

EVALUATION REPORT
GAVILAN COLLEGE
Gilroy, California

ACCREDITATION EVALUATION TEAM

Bill Scroggins
President/Superintendent (Team Chair)
College of the Sequoias

Robert Hughlett
Trustee
Cerritos College

Susan Carleo
Senior Associate Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
Los Angeles Community College District

Jannett Jackson
Dean of Instruction, Learning Resources
College of Alameda

Darla Cooper, Senior Director
Institutional Advancement, Research and Planning
Santa Barbara City College

Mark Snowwhite
Professor of English
Crafton Hills College

Rod Frese
Vice President, Administrative Services
College of the Sequoias

Arvid Spor
Dean, Enrollment Services
El Camino College

Pamela Hawkins
Faculty, Business Division
Diablo Valley College

David Viar
President
American River College

Kathie Lewis
Librarian (Team Assistant)
College of the Sequoias

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT GAVILAN COLLEGE

DATES OF VISIT: March 5-8, 2007

INSTITUTION: Gavilan College

TEAM CHAIR: William T. Scroggins
President/Superintendent, College of the Sequoias

Gavilan College is a comprehensive college with its main campus in Gilroy, California, founded originally as San Benito County Junior College in 1919. The Gavilan Joint Community College District serves southern Santa Clara County in addition to most of San Benito County. The college also operates centers in Morgan Hill and Hollister with a site at Hollister Airport for its aviation technology program. Gavilan College served 5,532 students in the fall of 2005 and had a full-time equivalent student count of 4,494 for 2005-06.

The evaluation visit spanned from Monday, March 5, to Thursday, March 8, 2007. The ten-member team, supplemented with a team assistant, conducted a comprehensive evaluation to review evidence that Gavilan College meets the accreditation standards of ACCJC. The team reviewed past evaluation reports as well as the progress report and midterm report, received and analyzed the Self Study, requested and reviewed additional evidence provided by the college, and extensively viewed information provided by the college on its web site.

The previous evaluation report of March, 2001 made major recommendations in the areas of Board Policies, Planning, Physical Resources, Faculty and Staff, and Financial Resources. The team found that the college had extensively reviewed and updated its board policies and established a well-integrated strategic plan that is used to drive budget decisions. The planning process fulfills the 2001 recommendation with the exception that outcomes are not specified, collected, and used to advance future plans. The college is in the process of improving facilities, based largely on the resources provided by the Measure E capital bond, and is implementing a five-year faculty staffing plan. Planning for classified staff is considerably less advanced. The team found that the financial status of the district is healthy.

In preparing for the visit, the team experienced considerable frustration in not having documented evidence supporting statements made in the Self Study. In fact, the tone of the Self Study did not reflect the commitment to evidence that is one of the hallmarks of the current standards. An excessive amount of time and energy was expended by team members during the visit in seeking out documented evidence on the extent of Gavilan College's compliance with the standards. It is strongly recommended that the college institute an ongoing program aimed at documenting procedures, practices, outputs and outcomes sufficient to provide future visiting teams the level of documented evidence that the Commission requires.

The administrators, faculty, staff and students of Gavilan College were gracious hosts. The college rearranged the dates and times of several of its core committees and groups to enable the team to observe and ask questions regarding matters under the purview of these groups. The staff assigned to facilitate the work of the team were friendly, knowledgeable, and accommodating. All materials and appointments requested were fulfilled quickly and amicably. Those interviewed responded with openness and candor.

Gavilan College appears to be on much more solid ground than was found by the previous team which performed a comprehensive review in 2001. The leadership has identified major challenges facing the college and aggressively moved to address each of them.

The following recommendations are advanced with the purpose of assisting Gavilan College in further strengthening its operations and outcomes.

Planning, Evaluation, and Program Review

In order for the college to ensure an ongoing, systematic, and cyclical process that includes evaluation, planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation, the team recommends the following evaluation and improvement steps:

- The college formally structure and document all aspects of the planning process by which budget requests connect to program reviews and their accompanying unit plans and ensure the consistent application of the planning procedures throughout the college (I.B.3) (II.A.2.c,e,f)(II.B.1)(II.C.2).
- The college regularly evaluate and document the college's progress on the achievement of goals outlined in the strategic plan and individual unit plans and use the results of this evaluation to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness (I.B.2, I.B.4) (II.A.2.c,e,f)(II.B.4)(II.C.2).
- The college develop mechanisms to evaluate regularly all of the college's planning and resource allocation processes (I.B.6) (II.A.2.c,e,f)(II.B.1,4)(II.C.2).

Student Learning Outcomes

The team recommends that the college identify assessment methods and establish dates for completing student learning outcomes for all of its courses, programs and services. This process should also include the development of performance measures to assess and improve institutional effectiveness of all programs and services. The college should disseminate the outcomes widely and use these results in the strategic planning and resource allocation process (II.A.1.a,c; II.A.2.a,h; II.B.4; II.C.2).

Adjunct Faculty Evaluation

The team recommends that the college Human Resources Office regularly evaluate adjunct faculty and that a schedule and record of completed adjunct faculty evaluations be kept (III.A.1.b).

EVALUATION OF THE COLLEGE USING ACCJC STANDARDS TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS

GAVILAN COLLEGE ACCREDITATION SITE VISIT MARCH 5-8, 2007

INTRODUCTION

Gavilan College is a comprehensive college with its main campus in Gilroy, California, founded originally as San Benito County Junior College in 1919. The Gavilan Joint Community College District serves southern Santa Clara County in addition to most of San Benito County. The college also operates centers in Morgan Hill and Hollister with a site at Hollister Airport for its aviation technology program. Gavilan College served 5,532 students in the fall of 2005 and had a full-time equivalent student count of 4,494 for 2005-06.

Self-Study and Site Visit Evaluation

The evaluation visit spanned from Monday, March 5, to Thursday, March 8, 2007. The ten-member team, supplemented with a team assistant, conducted a comprehensive evaluation to review evidence that Gavilan College meets the accreditation standards of ACCJC. The team reviewed past evaluation reports as well as the progress report and midterm report, received and analyzed the Self Study, requested and reviewed additional evidence provided by the college, and extensively viewed information provided by the college on its web site.

The previous evaluation report of March, 2001 made major recommendations in the areas of Board Policies, Planning, Physical Resources, Faculty and Staff, and Financial Resources. The team found that the college had extensively reviewed and updated its board policies. In fact, the operation of the Board, particularly the orientation of Board members, is done well. The college has made great strides in establishing a well-integrated strategic plan that is used to drive budget decisions. Budget requests are tied to objectives in the Strategic Plan, and progress in advancing these objectives is the major criterion for approving these requests. This planning process is one of the major reasons that the college has been able to achieve unified, strategic progress in advancing its mission. This planning process fulfills the 2001 recommendation with the exception that outcomes are not specified, collected, and used to advance future plans. The current use of data, although extensive, is not tied to evaluating individual objectives or projects. The collection of data on the effectiveness of budgeted initiatives and the use of that information to inform future decision is a key element missing from the planning process.

The college is in the process of improving facilities, based largely on the resources provided by the Measure E capital bond. This initiative is an important stride forward for the district and will enable both the enhancement of the attractiveness and utility of the main campus in Gilroy as well as providing outreach centers in growing areas of the district which are currently underserved. The college is implementing a five-year faculty staffing plan which partially

addresses one of the previous team recommendations. Planning for classified staff is considerably less advanced.

The team found that the financial status of the district is healthy. Particularly noteworthy is the near elimination of the retiree medical benefit obligation. In addition, the mechanics of the operation of the financial side of the house is quite well designed and operated.

In preparing for the visit, the team experienced considerable frustration in not having documented evidence supporting statements made in the Self Study. In fact, the tone of the Self Study did not reflect the commitment to evidence that is one of the hallmarks of the current standards. An excessive amount of time and energy was expended by team members during the visit in seeking out documented evidence on the extent of Gavilan College's compliance with the standards. It is strongly recommended that the college institute an ongoing program aimed at documenting procedures, practices, outputs and outcomes sufficient to provide future visiting teams the level of documented evidence that the Commission requires.

The administrators, faculty, staff and students of Gavilan College were gracious hosts. The college rearranged the dates and times of several of its core committees and groups to enable the team to observe and ask questions regarding matters under the purview of these groups. The staff assigned to facilitate the work of the team were friendly, knowledgeable, and accommodating. All materials and appointments requested were fulfilled quickly and amicably. Those interviewed responded with openness and candor.

General Observations and Commendations

Gavilan College appears to be on much more solid ground than was found by the previous team which performed a comprehensive review in 2001. The leadership has identified major challenges facing the college and aggressively moved to address each of them.

The team commends the college for its College of Choice initiative as an example of the use of research to develop and implement a plan that resulted in intended improvements. The team commends the college for making its Strategic Plan the center of its planning and budgeting process and that unit plans and budget requests link to the Strategic Plan. The team commends the Disabled Resource Center staff on the quality of its programs and services. The DRC staff are integrally involved in campus committees to insure students with special needs have physical and electronic access to services. They are visible throughout the community and are recognized for their untiring advocacy. The team commends the human resource office for personnel records maintenance, its methodology for recording and organizing records and its detailed review process. Process and product in this area is clearly a model for other colleges. The team commends the college for the liquidation of all debt in the college and the almost complete funding of all retiree obligations in such a short time. The team commends Dr. Kinsella for his tireless pursuit of dialog and collaboration and willingness to hear and share input at multiple levels while maintaining the prerogative to make ultimate decisions within Board parameters. Dr. Kinsella's singular efforts have made the spirit of optimism and camaraderie possible on campus.

MAJOR RECOMMEDATIONS

The following recommendations are advanced with the purpose of assisting Gavilan College is further strengthening its operations and outcomes.

Planning, Evaluation, and Program Review

In order for the college to ensure an ongoing, systematic, and cyclical process that includes evaluation, planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation, the team recommends the following evaluation and improvement steps:

- The college formally structure and document all aspects of the planning process by which budget requests connect to program reviews and their accompanying unit plans and ensure the consistent application of the planning procedures throughout the college (I.B.3) (II.A.2.c,e,f)(II.B.1)(II.C.2).
- The college regularly evaluate and document the college's progress on the achievement of goals outlined in the strategic plan and individual unit plans and use the results of this evaluation to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness (I.B.2, I.B.4) (II.A.2.c,e,f)(II.B.4)(II.C.2).
- The college develop mechanisms to evaluate regularly all of the college's planning and resource allocation processes (I.B.6) (II.A.2.c,e,f)(II.B.1,4)(II.C.2).

Student Learning Outcomes

The team recommends that the college identify assessment methods and establish dates for completing student learning outcomes for all of its courses, programs and services. This process should also include the development of performance measures to assess and improve institutional effectiveness of all programs and services. The college should disseminate the outcomes widely and use these results in the strategic planning and resource allocation process (II.A.1.a,c; II.A.2.a,h; II.B.4; II.C.2).

Adjunct Faculty Evaluation

The team recommends that the college Human Resources Office regularly evaluate adjunct faculty and that a schedule and record of completed adjunct faculty evaluations be kept (III.A.1.b).

STANDARD I

Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

I. Responses to the Previous Team's Recommendations

The 2001 Accreditation Visit was conducted using the previous standards. The recommendations that relate most to the new Standard I are the following.

The team recommends that:

(4) The college identifies specific institutional outcomes and measures and documents their achievement. The college should define the relationship between its student outcomes, program outcomes and institutional outcomes in order to assess the extent to which it is meeting student needs. [Standard 3C.1]

(5) The college updates the Strategic Plan and provides for integration with the Educational Master Plan, Facilities Plan, Technology Plan and Staffing Plan. It is recommended that all plans have their outcomes specified, priorities and strategies delineated. In order to assure all constituencies that the plans are actually the basis for decision-making, specific consultative procedures should be developed to include input from staff that have direct operational responsibilities for the execution of the respective plans. [Standard 3C.3]

(6) The college should follow the previous recommendation of reviewing all plans annually with a representative college group and make provisions for responding to changing circumstances and opportunities an explicit part of its planning processes. [Standard 3B.1]

The college has developed a series of institutional plans since the 2001 visit including the Educational Master Plan, Strategic Plan, Technology Master Plan, and Facilities Master Plan. Looking at the plans overall, they are very detailed, and the objectives are stated in measurable terms, with clear strategies. However, the outcomes in the Strategic Plan are not time specific, do not have associated indicators, and do not have assigned areas responsible for achieving the outcomes. It is very clear from several interviews that efforts have been made to involve members from all constituency groups. Since the 2001 visit, the college now has a permanent research position and is working to build a culture of assessment.

II. General Observations

The college has made many strides in the areas of planning and institutional effectiveness. A significant effort was made in the self study to assess the college's performance in meeting the various components of Standard I and to provide appropriate evidence. The self-study addressed a few aspects of the standard in broad language with limited direct evidence and in two areas did not fully address the intent of the standard (I.B.6 and I.B.7). During the visit to the college, the team was able to obtain additional evidence through interviews and examinations of other documents provided by the college. As a result, the team was able to gain a more complete perspective. Several key administrative positions have been filled within the year or are

currently filled by an interim. Nonetheless, historical information related to the self-study and college practices was understood and conveyed and the college provided identification of, and access to, necessary reference documents.

The college's formal and informal processes related to institutional mission and effectiveness appear to be embraced throughout the college with most finding that these processes work well for the college and they generally address the components of Standard I. However, it also became clear during the visit that the college does not have formal, structured processes that regularly assess the effectiveness of the college's planning and allocation processes. Responses to team questions in this area showed that if a problem arises, it is addressed, but there is no mechanism in place to assess these processes regularly. It also is important that the college increases efforts on assuring that the processes related to mission review, planning, budget allocation, and assessment are not just informal but are in writing, clear, and widely disseminated.

III. Findings and Evidence

Gavilan College's mission statement defines its "broad educational purposes" and those purposes are appropriate for an institution of higher learning. The mission statement speaks very broadly of "serving the community" but gives no clear delineation of Gavilan College's "intended student population," beyond that embodied in the state mission of California Community Colleges. Also, the mission statement is passive in its expression of Gavilan College's "commitment to achieving student learning." It is noted the college has begun a process to address these issues of mission clarification and it is encouraged to be more specific in its next mission iteration (IA).

Discussions of the Strategic Planning Committee, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC), President's Council, and Department Chairs have been held that use the mission statement as a guide for planning and decision making. The college has provided evidence in its catalogue, Educational Master Plan (EMP), student demographic data, Strategic Plan, and through the development of four new credit programs and a noncredit program developed since 2003 that its programs and services align with its purposes and student population in its service area (I.A.1).

Board minutes indicate the mission statement was approved by the governing board February 14, 2006 and the mission statement is published in printed and electronic formats available in the catalogue, Board Policy Manual, Report to the Community, EMP, Faculty Handbook, and in the Student Center (I.A.2).

The college does an annual review of the mission statement as part of the strategic planning process through an inclusive process that includes the Strategic Planning Committee, the President's Council and ultimately the governing board. The most recent review of the mission statement in 2006 resulted in slight wording changes (I.A.3).

A review of the Educational Master Plan, Strategic Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, the Technology Master Plan and various committee minutes shows evidence that the mission is

central to planning and decision making at Gavilan College. This judgment is supported further in the employee survey and in discussions on campus with college leaders. The Strategies and Goals developed through the college's process and adopted by the governing board relate to achieving the college mission (I.A.4).

The team found anecdotal information on wide discussion of student learning and college issues, but actual written evidence of dialogue was lacking. While those interviewed cited several examples where positive results occurred as a result of dialogue, the college could not provide written documentation of how it has structured its dialogue and the specific impact dialogue has had on the improvement of student learning. There was an acknowledgement among those interviewed that there has not been an intention of structuring and documenting dialogue, but that it had been occurring with positive results (I.B.1).

The college has crafted a set of strategies and goals into its Strategic Plan that are designed with the purpose of helping the college fulfill its mission. These goals are central to the college's unit planning and budget requests processes and therefore are very familiar to any faculty and staff involved in these processes. However, with an examination of the Strategic Plan, the team determined that while the goals are generally stated in measurable terms, they lack clearly stated expected outcomes, delineation of responsibility, and a process to monitor the college's progress in meeting the goals outlined in these plans. As a result, the college does not have a formal and structured process to document its progress on achieving each of these goals, and therefore the team was unable to fully determine how well the college is achieving its intended outcomes (I.B.2).

Program review, which is conducted every three to five years and is overseen by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, serves as the college's evaluation process. Programs are expected to produce unit plans annually, and unit plan goals must be aligned with the goals in the college's Strategic Plan. These unit plans serve as the planning process for the college's units. Resources are allocated through a budgeting process whereby requests must be linked to the Strategic Plan. While the college has the components for evaluation, planning, and resource allocation, and these components are linked to the Strategic Plan, these processes are not always integrated with each other in all areas of the college. Some units are diligent about ensuring that their unit plans and budget requests are aligned with each other and with program review, but other areas are not. When asked in interviews how program review was linked to the annual unit plan or how unit plans are linked to the budgeting process, some responded that they are not linked. In addition, when the team examined program reviews, unit plans and budget requests from different areas, we found that items requested in the budgeting process were not always mentioned in the program review or unit plan for that area. This inconsistent application of the planning process leads to a disconnect between unit plans and budget allocation in some areas of the college (I.B.3).

The college has a plethora of data made available via the Institutional Research website. In addition, a great deal of data is provided to programs as part of the program review process. There is clearly a concerted effort at the college to build a culture of assessment where data play a central role. However, what the team was not able to find in equal proportions was the analysis

and interpretation of these data to use in the college's planning processes. In interviews, the team learned that the college acknowledges that more interpretation of the data is needed (I.B.3).

The current researcher is fairly new to the college and is still getting acclimated. The researcher sits on both the Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning Committees as a resource. In particular, the researcher provides the data for programs undergoing program review and is available to help programs interpret data. The researcher has also been involved in working with the student services area in developing surveys and collecting other data to assess different aspects of their effectiveness. What is missing currently is the researcher's involvement in working with the instructional area of the college in their efforts to measure effectiveness beyond the program review process (I.B.3).

There are four committees that provide the constituency groups the opportunity to participate in college planning: President's Council, Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Strategic Planning Committee and Budget Committee. Through the examination of each committee's bylaws and team interviews with members from these committees, the team determined that each of these committees has designated positions for each constituency group. Committee representatives are selected by their respective constituency groups. The team found that the opportunity for participation and input was adequate. The team's only concern in this area is ~~related to~~ the communication of the college's planning and decision making processes throughout the institution. In particular, some professional support staff are not familiar with the program review and unit planning processes. The team would encourage the college to examine the methods it uses to inform all members of the campus community on the college's planning and evaluation processes, how these processes affect them, and what their opportunities for involvement are (I.B.4).

The college allocates resources through a budgeting process that requires requests to be linked to the Strategic Plan. Through this linkage the college has a process to ensure that resources are allocated in a manner that supports the advancement of its Strategic Plan. However, it must be noted that a recent budget request process for distribution of new monies was not a part of the college's existing processes. A wholly separate process was created to determine how these new funds would be allocated, and there was no connection made to the existing program review or unit planning processes (I.B.4).

One of the best examples of how the college implemented a plan that resulted in an improvement is related to the College of Choice effort. The college determined through an examination of existing data that many students who live in its service area are choosing to attend colleges other than Gavilan. As a result, the college crafted a plan on how to address this issue beginning with more extensive research to learn why students were choosing to attend other colleges. Once this information was gathered, the college developed an action plan on how to attract these students to Gavilan. The college has now implemented much of this action plan and recent data show improvements in student enrollment (I.B.4).

As mentioned, the college collects a great deal of information that assesses student achievement, and much of this information is posted on the college's website, which is available to the public. In addition, the college publishes an annual report to the community. In examining this

publication, the team found that it contains very little assessment data. In particular, this report presents the number of degrees and certificates awarded in the previous year and information on a couple of individual students who earned awards. The team also found no evidence of how the college assesses the effectiveness of its current methods to communicate institutional quality to the public (I.B.5).

In the self study report, the college did not describe the mechanisms it uses to regularly assess the effectiveness of its planning and resource allocation processes, but simply describes these processes. Through the examination of meeting minutes and interviews, the team confirmed that the college on the whole has not established a systematic method to regularly assess the effectiveness of its planning processes. Instead, the college appears to react only when a problem with or complaint about a process arises (I.B.6).

The situation is similar in relation to the assessment of the college's evaluation process in that it was not described in the self study. However, after we conducted interviews with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, it became clear that this committee did have a regular established process for reviewing its functions and processes. The IEC undergoes program review every four years using feedback from program review participants as the basis for their review. The team examined the last review conducted by IEC in 2003 and found the review to be comprehensive and candid. In fact, the team noted areas that were identified by IEC as needing improvement and had been improved since this review. The only concern from the team is that this review does not appear to be formally evaluated by any body outside of IEC (I.B.7).

IV. Conclusions

Gavilan College generally meets the standard related to institutional mission (I.A, I.A.1, I.A.2, I.A.3, I.A.4). The only notation would be that the team encourages the college to address the issue raised regarding intended student population and expressed commitment to student learning.

Although the team found through interviews that the level of dialog is adequate, the team could not find sufficient written evidence that the college is engaged in ongoing dialogue. As a result, the team determined that the standard of dialogue that is structured, self-reflective, and leads to improvements in student learning and institutional effectiveness is only partially met (I.B.1).

The team commends the college for making its Strategic Plan the center of its planning and budgeting processes. Faculty and staff involved in these processes are very familiar with these goals, are very clear that their unit plans and budget requests need to link to the Strategic Plan, and strive to link their efforts to the college's Strategic Plan. However, the strategic planning goals are not articulated in a way that allows for the college to monitor its progress in achieving these goals. Consequently, the team has determined that the college does not fully meet this standard (I.B.2).

The college has made great strides in creating a culture of assessment where data are used frequently to assess effectiveness of programs and specialized initiatives. The team would

encourage the college to further integrate the researcher with the efforts being pursued by the instructional area to determine effectiveness. With no formal mechanisms in place to assess the college's progress made toward the achievement of the strategic planning goals, the team has determined that the college does not meet this standard (I.B.3).

Evidence was provided to demonstrate that the college's planning processes are broad based and provide sufficient opportunities for participation from all constituent groups. The team commends the college for its College of Choice initiative as an example of how the college used research to develop and implement this plan that resulted in intended improvements. However, evidence showing how the existing planning processes directly lead to the improvement of institutional effectiveness was limited. While the college meets this standard, the team encourages the college to develop ways to strengthen how it documents its successes in relation to improved institutional effectiveness (I.B.4).

The team determined the college generally met the standard related to the communication of quality assurance to the public. However, while a great deal of data is available on the website and is presented in the program review process, an analysis and interpretation does not accompany these data. The team encourages the college to work to include an analysis of the data that would make it easier for members from the public to better understand the meaning of the data. In addition, the team suggests the college begin to assess how well it is communicating this information to its community in a way that is understandable (I.B.5).

The college did not provide any evidence of having established mechanisms that regularly evaluate the effectiveness of the planning and resource allocation processes and therefore does not meet this standard (I.B.6). However, the team commends the initiative taken by the IEC to regularly evaluate itself and its processes and encourages this committee to make this evaluation more formal and extend it beyond those directly involved in program review to the campus at large (I.B.7).

V. Recommendations

In order for the college to ensure an ongoing, systematic, and cyclical process that includes evaluation, planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation, the team recommends the following evaluation and improvement steps:

- The college formally structure and document all aspects of the planning process by which budget requests connect to program reviews and their accompanying unit plans and ensure the consistent application of the planning procedures throughout the college (I.B.3) (II.A.2.c,e,f)(II.B.1)(II.C.2).
- The college regularly evaluate and document the college's progress on the achievement of goals outlined in the strategic plan and individual unit plans and use the results of this evaluation to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness (I.B.2, I.B.4) (II.A.2.c,e,f)(II.B.4)(II.C.2).
- The college develop mechanisms to evaluate regularly all of the college's planning and resource allocation processes (I.B.6) (II.A.2.c,e,f)(II.B.1,4)(II.C.2).

STANDARD II
Student Learning Programs and Services

STANDARD IIA
Instructional Programs

I. Response to the Previous Team's Recommendations

The 2001 Accreditation Visit was conducted using the previous standards. The recommendations that relate most to the new Standard IIA are the following.

- (1) The college develops for Board approval a statement on academic freedom and makes it readily available by inclusion in college publications. [Standard 2.2]
- (7) The college develops the required policy and receives board approval to address distance education and electronic delivery of courses, including such issues as support, workload, and intellectual property. [Standards 4A, 4D.6, 4D.7]
- (8) The college implements its intention to ensure adherence to course outlines.
- (9) The college comes to a decision in the matter of what grade represents degree level competence. [Standards 4D.2, 4D.3]

While the college has updated its curriculum, added new programs, sought input from advisory committees and begun to define learning outcomes, it is still developing ways to assess student achievement of these outcomes. In addition, it intends to, but has not, developed ways to assess the effectiveness of its delivery systems such as distance learning. Its plan to develop such measures and provide training to departments on how to carry out this assessment is a good sign that the intent of student learning outcomes is understood.

While intentions are admirable, the evidence that the college actually used data to measure student achievement and make improvements was not obvious. The need to validate English exams, and assess whether ethics, citizenship and general education skills have been integrated into the curricular offerings shows a realization that much work is needed to achieve the level of validation of outcomes called for in Standard II.

No college has enough resources to carry out all its goals and objectives at the level it would desire. The true test of effectiveness is progress in spite of meager resources. Gavilan College describes its desire to venture into new delivery modes and yet it cites staffing shortfalls in key support areas such as the library. It talks about a long term staffing plan for faculty but then says it decides year to year which classified staff to hire.

The existence of a Strategic Plan, an Educational Master Plan, a Technology Plan and a Facilities Plan shows the college understands the full array of areas that they must address. However, it is not clear how the plans are integrated so that they compliment each other and enable the college to fulfill its mission.

All colleges struggle to communicate their mission and goals internally and externally. Gavilan appears to experience that same challenge. Committee representatives do not always convey information or seek input. Web page information is not always up to date. Broad participation is sought but a core of individuals carries out most of the committee tasks. Mentoring new faculty and staff is planned and may help address this issue. A review of committee minutes, staffing plans, surveys and assessment tools reveal efforts to create a culture of assessment.

The college appears to have heeded the recommendations from its last visit. The college hired a researcher and began to develop performance indicators. The use of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee to guide the college in improving its programs and services is clear. The college seems to have matured in its understanding of how to use planning to improve. With a technology plan and a strategic plan now in place, it can assess progress more effectively. The last visit also sought evidence that the college develop standards in the areas of academic freedom and distance learning.

II. General Observations

The college has clearly stated its mission to its students and community via its electronic and printed documents. It has added program learning outcomes for most of its offerings to the catalog. It has expanded its offerings to include remote centers, noncredit, language programs, learning communities and other outreach efforts to recognize the changing and growing needs in its community and meet student needs.

Since its last accreditation, the college has moved to a 16-week compressed academic calendar and added to its online course offerings, which now include 42 classes. Students can participate in the educational experience fully or partially in an electronic mode. The same student classroom evaluation process is used in both in-person and online instruction.

Through its Institutional Effectiveness Committee, the college continues to assess its success at meeting its mission at the program level. Industry advisory committees provide input on the success of programs in a manner which is informal and not fully integrated into the program review, program learning outcomes, or unit plan processes.

The college is aware that the quality of instruction is also manifested in the quality of its faculty, and the lack of consistent evaluation of adjunct instructors is being discussed in this context.

The college assures that all its offerings, regardless of delivery mode, meet the academic standards of the college. It awards credit via Carnegie Units, three (3) hours of course-related work per unit of credit. Credits are based on student learning outcomes. Course articulation with institutions of higher education ensures that credits follow accepted standards.

In consultation with deans, the articulation officer, and others, instructional faculty are responsible for the design of new courses and the regular updating of existing courses. The Curriculum Committee determines the suitability of proposed courses and course revisions, including conducting a special review for online deliver mode. The committee reviews existing

course outlines every four years. A dormant course cannot be offered again until it is updated to include student learning outcomes.

Through its curriculum review process, the institution has added student learning outcomes to most course outlines. The outcomes attempt to define assessment measures but more work is planned to incorporate data on student success at achieving learning outcomes. The English department has developed a holistically-scored writing final exam for all students in ESL courses to address the disparity of student outcomes due in great part to the large number of instructors teaching the English courses. The college intends to validate the English department exams.

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) reviews instructional programs every three to five years and includes a review of program learning outcomes, which have been established at the department for most programs offering a degree or certificate. Program breadth and depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning are examined, and the IEC recommends changes such as the addition or deletion of classes.

The college's Transfer Institute program encourages students to pursue guaranteed transfer agreements. Rigor is addressed at the curriculum level according to course transferability, with factors such as reading, writing, critical thinking, research, and computational skills being addressed.

New full-time faculty orientations and assigned faculty mentors help orient faculty to the college's quality standards. Special initiatives such as the April 2005 Teaching Institute give faculty the opportunity to discuss recent research about learning and teaching objectives. Many instructors and departments have also enhanced the quality of their instruction with use of electronic technology.

Faculty employ a variety of ways to present course content to address varying student learning needs. Lecture, demonstration, discussion, and activities all enhance the way students learn. The majority of Gavilan's faculty has accepted the premise that students learn differently.

The noncredit program is beginning to expand offerings into the basic skills area, which are complimentary to credit courses in basic skills in the areas of English as a Second Language, English, and math although the overall program plan for the noncredit offering is not clear, especially as it relates to program learning outcomes. Noncredit offerings include physical education, music, film, theater, English, library, and allied health designed to serve primarily older adults.

Community education and contract education offerings include real estate and estate planning, sign language, motorcycle driving, online classes for computer skills and ESL which do not overlap with credit instruction. The college offers some study abroad opportunities for its own students but does not have a foreign student programs.

The college's general education (GE) requirements develop students' abilities to think and communicate clearly, both orally and in writing; to use mathematics and employ the scientific method; to understand the modes of inquiry in major disciplines; to be aware of other cultures

and other eras; to apply critical thinking to ethical and social issues; and to develop the capacity for self understanding and improvement. The courses span the traditional major areas of knowledge including the humanities, fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences that introduce students to a variety of topics. Student learning outcomes are constructed to promote understanding of basic content and methodology, and to require students to demonstrate critical thinking skills, as well as encompassing what it means to be an ethical human being and effective citizen. An associate degree cultural diversity requirement was added in 2001, and the social science department has emphasized the development of a sense of civic, political, and social responsibilities on local, national, and global levels in many of its course learning outcomes. The courses fulfill general education transfer requirements.

The College's degree programs include at least one area of focused study or interdisciplinary core and are listed in the catalog.

Gavilan's vocational students receive employable skills as evidenced by the number of students employed at local and regional businesses and by those gaining licensure and certification in cosmetology, aviation, and nursing.

Gavilan College's catalog and schedule are comprehensive and easy to read. Both documents provide students information about the college's offerings. However, there were courses listed in the catalog that have not been offered in some time. Inconsistencies were also found in the number of units required compared to the number of state authorized units for at least one program (real estate). The college is commended for adding program learning outcomes for most programs. The class schedule is easy to navigate and includes instructions for students with special needs or interested in remote sites or online education.

The college catalog and schedule information is for the most part accurate and up to date. The college assures that all students receive course syllabi in all courses. Faculty training, as recommended in the college's plan, will assure that new employees understand the need to adhere to the official course outline and provide the students with a syllabus that includes student learning outcomes.

Credit transfer policies with class patterns are available in the college schedules, catalog, and through the counseling department. If courses are transferred from other colleges, they receive scrutiny from counselors and the admissions and records office. The college has at least fifteen articulation agreements with private colleges, twenty-three with California State University (CSU) campuses, and ten with University of California (UC) schools. The articulation officer scrutinizes all curricula to be sure they will meet four-year requirements, and researches changing GE patterns at four-year institutions

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee makes recommendations for program improvements, changes and elimination. If a program is eliminated or a course is not available, students can complete a waiver form to request a course substitution in a department that has made a program change. When programs are eliminated, the counselors, division dean, department chair, and instructors inform students of any modifications that have or will take place and assist students in continuing their studies.

The college has produced paper and electronic versions of its catalog and schedule. It has an on-going review and update process that includes the essential staff to maintain accurate documents in both formats. A format for the disabled is available.

The college has also created a Student Handbook to assist with conveying information to its students and is creating a handbook of Policies and Procedures to further inform. Faculty and staff guides, handbooks and manuals are also regularly updated.

The college web site is easy to navigate and works well to guide the user to find answers to common questions and to facilitate registration and use of college services.

The college clearly states its policy on academic freedom and has adopted board rules that confirm this. Its student policies for behavior and academic honesty are included in the catalog and, if added to the class schedule's policies and procedures section, they will be even more prominent for the college's students. The college has a plan to provide orientation for new faculty, especially adjuncts, to include its policy on this issue.

III. Findings and Evidence

As evidenced by a thorough review of the college catalog, the college has yet to complete the development of program learning outcomes and student learning outcomes for all courses and programs. While progress has been made, the outcomes will not be complete until the process to evaluate the outcomes is also in place (II.A.1.a).

The college has made progress in delivering courses in various modes, with a wide array of courses offered via distance education and linked to the web site. With regard to credit courses, the same course outlines are used, regardless of delivery mode. As acknowledged by faculty and administrative leaders we interviewed, the task of implementing program learning outcomes and/or performing comparative studies to evaluate the effectiveness of all its programs, including distance education, is not yet complete (II.A.1.b).

While the college has made visible progress in adding program learning outcomes to its catalog, it should continue with its efforts to complete this task for its next catalog. While learning outcomes training was conducted in the past two years, as confirmed by training materials provided by academic administrators, the need to develop measurement methods still exists and, when fully developed, will allow better assessment of programs. Concerns about carrying out performance evaluations, especially of adjunct faculty, and hiring faculty reflect the college's attention to its need to maintain instructional quality (II.A.1.c).

A review of the IEC process and selected reports appears to show that the college is not proactive in completing the process of developing and validating program and student learning outcomes for all its programs. It has not collected or used data that will assist with program improvement. However, curriculum committee and academic senate leaders as well as academic administrators confirm this will be the focus over the next planning cycle (II.A.2.a).

While advisory committee minutes exist, a review of these documents does not show a discussion of how industry members influence the actual program offerings. Follow up on advisory committee recommendations is not written and not well documented and appears to be more informal (II.A.2.b).

A review of the unit plan documents revealed that the college is lacking a clear and consistent method to assure that unit plans are consistent in quality and are connected to the program review process. Sharing with adjunct faculty is also lacking, creating a gap in understanding for all members of the faculty (II.A.2.c).

The college has not considered studying actual student success, persistence, and retention, which would indicate that students are having learning success (II.A.2.d).

While the IEC committee is charged with program review, an interview with the committee chair and some of its members revealed that the college has not established a process to assure that program and curricular review are completed in a timely manner and at a level of sophistication that reflects understanding of the review process. Gentle reminders and collegiality seem to be the preferred method of persuasion, rather than strong accountability measures. The college has not clearly linked recommended improvements to resource allocation (II.A.2.e).

The college has not yet begun to collect and use data on student learning outcomes, as confirmed by interviews with academic leaders. While the college has a process that connects strategic plan objectives with budgeting, this process does not yet include student learning outcomes (II.A.2.f).

Other than the English department, the college academic administrators confirmed that academic departments have not developed a method to validate exams as they relate to student learning outcomes (II.A.2.g)

Credit for courses as well as degrees awarded for program completion are connected to expected student learning outcomes, as can be seen by a review of the college's official course outlines and catalog documents, and the college is in the process of developing a method of assessing student and program learning outcomes to assure that the stated learning outcomes are being met, but has not yet begun this process (II.A.2.h,i).

Based on a review of course outline and catalog documents, the college has developed general education learning outcomes in keeping with this standard but has again not collected or used outcome data in this area (II.A.3).

The college's programs include at least one area of focused study as listed in the catalog (II.A.4).

The college keeps in tune with labor market data informally, as described by the dean for vocational programs, who also indicated that area employment needs and the success of graduates are the subject of discussion at advisory committee meetings (II.A.5).

The college has developed a useful web site with transfer and related information, which also exists in its printed documents. It continues to add more information (II.A.6.a). The college has

not eliminated any programs in the recent past. College academic administrators acknowledge the need to address those students who cannot complete programs when required courses are not offered. It does recognize the need to coordinate the sequence of offerings, however, this appears to be done informally, with some departments charting out their offerings and others responding term by term (II.A.6.b). A question arose as to the accuracy of course listings (computer information systems) and degree or certificate requirements (real estate) in the catalog since some courses have not been offered in a long time and unit requirements may be out of date (II.A.6.c).

The faculty appear to distinguish between personal and professional responsibilities as observed by their manner of conducting academic senate, curriculum, and shared governance meetings (II.A.7.a). The college has adopted a policy on academic honesty and published it widely (II.A.7.b). The college has codes of conduct which it follows (II.A.7.c).

IV. Conclusions

The college has made progress toward meeting this standard, but it will not fully meet this standard until it completes the development of program and student learning outcomes for all courses and programs. This process also needs to include a mechanism to measure student success in meeting the stated outcomes. The college should proceed with its plans to use program learning outcomes and/or perform comparative studies to evaluate the effectiveness of all its programs, regardless of delivery system. The need to develop assessment of learning outcomes, relate that to program viability, and better evaluation practices with regard to adjunct faculty will enhance instructional quality (II.A.1).

The college has made strides toward meeting the intent of this standard, but areas of specific concern remain. Completing the process of developing and validating program and student learning outcomes for all programs and using that data for program improvement is essential. The college also needs to strengthen and incorporate the use of its advisory committee input to show a direct link between industry input in program improvement and student learning outcomes (II.A.2.a,b,h).

The college should establish a method to assure that program and curricular review are completed in a timely manner and at a level of sophistication that reflects understanding of the review process. The college should include as part of this process a way to link recommended improvements to resource allocation. The college needs to show a more direct connection between the findings of its program review process and the strategic planning and budgeting process, including the use of student learning outcomes as a measure of achieving strategic objectives, where appropriate. The colleges should be able to link the use of its resources, where appropriate, to the achievement of its plans for improvement and share the results of this process with all faculty and staff (II.A.2.c,e,f).

The college has developed a general education offering that meets this standard, relying on the expertise of its faculty. The GE learning outcomes should continue to be reviewed to assure that specific GE learning outcomes can be identified with appropriate GE courses and that they have

integrated ethics, citizenship, cultural diversity, and civil responsibility values into program learning outcomes (II.A.3).

The college's degree programs have a focus in a major area of study (II.A.4).

The college meets the standard for program completers demonstrating employment competencies, however, a continuing focus on changing labor needs is recommended to enhance new and revised program offerings (II.A.5).

The college has generally met the standard of clearly representing itself, however, some effort needs to be made to assure that all catalog course and program listings are up to date. The college should continue with its plans to provide more of this information on its web site and refine its booklet for student conduct, academic freedom, and rights and responsibilities. The college also needs to assure that faculty do provide each student with a syllabus that clearly states course learning outcomes (II.A.6).

The college meets Standard II.A.7. It would be helpful to also add codes of conduct to the class schedule in addition to the catalog, to assure wider distribution (II.A.7).

V. Recommendations

The team recommends that the college identify assessment methods and establish dates for completing student learning outcomes for all of its courses, programs and services. This process should also include the development of performance measures to assess and improve institutional effectiveness of all programs and services. The college should disseminate the outcomes widely and use these results in the strategic planning and resource allocation process (II.A.1.a,c; II.A.2.a,h; II.B.4; II.C.2).

Also see the Recommendation under Standard I.

STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Services

STANDARD IIB

Student Support Services

I. Responses to the Previous Team's Recommendations

The 2001 Accreditation Visit was conducted using the previous standards. The recommendations that relate most to the new Standard IIB are the following.

(10) The college identifies space that provides an opportunity for staff in the Financial Aid Office to meet with students who need to discuss confidential information. [Standard 5.6]

(11) The team recommends that the college implement a regular program review process aimed at a comprehensive analysis of the entire student services area; including its relationship to academic programs and services. [Standard 5.10]

The Financial Aid Office seems to have adequate confidential space. Gavilan College has an established program review process. Student services units have completed program reviews during the last three years.

II. General Observations

Gavilan College serves a diverse student population. Student support services offer a wide range of programs and support consistent with the mission of the college and meet the needs of its students. Student support services provide quality services to meet students' needs both on its main campus and at the off campus Hollister and Morgan Hill locations.

Student support services use data collected from different sources to evaluate services provided to students in order to enhance and improve program efficiency and effectiveness. Most student support services programs have identified student learning outcomes and are in the process of developing measurements for the SLOs.

Gavilan College provides all student support services in-person at the main campus and at the Hollister and Morgan Hill locations. The college provides orientation, counseling, and bookstore services online for student convenience. To assure quality the Gavilan College student support services participated in the program review process in 2004 and utilized the college's unit plan format to facilitate change.

The catalog and schedule of classes are published and made available at the Gavilan campus bookstore and online. Both documents contain the required information except for the Acceptance of Transfer Credits policy, which is found in the schedule of classes and in the

online catalog. An online service referred to as OLGA (On-Line Gavilan Access) was launched to provide online student support services.

The college provides comprehensive and reliable services to students at the Gavilan campus. Orientations, counseling, and bookstore purchases are available in person and online. Admissions and Records, Assessment, Financial Aid, EOP&S, DRC, MESA, TRIO, Puente, tutoring, career and transfer services, and health services are all available at the Gavilan campus. Students are encouraged to participate in the Associated Student Body and Inter-Club Council. Students work with faculty and management to create and host campus events that promote diversity and civic duty. Intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development is available through courses offerings and performing arts presentations. Counseling services are evaluated through program review, point of service surveys, and a 2006 satisfaction survey. Counselors are evaluated by peers and students via classroom evaluations of instruction and scheduled faculty evaluations. Guest speakers are brought in to the counseling department meetings for counselor training. The college promotes the development and celebration of cultural events. A new program titled “cultural diversity and global studies” is being developed to promote cultural awareness and diversity.

The research office evaluates the validity of the college’s placement instruments for the Gavilan student population. Academic records are kept on microfiche and hard copy. Hard copy records are housed in a fireproof vault. The records are secure and confidential.

The college utilizes student surveys, program reviews, and daily interaction with students as tools to assess and address student needs.

Three student learning outcomes (SLOs) and twenty-seven program learning outcome (PLO) statements have been developed. Assessment methods have been developed for the twenty-seven PLOs.

III. Findings and Evidence

Unit plans seem to be disconnected from the program review process while connecting directly to the college’s strategic plan (II.B.1).

Managers and students report the need for more online services. Some of the courses and programs appear to be out of date and need revision. The printed catalogue was not available at the Hollister or Morgan Hill locations. Catalogs could be ordered from the bookstore and delivered to either site (II.B.2).

All services appear to promote equitable access for students at the Gavilan campus. The Hollister location provides services according to the following schedule: EOP&S appointments – weekly; Counseling appointments – monthly; DRC appointments – monthly; Bookstore deliveries - weekly; Financial Aid workshops – once each semester preceding the start of classes. A 2006 student survey indicated that 81% of student respondents acknowledge the college supports diversity (II.B.3).

Student survey results have been discussed in student services department meetings. Program reviews were written in 2004, so they do not utilize 2005 and 2006 survey information. Student Services SLOs do not appear to have an assessment component, and both SLO and PLO assessments seem to lack documentation indicating how the results will be used to improve services. Use of a questionnaire may not be the most effective method to capture assessment results as opposed to a more direct measure of assessment at the point of service delivery (II.B.4).

IV. Conclusions

The college meets the standard for information in its catalog (II.B.2) and provides appropriate services and programs to meet student needs (II.B.3). Program review, the primary method of assuring quality, does not connect to resource allocation. Unit plans, as annual updates from program review plans, do not contain measurable indicators of progress on objectives. The SLO process for student services has not collected or used outcome data to improve services to students. The college does not meet these standards (II.B.1,4).

V. Recommendations

See the recommendations under Standard I and Standard IIA.

STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Services

STANDARD IIC

Library and Learning Support Services

I. Responses to the Previous Team's Recommendations

There were no previous recommendations pertaining to this section.

II. General Observations

The college has centralized many of its instructional support and student services programs in the library building. In addition to the Library, this building houses the Tutorial and Writing Center, the Disabled Resource Center (DRC), EOPS, a 50-station student computer lab and a 30-station smart classroom and overflow lab. Students have access to audio-materials, computers, and small meeting areas on the main campus and the Hollister and Morgan Hill centers. This allows for easy student access to a variety of learning support services.

The Library is staffed by two full-time librarians and four classified staff. They receive additional assistance from adjunct librarians who work an additional twenty hours per week, as well as assistance from part-time student workers. During the regular semester, the Library is open 55 hours per week and 24 hours per week during summer school. It is always closed on the weekends, and there is no onsite library service at the Hollister or Morgan Hill centers.

In 2005 the library conducted an overall review of its entire collection using formal assessment techniques developed at George Mason University in conjunction with recommended book and print resources tailored for discipline-specific bibliographies. This resulted in a reduction in several thousand obsolete books and periodicals. To augment its 60,000+ titles the college has invested heavily in online print and e-reference materials. The result is an online e-book collection of 12,000 titles and 2500+ full-text newspapers and periodicals.

To ensure print and online resources are available in the library and to stay abreast of new courses and programs that support instructional programs, the librarians maintain an active presence on the curriculum committee. They are also part of the course outline approval process. Several grants have afforded to librarians the opportunity to develop training modules for English as a Second Language (12) and Allied Health and Nursing (5). These grant funded "life orientation" modules are on the web and are a way for the library to deliver needed print resources and reference assistance to students off-site without having a librarian physically present.

The librarians and the library staff are an integral part of the online community of learners at Gavilan College. They have an excellent web site which is well planned, well laid out, and easy

to navigate. Off-campus students are provided online access to their resources for those who have connectivity to the Internet. With the additional online resources of e-books, full-text journals and a variety of online databases, students have access to a virtual library whose resources are available 24/7. These online resources augment their existing in-house collections providing timely print and electronic resources that facilitate educational offerings on campus, at the remote sites, or to students enrolled in online or hybrid classes. There is only one audio-visual technician position. A recent retirement is planned to be replaced, but currently there is a temporary person in the position.

At the main campus, the library provides face-to-face orientations that teach students how to navigate and succeed in the online environment. These classes are pre-scheduled, and students can "drop-in," but appointments are also accepted. Completing the orientation to online learning is mandatory for many classes. If students cannot make it to campus, they are encouraged to contact their instructor who can make alternate arrangements on a case-by-case basis. The college's off-campus programs include instructional centers at the Briggs building in Hollister and in Morgan Hill with non-credit courses being offered at South Valley Junior High School. These orientation services are not offered at the Hollister or Morgan Hill centers.

The Writing Center and Tutorial Center provide small group and one-on-one peer tutoring to students in ESL, English (writing across the curriculum), and a variety of other academic disciplines. This area continues to provide excellent service to students as evidenced by satisfaction surveys, personal interviews, and the large number of students found in these areas throughout the day.

The Staff Resource Center is staffed by a full-time Distance Education Coordinator. This faculty member is responsible for training as well as maintaining a small computer lab, maintaining self-paced learning modules, and providing customized tutorials upon request. This facility can also accommodate video conferencing and small group training.

III. Findings and Evidence

The library provides timely printed and electronic resources sufficient in depth, quantity, and variety, anytime and anywhere, to facilitate educational offerings and support student learning (II.C.1). The college has added additional alternative formats of learning resources such as e-books, e-audio books, and DVDs that have enhanced and supplemented the present collection. For the past four years, the funding of learning resources from various grants has resulted in a superior learning collection, a good online collection, and additional equipment. There is concern, however, over the lack of an established baseline budget for stability and planning purposes (II.C.1.a).

The self-study cited that "Weekend, evening, and offsite students are not as efficiently served" in terms of library and instructional support services. When the team viewed these areas, we found all classrooms had a TV-VCR and an overhead projector, there were no smart classrooms at either site, and there was limited high-tech audio-visual equipment-on-a-cart (II.C.1.c).

Since there is only one temporary audio-video technician, there are limited human resources to maintain equipment at the off-site locations (II.C.1.a). With only one building supervisor per site who handles all administrative, security, and clerical tasks, staffing appears strained (II.C.2). The administrator responsible for this area indicated that there is a contingency plan whereby trained substitutes could be contacted in case of an emergency. However, other learning support services available on the main campus continue to be notably absent at the centers. The team is concerned that as enrollment continues to grow at these sites, the viability of this contingency plan may come into question (II.C.1.d).

The Gavilan Library staff have been at the forefront of the community college movement to integrate information competency into the curriculum. In 1998 they developed the California Community Colleges' Information Competency Plan. Their web page reflects these efforts and offers links to library online references, databases and courses, as well as links to other distance education courses. The library web page also includes other projects in which the staff has been involved such as the integration of information competency into the Allied Health curriculum and the use of mixed media alternative instruction (II.C.1.b,e, II.C.2).

The Library has an annual unit plan which is on the web. Additionally, there is a part of the Technology Plan that addresses the need to expand virtual library resources to support information competency to include the off campus sites. An area of concern is the lack of strategic program review and data analysis. A review of program planning documents and online web pages shows that little has been done to develop a program review process (II.C.1.e, II.C.2). Additionally, evaluation instruments used to analyze and develop plans for improvement of the library and learning support services to further student learning outcomes were noticeably absent (II.C.2).

An area of concern was the lack of staff to adequately maintain the technology equipment as well as a lack of technical support personnel for both instructional and administrative computing (II.C.1.a). There are areas that clearly have improved: hiring of a distance education coordinator, increased training for staff and faculty, expanded access to computers for students, and a state-of-the-art adaptive computer lab. However, there are others where initiatives have been started but which require additional resources if improvement is to be sustained, specifically, the need for adequate technology support staff.

The college has made efforts towards hiring more technology support staff, currently two full time technicians and a technology supervisor. Plans are in place to hire an additional technician within the next fiscal year. However, with the implementation of a new administrative computer system and the increase in online education and campus labs, continued long term growth and improvement could be hampered if the college continues to stretch these limited human resources (II.C.1.a,c, II.C.2).

IV. Conclusions

The college meets this standard. Sufficient library and learning support services are critical to support student learning and enhance the mission of the institution. These resources are

necessary to assure quality instructional programs and are an integral part of the student success and learning experience. The library and learning support services provided by Gavilan College are sufficient to support the quality of its instructional programs (II.C.1).

By co-locating the Library, open computer lab, tutorial, and the adaptive access lab in the same facility, the college has leveraged its resources, making it easy for students to these services. However, sufficient space allocation for students should be included in any future planning considerations. Ongoing instruction provided by the distance education coordinator maintains faculty currency in technology as well as workshops tailored to specific needs (II.C.1.a). The institution continues to provide effective access to its programs and services sufficient to support student leaning and to enhance the achievement of its students (II.C.1.b,c,e). However, if Gavilan College is to continue to maintain a high standard of quality and learning support, technology staffing needs should be clearly articulated, planned for and then acted upon (II.C.1.a,d, II.C.2).

V. Recommendations

See the recommendations under Standard I and Standard IIA.

STANDARD III Resources

STANDARD IIIA Human Resources

I. Responses to the Previous Team's Recommendations

The 2001 Accreditation Visit was conducted using the previous standards. The recommendations that relate most to the new Standard IIIA are the following.

The team recommends that:

(14) In order to support the college's existing programs and services as well as new initiatives, the college critically analyzes its staffing needs, establishes priorities, and hires adequate staff in accordance with an approved college staffing plan. [Standard 7A.1]

(15) The college ensures that administrative, faculty, and staff evaluations be consistent, confidential, fairly applied, and non-punitive. [Standards 7B.1, 7B.2]

The college prepared a tentative staffing plan in the spring of 2003 and more recently established and is following a five year plan for increasing the number of full-time faculty. The college revised its evaluation processes in 2002 and is following that process.

II. General Observations

The Human Resources Office staff was very professional and was able to quickly produce documentation for the requested information. Personnel files were organized and were indexed on the computer. Staff was on task and conducted themselves in a very friendly business like manner. Offices were laid out well and there appeared to be adequate space for storage and staff work stations. The evaluative and structural process appears to be done by Gavilan College in an exemplary manner.

III. Findings and Evidence

The human resources office produced documents showing that job descriptions were on file for all positions that were requested for review. The district uses representatives of each of the constituent groups for interview panels for each of the posted positions. This was determined by interviews with individuals from each of the constituent groups. Justification for new positions is documented with references to the Strategic Plan as to how the position contributes to the completion of the plan. Documentation for requested positions included references to the specific areas of compliance with the Strategic Plan. Academic preparation and degrees for faculty member are identified in the college catalog. A five year personnel plan for faculty positions is in place. There is no personnel plan in place for classified employees (III.A.1.a).

The accreditation team reviewed the evaluations on all the current probationary employees at the college. The Human Resources Office monitors, reviews and records all evaluations on probationary employees. The evaluations were filed in the personnel folders for each employee. The evaluations were approved by the supervisor and employee and initialed by the appropriate human resources officer. The college presented evidence of a consistent evaluation process driven by the job descriptions. The evaluations were done in a professional manner that provided a good evaluation of the employee's performance. Evaluations of adjunct faculty positions are seen as a responsibility of the academic deans. The Human Resources Office does not track when adjunct faculty need to be evaluated. They did however file the evaluations on adjunct faculty that were completed by the deans (III.A.1.b).

The district uses faculty for in class evaluations. Student learning outcomes are not part of faculty evaluations. (III.A.1.c)

The district has a published code of professional ethics. (III.A.1.d)

The institution follows the Strategic Plan and Operating Budget Standards to determine appropriate staffing levels for each program and service. The use of program review by divisions for staffing and other resources does not appear to be consistent. After reviewing a request for additional classified personnel from the Physical Education department, the provided program review and action plan did not identify a need for this position. The allocation of the new requested personnel had constituent review and followed a rational process for allocation, but did not use the program review and action plan vehicles (III.A.2).

The institution's personnel policies and procedures are available on the Gavilan web site. The college is compliant with its policies and follows its procedures. **The accreditation team reviewed the personnel records and found them to be filed in an orderly fashion. Files were retrievable upon request of the team and the individual file entries were secured to the folder** (III.A.3).

The team met with the equal opportunity officer and reviewed processes for maintaining diversity. The class schedule and hiring notices include nondiscrimination statements (III.A.4.a). The Human Resources Department maintains a database of all employees and information on equity and diversity (III.A.4.b).

The consistent application of policies, procedures and documentation provided on hiring and evaluation demonstrate consistency and provide strong evidence of integrity in its treatment of administration, faculty, and staff. (III.A.4.c)

The committee reviewed the professional growth, flex day activities, sabbaticals and professional leaves that have been granted and found them to be compliant with fostering growth for the college staff. Members of the Gavilan College administration also engage in at least four types of activities in order to maintain currency. Each administrator has individual travel/conference funds available to be used for workshops and conferences. When appropriate, administrators also attend the on-campus flex activities planned for the faculty. Each year the administration holds a retreat/workshop to address current group administrative needs. Administrators participate in regional meetings in order to keep abreast of current regulations and trends (III.A.5.a).

The Staff Development Committee reviews the surveys of employees attending professional development activities for consideration in program planning. Improvements and suggestions are incorporated in future staff development activities (III.A.5.b).

The district uses the Strategic Plan to identify the long-term direction and goals of the district. When the goals of the district identify the need for additional human resources, decisions are made based on the actual needs of the new program and funding available. A full-time faculty requirement is established by the state based on the prior year's base revenues. Increases in full-time faculty levels are required when the college receives growth or equalization revenue. Classified employee positions are evaluated on a year-to-year basis to determine where additional employees are needed to support student success and the instructional program or to enhance the working and learning environment. Support staffing levels are also considered when evaluating changes to instructional programs and student services (III.A.6).

IV. Conclusions

The college meets the standard on employee qualifications. The college does a good job with job descriptions, hiring committees and evaluations of management, classified and full time faculty. A plan for classified employees needs to be developed (III.A.1.a). Regarding faculty evaluation, the last accreditation study noted a need to “Develop a written evaluation procedure for adjunct faculty that includes frequency of evaluation.” There is no evidence that the study plan was done. Adjunct faculty are not regularly evaluated; consequently the college does not meet this standard (III.A.1.b). Student learning outcomes in the faculty evaluations need to be implemented (III.A.1.c). The college meets the requirement for a written code of professional ethics for its employees (III.A.1.d).

The college meets the standard of sufficient qualified faculty, staff and administrators (III.A.2).

The college meets this standard regarding personnel policies and procedures. Workmanship of the file maintenance and the professionalism of the human resources staff are commendable (III.A.3). The college demonstrates equity and integrity as well as a commitment to diversity in carrying out its established personnel policies and procedures (III.A.4). Efforts and implementation for all constituent groups are commendable (III.A.5). The college has planned well for faculty positions but needs the same level of commitment to planning for staff needs (III.A.6).

V. Recommendations

The team recommends that the college Human Resources Office regularly evaluate adjunct faculty and that a schedule and record of completed adjunct faculty evaluations be kept (III.A.1.b).

STANDARD III Resources

STANDARD IIIB Physical Resources

I. Responses to the Previous Team's Recommendations

The 2001 Accreditation Visit was conducted using the previous standards. The recommendations that relate most to the new Standard IIIB are the following.

The team recommends that:

(13) The college completes the engineering evaluation and installs air conditioning for the new Library building. [Standard 6.1]

(18) The college completes the engineering evaluation and install air-cooling and circulation for all facilities where this is needed and required, including the Library. [Standards 6.4, 6.7, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3]

The college has implemented Measure E which includes infrastructure upgrades such as air conditioning.

II. General Observations

The college has embarked on a significant layered plan to upgrade the physical resources of the campus. Failure of major infrastructure resources has prompted that water and electrical services be one of the first areas of bond measure expenditures. Evidence of recent trenching, and replacement of infrastructure is evident in many areas of the campus. The plans for building upgrades, remodeling, air conditioning and execution of previously under funded scheduled maintenance are being implemented. This process of physical resources planning and upgrading will take many years to complete, but Gavilan has their planning and implementation under way.

III. Findings and Evidence

Safety reports and injury reports were provided which identified safety needs and access issues. This process was validated through interviews with the administrative services staff and the Disability Resource Center (DRC) staff. The feedback indicated that concerns and problems were fixed promptly and to the satisfaction of the DRC staff and students (III.B.1).

The district has an adequate plan in place for the allocation of bond funds for the refurbishment of existing buildings and for the addition of new buildings for the growth of new and existing programs. The allocations of resources from the bond are reviewed by the bond oversight committee for Measure E. The allocations of these resources appear to be commendable (III.B.1.a).

The college uses plans that are prepared by licensed architects and college planners. All plans are reviewed by the Division of State Architect for compliance with Title 24 access and safety requirements. The library stacks should be brought up to seismic safety standards (III.B.1.b).

The district uses the Five Year Construction Plan, Facilities Master Plan and the Space Utilization Analysis are available to the district as tools for measuring facilities use (III.B.2.a).

Planning is coordinated with through the President's Council from committees composed of representatives from all constituent groups on campus. Recommendations are made to the Board of Trustees. The Facilities Master Plan was approved by the Board of Trustees. Sixty-four million dollars of the Measure E funds have been designated for remodeling buildings on the main campus and repairing and upgrading the underground infrastructure. A design team worked closely with all campus user groups and committees. The district began construction in the summer of 2006 with the campus infrastructure upgrade and replacement of the gas, electrical service and supply, phone, and data upgrades (III.B.2.b).

IV. Conclusions

The college meets this standard. The team urges the college to bring the library stacks into compliance with earthquake standards (III.B.1.b).

V. Recommendations

None

STANDARD III Resources

STANDARD IIIC Technology Resources

I. Responses to the Previous Team's Recommendations

The 2001 Accreditation Visit was conducted using the previous standards. The recommendations that relate most to the new Standard IIIC are the following.

The team recommends that:

(12) The college speed up the completion of the Technology Master Plan to develop more coordination between the Technology and MIS departments.

[Standards 6.1, 6.2, 6.7]

(16) The college expedites the completion of the Technology Master Plan and the associated implementation features. [Standards 8.1, 8.2, 8.4, 8.5]

The college created its first Technology Plan in the spring of 2003 and has recently established as second Technology Plan. The college is following the components of this plan that call for phased replacement of computers on campus.

II. General Observations

The Gavilan Information Technology department is in the initial throws of a complete and comprehensive revision of its facilities, hardware and software. The current facility is overgrown with phone systems, servers, printers staff work stations and networking terminations and hardware. The physical facility for the Gavilan Information Technology department is clearly too small and in need of restructuring. The staff has done an admirable job of meeting the information needs of the district with the current configuration of hardware and software.

III. Findings and Evidence

The Gavilan College Technology Master Plan is comprehensive and is on point in designing the technology resources necessary to provide the tools to accomplish the institutions master plan. Gavilan has had an active Technology Committee consisting of faculty, staff, administrators, and students interested in technology issues. The members serve both an advocacy and an advisory role.

Gavilan College has provided quality technology training as required for staff, faculty, and students. The College Staff Development Committee organizes various one-hour technical workshops that are offered during Staff Development days on subjects such as Excel, Word, Reflections, and web page development. The implementation of Enterprise Resource Planning

(ERP) system will include significant amounts of technology training especially for faculty and staff.

Through the District Technology Committee and the Technology Master Plan, Gavilan College systematically plans technology acquisitions and upgrades to meet institutional needs and stay current with prevailing technology.

Gavilan College makes decisions about the use and distribution of its technology resources via the District Technology Committee with input from Deans Council, Curriculum Committee, and Department Chairs.

Gavilan College ensures that facilities decisions relating to technology emanate from institutional needs and plans for improvement through the Technology Master Plan.

The "Minimum Technology Standards in Classroom and Labs" was drafted in consultation with the Academic Senate, Academic Senate Tech Task Force, and Alfa Tech, a private consulting firm.

IV. Conclusions

The college should be commended for its technology plan and active involvement of the campus community in setting the direction for technology resources (III.C.1.a).

The college provides extensive technology training for staff and has three planning entities in place for staff training by constituency. The college offers structured and open technology learning labs and classes for students. The need for training will need to be expanded for training staff to use the new integrated institutional software for existing and new employees (III.C.1.b).

A disaster plan for off-site storage and disaster recovery needs to be included in the update of the District Technology Plan. Also included should be an annual allocation of funds for upgrading the technological infrastructure, support services, and equipment once the Measure E bond funds are expended (III.C.1.c).

Gavilan College is following the existing hardware and software standards developed by the District Technology Committee (DTC). The web and network management standards are still being developed by various subcommittees under the DTC (III.C.1.d).

The District Technology Committee continues to monitor the current Technology Master Plan while making technology related decisions. In October 2005, the district hired a consultant to improve and update the existing plan. Gavilan College bases its technology decisions on the results of evaluation of program and service needs. The current "Minimum Standards for Classrooms and Labs" document is the result of meetings with faculty, staff, and students and is incorporated into the Technology Master Plan. Gavilan College prioritizes needs when making decisions about technology purchases by taking issues to the DTC. The DTC needs to address

the following issues in priority order: safety, security, equal access, cost effectiveness, improved education, and improved operation (III.C.2).

V. Recommendations

None.

STANDARD III Resources

STANDARD IIID Financial Resources

I. Responses to the Previous Team's Recommendations

The 2001 Accreditation Visit was conducted using the previous standards. The recommendations that relate most to the new Standard IIID are the following.

The team recommends that:

(17) The college in forthcoming budget cycles obligates appropriate levels of funds for the operation, maintenance, and upkeep of all facilities and infrastructure. [Standards 8.1, 8.5]

The college evaluated its infrastructure needs in 2002 and passed Measure E in the spring of 2004. The college budgets adequately for maintenance but needs to follow through that budgeted funds are expended as planned.

II. General Observations

The chief financial officer of the district is very experienced and has a comprehensive understanding of the financials needs of the college. The planning process for finances and committee structure provide a good overview for observing, controlling and allocating the college's financial resources. The college has made great strides in eliminating prior debt that the college had incurred. Overall finances of the college are excellent.

III. Findings and Evidence

The Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, the Technology Plan, and the Five Year Full Time Faculty Hiring Plan provide the goals from which the district derives its multi-year Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan lists specific objectives intended to enhance the achievement of the district's mission. This in turn is used for budget development. Evidence provided demonstrates compliance with the standard (III.D.1.a).

The best measure of quality institutional budgeting is the fact that the district provides funding for its operations, eliminates debt and its expenditures are less than its revenue with in a fiscal year. The District's difference between revenues and expenditures was 1.6 percent which is a reflection of careful budgeting and systematic oversight of the budget process. The budget process is collaborative, includes prioritized educational initiatives based upon planning objectives, and occurs within the context of retaining a healthy unrestricted reserve (III.D.1.b).

The final budget includes a 1.25 percent charge on all payroll expenditures to fund future retiree health benefit obligations. The district recently discharged the last of its long-term bond liabilities (III.D.1.c).

Financial planning allows for input from all college constituents, and financial information is readily available to all who are interested. In both spirit and action, the district treats financial data and the process of developing financial plans transparently (III.D.1.d).

The vice president of administrative services assures that district accounting conforms to standard accounting practices. Once the budget is adopted for a given year, the vice president of administrative services must approve all subsequent budget transfers and revisions. These checks ensure the proper allocation of funds (III.D.2.a).

Budget changes are posted in the board information and posted to the Gavilan web site. Budget changes are reviewed and approved by committees with constituent representation (III.D.2.b).

Given the reserve required by board policy and careful budgeting cash flow issues are addressed successfully (III.D.2.c).

Standardized audits by a nationally recognized audit firm, has not identified any material weaknesses in the process used by Gavilan for fiscal oversight (III.D.2.d).

The Gavilan annual audit shows compliance with standard governmental accounting practices. Having no audit findings in this usually difficult area is laudable (III.D.2.e).

Contracts are developed and reviewed by the administrative staff for consistency with mission and goals of the institution prior to being issued (III.D.2.f).

Gavilan's annual audit is an evaluation of the financial management of the district and has regularly had no findings or management concerns. The college continues to review its process of financial management and continues to fine tune its procedures and processes (III.D.2.g).

The college uses its variation from budgeted dollars to actual dollars spent to assess the accuracy of the budgeting at Gavilan College. The variation of 1.6 percent demonstrate an extremely accurate process, and the review by the budget committee and administration is clearly evidence of a college that does its budget development well (III.D.3).

IV. Conclusions

The college is compliant with this accreditation standard. The team commends the college for its budgeting process; budget committee and alignments to the strategic plan (III.D.1.b). The team commends the college for the liquidation of all debt in the college and the almost complete funding of all retiree obligations in such a short time (III.D.1.c).

STANDARD IV

Leadership and Governance

I. Responses to the Previous Team's Recommendations

The 2001 Accreditation Visit was conducted using the previous standards. The recommendations that relate most to the new Standard IV are the following.

The team recommends that:

- (3) The college engages in an expedited review and revision of the Board Policy Manual. The team furthermore recommends using an internal and participatory process to tailor policies to the college's culture while reflecting external requirements. [Standard 2.9]
- (19) The college ensures all employee groups understand and actively participate in the budget development process. [Standard 9A.5]
- (22) Given the fact that out-of-date and incomplete Board Policies place the institution at risk, the governing board expedites its review and revision of Board Policies as soon as possible. The team further recommends that Gavilan College utilize a participatory review process to insure that policies reflect internal needs as well as external requirements. [Standards 10A.1, 10A.2, 10A.3, 10A.5]
- (23) The college establishes clear written policies and procedures delineating the roles and responsibilities of the various campus constituencies that participate in institutional governance. [Standards 10B.5, 10B.6, 10B.8, 10B.9 and 10B.10]

The updating of Board Policies and administrative procedures appears to have been done well. Policies are presented in economical, straightforward language and are distinct from administrative procedures that are used to implement them.

Issues involving institutional decision-making are included in responses to major recommendations relating to other standards. The report includes a reference to including *all constituent groups* in developing the staffing plan and development of consultation processes to assure that all that college plans are used as the bases for decision-making.

Faculty participate in determining the number of full-time, permanent faculty and classified staff through the participation of these two constituencies in developing unit (i.e., department) plans and the Strategic Plan (III A.2). According to the self-study report, "the district may...also evaluate the need for additional full-time faculty members in order to meet...instructional demands" (Self Study, III A.2).

All constituencies are assured that the college plans are used as the bases for decision-making. Unit plans, which are linked to the goals of the strategic plan and to the educational master plan, appear to drive budgeting decisions. All constituencies have an opportunity to participate in development of the Strategic Plan and participate on the Budget Committee. To complete the process, the Board Budget Subcommittee reviews all budget decisions. The college has

succeeded in involving faculty in these processes. However, the classified staff does not appear to have proportionate influence in staffing decisions. Not all participate in developing unit plans.

II. General Observations

In general, Standard IV of the self study report is clearly written and appears candid in its descriptions and evaluations, recognizing areas that need improvement. One key statement is that “Participatory committees are the primary vehicles of institutional governance.” While faculty appear to have a well-functioning academic senate and participate on these committees, Professional Support Staff (i.e., classified) appear to be seriously underrepresented. According to the Associated Student Body president and college administrators, students are active on such key committees as the Budget, Strategic Plan, and Technology Committees as well as the President’s Council. (Evidence to support this claim is limited. There are no committee membership lists, and minutes have names of members but not their respective positions, yet participation was confirmed through multiple interviews.)

The accreditation survey indicates that more of the campus community than not agree that they have a role in governance (Self Study, IV.A.1, p. 3), though there is a substantial minority (29%) that do not feel that there are sufficient opportunities to participate in decision-making, and the report states that faculty serving on committees often do not communicate back to those they represent (Self Study IV.A.3, p. 12).

The self study report reveals that there were three decisions for which the faculty had insufficient input through consultation: 1) “the hiring ... of a full-time athletic director in 2001 at a time when budgets were being cut” (Self Study IV.A.2.a, p. 9); 2) the establishment of a noncredit program in 2004, which seems to have been initiated as much for the opportunity to gain apportionment as to serve a recognized need (Self Study IV.A.1, p 6); and 3), and the hiring of a full-time music instructor in 2005 (Self Study IV, p. 5, last full paragraph). The self study report indicates that those disturbed by these decisions may not have understood how items in the budget are prioritized. The college president and the board members interviewed indicated that there was sufficient opportunity for consultation on these issues but that not all faculty agreed with board actions.

Gavilan College governance procedures invite participation by the college community in initiating practices, programs, and services that improve the college through Board Policy and procedures (Administrative Procedure 3250) which dictate a planning and budgeting process that begins at the unit level and relates to goals developed with broad institutional input. Roles in college governance appear in publications such as the faculty handbooks. Faculty, Professional Support Staff (i.e., classified staff), and students serve on all key decision-making committees: President’s Council, Budget, Institutional Effectiveness, and District Technology Committees, though attendance for students and classified employees is not consistent. Each of these standing committees operates according to bylaws. The college intranet provides information about each committee, although obtaining evidence of participation by all constituencies is anecdotal; there are no committee membership lists, and minutes have names of members but not their respective positions.

In addition to Board Policy and administrative procedure 3250 (Planning), Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 2510 define the role in governance for each constituency. These policies and procedures appear to have been implemented, but, again, we could not find direct evidence of equitable participation from all constituencies.

The governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students appear to work together for the good of the institution. We observed an academic senate meeting in which administrators and faculty exchanged ideas in frank and open discussion and differences of opinion comfortably expressed. Interviews with faculty and minutes of meetings confirm a high degree of collegiality in determining action. The accreditation survey revealed that a majority of the college community agrees that they have a voice in college governance. Because there is no way to determine what positions people on committees occupy, direct evidence of committee participation by all constituencies was lacking.

The college has an active curriculum committee that approves all courses and educational programs. In this capacity, the committee reviews student learning outcomes at the course and program levels. The academic senate makes recommendations on curriculum and other academic matters.

Based on a review of previous Progress and Midterm Reports, the college has responded to recommendations from the Commission and reports to other agencies with regulatory authority. The self study prepared for this visit responded to some standards incompletely and provided insufficient evidence to support many general statements.

The board has an evaluation instrument by which members evaluate their collective performance. Responses are summarized in a board self-evaluation item that appears at an annual board meeting. Also, those in leadership roles are evaluated for their performance. However, the college has no regular procedures for evaluating its governance and decision-making structures and processes beyond surveying the college community for accreditation.

III. Findings and Evidence

The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator (IV).

The college meets this standard in terms of its structures and processes. In terms of execution, the accreditation survey indicates that more of the campus community than not agree that they have a role in governance (Self Study IV.A.1, p. 3), though there is a substantial minority (29%) that do not feel that there are sufficient opportunities to participate in decision-making, and the report states that faculty serving on committees often do not communicate back to those they represent (Self Study IV.A.1).

The self study report reveals that there were three decisions for which the faculty had insufficient input through consultation: 1) “the hiring ... of a full-time athletic director in 2001 at a time when budgets were being cut” (Self Study IV.A. 2. a, p. 9); 2) the establishment of a noncredit program in 2004, which seems to have been initiated as much for the opportunity to gain apportionment than to serve a documented need (Self Study IV.A.1, p. 6); and 3) the hiring of a full-time music instructor in 2005 (Self Study IV, p. 5, last full paragraph). The college president and the board members we interviewed do not agree that the board acted without sufficient input from the college community, especially the academic senate. It appears that the board followed its procedures in making these decisions. During the past six years these are the only decisions that elicited controversy, and no constituent group formally objected to the process used.

Through numerous interviews, the team learned that the decision to begin a noncredit program created a lingering problem. The Board responded to a community need to initiate a noncredit program for older adults and second language learners, but in so doing the Board did not follow the processes delineated in Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 3250. The practice calls for the Board to formulate its goals annually and for the college to incorporate these goals into the Strategic Plan through the annual update. A noncredit program does not appear in the goals available at the time, and plans for such a program had not been formally developed. In fact, plans for this program still have not been formally developed, although expansion of the noncredit program appears in the current Strategic Plan. A concrete plan for noncredit would provide a framework for shaping this program. Questions relating to how noncredit courses might articulate with credit courses, especially how ESL classes would align with the credit ESL program could then be resolved within a context of program mission and goals. Clearly, the Board seems not to have used its planning processes to initiate this program.

Board Policies 3250 and 2510 define the role in governance for each constituency, and the leaders of each constituency appear to be actively involved in fulfilling their role. The college meets this standard (IV.A.2.a).

The college generally meets the standard of faculty involvement. However, the noncredit program appears to have been established (in 2004) by board action without advice or recommendation by faculty on the curriculum committee or the academic senate and thus violates the college’s policy and procedure relating to program and course approval (IV.A.1.b).

The college exceeds this standard. It is worth noting that the college president, at times with other administrators, attends meetings of the Associated Student Body and the Academic Senate. Communication at the Academic Senate meeting the team observed revealed a congenial relationship between the president and faculty and a healthy exchange of opinions on issues (IV.A.3).

The college minimally meets this standard. While policies and processes are clearly referenced, and much dialog occurs informally, we saw little documentation of ongoing, structured dialogue about learning outcomes. Also of note is that most dialogue and subsequent recommendations leading to decisions appeared to be made by all of the same participants from faculty and classified staff (IV.A.4).

The college has not put effort into a formal evaluation of its governance structures beyond collecting survey data for the self study and therefore does not meet the standard. However, the campus climate at Gavilan College is such that informal indicators that governance is working well appear to confirm that the college community has the opportunity to participate in governance. On the other hand, the board has an evaluative instrument that they use to reflect on their performance and plan future activities (IV.A.5).

The re-write of Board Policies is referenced numerous times in the Self-Study and was corroborated. Board Policy 4020 establishes the policy that curriculum and programs are to be of high quality and meet student needs. The process by which the college president was appointed was in direct keeping with Board Policy 2431 and said policy was, upon review, found to be participatory, thorough and inclusive. There have been acceptable policies which speak to issues such as the distribution of board seats by geographic area (Board Policy 2100), terms of office (Board Policy 2305) and process by which the public may participate in Board Meetings (Board Policy 2345) (IV.B.1.a).

Board Policy 1200 clearly identifies the mission of the district and ensuing policies address the assurance of integrity, quality and improvement of student learning programs (Board Policy 4020) (IV.B.1.b).

The Board, as elected officials in the public entity of a community college district, functions independently and is ultimately responsible for the educational quality, legal matters and financial integrity of the college (IV.B.1.c).

Board Policy 2010 identifies the eligibility requirements for board service while the duties and responsibilities of the Board members and officers are found in Board Policies 2010 and 2210, respectively (IV.B.1.d).

The Board regularly reviews and updates Board Policies with the assistance of the Community College League of California (CCLC). A board retreat was used to develop the current goals in 2005 which have been reviewed through a workable process involving the President's Council and, in turn, the various constituent groups (IV.B.1.e).

Newly elected Board members are provided a thorough orientation under the direction of the President which is spelled out in Board Policy 2010. Upon review and interview, the process was found to be most complete and beneficial. The board has indeed made presentations at conferences detailing the orientation process (IV.B.1.f).

A two step evaluation process is used to accomplish a self-evaluation. The Self-Evaluation Subcommittee (Board Policy 2745) prepares materials for review and finalization at an annual end-of-year retreat (Board Policy 2745). Minutes corroborated the activities of the Subcommittee and the outcome provided a useful tool to facilitate the improvement of board member performance (IV.B.1.g).

Board Policies 2715 and 2710 clearly identify a Board Code of Ethics that provides a policy for dealing with behavior which violates the code. There were no reported instances wherein there was a need to invoke the code (IV.B.1.h).

There is evidence of periodic reports to the board in regard to the accreditation process at a meeting held December 13, 2005 and ultimately approved the self-study on November 14, 2006. A board member was an active participant in the activities of the steering committee for accreditation (IV.B.1.i).

As noted previously, the college president was hired in full keeping with Board Policy 2431. Board Policy 2435 well describes the process by which he is reviewed in regard to his progress toward agreed upon goals and performance requirements on a semi-annual basis. The board last evaluated the president on April 26, 2005 and involved the various employee groups in so doing (IV.B.1.j).

In early 2004 significant reductions were made to the management structure due to budget exigencies. Once funding improved the organizational structure was revisited and further adjustments and restorations were made accordingly. Upon conversation and interview with the Board and president they were of the opinion that the current structure is adequate and no further adjustments or restorations are required (IV.B.2.a).

Through a combination of President's Council and the Strategic Planning Committee the district purports to tie the allocation of resources to the budget planning process. The college also states that research information plays a significant role in the further (re)development of strategic plans. Upon review and interview, the reality is that research does exist on a sporadic basis but does not appear to be particularly focused or essential to the planning process. The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies (IV.B.2.b).

As noted previously, the Board of Trustees exercises the rights and responsibilities granted them by Board Policy: approves expenditures, approves curriculum and budget and insures that human resources requirements are met (IV.B.2.c).

A most thorough budget calendar is in use and the College Budget Committee and Board of Trustees Budget Committee review and approved all budget changes. The interface between the two budget committees was satisfactorily explained (IV.B.2.d).

The president is thoroughly involved in numerous communities within the district (chamber of commerce, service clubs and involvements with local K-12 districts) and was further involved in a planning process for the San Benito region in anticipation of the development of educational services to this segment of the population with funds made available through the bond (IV.B.2.e).

IV. Conclusions

The college appears to have very sound governance structures from the board level to the unit level. The last visiting team had no major recommendations, and the college seems to have improved over its status at that visit. Certainly it has made admirable strides since the 1995 visit.

Still, there are some issues that bear further scrutiny. The institution defines the roles of college constituencies in planning documents in greater detail than it does in its governance policy and procedures (Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 2510). This later policy and its procedures do not specify all the governance committees and their charges (e.g., Institutional Effectiveness Committee). The team encourages the college to develop administrative procedures that include the roles of major standing governance committees (IV.A.2). Also, in two or three instances of major decisions, consultation with faculty was considered by some faculty to have been insufficient (IV.A.1). Finally, the institution does not appear to evaluate regularly the role of leadership and the decision-making structures and processes and communicate the results (IV.A.5).

The team found that the board has recently updated its policies and administrative procedures (IV.B.1.b). The Strategic Plan sets goals for the district based and interviews and minutes demonstrated that the Strategic Plan was developed with broad participation from the college community (IV.B.1). The board has a very complete and effective orientation for new and continuing board members (IV.B.1.f). Board minutes show that the board regularly evaluates the president/superintendent and conducts an annual self-evaluation (IV.B.1.g,j).

Documentation produced by the Budget Reduction Task Force demonstrates that the all constituencies were involved in the process of budget reductions and reorganization and provided a sufficient amount of time (eight months) for comments by anyone in the college community (IV.B.2). Planning and budget documents as well as individual interviews show that the college has used the new planning process, which includes representatives from all constituencies, to drive budgeting and provide opportunity for the entire college community to be involved in decision-making. An example is how the college responded to mid-year budget cuts in 2004. Severe budget reductions were accomplished in a most collegial manner.

The team commends the college president for his tireless pursuit of dialog and collaboration and willingness to hear and share input at multiple levels while maintaining the prerogative to make ultimate decisions within Board parameters. His singular efforts have made the spirit of optimism and camaraderie possible on campus.

V. Recommendations

None