excellent resource, Angelo and Cross’s *Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook*. These texts have been distributed to faculty who participate in SLOAC workshops and use SLOAC in their courses. Some workshops have highlighted techniques described in this book; more discussions are planned for 2008-09.
OTHER NOTEWORTHY ACHIEVEMENTS

Gregory Stoup, Cañada’s director of research, planning, and student success, was named “Communicator of the Year” by the statewide academic senate (ASCCC) and the Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges (RP Group). He received the award for his exemplary data presentations, seminars, and SLO coaching across the campus and district.

Our SLOAC web page includes a sharepoint site that allows Cañada faculty and staff to view the SLOAC of any course or program on campus. This easy on-line access has enabled adjunct faculty, in particular, to participate in SLOAC for courses they teach, regardless of their schedule. Faculty can readily review SLOs for related courses to compare assessment methods or results. Reflections on assessment results are included, which provide anecdotal evidence that SLOAC is working and that it is becoming part of how Cañada College operates.

Faculty use of SLOAC has increased substantially, as shown by data in Table 2. Most core courses have SLOs on file, and many state them on course syllabi. In addition, as noted above, the percentage of courses that have had a full cycle (SLO, assessment, and reflection) has increased to 39% from 11% last year. While accurate, note that these data do not reflect the substantial amount of work necessary to coordinate the assessment and reflection process among faculty who teach separate sections of the same course, and there may be as many as 18 separate sections. Each course, regardless of the number of sections, counts as one entry.

The SLOAC reporting form for courses has been revised again. It is now compatible with any computer system and flexible enough to allow for multiple types and quantities of data. The prompts encourage reflection on how the diverse aspects of a course could be modified to improve student learning.  http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html

Also, during 2008-09 as well as during the current year, faculty are engaging in professional development workshops that address multiple aspects of assessment, from writing good test questions to easy analysis of assessment data, types of assessment, and potential biases. A complete list of activities is found here:  http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html

Beginning in spring 2009, additional flex days were added to the academic calendar to promote productive discussion of teaching and student learning. The scheduling of these days should
allow easier participation by adjunct faculty as well as greater collaboration between instructional and student services faculty and staff. Finally, the newly filled positions of vice presidents of student services and instruction offer additional momentum and administrative resources for the improved use of SLOAC throughout the campus.

**PLANS FOR 2009/10 ACADEMIC YEAR**

The SLOAC committee is working with the director of research and our new vice president of instruction to gather data for program assessment. The district has purchased the software programs TrakDat and Curricunet, with the intention of using TrakDat for compiling SLO data. Cañada will utilize TrakDat once the system has been implemented and training conducted. We will then complete the alignment matrices for program assessments and incorporate these data analyses into the program review processes.

Even as we continue to educate faculty and staff on creating effective SLOs and valid assessments, the SLOAC events this year will emphasize student-centered teaching so as to generate stimulating discussions among staff and faculty on best practices and meaningful assessments. Innovation and risk-taking with new approaches to learning will be encouraged. Sessions will focus on improving the ability of faculty and staff to interpret assessment data on the course, department, and program level. In addition, some faculty members are beginning to establish assessment connections across disciplines (i.e., basic skills and math, ESL and English) to help increase student success. In each of these ways, Cañada is demonstrating its commitment to making the SLOAC an integral part of its approach to teaching and learning.
Table 1. Progress in aligning course SLOs with Program SLOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Coverage</th>
<th>Total Courses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses with SLOs aligned with General Education/Transfer SLOs</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>98% (^a) 40% (^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses with SLOs aligned with Workforce Development SLOs</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses with SLOs aligned with Basic Skills SLOs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) relative to the number of CSU GE courses (250). \(^b\) relative to the number of CSU transferable courses (614).

Table 2. SLOAC Status for Courses Taught Fall ‘08 or spring ‘09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Coverage</th>
<th>Total Courses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses Offered Fall ‘08 or Spring 09</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses with SLO’s</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses with Completed Assessments for at least one SLO</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This tally does not reflect the large amount of work required to coordinate assessments and collate results for courses with multiple sections (up to 18) taught by numerous instructors.
PROGRESS: STUDENT SERVICES STAFFING PLAN

Recommendation 4

To increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that a staffing plan for all student support services, including counseling and the library and the learning center is developed with broad collegial input from all areas of the college to ensure that all afternoon and evening, second language learners, on-site, and off-site students are provided quality and equitable access to student support services. (Standards II.B.3.a, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.c, III.A, and III.A.2)

In response to the January 31, 2008 letter from the ACCJC informing the college that it must address three recommendations from the report of the visiting team, the student services administrators, supervisors, faculty and staff met to formulate the college’s response plan. Additionally, recommendation 4 was discussed in detail at the following meetings to ensure that the ensuing plan was comprehensive:

- Student services program, department, and division meetings
- Student services supervisory council meetings
- Student services supervisory council retreat [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html)
- Student services planning council

In order to develop the student services staffing plan, administrators reviewed the college’s current and projected student demographics; the projected state budget; the current student services processes; the college’s on-site and off-site services and needs; the status of newly-acquired positions; and the college’s hiring needs.

Furthermore, to better understand the needs of students and support the development of an efficient and high quality service environment, the director of planning, research and student success developed a student segmentation framework to identify populations of students who take similar courses [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html). This segmentation framework creates a foundation on which to build a service needs profile for various categories of students including basic skills students, career and technology directed students, transfer oriented students, and lifelong learners. Each of these segments will be divided into subgroups based on day/evening classification, on-site/off-site instruction, and the student’s primary language. The director of planning will be working with student service
managers to develop the means of capturing information related to the service needs of students in each of these categories. Findings from the investigation will be shared with the SSPC in fall 2009.
COLLEGIAL INPUT

The student support services staffing plan was drafted by student services faculty, staff, and administrators. To ensure broad collegial input, the Student Services Staffing Plan Review Committee was convened in July 2008. Subsequently, the SSPC met throughout 2009 to review the data and preliminary findings. Further, the plan was presented to the following college shared governance bodies for input and recommendations:

- administrative council
- planning and budget committee
- planning council
- educational master plan steering committee
- academic senate governing council
- Associated Students of Cañada College

These committees include on-campus instructional faculty as well as those teaching off-site in programs such as CBET, distance education, and in high school concurrent enrollment programs. They also include key representatives from counseling, enrollment, and academic support services, as well as student representatives. Revisions to the plan will be made in concert with institutional planning and budgeting processes.

Membership of the committees included:

- Peter Barbatis, Vice President of Student Services
- Phyllis Lucas-Woods, former Vice President of Student Services
- Melissa Raby, former Dean of Counseling and Enrollment Services
- Jeanne Gross, former Dean of the University Center and Academic Support Services
- Leonor Cabrera, Professor of accounting
- Margie Carrington, Director of Financial Aid
- Jennifer Castello, Professor of English as a Second Language
- Patty Dilko, Professor of Early Childhood Education
- Linda Haley, Professor of ESL and CBET coordinator
- Ray Lapuz, Professor of mathematics
- Thomas Mohr, President of Cañada College
- Martin Partlan, President of the Academic Senate
- Anniqqua Rana, Professor of English and ESL
- Rita Sabbadini, manager of the learning center
- Michael Stanford, Professor of history
- Kathy Sammut, Professor of counseling
- Gregory Stoup, Director of Planning, Research and Student Success
IMMEDIATE RESPONSES TO SUMMARY LIST OF FINDINGS

Despite recent budget cuts to categorical funding, student services and instructional programs and departments have made immediate and concerted efforts to increase services to afternoon/evening, second language, on- and off-site students, and to increase outreach to the broader community.

These efforts include new hires, an increase in evening services on and off campus, and increased bilingual support on-line and in person. In addition, the Student Services Planning Council (SSPC) was created in fall 2008 to assess the changes that have been implemented this year in staffing, to continue the detailed analyses completed in response to the letter of warning, and to be sure that the student services plans are integrated with college-wide plans.

Important Changes in Response to the State’s Budgetary Challenges

In January 2009, the college began redesigning the college’s organizational structure to cope with the state’s ever worsening budgetary situation. As the extent of the budget crisis became apparent, it became evident that student services would be disproportionately affected, due largely to cuts in categorical funding. Therefore, the college embarked on a plan to identify and eliminate operational redundancies, improve the cohesion of procedural processes, and achieve tighter alignment between instruction and student services.

The college administration developed several reorganization plans and shared them with the CPC as well as the academic, classified staff, and student senates. Based on feedback from the participants in these open-forum discussions, the administration collected and shared additional data related to operational functions and subsequently made multiple revisions to the reorganization plan [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html) A final reorganization model emerged in March 2009 and was adopted by the CPC as a formal recommendation to the president [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html)
Figure 4 (instruction) and figure 5 (student services) illustrate the college’s organizational architecture prior to the reorganization.

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figures 6 and 7 display the revised organizational structure for instruction and student services. Key features of the reorganization include moving service programs that are closely linked to academic planning to the instructional division, and consolidating other student service functions.

Figure 6

Figure 7

Note: For a more detailed description of the reorganization see http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html
As part of this reorganization, the college significantly redefined the job description of the vice president of student services. Whereas the previous description focused largely on managerial ability, the new description emphasizes leadership qualities. The newly defined role of the vice president of student services is to nurture and empower a diverse staff of professionals to develop solutions to old challenges and to marshal talent to improve student learning. In May 2009, the college was pleased to welcome Peter Barbatis in this newly defined role.

The remainder of this section describes the ongoing staffing adjustments made by the college in response to the January 2008 ACCJC recommendations. To provide a comprehensive view of the progress that led to the college’s reaffirmation in January 2009, this section retains many of the same tables as the first follow-up report, but it is updated to reflect the recent and ongoing improvements in student service staffing and planning.
The needs of all students, including afternoon, evening, and weekend students, are addressed through the services listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Weekend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMISSIONS &amp; RECORDS OFFICE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>T AND W UNTIL 7:00 P.M.</td>
<td>3 PEP Sessions/Year on Saturdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT CENTER</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>T UNTIL 9 P.M.</td>
<td>12 SATURDAYS/YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS SKILLS CENTER</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M – TH 4:30-10:00</td>
<td>WHEN COURSES ARE IN SESSION, OTHER ROOMS ARE USED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFETERIA/FOOD SERVICE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M – TH UNTIL 8:00</td>
<td>SAT &amp; SUN UNTIL 10 P.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPUS SECURITY</td>
<td></td>
<td>M – TH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASHIER’S OFFICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE BOOKSTORE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M – TH UNTIL 9:00</td>
<td>3 Saturdays/Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNSELING CENTER</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>T AND W UNTIL 7:00 P.M.</td>
<td>First Sat. of the semester &amp; 3 PEP Session/Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISABLED STUDENTS PROGRAMS AND SERVICES (DSP&amp;E+S)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>W until 7:00 p.m.; TH until 9:00 p.m.</td>
<td>3 PEP Session/Year &amp; PEP Midnight Madness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOPS / CARE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>T &amp; W UNTIL7P.M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENING ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT</td>
<td></td>
<td>M-TH UNTIL 9 P.M.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL AID OFFICE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>T AND W UNTIL 7:00 &amp; BY APPOINTMENT</td>
<td>4 SATURDAYS/YEAR &amp; OTHER by APPOINTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH CENTER</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>T AND W UNTIL 7:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING CENTER</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M – TH UNTIL 8:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M – TH UNTIL 8:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M &amp; W UNTIL 6 P.M.; TH UNTIL 7 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For Spring 2010, the college is currently studying the need to change the Monday schedule to include an 11-7 P.M. shift.

To support the college’s mission and strategies as described in the educational master plan, the college’s director of planning met with student service managers to determine how to assess the effectiveness of the student services listed above.

One outcome of this discussion was a comprehensive, college-wide student services survey. This survey includes both an awareness (random in-class survey) and satisfaction (point-of-service survey) component, and it is structured to measure the effectiveness of various student service bundles on student performance. The survey design has been completed, and it will be
conducted every fall term. The survey findings will undergird college-wide discussions on how to improve the efficacy of student services.

Changes实施的自2007年ACCJC访问以来

In response to the ACCJC report of 2007, student services identified activities to serve off-site, evening, and ESL students. The chart below lists many of these student support activities. The impact of these activities on students and student services will be addressed by the SSPC in collaboration with the college researcher and integrated with the student learning assessment cycle. The college’s plans and analysis may be found at http://canadacollege.net/inside/slo/plans.html.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Activity</th>
<th>AM/PM &amp; WKD</th>
<th>ESL Students</th>
<th>Distance Ed</th>
<th>Off-site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Super Saturday, a registration day held on May 17, 2008 in Downtown Redwood City included placement testing/ assessment, counseling, DSPS, financial aid information and applications assistance, and registration. Plan to repeat in Fall 2009 for Spring 2010 semesters. (link to flyer)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. E-Counseling offering counseling services to students on-line began Fall 2008</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Appointments available for Assessment Testing, Counseling, and Tutoring available on-line. (dates, links)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In-person counseling in English and Spanish offered on as-needed basis to off-campus sites. Fall 2008</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Development of Student Services Information packet for off-site faculty; contains descriptions of the services (including bilingual) provided by Counseling, Enrollment Services, EOPS, DSPS, Financial Aid, Learning Center, the Library and other student supportive services. Fall 2008</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. On-site counseling session and math tutoring for County of San Mateo Accelerated Degree program as it nears goal of offering necessary coursework toward the AA in University Studies, and revised associates degrees. Fall 2008</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Financial Aid “I Can Afford College” promotions – one at the Hotel Sofitel for the Chicana Latina Foundation and one at the HP Pavilion during a local hip-hop concert. (dates, flyers)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Enrollment Services event, Midnight Madness, on August 1, 2008 offered full enrollment services to serve students with difficulty completing registration services during normal business hours. Plan to repeat annually. (flyers)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Priority Enrollment Services (PEP) including Orientation, Financial Aid presentations, and Placement Testing held on Saturdays for graduating Seniors.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Expanded Outreach Information Sessions (See Attached Matrix)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>A Spanish Bilingual Instructional Aide II has been trained to administer placement tests on an as-needed basis at Menlo Park OICW Center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Saturday Financial Aid FAFSA Workshop. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Associated Students of Cañada College Evening Programs to include XXXXX (date/flyer?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Information competency workshops and classes in English/Spanish for off-site locations. Fall 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>EOPS/CARE has translated all of its materials into Spanish*; materials include admission application, brochures, orientation presentations (currently working on translating its website in its entirety to Spanish).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>DSFS is currently translating the adaptive physical education website into Spanish and revising DSFS website information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Added 6 hours of Saturday Counseling for the LAST YEAR 2009-2010 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>North Fair Oaks Community Festival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Schedule of Classes &amp; Catalog available in Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>First Year Experience &amp; Crossing Boarders Learning Communities available for evening &amp; part-time students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Off-Site Testing services available for Half Moon Bay and OICW Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Continued from before ACCJC visit in 2007
ACTIVITIES IMPLEMENTED TO IMPROVE STUDENT SERVICES 08-09

To further support off-site, evening, and ESL students, in 2008-09 student services plans to implement the activities listed in the chart below. The SSPC will assess the effectiveness of these activities using student and faculty surveys, focus groups, and longitudinal data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Activity</th>
<th>AM/PM &amp; WKD</th>
<th>ESL Students</th>
<th>Distance Ed</th>
<th>Off-site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Development of summary of student services best practices, trends, and directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including a review of how other colleges provide services at off-site locations) at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the conclusion of the Annual Student Services Summer Retreats. Fall 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development and administration of Student Survey Questionnaire to identify students'</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs for additional services. Fall 2008. Analysis of survey data gathered and modified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xation of services provided. Spring 2009.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Updating and appropriate linking of all student services websites</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Survey of students and provision of appropriate evening events every semester</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x = implementation; x = yes; x = no
To further support off-site, evening, and ESL students, student services plans to implement the following activities in 2009-10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Activity</th>
<th>AM/PM &amp; WKD</th>
<th>ESL Students</th>
<th>Distance Ed</th>
<th>Off-site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Development of Summary of Student Services Best Practices, Trends, and Directions (including a review of how other colleges provide services at off-site locations) at the conclusion of the Student Services Retreats.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development and administration of Student Survey Questionnaire to identify students' needs for additional services. Fall 2008. Analysis of survey data gathered and modification of services provided. Spring 2009.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Updating and appropriate linking of all Student Services websites</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Survey of students and provision of appropriate evening events every semester.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Group academic advisement sessions are scheduled equally for both day and evening students. After assessment, students register for sessions and are grouped based on ESL, basic skills, honors, and mainstream. It is expected that sessions may be held in Spanish for students who choose this delivery of service.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Carnival del Barrio is a student activity designed to celebrate the various Latino cultures represented by our student body. In addition to food, talent and entertainment will be provided by students and members of the community.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Freshmen Impression is an orientation program for new students and parents scheduled on the Saturday prior to the beginning of the semester. In addition to several workshops on time management, study skills, and financial aid, parents will have the opportunity to attend “Parents Going to College” workshop which will showcase campus resources and services.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Open House/Preview is an opportunity for faculty and staff to showcase the academic programs and support services of the College to the community.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Investigate development &amp; partnership of services with Veteran’s Administration in Palo Alto.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNSELOR OFF-SITE ASSIGNMENTS

Additionally, to meet the needs of off-site students, counselors have been assigned to the following locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Palo Alto Academy</td>
<td>Teach a 3 unit Career Course (CRER 137), counsel students for 2 hours per week providing orientation and information about programs and services at the College, also acts as liaison with faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlmont HS</td>
<td>Teach 3 unit CRER 137 (fall) providing instruction and support for students in the Academy Program</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside HS</td>
<td>Counseling support for students in HSCI 115; liaison with students and faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-counseling (on-line counseling)</td>
<td>E-counseling services began Fall 2008 providing counseling to students via Internet and phone</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Learning</td>
<td>Hybrid Career Course (CRER137) where half of the course is taught on-line.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoia Union HS</td>
<td>Teach 1 unit Career Course (CRER 401) College Connections at Sequoia HS.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hours per Week</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the “PreSchool for All” grant enables the Early Childhood Education/Child Development (ECE/CD) program services coordinator to meet bimonthly with ECE/CD majors in East Menlo Park, where ECE/CD courses are held. She advises the students on their student education plans, the courses required for the ECE certificate and degree, the transfer requirements for the Child and Adolescent Development Program at SFSU, and the matrix requirements for jobs requiring the child development permit.
BILINGUAL/EVENING COUNSELING

To meet the needs of non-English speaking evening students, bilingual counselors have been scheduled in the late afternoon and evening. Furthermore, the recently hired vice president of student services is fluent in Spanish and other languages and a qualified counselor. Given the recent budget cuts, he works with his staff to augment the delivery of counseling services. “B” indicates faculty/staff member is bilingual and “E” indicates faculty/staff member is monolingual (English).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>2E 1B</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>3E 1B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>3E 2B</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>3E 1B</td>
<td>2E 3B</td>
<td>3E 1B</td>
<td>E-Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>3E 2B</td>
<td>3E 4E 2B</td>
<td>2E 3B</td>
<td>3E 1B</td>
<td>E-Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>3E 2B</td>
<td>4E 2B</td>
<td>4E 2B</td>
<td>2E 3B</td>
<td>3E 1B</td>
<td>E-Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>3E 2B</td>
<td>4E 2B</td>
<td>2E 3B</td>
<td>3E 2B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>3E 2B</td>
<td>4E 3B</td>
<td>3E 3B</td>
<td>3E 2B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>2E 3B</td>
<td>4E 3B</td>
<td>3E 3B</td>
<td>3E 3B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>1E 3B</td>
<td>4E 3B</td>
<td>3E 3B</td>
<td>3E 3B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>1E 3B</td>
<td>2E 3B</td>
<td>1E 2B</td>
<td>1E 1B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>1E 2B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>1E 2B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Select Saturday service is available for students prior to the start of each semester**
BILINGUAL/EVENING SUPPORT IN ADMISSIONS AND RECORDS

A new admissions and records assistant (Spanish bilingual) was hired at .60 (22.5 hrs/wk) to provide evening information, admissions, registration, and enrollment services at the enrollment services front counter. This doubles the evening staff. “B” indicates faculty/staff member is bilingual, and “E” indicates faculty/staff member is monolingual (English).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>4 E 3 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 1 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>4 E 3 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 1 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>4 E 3 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 1 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>4 E 3 B</td>
<td>4 E 3 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 3 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td>4 E 2 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>4 E 1 B</td>
<td>4 E 3 B</td>
<td>4 E 3 B</td>
<td>4 E 1 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>2 B</td>
<td>2 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>2 B</td>
<td>2 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>2 B</td>
<td>2 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By hiring a second full-time librarian in January 2009, the library has increased its services by 0.2 FTE from 1.8 to 2.0. *For the first time in over five years, the library has two full-time librarians.* The new librarian, who is bilingual in Spanish and English, has experience serving second language and distance learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>2E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the hiring of a .66 instructional aide II and a bilingual MESA program assistant, the learning center has been able to offer tours, orientations, workshops, and tutoring until 8 p.m. Monday through Thursday. In addition, workshops and orientations are provided for 8 p.m. to 10 p.m. classes as requested.

“B” indicates faculty/staff member is bilingual; “E” indicates faculty/staff member is monolingual (English).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>1 E</td>
<td>1 E</td>
<td>1 E</td>
<td>1 E 1 B</td>
<td>1 E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>2 E 1 B</td>
<td>1 E 1 B</td>
<td>2 E 1 B</td>
<td>1 E 2 B</td>
<td>2 E 1 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>2 E</td>
<td>2 E</td>
<td>2 E</td>
<td>2 E 1 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>2 E</td>
<td>2 E</td>
<td>2 E</td>
<td>2 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>3 E</td>
<td>3 E</td>
<td>3 E</td>
<td>3 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>3 E 1 B</td>
<td>3 E 1 B</td>
<td>3 E 1 B</td>
<td>3 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>3 E 1 B</td>
<td>3 E 1 B</td>
<td>3 E 1 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 E</td>
<td>3 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>3 E 1 B</td>
<td>3 E 1 B</td>
<td>3 E 1 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>2 E 1 B</td>
<td>1 E 1 B</td>
<td>2 E 1 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 E 1 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>2 E 1 B</td>
<td>1 E 1 B</td>
<td>2 E 1 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 E 1 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>2 E 1 B</td>
<td>1 E 1 B</td>
<td>2 E 1 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 E 1 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>1 E 1 B</td>
<td>1 E 1 B</td>
<td>1 E 1 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 E 1 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEW HIRES IN STUDENT SERVICES

An in-depth assessment of student needs through program review of the learning center [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html) and the library [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html) as well as consultation with admissions and records and counseling, identified key personnel and system needs essential to improving and increasing the services provided to afternoon and evening, off-site, and ESL students.

To increase the effectiveness of student support off-campus as well as in the afternoon and evenings, and to provide support in Spanish, student services has filled several positions within the last year. The following is a list of the student services positions that have been filled or approved for hiring and the impact each will have toward providing quality and equitable student access to support services.

**FACULTY**

1. .40 bilingual “cyber adviser” to advise students about academic issues via the internet

2. Basic skills counselor to provide bilingual (English/Spanish) general counseling services as part of the basic skills student retention program. As a collaborative player in the “Crossing Borders” learning communities, the counselor teaches two sections of college success courses and supports the basic skills and ESL students in the program. [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/accred-oversight/links.html)

3. 1.0 EOPS/CARE counselor to provide bilingual (English/Spanish) counseling services to EOPS students

4. 1.0 reference and instruction librarian to provide afternoon and evening bilingual (English/Spanish) reference help and instruction
CLASSIFIED STAFF

1. .60 admissions and records aide III to provide information about admission, registration, and enrollment in Spanish and English at the enrollment services front counter in the evening

2. .66 instructional aide II to provide learning center coordination and tutoring in English and Spanish in the evening

3. office assistant II (information desk) to provide bilingual information at One-Stop Center as well as college directory information; and to welcome prospective and new students

4. .60 financial aid assistant (BFAP funds) (new) to provide bilingual information and assistance, and to assist with off-site services

5. .50 office assistant II (DSPS) (new) to provide information and services for disabled students

6. 1.0 staff assistant (EOPS) to provide bilingual assistance to low-income and first-generation students

7. .40 psychological services coordinator who also supervises four interns; fluent in Chinese (Mandarin/Cantonese)

ADMINISTRATION

8. The new vice president of student services (hired June 2009) speaks Spanish, Greek and French fluently and has a ‘Faculty Service Area’ in counseling.
FUTURE PLANNING RELATED TO STUDENT SERVICES

Student services examined the accreditation team’s recommendation for a student services staffing plan and analyzed data from the Student Demographic Comparisons Fall 2005 – Fall 2009 report, program reviews, and the 2007-08 student services SLOAC survey results, among other sources, to identify student equity and access concerns as well as the appropriate classified and faculty positions to address them. This information will be used as part of the college’s position justification process and help shape future college planning and resource allocations.

Given California’s budget crisis, student services recognizes that the college’s resource allocation is likely to be severely limited, and, consequently, new hiring will be minimal. Therefore the college intends to meet the needs of students through scheduling changes, eCounseling, testing, and, as the technology is developed, online services. Currently, the district is studying the implementation of DegreeWorks, a highly interactive degree audit system. Further, group advising sessions are held for both day and evening students. Students register for these sessions after assessment and are grouped based on ESL, developmental, honors, and mainstream placement.

Finally, the SSPC will continue to analyze student services to develop an overarching student services plan based upon needs identified in program review and college action plans. It is responsible for taking the lead on integrating the student services plan with all other college-wide plans.
DISTRICT RESPONSE

In addition to the three recommendations that the college was asked to respond to by October 15, the ACCJC letter of warning asked the district to respond to three additional recommendations. Although the district response is not due until October 2009, the district wants the commission to remain aware of its progress. Below we present the report of the resolution of each district recommendation, progress made toward addressing the resolution, and further plans to address each recommendation.

PROGRESS: INCLUSION OF THE PRODUCTION OF SLOS IN EVALUATION PROCEDURES

District Recommendation 6

It is recommended that the District develop and implement appropriate policies and procedures that incorporate effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes into the evaluation process of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes.

Response:

The vice chancellor of human resources and employee relations, in consultation with the president of the AFT and the president of the district academic senate, has made progress toward overseeing discussions concerning the incorporation of student learning outcomes into the faculty evaluation process. Currently, representatives from the administration, the AFT, and the district academic senate are identifying and assessing model evaluation forms and processes used by other California community colleges that have successfully addressed this standard in their official evaluation processes and procedures. Once the process and procedure most compatible with the San Mateo County Community College District have been identified, the incorporation of that process and those procedures must be negotiated in order for them to become an official component of the district’s faculty evaluation process. In fall 2008 the vice chancellor of human resources and employee relations and the faculty union were unable to reach consensus on how to reconvene the Trust Committee. Discussions on reconvening the Trust Committee will resume in fall 2009.
District Recommendation 7

In order to fully meet Standards regarding district evaluation procedures, while the district has clearly defined rules and regulations for the hiring and evaluation of the chancellor, that same clarity of process should be extended to evaluating college presidents, therefore the district should develop rules and regulations for the evaluation of college presidents. (Standards IV.B, B.1.j)

Resolution of the Recommendation: On June 11, 2008, the board of trustees added rules and regulations section 2.03, college president (see immediately below) to address evaluation of the college presidents. In July 2008, the annual evaluation of the presidents was conducted in accordance with this new policy. In summer 2009, another annual evaluation of the college presidents was conducted in accordance with the policy.

Evidence of Results and Analysis of the Results Achieved To Date: The newly adopted policy and the completion of two cycles of annual evaluation of the presidents is the evidence of results.

Additional Action: No additional action is necessary; annual evaluations will proceed as specified in the policy.

2.03 College President

1. The board of trustees and chancellor shall employ a president at each of the three colleges.

2. The chancellor shall delegate to each college president the executive responsibility for leading and directing the college operations including administrative services; the office of the president; the office of the vice president of instruction; the office of the vice president of student services; research; marketing; and public relations.

3. The college president shall establish administrative procedures necessary for the operation of the college.

4. The college president shall perform all duties specifically required or assigned to him/her by the statutes of the state of California, by the chancellor, and by the board of trustees of the San Mateo County Community College District.
5. The college president will be evaluated by the chancellor and board of trustees annually based upon goals previously established and agreed upon by the chancellor, board of trustees, and the college president and in accordance with any other provision of the contract for employment for college president.

6. The compensation of the college president shall be in accordance with the pay schedule established for the college president, and placement of the salary within that range shall be made by mutual consent between the chancellor and the college president.
District Recommendation 8

In order to fully meet accreditation standards and improve effectiveness of evaluation in the college and district, it is recommended that:

a. The board of trustees should regularly evaluate its “rules and regulations” and revise them as necessary. (Standard IV.B.1.e)

b. The district and colleges should collaborate to implement a process to regularly evaluate the delineation of functions and widely communicate those findings in order to enhance the college’s effectiveness and institutional success. (Standard IV.B.3.g)

Resolution of Recommendation 8a: On August 13, 2008, the board of trustees adopted the amended version of district rules and regulations section 2.08 (see immediately below), which establishes a two-year schedule for review of each of the eight chapters of rules and regulations. In collaboration with the academic senate, the district decided to start with chapter six (academic programs) since recent Title V changes require modifications in district policies.

The district also contracted with the California Community College League for its policy and procedures update service, which will be consulted for all reviews of district rules and regulations.

Evidence of Results and Analysis of the Results Achieved To Date: The district academic senate completed its review of 26 of the 37 sections of chapter six. It approved the amendment of those sections and the deletion of 4 policies. The results of the academic senate’s review were shared with the District Shared Governance Council in September of 2008. The board of trustees approved the changes at meetings on September 24, 2008 and December 10, 2008.

The remaining 11 sections of chapter six continue to be reviewed by the academic senate; it is expected that these sections will be ready for board approval in fall 2009 or early spring 2010.

Chapter seven of rules and regulations (student services) underwent review by the district academic senate and vice presidents of student services in spring 2009. Reviewed and revised policies were presented to the district shared governance council in late spring, and 18
reviewed and revised policies were approved by the board of trustees in May of 2009. An additional 3 policies were approved in July 2009.

In addition, staff reviewed chapters one and two of the rules and regulations during winter 2008, made appropriate revisions, and shared the results with the district shared governance council. The board of trustees approved 16 reviewed or revised policies in chapter one on February 25, 2009 and March 25, 2009. In May of 2009, the board approved the review or revision of 23 policies in chapter two.

Finally, district staff reviewed and revised 4 miscellaneous policies in chapter eight, which were approved by both the District Shared Governance Council and the board of trustees in September 2008, January 2009, and May 2009.

A summary of the approvals of these policies is shown in Attachment A.

**ADDITIONAL PLANNING BY THE DISTRICT**

The academic senate continues to review 11 outstanding policies in chapter six, which are expected to be adopted by the board of trustees in 2009-10 (see Attachment B). The District Shared Governance Council is expected to complete its review of 21 outstanding policies from chapters one, two, six and seven this fall, and they will be brought to the board for approval in fall of 2009 (see Attachment C).

Once the board approves these policies, staff will begin work on chapter five, as called for in the revised policy 2.08 (see below).

**2.08 Rules and Regulations**

1. The rules and regulations adopted by the board for the district have been written to be consistent with the provisions of law, but they do not encompass all of the laws relating to the district’s activities. All district employees shall be expected to know and shall be held responsible for observing all provisions of the law pertinent to their activities as district employees.

2. Any rule or regulation may be suspended by a majority vote of the board, which vote shall be taken by roll call and entered into the minutes of the meeting.

3. The rules and regulations governing the district may be amended by a majority vote of the board at any meeting. Amendment shall be made by repeal of the existing rule and, if required, the enactment of a new rule.
4. Additions, amendments, or deletions in rules and regulations that directly affect students or staff members are ordinarily introduced for a first reading at one board meeting and acted on at a subsequent meeting.

5. The board will review and update each chapter of rules and regulations on the following two-year schedule:

- Fiscal year 1, quarter 1: chapter six
- Fiscal year 1, quarter 2: chapter seven
- Fiscal year 1, quarter 3: chapter five
- Fiscal year 1, quarter 4: chapter four
- Fiscal year 2, quarter 1: chapter three
- Fiscal year 2, quarter 2: chapter two
- Fiscal year 2, quarter 3: chapter one
- Fiscal year 2, quarter 4: chapter eight

6. District rules and regulations section 2.06 assigns responsibility to the academic senate to advise the board on eleven different areas of academic and professional matters. Changes to rules and regulations that impact any of the eleven areas will be reviewed by the academic senate prior to being sent to the board for approval.

7. District rules and regulations section 2.09 assigns responsibility to the District Shared Governance Council (DSGC) to advise the board on nine different governance matters. Changes to rules and regulations that impact any of these nine areas will be reviewed by the DSGC before being sent to the board for approval.

8. District rules and regulations will be posted on the district’s website.

9. Administrative procedures implementing board-adopted policies shall be developed by designated administrators subject to approval of the chancellor. Procedures shall be consistent with and not conflict with policies adopted by the board.

Reference: Education Code 70902
CONCLUSION

In response to the three ACCJC recommendations identified in this report, Cañada College has embarked on an aggressive agenda to develop the institutional infrastructure necessary to support robust college wide assessment and integrated planning. Through a series of collaborative actions, and in full keeping of the spirit of shared and participatory planning, the college has:

- adopted an educational master plan to lead us into an era of integrated, cyclical planning and assessment;
- completely redesigned the college’s shared governance planning model to support participatory planning and monitor progress against the educational master plan.
- reinvented the systems and processes underlying Program Review to encourage both thoughtful reflection and more frequent assessment;
- reorganized the college’s administrative infrastructure to better respond to the state’s fiscal contraction and efficiently meet the current and emerging needs of our students;
- created faculty-centered processes that embrace SLOAC and institutionalize the cycle into the life of the college;
- more than tripled the number of courses with SLOs;
- developed staffing of student support services to provide equitable support to evening, off-site, and second language learners.

In a clear effort to respond immediately to the recommendations made by ACCJC, the San Mateo Community College District has, as recommended:

- developed and implemented new rules and regulations regarding the evaluation of college presidents;
- developed new policies regarding the timely review of rules and regulations;
- proposed a process to regularly review the delineation of functions between the district and the colleges;
- developed processes to attempt to negotiate the inclusion of the production of SLOs in the evaluation procedures of faculty and staff.

These actions represent a sincere commitment by Cañada faculty, staff and administration and San Mateo Community College District personnel to fully address, in terms of both coverage and quality, all the demands associated with that of a full service college. The actions achieved over the last year are a deliberate extension of the accomplishments highlighted in the First Follow-Up Report that resulted in ACCJC’s affirmation of Cañada College as a fully accredited institution of higher education. We look forward to building on these achievements moving forward into the 2009/10 academic year and beyond.
FOLLOW-UP REPORT
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College of San Mateo
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CERTIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONAL FOLLOW-UP REPORT

COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO

OCTOBER 15, 2009

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

FROM:    College of San Mateo
          1700 West Hillsdale Boulevard
          San Mateo, CA 94402

This institutional Follow-Up Report is submitted to fulfill the requirements from the January 31, 2008, letter to the President of College of San Mateo.

We certify that there were opportunities for broad participation by the campus community, and we believe that the Follow-Up Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of College of San Mateo.

Signed:

Karen Schwarz, President, Board of Trustees, San Mateo County Community College District

Ron Galatolo, Chancellor, San Mateo County Community College District

Michael E. Claire, President, College of San Mateo

Susan Estes, Vice President of Instruction, Accreditation Liaison Officer

Diana Bennett, President, Academic Senate

Annette Perot, Classified Staff Representative

Steffi Santana, President, Associated Students
STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

This section is an overview of the processes undergone at College of San Mateo (CSM) related to the preparation of this Follow-Up Report, including a recognition of the participants in those activities.

PROGRAM REVIEW OF LABS AND CENTERS

Since February 2008, CSM has been crafting a new Program Review process to address the Commission’s Recommendation #5 to “complete a comprehensive evaluation of the learning support services.” All of CSM’s Labs and Centers have since undergone a comprehensive Program Review that included the assessment of SLO’s, evaluation of students’ self-reported experiences in the programs, and analysis of student success outcomes, among other areas.

The process developed for the Labs and Centers was consistent with CSM’s newly-adopted Program Review models for Instructional and Student Services that were designed and implemented in the 2008/2009 academic year as part of the College’s integrated planning effort.

More than 50 individuals participated in the development of the new Program Review for Labs and Centers that eventually led to the adoption and installation of a new uniform mechanism in all the facilities to track student usage and learning activities.

Participants in the Program Reviews included faculty and instructional aides from the departments or disciplines of Accounting, Anatomy, Assistive Technology (DSPS), Basic Skills (Coastside), Business and Microcomputer Technology, Computer Forensics and Network Security, Computer Information Science, English, ESL, Foreign Languages, the multi-discipline Integrated Science Center, Mathematics, Nursing, Reading, and Speech Communication. They were assisted in these efforts by the Deans of Language Arts, Math/Science, Business/Technology, and Coastside/Study Aboard, Distance Education, and Community Education.
The Dean of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE), Coordinator of Planning from PRIE, and the post-retirement Dean of Business/Creative Arts together worked closely with the faculty, staff, and technical support team from Information Technology Services (ITS) to implement the new Program Review process. The President of the Academic Senate and Vice President of Instruction were critical in guiding the effort.

SAN MATEO COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT'S RECOMMENDATIONS

The Vice Chancellor, Educational Services and Planning, San Mateo County Community College District (SMCCCD), played a lead role in coordinating the District’s responses to Recommendations #6, #9, and #10 which pertained directly to District functions.

DEVELOPMENT OF SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE REPORT FOR DISTANCE LEARNING

As noted in the Section entitled “Update,” in September 2009 CSM has submitted a draft of its Substantive Change Report to the ACCJC for preliminary review in preparation for the Commission’s consideration in February 2010.

The Substantive Change Report proposes that CSM offer 57 Associate Degrees, 14 Certificates of Achievement, and 15 Certificates of Specialization in the distance learning mode.

The preliminary draft of the Substantive Change Report was submitted to the Commission by the Vice President of Instruction. Significant contributors included the Coordinator of Planning from the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE); the Chair, Committee on Instruction; the Dean of Coastside/Study Aboard, Distance Education, and Community Education; and the Dean of PRIE.

However, more significant are the ongoing contributions from the dozens of faculty and staff members who deliver and support the more than 120 courses that currently comprise CSM’s distance learning program of online and telecourses.
INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING INITIATIVES

The activities described in the Section entitled “Update” also briefly addresses continued progress in meeting or implementing Recommendation #1: Planning.

Work to address this Recommendation has been structured by CSM’s new integrated planning model implemented in the 2008/2009 academic year. The model creates a new strategic planning committee, the Integrated Planning Committee (IPC), to which the core institutional committees report (See Figure 1).

Today, more than 75 faculty, staff, administrators, and students work within these institutional planning committees to help advance CSM’s commitment to continuous improvement of its programs and services.
Background and Purpose

CSM responded immediately to receiving the January 31, 2008, letter stating that the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges had acted to place the College on Warning status. The President announced in February 2008 the formation of the Accreditation Oversight Committee. It replaced the Accreditation Steering Committee, which was an ad hoc committee that had been formed to coordinate the College’s 2007 Self Study. (Subsequently CSM was removed from the Warning status and its accreditation was reaffirmed in January 2009.)

The mandate for the Accreditation Oversight Committee has been threefold:

1. to ensure that the College is meeting accreditation standards;
2. to take action on all prior ACCJC recommendations; and
3. to take action on all recommendations identified in the College’s 2007 Self Study.

The Accreditation Oversight Committee has become a permanent standing, shared-governance institutional committee reporting to College Council, joining the institutional planning committees which now comprise CSM’s new integrated planning model (see Figure 1).

Membership

The College’s Accreditation Liaison Officer chairs the Accreditation Oversight Committee and members are appointed from the College’s four shared governance constituencies. They include:

- President of the College;
- Vice President of Instruction (the Accreditation Liaison Officer and chair of the Accreditation Oversight Committee);
- Vice President of Student Services (and co-chair of the Institutional Planning Committee);
- Dean of Administrative Services;
- Academic Senate President (and co-chair of the Institutional Planning Committee);
• Dean of the Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness;
• Coordinator of Planning from the Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness, a faculty member;
• Faculty Representative from the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), the faculty union;
• At-Large Classified Staff member;
• Coordinator of Student Activities;
• Dean of Physical Education/Athletics (former co-chair of the Educational Master Plan Committee);
• Faculty Assessment (SLO’s) Coordinator; and
• General Manager of KCSM.

Communications

To promote open, genuine, inclusive communication, information about the work of the committee has been available to the entire College community through the Accreditation Oversight Committee’s website at: http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/accredinfo.

The website includes the following sections and links:

• Overview;
• Committee Membership;
• Meeting Agendas;
• Meeting Summaries (specific information about the work of the committee);
• Work Plan Updates;
• Email Notices;
• Communication from ACCJC;
• Links;
• Documents and Downloads;
• Summer Institutional Planning Projects;
• Contact Us;
• 2008 Follow-up Report and Supporting Documentation;
• 2009 Follow-up Report and Supporting Documentation;
• Substantive Change Proposal, 9/22/09
• Planning Agenda for 2010 Midterm Report
Accreditation Oversight Committee and Preparation for Follow-Up Report

Members of the Accreditation Oversight Committee have been active in addressing the ACCJC’s Recommendations and in the Follow-Up Report preparation. They reviewed and commented on the Follow-Up Report which was posted online for review on September 28, 2009.
WRITING OF THE FOLLOW-UP REPORT

The activities outlined above informed the content of the Follow-Up Report. A number of people participated in its development.

Contributions to the text of the Follow-Up Report came from participants in the Labs and Centers Program Review, the development of CSM’s Substantive Change Proposal (Distance Learning), the staff of the Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE), the President of the Academic Senate, and San Mateo County Community College District (SMCCCD) staff. The lead writer was the Coordinator of Planning, Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness. CSM’s Accreditation Liaison Officer served as the principal editor.

The Accreditation Oversight Committee reviewed and commented on the Follow-Up Report. In addition, the campus at large was invited to review and comment on its contents on September 29, 2009.

The President of the Academic Senate, the President of the Associated Students, and a representative for classified staff reviewed and approved the Follow-Up Report. College Council approved the Follow-Up at its October 7, 2009, meeting. The SMCCCD Board of Trustees subsequently approved the Follow-Up Report at its October 14, 2009, meeting.

Michael E. Claire, President
RESPONSE TO TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS:
MANDATED REPORTING BY OCTOBER 15, 2009

This section addresses the Commission’s Recommendations whose resolution the College is required to report to ACCJC by October 15, 2009 (ACCJC, Letter to College of San Mateo, February 3, 2009).

COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 5:
COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION OF LEARNING SUPPORT SERVICES

Recommendation #5: In order to fully meet Standard II. C, the college must complete a comprehensive evaluation of the learning support services provided to include Assistive Technology Center, Biology Computer Lab, Business Microcomputer Lab, Business Students Lab, Chemistry Study Center, Computer and Information Science Center Lab, English 800 Lab, Foreign Language Center, Integrated Science Lab, Math Resource Center, Multimedia Lab, Nursing Lab, Physical Education Lab, Reading and ESL Center, Speech Lab, and Writing Center. (Standards II.C.1.a, c, II.2.)

RESOLUTION OF THE RECOMMENDATION

Spring 2008: Identifying the Issues

In Spring 2008 the Vice President of Instruction (and chair of the Accreditation Oversight Committee); Dean of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE); Coordinator of Planning (from PRIE); and members from the Accreditation Oversight Committee began to address this recommendation. The participants immediately reviewed the pertinent Standards (II.C, II. C.1.a, II. C.2.). Of particular concern was the need for CSM to develop consistent practices for identifying student outcomes among the diverse Labs and Centers that could be used for the systematic assessment of their effectiveness on a regular basis. (Note: The Standards are included below for documentation purposes and to highlight for campus readers the role of assessment and student outcomes data.)
**Standard II.C. Library and Learning Support Services**

Library and other learning support services for students are sufficient to support the institution’s instructional programs and intellectual, aesthetic, and cultural activities in whatever format and wherever they are offered. Such services include library services and collections, tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, and learning technology development and training. The institution provides access and training to students so that library and other learning support services may be used effectively and efficiently. **The institution systematically assesses these services using student learning outcomes, faculty input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of the services** [Emphasis added].

**Standard II.C.1.a**

1. The institution supports the quality of its instructional programs by providing library and other learning support services that are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to facilitate educational offerings, regardless of location or means of delivery.

   a. Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission of the institution.

**Standard II.C.2**

2. The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. **Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.** [Emphasis added].

PRIE staff immediately identified the Labs and Centers which, at that time, accurately met the definition of “learning support services”:

- Accounting Lab
- Anatomy Lab
- Assistive Technology Center
- Basic Skills Lab (Coastside location)
- Business Microcomputer Lab
- Business Students Lab (later combined with Business Microcomputer Lab)
- Computer Forensics Lab
- Computer and Information Science Lab

---

1 The Peer Tutoring Center was dropped from this list as it was not considered an established ongoing College program. The Chemistry Lab cited in ACCJC’s Recommendation also no longer exists. The Physical Education Lab also cited in the Recommendation was evaluated as not under the umbrella of this review: it is a facility that does not provide supplemental learning support, but a location where courses are delivered.
PRIE’s Dean then met with the faculty leads of nine of these Labs and Centers to gain a better understanding of the functions and activities associated with each facility and began to document the Labs’ quite diverse practices. (These field observations helped shape the types of questions and probes that would later be used to create a survey instrument—designed for completion by Lab faculty and staff—that could capture an inventory of Labs’ and Centers’ practices.)

These meetings explored how each facility provided tutorials, workshops, general support, “Study Hall,” online services, hours of operations, hours by arrangement, staffing, and methods of inviting student participation (e.g. whether lab attendance was voluntary, through drop-in, or by scheduled appointments). Key issues also included how student attendance was tracked (via SARS-Trak or local database or paper “capturing” of student usage), whether there were efforts to link student usage levels of labs with student success in coursework, and whether any surveys had measured student satisfaction with the Labs’ services.

For Spring 2008, the preliminary findings pertinent to the design of a comprehensive Program Review were these:

- There needed to be a current and comprehensive inventory of Labs and Centers, to which the ACCJC Recommendation #5 applied, including summary information about their diverse goals, policies, procedures, staffing, and equipment.

- Some, but not all, programs had published statements of purpose and SLO’s articulated for those programs.

- There were no consistent methods for tracking student use or attendance among the Labs and Centers.
A consistent means of tracking of students by their student identification numbers (G numbers) would be required in order for PRIE staff to correlate student use of the program with student outcomes related to student success (e.g. rates of course completion and retention). The student identifiers would also be needed in order to develop a student-user profile for each Lab or Center that would include such demographic variables as gender, ethnicity, and age.

- A few Labs and Centers had developed customized surveys to capture student feedback and other qualitative data about student satisfaction. This information was primarily captured using pencil and paper survey instruments.

- Demographic profiles of student users of individual programs had not been consistently available.

The Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (previously the Office of Articulation and Research) had historically assisted only one program (Math Resource Center) with the retrieval and analysis of student outcomes data derived from the SMCCCD student database.

- Evaluation of most Labs and Centers had been conducted consistently through the existing instructional Program Review process in place in Spring 2008. In most cases, assessment of the Lab or Center historically had been conducted under the umbrella of a department or discipline to which it was the most closely aligned, not as a separate entity.

These assessments, obviously, did not conform to the new Program Review model that CSM would implement in the academic year, Fall 2008-Spring 2009. This new Program Review model requires faculty and staff to analyze a data set, Core Program and Student Success Indicators, provided by PRIE that is disaggregated for each instructional department (Core Program and Student Success Indicators: Fall 2008 Cycle, http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/program_review_data.php). (Ref.1)

In addition, the new Program Review model requires the identification and assessment of SLO’s (Templates for Comprehensive and Annual Program Reviews, http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/program_review.php). (Ref. 2)

To begin addressing these issues, a pilot online satisfaction survey for students using the Anatomy Lab was developed and administered at the conclusion of the Spring 2008 term. The pilot survey probed student satisfaction with the various aspects of the Anatomy Labs’ hours of operation, availability of support and equipment, and
the extent to which Lab activities promoted student success. This pilot survey was eventually used to help develop the final Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey administered to student Lab users in late Spring 2009.

**Summer 2008: Charge for Labs and Centers Work Group**

In order to demonstrate significant progress on the Commission’s January 2008 Recommendations, the College needed to engage in focused work with broad campus participation over Summer 2008. Summer work groups of more than 40 faculty, classified staff, students, and administrators were formed to address seven critical planning initiatives, all tied to the Commission’s Recommendations (College of San Mateo’s Follow-Up Report, October 15, 2008, http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/accredinfo/followup.asp). (Ref. 3)

The Comprehensive Evaluation of Labs and Centers Work Group was one such group initially comprised of five faculty members and PRIE’s Dean and PRIE’s Planning Coordinator. They were later joined by the post-retirement Dean of Business/Creative Arts who agreed to assist PRIE staff in coordinating the activities throughout the resolution of the Recommendation. The group immediately identified the task of designing a Program Review document that would be used in a Spring 2009 comprehensive evaluation of CSM’s very diverse Labs and Centers. They determined that the new Program Review instrument for the Labs and Centers would need to include the assessment of SLO’s, qualitative data about student satisfaction, and quantitative data about student performance outcomes.

The work group designed an online Lab Inventory Questionnaire, which was tested by the work group and administered by PRIE staff in August 2008 to the staff and faculty who oversaw the 17 Labs and Centers. Data collected through the Lab Inventory Questionnaire provided additional information regarding the scope and variety of student use and revealed that three labs also had “local” student satisfaction survey instruments in place for their students and confirmed that the various labs have a myriad of learning activities, staffing, tracking mechanisms, attendance policies, etc. (Lab Inventory Questionnaire, 2008, http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/labs_centers.php). (Ref. 4)
During the fourth week of the Fall 2008 semester, this survey, with sample statements of purpose and SLO’s from three Labs in the Language Arts Division, was sent electronically to those responsible for the Labs and Centers (Inventory of Labs and Centers, http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/labs_centers.php). (Ref. 5)

**Fall 2008: Identifying Short- and Long-term Strategies for Implementation of Labs’ & Centers’ Program Review**

Several findings resulted from the summer work group’s efforts and from the review of the comprehensive inventory of Labs’ and Centers’ practices. They include:

- **Need to Adapt the Program Review Template**
  CSM’s new Program Review needed to be tailored to the issues specific to the Labs and Centers yet remain consistent with the newly-adopted College model for Program Review. What’s more, it needed review by and input from all the faculty leads for Labs (approximately 30 individuals) and approval by the Academic Senate.

- **Need to Develop and Conduct a Student Self-Assessment**
  The only short-term strategy that would allow PRIE staff to retrieve student success data about users of individual Labs and Centers and create unique profiles of students in each program would be through the administration of an online student self-assessment. This online survey would result in feedback from students about their Lab experiences along with enabling PRIE to create profiles of the users.

  Students would provide their student numbers (G numbers) while completing the assessment. The resulting student outcomes and demographic data (to be retrieved and analyzed by PRIE) would be limited to those students who voluntarily completed the self-assessment.

- **Need to Implement a Long-Term Student Tracking Mechanism**
  A long-term strategy had to be implemented that would allow consistent tracking of student attendance and learning activities and thus enable study of the correlation between students’ usage and their academic performance.

**Fall 2008-Spring 2009: Developing the Program Review Template**

From Fall 2008 through Spring 2009 the Labs’ and Centers’ faculty leads, PRIE staff, and the post-retirement Dean crafted a template for a comprehensive Labs’ and Centers’ Program Review. A subset of this template was a new data template prepared by PRIE for the Labs and Centers which mirrored the data used in the new Instructional Program Review (Core Program and Student Success Indicators: Fall
This new data template, Labs and Learning Centers Student Profile: Spring 2009, would provide a portrait for each Lab of its unique student users and include data on those students' ethnicity, age, gender, units enrolled, number of courses, day/evening enrollments as well as a list of those courses in which the students were concurrently enrolled (sorted by discipline and ranked by number). All data was eventually derived solely from the student respondents to the Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey administered in late Spring 2009. The Labs and Centers lead faculty and deans would be provided with these data as part of the Program Review packet. (See: Student Profile and Quantitative Data posted online for each Lab and Center, http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/labs_centers.php.) (Ref. 7)

The final template, Program Review of Labs and Centers, was approved by the Academic Senate Governing Council on May 12, 2009 (May 12, 2009 Minutes, Academic Senate Governing Council, http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/academicsenate/meetings_minutes.asp). (Ref. 8)

The Program Review of Labs and Centers template encompasses the following:

- SLO’s, their identification and assessment specific to the Lab or Center
- Institutional General Education SLO’s assessment
- Findings from the Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey (administrated online by PRIE in Spring 2009)
- Staffing Overview and Needs
- Productivity
- Student Success Evaluation and Assessment (data was to be derived from the Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey and the student outcomes data provided by PRIE as well as sources like CSM’s new Educational Master Plan, 2008
- Reflective Assessment of Internal and External Factors Affecting Student Success
- Proposed Action Steps and Expected Outcomes
- Summary of Resources Needed to Achieve Outcomes (Program Review of Labs and Centers, May 2009, [template] http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/labs_centers.php.) (Ref. 9)

Several faculty began work on their Program Reviews in May 2009, several completed their Program Reviews over the summer, and another group finished
their work in early Fall 2009. All completed Program Reviews are posted online at the PRIE website:
http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/lab_center_completed_program_review.php. (Ref. 10)

**Fall 2008-Spring 2009: Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey**

As noted above, the Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey was initially based on a pilot survey developed by Anatomy faculty as well as the local paper survey instruments historically used by faculty in the Math Lab, ESL Center, and Writing Center.

The faculty leads from each facility reviewed the results of the student survey submitted to PRIE from December 2008 to January 2009. They then reached consensus that the survey would contain a core of 15 common questions to be used in all Lab or Center surveys. Each program was provided with the opportunity to include additional survey questions to probe local issues and activities unique to its instructional environment. The following Labs and Centers responded with requests for additional questions: Accounting, Assistive Technology Center, ENGL 800 Lab/Writing Center, ESL/Reading Center, and Nursing Lab. In all, PRIE created 17 online surveys. (See sample: Writing Center/ENGL 800 Student Survey, http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/UltimateSurvey/takeSurvey.asp?surveyID=213.) (Ref. 11)

The Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey was finalized in March 2009 and administered May 8-22, 2009 in all Labs and Centers. An online survey was created for each campus Lab, each with a unique URL for online access. The online survey was distributed via email invitation (which contained a web link to the survey) to students enrolled in courses associated with the various Labs and Centers. For example, all students enrolled in any Foreign Language course were sent an email inviting participation in the survey. In addition, a link to the online survey was installed on various computer workstations in each of the Labs and Centers with computers. This link provided on-site survey access to students using the Labs. In several cases, such as in selected ESL, Reading, and English classes, faculty brought their regular classes into the those Labs and Centers associated with their courses to allow students to complete the surveys.
A total of 1,448 survey responses were received.

**Data and Information Provided For Labs and Centers Program Review**

As noted above, PRIE staff compiled the Program Review data for the 17 Labs and Centers during May 2009 by means of the online Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey (Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey, http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/labs_centers.php.) (Ref. 12)

At the completion of the Spring 2009 semester, PRIE staff matched valid student identification G Numbers provided by survey respondents with the BANNER student academic history database. This match enabled PRIE to create a profile of student users of each of the CSM Labs and Centers.

**Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey: Quantitative Responses and Narrative Comments:**

The Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey consisted of 15 core items probing overall student satisfaction with various aspects of Lab and Center operations such as hours of operation, availability of assistance, an assessment of the extent to which Lab work assisted student academic performance in courses linked to the Lab, and a self-assessment of gains made on the 12 Collegewide General Education SLO’s.

Because not all Labs and Centers have linked courses and each program environment is unique, survey instructions directed respondents to skip questions not applicable to their Lab experience. Some Lab surveys had supplementary questions which probed unique aspects of a Lab’s learning environment. (See sample: Writing Center/ENGL 800 Student Survey, http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/UltimateSurvey/takeSurvey.asp?surveyID=213.) (Ref. 13)

Survey participation was voluntary and respondents were given survey instructions directing them to skip individual survey items if not applicable or they did not understand the question. Accordingly, the number of responses to each survey item (the “n”) varied. Summary presentation of data was posted on the PRIE website for each Lab and Center (http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/labs_centers.php). (Ref. 14)
In addition to scaled responses to individual survey items, the survey instrument provided the opportunity for narrative comments as well as one open-ended question soliciting general feedback about the student Lab experience. PRIE provided the verbatim text of student narrative comments (with names removed) in a separate document accompanying the summary of quantitative survey responses. These narratives were not posted online but emailed to the lead faculty conducting the Program Review and their deans.

Student Profile:

As noted above, that students voluntarily provided G Numbers enabled PRIE staff to create a demographic and academic profile of Lab users. PRIE matched G Numbers to students’ Spring 2009 academic history and initial College application databases.

Also posted on the PRIE website were the demographic profile (ethnicity, gender, and age) of Lab users and a snapshot of students’ Spring 2009 course enrollment patterns. PRIE also included collegewide comparison data as a context for the Lab-user profile. The Lab-user profile includes data about:

- Total number of courses enrolled;
- Total units enrolled;
- Day vs. evening course enrollments;
- Top 25 courses enrolled (sorted by greatest enrollment); and
- All course enrollments (sorted by discipline/department).

In addition to the above profile, each report included student Lab users’ academic success, non-success, and retention rates in all courses enrolled, Spring 2009. The data included counts of survey respondents’ total Spring 2009 course enrollments. As a parallel to the core indicators used in the College’s Comprehensive and Annual Instructional Program Review, these rates were disaggregated by key demographic variables of ethnicity, gender, and age with collegewide comparison data.

Because of the voluntary nature of these surveys, the number of student responses available for analysis for a few Labs was small and these populations could not be viewed as typically “representative.” This problem has been alleviated with the implementation of SARS-TRAK software in Fall 2009, which will track all students using all campus Labs and Centers. Although student satisfaction survey participation will
always remain voluntary (and thus comprise a sample of users), the SARS-TRAK tracking system will enable reliable tracking of all students who use Lab services. Most importantly, SARS-TRAK will allow for correlating levels of Lab usage with student academic success in specific courses associated with a Lab, as well as overall College academic performance.

**Spring 2009-Fall 2009 Scheduling and Reporting Systems (SARS-TRAK)**

One outcome of the 2008 summer work group was the decision for CSM to use SARS-TRAK software in each Lab and Center to provide a complete and accurate accounting of student use in all campus Labs. SARS-TRAK is proprietary software with the capacity to record students' use of Labs' and Centers' services and it has been used by the Anatomy Lab, Assistive Technology, Integrated Science Center, Math Resource Center, Coastside Lab, and many Student Services units to track student usage. It was also chosen as the best option to facilitate the research and analysis reporting needs of our Lab Program Review—specifically, the tracking of student lab usage with academic success and performance in coursework supported by Lab services and programs.

A computer workstation at each Lab or Learning Center prompts students to automatically record their arrivals and departures each time they visit a Lab. Students enter their college ID number using a keyboard or touch screen. Log-in and log-out times are stored in a database which allows for the generation of summary reports indicating times and dates of services used, the amount of time spent at each Lab, and student course enrollments associated with Lab visits. Local SARS-TRAK databases are integrated with District network servers and student enrollment databases.

In preparation for implementation of SARS-TRAK during the Spring 2009 semester, PRIE's Dean and the post-retirement Dean interviewed all Lab staff to inventory current Lab space configurations, computer hardware/workstation availability, access to districtwide computer network servers, and furniture and space needs required for the installation of SARS-TRAK software. In addition, they consulted with SARS-TRAK (SARS Software Products) staff and District computer network
administrators and technical staff to delineate the necessary system requirements associated with the installation of SARS-TRAK software in campus Labs.

The District’s Information Technology Services (ITS) staff, working with Lab instructional aides, installed SARS-TRAK software on individual computer workstations in each Lab during July and August 2009 prior to the Fall 2009 semester. Labs requiring additional computer workstations to host SARS-TRAK software were identified and computers secured and installed by ITS staff during this time. An instructional aide was assigned responsibility for working with each Lab to configure the SARS-TRAK software to meet the unique needs of each program, including the set-up of student menus displayed on computer check-in screens. In addition, she has trained individual Lab staff about SARS-TRAK software functionality and custom report generation.

All campus Labs and Centers now have SARS-TRAK software installed.

**ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS ACHIEVED TO DATE**

CSM has successfully addressed this Recommendation.

Developing and implementing all aspects of this Program Review through a consensus model has been a massive effort that involved more than 50 individuals. They included the Vice Presidents of Instruction and Student Services, faculty, instructional aides, deans, ITS technicians and senior ITS staff, and all PRIE staff as well as members of the Accreditation Oversight Committee.

From May to early September 2009, faculty and staff completed comprehensive Program Review for all Labs and Centers. The Program Review addresses the ACCJC’s Standards, including the need to evaluate program effectiveness through the assessment of student outcomes. Data analysis considered a variety of quantitative and qualitative data, including student feedback and student performance outcomes. A new Program Review template was developed through a consensus of all the lead faculty in the Labs and Centers with assistance from PRIE (http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/labs_centers.php). (Ref 15.) In addition, the new Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey can be used regularly for comparative analysis and assessment. (Ref 16.)
What’s more, the College has addressed the long-term issue of identifying a means to implement computerized tracking of all students in all Labs and Centers. As noted above, SARS-TRAK has been installed in all Labs in Fall 2009 to track student usage. A PC at each Lab prompts students to record their arrivals and departures and the reasons for their visits. And, as noted above, SARS-TRAK student data will also enable PRIE staff, through matching with BANNER student academic history, to make correlations between student academic success in Lab-affiliated coursework and share their findings with faculty and staff.

**EVIDENCE OF THE RESULTS**

In addition to the evidence provided throughout this narrative, all the completed narratives for the comprehensive Program Review of Labs and Centers, including data supporting the assessment, are posted online at the PRIE website along with the supporting documentation. (See: [http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/lab_center_completed_program_review.php](http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/lab_center_completed_program_review.php) (Ref 17.)

Because of overlap between some of the Labs and Centers’ mission or because several programs shared facilities and staff, the final completed Program Reviews are organized and posted online as follows:

- Accounting Lab
- Anatomy Lab
- Assistive Technology Center
- Basic Skills Lab (Coastside location)
- Business Microcomputer Lab (combined with Business Students Lab)
- Computer Forensics Lab and Computer and Information Science Lab (posted together)
- Foreign Language Center
- Integrated Science Center
- Math Resource Center
- Multimedia Lab (posted as Media)
- Nursing Lab
- Reading and ESL Center (posted together)
- Speech Lab
- Writing Center and English 800 Lab (posted together)
ADDITIONAL PLANS

Beginning this Fall 2009 semester, the Academic Senate will conduct an assessment of the Instructional and Student Services Program Review models implemented last year along with an assessment of the Program Improvement and Viability Process (PIV). The new Program Review of Labs and Centers will be assessed as well.

Participants in this assessment will include the staff, faculty, deans, and PRIE staff who all worked to craft, use, and implement the new model.

In addition, the functionality of the new SARS-TRAK student tracking system, used for the first time on such a large scale at CSM, must be assessed from multiple perspectives. Those perspectives include students, faculty, instructional aides, and PRIE staff who will—beginning in early Spring 2010 when Fall 2009 grades are available—match the SARS-TRAK data with the Banner student academic records to retrieve student outcomes data.

Results of these assessments will be used to improve the effectiveness of the processes and their outcomes.

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 6:
INCORPORATION OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES INTO THE EVALUATION PROCESS OF FACULTY AND OTHERS

Recommendation #6: It is recommended that the District develop and implement appropriate policies and procedures that incorporate effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes into the evaluation process of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes. (Standard III. A.1.c.)

RESOLUTION OF THE RECOMMENDATION

The Vice Chancellor, Human Resources and Employee Relations, in consultation with the president of the AFT and the president of the District Academic Senate, is planning discussions concerning the incorporation of student learning outcomes into the faculty evaluation process. Currently, staff are identifying and assessing model evaluation forms and processes used by other California community colleges that have successfully addressed this standard in their official evaluation process and procedures. Once the process and procedures most compatible with the San Mateo County Community College District have been identified, then the
incorporation of that process and those procedures must be negotiated in order for them to become an official component of the District’s faculty evaluation process. The Vice Chancellor, Human Resources and Employee Relations, will be meeting with union representatives in early Fall 2009.

**DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 9:**

**EVALUATION OF RULES AND REGULATIONS, EVALUATION OF COLLEGE PRESIDENTS, AND DELINEATION OF FUNCTIONS**

**Recommendation 9.a.:** The board of trustees should regularly evaluate its “rules and regulations” and revise them as necessary. (Standard IV.B.1.e)

**RESOLUTION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

On August 13, 2008, the Board of Trustees adopted the amended version of District Rules and Regulations Section 2.08 which establishes a two-year schedule for review of each of the eight chapters in Rules and Regulations. (See “Evidence” below.) (Ref 18.)

In collaboration with the Academic Senate, a decision was made to start with Chapter Six (Academic Programs) due to the fact that a number of changes in Title V that require changes in the District policies have been recently made.

The District also contracted with the California Community College League for its Policy and Procedures Update Service. This service provides a model set of policies and a regular update service. This service will be consulted for all reviews of District Rules and Regulations.

**ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS ACHIEVED TO DATE**

The District Academic Senate completed its review of 26 sections of Chapter Six (out of a total of 37 sections) and granted its approval for the amendment of those sections and the deletion of four policies. The results of the District Academic Senate’s review were shared with the District Shared Governance Council (DSGC) in September 2008; the Board of Trustees approved the changes at two separate meetings: on September 24, 2008 and December 10, 2008.

The remaining sections of Chapter Six (11 policies) continue to be reviewed by the Academic Senate; it is expected that these sections will be ready for Board
approval in Fall 2009 or early Spring 2010. (See SMCCCD Policies Awaiting Review by the District Academic Senate.) (Ref.19)

Chapter 7 of Rules and Regulations (Student Services) underwent review by the Academic Senate and Vice Presidents of Student Services in Spring 2009; reviewed and revised policies were presented to the District Shared Governance Council in late Spring and; and 18 reviewed and revised polices were approved by the Board of Trustees in May 2009. An additional three polices were approved in July 2009.

Staff also reviewed Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 of District Rules and Regulations in Fall 2008, made appropriate revisions, and shared the results with the District Shared Governance Council. The Board of Trustees approved 16 reviewed or revised policies in Chapter 1 on February 25, 2009, and on March 25, 2009. The Board also approved the review or revision of 23 polices in Chapter 2 in May 2009.

Finally, District staff reviewed and revised four miscellaneous polices in Chapter 8, which were approved by both the District Shared Governance Council and the Board of Trustees in September 2008, January 2009, and May 2009.

A summary of the approvals of these polices is shown in SMCCCD Board of Trustees Changes in Rules and Regulations. (Ref 20.)

**EVIDENCE OF THE RESULTS**

As noted above, the Board of Trustees approved the following section which establishes a regular process for the review of Rules and Regulations.

**2.08 Rules and Regulations**

1. The Rules and Regulations adopted by the Board for the District have been written to be consistent with the provisions of law, but do not encompass all laws relating to the District’s activities. All District employees shall be expected to know and shall be held responsible for observing all provisions of law pertinent to their activities as District employees.

2. Any rule or regulation may be suspended by a majority vote of the Board, which vote shall be taken by roll call and shall be entered in the minutes of the meeting.

3. The Rules and Regulations governing the District may be amended by a majority vote of the Board at any meeting. Amendment shall be
made by repeal of the existing rule and, if required, the enactment of a new rule.

4. Additions, amendments, or deletions in Rules and Regulations which directly affect students or staff members are ordinarily introduced for first reading at one Board meeting and acted on at a subsequent meeting.

5. The Board will review and update each chapter of Rules and Regulations on the following two-year schedule:
   - Fiscal Year 1, Quarter 1: Chapter 6
   - Fiscal Year 1, Quarter 2: Chapter 7
   - Fiscal Year 1, Quarter 3: Chapter 5
   - Fiscal Year 1, Quarter 4: Chapter 4
   - Fiscal Year 2, Quarter 1: Chapter 3
   - Fiscal Year 2, Quarter 2: Chapter 2
   - Fiscal Year 2, Quarter 3: Chapter 1
   - Fiscal Year 2, Quarter 4: Chapter 8

6. District Rules and Regulations Section 2.06 assigns responsibility to the Academic Senate to advise the Board on eleven different areas of “academic and professional” matters. Rules and Regulations changes which impact any of the eleven areas will be reviewed by the Academic Senate prior to being sent to the Board for approval.

7. District Rules and Regulations Section 2.09 assigns responsibility to the District Shared Governance Council (DSGC) to advise the Board on nine different governance matters. Rules and Regulations changes which impact any of these nine areas will be reviewed by the DSGC before being sent to the Board for approval.

8. District Rules and Regulations will be posted on the District’s website.

9. Administrative procedures implementing Board-adopted policies shall be developed by designated administrators subject to approval of the Chancellor.
   Procedures shall be consistent with and not in conflict with policies adopted by the Board.

Reference: Education Code 70902

**ADDITIONAL PLANS**

The Academic Senate continues to review 11 outstanding policies in Chapter 6 and these are expected to be adopted by the Board of Trustees in 2009-10. (See SMCCCD Policies Awaiting Review by the District Academic Senate.) (Ref. 21)
The District Shared Governance Council is expected to complete its review of 21 outstanding polices, from Chapters 1, 2, 6, and 7, this fall and they will be brought to the Board for approval in Fall 2009. (See SMCCCD Policies Awaiting Approval by District Shared Governance Council.) (Ref 22.)

Once these policies are approved by the Board, staff will begin work on Chapter 5 as called for in the newly revised policy 2.08.

**Recommendation 9.b:** In order to fully meet Standards regarding district evaluation procedures, while the district has clearly defined rules and regulations for the hiring and evaluation of the chancellor, that same clarity of process should be extended to evaluating college presidents; therefore, the district should develop rules and regulations for the evaluation of college presidents. (Standards IV.B, B.1.j)

**RESOLUTION OF THE RECOMMENDATION**

On June 11, 2008, the Board of Trustees added Rules and Regulations Section 2.03, College President, to address evaluation of the College Presidents. (See attached and below.) (Ref. 23) In July 2008, the annual evaluation of the Presidents was conducted in accordance with this new policy. In Summer 2009, another annual evaluation of the College Presidents was conducted in accordance with the policy.

**ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS ACHIEVED TO DATE**

The new policy is in place.

**EVIDENCE OF THE RESULTS**

The policy has been adopted and CSM’s President has been evaluated. Two cycles of annual evaluation of the Presidents have been completed. (Ref. 24)

On June 11, 2008, the Board of Trustees added Rules and Regulations Section 2.03, College President:

**2.03 College President**

1. The Board of Trustees and Chancellor shall employ a President at each of the three Colleges within the District.

2. The Chancellor shall delegate to each College President the executive responsibility for leading and directing the College operations including Administrative Services, the Office of the President, the Office of the Vice President of Instruction, the Office of the Vice President of Student Services, Research, Marketing, and Public Relations.
3. The College President shall establish administrative procedures necessary for the operation of the College.

4. The College President shall perform all duties specifically required or assigned to him/her by the statutes of the State of California, by the Chancellor and by the Board of Trustees of the San Mateo County Community College District.

5. The College President will be evaluated by the Chancellor and Board of Trustees annually based upon goals previously established and agreed upon by the Chancellor, Board of Trustees and the College President and in accordance with any other provision of the Contract for Employment for the College President.

6. The compensation of the College President shall be in accordance with the pay schedule established for the College President and placement of the salary in the range shall be made by mutual consent between the Chancellor and the College President.

**ADDITIONAL PLANS**

The District has established the necessary policy and procedures, so no additional plans are necessary at this time.

**Recommendation 9.c** The district and colleges should collaborate to implement a process to regularly evaluate the delineation of functions and widely communicate those findings in order to enhance the college’s effectiveness and institutional success. (Standard IV.B.3.g)

**RESOLUTION OF THE RECOMMENDATION**

The District Accreditation Coordination Committee, consisting of members from the Colleges and the District Office, reviewed this recommendation and met in August 2008 to review the proposed process for evaluating the delineation of functions using the “function map” created for the 2007-2008 accreditation self-study (Standard IV.B.3.g) (Process for Evaluation Delineation of Functions and San Mateo County Community College District Function Map.) (Ref. 25 and Ref. 26) The process will require the Colleges and District to review the function map on a regular basis so that findings can be documented and communicated widely in order to enhance the Colleges’ effectiveness and institutional success.
ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS ACHIEVED TO DATE

The District has developed a process for evaluating the delineation of functions and communicating the findings (Process for Evaluation Delineation of Functions). (Ref. 27)

EVIDENCE OF THE RESULTS

The process is approved and adopted (Process for Evaluation Delineation of Functions). (Ref. 28)

ADDITIONAL PLANS

As approved by various governance groups at both the College and District levels in late 2008, the evaluation of the delineation of functions is scheduled to begin in February 2010 and the results of this review will be widely communicated to the College community.

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 10: EVALUATION OF COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

The response to this recommendation is found in Recommendation 9.b.
UPDATE: ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

AND

SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE PROPOSAL

This section is an update for the ACCJC and for CSM’s community for informational and documentation purposes. The Commission’s Recommendations addressed below have either been resolved through CSM’s Follow-Up Reports (October 2008) and Additional Documentation (December 2008) or are required to be resolved by the Mid-Term Report, 2010.

**COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 1: PLANNING**

*Recommendation 1.a.*: College of San Mateo should develop specific, measurable, realistic, and time-bound objectives in relation to its stated goals; conduct consistent, systematic, and timely evaluations for all its plans based on analyses of both qualitative and quantitative data; and ensure that the results are communicated and understood by college constituencies. Further, in order to promote and sustain a culture of evidence and improve institutional effectiveness, the College should establish and implement a clear, systematic, consistent, and ongoing method of measuring and evaluating its effectiveness in achieving stated institutional performance and student learning outcomes. (Standards I.B.2 through 7)

*Recommendation 1.b.*: College of San Mateo will integrate and align its various plans and ensure that they are fully implemented. (Standards I.B.2, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2)

*Recommendation 1.c.*: College of San Mateo will complete its Educational Master Plan expeditiously, no later than fall 2008. In addition, the College must demonstrate that decisions regarding building priorities result from the priorities of the Educational Master Plan (Standard III.B.2.b)

With regard to Recommendation 1, at the time of the October 2008 report, the college is expected to have completed its educational master plan, will have included program review data on such student achievement data as course completion, retention, program completion, degrees and certificates awarded, and where available and applicable such as transfer, job placement, and results of licensure exams.

Implementation of CSM’s new integrated planning model began in Fall 2008, as reported in the Follow-Up Report (2008). The model was designed to promote genuine, broad-based participatory governance and a campus climate in which institutional decision-making is transparent and supported by a wide variety of data and information. And at this time, when CSM—like all community colleges in the State—is faced with enormous budgetary challenges, this model is being tested and refined. While CSM may be compelled to restructure and redefine its offerings and programs, it can now do so through planning processes that are now more explicit, reliant on meaningful dialogue, and supported by evidence.
The narrative below summarizes how CSM continues to refine and improve this planning model.

**Planning Goals and Philosophy**

The overarching goals of CSM’s institutional planning efforts are to ensure that the College meets the needs of students by establishing and measuring SLO’s, that the College responds to the ever-changing educational needs of the community at large, and that resources are aligned so that the College can achieve these goals.

Inherent in the College’s planning system is a well-defined integration of key institutional plans; a reliance on internal and external data to inform decision-making and to facilitate evaluation at all levels in the organization; transparent and predictable planning processes; and mechanisms to evaluate the effectiveness of decisions made as well as planning processes.

At the foundation of the College’s planning efforts is a commitment to institutional dialogue. The effectiveness of institutional dialogue depends on three factors: the planning system itself; the willingness of every individual to become informed and engaged in departmental, division, and college-wide decisions; and a commitment from the various committee representatives to inform and seek input on issues from their respective constituencies.

**Evolution and Assessment of College Plans**

As the Institutional Planning Committee has been able to conduct its work over the past year, it has continuously assessed the utility of the primary planning documents. At the time of the previous Follow-Up Report (2008) they included:

- 2008-2013 College of San Mateo Strategic Plan
- College of San Mateo Educational Master Plan, 2008 (EMP)
- Planning Calendar
- Program Review, 2008
- Program Improvement and Viability process plans

The EMP continues to play a central role in the decision-making processes, especially at a time when data and information must be accurate and well-understood. What’s more, the College has now completed a one-year cycle of
Program Review using the new model crafted in 2008. This new model specifically asks programs to assess their SLO’s as well as analyze detailed information on program efficiency and student success outcomes. (These data were provided for each program by PRIE as the Core Program and Student Success Indicators.) During the Fall 2009 semester, the Academic Senate will conduct an evaluation of this new Program Review model (and the related PIV process). (For completed 2008-2009 Student Services, Instructional, and Labs’ and Centers’ Program Reviews and related data, see: http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/program_review.php.)

(Ref. 29)

However, to more sharply articulate priorities for the institution, particularly at a time of scarce resources, IPC has worked to collapse and hone several of the goals in last year’s 2008-2013 College of San Mateo Strategic Plan into a new document, Institutional Priorities 2008-2011 (Institutional Priorities 2008-2011, http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/institutional_documents.php). (Ref. 30)

In the process of updating Institutional Priorities for CSM, IPC has clarified the reporting relationships among planning groups and among the plans themselves. (See Figure 2.)
And to ensure that progress in addressing these new Institutional Priorities can be measured, CSM has created the College Index, 2009-2010, which is comprised of 60 measures and indicators of institutional effectiveness. Each indicator is aligned with an Institutional Priority. PRIE is currently working with IPC to complete the identification of quantifiable targets for 2009/2010 as some of the baseline data for 2008/09 is not yet available (College Index, 2009-2010, http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/institutional_documents.php). (Ref. 31)

Progress in meeting the target indicators will be monitored by IPC, both formatively and summatively, as one of the primary methods for the institution to measure its effectiveness. The summative assessment of the institutional planning process will occur in May 2010 and CSM will continue to improve its processes based on the results of the assessment.
Institutional Committees and Issue-Specific Plans

After one year of implementation, the institutional planning committee structure has been sharpened and the committees are all active with clearly articulated missions. To foster campus-wide communication and collaboration, the institutional planning committees post their agenda and meeting summaries at a central site hosted by PRIE (See: http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/institutionalcommittees/).

In addition, they all have responsibilities to complete the initial drafts for new college-wide plans by November 5, 2009. Such plans include: Distance Education Plan, Technology Plan, Human Resources Plan, Budget Planning Committee Plan, and Enrollment Management Plan, among others. (See Figure 2.)

A template, Key Issues for Issue-specific College-wide Plans, developed for these plans, details a common structure for these plans.

Each plan must be supported by a rationale that cites the evidence and planning assumptions which led to the recommended goals articulated in the plan. Goals are expected to be measurable, realistic, and time-bound. Plans are also expected to use quantitative and qualitative methods of evaluating institutional effectiveness in meeting the individual plan’s goals.

In addition, plans need to address:

- Indicators contained in the College Index or in the Comprehensive Listing of Indicators and Measures
- Recommendations contained in CSM’s Educational Master Plan, 2008 (EMP)
- Priorities and Objectives articulated in CSM’s Institutional Priorities, 2008-2011
- Findings and themes discussed in the Annual and Comprehensive Program Reviews
- Activities outlined in the Division Unit Annual Workplans

(The Key Issues for Issue-specific College-wide Plans, 9/1/09 http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/institutionalcommittees/) (Ref. 32)

The planning horizon for this cycle is four years so that plans will be synchronized with CSM’s current accreditation cycle. Thereafter the planning horizon will be 3 years for new plans, also synchronized with the accreditation cycle.

It is the role of the Institutional Planning Committee to ensure that the plans address the Institutional Priorities and are consistent with the findings and recommendations from CSM’s EMP. In addition, IPC will make recommendations to College Council
Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE)

PRIE has planned an active role in supporting all aspects of the integrated planning model. Its mission is to enhance and foster the institutional effectiveness of CSM by providing information, data, analysis, training, and research to support the operation, decision-making, and planning processes of the College community. PRIE continues to be responsible for conducting a wide range of analytical support and consultative services, including support of institutional planning as a participatory process.

COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 3: DISTANCE EDUCATION

Recommendation #3: In order to meet distance education accreditation standards and ACCJC distance education policy, the College must evaluate the educational effectiveness of electronically delivered courses including assessment of student learning outcomes, student retention, and student and faculty satisfaction. As a result of the site visit, it was determined that the College may have several certificates and degrees where 50% or more of the requirements are delivered via distance learning. The team recommends that the College notify the Accrediting Commission and submit a substantive change proposal which will validate the program's adherence to the accreditation standards. (Standards II.A.1.b, d, II.B, 1, II.B.2, 2.a, II. C.1, II.C, 2.c)

With regard to Recommendation 3, at the time of the October 2008 report, the College will demonstrate significant progress in evaluating distance learning courses and establish a plan to complete reviews by October 2009.

Evaluation of Distance Learning Courses

As reported in CSM’s last Follow-Up Report (2008), CSM has completed a comprehensive evaluation of its distance learning offerings. It has identified several gaps in the program, including the comparatively low rates of success for distance learning students. The evaluation was guided by the ACCJC’s Distance Learning Manual (2008) and resulted in a detailed plan and timeline to address those gaps, as reported to the Commission. Further, the need to improve the effectiveness of its distance learning program is now explicitly an Institutional Priority:
“Priority #2: Promote Academic Excellence/Objective 2.6: Improve effectiveness of distance learning program.”
(Institutional Priorities 2008-2011, September, 2009
http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/institutional_documents.php) (Ref. 33)

In addition, measurable indicators for growth in distance learning offerings are included in the new College Index, 2009-2010, which contains the core indicators of institutional success, aligned with the Institutional Priorities (College Index, 2009-2010, http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/institutional_documents.php). (Ref. 34)

CSM’s new Distance Education Committee (DEC) is now established as one of the core institutional planning committees which reports to the Institutional Planning Committee, the College strategic planning entity. DEC’s mission is to: “create a framework to facilitate the development of distance learning instruction in response to student and community needs” (DEC’s Vision, Mission, Tasks, 2009, http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/institutionalcommittees/distanceeducation.asp). (Ref. 35)

As a group of discipline experts, DEC forms a critical role in advising the Committee on Instruction about matters related to approval and review of distance learning courses and the articulation and enforcement of standards for distance learning at CSM. It also will help develop strategies to address the achievement gaps between students enrolled in distance mode classes vs. those enrolled in comparable traditional mode courses.

DEC’s charge includes:

- Advising the Committee on Instruction about the review and approval of academic course outlines;
- Advising the Dean of Distance Education regarding issues related to professional development and faculty compliance with standards related to teaching in distance modes;
- Coordinating with the district’s Distance Education Advisory Committee;
- Coordinating with Technology Services (ITS) regarding training and support needs;
- Implementing the plans, DL Priorities, and the DL Quality Assurance Review; (as reported in the Follow-Up Report, 2008); and
- Coordinating with the Technology Committee in the development of the Technology Plan.

The tasks DEC articulated for its work in 2009 have included:
• Helping shape a college vision of distance education;
• Providing direction for course and program development in the distance education mode;
• Guiding departments, faculty, and staff towards an efficient, effective, and consistent use of the distance education mode;
• Recommending policies for quality and academic rigor of all distance education classes;
• Encouraging faculty participation in distance learning initiatives and making recommendations on assistance and support in the development of courses, course materials, and the use of appropriate learning technologies;
• Helping guide student accessibility and promote distance education courses as a viable option for pursuing educational goals; and
• Promoting the investigation and use of emerging technologies and resources to support the enhancement of teaching and delivery of distance education courses.

**Status of Substantive Change Report**

A draft of College of San Mateo’s Substantive Change Proposal was submitted in September 2009 by the Vice President of Instruction to ACCJC for its preliminary review. The final version will be submitted again to the Commission before January 2010 for its final consideration at the ACCJC’s February 2010 meeting.

CSM is requesting approval from the ACCJC to offer 57 Associate Degrees, 14 Certificates of Achievement, and 15 Certificates of Specialization in the distance learning mode. CSM also requests approval to offer CSM’s general education program through the distance learning mode.

Completion of the Substantive Change Proposal has been extremely beneficial because it provides information critical to the development and/or expansion of distance education at CSM. The College now has a comprehensive inventory as well as a well-documented history of enrollment trends. This data is now being shared with faculty, staff, and administrators as a catalyst for promoting robust discussions about the role of distance education at CSM and about ways to increase student success.
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This Institutional Progress Report is submitted for the purpose of responding to the District recommendations made to the College by the Commission in its letter of January 31,2008.

We certify that there were opportunities for broad participation by the campus community, and we believe that this progress report accurately reflects the nature and substance of Skyline College.
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Preparation of the report

This report addresses some recommendations made to Skyline College by the evaluation team that visited the campus in October, 2007. Skyline is one of three colleges in the San Mateo County Community College District. The recommendations addressed in this report are those that were to be resolved at the district level.

Responses to the individual recommendations were prepared by Jing Luan, Vice Chancellor for Educational Services and Planning with assistance from Harry Joel, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources. These responses were sent in August, 2009 to Skyline’s accreditation liaison officer, Rob Johnstone. Dr. Johnstone and the co-chairs of the accreditation steering committee that produced the 2007 report - Donna Bestock for the administration and Ray Hernandez for the faculty - were given the task of compiling and editing the report and seeing it through the shared governance process.

Dr. Johnstone, Ms. Bestock and Mr. Hernandez made a presentation to the Skyline College Council on August 26, 2009 at which they outlined the process and timeline to be followed and discussed the specific responses to recommendations. College Council consists of the college president, the two vice presidents, and the presidents and vice presidents of the Academic Senate, Classified Council and Associated Students. The Council approved the proposed process.

In the period between September 8 and October 7, 2009, consultations took place with each of the shared governance constituents and the campus at large. A presentation was made to the Academic Senate on Sept 11, to the Associated Students on Sept. 14 and to the Classified Council on October 1. The managers were consulted by email. Originally a presentation had been scheduled for the managers’ meeting of Sept 8, but that meeting was cancelled so that the college could hold a forum to discuss a shooting incident. The draft document was also made available to the entire community by emailing it to all employees and inviting feedback. Comments and suggestions gathered from all of these consultations were then used to prepare the final draft. The final draft was presented to College Council by email. After being signed by the college president, the report was sent to the Board of Trustees for approval at their meeting October 14, 2009.
**Skyline College - ACCJC Follow up Report Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Committee to review timeline, district responses  
ALO, Administrator, Classified Staff, Faculty, Student                                      | 8/24-28/2009  |
| Present Timeline/Plan to College Council                                                                                                        | 8/26/2009     |
| Draft of ACCJC follow up report presented to college constituency groups and distributed college wide for review/feedback.                  | 8/31/2009 – 10/07/2009 |
| Committee to incorporate feedback and finalize follow up report                                                                                | 10/07/2009    |
| Present final report to College Council for approval                                                                                           | 10/08/2009    |
District Recommendation #1:

It is recommended that the District develop and implement appropriate policies and procedures that incorporate effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes into the evaluation process of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes.

Response:

The Vice Chancellor, Human Resources and Employee Relations, in consultation with the president of the AFT and the president of the District Academic Senate, is planning discussions concerning the incorporation of student learning outcomes into the faculty evaluation process. Currently, staff are identifying and assessing model evaluation forms and processes used by other California community colleges that have successfully addressed this standard in their official evaluation process and procedures. Once the process and procedures most compatible with the San Mateo County Community College District have been identified, then the incorporation of that process and those procedures must be negotiated in order for them to become an official component of the District’s faculty evaluation process. The Vice Chancellor, Human Resources and Employee Relations, will be meeting with union representatives in early fall 2009.
District Recommendation #2

In order to fully meet Standards regarding district evaluation procedures, while the district has clearly defined rules and regulations for the hiring and evaluation of the chancellor, that same clarity of process should be extended to evaluating college presidents, therefore the district should develop rules and regulations for the evaluation of college presidents. (Standards IV.B, B.1.j)

Resolution of the Recommendation: On June 11, 2008, the Board of Trustees added Rules and Regulations Section 2.03, College President (see immediately below) to address evaluation of the College Presidents. In July, 2008, the annual evaluation of the Presidents was conducted in accordance with this new policy. In Summer, 2009, another annual evaluation of the College Presidents was conducted in accordance with the policy.

Evidence of Results and Analysis of the Results Achieved To Date: The newly adopted policy and completion of two cycles of annual evaluation of the Presidents is the evidence of results.

Additional Action: No additional action is necessary.

2.03 College President
1. The Board of Trustees and Chancellor shall employ a President at each of the three Colleges within the District.

2. The Chancellor shall delegate to each College President the executive responsibility for leading and directing the College operations including Administrative Services, the Office of the President, the Office of the Vice President of Instruction, the Office of the Vice President of Student Services, Research, Marketing, and Public Relations.

3. The College President shall establish administrative procedures necessary for the operation of the College.

4. The College President shall perform all duties specifically required or assigned to him/her by the statutes of the State of California, by the Chancellor and by the Board of Trustees of the San Mateo County Community College District.

5. The College President will be evaluated by the Chancellor and Board of Trustees annually based upon goals previously established and agreed upon by the Chancellor, Board of Trustees and the College President and in accordance with any other provision of the Contract for Employment for College President.

6. The compensation of the College President shall be in accordance with the pay schedule established for the College President and placement of the salary in the range shall be made by mutual consent between the Chancellor and the College President.

(7/08)
District Recommendation #3

In order to fully meet Accreditation Standards and improve effectiveness of evaluation in the college and district, it is recommended that:

a. The board of trustees should regularly evaluate its “rules and regulations” and revise them as necessary. (Standard IV.B.1.e)

b. The district and colleges should collaborate to implement a process to regularly evaluate the delineation of functions and widely communicate those findings in order to enhance the college’s effectiveness and institutional success. (Standard IV.B.3.g)

Resolution of the Recommendation 8a: On August 13, 2008, the Board of Trustees adopted the amended version of District Rules and Regulations Section 2.08 (see immediately below), which establishes a two-year schedule for review of each of the eight chapters in Rules and Regulations. In collaboration with the Academic Senate, a decision was made to start with Chapter Six (Academic Programs) due to the fact that a number of changes in Title V have been made recently that require changes in the District policies.

The District also contracted with the California Community College League for its Policy and Procedures Update Service. This service provides a model set of policies and a regular update service. This service will be consulted for all reviews of District Rules and Regulations.

Evidence of Results and Analysis of the Results Achieved To Date: The District Academic Senate completed its review of 26 sections of Chapter Six (out of total of 37 sections) and granted its approval for the amendment of those sections and the deletion of four policies. The results of the Academic Senate’s review were shared with the District Shared Governance Council in September, 2008; the Board of Trustees approved the changes at two separate meetings: on September 24, 2008 and December 10, 2008.

The remaining sections of Chapter Six (11 policies) continue to be reviewed by the Academic Senate; it is expected that these sections will be ready for Board approval in Fall 2009 or early Spring 2010.

Chapter 7 of Rules and Regulations (Student Services) underwent review by the Faculty Senate and Vice Presidents of Student Services in Spring 2009; reviewed and revised polices were presented to the District Shared Governance Council in late Spring and; and 18 reviewed and revised polices were approved by the Board of Trustees in May, 2009. An additional three polices were approved in July 2009.

In addition to that, staff reviewed Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 of District Rules and Regulations in Winter, 2008, made appropriate revisions and shared the results with the District Shared Governance Council. The Board of Trustees approved 16 reviewed or revised policies in Chapter 1 on February 25, 2009 and March 25, 2009. The Board also approved the review or revision of 23 polices in Chapter 2 in May, 2009.
Finally, District staff reviewed and revised four miscellaneous polices in Chapter 8, which were approved by both the District Shared Governance Council and the Board of Trustees in September, 2008, January 2009 and May 2009.

A summary of the approvals of these polices is shown in Attachment A

**Additional Plans**

The Academic Senate continues to review 11 outstanding polices in Chapter 6 and these are expected to be adopted by the Board of Trustees in 2009-10 (see Attachment B). The District Shared Governance Council is expected to complete its review of 21 outstanding polices from Chapters 1, 2, 6 and 7 this Fall and they will be brought to the Board for approval in Fall, 2009 (see Attachment C).

Once these policies are approved by the Board, staff will begin work on Chapter 5, as called for in the newly revised policy 2.08 (see below).

**2.08 Rules and Regulations**

1. The Rules and Regulations adopted by the Board for the District have been written to be consistent with the provisions of law, but do not encompass all laws relating to the District’s activities. All District employees shall be expected to know and shall be held responsible for observing all provisions of law pertinent to their activities as District employees.

2. Any rule or regulation may be suspended by a majority vote of the Board, which vote shall be taken by roll call and shall be entered in the minutes of the meeting.

3. The Rules and Regulations governing the District may be amended by a majority vote of the Board at any meeting. Amendment shall be made by repeal of the existing rule and, if required, the enactment of a new rule.

4. Additions, amendments, or deletions in Rules and Regulations which directly affect students or staff members are ordinarily introduced for first reading at one Board meeting and acted on at a subsequent meeting.

5. The Board will review and update each chapter of Rules and Regulations on the following two-year schedule:

   - Fiscal Year 1, Quarter 1: Chapter 6
   - Fiscal Year 1, Quarter 2: Chapter 7
   - Fiscal Year 1, Quarter 3: Chapter 5
   - Fiscal Year 1, Quarter 4: Chapter 4
   - Fiscal Year 2, Quarter 1: Chapter 3
   - Fiscal Year 2, Quarter 2: Chapter 2
   - Fiscal Year 2, Quarter 3: Chapter 1
   - Fiscal Year 2, Quarter 4: Chapter 8
6. District Rules and Regulations Section 2.06 assigns responsibility to the Academic Senate to advise the Board on eleven different areas of “academic and professional” matters. Rules and Regulations changes which impact any of the eleven areas will be reviewed by the Academic Senate prior to being sent to the Board for approval.

7. District Rules and Regulations Section 2.09 assigns responsibility to the District Shared Governance Council (DSGC) to advise the Board on nine different governance matters. Rules and Regulations changes which impact any of these nine areas will be reviewed by the DSGC before being sent to the Board for approval.

8. District Rules and Regulations will be posted on the District’s website.

9. Administrative procedures implementing Board-adopted policies shall be developed by designated administrators subject to approval of the Chancellor. Procedures shall be consistent with and not in conflict with policies adopted by the Board.

Reference: Education Code 70902  
(Rev.8/08)
### Policies Awaiting Approval by District Shared Governance Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>The San Mateo County Community College District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2.13</td>
<td>Dissemination of Employee Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2.19</td>
<td>Nondiscrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2.20</td>
<td>Equal Employment Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2.25</td>
<td>Prohibition of Harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2.28</td>
<td>Safety: Injury and Illness Prevention Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2.29</td>
<td>Sexual Assault Education, Prevention, and Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2.51</td>
<td>Reporting of Crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>Emergency Response Plan (Eliminate 7.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2.60</td>
<td>Resignations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>Multiple and Overlapping Enrollments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>Grading and Academic Record Symbols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>Community Education Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*7.03</td>
<td>Eligibility Requirement for admission of International Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*7.07</td>
<td>Non-Resident Student Tuition Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>Student Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>Speech: Time, Place and Manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>Student Credit Card Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>Student Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>Student Disciplinary Sanctions (eliminate 7.71 and 7.72)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Presented to DSGC in May 2009; members took to constituencies for review
## Policies Awaiting Review by District Academic Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>Minimum Class Size Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>Course Repetition [eliminate 7.35(4)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>Credit by Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>Academic Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>Articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>Pass-No Pass Options [eliminate 7.35(6)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>Educational Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>Academic Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>Field Trips and Excursions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>Nursing Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District Recommendation #3b

The district and colleges should collaborate to implement a process to regularly evaluate the delineation of functions and widely communicate those findings in order to enhance the college’s effectiveness and institutional success. (Standard IV.B.3.g)

Resolution of the Recommendation: The District Accreditation Coordination Committee, consisting of members from the Colleges and the District Office, reviewed this recommendation and met in August 2008 to review the proposed process for evaluating the delineation of functions using the “function map” created for the 2007-2008 accreditation self-study (Standard IV.B.3.g); see proposal immediately below. The process will require the Colleges and District to review the function map on a regular basis so that findings can be documented and communicated widely in order to enhance the Colleges’ effectiveness and institutional success.

Evidence of Results and Analysis of the Results Achieved To Date: The District has developed a process for evaluating the delineation of functions and communicating the findings. The proposed process shown below is evidence of results.

Additional Action: As approved by various governance groups at both the College and District levels in late 2008, the evaluation of the delineation of functions is scheduled to begin in February 2010 and the results of this review will be widely communicated to the College community.
Process for Evaluating Delineation of Functions

Background

In the 2007-2008 Accreditation Self Studies, the three Colleges incorporated a Function Map, which had been developed and adopted by the District Accreditation Coordination Committee* based on the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) policy directives. The Function Map was reviewed by the District Shared Governance Council in April 2007 and was later adopted by the Chancellor’s Council. At the conclusion of the 2007 Accreditation site visits, one of the recommendations from ACCJC states that:

“The district and colleges should collaborate to implement a process to regularly evaluate the delineation of functions and widely communicate those findings in order to enhance the college’s effectiveness and institutional success. (Standard IV.B.3.g)”.

The District Accreditation Coordination Committee met on Wednesday August 13, 2008 to address this recommendation. The committee recommended that the Colleges and the District review the Delineation of Functions Agreement every three years with the first round of review commencing during the spring 2010 semester and before the three Colleges Mid-term Accreditation Report period (Reports due to the Commission Oct 15, 2010). The committee further recommended that a committee, named “Delineation of Functions Review Committee” (DFRC) be established to coordinate the Districtwide delineation of function review efforts, including communicating findings and seeking approval.

Process

The District Accreditation Coordination Committee has established the following review process adopted by the College Councils and the District Shared Governance Council (DSGC)**:

February 2010 – each College Council appoints a representative to the Delineation of Functions Review Committee (DFRC) and begins review of the Delineation of Functions at the College level.

Mid-spring 2010 – DFRC convenes to communicate the findings made by the individual College Councils and to prepare one coordinated response. The results of their work will be sent back to both the College Councils and the District Shared Governance Council for review and information and dissemination to their respective constituents. Following the review, the findings will be forwarded to the Chancellor for adoption by the Chancellor’s Council.

Fall 2010 – findings are widely communicated to the Colleges and the District Office for the purpose of enhancing the institution’s effectiveness and success.
Spring 2013 – the next review process convenes and will continue on a three-year cycle.

*Consisting of College and District Accreditation Liaison Officers (ALOs) and Self-Study Co-chairs.
** Board Policy 2.09 District Shared Governance Council, section 5.c “Appropriate roles and involvement in accreditation.”
BOARD REPORT NO. 09-10-1C

FINANCING PLAN FOR CAÑADA VISTA

There is no printed report for this agenda item.
HIGHLIGHTS OF CENSUS COMPARISONS

Comparing the fall 2008 and fall 2009 Census, the following changes are noted:

**District**
- The overall percentage distribution of student headcount at the three colleges remained relatively stable: 25% Canada, 39% CSM and 36% Skyline.
- The total student headcount in fall 2009 was 29,360. Compared to fall 2008, the total district student headcount increased by 2,135 students, or 7.8%.
- Compared to fall 2008, all age groups increased, most notably are the surges among students in the 18-20 and 21-24 age groups who collectively accounted for 67% of the total increase.
- Compared to fall 2008, Day and Evening students increased by 868 or 15.3%, more than either Day or Evening students alone. In addition, there were 643 more students with BA or higher degrees (14.2% increase) in fall 2009 than in fall 2008. Full-time students increased twice as much as Part-time students (13.4% vs. 5.7%).

**Cañada College**
- Cañada College’s total student headcount in fall 2009 was 7,248. Compared to fall 2008, the total college student headcount increased by 687 students, or 10.5%.
- Compared to fall 2008, all age groups increased with more younger students in the 18 to 29 age groups who collectively accounted for 64% of the total increase. Day and Evening students increased by 242 or 18.8% in fall 2009.
- Compared to fall 2008, Full-time students increased three times as much as Part-time students (22.1% vs. 7.1%).

**College of San Mateo**
- CSM’s total student headcount in fall 2009 was 11,508. Compared to fall 2008, the total college student headcount increased by 293 students, or 2.6%.
- Compared to fall 2008, students in the 18-20 age group increased the most by 232 students (7.4%), but there were slight decreases in students in the age groups 30 through 59.
- Compared to fall 2008, Day and Evening students increased by 306 or 14.9% in fall 2009 while Evening students dropped by 257 (-6%). Relatively speaking, Full-time students increased more than Part-time (7.7% vs. .6%).

**Skyline College**
- Skyline’s total student headcount in fall 2009 was 10,604. Compared to fall 2008, the total college student headcount increased by 1,155 students, or 12.2%.
- Compared to fall 2008, all age groups increased, except for those younger than 18 who had a decrease of -14.5%. Evening students increased the most (17.1%) compared to either Day (5.5%) or Day and Evening students (13.8%).
- Compared to fall 2008, there were 822 more students whose education level was High School or Equivalent and 293 more students with BA/BS Degrees or higher.

Official fall 2009 Census Day was September 8.
Analysis: VC-ESP
Data provided by Hyperion Real-time Census Report, ITS, and Suki Chang
## Headcount Distribution

### Colleges & District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cañada</th>
<th>CSM</th>
<th>Skyline</th>
<th>SMCCCD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>11,215</td>
<td>4,791</td>
<td>4,791</td>
<td>16,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of SMCCCD</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students</td>
<td>6,561</td>
<td>5,148</td>
<td>5,148</td>
<td>11,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of SMCCCD</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4,181</td>
<td>4,636</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>2,454</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>2,876</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Ethnicity</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>146.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>112.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 18</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or more</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Enrollment Pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day Students</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>2,899</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Students</td>
<td>2,656</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day &amp; Evening Students</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calif. Residents</td>
<td>6,347</td>
<td>7,016</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Calif. Residents</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Highest Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not a High School Graduate</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>-97</td>
<td>-10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent High School</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent Adult School</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Grad or Equivalent</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td>4,205</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/AS Degree</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS Degree or Higher</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time &gt;= 12 units</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time &lt; 12 units</td>
<td>5,087</td>
<td>5,448</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Class Standing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5 - 14.5 units</td>
<td>3,185</td>
<td>3,341</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0 - 29.5 units</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.0 - 44.5 units</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.0 - 60.0 units</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.5 or more</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cañada</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>Skyline</td>
<td>SMCCCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of SMCCCD</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and District</td>
<td>6,561</td>
<td>7,248</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>11,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 18</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or more</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Pattern</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Students</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Students</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day &amp; Evening Students</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calif. Residents</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Calif. Residents</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a High School Graduate</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-10.4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent High School</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent Adult School</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-11.8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Grad or Equivalent</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAAS Degree</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS Degree or Higher</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time &gt;= 12 units</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time &lt; 12 units</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Standing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 - 1.45 units</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0 - 29.5 units</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.0 - 44.5 units</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.0 - 60.0 units</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.5 or more</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SELECT GRAPHIC COMPARISONS

Overview Fall 2009

% Distribution of Student Headcount by College - Fall 2009

- Cañada: 25%
- Skyline: 36%
- CSM: 39%

Headcount % Change Fall 2008 - 09

- Cañada: 0.0%
- CSM: 2.0%
- Skyline: 14.0%

Gender Distribution Fall 2009 (Excluding "Unknowns")

- Female
- Male

Gender % Change Fall 2008 - 09 (Excluding "Unknowns")

- Female
- Male
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UPDATE ON SAN MATEO ATHLETIC CENTER

There is no printed report for this agenda item.