

Glendale Community College

Midterm Report

Submitted by:

Glendale Community College
1500 North Verdugo Road
Glendale, California 91208

Submitted to:

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

Date Submitted:

[date]

2. Midterm Report Certification Page

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

From:

Dr. David Viar
(Chief Executive Officer)

Glendale Community College
1500 North Verdugo Road
Glendale, California 91208

I certify there was broad participation/review by the campus community and believe this report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

Signatures:

(Dr. David Viar, Chief Executive Officer) (Date)

(President, Board of Trustees) (Date)

(President, Academic Senate) (Date)

(President, Faculty Guild) (Date)

(President, CSEA) (Date)

3. Table of Contents

4. Report Preparation

The preparation of the Midterm Report was organized by the Institutional Planning Coordination Committee (IPCC), a governance committee charged with coordinating the College's strategic planning and other institutional effectiveness efforts. A task force of the IPCC was delegated the responsibility for assembling all relevant supporting evidence and writing initial drafts of the responses to the commission's recommendations for improvement. This work occurred during the summer of 2019. At the start of fall 2019, the Academic Senate approved the creation of work groups tasked with reviewing and finalizing the responses to the recommendations. Seven work groups were constituted, one for each recommendation for improvement. These groups consisted of experts whose positions at the College are associated with the subject matter relevant to the recommendation. Work groups varied in the number of their participants but all consisted of at least one member from each classified staff, faculty, and administration constituent group. The work groups' resulting drafts were finalized by the end of November 2019 and constituted the substance of the Midterm Report. Beginning in December 2019 and continuing through the spring of 2020, the Midterm Report was reviewed for input from, and approval by, all relevant governance committees and the Academic Senate, and culminated in the final version which was reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees in the summer of 2020.

5. Plans Arising from the Self-Evaluation Process

Standard I		
Standard	Item	Status
I.A.2	Continue dialog about critical thinking ILO based on task force recommendations	The Learning Outcomes Committee discussed focusing on the critical thinking ILO in spring 2018.
I.A.2	Initiate dialog about additional ILOs through Learning Outcomes Committee and task forces	The Learning Outcomes coordinators and committee have focused on the eLumen implementation and are planning to wait to discuss adding ILOs until eLumen has been used for several semesters.
I.B.3	Foster improved communication across divisions about learning outcomes	The implementation of eLumen has addressed this plan. After submission of student assessments in eLumen, faculty members are asked reflection questions regarding the class. Reflections may be accessed and shared at division meetings or retreats by the division's learning outcomes lead. This information will help identify gaps and will allow for better assessments of PLOs.
I.B.6	Expand efforts to allocate resources to mitigate gaps in student achievement and student learning identified in Student Equity Plan	The College has undertaken several expanded efforts to address achievement gaps, including participating in the National Assessment of Collegiate Campus Climates, coordinated by the USC Race and Equity Center, as well as the #RealCollege survey on student experiences, food insecurity, and housing insecurity coordinated by the Hope Center for College, Community, and Justice at Temple University. The College's Student Equity and Achievement Committee is being formed in 2019-2020 as part of the governance structure and a Student Basic Needs Task Force began meeting in fall 2019. The College continues to expand efforts to address achievement gaps.
I.B.9	Integrate existing plans more closely (see QFE Planning Project)	The College developed an online tracking system to track progress on the Institutional Master Plan and the Component Plans.

I.C.3	Continue to improve the accessibility of learning outcomes data to appropriate constituencies (see QFE LO Project)	The implementation of eLumen has improved accessibility of learning outcomes data to appropriate constituencies.
Standard II		
II.A	Improve reporting and use of assessment data	The implementation of eLumen has improved accessibility of learning outcomes data to appropriate constituencies.
II.A	Further develop accelerated learning programs	The College has implemented redesigned English and Mathematics curricula and is working to redesign the placement process for English as a Second Language.
II.A.6	Create guided pathways for students	Implementation of guided pathways is ongoing. A steering team coordinates the work of six workgroups addressing metamajors and program mapping, onboarding, professional development and communication, student, voice, implementation of Navigate software, and reorganization of developmental education in response to AB 705. Progress reports on guided pathways implementation are presented to the Board of Trustees on a monthly basis. As of fall 2019, the College is finalizing its metamajors and program maps.
II.A.6	Implement CMS & EMS	CMS (Curriculum Management System) has been implemented. The Curriculum & Instruction Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee are considering moving to a new software system for curriculum management to coincide with the California Community College Chancellor's Office adoption of a new system. EMS (Enrollment Management System) has not been implemented; its functions are being replaced with locally developed data dashboards.
II.C.3	Establish a Welcome Center	The Welcome Center has been established and is operating.
II.C.3	Establish a Multicultural Center	The Multicultural and Community Engagement Center has been established and is operating.

II.C.7 & II.C8	Investigate centralization of Admissions & Records across the Verdugo & Garfield Campuses	The College has discussed centralization of admissions functions across credit and noncredit but has decided not to fully integrate the processes. In fall 2019, the noncredit application process moved from a locally developed application to CCCApply, the same system used by the credit program.
II.C.6 & II.A.6	Change format of catalog to include when courses are typically offered and pathways to completion	The Catalog now shows in which terms courses are typically offered. Pathways are being defined and mapped. Career education has developed program web pages that clearly outline the pathways required to complete skill awards, certificates, and degrees.
II.C.2, II.C.5, II.C.6	Conduct dialog about student satisfaction with counseling based on student survey result of "helpfulness of counselors" at 66% excellent or good	Student Services has developed a strategic plan to address student satisfaction including but not limited to purchasing and implementing EAB Navigate, the implementation of Guided Pathways, ongoing team meetings and professional development. Cranium Café, software supporting online counseling, launched in spring 2019. Student panels discussing onboarding and success have been part of the annual Faculty Institute in fall 2018 and fall 2019.
II.C.2 & II.C.5	Develop an outreach/marketing plan to increase the utilization of noncredit counselors based on the survey result of 27% utilization of counseling at the Garfield Campus	Beginning in spring 2017, the College has added adjunct counselors to assist noncredit students with disabilities, career and academic counseling. In addition, the College has organized co-located community services with Glendale Youth Alliance, State Department of Rehabilitation, and the Verdugo Jobs Center to increase awareness and promote student use of the Career and Counseling Center at the Garfield Campus. The College is also setting up electronic noncredit student educational plans, updating orientation workshops, and developing a new student handbook. Efforts to rebrand and remarket the Garfield Campus began in spring 2019, with the help of the Office of Communications and Community Relations.

	Student Equity Committee will collaborate with Office of Research & Planning to develop a year-end project reports delineating the success rates of DI student groups with further disaggregation	The Student Equity Committee met monthly through spring 2019, when the committee was reorganized to become part of the new Student Equity and Achievement Committee. While the Student Equity Committee met, it reviewed data and regularly requested disaggregated data from Research and Planning. As the Student Equity and Achievement Committee begins its work, it will continue to request and discuss disaggregated data about student groups.
II.C.2 & II.C.5	Investigate options for conducting student satisfaction survey of services more frequently (currently every 3 years)	The Vice President of Student Services and the Research and Planning Office decided to conduct student satisfaction surveys of services every two years. Satisfaction items were included in the 2019 spring student survey; the items will be included next in 2021.
Standard III		
III.A.6	Division chair and administrator evaluations are currently being revised to reflect evidence of student learning	While Standard III.A.6 was deleted by the ACCJC at its January 2018 Board of Directors meeting, an item was added to the administrator evaluation: "Demonstrates knowledge of, commitment to, and productivity regarding institutional effectiveness initiatives (e.g. accreditation, learning outcomes assessment, planning) as appropriate to the job position."
III.A.13	College is in the process of creating consequences for violation of its code of ethics	Under Board Policy 2200, the Board of Trustees has the authority to uphold ethic violations. The Board "adopts and upholds a code of ethics & conflict of Interest Policy." The Guild Contract, Article III, Section 2B specifies the Due Process for faculty and the CSEA Contract, Article XVIII specifies "Disciplinary Procedures."
III.A.1	Update AR7123: recruitment and selection to reflect current practices including hiring committee composition and roles	Administrative Regulation 7123 was revised and approved by the Administrative Affairs Committee in spring 2019.
III.A.3	Update AR 7225: Division Chairs, Duties & Election	Administrative Regulation 7225 continues to be discussed. A meeting with the division

	Procedures to include qualifications necessary to perform duties of division chair	chairs and the Vice President of Human Resources is scheduled for January 8, 2020.
III.A.14	Develop regular systems for evaluating professional development activities	A new evaluation form for professional development for classified staff was created and implemented in 2018.
III.A.9	Develop methods for using data to determine appropriate staffing levels	<p>Student Services: The College is using SARS data for counselors (seeing what times the counselors are the busiest). The Welcome Center keeps a time stamp of students when they arrive. The College is piloting Qless, a software system for drop-in appointments.</p> <p>Academic: The college has recently increased staffing in areas for programs in Engineering, and CS/IS due to an increase in student enrollments. Those same increases have also created staffing in student labs to help support those same academic areas.</p> <p>Administrative: The College is starting a Position Control List where every position with an individual will be listed with the goal of obtaining accurate labor costs. The Administrative Executive Committee also began discussions of reviewing metrics for hiring committees SSHAC, IHAC, CHAC.</p>
III.B.2	Remodel Library according to recommendations from Library Consulting Services	The Library was remodeled using the recommendations from Library Consulting Services. Remodeling was completed in spring 2018.
III.B.4	Investigate possibility of a new local bond measure to fund facilities improvements	Measure GC was passed in November 2016. Facilities improvements are underway.
III.C.1	Redesign Glendale.edu website using current Web standards, navigation best practices, modern design, and responsive browsing experience	The College's website was redesigned in 2017.
III.C.1	myGCC: Update to work on all devices using	Beginning in fall 2019, the College is upgrading to PeopleSoft 9.2, which supports

	responsive modern look and feel	mobile devices and modern standards better than the current system.
III.C.1 & III.C.3	Strive to maintain technology currency by proactively maintaining, virtualizing, decommissioning, upgrading, or expanding systems, networks, software, computers, classrooms, labs, and info systems	The Learning Environment Enhancement Taskforce was created in spring 2018 and has developed a replacement/recycle plan. As of fall 2019, the Technology Master Plan is currently being revised and includes technology updates as a goal.
III.C.1, III.C.2, & III.C.3	Endeavor to proactively improve and deliver seamless, secure, easy to use, highly available, and integrated access to info systems	Improvement and integration of systems is part of the Technology Master Plan, which is being revised as of fall 2019. The implementation of EAB Navigate and its integration with PeopleSoft will allow students to have a single access point for guided pathways. In fall 2019, the application process was redesigned and automated to reduce the time between electronic application for admission and the assignment of a student ID number and email. In fall 2019, processes for credit and noncredit orientation were reviewed for improvements. PortalGuard was implemented for single sign-on, making interaction with College systems more seamless.
III.C.5	Continue to review, revise, and update all policies and procedures that guide the appropriate use of technology in support of the mission	Technology policies, like all other policies, are reviewed on a three-year basis. A Security Task Force was created in spring 2019. As of spring 2019, Board Policy 3720 (Computer Network Use) and Administrative Regulation 3720 (Using Information Technology Resources at Glendale Community College) are being reviewed.
III.C.1 & III.C.2	Follow Computer Refresh Plan to ensure updated technology available to students and employees	The Learning Environment Enhancement Taskforce was created in spring 2018 and has developed a replacement/recycle plan. As of fall 2019, the Technology Master Plan is currently being revised and includes technology updates as a goal. As of spring 2019, Zoho software is being used to track completion of the refresh cycle.

Standard IV		
IV.A.3	Revision of the Hiring Allocation Committee documents	In summer 2017, the work of a Senate task force led to the fall 2018 Senate and Academic Affairs approval of more efficient and meaningful IHAC (Instructional Hiring Allocation Committee) form. In spring 2018, an IHAC task force began work to reexamine and revise the IHAC process manual and timeline. In spring 2019, the Senate requested another revision of the IHAC form; a task force was created in March 2019. Also in 2019, the CHAC (Classified Hiring Allocation Committee) form was revised. SSHAC (Student Services Hiring Committee) chose not to revise its process.

6. Institutional Reporting on Quality Improvements

6.A. Responses to Recommendations for Improvement

Recommendation 1: *[Although original text is provided here, see note below for the Commission's change to the recommendation.]* In order to meet the **Standard and Eligibility Requirements**, the team recommends that when the College establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, including job placement rates, it consistently publishes this information. The team further recommends that when the College identifies gaps between performance and institution-set standards appropriate to its mission, it implements strategies to mitigate those gaps and evaluate the efficacy of those strategies. (I.B.3, I.B.6, ER 11, ER 19)

Note: The [action letter](#) from the Commission dated February 3, 2017 included the following text: "The Commission acted to change Recommendation 1 to a recommendation to increase institutional effectiveness. These recommendations do not identify current areas of deficiency in institutional practice, but highlight areas of practice for which College attention may be needed."

Recommendation 1 consisted of two components, the first regarded the College's consistent publishing of institution-set standards for student achievement, including job placement rates. The recommendation's second component emphasized that when the College identifies gaps between institution-set standards and performance, it implements strategies to mitigate the gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.

Component 1 of Recommendation 1 – Consistency of Information Published

Different Standards Were Published in Different Reports.

Regarding the recommendation's first component, the Evaluation Team Report stated that the job placement rate standards which were published in the College's 2014 and 2015 ACCJC Annual Reports were not consistent with those in the 2016 ACCJC Self-Evaluation Report and GCC's Institutional Effectiveness Report. The major reason for the apparent inconsistency lies in the different types of job placement rate standards mandated by the College's external entities.

The job placement rate standard published in the Institutional Effectiveness Report is required annually by the California Community College system and is: 1) a Chancellor's Office-set standard, and 2) a *singular* benchmark that applies *across* all Career Education programs at the College. This job placement rate is a standard assigned to the College by the Chancellor's Office. If the College disagrees with the assigned standard, it may negotiate a change in the standard. The standard applies to the aggregated job placement rate which is derived from averaging of the rates of all Career Education programs at the College and is therefore a single number.

In contrast, the job placement rate standards required by the ACCJC (and published in the ACCJC Annual Reports and ACCJC Self Evaluation Report) are program-set standards that: 1) are determined by the faculty experts of each academic program and approved by the Academic Senate, and 2) consist of a *different* standard enumerated for each individual academic program (rather than a singular collegewide standard that applied across all programs). Therefore, the standards for job placement reported in the Institutional Effectiveness Report and those reported in the ACCJC reports are --by their nature-- different. Although the College must continue to report these different types of job placement rate standards, it has taken steps to reduce any resulting confusion.

College's Actions Regarding Different Standards Published in Different Reports.

Reflection and discussion among the institutional researchers of the Office of Research & Planning has resulted in the establishment of a procedure designed to avoid confusion that might result from the different types of job placement rate standards reported by the College. Going forward, the various reports will now be presented with explicit language that explains how the College must report job placement rate standards in the ACCJC Annual Report and ACCJC Self Evaluation Report that are necessarily different than the job placement rate standard included in the Institutional Effectiveness Report. The providing of this explanation in institutional reports and webpages can give stakeholders much-needed context and should clarify the different types of job placement rate standards published by the College. This adopted practice can be verified: 1) at the College's [accreditation webpage](#) which houses ACCJC Annual Reports, 2) in the 2019 Institutional Effectiveness Report **[need to finalize report and insert link – to be done beginning of Spring 2020]**, and 3) at the College's webpage for the Office of Research and Planning which posts [institution-set standards](#).

In addition, both types of standards will be published in the Institutional Effectiveness Report and at the Institution-Set Standards webpage. Since the ACCJC Annual Reports are submitted through online portals which will not accommodate the publishing of the Chancellor's Office-set standard, the standard will instead be presented at the College's [accreditation webpage](#) that houses all submitted ACCJC Annual Reports. When the 2023 ACCJC Self-Evaluation Report is prepared, the section regarding ACCJC job placement rate standards will also include the Chancellor's Office-set standard along with an explanation of how its methodology varies from that of the ACCJC.

Alignment of Publication Schedules.

The Evaluation Team Report stated that the College reported standards for job placement rates in its 2014 and 2015 ACCJC Annual Reports that were not consistent with those reported in the 2016 ACCJC Self Evaluation Report. Specifically, the Evaluation Team Report indicated that the 2016 ACCJC Self Evaluation Report showed no standards below 50% whereas the 2014 and 2015 ACCJC Annual Reports showed rates that ranged between 0 and 80%. It is important to note why any college would revisit and adjust its standards from one year to the next: it is in keeping with good practice to do so. At the College, the 2014 and 2015 ACCJC Annual Report standards

were indeed between 0 and 80%. Prior to the Commission's recommendation, the College's process for program-set standards for rates of job placement involved Career Education faculty examining annual job placement rates each spring semester, adjusting their standards as needed, and the Academic Senate review and approval each fall semester. However, after the 2015 ACCJC Annual Report was submitted, the College revisited its process for the setting of job placement standards. Broad-based discussions occurred and included input from the Academic Senate and division chairs of Career Education programs. Consequently, the process was revised to ensure that the standards would be based upon examination of historical data and that resulting standards should never be under 50 percent for any program.

The [historical data](#) include, for each of the last nine years, the program's employment rate, number of program completers, and number of completers employed. Program faculty are also provided with data on the total number of completers for the last three years as well as the last seven years. Additionally given, are the average employment rates for the last three years and last seven-years. Program-level job placement rates are calculated using relatively small numbers of students and therefore can be subject to dramatic increases and decreases in placement rate from year to year. Consequently, the College chooses to focus on whether the three- and seven-year averages fell below set standards. In preparation for the 2016 ACCJC Annual Report, the division chairs –with input from the Academic Senate-- then applied the newly-revised practices when setting standards for each of their individual programs. Through that process, program-set of standards, which now had no standard below 50 percent, were approved and included in the 2016 ACCJC Annual Report. These revised standards were also included in the 2016 ACCJC Self Evaluation Report.

The Evaluation Team Report stated that the job placement standard published in the College's 2014-2015 Institutional Effectiveness Report included "xx" as a placeholder for the 2013-2014 CTE Employment Rate standard, a standard which was negotiated with the state of California. Prior to the recommendation, the Institutional Effectiveness Report was scheduled for routine publication each fall semester. In the fall semester of 2016, the College was still awaiting the negotiated rate from the Chancellor's Office and therefore did not have it available in time for the publication of the report. For this reason, the report with all of its various performance metrics was published on schedule but a placeholder had to be used for job placement rate. The mismatch in timelines regarding when various college reports are due and published led to the inconsistency in published standards.

College's Actions Regarding Alignment of Publication Schedules.

To ensure consistency among job placement rate standards published in the College's reports, the Office of Research & Planning has taken steps to eliminate the chance of mismatch due to differences in the cyclical timing for the publishing of those reports. Going forward, updates to the yearly reports that routinely publish these standards will now occur in the spring semester *shortly after the ACCJC Annual Report is submitted*. Specifically, the Institutional Effectiveness Report and institution-set standards webpage

will be updated in the spring semester to ensure that their published standards are in chronological alignment with those in the ACCJC Annual Report.

Component 2 of Recommendation 1: Addressing Gaps Between Performance and Standards.

Recommendation 1 consisted of a second component which regarded identifying gaps between institution-set standards and performance, implementing strategies to mitigate such gaps, and evaluating the efficacy of those strategies. Regarding aggregated, collegewide indicators such as course completion and transfer, the College regularly reviews its data to examine for any gaps between performance and institution-set standards. Each spring semester, the Academic Senate and Master Planning Committee engages in this review. To date, collegewide performance has not fallen short for any institution-set standard. At their [September 2019](#) meeting, the Academic Senate passed a motion to create a task force to draft a process for how should the College respond if it ever falls below one of these set standards. Based upon the recommendations of the task force, the Academic Senate approved a [policy](#) at their October 2019 meeting, that specifies the actions the College will take if performance on these collegewide indicators should become unacceptably low. The policy establishes that, in such instances, a group of functional experts associated with the affected performance indicator will: 1) identify the reasons why performance fell below the standard, 2) provide supporting evidence, 3) give recommendations on the appropriateness, or need for adjustment, of the set standard, and 4) develop, implement, and evaluate an action plan for improvement.

Prior to the Commission's recommendation, the College's process for program-set standards for rates of job placement and passing of licensure exam involved Career Education faculty examining annual job placement rates each spring semester, adjusting their standards as needed, and the Academic Senate review and approval each fall semester. In response to the recommendation, the College recognized the need to codify and implement a much more substantive process. An ad hoc task force of the Academic Senate was assembled to address the need to establish a procedure to follow when a department falls below its own set standard for job placement and passing of licensure exam. The task force held a number of meetings to discuss and develop the procedure. At their September 2017 meeting, the Academic Senate [approved](#) the recommendations of the task force for the new [process](#) (also described below in the response to Recommendation 2.)

To further support departments in following the process, in spring semester of 2018, online tools were provided to Career Education faculty for examining program performance data. The [Data Tools page](#) at Program Review website was augmented to include a [centralized hub](#) where faculty can examine labor market information from online dashboards and reports of the Centers of Excellence, Doing What Matters for Jobs and the Economy, Employment Development Department's Labor Market Division, Cal-PASS Plus, Los Angeles Economic Development Corporation & Center for a Competitive Workforce, and O*NET Online. Additionally, representatives of the Office of Workforce Development and the Office of Research and Planning jointly attended

Career Education division meetings throughout the spring semester of 2018 to give demonstration presentations of these online tools. Further, in June 2018, an all-day collegewide event was held during which the director of educational data and policy at West Ed discussed the Guided Pathways Initiative and led discussions and hands-on activities for Career Education faculty in the use of [Launchboard](#) which is a statewide data system that provides data on progress, success, employment, and earnings outcomes for California Community College students.

In September 2018, three Career Education departments fell below their set standards. In accordance with the Academic Senate's newly established process, the faculty of these programs engaged in dialog about program performance and established strategies for mitigating the gap between their performance and their standard. Those resulting outcomes from the discussions within the programs of [Graphic Design](#), [Restaurant Management](#), and [Web Development](#) were provided to the Academic Senate during its annual review and approval of program set standards. In their subsequent 2018 program reviews, the associated departments reported their planned strategies for improvement. To ensure that college leadership regularly reviews the operations, performance, and strategic planning of instructional departments, in the fall semester of 2018, deans and vice presidents, including those over Career Education programs, examined the program reviews for departments under their purview and reported out to the Master Planning Committee their top line takeaways. In the 2019 program reviews for those departments, faculty documented follow up on the efficacy of their strategies for improvement.

Recommendation 2: In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College revisits its institution-set standards on a regular basis to ensure they remain appropriate and useful for determining institutional effectiveness. (I.B.3, ER 11)

Institution-Set Standards for Collegewide Indicators.

Regarding aggregated, collegewide indicators such as course completion and transfer, the College regularly reviews for year-over-year trends in the data, examining for any gaps between performance and institution-set standards. Since it falls under their purview, the Academic Senate and Master Planning Committee engages in this regular review each spring semester. During such review, there is consideration regarding whether the standards continue to be appropriate and useful. For example, for the 2016-2017 academic year, the Academic Senate [increased](#) the standard for degree completion from 350 to 500 and for the 2017-2018 year, further [increased](#) it to 550. For broad sharing of information, these standards have also been occasionally included in presentations given to the board of trustees and classified staff although oversight of these standards are not the responsibility of these groups. In striving for continuous improvement, the Academic Senate has also [established stretch goals](#) for these collegewide indicators that heretofore have only had institution-set standards.

Institution-Set Standards for Job Placement Rate and Licensure Exam Pass Rate (A.K.A. “Program-Set Standards”).

Prior to the Commission’s recommendation, the College’s process for program-set standards for rates of job placement involved Career Education faculty examining annual job placement rates each spring semester, adjusting their standards as needed, and the Academic Senate’s review and approval each fall semester. In response to the recommendation, the College recognized the need to codify and implement a much more substantive process. An ad hoc task force of the Academic Senate was assembled to address the need to establish a procedure to follow when a department falls below its own set standard for job placement and passing of licensure exam. The task force held a number of meetings to discuss and develop the procedure. At their September 2017 meeting, the Academic Senate [approved](#) the recommendations of the task force for the new [process](#). The process establishes a specific and regular schedule for the data review, dialog about data, setting of program standards, and pursuit of actions for improvement. In the summer of 2017, all votes cast among instructional division chairs and instructional managers regarding the proposal were unanimously in favor. At their [September 2017 meeting](#), the IPCC also approved it.

The revised process has been followed in the time since its implementation. In 2018, three Career Education departments fell below their set standards. In accordance with the Academic Senate’s newly established [process](#), the faculty of these programs engaged in dialog about program performance and established strategies for mitigating the gap between their performance and their standard. Those resulting outcomes from the discussion within the programs of [Graphic Design](#), [Restaurant Management](#), and [Web Development](#) were provided to the Academic Senate during its annual [review and](#)

[approval](#) of program set standards. In their subsequent 2018 program reviews, the associated departments reported their planned strategies for improvement. In the 2019 program reviews for those departments, faculty documented the efficacy of their strategies for improvement.

Recommendation 3: In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College collect and disaggregate student learning outcome data for subpopulations of students to determine performance gaps and implement strategies for allocating resources to address those gaps. (I.B.6).

In order to enable individual student level assessment and allow disaggregation of assessment data, course and program learning outcomes were migrated from the home-grown database to eLumen. Course level learning outcomes were uploaded to eLumen during Summer 2017. Data was vetted against current course outlines of record posted on the Curriculum and Instruction website and the Curriculum Management System. Upon synchronizing eLumen with the Student Information System, PeopleSoft, conflicts between the three databases have required continual updates due to lack of synchronization. Currently, the college is considering migrating the existing Curriculum Management System to eLumen Curriculum to help mitigate errors and synchronize data.

In Fall 2018, college wide assessment in eLumen was deployed. First cycles within eLumen are to be completed by Spring 2021. There are divisions and areas that will be ready to run reports associated with student disaggregation as early as this Fall. Credit ESL, Health, and Kinesiology are some that will be able to review data and use it to view performance gaps based on subpopulations.

Every year since 2017, the annual [instructional priorities](#) developed by the Academic Affairs Committee has included “assist with the improvement of the use of learning outcomes assessments.” The purposes of instructional priorities are 1) to steer the work of the Academic Affairs Committee and 2) to identify areas that will receive priority for resource allocation.

Recommendation 4: In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College formalize and record its widespread, but often informal, efforts to assess student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels in order to improve student learning and support programs, to fine-tune processes, and to allocate resources as appropriate. (I.B.6, II.A.1, II.A.3, II.A.11).

Beta testing of the eLumen assessment process began in Fall 2017, with select divisions and areas with direct training and support. Initial feedback was supportive and deployment to the remaining campus in following terms with additional training and support provided campus wide. In December 2018, eLumen integration into Canvas was initiated to further support faculty. Currently, all course level assessments are conducted within eLumen. To support campus assessment dialog and understanding the Learning Outcome Coordinator has conducted workshops and open office hours for faculty since implementation (align to formal flyers).

Program Learning Outcome (PLO) assessment within eLumen has not been implemented. All PLOs have been uploaded to eLumen. In Summer 2019, all divisions and departments were provided with their current Program Learning Outcomes to confirm or update as needed.

In analyzing the former hierarchical mapping of Course/Program/Institutional learning outcomes, the Learning Outcome Committee approved changing to a split mapping system to improve data consistency and accuracy. (Minutes September 26, 2019) The mapping proposal was [approved](#) by the Senate on Thursday October 17, 2019.

To further support campus dialog the Learning Outcome Coordinator has attended various division and department meetings to discuss the use of eLumen, moving SLO changes through the curriculum process and how the information gained from disaggregated information can be used to examine performance gaps or successes. The migration process and dialogue on campus have triggered some needed changes that will be completed this fall, the change of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) to Course Learning Outcomes (CLO) and the rewording of the ILOs to improve fluidity. (will add minutes from senate and LO committee once completed)

Through the college dialogue and the change to eLumen the current best practices list is outdated. The development of a best practices that include eLumen and new processes is vital. This will be developed and formalized in the spring of 2020.

Recommendation 5: In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College assess the effectiveness of its current decentralized approach to student support labs and tutorial coverage and utilize the results to implement change as appropriate. (II.B.2)

At the [October 2016 meeting](#) of the IPCC, the recommendation was shared with the voting membership. This discussion served to ensure that relevant entities understood the meaning and import of the recommendation. At the committee's [May 2017 meeting](#), the College's dean of library and learning support was delegated primary responsibility for action steps to address the recommendation. His first action was to assess existing conditions with regard to student support labs and tutorial coverage. In the spring of 2017, he administered a survey to gather information from the college's various lab supervisors and tutoring managers regarding services that their area offered, types of training used for tutors, software utilized in labs, and any relevant student needs that still needed to be addressed. The [results of the survey](#) helped stakeholders understand all of the College's locations and types of learning support, services provided, technology relied upon, nature and extent of tutor training, and any unmet needs.

In the fall of 2017, a coordination effort was initiated among the College's various learning support areas. At a [September 2017 meeting](#) that brought together coordinators and managers over all areas of learning support, discussions served to explore future areas of collaboration. As a result of the meeting, multiple plans were agreed to:

- Develop an official training program for tutors of the Learning Center and Supplemental Instruction
- Ensure Supplemental Instruction tutors can access library study rooms and learning center meeting areas when no other space on campus is available
- Provide a centralized office location for the distance education and faculty development personnel in the newly constructed Faculty Innovation Center
- Coordinate work among personnel in the areas of faculty development, instructional services technical support, and distance education
- Disseminate the contact information for all area leads responsible for learning support to promote further collaboration

At IPCC's [October 2017 meeting](#), a progress report was provided to the voting membership and it was affirmed that high-level coordination and improvement of student support labs and tutoring would be centralized under the dean of library and learning support. The dean was working closely with: 1) the supervisors of student support labs to ensure cohesion in operations, and 2) managers over tutoring areas to develop alignment in tutor training. The dean would continue to convene all learning support coordinators and managers at least once a year (or more frequently, if needed) to review operations and discuss best practices.

Each of the plans were completed or had made substantive progress in the ensuing months. Coordination efforts began on a pilot project for increasing the effectiveness of

tutor training across the college. Since the College's Learning Center is recognized for its robust system of tutoring and high-level of quality due to years of data-driven continuous improvement, steps were taken to adopt a standardized method across the institution for training tutors using the Learning Center's time-tested procedures. The Learning Center's training of tutors is tailored to the needs of the subject matter delivery and includes substantial guidance on tutoring and instruction. [Feedback](#) results collected from Anatomy tutors trained in the pilot project indicated that the training was very helpful and effective. Discussions have occurred regarding how this tutor training might be expanded to Math which is the College's other major lab or instructional department that provides tutoring.

In the [fall of 2018](#), the deans associated with each of these learning support areas met to discuss learning support best practices already in place, and other processes to potentially implement. Through its participation in the California Virtual Campus-Online Education Initiative, the College had adopted NetTutor which supports online tutoring for distance education students as well as provides a standardized form of online tutoring for all course taking modalities. This leveraging of technology allows the College to greatly expand the availability of tutoring and thereby increase student access to learning support.

Also, to strengthen coordination between the College's tutoring and Supplemental Instruction (SI) efforts, the Learning Center coordinator completed training designed for supervisors of SI. This training is offered annually by the International Center for Supplemental Instruction at the University of Missouri-Kansas City and the training areas included: procedures for selecting SI courses and SI leaders, roles and benefits of supervisors and leaders, evaluation and funding of the program, training and supervision of SI leaders, theoretical frameworks underlying the SI model, and effective learning strategies and SI session activities. Completers of the training participated in SI simulations and were provided with SI Supervisor and SI Leader manuals for use and distribution at completers' institutions. As a result of this training, multiple outcomes were gained: 1) a greater understanding of the ways tutoring and SI are necessarily separate and distinct processes, 2) discovery of areas where tutoring and SI approaches overlap with regard to teaching and learning and could benefit from the same methods (e.g. pedagogical techniques like Flipped Classrooms), 3) identification of the types of training that tutors currently receive that should be additionally required of SI leaders (e.g. handling sexual harassment, active shooter, etc.), 4) training that increases the number of individuals who can train SI leaders at the College.

As a result of the fall 2018 meeting, a plan was developed in coordination with the Office of Communications and Community Relations to increase students' awareness of available learning support. This included the creation of a webpage to function as the centralized hub of all learning support available to students and to include the locations of learning labs on campus maps. There was also discussion about the possibility of designing a standard icon to be displayed on college buildings and on maps to help students know how to find learning support.

In the [fall of 2019](#), the lab coordination and collaboration workgroup reconvened to follow up on plans to improve communication and ensure consistency across open labs on campus and expand standardized tutor training across the College. The Learning Center and Biology division had successfully implemented specialized, truncated tutor training for tutors employed in the Anatomy lab. The tutor training sessions were extensive and evaluative feedback from student tutors indicated that the new training model had been very helpful and informative. Since the Mathematics Steering Committee was open to integrating components of the Learning Center's tutor training that can be applied to Math tutoring, specific proposals to expand tutor training to Math were discussed among the lab coordination and collaboration workgroup.

The workgroup reviewed progress on NetTutor which supports online tutoring for distance education students as well as provides a standardized form of online tutoring for all course taking modalities. Discussion included the 24/7 availability of the service which is free to students, the ways in which it is publicized to students, its integration in the Canvas learning management system, the number of hours students can use it, and the significant degree to which students at the College have utilized the service for writing and Math. The workgroup reviewed the various ways in which students are informed of learning support services. At the College's website is a centralized hub called [HelpFinder](#) which was designed to be a student-friendly resource that directs students to available student support, including learning support such as tutoring and SI. One of the most visible mediums that directly communicates information to students consists of the many large television displays mounted in indoor and outdoor locations across the College. These have provided a way to broadcast information about tutor support, through both eye-catching digital signage as well as through video. And, within the Learning Center, support services are publicized to students.

In summary, in the time since the College received the recommendation, it has assessed the effectiveness of its approaches to learning support and tutorial coverage. In seeking continuous development and enhancement, high-level coordination and improvement of student support labs and tutoring was centralized under the dean of library and learning support. Recurring meetings have taken place among learning support coordinators and managers to plan actions for improvement and ensure cohesion in operations. Numerous changes have been implemented, including a formal training program for Anatomy tutors based on the most applicable and useful elements of the existing tutor training program. This work has yielded positive results from the completers of the Anatomy tutor training and has provided an auspicious onramp for Math tutoring. The College will continue to strengthen coordination and collaboration regarding its learning support services.

Recommendation 6: In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College provide access to online counseling for students and identify methods to reduce wait time for counseling appointments. (II.C.5)

Online Counseling.

Throughout the year, the average wait time for a counseling services has been 17 minutes which is quite good when measured against comparable colleges. However, during priority registration periods, the average wait time can be considerably longer (e.g. in August 2018, it was 45 minutes). In pursuing continuous improvement and in response to the recommendation, discussions commenced among relevant committees with regard to steps that must be taken to provide online counseling for students and identify methods to reduce wait times for counseling appointments. At their [October 2016 meeting](#), the Student Affairs Committee discussed the recommendation and its significance in meeting of students' needs. This is the standing committee that presides over student services and student life matters at the College.

The use of technology to address the need for online counseling fell directly under the purview of the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) Committee and consequently the review of progress on the issue of online counseling became a routine agenda item for SSSP Committee meetings. For the 2016-2017 year, the College had purchased ConexEd's Cranium Café, which was the online meeting and collaboration platform selected by the California Community College's Online Education Initiative (OEI). In the SSSP Committee's [March 2017 meeting](#), the counselor and student services technician who were delegated the responsibility for implementing the technology discussed progress to date and future direction. The platform was a promising solution for online counseling because: 1) going forward, the cost would be wholly subsidized by the Chancellor's Office through its California Virtual Campus-Online Education Initiative, 2) it was ADA and FERPA compliant, and 3) it easily integrated with Canvas—the learning management system that the College was anticipating to adopt. Work soon commenced on integrating Cranium Café with SARS—the College's system for setting appointments, including those for counseling.

By the time of their next [meeting in April 2017](#), testing had begun on the compatibility and data sharing between Cranium Café and SARS to ensure that students would be able to make appointments for online counseling. For counselors who would be participating in the pilot of Cranium Café, demonstrations were provided that explored the various tools of the system. By the time of their [May 2017 meeting](#), the technical implementation of Cranium Café was completed to include full connection to SARS. In their [September 2017 meeting](#), the SSSP Committee was provided a demonstration of an online counseling session using a mock appointment between a counselor and another counselor playing the role of a student. Discussions then focused on logistics behind the sharing and completing of Admissions & Records and Financial Aid forms electronically, and with ensured confidentiality. To learn best practices for online counseling, the counselors who would be participating in the Cranium Café pilot underwent the OEI Online College Counseling Course and Orientation between February 5th and March 18 of 2018. As documented in the minutes of their [September](#)

[2018 meeting](#), the pilot for online counseling began at the College at the start of the fall semester of 2018 and concluded at the end of that semester.

Campus wide implementation Cranium Café began at the start of Spring 2019. Since that time, students have been able to engage in online counseling appointments. An informational campaign to promote awareness of this option has been ongoing through governance and non-governance committee meetings and flyers distributed throughout the college. The College's Counseling website includes a page specifically for information on how and when students can access online counseling ([Webpage for Online Counseling](#)). The counseling department is also taking steps to expand the hours during which online counseling is available to students.

Use of Multiple Modalities for Improving Student Access to Student Services.

At the College, students have the following modalities to access counselors for their counseling experience: In-person one-to-one counseling, group counseling and workshops, Student Development classes, online counseling, email communication, phone communication, texting functionality through EAB Navigate, Early Alert through PeopleSoft, and student club and organization advising. All of these modalities allow for access to students to remind them of counseling availability and resources for student growth and matriculation.

Each semester Academic Counseling sends email reminders to all enrolled students inviting them to make counseling appointments to develop or update their student education plans. These reminders help students meet with their counselors early in the semester to set up their Planner in preparation for the next term registration period. Along with helping students become fully engaged in their academic planning, this process also supports all counseling offices' efforts to provide services to students in a timely matter.

Mobile Counseling.

Mobile Counseling is a unique and purposefully decentralized counseling operation to foster the counselor-to-student experience. It is the goal of Mobile Counseling to house full-time and/or adjunct counselors in strategic office locations across the College and away from the "main counseling area" in order to help decrease the wait times to see a counselor, particularly during peak times of registration. Some examples of these decentralized locations include Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), Student Equity, Center for Students with Disabilities, Veterans Resource Center, and Student Outreach Center. Mobile Counseling provides students easier access in connecting with a counselor. At the Garfield campus, students can access counselors in the main hubs where students congregate. Students are able to receive counseling support from multiple areas on campus, away from the main counseling buildings.

Embedded Counseling.

Embedded Counseling is a student-centered innovation that helps students reach their educational and career goals by making available to them, counselors with highly-specialized academic and career information about their meta major. These counselors

will conduct outreach visits to specific gateway courses that mostly contain students in the meta major and will also be available for counseling sessions. Like Mobile Counseling, Embedding Counseling seeks to reach students “where they are” and adds to the number options students have for counseling.

Addition of Streamlined and Transformational Counseling Experiences.

A team of the College’s student services representatives attended a *Counseling in the Era of Equity* conference hosted by Skyline College and their Equity Institute in order to adapt transformative principles in student services. After evaluating existing processes with a more “student-ready” mindset, the general Academic Counseling department has recently implemented practices designed to reduce the wait times for counseling during priority registration periods while also ensuring students are receiving the services they need. This approach was discussed at the College’s own Counseling in the Era of Equity [retreat](#), [Student Affairs Committee](#), and [Faculty Meeting](#). At the heart of the redesigned process is a focus on student-centered service. This is reflected in the use of student staff as greeters who are employed to welcome all students who arrive at the general Academic Counseling department, determine the specific outcomes the student desires, and consequently guide the student on the next step. Based upon the student’s reported needs, the greeter will often describe to the student the specific type of appointment she/he will need that day and direct her/him to office of the appropriate counselor. The use of greeters in the Academic Counseling area aims to ensure students receive what they need and it also facilitates timely delivery of services.

The focus on student-centered service was likewise the basis of newly-categorizing three types of counseling services that not only address wait times, but also improve operational efficiency: Express Counseling, Express+ Counseling, and Transformational Counseling. The first two types function to quickly provide students solely the service they stopped in for and promptly get them on their way. Express Counseling is a quick fix for transactional items such as prerequisite clearances which typically require about five minutes. In Express+ Counseling, a counselor can spend a little more time with the student however, if not able fully serve the students’ needs, they can determine whether the student requires an on-the-spot appointment. Express+ Counseling aims for a 10 minute meeting duration. Transformational Counseling applies theory to practice and endeavors to move beyond the transactional functions of counseling. Using the full 30-to-60 minute appointment allotment, better rapport is developed between the counselor and the student with the intent to inspire return visits with the same counselor. The Transformational Counseling approach allows full-time counselors to get to know students, identify their needs (including but not limited to basic needs such as food, shelter, safety, etc.), determine if the student requires an abbreviated or comprehensive educational plan, and establish if they additionally need specialized consultation with a counselor in Career Services, Transfer Center, Career Education, EOPS, or Equity.

Recommendation 7: In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College develop a method for identifying, completing, and tracking timely evaluations of adjunct faculty. (III.A.5)

[Note: This section is being rewritten by Dr. Viar.]

At the [October 2016 meeting](#) of the IPCC, the recommendation was shared with the voting membership. However, it was emphasized that the information in the draft of the team evaluation report was not to be made public until the final, official recommendations were provided to the college in January 2017. At IPCC's [March 2017 meeting](#), the recommendation was again shared with the committee as a result of the official conclusions by the ACCJC. This discussion served to ensure that relevant entities understood the meaning and importance of the recommendation. In essence, the College had fallen short on ensuring timely evaluation of adjunct faculty according to the College's established schedule. From that point forward, progress on accreditation recommendations became a routine line item in the agenda of each IPCC meeting.

By the time of IPCC's [April 2017 meeting](#), the human resources (HR) manager was delegated primary responsibility for coordinating the action steps to address the recommendation. At the [May 2017 meeting](#), the committee engaged in a robust discussion to understand the current conditions surrounding adjunct faculty evaluations and the factors underlying why instructional divisions were not able to complete the evaluations in a timely manner. It was identified that part of the problem was due to a lack of information provided to the HR department regarding current status of adjuncts which is required in order to accurately track who needs to be evaluated. The HR department currently tracks evaluations manually and relies on this information from the instructional divisions. Additionally, there had been a shortcoming on the part of the instructional divisions in ensuring evaluations were actually completed in a timely manner. Discussion further explored the factors underlying why instructional divisions were not able to complete the evaluations. The meeting concluded with an action item to assemble a core workgroup to address the recommendation.

Beginning the summer of 2017, the HR manager led a series of fact-finding and problem-solving meetings with key personnel from the departments of instructional services, student services, HR, and IT. She also assembled ad hoc meetings with a core workgroup that consisted of the HR management, the vice president of instruction, the vice president of student affairs, the dean of research, planning, and grants, the dean of instructional services, the manager of accreditation and institutional effectiveness, and the faculty coordinator of planning and accreditation. The discussions of these meetings generally centered on clarifying business processes, understanding the tracking and transmittal of relevant data, and problem-solving for effective workflows. In essence, the ultimate goals of these meetings were to clarify: 1) what specific factors had made it difficult for the College to ensure timely completion of evaluations for adjunct faculty, and 2) the ways that structures or processes could be modified to ensure timely completion.

Research also began in earnest regarding online systems and the focus turned to the possibility of adopting employee performance evaluation modules of online systems that were already used by the College. Since NeoGov is the system for managing the application and onboarding phases of employment at the College, its module for employee evaluations was investigated. Also, research was initiated into expanding the use of Oracle since it was already used by the College for enterprise resource planning (ERP), including payroll. After a careful assessment of the compatibility of these options with the college's existing data sources and tracking systems for adjunct faculty, it was concluded that NeoGov's module appeared to be the most optimal solution since out-of-the-box, it was fairly ready for implementation. In contrast, the technicians for Oracle indicated that the system would require customized development in order to ensure compatibility with the relevant data sources.

At IPCC's [September 2017 meeting](#), the committee reviewed and discussed the work progress and its findings to date. Further discussion ensued regarding the complexity associated with adjunct faculty since the instructional divisions' need for part time instructors varies so much from term to term. The committee discussed the difficulty in reconciling data, processes, and practices associated with: 1) determining which adjunct faculty members are actively teaching during any single term, and 2) determining whether the active faculty member is due for an evaluation (given the College's policy for the frequency of evaluations). At IPCC's [October 2017 meeting](#), the vice president of administrative affairs urged the reconsideration of Oracle as the technology to facilitate evaluation of adjunct faculty. By this time, the College's chief information systems officer had taken employment elsewhere and his interim replacement notified the committee that Oracle was contacted to revisit the system's options. At IPCC's [November 2017 meeting](#), the committee was told that Oracle was a viable option and that further exploration would resume in the spring semester after the IT department and Office of Administrative Affairs implemented a high-priority system for the college's planning and budgeting. At IPCC's [April 2018 meeting](#), the committee was notified that a meeting was being scheduled to review technology options. By the time of IPCC's [May 2018 meeting](#), work had focused on a business process for how to reconcile the complexities associated with the data, processes, and practices relevant to instructional divisions completing adjunct evaluations. The new process was validated by instruction, HR, and IT and tested in Oracle. The resulting processing workflow was then [piloted](#) with an eye toward incorporating and automating data that adhered to the College's complex "re-employment rights" rules. After the [pilot work](#) was completed by the time of IPCC's [September 2018 meeting](#), and the new process was confirmed as viable, the next step sought to finalize the College's direction regarding the technology systems that could further facilitate and strengthen the College's ability to ensure timely evaluations.

In the ensuing months, it was also decided that demonstrations would be scheduled for the workgroup to evaluate technology solutions. Multiple onsite demonstrations of each system was completed with the workgroup in attendance. Collectively, it was decided to move forward with NeoGov. Testing was completed by the IT department to ensure the processing using NeoGov was handled correctly.

By the time of IPCC's [March 2019 meeting](#), the committee was notified that the Oracle option would necessitate the moving of all HR systems to a cloud network and therefore the NeoGov module might instead be implemented. The College's most recently hired chief information systems officer indicated that he was carefully reviewing contract terms for NeoGov and that another meeting with the company would be scheduled.

In April 2019, the HR manager coordinated several follow up meetings with NeoGov and the College's chief information systems officer to confirm that NeoGov's PERFORM module could support the college's performance evaluation tracking needs and interface compatibility of the software with Oracle. It was determined by IT that NeoGov's system requirements for the interface could be met. Further discussions with IT and NeoGov regarding moving forward with the software were postponed by IT until mid-September 2019.

Recommendation 8: In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College revises the evaluation forms for faculty, counselors, and librarians to more clearly and effectively demonstrate that the results of the assessment of learning outcomes are used to improve teaching and learning. (III.A.6)

At its [January 2018 Commission Meeting](#), the ACCJC had a second reading on its proposal to eliminate Standard III.A.6 based upon the rationale “to remove the evaluative spotlight of student learning assessment from the individual”. On page 9 of the [ACCJC’s Accreditation Standards](#), the section for Standard III.A.6 now states, “Effective January 2018, Standard III.A.6 is no longer applicable. The Commission acted to delete the Standard during its January 2018 Board of Directors meeting.” In light of the Commission’s decision to remove this standard, the College felt the need to adjust its actions accordingly and therefore discontinued discussions and actions related to the eliminated standard.

6.B. Reflection on Improving Institutional Performance: Student Learning Outcomes and Institution Set Standards

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (Standard I.B.2)

Reflect on the college's assessment processes since the last comprehensive review:

- **What are the strengths of the process that helps lead the college to improve teaching and learning?**

Faculty engagement and support has grown significantly over the past three years. Almost all divisions are represented on the Learning Outcome Committee and actively report back to their constituents. As faculty more regularly conduct assessments, they are actively reviewing and revising learning outcomes to improve assessment results. The migration to eLumen has supported more transparency, stronger communication around learning outcomes, and more consistent assessment frequency.

- **What growth opportunities in the assessment process has the college identified to further refine its authentic culture of assessment?**

The assessment process continues to be integrated into the campus wide culture. As more departments and divisions close their assessment cycles the data set will improve and allow further integration of results into planning. Migration to an integrated and synchronized curriculum management system has been identified as a necessary step to support consistency between learning outcomes and course outlines. The Learning Outcome Committee has moved that the college change the current hierarchical mapping to split mapping to improve data integrity when assessing ILO. Documentation of actions taken as a result of assessment. Communication between constituents...

- **Provide examples where course, program, or service improvements have occurred based on outcomes assessment data.**

Assessment cycles in eLumen are incomplete. As these cycles are completed in the coming academic year, assessment data can be further integrated into improvements. (This might be best answered by LO Committee members who have been involved with assessment in their respective areas. Also, curriculum changes based on assessments is a recorded data point when modifying a course at C&I. This really needs research and require documentation like the data dialog documentation.)

- **In those areas where assessment may be falling behind, what is the college doing to complete the assessments per the college's schedule.**

Consistent and regular ILO and GELO assessments need to be integrated into current processes. The adoption of the split mapping model is intended to specifically support

the assessment of ILO and GELO. Particular programs and divisions continue to refuse participation in learning outcome assessment despite stated requirements.

INSTITUTION SET STANDARDS (Standard I.B.3)

Using the most recent Annual Report, the college will reflect on its trend data on institution-set standards for course completion, certificate completion, degrees awarded, and transfer.

- **Has the college met its floor standards?**
- **Has the college achieved its stretch goals?**
- **What initiatives has the college undertaken to improve its outcomes?**
- **How does the college inform its constituents of this information?**

In recent years, the College has maintained an institution-set floor standard of 67% for course completion. Not only has the institution exceeded that standard, pass rates for courses have been steadily [increasing](#) each year. In aspiring to continually improve the academic success of students, in [October 2019](#), the Academic Senate established an associated stretch goal of 75%.

For degrees awarded, the institution has never fallen below its institution-set floor and, in fact, has consistently [raised](#) its standard which is now up to 550 per year. Although the statewide trend in decreased community college enrollment has likewise impacted the College, its number of awarded degrees has nevertheless outperformed its low-enrollment conditions. Discussions among stakeholders have predominantly attributed this robust performance to the College's success in recently creating a significant number of Associate Degrees for Transfer. In addition to its 31 local associates degrees, the College offers 24 Associate Degrees for Transfer. For this indicator, the Academic Senate established a stretch goal of 900.

For certificate completion, the College has maintained an institution-set floor standard of 200 per year. To date, the institution has never fallen below that standard. However, over the years, there has been a steady [decrease](#) in certificates awarded. This trend has been presented at meetings of the Master Planning Committee and the Academic Senate. In such meetings, discussions have explored the reasons for this trend and have speculated on the inverse relationship between number of awarded degrees and number of awarded certificates.

To uncover possible reasons underlying the downward trend for certificates, the Student Voices task force has partnered with the Office of Research & Planning in developing a student survey focused on this completion metric. The survey questions include asking students whether a certificate is among their educational goals and if so, what types of obstacles have they faced in pursuit of a certificate. For this indicator, the Academic Senate established a stretch goal of 225.

For transfers, the College had recently [raised](#) its institution-set floor standard which is currently at 850 per year. To date, the College has never fallen below that standard. In seeking to continually increase the number of students who are able to transfer to a four-year college, in 2019, the Academic Senate established an associated stretch goal of 950.

The College has embarked upon a number of initiatives to improve the success and achievement of its students. These initiatives include college wide efforts for student equity and the implementation of Guided Pathways best practices as described in the present report's Quality Focus Projects.

Information about institution-set standards is effectively communicated throughout the organization. Regarding institution-set standards for collegewide indicators, the College regularly reviews for year-over-year trends in the data, examining for any gaps between performance and institution-set standards. Since it falls under their purview, the Academic Senate and Master Planning Committee engage in this regular review each spring semester. During such review, there is consideration regarding whether the standards continue to be appropriate and useful. The Academic Senate is composed of faculty representatives from each instructional division. Between the Senate and their instructional division, these senators confer information about academic and professional matters (including institution-set standards). The senators are a vital mechanism for information-sharing among instructional stakeholders and facilitate discussions that inform relevant decision-making. Similarly, the Master Planning Committee is the largest of the College's governance committees and is composed of the College's leadership as well as representatives from the student, staff, faculty, and administrator constituent groups. In the same way that senators convey information to and from their respective division faculty, representatives on the Master Planning Committee convey information to and from their respective constituent group.

For broader sharing of information, institution-set standards have also been occasionally included in presentations given to the board of trustees and classified staff. Additionally, the institution-set floor standards are shared online with the college and surrounding community through their own dedicated [webpage](#) within the Research & Planning website and are accessible within the [ACCJC Annual Reports](#) which are posted at the accreditation website.

6.C. Report on Outcomes of the Quality Focus Projects

(The original Quality Focus Essay from the 2016 Institutional Self Evaluation Report included goals on measuring learning outcomes and integrating planning. The College received permission from the Commission to write about projects in the Midterm Report that reflect how the College is moving the needle for student success.)

STUDENT EQUITY

The College recognizes the importance of equity and is committed to ensuring that students, staff, faculty, and administrators contribute to a learning environment that develops and implements academic and student support programs aimed at promoting an equitable college. Therefore, the College's student equity initiative is the focus of its first Quality Focus Project. Equity efforts are interwoven throughout the College through a variety of initiatives, projects, and programs that ensure equal educational opportunities and to promote student success for all students, regardless of race, gender, age, disability, or economic circumstances. Addressing inequities is such a priority that the College's Institutional Master Plan incorporates goals for achieving equity and reducing gaps in learning and completion among student groups. Guided Pathways efforts also encompass equity goals and include participation from the Student Equity Committee (soon to be reconstituted as the Student Equity and Achievement Committee). Student equity faculty leaders have been supporting instructional efforts in implementing projects and they oversee programs in their respective divisions that engage student learning and are targeted toward achieving the institution's equity goals. Students are active participants in our decision-making processes and our improvements are focused on student-centered initiatives.

GOALS

The College has identified goals for various student groups who are achieving below college wide averages and need assistance to improve their success on various academic indicators.

- Access – Successful Enrollment
- Retention – Fall to Spring
- Transfer to a Four-Year institution
- Completion of Transfer-Level Math and English within the First Year
- Earned Credit Certificate over 18 units or Associate Degree

The Office of Research and Planning collects and analyzes data that helps clarify the priorities of our programs and track relevant outcomes. Using the "Percentage Point Gap Method" suggested by the State Chancellor's office, disproportionately impacted student groups have been identified. Disproportionately impacted groups are those that achieve success at much lower rates than students who achieve average rates. The data has subsequently been used in the development of strategies that address the gaps found for these success indicators.

The 2019 – 2022 Student Equity plan has been aligned with the system’s new Student Success Metrics. Colleges have been directed to use the Student Success Metrics Dashboard to access their data for their overall student population and then set three-year goals from the Student Success Metrics for each student equity population shown to have disproportionate impact in Access, Retention, Transfer to a four-year institution, Completion of transfer-level math and English, and earned certificate over 18 units or associate degree.

ACTIVITIES

Several activities were developed through instruction and student services that focused on increasing **course completion** for the full range of disproportionately impacted (DI) student groups. iPads were provided for students’ use to enable the completion of class assignments, the conducting of research, and ensuring currency on information for enrollment, financial aid, the accessing of Canvas. Summer Bridge provides incoming students with support for a smooth transition into college. DI students are encouraged to partake in the Summer Bridge program to become oriented and connected to the College prior to their first term as college students. Black Scholars, La Comunidad, and Guardian Scholars are three learning communities that serve many of our Latinx, Black/African American, and current and former foster youth students by providing a wide range of support services and activities and events that help students stay engaged, connected, and involved. There is also a focus on professional development to increase faculty and staff awareness of strategies and promising practices for serving DI students.

Activities focused on **degree and certificate completion** included direct services for students, tutoring, group counseling and food needs for our students. Several **transfer** programs were created to address the various needs of DI students. These include several college tours such as the Northern and Southern California trips and the Historically Black Colleges and University (HBCU) tours. The SPARK peer mentoring program (addressed below) also aims to increase indicators such as **course completion and degree/certificate completion**.

Evaluation of projects and programs supported through student equity are essential in helping determine the strategic direction of the student equity program. Decisions will be based on data indicating successful outcomes in helping close gaps. Projects that have demonstrated and will continue to show success in closing our equity gaps will be scaled up and enhanced to help positively affect more DI students.

The College has increased access for veterans by developing a more rigorous marketing campaign to increase enrollment. Publications and videos were developed to promote our Veterans Resource Center, student assistants were hired to help in the Center as well as increased outreach efforts to local high schools. Assistance to adults with disabilities in the noncredit/Garfield campus included pre-orientation and orientation services. Shadow Days have provided opportunities for high school students to attend the College and shadow a college-level peer mentor and learn what it looks like for a “day in the life of a college student”.

Advocates for Student Access and Participation (ASAP):

- Guides Probation 1 students through a year-long self-reflection and support program to help them get back on track.

Cultural Diversity Lecture Series:

- Promotes cultural competency among constituents by organizing and executing educational/cultural/social activities and events designed for the exploration, promotion, and celebration of diverse cultures, particularly those represented in the student community as disproportionately impacted (DI).

Dream Resource Center:

- Helps support our Dreamer students, coordinate events, and work on outreach and retention efforts.

English Division 3rd Attempt Program:

- Aims to support students repeating courses for the 3rd time by offering intrusive advising and support services.

Filipino Student Empowerment Program:

- Supports three major cultural events on campus: Filipino Culture Night, Filipino Community Culture Event, and 3rd Annual Filipino Fiesta.

Learning Center Enhancement:

- English Grammar Workshops: Facilitate workshop through the learning center to help students succeed in English.
- Keys to College Success Workshops: Through our Learning Center, providing workshops based on Growth Mindset interventions.

Math Adjunct Support:

- A training and mentorship program for adjunct faculty to ensure that teaching excellence is a priority, provide workshops that focus on a range of math education topics including awareness of DI student issues, practical teaching methods for the classroom, and general math education theory

Non-Credit Career Enhancement:

- Career Assessments for DI students (i.e. Strong II, MBTI, Knowdell Career Values Card Sorts, Choices 360 site license).

Project to Provide Access, Inclusion, Resources, Understanding, and Preparation (PAIR UP):

- Workshops and specialized support to help Disabled Students Programs and Services students on effective use of access technology.

Puerto Rico-An Exhibition and Spanish Language Guided Study:

- Exhibition featuring artwork exploring Latino social identity; Collaboration with

Contextualized Learning Coordinator to bring integrated themes into different classes; Public lectures and in-class demonstrations by working artists; Develop artist interviews and other audio in Spanish

Restorative Justice Project:

- Coordination of events on campus for previously incarcerated student population

Supplemental Instruction (SI):

- Supplemental Instruction is a program that offers collaborative learning workshops for participating classes. The workshops focus on critical thinking and problem solving exercises centered on the course material. They are scheduled outside of class time and are led by trained student leaders.

Social Science Lecture Series with the theme of “The World of the Uniquely Abled”:

- Lecture series provided to campus community aimed at addressing the needs of Disabled Students Programs and Services students by educating faculty, staff, and students.

Students Providing Assistance, Resources, and Knowledge (SPARK) Mentoring for Summer Bridge and fall term:

- Pairs students together for a peer to peer mentorship experience to help support students in their first year of college. Peer mentors are also trained and they implement activities to help students connect with one another during Summer Bridge.

Student Athlete Orientations:

- Designed to inform athletes of campus recourses, requirements, and introduce them to various faculty and staff.

Summer Bridge:

- Invites incoming students to participate in a week-long intensive bridge program to help them transition into college, explore major and career options, get connected with faculty and staff, and learn about campus resources.

Welcome Center:

Early College Acceptance Program (ECAP)

- Brings high school seniors in to complete matriculation steps, meet faculty and staff, get orientation and campus tours, so that they are ready for fall registration.

Shadow Days

- Interested high school students sign up to come to the College and shadow a Peer Mentor for “a day in the life of a college student”.

Learning Communities:

- **Black Scholars, Guardian Scholars, and La Comunidad** help students feel connected to the campus and support them as they progress toward their goals by

offering services to help guide them throughout their educational journey. The learning communities provide a safe space on campus for students, create opportunities for students to connect with their peers, provide opportunities to explore options in degree and transfer attainment, and provide students a vehicle to navigate college. Includes direct support and emergency assistance.

University Tours:

- **Northern California University Tours, Southern California University Tours, HBCU Tours, and Local University Tours** are coordinated each year to help expose students to possible transfer institutions and motivate students toward transfer.

LGBTQ+ Pride Center:

- Developed to help support LGBTQ+ students.

GCC Pride Week:

- An annual week-long event that includes workshops for faculty and staff, safe zone training, a community resource fair, and other activities throughout the week to support LGBTQ+ students and to inform the campus community.

OUTCOMES

According to results from analyses on project data, improvements had occurred for some DI groups. There has been a decrease in gaps with the following student groups and indicators.

For veteran students and students with disabilities, we have been narrowing the gap in successful enrollment.

For African–American, LGBT, and veteran students, we have successfully narrowed the gaps for fall to spring semester retention.

For African–American and Latino students, we have been narrowing the gaps in transfer rates to a four–year institution.

For LGBT and veteran students, we have been narrowing gaps in completion of transfer level math and English in their first year.

For African–American, Latino, LGBT, and foster youth students, we have been narrowing the gaps for earning an associate degree or credit certificate.

The College is committed to ensuring that we continue to support students who have been identified as disproportionately impacted. These results are promising and we will continue to implement successful activities, projects, and support programs so that we continue progress toward our goals and eventually close gaps for all of our DI students within all metrics.

GUIDED PATHWAYS

The College's guided pathways initiative is the focus of its second Quality Focus Project.

6.D. Fiscal Reporting

(The Commission requires us to include the annual fiscal report from 2019. Dr. Culpepper will be supplying a copy to include here.)