



San Joaquin Delta College
Stockton, CA

PROGRESS REPORT

Response to Accreditation Evaluation

March 23, 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Statement of Report Preparation..... 2

Introductory Remarks..... 3

Accreditation Team Recommendations to San Joaquin Delta College.....4

San Joaquin Delta College Responses.....5

 Standard Two: Institutional Integrity.....5

 Standard Three: Institutional Effectiveness..... 8

 Standard Seven: Faculty and Staff..... 11

 Standard Eight: Physical Resources.....12

 Standard Ten: Governance and Administration.....14

APPENDICES

 Appendix I: Standard Two Resources.....18

 Appendix II: Standard Three Resources.....19

 Appendix III: Standard Seven Resources.....20

 Appendix IV: Standard Eight Resources.....21

 Appendix V: Standard Ten Resources.....22

STATEMENT OF REPORT PREPARATION

In response to the Accreditation Team Evaluation Report, an Accreditation Task Force was formed in 2003 to prepare a progress report. Chaired by Dr. Francisco Arce, the Task Force identified questions to be researched and persons or groups to be interviewed for the preparation of the progress report.

The completed draft progress report was distributed to the President's Council for the constituent groups to review and make recommendations. The final report was presented to and approved by the Board of Trustees.

Accreditation Task Force

Francisco Arce	Interim Assistant Superintendent/Vice President of Instruction
Janice Takahashi	Academic Senate President
Kathy Hart	Dean of Research, Planning, and Regional Education
Roger Waller	Faculty, Past Academic Senate President
Lynn Welch	Faculty, First Vice President of Academic Senate
Cynthia Gatlin	Classified Appointment
Marcos Villanueva	Student Appointment

Dr. Raul Rodriguez
Superintendent President

Date

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

At the time of the last accreditation evaluation visit in March of 2002, an interim President was in place at San Joaquin Delta College. After a national search, Dr. Raul Rodriguez was selected as the eighth Superintendent/President of San Joaquin Delta College, and he started on August 1, 2002. Prior to Dr. Rodriguez's appointment, the previous president had served for 23 months.

The 2002 – 2003 Academic Year was the start of an unusual period for Delta College. A new Superintendent/President, an Interim Assistant Superintendent/Vice President for Instruction, and a new Vice President for Business Services were hired. Closely following their arrival came midyear budget reductions and the uncertainty of future funding. The midyear State budget reduction required the District to reduce its budget by four percent (\$2.3 million) in December 2002. In addition, unexpected cost increases in health benefits, PERS, unfunded mandated costs, and electricity rate hikes created a shortfall in the 2002-2003 Published Budget of just under four percent (\$1.8million). Like most other California Community Colleges, Delta was forced to cut classes and program budgets and to freeze or eliminate unstaffed positions in management, classified, and part-time faculty ranks. The effect of these changes and others that came later presented formidable challenges. However, when combined with the recommendations of the 2002 accreditation team, they also presented new opportunities for San Joaquin Delta College to improve.

**ACCREDITATION TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS TO
SAN JOAQUIN DELTA COLLEGE**

- 2.1 The College should develop and implement plans to increase college-wide sensitivity to the needs of its diverse population, evaluate the perception of bias by some employees on the campus, and review implementation of workplace opportunities to ensure they are equitable for all employees. (Standards 2.6, 7.D1, and 7.D2)
- 3.1 The college needs to proceed under the guidance of the mission statement and with the leadership of its new President, to focus on college-wide strategic goals supported by department, division, and administrative plans. These college-wide goals with measurable objectives and action plans need to be clearly articulated as the basis for priorities in budgeting and other decisions. The process for planning and budgeting needs explicit communication and coordination, clearer charges for the related committees, and expected timelines to meet both long-range objectives and annual implementation processes. Furthermore, the college should implement the assessment of Institutional Outcome Measures as benchmarks for progress in achieving college-wide goals. (Standards 1.3, 3A.3, 3B.2, 3B.3, 6.2, 9A.1, 9A.2, 9A.3, 9A.4, 9B.1)
- 7.1 As called for in the 1996 Accreditation Evaluation Report recommendation 4-1, the College should ensure that evaluations of staff are conducted at agreed-upon intervals and provide training on evaluation procedures to managers, faculty, and classified staff. (Standards 7.B1 and 7.B2)
- 8.1 A comprehensive strategic plan should be developed with input from all key constituencies, which integrates educational programs and facilities needs for the entire San Joaquin Delta College District including the main campus in Stockton, the Tracy Learning Center, the proposed Mountain House Center, and other centers and sites. The plan should build in contingencies for short and long-term demographic trends and shifts, anticipate and balance needs at the main campus with needs at regional centers and outlying sites, maximize the use of distance education strategies, project expansion and investment in centers and sites as needed, and consider development of collaborative agreements with neighboring college districts to help address educational needs in outlying areas. (Standards 8A.1 and 8A.5)
- 10.1 In matters pertaining to policy development, planning, and resource allocation, the College needs to develop a broad consensus about the respective roles and responsibilities of the Board, the President, the Vice Presidents, and the various governance committees. (Standards 10A.3, 10B.1, 10B.2, 10B.4, 10B.5, 10B.6, 10B.8, 10B.9, and 10B.10)

SAN JOAQUIN DELTA COLLEGE RESPONSES

Standard Two: Institutional Integrity

2.1 *The College should develop and implement plans to increase college-wide sensitivity to the needs of its diverse population, evaluate the perception of bias by some employees on the campus, and review implementation of workplace opportunities to ensure they are equitable for all employees. (Standards 2.6, 7.D1, and 7.D2)*

Progress

In response to the Accrediting Commission’s recommendations, the District created the Vice President of Human Resources and Employee Relations position in fall 2002 as the first step in the reorganization of the Human Resources Department. Regrettably, the finalist selected for this position was unable to accept the position, and a new recruitment was started in the 2003-2004 academic year

The District also recognized the need for change in a variety of human resources policies, procedures and practices. In summer 2002, Interim President Shauerman appointed a Recruitment and Hiring Process Work Team to study current hiring processes and make recommendations for streamlining. President Rodriguez affirmed the work team’s charge. The Recruitment and Hiring Process Work Team has reported its findings to the President’s Cabinet and made recommendations for changes in policies and procedures. The next step will be to present the new policies to the Policies and Procedures Committee which will seek approval from the various governance groups.

The Accreditation Evaluation Report Standard Two acknowledges the great strides the College has made in hiring a more diverse workforce. However, it also indicates that some employees, particularly classified staff and African American faculty and staff, perceive a bias against them and do not perceive workplace opportunities as equitable. Numerical analysis of the Delta College workforce representation would suggest that hiring is relatively balanced in terms of ethnic make-up. As expected the most underrepresented group based on the ethnic composition of the county is Hispanics. Thirty percent of the county population is Hispanic compared to 14 percent of the Delta College workforce.

Ethnic Composition of Full Time Employees at Delta College Compared to County Population

Ethnic Group	2001	2002	2003	County 2003
Native American	1.9	1.2	1.9	1.1
African American	6.7	5.9	6.2	6.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	9.3	10.1	9.7	11.7
Hispanic	10.6	14.0	14.6	30.5
White	54.5	54.4	55.1	47.4

Source: Chancellor's Office, Census Bureau

Shown as a percentage

In response to the perception of bias and inequity, the Vice President of Instruction and First Vice President of the Academic Senate met with the African American Employees Association to discuss their perceptions of the College and management. Overall, the group, numbering about 12 employees from classified and faculty, was candid about its perceptions. This group of African Americans believe that the District does not hire African Americans in commensurate numbers with their proportion of the population in the District. However, based on a review of District hiring policies and practices, there is no evidence to support the perceptions of institutional barriers against African Americans.

The Human Resources Department collects and tracks demographic information throughout each recruitment. Unfortunately, a reliable applicant tracking system has not been developed that would enable the department to maintain applicant history once the recruitment has been completed. The most recent analysis of the District workforce composition can be found on the Chancellor's Office Data Mart Website for fall 2003. The state report demonstrates that African Americans are well represented in the classified employee ranks. All of the traditionally underrepresented groups except Native Americans are underrepresented in the full-time and adjunct faculty ranks.

Though institutional barriers may not be evident, the perception remains strong among classified staff and African-American staff and faculty that an air of insensitivity and a lack of understanding for their concerns continue to exist.

In spring, 2004 the Vice President of Instruction conducted an informal survey among educational managers asking for information about Delta College programs designed to improve cultural diversity and student success. The complete list of responses is available for the Commission's site visit. The responses were impressive both from the managers and faculty members. The college supports many programs designed to serve underrepresented groups such as the EOPS Basic Skills Academy, Puente, GED-HEP Program, MESA, DSPS Disability Awareness Annual Event and a non credit matriculation program that targets Hispanics. The College Cultural Awareness Committee (CAP) became a standing committee in spring 2003 and is a model of shared governance. Students, managers, faculty, and classified staff work together to produce quality programs to improve cultural awareness and to enhance the image of the College. CAP is a good example of the involvement and commitment of the faculty, staff and students to increase college-wide cultural competency and sensitivity to the needs of Delta's diverse population. There are also employee groups such as the African American Employees Association, the Asian Pacific Islander American Staff Association and the La Raza Employees Association that are active on campus.

Concerning the ongoing need to improve support for diversity, the College implemented the new Financial Aid program to offset the effect of higher fees on underserved students. The Financial Aid Office, in coordination with other student services programs and the Office of Instruction, is targeting ESL and Hispanic students in high school and elsewhere by offering more financial assistance and application workshops.

Another program to improve information about student performance and demographics is the District's Data Warehouse. The Data Warehouse website (<http://datawarehouse.deltacollege.edu>) is regularly updated with information about student progress by ethnicity, age, class status, and gender. The web-based data warehouse allows the user to drill down to the course and individual section to obtain information that is very detailed regarding student retention and success. Division Chairs and other end users responsible for program review have received and continue to receive training on the data warehouse. It is a current database that will assist programs to track their outcomes. Much training and access will be needed for additional managers, classified, and faculty to use the data base on a regular basis.

The College student demographic make-up is sixty percent traditionally underrepresented groups and thirty-eight percent persons that self identified as White. Such being the case, the College student population is more culturally and ethnically diverse than the county with forty-seven percent of the population classified as White.

Ethnic Composition of Students at Delta College Compared to County Population

Ethnic Group	2001	2002	2003	County 2003
Native American	1	1	1	1.1
African American	8	9	9	6.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	17	18	19	11.7
Hispanic	25	26	26	30.5
White	40	39	38	47.4

Source: Chancellor's Office, Census Bureau

Shown as a percentage

Notwithstanding the accomplishments and efforts to diversify and support a welcoming environment for all students and staff, the Human Resources Department is not operating at maximum efficiency. Although the Department is not fully staffed, progress has been and continues to be made in resolving and addressing needed changes and improvements in personnel process.

Plan

The District is proceeding with the recruitment of a Vice President for Human Resources and Employee Relations, a Human Resources Analyst, and a Human Resources Administrative Secretary.

The District is in the process of evaluating for purchase an applicant tracking software that will allow for ongoing analysis of the hiring process.

The President's Recruitment and Hiring Process Work Team will present recommendations for the District to revise or improve the personnel selection process during spring 2004. The Work Team, an inclusive group, under the direction of the Dean of Planning, Research and Regional Education, has met for over two years to identify opportunities for streamlining and strengthening recruitment and hiring processes.

Standard Three: Institutional Effectiveness

3.1 *The college needs to proceed under the guidance of the mission statement and with the leadership of its new President, to focus on college-wide strategic goals supported by department, division, and administrative plans. These college-wide goals with measurable objectives and action plans need to be clearly articulated as the basis for priorities in budgeting and other decisions. The process for planning and budgeting needs explicit communication and coordination, clearer charges for the related committees, and expected timelines to meet both long-range objectives and annual implementation processes. Furthermore, the college should implement the assessment of Institutional Outcome Measures as benchmarks for progress in achieving college-wide goals. (Standards 1.3, 3A.3, 3B.2, 3B.3, 6.2, 9A.1, 9A.2, 9A.3, 9A.4, 9B.1)*

Progress

In fall 2002, because of the State's fiscal crisis, the College, like all other colleges in California, faced the possibility of serious budget cuts. Under the leadership of the College President and Interim Dean of Planning, Research, and Grants Development Matt Wetstein, a Mission Centrality rubric was designed around the current College mission statement. The Mission Centrality rubric was presented to the College Planning and Budget Committee, comprised of representatives of all governance groups, and was circulated widely throughout academic, student services, and business services areas. Initially, the rubric was to be used by each program's managers, faculty (if applicable), and staff to assess the centrality of that program to the College's mission. Next, each of the members of the Planning and Budget Committee and the President's Cabinet would independently complete a ranking of every program. The Planning and Budget Committee and the President's Cabinet's scores would be compiled and averaged producing a ranking for each group. Using the three rankings for each program, all programs would be ranked from the one scoring the highest to the one scoring the lowest in terms of its centrality to the College Mission. Budget cuts, then, would be based on the Mission Centrality ranking rather than using an across the board or some other arbitrary approach.

From the outset, the process met with considerable resistance. Some programs rated themselves unreasonably high. Some committee members felt unqualified to rate academic programs. Others believed they needed more data on which to base their ratings. After a review of the individual program scores and the resistance from committee members, it was evident that additional data on programs and training in the use of the rubric was necessary. Subsequently, the President's Cabinet and Planning and Budget Committee were trained in the use of the rubric. After the training, each group member rated all 86 programs. Ultimately, each group produced a compiled ranking of 86 programs.

Unfortunately, while the concept may have been a good one, various problems such as lack of comparable data for programs, lack of confidence in the ratings despite a high degree of concurrence and comparability, prevented the use of the Mission Centrality results for the purpose for which it was intended. Nevertheless, the exercise engaged the whole College in

discussions surrounding the mission statement, sparked the development of appropriate data warehouses, and led to the conceptualization of a strategic planning process.

In August, 2003, President Rodriguez engaged the Company of Experts to facilitate a retreat focused on Appreciative Inquiry for the College managers. Managers had been through a very difficult year marked by severe budget cuts, loss of personnel, and a multitude of changes. The response to the retreat helped to create positive energy among the managers.

In October, 2003, President Rodriguez appointed an Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Team comprised of five managers, five faculty members, two classified professionals, and one student. He then engaged Company of Experts to provide an initial training on Appreciative Inquiry for the Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Team on October 23 followed by a four-day comprehensive Appreciative Inquiry and Facilitators Training in February, 2004. At the same time, he sent out a campus-wide email inviting the College community to participate with the Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Team in the February training. Fifteen persons responded to his invitation.

At the end of the October 23 training, the Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Team charged itself with completing a minimum of ten Appreciative Inquiry Interviews each, compiling the results, using the results to develop a new vision statement and a new mission statement for the college by the time of the February training. Dr. Rodriguez also requested that the fifteen additional February training attendees complete a minimum of ten Appreciative Inquiry Interviews each. The hope was to collect input from approximately 300 individuals from all constituent groups including the community and across the widest possible demographic characteristics.

By the December 19 deadline, a total of 160 interviews had been completed. Although most reported that the interview experience was positive, many team members found it difficult to complete all ten interviews by the deadline. In January the Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Team met to begin analyzing the results. Satisfied that a representative cross section of College and community members had been interviewed, the Team evaluated the interview summary sheets for themes regarding open communication and trust, service, and creativity and innovation; interviewees' perceptions of the College's core value and their value for the College, and their three wishes for Delta College's future. The Team presented its findings at a meeting to which the entire College community had been invited. Those attending expressed the desire to participate actively in the Strategic Planning Process.

From February 23-26, the expanded Strategic Planning Team, including President Rodriguez, attended the Appreciative Inquiry Facilitator Training. At the end of the training, the Company of Experts facilitators offered to use the Appreciative Inquiry Process for developing strategic intentions and initiatives in a one-day workshop for the College community. A one day strategic planning retreat that is open to the entire campus community is scheduled for March 19, 2004. The purpose of this day will be to bring the information that has been collected so far and develop it into a preliminary strategic plan for the College.

Plan

The Chief Information Officer and the Dean of Planning, Research, and Regional Education developed a strategic planning concept based on Appreciative Inquiry and the June 2002 iteration of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accreditation Standards. In March and April, 2004, the expanded Strategic Planning Committee will affirm and/or revise the current vision and mission statements and present them for approval through the current governance process. Programs, divisions, units, and the President/Trustees will develop annual prioritized goals and objectives. These goals and objectives will be clearly tied to the institutional vision and mission as well as to the Accreditation Standards, long-range College or unit plans, such as the Facilities Master Plan and program review.

The Strategic Planning Committee will gather annual goals and objectives from all levels of the organization, goals and objectives from existing plans, and goals and objectives from recent program reviews using a matrix designed to capture all necessary information. Through a collaborative and participative process involving all constituent groups as well as various individuals, the Committee will synthesize and prioritize these plans. Finally, the Committee will produce a rough draft Strategic Plan for the College which will include a rough draft Human Resource, Physical, Technology, and Financial Plan as required by Accreditation Standard Three.

The Strategic Planning Committee will submit the Strategic and Integrated Human Resource, Physical, Technology and Financial Plan to the President's Cabinet and the Budget and Planning Committee who will work in collaboration to revise, reprioritize, and approve the Plans and disseminate them to the College community. Immediately following the March 19 Appreciative Inquiry/Strategic Planning training, detailed plans for communication and coordination, charges for related committees, and expected timelines will be developed and disseminated.

Ultimately, goals and objectives proposed in program reviews and long-range plans will be updated annually to propose annual goals and objectives. This process will require that program reviews and long-range plans are clearly connected to annual goals and objectives.

Standard Seven: Faculty and Staff

7.1 *As called for in the 1996 Accreditation Evaluation Report recommendation 4-1, the College should ensure that evaluations of staff are conducted at agreed-upon intervals and provide training on evaluation procedures to managers, faculty, and classified staff. (Standards 7.B1 and 7.B2)*

Progress

The College continues to make significant progress in completing performance evaluations. For the past several years management evaluations had not been completed on a regular basis. During this time the Human Resources Office was responsible for notifying managers when evaluations were due and providing the evaluation questionnaire to those persons the manager supervised. Now and until a better tracking system is devised, each vice president has been charged with the responsibility to monitor and complete the management evaluations of staff in their area. Moreover, the Human Resources Department is being reorganized, and several key staff members, including the former director, are no longer employed in the department. The current Human Resources staff is working with Information Services to develop an automated evaluation tracking module, which will be an enhancement to the current system 2000 HR/Payroll system. The evaluation tracking module being developed will enable managers to access the information needed to complete all staff evaluations (management, faculty, and classified) in a more timely manner.

Faculty evaluations are overseen by the Assistant Superintendent/Vice President of Instruction and the Vice President of Student Services in their respective areas. Full time faculty and contract faculty evaluations are monitored by the administrative secretary to the Assistant Superintendent/Vice President of Instruction and the administrative secretary to the Vice President of Student Services. Another staff member is responsible for monitoring and tracking the part-time faculty evaluations. Division Chairs are notified each year which faculty are scheduled for evaluation. The faculty evaluation process is up-to-date and working in an orderly manner. Some of the divisions employ large numbers of part time faculty members making it difficult for the division chairs to stay current with the evaluations.

Plan

The college is in the process of hiring additional staff for the Human Resources Office to help improve the hiring, evaluation and monitoring systems. Software to track employee evaluations and other employee-related information is being developed and will be implemented during the summer. With the addition of a Vice President of Human Resources and Employee Relations and other necessary staff and resources, the college will bring several processes into compliance.

Standard Eight: Physical Resources

8.1 *A comprehensive strategic plan should be developed with input from all key constituencies, which integrates educational programs and facilities needs for the entire San Joaquin Delta College District including the main campus in Stockton, the Tracy Learning Center, the proposed Mountain House Center, and other centers and sites. The plan should build in contingencies for short and long-term demographic trends and shifts, anticipate and balance needs at the main campus with needs at regional centers and outlying sites, maximize the use of distance education strategies, project expansion and investment in centers and sites as needed, and consider development of collaborative agreements with neighboring college districts to help address educational needs in outlying areas. (Standards 8A.1 and 8A.5)*

Progress

In August 1999, the final draft of the San Joaquin Delta Community College Master Plan, developed with the assistance of the Keithley Consulting Group, was completed, and in 1999, it was accepted by the Board of Trustees. The Master Plan consisted of five volumes: the Educational and Student Services Master Plan, the Information Technology and Library Service Master Plan, the Facilities and Resources Master Plan as well as two volumes of appendices to the Education and Student Services and Facilities and Resources Master Plans. These plans were intended to serve as a foundation for the preparation of final plans by the District's administration during the fall of 1999. Unfortunately, these plans were never used in a College wide strategic planning process. In December, 2000, President Horton, the President presiding at the time of the writing of the Master Plan, retired. His retirement and the search for a new President led to the hiring of President Edward Gould. President Gould resigned unexpectedly in spring 2002, and the search for the third president in three years was begun. President Raul Rodriguez joined the College in August of 2002 just on the heels of California's much publicized budget crisis. The Master Plan remains in place, but other more pressing matters, i.e., the budget crisis, put off the development of a strategic planning process.

In spring, 2001, under President Gould's administration, the firm of Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates, an opinion research and public policy analysis firm, was engaged to assess the feasibility of placing a bond measure on the ballot in the near future. The results of the poll indicated that voters would, in general, be quite supportive of the College's efforts to generate money through a bond measure for building and other capital improvements to the Stockton campus as well as for building centers at off-campus sites such as Tracy/Mountain House.

Late in spring 2003, the President and the Board conducted a second bond-support assessment using the same firm as in 2002. Their goal was to assess the feasibility of placing a bond measure on the March 2, 2004 ballot. Again, the research was positive. Despite their being less optimistic about the economy in general, the voters recognized the problem of state funding cuts, were consistent in their evaluation of the District's job ratings, and generally supported a college bond measure that would repair/upgrade buildings, classrooms,

and laboratories, remove hazardous materials, repair plumbing and ventilation systems, upgrade wiring for computer technology, and expand and build education centers in Manteca, Tracy/Mountain House, Lodi/Galt and the Mother Lode.

Subsequently, the firm 3D/International, a group of master planning architects was engaged to assist with updating the facilities plan. In December, 2002, 3D/I conducted the initial visioning sessions with members of the College community, prepared the needed future-oriented demographic research on the District, and scheduled comprehensive visioning sessions and forums with College administrators, faculty, staff, students, the Board of Trustees, and community members. Members of the College community and campus groups such as the Facilities Committee, Budget and Planning Committee, President's Council were involved and kept informed as facilities plans were developed and revised. A representative of 3D/International, Vice President of Business Services, Andy Dunn, President Rodriguez, and others made frequent presentations at Board meetings, committee meetings (Budget & Planning, Facilities, President's Council), a college-wide town hall meeting, and President's Cabinet. On November 18, 2003 the Board of Trustees voted to adopt Phase I of the Facilities Bond Master Plan and to adopt Resolution No. 03-44 Ordering an Election and Establishing Specifications of the Election Order.

These facilities plans continue to be updated and reprioritized, and the Bond election campaign is completed. Building and renovation plans and schedules are beginning to take shape in anticipation of the bond's passage. These facilities plans will be fully integrated into the Strategic Planning Process as described above.

Plan

The District offered a capital construction bond, Measure L, for voter approval on March 2, 2004. The bond will raise \$250 million dollars over a 10 – 15 year period to modernize the main campus and build three centers, one in Mountain House (near Tracy), one in Manteca on the grounds of the SJDC Farm Laboratory and a third center in the Lodi-Galt community. Several of the building projects on the main campus will likely qualify for state bond support bringing the total state match to about \$75 million dollars. At this juncture the new centers do not qualify under the new Chancellor's Office criteria for center status. Regardless, based on the studies conducted by 3DI in preparation for the bond election, extensive data were collected about the demographic trends in the District service area that encompasses San Joaquin County, a sliver of Alameda County, Sacramento County in the Galt area, Solano County in the Rio Vista area and Calaveras County in the foothills. The College is also in the process of expanding the online program to accommodate the growth in the major service area as well as the outlying areas of the District.

Standard Ten: Governance and Administration

10.1 *In matters pertaining to policy development, planning, and resource allocation, the College needs to develop a broad consensus about the respective roles and responsibilities of the Board, the President, the vice presidents, and the various governance committees. (Standards 10A.3, 10B.1, 10B.2, 10B.4, 10B.5, 10B.6, 10B.8, 10B.9, and 10B.10)*

Progress

Since the Accreditation Site Visit, the College has revised the committee handbook to include specific committee charges and membership. There remains a need to reorganize and restructure some committees because there are many committees that may have outlived their usefulness. Some committees do not meet on a regular basis.

The major College governance committees for policy development, planning, and resource allocation are the Budget and Planning Committee and Policies and Procedures Committee. The first major test of the Budget and Planning Committee's effectiveness was last year during the midyear budget crisis. Each vice president was asked to reduce his budgets by 8.3 percent and present his recommendations to the Budget and Planning Committee. Though initially the reductions included significant employee layoffs, these were revised resulting in only 10 layoffs of mostly part-time staff. Overall, the college reduced some services and cut some flailing programs like the Interactive Television (ITV) distance education program. The Social Science Center was closed. Some positions were frozen or eliminated. The mid-year budget reduction was stressful for the entire college, but the College emerged without major disruptions and with overall agreement.

The Policies and Procedures Committee meets twice per month for discussion, action and referral to the President's Council. The President's Council advises the Superintendent/President.

The District is in the process of converting the Board Policies and Procedures into the CCLC templates that divide policies, which are Board approved, from administrative procedures. The process is slow, but it is an effective way to update Board Policies and Administrative Procedures. The process is overseen by former Interim Dean of Planning, Research, and Grants Development, Matt Wetstein, who has returned to faculty status. All policies and the revised policies and administrative procedures are available on the college website for review and comment.

President's Council meets twice per month in preparation for the Board of Trustees bi-monthly meetings. The Board Agenda and President's communications are discussed. All college committees include representation from the classified, faculty, and management constituencies. The Board of Trustees reformatted their meetings to have the first meeting of the month focus on consent items and information/reports. The second meeting of the month includes consent and actions items and reports. The format gives the Board more time to allow for more in-depth reporting and better quality of information from staff

In spring 2003 the College was reorganized to improve the communication in the instructional services program. It was felt that the Assistant Superintendent/Vice President of Instruction position was too isolated from the division chairs and the faculty. The eight division chairs now report directly to the Assistant Superintendent/Vice President of Instruction. In general the feedback has been positive since the reorganization.

The Superintendent/President meets before and after the Academic Senate meetings with the Senate officers to discuss the agendas, issues, communication from the faculty and other issues that may arise. These meetings take place every two weeks and serve as a good way for the administration and the faculty to resolve outstanding concerns the faculty may have. It is an opportunity for the President to hear from the faculty leadership about faculty governance issues and other ongoing problems that need his attention. This year the Assistant Superintendent/Vice President of Instruction attends these meetings, and the Vice President of Student Services will soon attend on a regular basis.

Shared governance appears to be working relatively well since the last accreditation visit. The one area that has presented difficulties in terms of climate issues has been the area of collective bargaining. The District and the faculty and classified unions have not been able to come to agreement on new contracts. The negotiations have progressed slowly over the last year and a half. The negotiations with the faculty are now at impasse.

In August of 2002, the new President and the Board of Trustees attended an off-campus retreat for an entire day. The retreat was facilitated by Dr. Narcisa Polonio of the Association of Community College Trustees. There was a clear discussion of roles and responsibilities between the President and the Board. A major outcome of this event was a prioritized list of goals for the President to focus on for the upcoming year.

Six months later, a follow-up retreat, also facilitated by Dr. Polonico, was held at the University of the Pacific. Each of the College Vice Presidents made presentations to the Board about key issues in their area of the College. The Board indicated at this meeting their interest in pursuing a general obligation bond measure in spring of 2004. The Board and the President also reviewed the previous discussion about roles and responsibilities to determine if the ideas previously discussed were being followed.

In July of 2003, the Board and the president scheduled a half-day retreat. David Viar, the Executive Director of CCLC served as the facilitator. Once again, the status of relations between the Board and the President was a major topic of discussion. The Board also identified a number of priority goals for the 2003-2004 academic year.

Plan

Overall, the governance process at San Joaquin Delta College appears to be functioning fairly well. There is an ongoing effort to improve communication, but there do not appear to be any major areas of conflict or ongoing problems. As previously noted, the President and the Vice President of Instruction meet with the executive leadership of the Academic Senate at least twice each month to discuss current issues and concerns. These meetings provide a

forum to share information, to speak directly about problems, and to develop follow-up tasks. These meetings are planned to continue.

The Board of Trustees made a commitment to examine the roles and responsibilities of both the CEO and the Board. They have followed through on this commitment by participating in several special retreats and by undertaking their own self-evaluation in July 2003. The next Board retreat is scheduled for July 2004.

APPENDICES

Standard Two Resources

Appendix I

1. Minutes and Recommendations from Hiring Process Team
2. Existing Hiring Policies and Procedures
 - a. Faculty – Policy 3000; Procedures 3001, 3002
 - b. Managers – Procedure 2032
 - c. Classified – Policy 4010; Procedures 4011, 4012
3. Draft Revision of Hiring Policies and Procedures
4. Workforce Demographics
5. Student Demographics
6. Notes from Meeting with African American Employees Association
7. Human Resources Hiring Data
8. Survey Response to Cultural Diversity
9. College Catalog
10. CAP Committee Programs
11. Financial Aid Program
12. Data Warehouse
13. Hiring Committee Orientation

Standard Three Resources

Appendix II

1. Mission Centrality Survey Results
2. Revised Mission Statement
3. Appreciative Inquiry Training for Managers – August 2003
4. Appreciative Inquiry Team
5. Appreciative Inquiry Training for Team – October 2003
6. Appreciative Inquiry Interviews
7. Appreciative Inquiry Training – February 2004
8. Appreciative Inquiry Training and Results – March 2004
9. Conceptual Framework for Strategic Planning

Standard Seven Resources

Appendix III

1. Evaluation Policies
 - a. Faculty – Policy 3300; Procedures 3301, 3302, 3303
 - b. Managers – Procedure 2033
 - c. Classified – Procedure 4150
2. Evaluation database
3. Evaluation schedules for all staff

Standard Eight Resources

Appendix IV

1. Educational Master Plan 1999
2. Mountain House Feasibility Plan/Study 1999
3. Fairbanks, Maslin, Maullin, Associates Analysis
4. 3D International Presentation to Board of Trustees
5. Bond Facilities Plan

Standard Ten Resources

Appendix V

1. College Committee Book
2. 2002-2003 Budget Reduction List
3. CCLC/Policies and Procedures Revisions
4. Organization Chart