

First Draft

INTERIM RESPONSE TO ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT OF 2001

SKYLINE COLLEGE

Writing Team Members:

Connie Beringer
Bernie Blackman
Paula Bray
Eloisa Briones
Anita Martinez
Margery Meadows
Jerry Peel, co-editor
Evelyn Seth
Regina Stanback-Stroud
Sandra Verhoogen, co-editor
Frances White
Rosemary Ybarra-Garcia
Kathy Zbikowski-Taylor

**PLEASE FORWARD YOUR COMMENTS, SUGGESTIONS, INPUT TO JERRY PEEL
AT peel@smccd.net OR TO SANDRA VERHOOGEN AT verhoogen@smccd.net**

RESPONSES due by September 11, 2001

Responses to Recommendations

Theme #1: Clarifying Communication Processes

Recommendation #1:

The college should gather current survey data, review policy manuals and handbooks, and update major written documents to identify more explicitly the responsibilities and composition of committees and functional units, especially with regard to the research component. (2.9, 3A1, 3B.1, 10B.2)

College Response:

Soon after being hired in January 2001, the Director of Planning, Research and Student Success conducted two surveys on governance and planning at Skyline College. The first survey investigated District and Skyline employee (faculty, staff and administration) perceptions and knowledge of current governance structure and process. The second survey collected and reviewed the current college policy manuals, handbooks, guidelines, and plans.

The Office of Planning and Research was then created, two research associates hired, an institutional reporting system to provide timely standard and ad hoc reporting created, and research staff appointed to governance councils and committees. The involvement of the research staff in college governance has enabled the integration of research into decision-making at the college and has improved communication and coordination between governing bodies. (See Figure 1 for list of committees.)

In addition, two initiatives were begun. The first focused on integrating annual planning and budgeting processes, while the second focused on creating the first college strategic plan.

Currently, the Office of Planning and Research is in the process of: 1. Writing a report describing governance at Skyline and making recommendations for improving communication, planning and participation; 2. Improving the guidelines for a new annual planning process initiated for AY 2001-2002; and, 3. Developing new procedures for integrating annual planning and budget cycle.

Recommendation #2:

The college should explicitly clarify the processes for decision-making and more closely align the relationships between and among the various decision-making bodies in order to support short- and long-range planning. (3B.1, 9A.5, 10B.1, 10B.2, 10B.6, 10B.8)

College Response:

The Office of Planning and Research is in the process of writing a report on the structure and process of governance at Skyline College. In the meantime, the College has immediately begun to address needs identified in preliminary findings and recommendations. For example, the College has:

1. Created and implemented new forms, guidelines and procedures for the Planning and Budget Committee;
2. Created and implemented forms and processes for Annual Planning , and trained management in the new format. AY 2002-2003 is the second year of implementation;
3. Created processes to coordinate and integrate annual planning with budget planning. Second year of implementation;
4. Created a FTE Faculty Allocation Committee to coordinate and recommend hiring for faculty position. First year of implementation;
5. Expanded, revised and improved the College Planning and Budgeting Calendar, and timelines. This explicitly combines the Annual Planning process with the Budget Planning process within a single detailed timeline. Second year of implementation.
6. Created a Strategic Planning Taskforce. The taskforce began work in Fall 2001 and will complete the College's first six-year plan and present it in final report form in Spring 2003.

Theme #2: Conducting Comprehensive, Integrated Planning

Recommendation #1:

In order to plan effectively, the college should conduct objective research, identify institutional outcomes, and engage in systematic and continuous assessment, especially with regard to enrollment management, program development, and learning resources. (3A.1, 3A.3, 3C.1, 6.7)

College Response:

1. In the spring 2001 the Office of Planning and Research was created, a Director and two research associates hired.
2. The Office has created an institutional reporting system to provide timely standard and ad hoc reporting.
3. The Office data management system provides enhanced reporting capabilities, through the employment of state-of-art reporting tools.
4. The Office has updated and expanded its website to add planning and research to a research only website. Information on Strategic Planning, Annual Work Planning, Accreditation, and Budgeting are available to the college community.

5. The process for Annual Planning has been redeveloped to include planning terminology developed by the Research and Planning Group which integrates goals and objectives with budgeting and assessment. New guidelines and forms and means of distribution have been created that identify responsible authorities, timelines, and means of assessment.
6. The Office now conducts customized surveys for management and program development review.
7. In the summer 2002 the Planning and Research office created the Enrollment Management Information System (EMIS), which provides daily and weekly reports on enrollment (headcount, seat count, FTE, FTES, WSCH, LOAD, and student demographics) to the President, Vice Presidents, Deans and Managers to improve enrollment management.
8. Beginning in the Fall 2002 and continuing each fall the College will administer a survey, "Faces of the Future" to collect student assessment of the college's programs, services and climate.

Recommendation #2:

Unresolved from the 1995 recommendations, the current team encourages the college to address the appropriate sequencing of courses, especially those involving prerequisites, be consistent in applying them, and coordinate the process with the district. (4B.1)

College Response:

The College has addressed the sequencing of courses by requiring through the curriculum process that faculty proposing new courses with course prerequisites validate the prerequisites and document this validation before approval by the Curriculum Committee. In addition, the Program Review Process overseen by the Curriculum Committee requires that departments review course outlines, including the validity of course prerequisites. The majority of prerequisites are advisory.

Each department continues to be responsible for the consistent application of prerequisites. With the exception of a few courses in the English Department, responsibility for the enforcement of prerequisites rests with each instructor checking each student status for the first two weeks of each semester. The English Departments district-wide have been instrumental in accomplishing the goal of computerized prerequisite checking for several courses.

The College department with the most stringent required prerequisites, the English Department, has established and validated English and Reading district-wide prerequisites in concert with the faculties at our sister colleges. Course registration blocks to student enrollment in two levels of English (ENGL 836 and ENGL 100) and one level of reading (READ 836) were reviewed and approved by the District Prerequisite Task Force, thus ensuring consistency in applying them. Skyline College members of the Task Force may be recommending that similar blocks be applied at two other levels of English.

The District Prerequisite Task Force was established to determine how computerized checking would operate with the primary goal of student access. Supported by the College faculty and Academic Senate and in line with Title 5, a course equivalency process and a reciprocity of placements policy have been formalized to enhance student access.

The College has established a fair and timely process for students to challenge course prerequisites and for the College to review and track such challenges. For example, a study of the process for English composition and reading courses conducted by the Matriculation Researcher in July 2002 concluded:

Challenge outcomes for the three semesters for which we have data suggest that the challenge process is working as intended. The number of challenges appears to be manageable and students with sound bases to support their challenges may be encouraged by the 69% approval rate. Most importantly, the classroom performance of students placed through the challenge process indicates the standards we are using are a reasonable predictor of success.

Recommendation #3:

Program review recommendations should be clearly integrated into the college's planning process, formally linked with the resource allocation process, and serve as the basis for on-going and demonstrable program improvement. (4D.1)

College Response:

Skyline College revised its planning process to be integrated with its budget processes. In doing so, the program review process was incorporated. Currently, the program review results inform the planning process which results in the college's next fiscal year work plan. The work-plan is then used by the budget committee when making budget priorities. Additional information generated through the program review process is forwarded to the Planning & Budgeting Committee members by the President and used when making allocation decisions for the division budgets

Scheduling decisions made by the division deans and the Vice President of Instruction use program review when determining the need for both increases and decreases in courses and sections.

The college created a new FTE Faculty Allocation Committee to make recommendations regarding priorities for faculty hiring. This committee uses the information generated through Program Review to determine college-wide hiring priorities for full time equivalent faculty.

Recommendation #4:

The college should support a program review format suitable for student services programs and begin conducting the reviews in coordination with the established schedule for instructional programs. (5.5)

College Response

The program review format has been modified to accommodate the evaluation of student services programs. Student services will be included in the cycle for program review beginning Fall 2002. The following changes were made to the current process. The instructions for the executive summary include a statement allowing the person preparing the report to use a self-study free form. The program review self study form has also been modified in various ways to be more relevant to student services. Part B on curriculum now includes counseling and orientation. A section on retention and success has been added requiring the following: a) number of students served, b) number of educational plans, c) student contact hours for various services, d) student satisfaction survey results.

Student services programs reviewed by outside agencies will highlight the results of those site visits and evaluations. The District Office and the campus researcher have provided data to the various programs in student services and these data will be included in their report as well.

Theme #3: Completing the Development of the Physical Environment**Recommendation #1:**

The college and district need to address issues related to the scheduled maintenance and operation of the campus by identifying ways to provide adequate service along with access to sufficient resources and equipment to support college priorities and its educational plan. (8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4)

College Response:

While the college and the district worked together to facilitate the passage of the Measure C facilities bond in order to address many of the scheduled maintenance needs, there is a remaining need for the college and district to identify ways to provide adequate services along with access to sufficient resources and equipment to support the college priorities and its educational plan.

The facilities department continues to be a function of the district which is funded off the top of the district funding allocation model. The facilities department has implemented

program review and analysis on both the college and district level to determine the most effective and efficient use of facilities resources.

Tension arises out of an incongruent perception about the function and purpose of the facilities department, and of the reasons for which the department is funded. The district maintains that the facilities department is funded to maintain custodial services and status quo. The facilities department views many of the college needs as additional special projects that have to be funded by the college itself. The college has an expectation that general facilities support could and should be available. Basic functions that are critical to the operation of the college are not available without having to pay the facilities department additional funds. For example, the college requested that facilities hang up a projector in a classroom. The facilities department responded with an estimated cost of over \$6,000.00 to hang the projector. Over half of the cost was related to asbestos abatement. Additionally, the cost included a project manager. Even with asbestos abatement, it is hard to imagine that the remaining time and labor to put a nut and bolt in the wall cost the remaining \$3,000.00.

The college is replete with conditions that remain unmitigated and affect the daily work environment of employees. These range from malfunctioning heating/air condition systems and poorly functioning toilet plumbing to leaking roofs that are dealt with by bracing a big plastic barrel bottom to the ceiling and placing a clamped hose in the barrel which can be released if the barrel fills up with too much water. This several-years-old “contraption” sits over an employee’s head today.

Thus, this recommendation has not been adequately addressed. One would be hard pressed to find a single individual on the campus in any of the constituent ranks that believes the college receives adequate services and sufficient resources in the area of facilities.

Recommendation #2:

Flowing from the Educational Master Plan, the college needs to work with the district office to develop a comprehensive environmental Facilities Master Plan that addresses the campus’ need for effective and adequate space utilization, including the need for office space; identifies sources of funds for repair and maintenance projects; and makes the most of the opportunities for institutional expansion resulting from the recent sale of land. (8.1, 8.3, 8.5, 9A.3)

College Response:

The college and the district have worked together to create a Facilities Master Plan. Representatives of faculty, staff and students worked on a planning committee to create Recommendations, Existing Analysis and Option Development for the Skyline College 2001 Facilities Master Plan.

Approximately two-thirds of the projects identified by the facilities master plan will be funded by Measure C dollars. The college and the district continue to explore additional resource development opportunities to fund the remaining one-third projects.

Sugimura and Associates have been contracted to complete a space utilization analysis and programming plan. This plan will include all of the space of the college and of the newly acquired Pacific Heights property.

Additional Recommendation:

As an additional recommendation to the district administration – separate from the preceding recommendations – the district office needs to take seriously the obligation to initiate and guide staff evaluation processes so that they are timely and consistent, and the college administration should follow through those evaluations. (7B.1, 7B.2, 10C.4, 10C.5)

College Response:

Beginning with the Fall 2002 Semester, the Assistant Chancellor of Human Resources position, which had been vacant for six months, has been filled, thus providing for more supervision in this area.

The District Office of Human Resources improved its system of notifying evaluators of staff performance evaluation due dates basis through the District E-mail system.(See Appendix) Classified Self-Assessment, Performance Evaluation and Special Recognition forms are now available on the District's Intranet system. Administrative and Academic Supervisory staff members continue to be evaluated on a regular basis, with appropriate evaluation instruments also available on the District's Intranet system.

During the current academic year, steps are being taken by the District Office of Human Resources to ensure timely submission of required evaluations through regular follow-up and the use of "staff evaluation" as one of the criteria used to evaluate administrative and supervisory staff.

The College makes every effort to evaluate all staff, including part-time faculty, in a timely manner, and is in compliance with District directives.

During the Fall Semester 2002, a Trust Committee, composed of members of both the American Federation of Teachers and the District Academic Senates, will revisit "Tenure Review Policy and Procedures," "Evaluation Policy and Procedures for Full-Time and Adjunct Faculty," and "Selection Procedures for Faculty Members".