



**ACCREDITING  
COMMISSION  
for COMMUNITY and  
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD  
SUITE 204  
NOVATO, CA 94949  
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234  
FAX: (415) 506-0238  
E-MAIL: [accjc@accjc.org](mailto:accjc@accjc.org)  
[www.accjc.org](http://www.accjc.org)

Chairperson  
LURELEAN B. GAINES  
East Los Angeles College

Vice Chairperson  
MICHAEL T. ROTA  
University of Hawai'i

President  
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President  
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD

Vice President  
STEVE MARADIAN

Vice President  
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President  
LILY OWYANG

MEMO TO: Dr. Dawn Lindsey  
Interim Superintendent/President  
Glendale Community College 05-18-2010 A10:07  
1500 North Verdugo Road  
Glendale, CA 91208

FROM: Barbara A. Beno, President *Barbara A. Beno*

DATE: May 17, 2010

SUBJECT: Enclosed Report of the Evaluation Team

Previously, the chairperson of the evaluation team sent you a draft report affording you the opportunity to correct errors of fact. We assume you have responded to the team chair. The Commission now has the final version of the report.

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges follows a policy of providing a copy of the final evaluation visit report to the chief executive officer of the visited institution prior to consideration by the Commission. Please examine the enclosed report.

- If you believe that the report contains inaccuracies, you are invited to call them to the attention of the Commission. To do so, a letter stating recommended corrections should be directed to the ACCJC President and signed by the chief executive officer of the institution. The letter should arrive at the Commission office by **May 24, 2010** in order to be included in Commission materials.
- ACCJC policy provides that, if desired, the chief administrator may request an appearance before the Commission to discuss the evaluation report. The Commission requires that the institution notify the Commission office by **June 1, 2010** or earlier of its intent to attend the meeting. This enables the Commission to invite the team chair to attend. The next meeting of the Accrediting Commission will be held on **June 9-11, 2010** at The Marriott Hotel, San Francisco Airport, Burlingame, California. The enclosure, "Appearing Before the Commission," addresses the protocol of such appearances.

Please note that the Commission will not consider the institution as being indifferent if its chief administrator does not choose to appear before the Commission. If the institution does request to be heard at the Commission meeting, the chairperson of the evaluation team will also be asked to be present to explain the reasons for statements in the team report. Both parties will be allowed brief testimony before the Commission deliberates in private.

The enclosed report should be considered confidential and not given general distribution until it has been acted upon by the Accrediting Commission and you have been notified by letter of the action taken.

BAB/tl

Enclosure

cc: Ms. Jill Lewis, Accreditation Liaison Officer (w/o enclosure)



**ACCREDITING  
COMMISSION  
for COMMUNITY and  
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD  
SUITE 204  
NOVATO, CA 94949  
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234  
FAX: (415) 506-0238  
E-MAIL: [accjc@accjc.org](mailto:accjc@accjc.org)  
[www.accjc.org](http://www.accjc.org)

Chairperson  
LURELEAN B. GAINES  
East Los Angeles College

Vice Chairperson  
MICHAEL T. ROTA  
University of Hawai'i

President  
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President  
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD

Vice President  
STEVE MARADIAN

Vice President  
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President  
LILY OWYANG

Appearing before the Commission

ACCJC policy provides that, if desired, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of an institution may request an appearance before the Commission to discuss the evaluation report. The opportunity is provided when the Commission is deliberating or acting upon matters that affect the institution.

The Commission meets in January and June. An institution must send written notification to the ACCJC office at least 15 days before the scheduled meeting if the CEO wishes to attend. If the institution wishes to submit additional material to the Commission, it should exercise care, keeping in mind the Commission cannot read and absorb large amounts of material on short notice. Material should arrive at the ACCJC office with the written notification that the CEO has accepted the invitation to address the Commission.

The Chief Executive Officer is expected to be the presenter, and should consult with Commission staff if there are plans to invite other representatives to join the CEO. On the day of the Commission meeting, ACCJC staff will escort the CEO (and additional representatives) to and from the designated waiting area to the meeting at the appropriate time.

An institution's presentation should not exceed five (5) minutes. The Chair of the institution's evaluation team or designee will also be invited to attend. The Commissioners may ask questions of the CEO or representatives, and then will continue their deliberations in private. The CEO will be notified in writing of the subsequent action taken by the Commission.

The Commission considers this opportunity beneficial to the process of accreditation and values the occasion to learn new information from the institution.

Policies that are relative to this process are the *Policy on Access to Commission Meetings*, *Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions*, *Policy on Commission Good Practice in Relations with Member Institutions*, and *Policy on the Rights and Responsibilities of ACCJC and Member Institutions in the Accrediting Process*.



**ACCREDITING  
COMMISSION  
for COMMUNITY and  
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD  
SUITE 204  
NOVATO, CA 94949  
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234  
FAX: (415) 506-0238  
E-MAIL: [accjc@accjc.org](mailto:accjc@accjc.org)  
[www.accjc.org](http://www.accjc.org)

Chairperson  
LURELEAN B. GAINES  
East Los Angeles College

Vice Chairperson  
MICHAEL T. ROTA  
University of Hawai'i

President  
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President  
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD

Vice President  
STEVE MARADIAN

Vice President  
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President  
LILY OWYANG

May 17, 2010

Dr. Dawn Lindsey  
Interim Superintendent/President  
Glendale Community College  
1500 North Verdugo Road  
Glendale, CA 91208

Dear President Lindsey:

As part of the Commission's assessment of the accreditation process, we ask the chief executive officer of each institution that has undergone a comprehensive evaluation visit to report on its effectiveness. In order that we can continue to improve accreditation processes, please submit the enclosed form.

In preparing your evaluation, I request that you seek the perceptions of those who were instrumental in the preparation of the self study and conduct of the team visit. In particular, input from trustee, student, faculty, staff and administrative leaders is important.

The Commission looks forward to receiving your evaluation of recent accreditation activities on your campus.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Barbara A. Beno".

Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.  
President

BAB/tl

Enclosure

## INSTITUTIONAL APPRAISAL OF THE EVALUATION VISIT

The Commission would appreciate your appraisal of the recent evaluation visit.

Institution \_\_\_\_\_ Dates of Visit \_\_\_\_\_

SCALE: A = Excellent - F = Very Poor

Circle one:

- |    |                                                                                     |           |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. | Was the composition of the team appropriate for the evaluation of your institution? | A B C D F |
| 2. | Was there good advance organization by the chairperson?                             | A B C D F |
| 3. | Was the team prepared for the visit?                                                | A B C D F |
| 4. | Did the team conduct itself in a professional manner?                               | A B C D F |
| 5. | Were the essential individuals and groups consulted?                                | A B C D F |
| 6. | Was a time publicized when any person could meet with team representatives?         | A B C D F |
| 7. | Were the important tasks completed?                                                 | A B C D F |
| 8. | Was the exit report clear and useful to the institution?                            | A B C D F |
| 9. | Overall, how would you rate the team?                                               |           |

\_\_\_\_\_ Excellent \_\_\_\_\_ Good \_\_\_\_\_ Acceptable \_\_\_\_\_ Poor \_\_\_\_\_ Very Poor

Comments (Please explain low grades and provide any information which will help us improve the process):

---

---

---

What change(s) has the accreditation self study and team visit process helped motivate?

---

---

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_

05-18-2010\_A10:07

MAY 04 2010

## **EVALUATION REPORT**

### **GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

1500 N. Verdugo Road  
Glendale, CA 91208

A Confidential Report Prepared for  
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited  
Glendale Community College from March 15 through March 18, 2010.

Constance M. Carroll, Ph.D.  
Chair

Glendale Community College  
Comprehensive Evaluation Visit Team Roster  
March 15-18, 2010

Dr. Constance M. Carroll (Chair)  
Chancellor  
San Diego Community College District

Mr. Anthony Cantu  
Vice President, Instruction  
Fresno City College

Dr. Darla Cooper  
Associate Director, Center for Student  
Success  
The RP Group

Dr. Roslyn Haley  
Dean of Counseling and Matriculation  
Antelope Valley College

Ms. Kathryn Sims  
Assistant Professor  
Hawaii Community College

Ms. Lynn Neault (Assistant)  
Vice Chancellor, Student Services  
San Diego Community College District

Mr. Mark Snowwhite  
Professor of English (Ret.)  
Crafton Hills College

Mr. Ken Stoppenbrink  
Vice Chancellor, Business Services  
West Hills Community College District

Dr. Audrey Trotter  
Faculty, Education and Learning  
Resources  
Merritt College

Dr. Frederick Wenck  
Trustee  
Lake Tahoe Community College District

## **Summary of the Evaluation Report**

**INSTITUTION:** Glendale Community College

**DATE OF VISIT:** March 15 – 18, 2010

**TEAM CHAIR:** Constance M. Carroll, Ph.D.  
Chancellor, San Diego Community College District

A ten-member team visited Glendale Community College during March 15 through March 18, 2010, for the purpose of reviewing and evaluating the institution's request for reaffirmation of accreditation within the context of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges 2002 Standards of Accreditation. The team arrived and began its process on March 14 in order to devote sufficient time to the review of evidence and materials pertinent to the visit. Through the review of evidence and through interviews, the team was able to validate the college's self study, determine the institution's compliance with the standards of accreditation, and assess how well the institution was doing in achieving its stated purposes and implementing its mission.

Initially established as Glendale Junior College and Glendale Junior College District in 1927, the institution's charter was repealed when, in 1936, the institution became part of the Glendale Unified School District. Another change occurred in 1971 when the college was retitled Glendale Community College and, by approval of the voters in 1980, the independent Glendale Community College District was formed. Since 1983, the district has been governed by a five-member board of trustees who are elected from the community.

Serving the greater Glendale community, the college has grown steadily over the years both in size and service. From an initial student population of 139 in its opening semester, the college grew to a total of 25,015 students by the time of its Self Study, representing 17,376 credit and 7,639 noncredit students. Enrollment issues have become critical to the institution. Like other California community colleges in recent years, Glendale's student demand has continued to rise while California resources have continued to diminish. The state has further complicated the enrollment situation by putting a funding cap on compensation for full-time-equivalent students (FTES). Glendale Community College has struggled with the mandate to serve its students and community while managing enrollments in a manner that decreases FTES to the funded level.

Since its founding, the college has undergone a physical transformation and expansion. Beginning with modest quarters, the college has constructed a handsome main campus, albeit with some remaining portable structures, on its 59-acre site in the northern sector of the City of Glendale; it established the Garfield Campus for noncredit education, located in south

Glendale; and opened the Professional Development Campus for contract education, located in Montrose. The college also has constructed and operates a Baja Field Station for students studying abroad, which is located in Mexico. In 2002, the Glendale Community College District successfully passed a bond measure, Measure "G," which provided \$98 million for construction and renovation. During the course of the visit, the team reviewed the primary sites consisting of the main campus and the Garfield Campus, while reviewing data pertinent to the other two sites.

Glendale Community College was in general well prepared for the team's visit. The college community had participated broadly in the development of a Self Study that reflected both a candid assessment of the institution and broad input into its development. Surveys, forums, special mailings and e-mail dissemination, presentations to the Board of Trustees, the gathering and analysis of considerable data and evidence, and active participation characterized the Self Study. The team room was well appointed and included the data necessary for the team to base its findings on factual evidence. The team was also quickly able to secure requested meetings with both groups and individuals on campus, including all five members of the governing board.

The team benefited from seeing the college in action during the visit, from a governing board meeting to sessions with the college's leadership and governance team to sessions with planning and specialized committees to individual meetings with key campus leaders. It became clear to the team that dialogue is a valued and extensive practice at Glendale Community College, where the frank exchange of ideas and perspectives is a hallmark. The team appreciated the great hospitality that was extended by the college, as well as the candor and access that enabled the team to fulfill its mission of evaluation.

Since the previous team visit, Glendale Community College has undergone severe challenges in its governance and leadership. Following the retirement of its superintendent/president of 21 years, the college hired a permanent successor in 2006. The new president's tenure was characterized by turbulence within the college regarding plans, decisions, and style, concerns which were also shared by the Board of Trustees. The college obtained the services of various California agencies to assist and facilitate during this period of time. However, the superintendent/president left in 2009, and was replaced by an interim CEO.

Issues of policy, issues of finance, issues of direction, and issues of trust were the order of the day for the Glendale College community as the institution moved into a transitional period of time, with interim leadership, and in the midst of the worst fiscal crisis in California history. The Self Study provides a candid view into all of these issues, carefully chronicling the steps that were taken to address the individual matters in need of solution and the collective imperative of re-inventing the college itself. Any one of these challenges would offer a daunting prospect, but together they placed the college under unprecedented pressure.

Within this context, the team was impressed by what it found. At the start of the visit, the interim CEO was named permanent superintendent/president by the unanimous decision of the governing board following a national search. Many of the college's noted deficiencies had been either fully or partially corrected since the previous team visit, and those that were

still outstanding were identified by the college and have been addressed in the 2010 team report and recommendations. The campus atmosphere was upbeat, though somewhat wary, and it was clear to the team that the campus community's pride in the institution and their commitment to a shared mission of service to students had enabled them as a group to confront and surmount the challenges they had faced in recent years. The team was impressed, especially with the following:

- The high quality of instruction and support services for students. The team found Glendale to be a student-centered institution in the best sense of that phrase, with a well-developed curriculum, programs of study, and excellent services for both credit and noncredit students.
- The active participation of all members of the college community. The governing board, the superintendent/president, the faculty, the administration, the staff, and student leaders participate in numerous committees and dialogues, and take an active interest in the development of college programs, services, and initiatives. This level of involvement and participation served the college well in bringing its several years of turbulence to a constructive conclusion.
- The college's commitment to focus on accountability and the implementation of plans and timelines that will integrate planning and budgeting.
- Improvement in budget and financial management. Glendale Community College has both established and maintained a 5% reserve as a mechanism to assist during financial emergencies and cash-flow difficulties. This reserve is now part of Board policy and may be elevated over time to a higher percentage if the California fiscal situation worsens. In addition, the college community, including the bargaining units, came together this year to effect some concessions that have eased the burden of the overall budget challenge.
- The college's commitment to providing resources for students and for its essential functions. Through its bond measure, through its technology acquisitions, and through its technical learning services, Glendale Community College has made significant positive improvements to the campus which is now accessible, beautiful, and up-to-date in its capabilities for serving students, staff, and the community.

While the college has made progress since the previous evaluation team visit, a number of issues are still in need of resolution and implementation. Overall, the focus of the college has been on the large issues of governance, leadership, and finance, which have dominated the institution's attention in recent years. The college should now be able to use its decisions in these areas as a foundation from which to address and/or complete other tasks that pertain to the Standards of Accreditation.

## Recommendations

Based upon a careful review of the Glendale Community College Self Study, considerable data and evidence, onsite interviews of all segments of the campus community, direct observation, and discussing its findings in relationship to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges 2002 Standards of Accreditation, the team offers the following nine recommendations.

1. Building on a recommendation made by the 2004 evaluation team, the team recommends that the college strengthen the linkages among the program review, planning and resource allocation processes in order to:
  - Establish and publish a clear timeline and specific outcomes for the integration of the planning processes;
  - Establish and implement formal and systematic processes for assessing the effectiveness of the planning, program review, and resource allocation processes that include clear measures of effectiveness and direct evidence;
  - Ensure that the implementation of integrated planning and resource allocation is not solely dependent upon the receipt of new revenue, but rather focuses on continuous improvement even if this requires reallocating or reprioritizing the use of existing resources;
  - Assign administrative responsibility and accountability for the implementation of plans;
  - Align the program review cycle and the annual planning and budget cycles to ensure that planning and resource allocation are data-driven and based upon annual outcome measures;
  - Clarify, document and review the multiple paths for requesting resources;
  - Ensure an integrated process for continuous improvement of the planning process; and
  - Facilitate increased campuswide awareness and understanding of the college's integrated planning and decision-making processes.

(Standards IB.2, IB.3, IB.4, IB.6, IB.7, IIIA.6, IIID.1.a, IIID.1.b, IIID.3)

2. The team recommends that the institution accelerate its efforts to develop and implement Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) assessment measures at the course, program and institutional levels to ensure ongoing, systematic, data driven improvement of student learning in order to meet the proficiency level of the Institutional Effectiveness Rubric

for Student Learning Outcomes by 2012. (Standards IIA.1.a, IIA.1.c, IIA.2.a, IIA.2.b, IIA.2.e)

3. The team recommends that the college ensure that all major policies affecting students are published in an accessible manner in such publications as the catalog, including the Academic Freedom Policy, transfer of credit and the process for sexual harassment complaints. (Standard IIB.2)
4. As recommended by the 2004 evaluation team, the team recommends that the college complete all overdue employee evaluations, as required by Board policy and employee collective bargaining agreements, including fully implementing professional development plans to ensure that all staff obtain the necessary skills to satisfactorily perform their jobs. (Standards IIIA.1.b, IIIA.5). The team also recommends that the evaluation processes of faculty and others responsible for learning clearly identify how the effectiveness of producing outcomes is addressed as a component of their evaluation (Standard IIIA.1.c).
5. The team recommends that the college use all traditional, federally-recognized Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) ethnic categories in order to develop a comprehensive approach in describing and planning for the diversity of faculty and staff at the college. (Standard IIIA. 4)
6. As recommended by the 2004 evaluation team, the team recommends that the college move quickly to implement long range planning in Information and Technology Services that is linked to budget allocation. (Standard IIIC.)
7. Building on the recommendation of the 2004 evaluation team, the team recommends that the college address the issue of inadequate staffing levels for its maintenance and custodial functions, including training to increase efficiency and productivity, as well as the lack of security between the hours of midnight and 6:00 a.m. (Standards IIIA.5, IIIB.1.b)
8. The team recommends that the college take the necessary steps to ensure the safety of the servers so that the system does not shut down due to overheating. (Standard IIIB.2.a)
9. The team recommends that the college develop and implement a plan for funding its long-term employee liability under Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) 45. (Standard IIID.1.c)

# **Accreditation Evaluation Report for Glendale Community College March 15-18, 2010**

## **Introduction**

Glendale Community College is a single, accredited college within the Glendale Community College District. The college is a comprehensive community college, offering a full range of associate degrees, certificates, and general education in the greater Glendale area. The college provides instructional and student support services for both credit and noncredit students at its 59-acre main campus in north Glendale. It provides noncredit ESL and other programs at its Garfield Campus in south Glendale. Classes are offered during the day and evening, online, and during weekends. The institution provides contract education services at its Professional Development Center in Montrose, and it offers study-abroad experiences at its Baja Field Station in Mexico.

Initially established as Glendale Junior College and Glendale Junior College District in 1927, the institution's charter was repealed when, in 1936, the institution became part of the Glendale Unified School District. Another change occurred in 1971 when the college was renamed Glendale Community College and, by approval of the voters in 1980, the independent Glendale Community College District was formed. Since 1983, the district has been governed by a five-member board of trustees who are elected from the community.

Serving the greater Glendale community, the college has grown steadily over the years both in size and service. From an initial student population of 139 in its opening semester, the college grew to a total of 25,015 students by the time of its Self Study, representing 17,376 credit and 7,639 noncredit students.

The college is particularly cognizant of and sensitive to its unique diversity configuration given the large Armenian population in the area. The college's student demographics take this population into consideration. Published student demographics indicate:

- 51% of credit students are a combination of White/Armenian and White/Anglo, with other groups being Hispanic/Latino (14%), Asian/Pacific Islander (13%), African American (3%) and other groups in smaller percentages;
- 62% of noncredit students are a combination of White/Armenian and White/Anglo, with other groups falling into smaller percentages;
- 62% of the students are under the age of 25; and
- Female students outnumber male students by 58 to 42 percent.

Enrollment issues have become critical to the institution. Like other California community colleges in recent years, Glendale's student demand has continued to rise while California resources have continued to diminish. The state has further complicated the enrollment situation by putting a funding cap on compensation for full-time-equivalent students (FTES). Glendale Community College has struggled with the mandate to serve its students and community while managing enrollments in a manner that decreases FTES to the funded level.

The college has continued to seek improvements, such as its successful \$98 million facilities bond issue, Measure "G," to provide adequate budgets for buildings, grounds, maintenance, and technology. Funding for all levels of staffing has also been a challenge during California's protracted fiscal crisis.

### **Recent Accreditation History for Glendale Community College**

The previous comprehensive evaluation and team visit for Glendale Community College took place in March 2004. The visit resulted in the Accrediting Commission's reaffirmation of accreditation with a Focused Midterm Report in which four of the ten team recommendations (Recommendations 2, 5, 6, and 7) were required to be fully addressed by the time of the Focused Midterm Report. The recommendations were as follows.

1. A facilities plan, a technology plan and focused department plans should comprise the action plans that emerge from the strategies and key performance indicators in the 2003-2009 Master Plan to ensure accountability. (Standards 3B.2, 3B.3, 4D.1, 8.5, 9A.1)
2. The team strongly recommends that the College address the previous team's recommendation by moving quickly to implement long-range planning in Information and Technology Services and Learning Resources that is linked to budget allocations. (Standard 6.5)
3. It is recommended that the College establish planning priorities to guide restoration of lost positions and hiring of new employees. A strong effort should also be made to restore and maintain an adequate level of staff development opportunities leading to professional growth of staff. (Standards 7A.1, 7A.3, 7C.3)
4. It is recommended that employee groups, especially management positions, be evaluated in a timely manner. (Standard 7B.1)
5. It is recommended that the College complete a staff diversity plan that helps to establish effective programs and opportunities that would result in greater equity and diversity among all employee groups, especially academic administration and full-time faculty. (Standards 7D.1, 7D.2, 7D.3; See previous team's Recommendation 6)
6. The College should develop a comprehensive Educational Master Plan that identifies program needs, strengths and weaknesses, and new proposed programs; the program

review process, the facilities plan and the budget process should be revised so that there is a clear linkage between the planning processes and the resource allocation process. (Standard 8.5; See previous team's Recommendation 4)

7. An actuarial study should be performed to quantify the outstanding liability of the College's post retirement benefits. (Standard 9C.1)
8. A comprehensive financial action plan should be developed as quickly as possible to restore the College's depleted reserves to minimum, prudent recommended levels. Additionally, with extremely low reserves, the College's fixed expenditures should not exceed its fixed revenue. (Standards 9C.3; 9C.4)
9. The Board of Trustees should adhere to a formal process for the evaluation of the CEO, the Board, institutional governance and their associated procedures. (Standards 10A.3, 10A.4)
10. With the impending retirement of the current CEO, the Board should take active steps toward the development of a presidential recruitment and transition plan. (Standards 10A.4, 10A.5)

The Glendale Community College Focused Midterm Report was accepted by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges and the college was notified of this action on June 29, 2007.

Between 2004 and 2010, the intervening years between the comprehensive self studies, and team visits, Glendale Community College experienced significant changes, including severe challenges in the area of leadership and governance. The institution's longtime CEO of 21 years retired. A permanent successor was hired in 2006. The new president's tenure was characterized by turbulence within the college regarding plans, decisions, and style, concerns which were also shared by the Board of Trustees. The college obtained the services of various California agencies to assist and facilitate during this period of time. However, the superintendent/president left in 2009, and was replaced by an interim CEO. During the team's visit in 2010, the Board appointed the interim CEO as permanent superintendent/president following a national search.

In addition, Glendale Community College was massively affected by the fiscal crisis in California, which forced this institution, like others, to make serious budget reductions, freeze faculty and staff positions, place many plans on hold, and focus on maintaining standards of quality and service with severely reduced resources. The \$98 million facilities bond measure, Measure "G," was one bright light in an otherwise negative framework of budget hardship and uncertainty.

## **Glendale Community College Self Study**

Glendale Community College was in general well prepared for the team's visit. The college community had participated broadly in the development of a Self Study that reflected both a

candid assessment of the institution and broad input into its development. Surveys, forums, special mailings and e-mail dissemination, presentations to the Board of Trustees, the gathering and analysis of considerable data and evidence, and active participation characterized the Self Study.

The Self Study document was thorough and handsomely presented, including clear citations of evidence. It was also a candid document that noted critical areas in which improvement was needed. The team found the Self Study to be a useful guide during the visit. The team also noted two major challenges it encountered in the document:

- It was difficult for the team to understand the interrelationships of the numerous campus committees involved in planning processes and to ascertain what administrators were responsible for implementing the results of the planning processes. The Self Study provided extensive description, which was at times redundant, but did not outline or map the overall process in clear terms.
- The Self Study presented some data in unusual ways, which made it challenging for the team to follow and understand. Especially with regard to diversity issues, the Self Study presented unique categories of classification, particularly in relation to individuals of Armenian heritage, while omitting some ethnic categories that are traditionally part of the federal reporting requirements.

### **Commendations for Glendale Community College**

Overall, the team was impressed by the entire Glendale campus community. Specifically, the team was impressed with the following.

- The high quality of instruction and support services for students. The team found Glendale to be a student-centered institution in the best sense of that phrase, with a well-developed curriculum, programs of study, and excellent services for both credit and noncredit students.
- The active participation of all members of the college community. The governing board, the superintendent/president, the faculty, the administration, the staff, and student leaders participate in numerous committees and dialogues, and take an active interest in the development of college programs, services, and initiatives. This level of involvement and participation served the college well in bringing its several years of turbulence to a constructive conclusion.
- The college's commitment to focus on accountability and the implementation of plans and timelines that will integrate planning and budgeting.
- Improvement in budget and financial management. Glendale Community College has both established and maintained a 5% reserve as a mechanism to assist during financial emergencies and cash-flow difficulties. This reserve is now part of Board policy and may be elevated over time to a higher percentage if the California fiscal

situation worsens. In addition, the college community, including the bargaining units, came together this year to effect some concessions that have eased the burden of the overall budget challenge.

- The college's commitment to providing resources for students and for its essential functions. Through its bond measure, through its technology acquisitions, and through its technical learning services, Glendale Community College has made significant positive improvements to the campus which is now accessible, beautiful, and up-to-date in its capabilities for serving students, staff, and the community.

The team could see that despite the challenges of California's ongoing fiscal crisis, and despite the difficulties of the immediate past, Glendale Community College's remarkable institutional community is optimistic about the future and willing to ensure that the college fulfills its mission and commitment to student learning and success.

## **Recommendations**

Based upon a careful review of the Glendale Community College Self Study, considerable data and evidence, onsite interviews of all segments of the campus community, direct observation, and discussing its findings in relationship to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges 2002 Standards of Accreditation, the team offers the following nine recommendations.

1. Building on a recommendation made by the 2004 evaluation team, the team recommends that the college strengthen the linkages among the program review, planning and resource allocation processes in order to:
  - Establish and publish a clear timeline and specific outcomes for the integration of the planning processes;
  - Establish and implement formal and systematic processes for assessing the effectiveness of the planning, program review, and resource allocation processes that include clear measures of effectiveness and direct evidence;
  - Ensure that the implementation of integrated planning and resource allocation is not solely dependent upon the receipt of new revenue, but rather focuses on continuous improvement even if this requires reallocating or reprioritizing the use of existing resources;
  - Assign administrative responsibility and accountability for the implementation of plans;
  - Align the program review cycle and the annual planning and budget cycles to ensure that planning and resource allocation are data-driven and based upon annual outcome measures;

- Clarify, document and review the multiple paths for requesting resources;
- Ensure an integrated process for continuous improvement of the planning process; and
- Facilitate increased campuswide awareness and understanding of the college's integrated planning and decision-making processes.

(Standards IB.2, IB.3, IB.4, IB.6, IB.7, IIIA.6, IIID.1.a, IIID.1.b, IIID.3)

2. The team recommends that the institution accelerate its efforts to develop and implement Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) assessment measures at the course, program and institutional levels to ensure ongoing, systematic, data driven improvement of student learning in order to meet the proficiency level of the Institutional Effectiveness Rubric for Student Learning Outcomes by 2012.  
(Standards IIA.1.a, IIA.1.c, IIA.2.a, IIA.2.b, IIA.2.e)
3. The team recommends that the college ensure that all major policies affecting students are published in an accessible manner in such publications as the catalog, including the Academic Freedom Policy, transfer of credit and the process for sexual harassment complaints. (Standard IIB.2)
4. As recommended by the 2004 evaluation team, the team recommends that the college complete all overdue employee evaluations, as required by Board policy and employee collective bargaining agreements, including fully implementing professional development plans to ensure that all staff obtain the necessary skills to satisfactorily perform their jobs. (Standards IIIA.1.b, IIIA.5). The team also recommends that the evaluation processes of faculty and others responsible for learning clearly identify how the effectiveness of producing outcomes is addressed as a component of their evaluation (Standard IIIA.1.c).
5. The team recommends that the college use all traditional, federally-recognized Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) ethnic categories in order to develop a comprehensive approach in describing and planning for the diversity of faculty and staff at the college. (Standard IIIA. 4)
6. As recommended by the 2004 evaluation team, the team recommends that the college move quickly to implement long range planning in Information and Technology Services that is linked to budget allocation. (Standard IIIC.)
7. Building on the recommendation of the 2004 evaluation team, the team recommends that the college address the issue of inadequate staffing levels for its maintenance and custodial functions, including training to increase efficiency and productivity, as well as the lack of security between the hours of midnight and 6:00 a.m. (Standards IIIA.5, IIB.1.b)

8. The team recommends that the college take the necessary steps to ensure the safety of the servers so that the system does not shut down due to overheating. (Standard IIIB.2.a)
9. The team recommends that the college develop and implement a plan for funding its long-term employee liability under Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) 45. (Standard IIID.1.c)

**Responses to  
Recommendations of the Previous Team  
March 15-18, 2004**

Aspects of the 2004 evaluation team recommendations that remain unmet have been incorporated in the recommendations made by the 2010 evaluation team.

**Recommendation 1**

**A facilities plan, a technology plan and focused department plans should comprise the action plans that emerge from the strategies and key performance indicators in the 2003-2009 Master Plan to ensure accountability. (Standards 3B.2, 3B.3, 4D.1, 8.5, 9A.1)**

This recommendation has been partially addressed by the college and the standards are partially met. The college has developed a Facilities Master Plan, an Information Technology Plan, and related departmental plans. These plans have been developed and are part of a coordinated process of review, but still need to be effectively linked to the Strategic Master Plan and scheduled for implementation. A consulting firm has been employed to assist the college in finalizing this step with a plan for implementation.

**Recommendation 2**

**The team strongly recommends that the College address the previous team's recommendation by moving quickly to implement long-range planning in Information and Technology Services and Learning Resources that is linked to budget allocations. (Standard 6.5)**

The college has addressed and partially addressed this recommendation. A Glendale Community College Library and Learning Resources Technology Plan - 2007 to 2012 - was approved by Student Affairs in December 2007. In fall 2009, a new college Technology Plan was completed. To date, budget augmentation processes have been used to fund learning resources technology needs. Although the college has implemented several components of the Oracle ERP system as well as PeopleSoft Solutions, and although IT has also been part of the college's program review process, there is still a need for the college to improve linkage of these plans to the budget process. This will be of particular importance given changes in college planning processes that may directly impact the large number of learning support and specialized labs at both the main campus of the college and the Garfield Campus. The institution has upgraded its IT Dean position to that of Associate Vice President of Information Technology in order to ensure greater accountability and responsibility. Systems upgrades are part of the Strategic Master Plan goals and, although some plans have been funded, full implementation will depend upon budget capability.

### **Recommendation 3**

**It is recommended that the College establish planning priorities to guide restoration of lost positions and hiring of new employees. A strong effort should also be made to restore and maintain an adequate level of staff development opportunities leading to professional growth of staff. (Standards 7A.1, 7A.3, 7C.3)**

The college has addressed and partially addressed this recommendation within the context of ongoing budget reductions. While maintaining an adequate core of faculty and staff, the college has not replaced most positions that have fallen vacant due to retirements or resignations. The duties of the vacant positions have been redistributed to other employees to maintain services. The college continues to assess and prioritize its position needs.

### **Recommendation 4**

**It is recommended that employee groups, especially management positions, be evaluated in a timely manner. (Standard 7B.1)**

As clearly stated in the Self Study, the college has only partially addressed this recommendation. Board policy, Human Resources procedures, and collective bargaining contracts specify and call for timely evaluations of all categories of staff. However, the team validated that there were large numbers of evaluations still outstanding, especially affecting classified staff positions. The college has plans to address this problem, but had not done so at the time of the team visit.

### **Recommendation 5**

**It is recommended that the College complete a staff diversity plan that helps to establish effective programs and opportunities that would result in greater equity and diversity among all employee groups, especially academic administration and full-time faculty. (Standards 7D.1, 7D.2, 7D.3; See previous team's Recommendation 6)**

The college has based much of its diversity planning on documents available in the state system office, and has emphasized in its own planning the category of Armenian Caucasian, which reflects the demographics of the area. While it is clear that the college has made progress in its hiring from this category, the absence of other EEO ethnic categories pertaining to traditional, federally-recognized groups made it difficult for the team to assess actual progress of a comprehensive nature. This recommendation is partially addressed, with further efforts to be made.

### **Recommendation 6**

**The College should develop a comprehensive Educational Master Plan that identifies program needs, strengths and weaknesses, and new proposed programs; the program review process, the facilities plan and the budget process should be revised so that there**

**is a clear linkage between the planning processes and the resource allocation process. (Standard 8.5; See previous team's Recommendation 4)**

The college has made progress in its response to this recommendation of the previous team, including the effort to link program review with the Strategic Master Plan and resource allocation. The facilities master plan, however, has yet to be effectively linked with the related planning and resource allocation processes. The college has contracted with a consulting firm to complete its Educational Master Plan with linkages to all other planning efforts. This recommendation has been partially addressed.

#### **Recommendation 7**

**An actuarial study should be performed to quantify the outstanding liability of the College's post retirement benefits. (Standard 9C.1)**

The college has addressed this recommendation. A Post Retirement Benefit Study was completed by a consulting firm and was reviewed and accepted by the Board of Trustees in 2006. In 2009, a new Actuarial Study was drafted to update changes in the budget and demographic data, which the team was able to review during the visit. The new plan is still under review due to collective bargaining concerns.

#### **Recommendation 8**

**A comprehensive financial action plan should be developed as quickly as possible to restore the College's depleted reserves to minimum, prudent recommended levels. Additionally, with extremely low reserves, the College's fixed expenditures should not exceed its fixed revenue. (Standards 9C.3; 9C.4)**

The college has addressed this recommendation. The Board of Trustees has developed a policy on general fund reserves under which the college has established and maintained a 5% Reserve for cash-flow and emergency purposes. In addition, the college has maintained a balanced budget, with ending balances in the 5% range for the past four years.

#### **Recommendation 9**

**The Board of Trustees should adhere to a formal process for the evaluation of the CEO, the Board, institutional governance and their associated procedures. (Standards 10A.3, 10A.4)**

Currently, the Board of Trustees conducts an annual self evaluation and is in the process of finalizing the formal evaluation process for the CEO. Surveys and similar instruments have been used to review institutional processes. The team was able to review the documents pertaining to these processes and was aware of the fact that the adoption of the final CEO evaluation process was imminent. At the time of the team visit, this recommendation was not yet fully addressed but will be addressed upon the Board's final action.

## **Recommendation 10**

**With the impending retirement of the current CEO, the Board should take active steps toward the development of a presidential recruitment and transition plan. (Standards 10A.4, 10A.5)**

This recommendation has been fully addressed. The Board initiated and implemented a presidential recruitment and transition plan, which resulted in the hiring of a permanent superintendent/president in 2006. Upon the departure of this CEO, an interim superintendent/president was selected, a recruitment and transition plan was implemented, and a new, permanent superintendent/president has been appointed.

## **Eligibility Requirements**

The team found Glendale Community College to be in compliance with all eligibility requirements established by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

### **1. AUTHORITY**

Glendale Community College is authorized to operate as an educational institution and award degrees by the (1) Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, (2) the California State Chancellor's Office, and (3) the locally-elected Board of Trustees of the Glendale Community College District.

### **2. MISSION**

The evaluation team confirmed that Glendale Community College completed a review of its mission statement, and that the college's mission statement was approved by the Board of Trustees during the 2007-2008 academic year.

### **3. GOVERNING BOARD**

Glendale Community College is governed by the five-member, locally-elected Board of Trustees of the Glendale Community College District, each of whom serves a four-year term. The annually-rotating position of student trustee also serves on the Board, with an advisory vote. Board meetings are monthly and are appropriately noticed and called. The evaluation team confirmed that the governing board is an independent body that enacts policies for the district and conducts oversight of the district's fiscal and related operations. Board members adhere to a conflict of interest requirement, as well as a code of ethics, and the Board conducts an annual self evaluation.

#### **4. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

Following the retirement of a long-term CEO, the Board authorized a search and appointed a successor CEO in 2006 who served until 2009. Upon this CEO's departure, the Board appointed an interim CEO, authorized a search, and appointed a permanent CEO in March 2010. The CEO serves on a full-time, dedicated basis as both district superintendent and college president. The superintendent/president is responsible for the administration of Board policies, the management of resources, compliance with all statutes and regulations, and all planning and decision-making pertaining to the institution.

#### **5. ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY**

Current administrators have been screened, selected, and employed because of their skills and abilities as required by the duties of their positions. The evaluation team observed that administrative capacity is good and that talented administrators serve on the staff. The high percentage of executive-level administrators serving in interim positions is anticipated to be reduced in the near future, especially since a permanent superintendent/president has recently been hired.

#### **6. OPERATING STATUS**

The team observed that Glendale Community College is fully operational, with students actively pursuing degree and certificate programs.

#### **7. DEGREES**

Glendale Community College offers degrees leading to the Associate in Arts and the Associate in Science, as well as certificates. The majority of the college's courses apply to these degrees and certificates. 2008-2009 data demonstrate that 96% of courses are degree-applicable and 71% are transferable.

#### **8. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS**

The evaluation team confirmed that Glendale Community College's degree and certificate programs are congruent with its educational mission, with all transfer and degree programs requiring a minimum of two years of study. Courses and programs are offered in diverse formats to ensure accessibility to students and the public.

#### **9. ACADEMIC CREDIT**

Glendale Community College awards academic credit in a traditional, conventional manner for community colleges, as approved within the organization of the California Community Colleges, and in formats considered to be generally accepted as good practice.

## **10. STUDENT LEARNING AND ACHIEVEMENT**

The team observed that Glendale Community College has made much progress in identifying Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) for individual courses and has begun a broad process of institutional dialogue designed to advance full SLO compliance by the 2012 deadline. The development of student learning outcomes at the program level is a work-in-progress.

## **11. GENERAL EDUCATION**

The evaluation team validated and certifies that Glendale Community College includes general education requirements in its degree programs to ensure breadth of knowledge in the major areas of study and inquiry. Writing and computational requirements, as well as other core competencies, are also part of this structure. Learning outcomes for these competencies are identified and the quality of educational delivery is high.

## **12. ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

The Glendale Community College District Board of Trustees has policies in place that define and protect academic freedom for faculty and students.

## **13. FACULTY**

At the time of the evaluation visit, Glendale Community College employed 221 full-time faculty members and 581 part-time faculty members, a more than sufficient complement to meet this eligibility requirement.

## **14. STUDENT SERVICES**

The evaluation team reviewed the services provided to support students at the college's credit and noncredit sites, and found them to be adequate in scope and variety for a student population of the size and characteristics of Glendale Community College. Services to students are also made available electronically.

## **15. ADMISSIONS**

Glendale Community College maintains an open-admission policy and process, in keeping with its mission under the regulations of the California Community Colleges.

## **16. INFORMATION AND LEARNING RESOURCES**

The evaluation team found the Glendale library and learning resources to be adequate in size and scope to support the college's instructional programs and educational mission.

## **17. FINANCIAL RESOURCES**

The evaluation team reviewed the college's budget and the most recent independent audit, and found that the institution has both an adequate base of funding and adequate financial reserves to support its instructional programs, services, and required operations.

## **18. FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY**

All funds of the college, including the funds of the college foundation and the general obligation bonds, are annually audited by an independent certified public accounting firm. Audits are officially presented to and accepted by the Board of Trustees and are made available to the public. The evaluation team was able to review the most recent audit and found it to be adequate and conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards.

## **19. INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION**

The college has engaged in a number of strategic, educational, financial, facilities, and related planning activities, has instituted a program review process, and has devoted considerable institutional dialogue to planning and goal-setting. While these efforts are well underway, and a consulting firm has been retained to assist, the college is aware of the need to improve and more fully integrate these processes.

## **20. PUBLIC INFORMATION**

Glendale Community College offers a catalog and other publications designed to provide complete information to students and the public. Information is generally available both in print and online.

## **21. RELATIONS WITH THE ACCREDITING COMMISSION**

Glendale Community College has ensured that its policies and procedures are compliant with the requirements and standards of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The college also complies with commission reporting requirements.

## **Evaluation of Glendale Community College Using ACCJC 2002 Standards**

This report pertains to the request for reaffirmation of accreditation for Glendale Community College, in accordance with the 2002 Standards of Accreditation adopted by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The team assessed the college within this framework and offered nine (9) recommendations that are provided at the beginning of the team report, as well as presented within the text of the Standards sections.

### **Standard I Institutional Mission and Effectiveness**

#### ***Standard IA. Mission*** **General Observations**

In March 2008, Glendale Community College adopted the following mission statement:

Glendale Community College welcomes students of all diverse backgrounds, goals, ages, abilities, and learning styles. As an institution of higher education, we are committed to student learning and success. Using personal interaction, dynamic and rigorous instruction, and innovative technologies, we foster the development of critical thinking and lifelong learning. We provide students with the opportunity and support to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to meet their educational, career, and personal goals. Our commitment is to prepare students for their many evolving roles in and responsibilities to our community, our state, and our society.

The mission statement expresses the college's commitment to preparing students to meet their goals and to serving the needs of a diverse student body. The mission statement defines the college's intended student population as "students of all diverse backgrounds, goals, ages, abilities, and learning styles" (Standard IA). The accompanying core values further define the institution's educational purposes.

The college ensures that its programs and services are aligned with its mission primarily through the program review process in which programs must address this item as part of their overall evaluation. The college regularly assesses students' needs and attempts to align its programs and services with these identified needs (Standard IA.1, IA.4).

In the fall of each year, the Master Planning Committee reviews the mission statement. This review process includes an organized procedure for obtaining input from various constituencies where committee members solicit suggestions for changes. Potential changes in the mission are addressed only if recommendations emerge during this planning process (Standard IA.3).

***Standard IA. Mission***  
**Findings and Evidence**

Because the college's mission is broad, the college's programs were easily found to be in alignment with the mission. The college's efforts in adapting to changing student needs and pedagogy indicate its interest in adopting new approaches to implementing its mission. The college's innovative approaches in developing learning communities, and its improvements in such programs as ESL and Nursing serve as evidence of how the college has worked to meet the needs of its students and community (Standard IA.1).

The college's current mission statement was approved by the Board of Trustees in March 2008, and is published in the catalog, class schedule and website. These locations are satisfactory in meeting this standard (Standard IA.2).

Survey results indicate that the majority of college employees feel that they had adequate opportunity to be involved in the most recent revision of the mission statement. However, the process used by the college to review its mission each year is limited to the members of the Master Planning Committee (Team A). This review process does not extend to the entire campus, so it is unclear how formalized input is solicited from the rest of the campus community (Standard IA.3).

The team found that the college has made a sincere effort to make the mission central to its planning processes. However, faculty/staff survey results indicate that over half of the respondents reported only "some of the time," when asked if the "governance committees focus on the College Mission Statement when making recommendations." These data indicate that more work needs to be done to communicate that this focus is an expectation of governance committees, and to ensure that the expectation is being met (Standard IA.4).

***Standard IA. Mission***  
**Conclusions**

Standard IA is met.

The college's current mission statement appears to meet the relevant standards. However, the college should ensure that there is broad involvement in the annual review of the mission statement to dispel the perception that the work of the governance committees only focuses on the mission "some of the time" (Standard IA.4).

***Standard IB. Improving Institutional Effectiveness***  
**General Comments**

The college has engaged in extensive dialogue regarding Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and institutional improvement in the program review and planning processes. Most of this dialogue at the college occurs in various committee, department and program meetings (Standard IB.1).

The college's Strategic Master Plan (SMP) was updated in fall 2008, and is based on considerable data related to the college and its community. The process to develop the plan was broad-based in an effort to include all campus constituencies. The Board of Trustees has also aligned its goals with the Strategic Master Plan goals. In addition, the college develops short-term, annual goals to direct resource allocation and ensures that resource requests that align with these annual goals are given higher priority (Standard IB.2).

Program review has been in place for many years and serves as the college's primary evaluation process. Every six years, all instructional, student services and administrative areas are required to complete a comprehensive self-examination. The self-evaluation includes: a review of how the program aligns with the college's mission, an analysis of program data, identification of staff professional development, identification of resource needs, and a plan for the next three years. However, the team found that there is not a process for regular, systematic review and updating of plans. As part of the program review process, a team of faculty and staff conduct a validation of each report to determine whether program plans, needs and resource requests are supported by data (Standard IB.3).

The college has made a significant effort to integrate institutional evaluation (program review), planning and resource allocation as demonstrated by the following: the Program Review Committee evaluates all requests for resources to determine if they are justified within the respective program review; and a subcommittee of Team A (the college's Master Planning Committee) reviews all requests for resources to determine if they are aligned with the college's strategic plan. Only requests with verified linkages are forwarded to the three standing governance committees (Academic Affairs, Student Services, Administrative Services) for prioritization, and then on to the Expanded Budget Development Committee where a final prioritized list for the college is established (Standard IB.3).

The college has two committees that serve as the primary institutional planning structure: the Master Planning Committee referred to as Team A, and the Planning Resource Committee referred to as Team B. Team A is comprised of approximately 60 members with broad representation from all constituencies. Team B is essentially a steering committee for Team A consisting of only 14 members from Team A who represent faculty, staff and administrators. An additional planning committee, the Institutional Planning Coordination Committee (IPCC), was recently created consisting of representatives from all constituencies. College employees also have the opportunity to provide input into the planning process through the college's three standing governance committees or the corresponding subcommittees that report to each standing committee (Standard IB.4).

A substantial amount of data and information is available regarding both the college and its surrounding community. The college's annual fact book includes a variety of data about the demographics of the college service area, the student population, and the college's employees, as well as student achievement and outcome measures. This report is widely distributed on campus and posted on the Research and Planning Office's website. In addition, as part of the program review process, instructional programs are provided with student performance and program productivity data in the year the program is being

reviewed. Division level data on productivity and student performance is provided annually. The team found the comprehensiveness of these data and how they are provided with consistent regularity by the Research and Planning Office to be commendable (Standard IB.5).

Recently, the responsibility for reviewing the college planning processes was moved from Team B to the newly-formed Institutional Planning Coordination Committee. The college relies upon the results from the annual faculty/staff surveys to assess the planning processes. The Program Review Committee has the responsibility to review the program review process on an ongoing basis (Standard IB.6, IB.7).

### ***Standard IB. Improving Institutional Effectiveness*** **Findings and Evidence**

A review of the minutes from various committee meetings provides evidence of the dialogue that takes place related to student learning outcomes (SLOs) and institutional effectiveness. However, in spite of the various efforts to facilitate dialogue throughout the college, survey results indicate a need to increase awareness of the learning outcomes cycle and local processes. In addition, the team had difficulty obtaining direct evidence of the impact that the SLO dialogue has had on student learning and how data and research have been used to achieve common understandings in the dialogue regarding student learning. Interviews with staff involved in SLOs revealed that the absence of evidence can be attributed to the college not having a system in place to gather data and information for this purpose. Further, there is not much data available on the assessment of student performance and SLOs. The college expects that the implementation of the eLumen software system will address both of these issues because it will serve as a repository for SLO assessment data (Standard IB.1).

The team verified that the Strategic Master Plan includes measurable objectives, strategies for achieving these objectives, timelines for completion, assessment methods, and budget implications. The development of annual goals helps highlight those areas upon which the college will focus in a given year. However, the process used to develop the annual goals relies heavily upon a survey of Team A members rather than data from a formalized needs assessment. Therefore, goals that are more familiar and/or easily understood tend to get the most survey votes rather than there being a true assessment of the most urgent or important needs of the college (Standard IB.2).

The college uses survey data to demonstrate understanding and familiarity with the strategic goals throughout the institution. While a large majority of respondents indicate familiarity with most of the goals, only 61% are familiar with Goal IX (integrated planning). The college is concerned with this response and acknowledges that they have more work to do to increase understanding of the nature of and the need for integrated planning throughout the college (Standard IB.2).

The college's program review process is very detailed and includes an in-depth analysis of a program's past, present and future. However, it appears that the template used for program review was originally developed for the instructional areas and has not been adequately

adapted to meet the varied needs of student services and administrative services. As a result, student services and administrative services must try to fit their program review process within parameters that are not particularly applicable to these functions (Standard IB.3).

There is not a clear link between the program review process that occurs every six years and the annual resource allocation cycle. While programs have the opportunity to update their program review information each year, very few programs take advantage of this opportunity. In interviews with the team, college faculty and staff acknowledged that there are issues related to trying to link outdated program review information with current resource requests and that this lack of connection has been an ongoing problem. While there have been attempts to resolve the matter, the college has not reached a resolution, although it was clear to the team that this is a priority as a goal (Standard IB.3).

The Institutional Planning Coordination Committee was initiated by the original Core 5 members after recognition of the need to integrate the processes related to planning, student learning outcomes, research, program review, and accreditation. The Core 5 began as an informal meeting among the persons who had been charged with coordinating these efforts. When they realized that they did not have the authority to implement many of changes that were needed, they invited the three vice presidents to join them in a dialogue about how to implement change. This group evolved into the Institutional Planning Dialogue Committee (IPDC) and helped to develop lines of communication across the different areas of the college that typically operated in silos. As a result of this dialogue, it became clear that this group needed to be integrated into the college's governance process. The IPDC eventually became the Institutional Planning Coordination Committee and was expanded to include representation from all constituent groups in addition to the original Core 5 members and vice presidents. The Institutional Planning Coordination Committee has become an integral part of the governance structure. The college has made serious efforts to integrate these processes, as well as its activities to achieve broader recognition of and support for the need for integrated planning (Standard IB.3).

The Institutional Planning Coordination Committee began meeting in fall 2009 and is still in the beginning stages of clarifying its charge and determining its priorities. However, in its former iteration as the Institutional Planning Dialogue Committee, it had previously discussed the need to integrate the various college plans in a meaningful way. To this end, the committee is currently developing a template that is designed to gather consistent information about all the plans in order to inform how these plans can be integrated with each other and into the overall planning process. It will be vital that this information is used to integrate these plans in a meaningful way, both with each other and into the college's overall planning process (Standard IB.3).

The Self Study states that annual reports will be completed that document the college's progress towards the completion of the Strategic Master Plan goals. The Strategic Master Plan was developed in fall 2008, and therefore the first set of these annual progress reports would have been due in fall 2009. When the team asked to review these reports, it discovered that the reports were requested informally, but were not completed in a systematic way. Instead, what was received were some verbal and written reports that had varying

levels of depth and usefulness. The lack of formal evidence is an indication of insufficient institutional support for collecting information that formally documents institutional effectiveness through a regular, systematic approach (Standard IB.3).

The college's Planning Handbook includes information on the structure of the primary planning committees, timelines related to different aspects of the planning process, descriptions of the Strategic and Educational Master Plans, and the processes used to evaluate planning activities. In interviews, college faculty and staff often cited the usefulness of this handbook in documenting and increasing understanding of the planning processes. However, in reviewing this document the team found that it was missing a description of the budget process. Only a list of the different committees involved in the budget process is included. When asked about this omission, college staff indicated it was an oversight that would be corrected (Standard IB.3).

The team noted significant differences in perceptions of the level of understanding of the planning and decision-making processes based upon the level of individuals' involvement in the process. Members of the campus community who have been directly involved were the most familiar with the processes and could speak in an informed manner. In interviews with those who were not directly involved in the process, the team found a distinct lack of understanding and familiarity (Standard IB.3).

The team noted inconsistencies in the Self Study regarding the process of resource allocation. In one place it states that only requests for resources from validated program reviews can be considered in the resource allocation process, while in another place the report states that "most resource allocation is tied to program review" and there are "multiple paths for funding different types of requests." For example, requests for human resources follow a different path in that they are reviewed by three separate hiring advisory committees that prioritize the requested positions. The Expanded Budget Committee determines how many positions are available to be filled and these prioritized lists determine which exact positions will be filled. Another example is with what the college calls "must do" requests, which are mostly related to health and safety issues or contractual obligations. It also appears that the path to funding is often determined by the source of the funding as there is a separate path to each type of funding source (e.g., Perkins, instructional equipment). The college has not formally documented all the different paths to funding or the criteria and requirements for each path. The college leadership and staff are aware that there is a need to address the multiple paths as demonstrated in discussions by the Institutional Planning Dialogue Committee (Standard IB.3).

In its Self Study, the college acknowledges that it only partially meets Standard IB.3. One problem the college identified is the lack of integration among the various plans at the college, including the Educational Master Plan, Strategic Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Technology Plan, and Human Resources Plan. The college has hired a consultant to assist in the development an Educational Master Plan, and as part of this work, the consultants are expected to help address this lack of integration. The other problem the college identified through survey results is that college constituencies do not perceive that resource allocation is tied in a meaningful way to student learning. While a student learning outcome component

was recently added to the program review process, it appears that the college still has work to do to clarify how to connect student assessment data to the allocation of resources (Standard IB.3).

While still defining the scope of its charge, it appears that the Institutional Planning Coordination Committee will be responsible for ensuring that the college has an integrated planning process that leads to documented institutional effectiveness. This charge will entail integrating all the various college plans with each other and into the overall planning process. It will be important for the Institutional Planning Coordination Committee to clarify the roles and relationships among the three primary planning committees (Standard IB.4).

With the large number of committees at the college it appears that employees have ample opportunity to be involved in planning. Administrators and faculty members are most definitely involved in aspects of planning, and classified staff reported that they are well-represented in all of the governance committees, depending upon release time they receive from their supervisors to participate (Standard IB.4).

The Self Study states that every student in the Associated Student Government (ASGCC) is required to participate in two governance committees. In interviews with student leaders, the team confirmed that this requirement is enforced by the ASGCC through a system that monitors attendance at meetings and includes measures to address excessive absences. In addition, student committee representatives are trained by student advisors to ensure that they are well informed about their respective committee's function and purpose. The team was quite impressed by the consistent level of commitment and active involvement in college governance by students, and commends the ASGCC for its efforts to ensure the meaningful involvement of students (Standard IB.4).

The efforts of the Research and Planning Office have helped create the foundation for a culture of evidence at the college, where data and information are available and integrated into planning and evaluation processes. However, while data is gathered, there seems to be an inadequate effort in interpreting and determining the relevance of the data. Much the data on the website is presented without narrative or an executive summary, which can be critical components in helping readers understand what constitutes evidence, the differences between indirect and direct evidence, and how evidence should be used to demonstrate effectiveness. Additionally, while the reports produced by the Research and Planning Office are made available to the public via the college's website, what is missing is an assessment of whether the current efforts to communicate institutional quality, both internally and externally, are effective and adequate (Standard IB.5).

The Self Study reports that over a third of respondents to the faculty/staff survey indicated they did not know if the college "regularly evaluates its planning processes and makes changes to improve them." The Self Study states that the college's planning process "is not easily condensed into a simple organizational diagram or flow chart." In interviews with the team, college staff admitted that their processes may appear cumbersome, complicated, and slow, but most followed these statements with the sentiment that these processes "work for them." However, when asked what direct evidence they have to prove that these processes

are effective most cited indirect measures including participation, buy-in and survey results that indicate that faculty and staff are satisfied. It appears that college staff does not have a broad understanding of what constitutes evidence, and are not familiar with the differences between direct and indirect evidence. As a result, the college has not identified clear measures of effectiveness for their planning processes. Lack of funding was also cited as a reason for not generating evidence of the effectiveness of the planning process, making it seem as though this aspect of planning is dependent upon new resources rather than part of the ongoing process (Standard IB.4, IB.6).

While the evaluation of the program review process has led to changes designed to improve the process, there is not a formal process to gather evidence regarding effectiveness. Information is gathered informally from some program review participants, validation team members, and program review committee members; however, the opportunity to provide feedback is not offered to every participant. Previously an exit survey was administered, but when the surveys were rarely returned the survey practice was discontinued. The committee has no clear measures of effectiveness for the program review process, nor does it document how program review leads to specific program improvements (Standard IB.7).

#### ***Standard IB. Improving Institutional Effectiveness*** **Conclusions**

Standard IB is partially met.

The college has made progress in increasing awareness of the planning processes as well as in obtaining buy-in and improving attitudes towards planning throughout the institution. It was described by one person as “moving the culture of Glendale Community College to valuing integration, planning, evaluation and outcomes,” so that the question of how different functions support the strategic master plan is raised more often and where data are no longer feared, but rather seen as a tool used to validate effectiveness and identify areas for improvement. Making planning a central function of the college is a clear priority of the superintendent/president who has emphasized the need for organization, dialogue and support among constituents as fundamental to the success of the planning process, while moving forward with the systems necessary to reach planning goals.

The college also candidly demonstrates its awareness of the gaps in its planning processes, one of which is the absence of direct evidence to demonstrate institutional effectiveness with a heavy reliance on indirect (i.e., surveys) and anecdotal information. In addition, there is recognition that the college has relied on informal processes to gather information about institutional effectiveness and there is a need for the establishment of systematic processes to collect and document evidence of institutional effectiveness that complements the student achievement data already being used.

The college has developed linkages between program review and resource allocation and the Strategic Master Plan. However, the integration of other planning elements into an overall planning process has not been achieved. The college’s planning process is not broadly understood across the college. In addition, the college’s efforts to incorporate student

learning into the planning process have thus far not resulted in a meaningful connection where student learning is driving resource allocation (Standard IB.3, IB.4).

Data have clearly been incorporated into the college's planning processes and the Research and Planning Office is to be commended for continually providing the college with comprehensive and timely data. However, this extensive data needs to be accompanied by an effort to help college faculty and staff understand the different aspects and uses of evidence, identify which data are applicable to their work, and document how they use information to improve program and institutional effectiveness (Standard IB.5).

The evaluation of the planning and program review processes has not been based on defined measures of effectiveness and has not used direct evidence to demonstrate effectiveness. Efforts to gather feedback from the college community on the effectiveness of these processes have been mostly informal and not systematic or consistent (Standard IB.6, IB.7).

As a result of the evidence provided in the Self-Study and gathered during the visit, the team determined that the college is at the proficiency level in program review. The program review process has been in place for several years, is using qualitative and quantitative data, and is linked to planning in that most resource requests must be justified by the program review. The reasons why program review is not at the *Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement* level are that there is no evidence how program review leads to improvement and the link to student learning is not strong.

Based on the evidence, the team also determined that the college is at the development level in planning. The college's planning process has been defined in the linkages between the strategic master plan, program review and resource allocation. Data were used to inform the development of the Strategic Master Plan, the mission is reviewed on a regular basis, and there are various opportunities available for all constituencies to be involved in planning. While planning has some elements at the proficiency level, the college has not clearly documented assessment results, the various college plans are not integrated with each other or into the overall planning process, the annual goals are not consistently or strongly linked to resource allocation, and the planning and decision making process is not found to be understood broadly across the campus.

***Standard I. Institutional Mission and Effectiveness***  
**Recommendations**

Recommendation 1.

Building on a recommendation made by the 2004 evaluation team, the team recommends that the college strengthen the linkages among the program review, planning and resource allocation processes in order to:

- Establish and publish a clear timeline and specific outcomes for the integration of the planning processes;
- Establish and implement formal and systematic processes for assessing the effectiveness of the planning, program review, and resource allocation processes that include clear measures of effectiveness and direct evidence,
- Ensure that the implementation of integrated planning and resource allocation is not solely dependent upon the receipt of new revenue, but rather focuses on continuous improvement even if this requires reallocating or reprioritizing the use of existing resources;
- Assign administrative responsibility and accountability for the implementation of plans;
- Align the program review cycle and the annual planning and budget cycles to ensure that planning and resource allocation are data-driven and based upon annual outcome measures;
- Clarify, document and review the multiple paths for requesting resources;
- Ensure an integrated process for continuous improvement of the planning process; and
- Facilitate increased campuswide awareness and understanding of the college's integrated planning and decision-making processes.

(Standards IB.2, IB.3, IB.4, IB.6, IB.7, IIIA.6, IIID.1.a, IIID.1.b, IIID.3)

## **Standard II**

### **Student Learning Programs and Services**

#### ***Standard IIA. Instructional Programs***

##### **General Comments**

Glendale Community College (GCC) provides a comprehensive general education program as well as programs designed to prepare students for transfer, career and technical education, workforce training, developmental skills, lifelong learning and community services education. AA degrees are available in 16 fields, AS degrees in 42 fields and certificates in 58 career and technical programs. The Garfield Campus offers continuing education classes in the following: English as a Second Language (ESL), career skills, high school diploma (GED), life-long learning, and parent education. Contract instruction is supported by the Professional Development Center and a field station in Baja is the site for field trips and classes. According to its website, the college serves approximately 25,000 students in day and evening classes, and 10,000 others in the adult education and specialized job training programs. The college offers instruction in a variety of modes, including online and hybrid, to help students to meet the requirements of their educational choices.

Glendale Community College clearly takes pride in the quality of its academic instruction. During the visit, the team noted that classrooms were full and students appeared highly engaged in learning, whether in classrooms, the library, labs or in offices. The college should be commended for the conscientiousness with which faculty members were observed engaging with students in office hours demonstrating a dedication to academic interests and student learning. In addition, high quality instruction is evidenced by strong performance in California accountability measures, such as the California Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC), a statewide performance measure system for community colleges, and transfer rates, which exceed those of many other colleges (Standard IIA).

The college uses research to identify student needs including educational preparation, diversity, and demographics in making decisions about courses and programs. The college offers a broad range of courses and programs to meet these needs. For example, after monitoring workforce training and language learning needs, the college developed programs that respond to the community. In addition, the college hired a consulting firm to assist in research about Glendale and neighboring communities in order to anticipate future student needs (Standard IIA.1.a).

The college utilizes various delivery systems and modes including many distance learning opportunities, enhanced or experiential courses, cohorts, courses designed for academically accomplished students, as well as adapted courses for students with disabilities. Technology support is provided at the High Tech Center for students with disabilities who are on campus. However, there is not yet in place support for online students who have disabilities except

through the Distance Education Captioning and Transcription grant that provides California Community Colleges with funding for live and asynchronous captioning and transcription to enhance access of students to distance education courses (Standard IIA.1.b).

To ensure academic integrity all courses go through the same basic approval process (with an additional step for distance education courses), which includes proposal approval through Division Division meetings, as well as from the Technical Review Committee, Curriculum and Instruction Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, Executive Committee, and Board of Trustees. The additional step for distance education courses involves approval from the Technology Mediated Instruction (TMI) committee (Standard IIA.1).

The faculty, division chairs, Academic Senate, Academic Affairs Committee and program administrators take responsibility for the integrity of the curriculum. The Self Study indicated that the college monitors the quality of courses through program review (in which SLO's are listed); although it appeared to the team that curriculum quality was more often monitored by faculty, divisions and through the Curriculum and Instruction Committee's course approval process. Career Technical Education (CTE) programs are further assessed by the California Community College Chancellor's Office Core Indicators (CCI), which are a range of state indicators to show how well Career Technical Education is doing to help students succeed. Program advisory committees that include professionals and practitioners in CTE fields also provide input. Faculty and staff adhere to the mission and college core values when making a decision, which provides consistency and integrity to the college curriculum. The team attended sessions in which there were conversations about the way specific courses and programs align with college values, leaving the impression that questions about curriculum decisions are conscientiously explored which should be commended (Standard IIA.1).

The ARCC report indicates that the percentages of students at Glendale College who complete degrees or certificates, transfer to four year institutions or become prepared to transfer are well above state averages. In addition, core indicators aggregated across all Perkins-funded programs are well above state rates as are employment indicators. (Standard IIA.1).

The college has begun to define and assess achievement of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's). At the course level, 79.5 percent of courses have written SLO's. Plans for assessment have been developed in 11.8 percent of courses. Program assessment of student learning is rudimentary; in September 2009 the Academic Senate adopted a formal definition of "program" to apply to the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Cycle (SLOAC). The Self Study indicated that the Research and Planning Office tracked student achievement via student learning outcomes, although this seemed not to be clear to all division chairs. The college began using eLumen software in 2009 to help track SLO assessment in courses, programs and core competencies. Two faculty members were each given 20 percent release time for coordinating the SLOAC, implementing eLumen and training faculty and staff in the development and assessment of student learning outcomes. Pilot testing of eLumen for recording SLO assessments at the course level has been conducted by faculty members from English, mathematics, nursing and credit ESL. At present, eLumen is not being used as

initially intended. The software program involves large start up costs of time and infrastructure development, and the one faculty member who was assigned to implement the system has only 20 percent release time. In addition, the college seems unsure regarding how SLO data need to be organized, although it has made some progress in mapping course/service-level SLOs to the core competencies; this alignment will be critical to the complete implementation of eLumen (Standard IIA.1.c).

Training to develop appropriate course student learning outcomes has been offered to faculty. The SLOAC coordinator is available to help them as well. However, resistance to moving away from exit standards, which have been used for many years, to monitoring student learning has been pervasive. At the moment writing SLO's for courses appears to be a "check off the box" exercise rather than a meaningful commitment to using student learning outcomes for authentic assessment and improvement (Standard IIA.1.c).

The college assures the quality and improvement of all instructional programs and courses by first vetting new proposals through a complex, multi-tiered approval process. Course quality is also assessed through student evaluations of faculty, regular curriculum review (every six years), program review, and, to a more limited degree, SLO assessment. (At this point, SLO assessment is not well reported.) A task force has looked at monitoring the quality of distance education and made recommendations to the appropriate governance committee and collective bargaining unit. A policy on monitoring distance education courses is pending (Standard IIA.2).

Faculty members are expected to meet or exceed minimum qualifications for the discipline they teach as defined by the Glendale Community College Minimum Qualifications list. In career technical education programs, faculty members work with advisory committees to ensure that programs meet the standards of employers. Holding monthly division meetings, division chairs are responsible for monitoring competency levels, exit standards, teaching practices and student learning outcomes (Standard IIA.2.b).

Appropriate breadth, depth, rigor and sequencing, time to completion and synthesis of learning are secured through the comprehensive program and course approval and review process. Articulation of courses with other institutions is monitored. Hiring high-quality faculty also contributes to course depth and rigor. The 2009 ARCC report indicates that the college's Student Progress and Achievement Rate (SPAR) which is a measure of transfer (including transfer prepared), degree and certificate attainment (including degree directed), was above both state and peer group averages (58.8% compared to an average of 55.4% for the peer group and 51.8% for the state). Most of the college's core indicators aggregated across all Perkins-funded programs are well above state-negotiated minimum rates. One more indication of the college's commitment to high-quality instruction is that a faculty teaching and learning center has been funded to provide resources aimed at improving teaching and learning (Standard IIA.2.c).

The college uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of students. Staff development workshops and one-on-one training sessions that focus on identifying learning styles, appropriate pedagogical strategies, as well

as a multitude of technological tools, are provided to promote student success. Cohort programs (like Achieving College Excellence, Project for Adult College Education and Scholars) are set up to benefit students with special needs. Assessments of student learning styles for students with disabilities are done at the Instructional Assistance Center (IAC). Evaluations of classes, both face-to-face and online, and data on success and retention rates from the Research and Planning Office, indicate successful uses of delivery modes and teaching approaches (Standard IIA.2.d).

Systematic review of course relevance, appropriateness, currency and future needs and plans take place in both the program review process and in the Curriculum and Instruction Committee (Standard IIA.2.e).

Program review is the primary means of evaluation to assure that programs are implementing student learning outcomes. (The Self Study states that changes to the 2010-2011 program review document are being discussed by the Program Review Committee to strengthen the component of currency in the program review process, although the team did not find evidence to support this assertion). Additionally, Team A, Team B and the Institutional Planning Coordination Committee are responsible for alignment of the college's activities to the Strategic Master Plan, the overarching integrated planning document. The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle Committee is charged with coordinating SLO assessment, which monitors student achievement, and, to a limited extent, it has been successful with coordination efforts (Standard IIA.2.f).

Common course examinations are used in English, math and credit ESL divisions. In English, examinations are evaluated during day-long holistic grading sessions where each exam is assessed by multiple readers in order to ensure grading consistency. Writing prompts for these exams are determined by a faculty group and examined to assure sensitivity to students' backgrounds and experience (Standard IIA.2.g).

The college awards credit in ways that are consistent with generally accepted norms of higher education. SLO assessment is at a rudimentary level, although for years students' success has been measured through the use of *exit standards*, and faculty members believe this is comparable, providing them with information that they need for instructional improvement (Standard IIA.2.h).

Awarding of degrees and certificates is based on student achievement of a program's exit standards (or in some limited courses, SLO's), which are consistent with institutional policies and accepted norms and equivalencies in higher education. A task force of the Academic Senate is evaluating the number of requirements (thought by some to be too numerous), the currency of the requirements and the correlation of the graduation requirements with the core competencies (although the team could not find reports from this task force). Though not based on SLO achievement, articulation agreements with a wide variety of public and private colleges and universities indicate that the awarding of degrees is appropriate (Standard IIA.2.i).

The 2009-2010 college catalog describes the general education requirements for graduation from colleges and universities, including the details of these requirements. The Self Study suggests that the development and approval of core competencies as Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO's) sufficiently meets the standard. The approval process for the core competencies in 2006 supports the idea that the college has a "carefully considered philosophy" of general education. Academic and vocational degrees are awarded based on students' successful achievement of these competencies, which include: Communication (Standard IIA.3.b), Mathematical Competency/Quantitative Reasoning (Standard IIA.3.b), Information Competency (Standard IIA.3.b), Critical Thinking (Standard IIA.3.b), Global Awareness and Appreciation (Standard IIA.3), Personal Responsibility (Standard IIA.3.c), and Application of Knowledge (Standard IIA.3.b).

General education requirements for a degree include 18 units of general education, including the following: Humanities and Arts, Foreign Language, Literature and Philosophy (6 units); Natural Science (3 units); Social Sciences (3 units); Language and Rationality (6 units). These satisfy Standard IIA.3.a.

The Self Study identifies that the American institutions, state and local government and U.S. history requirement fulfills Standard IIA.3.c, as these courses focus on ethics, citizenship and social responsibility. Cultural diversity is a separate graduation requirement that stipulates the completion of three units of a course identified as satisfying the cultural diversity requirement in the catalog (Standard IIA.3.c).

In addition to general education, all AA degree programs require 18 units in a major area of emphasis. Students can choose from 16 major programs. AS degree programs offer 42 specific areas of inquiry to meet the 24 unit requirement in an occupational area (Standard II A4). Similarly, vocational and occupational certificates and degrees also require that students demonstrate technical and professional competencies. Course content is aligned with the regulations and content of the appropriate certification or licensing board and/or accrediting agency. Vocational or occupational degree faculty members meet at least annually with advisory committees. Career and Technical programs are measured annually through Career Technical Education Core Indicators (Standard IIA.5).

Students and the general public can receive information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies through the college catalog, website and, hopefully soon, a fully implemented People Soft management program. The Self Study indicated that course outlines posted online list the student learning outcomes in Section 8; however, the team found inconsistencies in reviewing evidence. Many courses did include SLO's in Section 8, and many others did not. Despite the lengthy course approval process, some course outlines that were listed online had some inconsistencies and proofreading errors (Standard IIA.6). The Self Study states that transfer-of-credit policies are clearly defined and made available to students. This is true for transfer-out policies, but policies for units that can be transferred in are found only in Student Services, and not in the catalog or on the website (Standard IIA.6.a). The college has a process for discontinuing or enhancing programs and includes provisions for affected students (Standard IIA.6.b). With some exceptions, the college publications are generally accurate. Although keeping up with the dynamic changes of any

college is difficult, the team found this to be especially challenging at Glendale Community College where engagement in dialogue and decision making sometimes takes place within groups, but not consistently between groups (Standard IIA.6.c).

Board adopted policies on academic freedom / responsibility and student academic honesty are made available on the website and in the catalog (Standard IIA.7 and 7.b). The Academic Senate's faculty ethics statement includes expectations about data and information being presented both fairly and objectively (Standard IIA.7.a).

### ***Standard IIA. Instructional Programs*** **Findings and Evidence**

Although a good beginning has been made, the faculty has not made a full transition to an SLO culture. One reason given is that the college has not had the resources to devote to staff development in this area. Two faculty members have each been given 20 percent re-assigned time to provide SLO support to the entire college; one acts as the SLO coordinator while the other manages assessment data with the use of eLumen. Given the size of the institution and some resistance to the SLO concept, it is not surprising that progress on SLO's has been uneven: most course outlines have SLO's (though the website course outlines had fewer SLO's on them than were reported by SLOAC), and some assessment is being done, although evidence of the latter is not well tracked, consolidated or communicated. There was little evidence that SLO assessment has impacted instruction. One notable exception was found in the English department, which uses common finals in three of its key courses. These exams are created and graded (using rubrics) by faculty teams that include both full-time and adjunct faculty. Examinations are evaluated during day-long, holistic grading sessions during which each exam is assessed by multiple readers in order to ensure grading consistency. Assessment Reports produced from departmental grading demonstrate that a systematic approach to course improvement is being successfully achieved through this process. It is important to note that grant money has been given to fund this comprehensive process (Standard IIA.1.c).

The SLO coordinator has spent some effort training faculty by working with individuals, groups or giving presentations, and some progress has been made. However, while it was evident to the team that some faculty members support SLO's and have adopted them, others still question and resist the concept and implementation of Student Learning Outcomes. Despite survey results provided in the Self Study, it was difficult to assess how pervasive the "buy in" to SLO's was on campus, although it was clear to the team that a conscientious effort is being made by the faculty (Standard IIA.1.c).

At the program level, the process of assessment is at a rudimentary stage, with only 6.7 percent of associate degree programs and 8.5 percent of certificate programs having Student Learning Outcomes in place. The team found that program SLOs are not published in the college catalog. Plans for assessment of programs are linked to alignment with course SLO's using the eLumen software as the means for keeping track of assessment data, but so far, this has not progressed. SLO assessment of core competencies, which function as institutional learning outcomes and general education outcomes, appears non-existent (Standard IIA.1.c).

Overall, the college appears to be at the development level on the *Institutional Effectiveness Rubric for Student Learning Outcomes* from ACCJC. The college will need to accelerate its efforts to meet the ACCJC 2012 requirements.

The distance education staff is still working on developing ways to assure curriculum integrity for online courses; the Quality in Distance Education Committee identified areas of concern, including course evaluation procedures, faculty training, accessibility issues, and code of student conduct (Standard IIA.1.b). Note: the short quiz for a student to determine if he/she is a good fit for DE described on page 13 in the current catalog (listed to be at <http://www.glendale.edu/online/de4me>) is not working (Standard IIA.2.b).

#### ***Standard IIA. Instructional Programs*** ***Conclusions***

Standard IIA is partially met.

See Recommendation 1.

#### ***Standard IIB: Student Support Services*** ***General Comments***

Glendale Community College recruits and admits diverse students who are able to benefit from its programs in accordance with its mission. The primary mission of the college is to prepare students for successful transfer to four year colleges and universities or for successful placement or advancement in rewarding careers through providing credit instruction. Its mission is also to serve its surrounding communities through noncredit education and community services courses and programs. Student support services are a key factor in students' benefiting from the colleges instructional opportunities.

Student Services are operated under the direction of the vice-president of student services. Student Services faculty and staff serve on college governance committees and express the needs of all departments in Student Services. They are engaged in dialogue regarding student achievement, and student learning outcomes are incorporated into the program review document however, program review practices do not seem to inform planning. Kiosks provide students with information on all student support services, as well as direct access to their class schedules, grade reports, and transcripts with an option to print. This innovative use of technology is a model for other institutions of higher education.

The team observed that student services provided at the college's main campus and noncredit Garfield campus cultivate a supportive learning environment. Student needs are identified primarily through surveys as well as interaction with students. Students from the Garfield campus are referred to the main campus for additional student support services when these are not available at Garfield. The quality of services is assessed through program review and student satisfaction surveys. The program review process includes Student Learning Outcomes and mission statements for each area with overarching themes in support of the college mission (Standard IIB.1). Student Services has made a commitment to continue to

evaluate and revise methodologies and delivery methods to ensure student success. Evidence of this commitment includes implementation of a “one stop” student services support center, plans for implementation of an electronic education planning tool for students, improvement in the student transcript and the imaging of student records to improve efficiency as the college transitions to a new administrative system (Standard IIA.2.d).

The college values and promotes student success and transfer. The college reports that it has the largest community college scholarship program in California. More than 500 scholarships and grants are available totaling more than \$300,000. The college also has one of the highest student transfer rates in the state in achievement of its primary mission to prepare students for successful transfer to four-year colleges and universities.

The faculty, staff, and administration at the noncredit Garfield campus also place high value on student success. A caring and accommodating environment is apparent in all service delivery areas, including classrooms and learning resource areas. The team observed that the campus is collegial and fosters a climate of support and encouragement for its students. Interviews with students on campus also confirmed that the college provides a supportive and encouraging learning environment.

#### ***Standard IIB. Student Support Services*** **Findings and Evidence**

Glendale Community College provides services to students in separate campus locations. In order to better serve students, the college has created an interim one-stop Student Services area to better serve students while completing the new classrooms/lab/Student Services building. The interim one-stop area is scheduled to open in the spring semester 2010 (Standard IIB.1.).

Noncredit courses are offered at the Garfield campus, but student support services are limited and many are not offered at this location. Academic, mental health and career counseling support services are provided to students at the Garfield campus. However, if additional services are required, students are referred to the main campus.

The college provides a catalog with official information concerning its mission, requirements, and policies. The team noted that a major policy affecting students, sexual harassment, was not contained in the catalog or the schedule of classes (Standard IIB.2.c). Although, the 2008-2009 Student Handbook previously included a sexual harassment statement, the handbook became cost prohibitive and was not printed or placed online for students to access in 2009-2010. The staff acknowledged that the omission of the information in the catalog and schedule was an oversight. The team also noted that the “Old Board Policy” link on the college website ([www.glendale.edu](http://www.glendale.edu)) has the previous Sexual Harassment Board Policy (2700 adopted 1/25/89 and BP 2710 revised 3/3/00); yet these policy statements do not appear in current board policy.

Additionally, the policy on Academic Freedom does not appear in the college catalog or class schedule, although there is a current board policy on Academic Freedom (BP 4030)

(Standard IIB.2.A).

Another major policy affecting students is the acceptance of transfer credits. The college reports a high transfer rate; however, the catalog does not contain information about the policy and procedure for acceptance of transfer credits and the process for the evaluation of those credits (Standard IIB.2.c). The team also noted that while the catalog contains a statement on Accreditation with a reference to ACCJC/WASC, the contact information for the accreditor is not accurate.

Glendale Community College provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students. It evaluates counseling and academic advising programs through student satisfaction surveys included in program review, to support student development and success. The survey results reviewed by the team showed high levels of student satisfaction with counseling and advising. The college also prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function (Standard IIB.3.b).

The college has a diversity requirement and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity. Student leaders interviewed reported that student government offers additional diversity workshops, cultural events, and activities to increase awareness and inclusion (Standard IIB.3.d).

Admissions and placement instruments and practices are regularly evaluated to validate their effectiveness. The college is currently transitioning to the Student Information module in PeopleSoft. The admissions application was activated during the team's visit and the student records module is planned for implementation in December 2010. In the interim, the college will run its legacy system concurrently with PeopleSoft to ensure a seamless transition. The college has placed a high priority on ensuring that quality information and access is provided. A consultant group was hired to provide training and to facilitate a seamless transition to the new system (Standard IIB.3.e).

## **Conclusions**

Standard IIB is met.

## ***Standard IIC. Student Learning Programs and Services, Library and Learning Support Services***

### **General Comments**

The college library offers a full complement of library and learning support services to students and faculty in a two-story 36,000 square foot facility located in the center of the campus. The library collection includes approximately 123,000 volumes, 188 periodical subscriptions, 40 subscription databases, and 20,000 electronic books. The library has 113 computer workstations, with 88 for student use, and five circulating laptops for student use in the library. Wireless access to the Internet is available along with a number of technological

resources including microforms, music CDs, tapes, magazines and newspapers and more than 1,000 reserve textbooks, customized research guides, and other web-based services and materials. The library has a 357 seat capacity, including 12 group study rooms with a seating capacity of 56, and a 27 seat technology enhanced classroom (Standard IIC.1.a).

Each librarian focuses on a specific area in the library such as collection development, credit instruction, information competency workshops, reference services, and systems/technical services. To meet discipline-specific needs, each of the full-time librarians serves as a liaison to three or four instructional divisions and collaborates with faculty on the selection of materials, as well as support for instructional assignments. In addition, the discipline-specific faculty and library liaisons work with the Collection Development librarian to update the selection of library materials. Librarians are also integrated into the college's curriculum development processes for courses and programs (Standards IIC.1 and IIC.1.a).

Learning support services are provided through the Learning Center in three areas: The Writing Center, Tutorial Center, and Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) Lab which are centrally located on the main campus in the Administration building. General computer lab support services are provided to students in two large open computer labs with a total of 400 computers. The San Gabriel Lab is designed to provide hands on training in word processing, databases, spreadsheets, presentations, desktop publishing, and digital imaging; and the San Rafael Lab provides support in business and computing subjects. In addition, a great number of learning support services are provided through the instructional divisions and student services programs in discipline-specific labs at both the main campus and Garfield campus. Main campus labs include a Career Center, English Lab, High Tech Center, Language Lab, Math Discovery Center, Media Arts Lab, Music Lab, Nursing Resource Lab, Physical Science Computing, and an Instructional Technology Resource Center. The Garfield campus houses the Career Resource Center and labs for Developmental Skills, Continuing Education/Business Department Computing, and Noncredit ESL (Standards IIC.1 and IIC.1.a).

The library provides ongoing instruction through a series of information competency workshops, a full range of library workshops, and a UC/CSU transferable credit course in information competency. Writing skills workshops are also offered in the Learning Center to support classroom instruction (Standard IIC.1.b).

A full range of library services are available to students, faculty, and staff. The library collection and services may be accessed by currently enrolled students either remotely 24/7 via the Internet, or by telephone, and in person during business hours. The Garfield campus houses a small library of approximately 1,000 titles selected in collaboration with the Garfield campus faculty. Limited reference and research assistance was funded by the college's Foundation Skills grant and was made available in April 2009. Students and faculty may also access online databases and services. The hours of operation for the Learning Center and specialized learning labs are available on the college website and in the printed class schedules (Standard IIC.1.c).

In addition to the Glendale Community College Police Services, security systems for the library and Garfield Campus include a Simplex fire alarm system, a 3M magnetic detection system at the main campus library to protect library holdings, and the Sentry Technology Knogo electro-magnetic system at the Garfield library. Maintenance agreements are in place for the security systems, and the library's integrated library system. The college's custodial staff is responsible for the daily maintenance of the library and learning support services' facilities and external vendors have been used for periodic deep cleaning of the library (Standard IIC.1.d).

Reciprocal borrowing agreements are maintained between Glendale Community College, Pasadena City College, and California State University Los Angeles. All other library services are provided at the college. The library is also a member of the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) to support interlibrary loan options for students, faculty, and staff. Photocopy service vendor agreements are maintained to support the library, Learning Center, and other computer labs (Standard IIC.1.e).

The library routinely collects data on the adequacy of its services, the currency of library holdings, enrollment data on the number of students served in library information workshops, and student success in library information competency courses. The Learning Center collects student attendance statistics and tracks data on the number and delivery of discipline specific tutorial services. Learning Center student data is tracked by the number of students served by hours, days, and on a semester basis, as well. The various specialized Learning Support Computer labs also track student contact hour data by day, hour, and semester usage to plan services needed by students. (Standard IIIC.2).

### ***Standard IIC. Student Learning Programs and Services, Library and Learning Support Services***

#### **Findings and Evidence**

Glendale Community College provides workshops and classes to support information competency along with many learning support services to support instructional programs. Concerns have been raised regarding the number of full-time librarians, the need for a dedicated librarian for the Garfield campus, and additional staffing in the Learning Center. However, the team found that there is sufficient space and staff to provide library and learning support services to students, instructional programs and faculty (Standards IIC.1).

Based on observations, interviews, and the examination of the findings of the Research and Planning Office and student satisfaction surveys, the library is meeting a primary tenet of its philosophy to serve as an "...educational service designed to implement the curriculum". The 2008 Library Services Student Survey results indicate eighty percent of the students surveyed reported using the library, with 34 percent indicating they use the library monthly. About 53 percent of the respondents noted that they have used the library website. Of the students responding to the spring 2009 Library Services Student Survey, 30 percent of students reported using the library weekly, 30 percent monthly and 14 percent on a daily basis (Standard IIC.1).

The college relies on the expertise of the instructional faculty and librarians in the selection of library and instructional materials. It also uses librarian liaison relationships with specific instructional divisions in order to link the purchase of library materials to the college's educational programs. In addition, the college has established a Library and Information Competency Committee (L&IC) to broaden communication on the needs for library and learning support services at the main campus and at the Garfield campus (Standards IIC.1. and IIC.1.a).

Enrollment data indicate a high level of participation in the library information competency workshops (over 4500 students participated in 2007-2008 out of a total student population of 25,000 ). The Information Competency 191 credit course is taught as a stand-alone course or paired with English 101 and information competency instruction in the nursing curriculum. The Glendale Community College Information Competency 191 course has been cited as a model for other community colleges in California (Standard IIC.1.b).

The library is open Monday through Thursday, 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., and Saturday, 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. The Learning Center is open 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday, 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Friday, and 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. Saturday. The 15 computer and specialized learning support labs at the college, along with the library and computer labs at the Garfield campus are open 40 to 60 hours per week, Monday through Friday, some on Saturday, and evening hours, as well (Standard IIC.1.c).

The college has a structure in place for a Library and Learning Center Resources Director to supervise the Library and Learning Center. However, there is not a formalized structure for coordination and planning among the San Gabriel and San Rafael open computer labs and the other 14 computer and specialized learning support labs (some discipline specific) at the main campus and the Garfield campus. In addition, Information and Technology Services (ITS) is primarily responsible for maintaining software licenses for the computer and other specialized learning support service labs across the campus, while the licenses for some of the discipline-specific software are maintained in the program areas. Again, this inconsistency speaks to the need for strong linkages in planning processes across the college (Standards IIC.1.a, IIC.1.c, IIC.1.e).

The fire alarm system is adequate for the protection of the main campus library, and security systems for library materials are in place at the main campus and the Garfield campus. However, the team found that inconsistent security practices, exacerbated by reductions in custodial staffing, have created security breaches with the main library facility. Doors to the library have inadvertently not been secured and locked after closing and cleaning. Library staff report that they have encountered people who are already in the building upon arrival to work the next day. In addition, lack of funds to support the annual cleaning of the carpet in the main library and the cleaning of library books may create longer term maintenance issues (Standard IIC.1.d).

The Library and Learning Center program reviews were completed in the past year. The Library completed a program review in spring 2008 and the Learning Center conducted its program review in spring 2009. The Library and the Learning Center program reviews

outline defined student learning outcomes and student assessment outcomes. Assessment tools were written, the assessment of data was analyzed, and evidence supported the usage of these data in their planning processes. The college's system used to track progress on SLOs and SAOs indicates that the Library and Learning Center implemented this process in 2007 (Standard IIC.2).

***Standard IIC. Student Learning Programs and Services, Library and Learning Support Services***

**Conclusions**

Standard II C is met.

***Standard II. Student Learning Programs and Services***

**Recommendations**

Recommendation 2.

The team recommends that the institution accelerate its efforts to develop and implement Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) assessment measures at the course, program and institutional levels to ensure ongoing, systematic, data driven improvement of student learning in order to meet the proficiency level of the Institutional Effectiveness Rubric for Student Learning Outcomes by 2012. (Standards IIA.1.a, IIA.1.c, IIA.2.a, IIA.2.b, IIA.2.e)

Recommendation 3.

The team recommends that the college ensure that all major policies affecting students are published in an accessible manner in such publications as the catalog, including the Academic Freedom Policy, transfer of credit and the process for sexual harassment complaints. (Standard IIB.2)

## **Standard III Resources**

### ***Standard III.A. Human Resources***

#### **General Comments**

The college has a philosophy that hiring procedures and guidelines for faculty and staff are intended to facilitate the hiring of qualified individuals who are experts in their subject areas and who are skilled in teaching and serving the needs of the student population.

The hiring policies reflect a thorough hiring process that is specific to each position's role in the institution.

Glendale Community College has board policies and administrative regulations in place to ensure that it hires employees who are qualified, meet minimum qualifications, and have appropriate experience to support the different services that it provides to its students. Additionally, the Board of Trustees and the Academic Senate share the responsibility for establishing the policies and procedures for evaluating equivalencies to the minimum qualifications for faculty positions (Standard IIIA.1).

The team found that there are adequate policies, procedures and processes in place to ensure that all faculty meet minimum qualifications as defined in Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, and the California Education Code, and are fully qualified to support student learning programs and services (Standard III A.1.a).

Policies and procedures are in place for the evaluation of all staff on a regular basis. They are detailed in board policies, administrative regulations, and the employee collective bargaining contracts. Tenured faculty members are to be evaluated at least once every three years. Tenure track faculty members are to be evaluated in the fall of each year for four years. Adjunct faculty members are to be evaluated at least once during their first or second semester of employment, and every sixth semester thereafter. The purpose of the evaluation process is to evaluate the faculty member's overall performance and encourage improvement in order to maintain high standards in instruction (Standard IIIA.1.b).

Permanent classified employees are to be evaluated every two years. Probationary classified employees are to be evaluated at the end of the second and fifth month. Classified employees are to be evaluated in accordance with on-the-job performance criteria related to the position. The purpose of evaluations is to ensure that the evaluation process leads to improvement (Standard IIIA.1.b).

Administrative personnel are to be evaluated during each of the first two years, and at least once every two years thereafter to assess continued excellent performance. The superintendent/president is to be evaluated annually by the Board of Trustees, based upon the job description and goals identified by the governing board (Standard IIIA.1.b).

The college has a written code of ethics stated in a board policy along with an administrative regulation that speaks to the expected ethical and professional behavior of all employees. The Academic Senate adopted an ethics statement in 1996 that is included in the Faculty Handbook (Standard IIIA.1.d).

The college has policies and procedures to ensure fairness in all employment procedures. Hiring procedures for the different employee groups are found in employee collective bargaining agreements and in board policy. An Equal Employment Advisory Committee is one of the college's governance committees and ensures that hiring procedures are applied fairly. All hiring committees have an Equal Employment Opportunity representative who is required to receive specialized training prior to serving on a hiring committee. All other hiring committee members also receive Equal Employment Opportunity training and sign a confidentiality statement (Standard IIIA.3.a).

Personnel records are confidential and secured in the Human Resources Office. Archived personnel records are secured in a locked storage room in the Arts and Aviation building. Employees have access to their personnel records (Standard IIIA.3.B).

The Board of Trustees has a policy on the college's commitment to diversity. The Academic Senate created a Faculty Diversity Task Force to establish greater equity and diversity among academic administration and full-time faculty. The importance of diversity and equity is also included in the college's mission statement and core values. An Equal Employment Opportunity Plan is included as part of the Human Resources Strategic Plan. Several campus wide activities have been held to promote and celebrate cultural diversity (Standard IIIA.4.a).

Policies clearly outline the minimum qualifications for all faculty, classified employees, classified administrators/managers, and academic administrators/managers. Job openings are announced on the college website. Hiring committees are established by the department chair who communicates with Human Resources who then sets up the committee. Human Resources is responsible for screening all applications for minimum qualifications (Standard IIIA.1.a).

Staff development funds have been reduced by budget cuts due to the state's fiscal crisis. New faculty members who are on tenure track are required to develop a three-year professional development plan beginning their first year of probation (Standard IIIA.5.a).

Faculty members who do not meet minimum qualifications are able to petition for equivalency. With review by the Academic Senate, the committee that determines equivalency consists of three members of the appropriate division and the committee must have unanimous consent before equivalency can be granted.

The Human Resources department verifies minimum qualifications, a process that includes the chair of the hiring committee, and checks references, credentials, licenses and transcripts to determine that all the appropriate documents are there before sending the names to the committee for interviews.

The Human Resources department has started the process of converting its files to an electronic database which will be accessed by passwords. To ensure the security of personnel records, there will be a requirement to change passwords on a regular basis.

### ***Standard III A. Human Resources*** **Findings and Evidence**

The Self Study indicates that employee evaluations have not been done in a timely manner for a variety of reasons, including a high turnover of administrative staff, and that the college has a plan to bring all evaluations up to date by June 30, 2010, and the superintendent/president has indicated that this will be a top priority in the immediate future (Standard IIIA.1.b).

The team found that the employee demographic information on diversity in the Self Study does not include many of the federal EEO ethnic categories, and instead groups them into the category of "other." However, the team noted that the Campus Profile contains the employee diversity information specified for all groups.

Hiring procedures for the different employee groups are found in board policy and in the collective bargaining agreements. The Human Resources department also publishes a mini-brochure that outlines the hiring process for prospective applicants. Hiring committees are made up of individuals with expertise in the area identified in the job announcement. Committee members all receive Equal Employment Opportunity training to ensure that the hiring process is fair and equitable (Standard IIIA.3.a). The Human Resources department works closely with the manager of the appropriate department or division in writing the job descriptions, establishing minimum qualifications, and developing screening criteria for the initial evaluation of the applicant pool. A teaching demonstration is required as part of the interview process for faculty positions. The one employee group that does not have a clearly defined hiring process is classified managers. At this time, the process is the same one that used for classified positions (Standard IIIA.1.a). Once hired, the personnel records of all employees are secure and confidential (Standard IIIA.3.b).

Although there are board policies and collective bargaining agreements that prescribe the evaluation process and timeline for all employee groups, evaluations are not conducted in a systematic or timely manner, which was also noted by the 2004 visiting team. This is especially evident in the evaluation of classified staff and classified managers. At the time of the visit, there were 147 out of 320 classified evaluations overdue and no progress had been made for 11 out of 35 classified management evaluations that were overdue. The team was able to validate that the six academic manager evaluations that were overdue at the time the Self Study was submitted have been completed. The superintendent/president indicated that all overdue evaluations would be completed by June 30, 2010. In addition, the Board of Trustees is currently revising its policy on the evaluation of the superintendent/president (Standard IIIA.1.b).

The achievement of stated student learning outcomes (SLOs) was not clearly identified as being a component of the evaluation of faculty. However, it is indirectly included in the

evaluation process in that faculty are actively participating in the development and assessment of student learning outcomes. SLOs are included in the course overviews (syllabi) and many are published on the college website. (Standard IIIA.1.c.).

The college has an adequate complement of full-time faculty. However, due to the budget impact of California's ongoing fiscal crisis, vacant faculty positions that resulted from retirements have not been filled. Vacant classified and management positions have also not been filled and the duties associated with those positions have been distributed to other employees. In addition, there are several management positions that are currently filled on an interim basis. With the appointment of a new superintendent/president, it is expected that the process to fill these interim and vacant positions on a permanent basis will begin (Standard IIIA.2).

The team was able to validate that there are written policies that ensure that all employment procedures are fair and equitably carried out (Standard IIIA.3.a). There is a board policy that demonstrates a commitment to diversity. Respect for and understanding of diversity is also included in the mission statement and in the college's core values (Standard IIIA.4). In addition, there have been several campus-wide activities designed to celebrate diversity and increase cultural awareness as part of staff development activities (Standard IIIA.4.a).

Although the college provides an array of different college-wide activities to promote an understanding of and appreciation of diversity, it has not fully met the recommendation made by the prior team to complete a staff diversity plan that would help to establish effective programs and opportunities that would result in greater equity and diversity among all employee groups. A Faculty Diversity Internship Program is going through the approval process. The workforce analysis in the Human Resources Strategic Plan has also not been initiated (Standard IIIA, 4.a).

### ***Standard IIIA. Human Resources***

#### **Conclusions**

Standard IIIA is partially met.

### ***IIIB. Physical Resources***

#### **General Comments**

The team found the college campus to be well maintained and inviting for students. The college is built on 59 acres however, only 43 acres are useable due to the hillside. Additionally, the college is surrounded by a residential community and there is no room to expand. The only option would be to build multi-story buildings. Out of a total of 39 buildings, 15 are temporary, relocatable buildings.

The Garfield campus offers classes in continuing and community education, English as a Second Language, citizenship, and a variety of non-credit certificate programs, including adult basic education, high school diploma, and office skills programs. It also provides programs and services that are part of CalWorks and the Workforce Investment Act. The Garfield campus has a career resource center, developmental skills labs, a parent support

center that provides childcare, and an array student support services available to students. A new facility to replace bungalows at the Garfield campus is under construction. It is being funded by the college's Measure G passed by voters. The new facility is scheduled to be ready for use in 2011.

The college has a field station in Baja California, Mexico where classes and field trips are offered to study the natural environment.

Capital projects consisted of HVAC at the Garfield campus; expansion of the Culinary Arts facility; a three-story building for nursing, science, and digital imaging and facilities department; an 850 space parking structure and air conditioning of the gymnasium. There are plans to upgrade the facilities to come into compliance with seismic standards, which is critical given the area where the college is located.

Training for utility vehicle and forklift safety are offered to provide the necessary information to operate all aspects in a safe manner.

The police officers are armed, sworn peace officers and empowered by section 830.32 of the California Penal Code.

The Board of Trustees has adopted a resolution requiring that all new buildings at the college qualify for LEED certification.

### ***Standard IIIB. Physical Resources*** **Findings and Evidence**

The college uses a consulting firm to keep their 5-year facilities plan current. The Enrollment Management Committee is used as a "think tank" to address scheduling issues designed to maximize utilization of classrooms and labs (Standard IIIB.1.a).

In interviews, the team found that there has been a lack of quality cleaning of the facilities due to a shortage and deployment patterns of custodial personnel. This has also manifested itself in the overall maintenance of the facilities. The Associate Students organization has designated a portion of their dues to help pay for expenses related to graffiti removal (Standard IIIB.2.a).

A \$98 million bond measure (Measure G) was passed in 2002 and is being used to renovate classrooms, complete a new science center, upgrade the electrical and technology infrastructure and improve energy efficiency. The team found that as of the writing of the Self Study, over 50 percent of the projects were completed.

Outside contracts are used to handle large projects and necessary repairs. The college also contracts with its architects to ensure that the theme of the college is consistent with the buildings already in existence.

The Police Department is responsible for the maintenance of the Disaster Response Plan and the National Incident Management System (NIMS), which are incident plans mandated by Federal and State agencies. This plan was implemented in March 2009 and provides for a multi-level emergency response organization within the college. The team confirmed that there is no security coverage from midnight to 6:00 a.m., and there currently is no provision or agreement with the Glendale Police Department to cover this period of time.

The college uses the governance process to evaluate facilities and then sets priorities for renovations and maintenance of existing structures. The total cost of ownership has not yet been codified into a facilities plan. The custodial, utility costs and maintenance agreements are considered in addition to any equipment needs (Standard IIIB.1.b).

There are plans to hire additional custodial staff and to provide new maintenance systems and training as the new facilities are brought online in the future. All ADA issues have been addressed and the college reports that there are no complaints about access; however, in interviews the team found that there have been complaints about the specific location of disabled access in the buildings.

New equipment is being purchased and training is provided to help staff be more effective and efficient in their use of resources. The college will be using a team cleaning/task-based approach to assigning duties to current resources.

#### ***Standard IIIB. Physical Resources*** **Conclusions**

Standard IIIB is met.

Integration of resource planning and institutional planning is required to properly assess the effective use of the physical resources which is addressed in the 2008-14 strategic plan. The linkage between the Strategic Master Plan and the facilities planning process has improved recently and has been manifested in the Facilities Master Plan Task Force.

There is an issue with the custodial staff's failure to consistently lock some of the facilities after cleaning. This issue is being addressed by the facilities director but concerns remain on campus regarding the fact that the security of buildings is often compromised (Standard IIIB.1.b).

There are plans to address the replacement of the air-conditioning system that services the server room of the Information Technology Services department. Additionally, the positioning of the servers themselves will be changed so that the hot air being generated does not blow directly onto the other servers. The ceiling will also be raised to allow for the hot air to rise and return air vents will be added lower so that the servers are operating at the correct temperature (Standard IIIB.2.a).

### ***IIIC. Technology Resources***

#### **General Comments**

The college's Technology Plan focuses on establishing strategic goals including an infrastructure design to provide support for meeting the goals.

The third Technology Master Plan was completed in fall 2009, and is considered a working document intended to focus on current and future needs of the district. The last program review was completed in spring 2009 and identified four learning outcome categories. There are three governance committees that guide identification of needs for the Information Technology Services department. Each governance committee is comprised of voting members representing all college constituencies, as well as non-voting members who serve as resources to the committee due to their specific knowledge about a particular area. Agendas for the committees are located on the college website. (Standard IIIC.1)

The Information Technology Services (ITS) department maintains a complex high-speed network consisting of approximately 2018 computers (1544 PCs and 474 Macs) located in 23 buildings throughout the main campus, and 330 computers (329 PCs and 1 Mac) located in four labs at the Garfield campus. The main campus network consists of a fiber optic cable backbone that connects all of the buildings. The buildings at Garfield are also interconnected via a fiber optic cable backbone. Upgrade of the bandwidth is currently under review at the Garfield campus (Standard IIIC.1.a.).

The team concurred with the college's assessment that some of the programmers are not proficient with the PeopleSoft software and, as a result, the organization has experienced delays in implementation of the new system for student services. However, the college plans to have the implementation completed by summer 2010. The college has already been upgraded to Oracle for the Human Resources and Finance areas. The Oracle system is functioning in a satisfactory manner.

The help desk provides a very important function in providing assistance for computer and audio visual issues for all users. The help desk is available from 8 a.m. to 7 p.m., Monday through Friday; voice messages can be left after hours which are responded to the next morning.

The college has an up-to-date web presence that conforms to criteria established to meet the college's information technology and marketing needs. The Web Oversight committee, which reports directly to the Campus Executive Committee, has responsibility for oversight of the college's web presence. The new content management system used to build and maintain the new website has helped to improve navigation and consistency but does not support building or maintaining websites from a Macintosh computer.

Surveys from spring 2009 indicate that services were satisfactory in all areas of support for computers, software, DVD players and projectors in labs (Standards IIIC. a, IIIC.c.).

The Information Technology Services department supports the instruction and administrative systems and receives feedback from multiple governance committees, as well as the program review process. The senior programmer analyst directly supervises five other programmer analysts. (Standard IIIC.d)

All but one of the fourteen academic divisions has a computer lab. The daily support for these labs is handled by instructional and non-instructional lab technicians. Any need for higher-level technical issues are referred to the Information Technology Services department.

The High Tech Center provides access and support for students with disabilities to ensure equal access to education. This center has its own specialized lab and offers specialized computer classes, evaluations and test proctoring for students with disabilities.

Backup tapes of mission critical data are stored off-site on a weekly basis; one month of backups are maintained off site at any given time. The infrastructure upgrade completed in 2005 allows for minimal cabling and enables the college to transmit voice, video and data over the same wire. The new infrastructure allows for upgrades to occur without installation of a completely new system. The system uses technology referred to as “voice over IP”.

The demand for online and hybrid courses has grown over the past several years and the college is committed to providing access and support for this mode of instruction. The online, hybrid and web-enhanced courses also place additional demands on the computer system due to the software requirements.

The Information Technology Services department provides training on various aspects of the technology such as Microsoft Office, Windows Vista, MAC OSX, Outlook, as well as other software. However staff noted that this training is limited depending upon an available funding source.

The associate dean of instructional technology reports to the vice president of instruction, and is supported by one full-time classified employee. The staffing for the ITS department appears to be adequate, however, the team noted that the college is also paying consultants to help support the PeopleSoft implementation due to inadequate training of ITS staff.

### ***Standard IIIC. Technology Resources*** **Findings and Evidence**

A staff development needs assessment was conducted in 2007 where 159 respondents identified areas of interest for training. There was a cross section of staff that was sent to Oracle University for classes to become familiar with the upgrade to PeopleSoft (Standard IIIC.1)

A policy that provides a guide for distribution of technology resources was adopted called the Computer Cascade Policy. This policy calls for the replacement of computers in the student computer labs every three years and the replacement of faculty and staff computers every five years. (Standard IIIC.1.c)

Concerns were expressed to the team that training on PeopleSoft has not been communicated or scheduled. This training is critical to ensuring effective application of information technology for students and employees (Standard IIIC.1.b).

The department completed its first program review in the spring of 2009 and was able to gather feedback from all stakeholders regarding their performance in providing for management, maintenance, and operation of the technology infrastructure.

### ***Standard IIIC. Technology Resources*** **Conclusions**

Standard IIIC is met.

The team found that there is a problem with the lack of required skills for some staff in the Information Technology Services department. Even after training was provided, there are still problems in keeping up with demands, which required the college to hire consultants to provide these services. College leadership plans to either continue with training or redeploy the resources elsewhere in the district (Standard IIIC.1.b).

There are three separate managerial staff members in the Information Technology Services department who report to the associate vice president. The staff in Information Technology Services has not been evaluated for the past three to four years, which indicates that there is a lack of communication as to expectations and interaction.

The Self Study reports that requests for resources are prioritized based upon a scoring system, and returned to the Budget Committee. However, due to a lack of funding this process has not been tested. College staff reported that online support for students, and implementation of the PeopleSoft student records and electronic planning tools have not been given priority. In addition, training for the programmers is insufficient (Standard IIIC.1.b).

In 2008 a survey was conducted asking about the quality of the service being provided by the department. There were three areas identified as needing improvement: technology planning and evaluation for improvement; integration of technology and institutional planning; and upgrading the current email system to be more user-friendly.

Decisions about deployment of technology resources are made by the Information and Technology Services department in conjunction with the campus-wide Computer Coordinating committee, and are based on the prioritized goals identified in the annual Technology Master Plan. The college assures that the technology planning integrates with institutional planning and that assessment measures are the basis for improvement by using the information created by the Information Technology Services department in consultation with the campus-wide Computer Coordinating Committee.

The staff acknowledges that outages in the air conditioning system where the servers are located have been problematic; however, there are plans to address this issue. In addition,

the mitigation plan has been budgeted and will be the responsibility of the Facilities department to coordinate.

Although plans seem to be in the development stage, the team strongly suggests that the college address the previous team's recommendation by moving quickly to implement long-range planning in Information and Technology Services and Learning Resources that is linked to budget allocation (Standard IIIC).

#### **IIID. Financial Resources**

##### **General Comments**

The operating budget for the college is \$88 million. This operating budget has served the growth of students at the college for the past two years. However, the ongoing California fiscal crisis has had a sustained and negative impact upon the college's budget. Staff report that there has been no additional funding from the state for growth and given that the district is located in a mature market, there is doubt that growth will be forthcoming. In the immediate future, any additional funding will need to be generated from outside sources such as federal funding opportunities. The college has contracted with a consulting firm that has written eight proposals for consideration.

The college has made a variety of reductions in its budget in non-personnel areas such as travel, supplies, equipment and repairs, and has also negotiated a temporary cost reduction with its unions and meet-and-confer staff. The college has implemented an Enrollment Management Committee to increase the efficiency of their instructional programs. Through the efforts of the committee and due to the surge in student demand, the college has experienced an increase in enrollment, while at the same time reducing a large number of class sections.

The college's financial processes are integrated into the Strategic Master Plan. The committee includes about 60 members representing all of the stakeholders. The overall process begins with factoring in any new revenues that may be expected from the state (Standard IIID.1). The college does not budget any growth funds until the subsequent year which allows for a conservative approach to fiscal stability (Standard IIID.1.b).

Identification of the liability for the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) 45 requirements has been completed; however, there is not agreement between the college and the unions as to whether funding this liability, which is \$16 million, is a negotiable item. The college has not implemented any funding plan at this point until this issue has been resolved (Standard IIID.1.c).

The college passed a \$98 million bond measure in 2002 for capital construction and renovations. Additionally, the college issued Certificates of Participation in 1997, and 2008 to fund construction of the Science Center and completion of the parking structure (Standard IIID.1.c). The funding sources to retire this debt are the general fund and Associated Students organization in the amount of \$ 300,000 and \$ 150,000 respectively (Standard IIID.1.c).

The budget for the college was institutionalized by Board Policy 3110. The budget complies with the California Code of Regulations and the college's policies. The tentative and final budget documents are completed in a timely manner and presented to the Board of Trustees for adoption in accordance with regulations (Standard IIID.1.d, III.2.b). In addition, budget information is shared monthly with the Board of Trustees including updates on the bond measure, quarterly 311 reports, new grants, purchase orders, warrants and contracts issued (Standard IIID.2.b). The college also holds budget committee meetings twice a month to discuss financial information with regards to revenues and expenses (Standard IIID.2.b).

In the past five fiscal years, the college has consistently met the regulations with regards to California's "50 Percent Law" (Standard IIID.2.a). In addition, due to strong fiscal management, the ending fund balances of the college have been in excess of 5 percent for the past four fiscal years. The Board has established a reserve at this same level to provide for emergencies, cash-flow needs, and economic uncertainty (Standard IIID.2.c).

The college uses Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes to help with their cash flow needs. This is particularly critical with the apportionment deferrals that community colleges have been experiencing as a result of the California's budget crisis (Standard IIID.2.c).

The college also applies for grants to help augment their operations. The goal is to ensure that the master plan is complemented by these grants (Standard IIID.2.e). The college plans on developing a process to ensure that all grant applications will achieve the goals in the Strategic Master Plan, and that there are provisions for the total cost of ownership (Standard IIID.2.f).

The college has established a risk management policy (BP 3551) that covers liability, fire, employees' bonding, boiler and workers' compensation coverage. These programs are self-insured through two joint powers agreements (Standard IIID.2.c).

The Oracle Financial System was implemented in 2003 for the purpose of properly tracking all financial transactions. These transactions are protected by user ID and passwords based upon the user's job responsibilities. This approach allows for internal controls to be monitored by the institution (Standard IIID.2.d).

The Associated Students is funded by the bookstore operations and an optional student services fee. This revenue stream supports student clubs and other activities to enhance the academic experience (Standard IIID.2.e).

Board policies are updated to ensure they are in compliance with changes that occur in state law. Semi-annual audits occur to ensure that disbursements are in accordance with the regulations of the Los Angeles County Office of Education. The college reviews all contracts for compliance with policies (Standard IIID.2.f).

The college reviewed and re-engineered their financial management system prior to the implementation of Oracle. The processes were documented and improvements were made prior to implementation (Standard IIID.2.g).

The college also asked the Fiscal Crisis Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) to provide an independent review of the budget and financial practices. The team provided a report and recommendations. The college also hired an independent CPA firm to audit and review its financial processes. The review process resulted in thirteen recommendations from FCMAT and three recommendations from the CPA firm (Standard IIID.2.g).

The college assesses its effective use of financial resources at regular intervals. Program reviews are used in the process to determine the basis for improvement and allocation of additional resources (Standard IIID.3).

### ***Standard IIID. Financial Resources***

#### **Findings and Evidence**

Due to the State of California's fiscal crisis, the college will not have sufficient resources to support any growth of the Educational Master Plan and will be required to develop new funding sources outside those offered by the State (Standard IIID.1.c)

The budget process has been institutionalized by Board Policy 3110, which identified the superintendent/president as the responsible individual for preparation and presentation of the budget to the Board of Trustees (Standard IIID.1). There are a variety of meetings that occur at the college so that all stakeholders are kept informed of any budget issues (Standard IIID.2.b).

Funding for GASB 45 has not been identified and is pending negotiations with the college's labor unions (Standard IIID.1.c).

Upon review of the 311 report and the annual audits for the past three fiscal years, there is evidence of the fiscal stability of the institution and the means to support any unforeseen circumstances that may arise (Standard IIID.2.c). All audit reports are unqualified and have no material findings. Fund balances are all appropriately funded with no (or limited) risk of being placed "at risk". (Standard IIID.2.d)

The college Foundation has built an endowment of about \$7.7 million which allows for student scholarships of over \$ 300,000 each year (Standard IIID.2.b). The college plans to develop a process to ensure that all grant applications will achieve the goals in the master plan, and that there are provisions for the total cost of ownership (Standard IIID.2.f).

The college instituted levels of contractual protections to avoid any legal issues that include review of work performed by vendors; dollar value of contract; delivery period; change orders and termination clauses just to name a few (Standard IIID.2.f).

The study conducted by an independent finance consulting firm includes recommendations that are specific to the fiscal well being of the college which the college has acknowledged.

The college plans to evaluate the findings and recommendations as well as developing a plan for implementation (Standard IIID.2.g).

Due to lack of funds from the state, the college has not had the opportunity to test the process for funding programs and services or assessing its use of financial resources (Standard IIID.3).

***Standard IIID. Financial Resources***  
**Conclusions**

Standard IIID is met.

***Standard III. Resources***  
**Recommendations**

Recommendation 4.

As recommended by the 2004 evaluation, the team recommends that the college complete all overdue employee evaluations, as required by Board policy and employee collective bargaining agreements, and fully implement professional development plans to ensure that all staff obtain the necessary skills to satisfactorily perform their jobs. (Standards IIIA.1.b, IIIA.5) The team also recommends that the evaluation processes of faculty and others responsible for learning clearly identify how the effectiveness of producing outcomes is addressed as a component of their evaluation (Standard IIIA.1.c).

Recommendation 5.

The team recommends that the college use all traditional, federally-recognized Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) ethnic categories in order to develop a comprehensive approach in describing and planning for the diversity of faculty and staff at the college. (Standard IIIA. 4)

Recommendation 6.

As recommended by the 2004 evaluation team, the team recommends that the college move quickly to implement long range planning in Information and Technology Services that is linked to budget allocation. (Standard IIIC.)

Recommendation 7.

The team recommends that the college address the issue of inadequate staffing levels for its maintenance and custodial functions, including training to increase efficiency and

productivity, as well as the lack of security between the hours of midnight and 6:00 a.m. (Standards IIIA.5, IIIB.1.b)

**Recommendation 8.**

The team recommends that the college take the necessary steps to ensure the safety of the servers so that the system does not shut down due to overheating. (Standard IIIB.2.a)

**Recommendation 9.**

The team recommends that the college develop and implement a plan for funding its long-term employee liability under Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) 45. (Standard IIID.1.c)

## **Standard IV Leadership and Governance**

***Standard IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes***  
**General Comments**

The governance structure of Glendale Community College is organized so that all constituencies have clearly defined and appropriate roles in improving institutional policy and practices through discussion and institutional planning. The college's governance document, available on its website, stresses the intention to include all constituencies "in deliberations regarding day-to-day and long-range planning." The structure includes four large standing committees with representation from all constituencies: Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Administrative Affairs and Executive. The Executive Committee, which includes leaders from administration, faculty (both Academic Senate and union), classified staff, and students, has final responsibility to recommend action to the superintendent/president, who brings the recommendations forward to the board.

Reporting to these standing committees are 28 different subcommittees (identified on the "Blue List"). Many of these committees are integral to planning and budgeting, and a recently established committee, the Institutional Planning Coordinating Committee, coordinates planning. Twenty-eight other committees, referred to as the "Green List," lie outside this committee structure but perform more specialized, non-governance functions, such as discussing employee benefits. Complementing this committee structure, the college's Academic Senate participates in recommending policies and practices in matters regarded as academic and professional. In accordance with board policy, a Mutual Gains document delineates the Academic Senate's responsibilities, indicating where the board will primarily accept the senate's recommendations and where the senate and the board must mutually agree on policies regarding academic and professional matters. The Associated Students of Glendale Community College (ASGCC) also has its own committee structure. The twenty-six students who make up the Associated Students of Glendale Community College serve on at least two governance committees.

The faculty union (Guild) and the classified staff union (CSEA) have powers included through their negotiations with the administration and board, as well as the power to appoint members to governance committees. This structure encourages broad participation in governance. Although classified staff participation has been inconsistent in the past, their participation has improved (Standard IVA.1, IVA.2).

Employees may bring forward ideas outside the formal governance structure. Faculty members suggest ideas through their respective divisions, which forward them to an appropriate governance committee or directly to administration. All employees may also bring forward ideas through the administrator to whom they report (Standard IVA.1, IVA.2).

Integral to the governance structure is the planning and budgeting process. This process includes input from the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Administrative Affairs committees to the Executive committee. An Institutional Planning Coordinating Committee has recently been established to coordinate the various college planning processes. All plans must show linkage to the college Strategic Master Plan. The structure developed for committee review of budget requests is extensive, though complex, and assures that budget requests meet strict criteria of adhering to planning priorities and being validated by program review. However, the accountability for seeing the execution for approved plans is not clearly set forth (Standard IV4.A.2.a).

Aside from the structure of governance, the atmosphere in which it transpires has been a concern. In recent years, the college has attempted to respond to a broad-based lack of confidence and distrust in its former leadership, both senior administration and the Board of Trustees. To address these problems, in early 2009 the college invited a joint technical assistance team from the Community College League of California (CCLC) and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) to provide technical assistance. The recommendations of the technical assistance team are currently being carried out by the new superintendent/president and the board (Standard IVA.1). During the accreditation team visit, the interim president/superintendent was named as the permanent president/superintendent.

The college's Academic Senate and its Academic Affairs and Student Affairs committees share responsibility for student learning programs and services. Their duties are delineated in the Mutual Gains document. Courses are approved by the Academic Affairs Committee, the membership of which is mostly faculty. The Academic Senate also reviews and determines course approval and their placement within disciplines. Programs are approved by the Academic Senate. The Student Affairs Committee approves student services programs. The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycles fall under the purview of the Academic Senate. Curriculum is approved by a subcommittee of the Academic Affairs Committee, which is comprised of mostly faculty. Program review is overseen by the Program Review Committee, led by a faculty coordinator on release time and a program manager. This committee reports to the vice president of instructional services. Other matters that are primarily academic, such as graduation requirements, grading policy, and the orientation of new faculty, are the responsibility of the college's Academic Senate (Standard IVA.2.b).

confidence in their newly appointed president/superintendent (This appointment occurred during the team visit). Surveys on campus views of governance reflect a clear improvement in confidence among administrators, faculty, and classified staff in the new president/superintendent, who was the interim president/superintendent during 2009 (Standard IVA.1).

Those who serve on governance committees are provided with adequate information to understand the processes of the work they are asked to do. The Academic Senate, the Guild, and CSEA all provide information for those who serve on committees, and the Governance Review Committee is available to answer questions on process as part of its mission.

The college's Academic Senate, Guild, and CSEA have offices in the administration building. A fulltime governance officer serves these offices and coordinates governance activities. This proximity and support staff appears to encourage communication among constituencies. In addition, a Governance Review Committee serves as "the conscience of governance." This committee surveys the campus community on how well they perceive governance working, provides effective practices in conducting committee business, monitors attendance at meetings, and resolves various problems related to the committee structure and processes.

Board Policy 1025, the Governance Document, and the Mutual Gains document clearly set forth in detail the structures and processes of participatory governance at Glendale Community College. Interviews with some faculty and classified personnel suggest most understand how the system works, although some were unsure about how planning and budgeting is carried out as that process has been evolving. Survey results indicate that all constituencies have positive attitudes about how well governance structures work.

Interviews with faculty and administrators at the Garfield campus indicate that those assigned to that campus fully participate in governance committees.

A visit to the Curriculum and Instruction Committee revealed some confusion over who has authority to make recommendations to establish new programs, the Curriculum and Instruction Committee or the Academic Senate.

#### ***Standard IVA. Decision-Making Roles and Processes*** **Conclusions**

Standard IV A is met.

The college's processes are inclusive and comprehensive. Members of the college community are comfortable with the formal governance structure, complex though it may be. All constituencies participate in decision-making as appropriate to their roles. There is a clear line of progression from a suggestion to the appropriate committee, to the president/superintendent, and ultimately to the Board of Trustees.

Since meetings of most standing committees occur monthly, action that requires approval of multiple committees can be slow. The planning process exemplifies this problem. While it has been designed with much thoughtful dialogue by many leaders from the faculty, administration, and (to a lesser extent) classified staff, it is still in its development stage after more than four years of work and has yet to be fully implemented.

The college community is optimistic about its governance structure and its new leadership, which also extends to the Board of Trustees.

### ***Standard IVB. Board and Administrative Organization*** **General Comments**

Glendale Community College is governed by an independent, five-member, publicly elected Board of Trustees, whose responsibilities are delineated in state law and regulations (California Education Code and Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations). A student representing the Associated Students of Glendale Community College is also a member of the board and casts “advisory” votes on issues. Through its philosophy statement and duties and responsibilities as set forth in board policy (BP 2200), it is clear that the board recognizes its duties to establish *policies and practices that assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs* (IVB.1.a). In addition, the board has final authority over all expenditures and other matters related to the financial health of the college. All contracts with the college/district or any other legal decisions must also be approved by the Board of Trustees (IVB.1.c)

The Board of Trustees maintains oversight and final authority over all of the college’s educational programs, including requirements for graduation, curriculum matters, program development and review, and calendar. The board consults with and regularly accepts the advice of the Academic Senate in matters designated as academic and professional, such as curriculum development and review, program review, student success policies and practices, and grading standards. The board has undertaken a review and revision of policies and processes to help improve the quality and integrity of student learning programs and services. In addition, board policy (BP 3250) now requires the board to be informed of and involved in all major institutional planning activities (Standard IVB1.b).

The board acts according to its policies on its own activities and ethical standards, some of which have been recently revised. These include the requirement that the college maintain a 5 percent reserve and a new policy on college governance (BP 2510) (IVB.1.c).

In recent years, the functioning of the Board of Trustees in the day-to-day activities of the college has been an issue on campus. The college has acknowledged findings from a joint technical assistance team from the ASCCC and CCLC that faculty, staff, and middle-level administrators viewed these activities of the board with distrust. The board agreed to work with facilitators hired by the college to correct this perception and restore confidence in its activities (IVB.1.c).

Board policies about the membership, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures are posted on the college website (IVB.1.d). One board policy (BP 2410) includes a general process by which the board annually evaluates and revises its own policies (IVB.1.e). Another policy (BP 2745) responds to a recommendation from the last visiting team, that the board assesses its own performance annually and determines ways to improve (IVB.1.g). Other board policies address orientation of new board members (BP 2210) and on-going education of members (BP 2740). Board policies also delineate the election procedure, including staggered terms, and how positions that become vacant are filled (IVB.1.f). Other policies include an ethics statement, including consequences of violations (BP 2715), and a process for selecting and evaluating the college president (BP 2431) (IVB.1.g, IVB.1.h). Board members were informed of activities in preparation for the visit. The board had an accreditation task force and two members participated as liaisons to the accreditation coordinator (IV1.B.i).

The superintendent/president provides overall leadership for the institution (IVB.2) and oversees both the governance processes of the college, ensuring the participation of all constituent groups (IVB.2.b). The superintendent/president inherited an administrative structure that includes a number of interim administrators at the executive level; the new CEO has plans to move forward with updating the organizational structure and providing for permanent, rather than interim leadership (IVB.2.a.).

The superintendent/president provides leadership for the college budget (IVB.2.d) and provides oversight for all fiscal practices. The superintendent/president also provides leadership and support for the instructional processes and quality of the institution, student support services, and all planning efforts that are related to the functioning of the college (IVB.2.b). The superintendent/president is also visible and active in the community served by the college, providing liaison between the surrounding area and the institution (IVB.2.e).

### ***IVB. Board and Administrative Organization***

#### **Findings and Evidence**

The team found members of the Board of Trustees of the Glendale Community College District to be knowledgeable and enthusiastic about their role as board members. Each expressed his or her desire to maintain a hands-off attitude towards the day-to-day activities of the college and to focus on policy issues and issues pertaining to furthering the college mission (Standard IVB.1.b). The board and the superintendent/president form a leadership team in which appropriate roles are observed.

By law, the board maintains ultimate responsibility for the quality of the college's educational programs, all legal matters affecting the college, and the financial integrity of the college (Standard IVB.1.c.). Interviews with board members revealed that they are intent upon maintaining and perhaps increasing the reserves of the college, which are currently about five percent. The board delegates the management and leadership for the institution's fiscal processes to the superintendent/president who provides regular reports to the board (Standard IVB.1.j.).

The board has been actively reviewing and amending its board policies and administrative regulations. At each board meeting several revised policies are on the action agenda. The college governance committees are asked for input into the revisions. One policy that they understand must be completed is the one on the evaluation of the president/superintendent, which is currently being revised after two board readings (Standard IVB1b, IVB1.e).

Board policies, administrative regulations, agendas, and minutes are available on the college website (Standard IVB1.d.).

The board orientation policy does not include much substance, but its policy on its own education is robust. The board has engaged in a number of educational activities to increase their knowledge and effectiveness. These include attending workshops sponsored by the California Community College Trustees (CCCT), Community College League of California (CCLC), and others. The board regularly engages in study sessions and has attempted to align its goals with those of the planning and budgeting of the college (Standard IVB1.f).

In addition, the board has a program by which each member will serve as a contact for specific community organizations and leaders to strengthen ties between the community and the college. One board member has been instrumental in helping the college develop a program to educate technicians for the Department of Power and Water.

According to interviews with those in all constituencies of the college community and survey results, the college community has restored its confidence in the Board of Trustees. Furthermore, interviews with all board members and the new college president/superintendent indicate that the board is comfortable with their respective roles in governance.

The board has a policy by which it evaluates its performance on an annual basis. This evaluation occurs during a retreat (Standard IVB1.g.).

Involvement in the accreditation process is shown in board minutes. The board reviewed three separate drafts of the self study as it went through stages of development. Every member of the board was available for interviews with the team (Standard IVB1.i.).

Following the departure of its long-term president, a superintendent/president was hired in 2006. The Self Study and the team's visit validated the fact that a turbulent period of cross-purposes and lack of confidence in overall college leadership ensued. The critical importance of a college's leadership cannot be over emphasized. Following the reviews and technical assistance visits, the permanent superintendent/president departed and an interim CEO was appointed in 2009 (Standard IVB1.j.).

During the team's visit, as noted, the interim superintendent/president was appointed to the permanent position, a decision that was greeted with enthusiasm on campus. The team noted that the new CEO had already begun to provide strong leadership, especially in areas of fiscal concern, enrollment management, and support for instruction and student services, and had

demonstrated clear support for the traditional governance structures of the campus and the appropriate role of leadership provided by each campus constituency.

The superintendent president was available to the team throughout the visit, providing a candid assessment of the institution, its strengths and weaknesses, and a path for future development.

***Standard IVB. Board and Administrative Organization***  
**Conclusions**

Standard IVB is met.

The governing board satisfies all of the sub-standards relating to their role and function, although self-evaluation seems to be a work-in-progress. The board has a clear appreciation of its role in governance. A new permanent superintendent/president is in place who provides effective leadership and enjoys the support of the board and the campus community.