

EVALUATION REPORT

SAN JOAQUIN DELTA COLLEGE

5151 Pacific Avenue
Stockton, CA 95207-6370

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

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
San Joaquin Delta College on March 24-27, 2008

Christopher O'Hearn, Ph.D.
Chair

SAN JOAQUIN DELTA COLLEGE

Team Roster

March 24-27, 2008

Dr. Christopher O'Hearn (Chair)

Jane de Leon, Ph.D. (Assistant)
Professor of English
American River College

Mr. Steven Crow
Vice President, Administrative &
Information Services
College of the Siskiyous

Dr Janet Fulks
Professor
Bakersfield College

Dr. Brian King
Superintendent/President
Cabrillo College

Mrs. Mary Ann Laun
Assistant Dean, Library Services
Pasadena City College

Dr. Kenneth Meehan
Director of Research & Planning
Fullerton College

Ms. Patricia Ross
Dean of Instruction
Bakersfield College

Dr. Celina Sau Lin Ing
Professor, Computer Information
Science Department
Sacramento City College

Dr. Pamela Walker
VP Student Services
American River College

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: San Joaquin Delta College

DATE OF VISIT: March 24-27, 2008

TEAM CHAIR: Christopher C. O'Hearn, Ph.D.

San Joaquin Delta College is a comprehensive community college founded in 1935. It serves a territory of 2,400 square miles and spans all of San Joaquin County as well as portions of Calaveras, Sacramento, Solano, and Alameda counties. The main campus of 165 acres is situated in Stockton, California. The district includes an active farm laboratory and classrooms in Manteca, a natural resources laboratory near Mountain Ranch, and a learning center in the city of Tracy.

In 2004 the district was successful in passing a \$250 million General Obligation Bond. The funding from the bond is being used for a number of purposes including to support relocation of the Tracy Center to a permanent site in Mountain House near the city of Tracy, to acquire sites for a proposed new center in Lodi, and to remodel and construct new facilities on the Stockton and Manteca campuses.

The college's last comprehensive accreditation visit in 2002 resulted in eight recommendations. A 2005 Focused Midterm report in 2005 describes efforts made by the college to comply with all eight recommendations of the Accrediting Commission, with an emphasis on three in particular relative to planning, expansion, and staff evaluations. Preparations for the current self study and accreditation visit began in 2005.

On February 20, 2008, the Team Chair and Team Assistant visited San Joaquin Delta College to familiarize ourselves with the institution and meet representative leaders from the college community. While the Team Chair met with the college superintendent/president, the Team Assistant finalized logistical arrangements with the Accreditation Liaison Officer. We received updates regarding developments since the publication of the self study report and created a schedule for the team visit, including visits to the Tracy Center.

A 10-member accreditation team visited San Joaquin Delta College from March 24-27, 2008, for the purposes of determining whether the institution meets accreditation standards, evaluating how well the college is achieving its stated mission and purposes, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the accredited status of the college.

In preparation for the March visit, team members attended an all day team training session on February 5, 2008, conducted by ACCJC, studied the Commission Handbook for evaluators, read the college's self study, including the recommendations from the 2002 accreditation team and related evidentiary documents provided by San Joaquin Delta College.

Two weeks prior to arriving on campus, each team member prepared written reactions to the San Joaquin Delta College self study report and identified inquiries to be made during the visit. One week prior to arriving on campus, team members requested appointments with college employees to be scheduled by the San Joaquin Delta College Accreditation Liaison Officer in preparation for the visit. On March 24, the team met for several hours to review the self study and finalize preliminary questions and issues to be addressed during the following three days.

During the three day visit, the team met either individually or in groups with numerous college faculty, classified staff, students, administrators, and governing board members. In addition, team members held two widely publicized sessions open to all members of the college community. Each session was well-attended by college employees and students, all of whom spoke positively about the college and its future. In addition, a member of the visiting team toured the Tracy Center and interviewed the center's staff. The team appreciated the candor of the employees and students throughout the visit.

The self study report contained all of the elements required by the Commission. The organization and writing style of the self study report were clear, albeit redundant. Citations to specific evidence were generally not made in the text of the self study, making it difficult to identify source material. The team found that the college was well prepared for the site visit. All of the necessary supporting documentation was readily available in the team room or easily obtainable on campus.

Overall, the visitation team was impressed with the college's programs/services and its positive response to most of the recommendations made by previous teams. In particular, the team observed the following strengths:

1. Dedicated faculty, staff, and administrators;
2. Comprehensive instructional and student services programs with which students are very satisfied;
3. Strong connections with and support of the region's major businesses and industry;

While a great deal has been accomplished at San Joaquin Delta College over the past few years, additional Board development must take place and further work needs to be done to institutionalize and integrate all planning processes.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2008 Team

The following four recommendations are made as a result of the March 24-27, 2008 team visit:

Recommendation 1: The team recommends that the Board of Trustees develops a systematic process to review and revise existing Board policies, establishes and adheres to an acceptable code of ethics (Standard IVB.1; IVB.1.a; IVB. 1.b-h).

Recommendation 2: The visiting team recommends that the Board of Trustees establishes and monitors itself as a policy-making body, reaffirms delegation of operational authority to the Superintendent/President, and actively supports the authority of management for the administration of the college (Standard IVB; IVB.1.e).

Recommendation 3: The visiting team recommends that the college decisively address the development and implementation of a comprehensive strategic plan closely focused on assessing institutional effectiveness. A systematic, continuous cycle of feedback and evaluative improvement must be critically and deliberately developed and put into effect. This strategic plan must incorporate student learning outcomes within all institutional efforts, resource allocations, and be supported by program and service reviews and research data. Educational, fiscal, technological, physical, and human resources should be considered and integrated. As a whole, the planning document should also identify short- and long-term directions for the college, timelines for implementation, the individuals responsible for each area, monitoring and follow-up strategies, and expected outcomes (Standard IA; IB).

Recommendation 4: The visiting team recommends that the college meet the urgent need to establish a stable management team. Longevity of the team, particularly at the vice-presidential level, will help resolve the perceived deficiencies in effective communication, comprehensive planning, and collaborative dialogue (Standard IIIA.1; IIIA.2).

Team Evaluation of Institutional Responses to 2002 Recommendations

The college received eight general recommendations by the team that visited in 2002. The 2008 visiting team conscientiously reviewed the recommendations from the 2002 visit. The progress reported on prior recommendations included the following:

Recommendation 3.1 (currently Standard I)

The college needs to proceed under the guidance of the mission statement and with the leadership of its new President, to focus on collegewide strategic goals supported by department, division, and administrative plans. These collegewide 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 collegewide goals.

An in-depth review of documentation did not verify the self study assertions that a current viable collegewide strategic plan forms the basis for decision-making. There is no across-the-board institutional plan that would include individual unit goals, measurable objectives, action plans for programs/services, needed resources, priorities for resource allocations, timelines for implementation, and evaluation processes. Although the college has conducted periodic program review and has gathered some appropriate research data, it is clear that these are isolated general procedures with little or no relationship to overall planning and appraisal. Commendable projects, such as those funded by the Appreciative Inquiry (AI) process, are limited by the availability of funds. The AI process encompasses only a relatively small portion of comprehensive planning and allocation. The college has not met this recommendation.

Recommendation 7.1 (currently Standard III)

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)

The college has established a systematic evaluation process for all employees. While processes exist, the team could not find evidence that evaluations are being met in a timely manner or, in some cases, completed at all. The college has partially met this recommendation.

Recommendation 8.1 (currently Standard III)

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.

The visiting team did not find evidence of a strategic plan integrating educational programs and facilities for the entire district. An in-depth review of documentation did not verify the self study assertions that a current viable collegewide strategic plan forms the basis for decision-making. There is no across-the-board institutional plan that would include individual unit goals, measurable objectives, action plans for programs/services, needed resources, priorities for resource allocations, timelines for implementation, and evaluation processes. Although the college has conducted periodic program review and has gathered some appropriate research data, it is clear that these are isolated general procedures with little or no relationship to overall planning and appraisal. Commendable projects, such as those funded by the Appreciative Inquiry (AI) process, are limited by the availability of funds. The AI process does not address traditional institutional activities and decisions and only encompass a relatively small portion of comprehensive planning and allocation. The college has not met this recommendation.

Recommendation 2.1 (currently Standard III)

The college should develop and implement plans to increase collegewide 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.

The visiting team interviewed faculty and staff and found general satisfaction regarding progress made addressing this recommendation. Student surveys validate this position. New initiatives since the 2005 mid-term progress report include the Equity for All projects as well as the establishment of the Cultural Awareness Program that provides speakers, performances, and other activities promoting diversity.

Although the self study also reflects that the college has developed comprehensive and detailed policies and procedures that speak to a wide range of equity and diversity, the team could not verify the existence of comprehensive and detailed policies, a Student Equity Plan or a Faculty and Staff Diversity Plan. The college has partially met this recommendation.

Recommendation 4.2 (currently Standard II)

The college needs to understand the importance of the learning outcomes of its students and improve its ability to document them throughout the learning process.

The college has addressed this recommendation and the college's progress represents the first level of the ACCJC rubric on student learning outcome. The college must further develop and implement the additional levels on the rubric, including evaluation of assessment measures to provide opportunities for reflection and improvement. The college has met this recommendation.

Recommendation 4.1 (currently Standard II)

Curriculum review procedures need to be revised in order to expedite the process while still maintaining quality.

Curriculum procedures have been implemented to expedite the curricular approval process and maintain quality through the use of CurricUNET. The faculty has taken the lead in assuring the quality courses, programs and instruction through a well-devised and implemented curricular process. Curriculum review is on a robust schedule and vocational curricula are reviewed every two years. The college has met this recommendation.

Recommendation 5.1 (currently Standard II)

It is recommended that the college enact a plan to resolve the issue of the counseling department schedules to ensure that the counseling needs of students are being met.

No evidence could be found to substantiate that this recommendation has been addressed. The college has not met this recommendation.

Recommendation 10.1 (currently Standard IV)

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.

The college has made progress towards the goal. The President's Council was tasked in 2005 to define and redefine the roles of the respective governance committees, including streamlining some committees and eliminating others. The institution defined the president's Council and developed annual reporting. Key campus committees have developed goals that are made public and broadly discussed. The college has met this recommendation.

Eligibility Requirements

1. AUTHORITY

The visiting team confirmed that San Joaquin Delta College receives State approval of its programs/services and is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association for Schools and Colleges. The college is authorized to operate as an educational institution and to offer undergraduate education. This authority is published on the first page of the college catalog.

2. MISSION

The Mission Statement of the college was adopted by the Board of Trustees in 2005. It has been further revised, reaffirmed by appropriate campus governance groups, and approved by the Board of Trustees in February 2008. The 2005 Mission Statement can be found in the college catalog, and the 2008 Mission Statement will appear on the college website and other college documents in the future. The 2008 Mission Statement features the addition of “economic development” as a way in which the college serves the needs of students, the college district, and the community. It also includes a statement about addressing effective developmental education.

3. GOVERNING BOARD

The visiting team confirmed that San Joaquin Delta College has a seven-member governing board responsible for the quality integrity, and financial stability of the institution and for ensuring that the institution’s mission is being carried out. The visiting team has identified two major recommendations related to the Board of Trustees. Appropriate responses to these recommendations must occur for the college to meet fully this eligibility requirement.

4. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

The visiting team confirmed that San Joaquin Delta College has a chief executive officer, the Superintendent/President, who is appointed by the Board of Trustees and whose primary responsibility is to the institution.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

The visiting team confirmed that San Joaquin Delta College has an administrative staff that supports the necessary service for an institution of its size, mission, and purpose; however, many members of the executive administrative team are serving in an interim capacity. The team identified a major recommendation relative to the stabilization of the administrative staff. The college must address this recommendation in order to satisfy fully this eligibility requirement.

6. OPERATING STATUS

The visiting team confirmed that San Joaquin Delta College is operational with students actively pursuing its degree and certificate programs.

7. DEGREES

The college offers associate of arts degrees with concentration in 16 academic areas, and associate of science degrees in 23 different majors. The college also features 129 certificate programs. The majority of course offerings provided by the college are transfer or associate's degree courses, and substantial proportions of students enroll in those courses.

8. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The visiting team confirmed that the degree and certificate courses offered at San Joaquin Delta College are congruent with its mission, are based on recognized higher education fields of study and are of sufficient content and length. The level of quality and rigor are appropriate to the degrees and certificates offered.

9. ACADEMIC CREDIT

The visiting team confirmed that San Joaquin Delta College awards academic credit based on generally accepted practices in degree granting institutions of higher education as outlined in the California Code of Regulations, Title 5. The credits awarded are in compliance with clearly stated criteria and processes published in the college catalog.

10. STUDENT LEARNING ACHIEVEMENT

The visiting team confirmed that San Joaquin Delta College defines and publishes the expected student learning outcomes for all instructional programs. Programs are required to use annual assessment and program review to demonstrate that students who complete these programs, no matter where or how they are offered, have achieved these outcomes.

11. GENERAL EDUCATION

The visiting team confirmed that San Joaquin Delta College defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and promote intellectual inquiry.

12. ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The visiting team confirmed that San Joaquin Delta College faculty and students are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as judged by the academic/educational community in general. An academic freedom policy, Policy 6620, is printed in a number of publications, including the College Catalog.

13. FACULTY

The visiting team confirmed that San Joaquin Delta College employees 220 full-time faculty members. The faculty members are qualified to instruct the institution's courses and programs and meet State mandated minimum requirements for employment.

14. STUDENT SERVICES

The visiting team confirmed that San Joaquin Delta College provides for all of its students appropriate student services and develops programs consistent with student characteristics and the institutional mission.

15. ADMISSIONS

The visiting team confirmed that San Joaquin Delta College has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission that specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs.

16. INFORMATION AND LEARNING RESOURCES

The college operates a library and possesses information services of sufficient quality to support the educational programs of the college. The library offers students access to a wide range of books, periodicals, newspapers, recordings, and online databases. The campus features a variety of computer labs offering access to a host of software packages and access to the Internet. Tutoring in all subjects and writing assistance are available to all students through the Reading Writing Learning Center and the Math Science Learning Center.

17. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The college utilizes funding from local property tax revenues, and state and federal government funding sources. The college's budget is approved annually by the Board of Trustees and spending is documented through the Business Office of the college. The college has maintained healthy reserve levels over the years to protect the quality of educational offerings and the financial stability of the college.

18. FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The visiting team confirmed that San Joaquin Delta College annually undergoes and makes available an external financial audit by a certified public accountant. The results of the external audit are made available to the public at a Board of Trustees meeting, and they are available for public review.

19. INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION

The visiting team confirmed that San Joaquin Delta College has created the infrastructure and processes necessary to ensure systematic evaluation of all programs and college functions. The college has undertaken an extensive planning process to integrate planning for human resources, physical resources, technology and equipment resources into a financial plan; however, additional work must be done to integrate fully all planning processes.

20. PUBLIC INFORMATION

The visiting team confirmed that San Joaquin Delta College publishes in its catalog, class schedule, and other publications information concerning the college's purposes and objectives, admission requirements and procedures, rules and regulations affecting students, degrees offered, degree requirements, etc. In addition, the college distributes annual publications that focus on program accomplishments and student graduates.

21. RELATIONS WITH THE ACCREDITING COMMISSION

The Board of Trustees provides assurance to the Accrediting Commission that it adheres to the eligibility requirements and accreditation standards of the Commission. The college agrees to disclose any information to the Accrediting Commission necessary to establish its continued accreditation.

STANDARD I

Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

A. Mission

General Comments

Since the last accreditation visit in 2002, San Joaquin Delta College has revised and redefined its mission statement incorporating its educational goals and intended student population. An important addition was the inclusion of student learning as a primary focus. Updated revisions were made during 2007-2008 to encompass other related areas such as student success and basic skills. All amendments and modifications, including the most recent 2008 revision, were reviewed by all campus constituent groups prior to presentation to the Board of Trustee for approval.

Specifically, during the last several years, campus initiatives have refined the broad mission statement to incorporate research and demographic data reflecting a commitment to learning outcomes, changing student populations and needs, and a new emphasis on learning through distance education. Other factors such as campus-wide implications of the successful bond measurement and renewed importance on program review were also considered.

Extensive campus-wide dialogue and efforts addressed student learning outcomes. Faculty members and support staff, e.g., research and technology specialists, were directly involved in the developing of learning outcomes at the curricular, program, and degree levels. These mutual efforts were then integrated into the vision and mission statements of the college.

Another consideration was the development of a new and distinctive proposal initiated as a means of re-thinking, re-focusing, and re-committing institutional concentration on excellence and effective change. This Appreciative Inquiry (AI) Strategic Planning and Budget Process subsequently evolved as a means for funding new and/or expanded projects. Because of its impact on collegial communication and decision-making processes, the AI process became the primary planning and learning outcomes, special assignments, and technological changes have been realized as a result of the AI process. Numerous campus processes and procedures now utilize this expanded process as the main avenue of funding requests and other recourse allocations.

Of special note, the AI process also became the principle campuswide planning structure to achieve stated strategic goals and objectives, to support learning outcomes, and to

refine key processes and procedures. Institutional projects such as program reviews, research priorities, facilities improvements, and technology considerations are cited as representative examples of funded projects and institutional planning efforts.

Findings and Evidence

Although the self study states that the college has developed a “cycle of evaluation, planning, and improvement focused around the mission statement and student learning outcomes, the assessment of those outcomes, and continuous improvement of courses and programs,” documentary evidence and interviews with college staff has established the contrary. While references to the college mission statement are apparent in numerous documents, processes, and initiatives, there are few clear, direct, and effective college-wide connections between the mission statement, student learning outcomes, program review, and comprehensive assessment or planning.

The mission statement is not fundamental to all institutional planning and decision-making processes, nor is it evident in any critical analyses or evaluative cycle. (Standard IA.4) Significantly, although commendable, projects funded through the College’s Appreciative Inquiry Strategy Planning and Budget process only cite its relationship to institutional mission and goals. Precise application, feedback, and improvement within each project have not been considered, developed, implemented, or measured. Moreover, AI projects are seriously limited by availability of funds, while traditional institutional activities and operations are not included within the AI budget. Finally, these projects only encompass a relatively selective portion of the total planning and decision-making activities.

Although the college has stated the close connection between program review and the inclusion of the mission statement within this review process, there is no clear or consistent evidence that such integration occurs. Simple acknowledgements within these reports do not show the direct and measurable relationship to the overall institutional direction. Importantly, there is no consistent use of standardized research data or other specialized comparative information despite an extensive existing data library. The examination and analyses of relevant data would have provided a valuable link to college strategic goals and direction. (Standard IIB).

While the mission statement and campus processes have been modified to reflect student learning there is still a concern that the institution lacks a fundamental understanding of the crucial integration of these outcomes within institutional goals and objectives. Although the college has implemented curriculum-based student learning outcomes, what is not evident is the comprehensive linkages between these outcomes, institutional mission and planning efforts, and continuous evaluation. Based on documented evidence, the institution is at the beginning phases of assessing student learning outcomes at the curricular and program review stages. Institutional dialogue on the effect of student learning outcomes on college priorities seems to occur only within various committees or individually, not comprehensively nor campus-wide. (Standard IA-B)

Importantly, based on careful examination of evidence and individual interviews, there is no current viable overall institutional strategic plan that guides decision-making or that incorporates student learning outcomes with the college's mission, goals and objectives. Existing planning measures reflect a specialized focus rather than on an integrated or inclusive approach. A comprehensive institutional plan is fundamentally crucial and must include individual unit goals, measurable objectives, action plans for program/service, needed resources, priorities for resource allocations, timelines for implementation, and evaluation processes. Although the college has instituted a projects-oriented system, it is clear that this direction only represents one planning aspect with limited relationship to overall planning and appraisal (Standard IB.1-3).

Equally significant, the critical comprehensive continuous evaluation and improvement component is non-existent. The college readily acknowledges that no mechanism exists to follow-up on short- and long-term goals or to measure specific objectives against which to evaluate its goals. For example, the AI projects have not been required to review stated outcomes, conduct assessments, or measure effectiveness for enhancing the institutional mission or learning outcomes. Additionally, at the key campus committee level, the college states, and the visiting team concurs, that there are no formal processes to evaluate the efficacy of both its planning and resource allocation processes to assure continued informed improvement (Standard IB.3, 6, and 7).

Without formal and precise institutional assessment policies and processes, the college will continue to rely on separate and discrete information formulated in a variety of areas, such as program review reports and curricular updates. As a result, the significance of the student learning outcomes and their link to a viable mission statement, integrated institutional plan, strategic goals and objectives, and continuous evaluation/improvement cannot be communicated to the college community or to the community at large and, thereby remains protracted and challenging (Standard IB.5).

With accreditation standards focusing on students learning outcomes throughout the institutional culture, San Joaquin Delta College must review, strengthen, and improve its comprehensive collegial actions focused on institutional planning and effectiveness. The college must make a concerted institutional effort to incorporate all campus-wide activities into a comprehensive strategic plan with a continuous evaluation cycle to fully direct and support all its programs and services. This cycle of feedback, evaluation, and improvement is paramount for the successful implementation of its mission statement.

The college would greatly benefit from a comprehensive in-depth analysis of all planning components related to achieving its overall mission. These components may include, but are not limited to institutional and departmental goals/objectives, special projects and activities, results from program and service reviews, and quantitative/qualitative research data/statistical information. Such examination would necessarily incorporate student

learning outcomes at each collegiate level from curricular offerings to Board policy decisions; other essential instructional and student support areas, such as human and technological resources, fiscal and facilities needs would be integrated within the institutional culture. Significantly, each planning and evaluation phase would be clearly and broadly communicated to community and campus constituent groups, while critical analysis, feedback, and improvement would be continuous.

Conclusion

Based on these findings, San Joaquin Delta College has not met the accreditation standards for Standard I, Institutional Mission and Effectiveness. The institution has not demonstrated sustained, all-inclusive progress on linking college programs and services to the mission statement and to a continuous and effective institutional evaluative and improvement structure. In addition, those essential interrelated efforts connecting curricular learning outcomes with integrated planning/evaluation for campus-wide direction and improvements have not been fully explored within the institutional environment.

Recommendation

The visiting team recommends that the college decisively address the development and the implementation of a comprehensive strategic plan closely focused on assessing institutional effectiveness. A systematic continuous cycle of feedback and evaluative improvement must be critically/deliberately developed and put into effect. This strategic plan must incorporate student learning outcomes within all institutional efforts, resource allocations, and be supported by program/service reviews and research data. Educational, fiscal, technological, physical, and human resources should be considered and integrated. As a whole, this planning document should also identify short- and long-term directions for the college, timelines for implementation, the individuals responsible for each area, monitoring and follow-up strategies, and expected outcomes (Standard IA, IB).

Standard II

Student Learning Programs and Services

A. Instructional Programs

General Comments

San Joaquin Delta College offers curriculum leading to degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other institutions. These courses of study support the mission of the college and are approved using the college's curriculum committee (Standard IIA.1). In addition, vocational programs are subject to advisory committee review or outside evaluation (Standard IIA.2b). All courses must be approved regardless of location or means of delivery (Standard IIA.2e).

Curriculum procedures have been implemented to expedite the approval process and maintain quality through implementation of CurricUNET, an on-line system that tracks curriculum development and revision. The faculty has taken the lead in assuring the quality courses, programs and instruction through a well-devised and implemented curriculum process. Curricular review is on a robust schedule and vocational curricula are reviewed every two years (Standard IIA.2e).

Findings and Evidence

San Joaquin Delta College offers diverse, high-quality instructional programs which are systematically reviewed to assure quality courses, programs and instruction (Standard II.A.1). Over the past five years the college has taken a very pro-active role in the establishment of an integrated online curriculum system to track curriculum development and revision, called CurricUNET. Curricular review includes validating the link to Delta's mission and values (Standard II.A.1). Recent institutional initiatives such as the Equity for All and the Developmental Education Review Task Force (DERTF) have contributed important data concerning the educational needs of their students (Standard II.A.1a and II.A.2d).

Courses that have been developed or reviewed via CurricUNET include student learning outcomes and draft assessments for each course. Course outlines for online courses are updated in CurricUNET including detail on the distance education options and quality assurances (Standard II.A). Approximately 50% of the courses still require updating and the addition of SLOs in the system. The forward-thinking development of a format to include assessment data and modifications to the curriculum is commendable (Standard II.A.1c).

Program review is used to assess and review long term planning and quality assurance for programs and curriculum (Standard II.A.2 a, b, c). The program review template provides

a thoughtful examination of the program including data related to student demographics, success and retention (Standard II.A.2 d and e.). Program reviews take place on a prescribed five-year cycle. Several instructional and student service programs have completed program reviews for 2007-2008. While faculty recognized program review as a useful tool, they were unclear as to how the mechanism can be used to make final budgeting and staffing decisions. The linkages between program review, effective use of data to make decisions, and impacts on budget and planning still need to be clarified. Administrative program reviews of administrative unit outcomes are not yet being completed. (1.B.4).

Courses and programs are also submitted for articulation with four-year institutions and are reviewed in light of community workforce needs (Standard II.A). Course and program options are presented to the community through the schedule of classes, college catalog, and college website (Standard II.2.A3, 4, 5, 6).

Students are assessed into English and math classes by completing the COMPASS or CELSA assessment processes (Standard II.A.1.a). A broad range of scheduling options is provided to meet student needs, including a growing online program. Assessments are also provided at the off campus center and at other off-campus sites.

Faculty evaluation is referenced as a vehicle for faculty to confirm quality instruction is being provided on campus. However, the self study indicates that some faculty consider the current process and paperwork as ineffective for promoting collegial exchange to help individual faculty members improve their teaching. The forms specified for use are general and do not encourage reflection or formative review.

Faculty and administrator interviews indicate satisfaction with the evaluation process as a vehicle for generating dialog about classroom strategy and improvement. To ensure that all faculty share the same positive experience regarding the evaluation process, a more formative focus on the process and paperwork could be added. In addition, training could be provided to clarify how deans and peer reviewers can best engage the faculty being evaluated. Perhaps the Professional Development Center, which already offers a wide array of effective workshops, could address this need.

A clearly identified General Education philosophy based upon SLOs exists and is available online (Standard II.A.3). Several statements and evidence of committee work validate the good dialogue in developing outcomes and the good work of the curriculum committee. There is substantial consideration of data; however, there seems to be little evidence that data analysis is used to generate improvements.

The college's recently developed Data Warehouse, which serves as a repository for institutional data, is a commendable accomplishment. The college, however, needs to

implement the use of collected data to improve student achievement and student learning, thus closing the assessment loop (Standard II.A.2.e).

Conclusion

The college has met this standard. The college is participating in several Basic Skills initiatives including Equity for All, Developmental Education Review Task Force and professional development activities as well as several federal grant programs. These efforts have provided multiple opportunities for considerable discussion and dialogue regarding student achievement. Funding for several student-centered proposals have been provided by the basic skills reallocation dollars and continue to spark innovation and dialog among the developmental faculty and staff.

The college has displayed commendable practices with regards to the Appreciative Inquiry deductive evaluation process. There appears to be good attention to dialogue and institution-wide response to statewide issues. The college's investment in developing a strategic plan and instituting student learning outcomes displays investment and attention to processes that require careful development to incorporate buy-in and sustainability.

With respect to student learning outcomes, there appears to have been extensive institutional dialog on SLOs, and many faculty have attended appropriate workshops, training and conferences. Although the college has made significant progress in the identification of SLOs, it does not yet have a fully developed assessment plan. Therefore, little if any systematic evaluation of the results of SLO assessment has taken place and few opportunities to use SLOs to influence pedagogy or curriculum have occurred. With respect to the full SLO identification, assessment, evaluation, reflection, and improvement cycle, it appears that the identification of SLOs is well under way. However, systematic assessment has not yet taken place, resulting in little college-wide attention to "closing the loop."

B. Student Support Services

General Comments

To support the instructional programs, the college offers a variety of comprehensive student services including assessment, admission, counseling, disabled students programs and services, financial aid, enrollment services, health services and a vibrant campus life program. Currently, programs and services under the student services division is housed in many areas on campus; however, the campus will break ground (May 2008) on a new student services building called the Gateway Building that will house most of the student support services and programs in a one-stop format. Many services are provided online. (Standard II.2.B.1)

Findings and Evidence

The student services departments and programs have begun the process of developing Student Learning Outcomes. A retreat was held to initiate the development of SLO's for each area. While this work has had a focused beginning, it has not been completed for all service departments and programs. Thus at a time when assessment should be part of the fabric of the planning process, extensive work still needs to be accomplished (Standard II.B.).

The college recruits a diverse student population throughout its service area. Through an active dialogue between the departments and programs on campus, the college focuses on a seamless pathway for all students as they pursue their academic goals. All programs in student support services have aligned their programs with the mission statement as a guide to improve access, progress, learning and success (Standard II.B.1). Interviews with developmental faculty and deans, including representatives from guidance and counseling, stresses the need for counselors to be better able to interact with new students as early as possible during their time on campus. There is also a concern that non-credit courses need to be developed to better meet a growing need in the community. Currently only GED non-credit courses are being offered. The basic skills reallocation dollars promise some funding possibilities to explore pilot projects and innovations.

Several programs in student services utilize a variety of research related tools to better understand the needs of their students. Results of that research have resulted in the development of the new communication tool in the Student Portal called MyDelta (Standard II.B.3). The funding for the student portal project came from the Title V grant recently awarded to the College.

Other data such as retention and success statistics are reported and analyzed to improve student success. The Developmental Education Review Task Force (DERTF), Retention Committee and the Matriculation and Student Access Committee address the needs of developmental and incoming students through research efforts (Standard II.B.3). Data analyzed through the Equity for All and DERTF resulted in innovative planning to create the new Student Success Coordinator. This initiative reflects the statewide efforts to address basic skills student needs and to diagnostically improve student success. The adoption of a coordinator position models best practices reported through the California Community College Chancellor's Office report on Basic Skills Students.

Standard 2B1 requires that student access, progress, and opportunity for learning success be equitable for the central campus, centers, and distance education. Little evidence was provided that the institution assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method. The institution needs to determine a means to evaluate and compare the accessibility of these services to distant sites and implement a plan to incorporate equitable access (2B3a).

A meeting with nine members of Developmental Education Review Task Force (DERTF) indicated a range of activities are already underway on the campus. For example, supplemental instruction is being piloted for selected math and science courses. Also, the division of general tutoring into two locations allowed each area to nearly double service and contact hours with students. The two centers are the Math Science Learning Center and the Reading and Writing Learning Center. These changes are new and follow-up tracking has not yet been collected to study the impact of these changes on student success.

The college provides an environment that encourages civic responsibility as well as personal, intellectual and aesthetic development (Standard II.B.) for the student population. The college provides a variety of opportunities through the student association and campus life activities that allow students to grow and learn outside of the classroom. Student leaders are involved in a variety of activities including the allocation of extensive funding generated from their weekly flea markets proceeds. Student budget allocations also provide resources for other students clubs and organizations, athletics, and academic organizations throughout the year. Student leaders also have the opportunity to attend state and national leadership conferences. (Standard II. B. 3.b)

Even though the college has not settled collective bargaining regarding counselor schedules, there are 23 counselors in three departments (General Counseling, EOP&S and DSP&S). These counselors are available to provide academic advising and personal counseling to students by appointment and through drop in services. (Standard II.B.3.c). Counselors stay current in their field through attendance at workshops and conferences throughout the year. (Standard II.B.3.c)

The student population at the college reflects a significant diversity, and the college offers many academic courses that promote an understanding of cultural competence. The Student Activities Program supports a variety of clubs and organizations and offers a number of campus activities that promote diversity throughout the year (Standard II.B. 3.d). For example, the college provides such opportunities as Puente, MESA, and UMOJA.

The college ensures that the students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses, programs, requirements and policies affecting their success (Standard II. B.2). The catalog describes program requirements, purposes and expected SLO's in curriculum and programs in both print and online formats. The catalog is undergoing a focused change so that it can become more logically organized and so curricular offerings can stay current. These changes will make the catalog more user friendly.

The student services section of the catalog is detailed and accurate, providing such information as admissions processes, financial aid obligations, and degree and certificate requirements. In addition, the Student Handbook is a very thorough document that also provides students with current information. The new student portal allows students easy access to their own data. The college website now must be redesigned and updated to align with the information from the student portal. (Standard II.B.2)

SJDC offers student service programs and services to help place students into the best programs to meet their needs and to help them progress in their studies. In addition to DSP&S, EOP&S and Financial Aid, specialty programs such as Title V, Puente, MESA, and UMOJA are available on campus. The college also participated in Equity for all with the USC Center for Urban Education to track an incoming cohort of students to verify their progress and thus learn how to improve support and service. Initial data from 2004 is provided online, but follow-up actions are not clear.

Campus instruction and service programs as well as the student population are supported by the library and three learning centers. The Math Science Learning Center and the Reading and Writing Learning Center offer limited scheduled tutoring as well as drop-by tutoring options for students in specified disciplines.

The team visited the Tracey Center and determined that while some services are available to its students, the services are not on the same level as that provided on the main campus. There is one counselor assigned to the Center, and all staff are trained in how to give accurate information to students regarding DSP&S as well as financial aid. A strong library presence is not evident at the Center, even through a loan program is in place and a computer lab provides some online access.

The growing online student population has access to the regular on-site campus services as well as to some assessment and orientation details online. In addition, there is a staffed student help desk and a student support webpage to give technical support when

problems erupt in the online environment. Although there is a half-unit class that would prepare students to succeed in the online environment, few students take it since it is not required. No data has yet been collected to track the success of those students who have taken the course in contrast to those who have not.

To ensure ongoing collaboration between the college's instructional and service programs, the college mission statement has been revised, most recently in 2008. The revision was approved by the Board of Trustees in February 2008, but all appropriate updates in print and online have not yet been made. An annual review of the mission statement and its role as the foundation for annual planning needs to be developed to ensure that evolving community needs are continually being addressed.

Conclusion

The college has met most of the requirements of this standard; however, the issue of providing appropriate and complete services to students regardless of service location or delivery method needs to be addressed.

The college is staffed by a wonderful and dedicated faculty, staff, and managers in the student services areas. People genuinely care about the students they serve and take an active interest in this college. In order to fully commit to accreditation standards, the Student Services personnel must work diligently to complete the SLO's for all programs. In doing so, they must work to develop a continual assessment process with a focused plan to complete program, review, SLO's, and assessments. These efforts must reflect an ongoing alignment with a regularly-reviewed mission statement.

C. Library and Learning Support Services

General Description

The Library is a center of information as well as instructional activities for the campus. It is centrally-located and provides a wide range of service options that adapt to changing needs and increasing demand. It is staffed with a Division Dean of Library Services, division secretary, four faculty librarians and 8.5 paraprofessional library technicians. Adjunct librarians as well as part-time library technicians and student assistants serve the campus. Librarians and Library Technicians work closely with faculty, divisions and students to ensure quality services and collections (print, media and electronic) to support the curriculum.

In addition, the campus has numerous Learning Support Services such as the Learning Center, the Basic Skills Math Lab, the Reading and Writing Learning Center, the Computing Lab, and the Math Science Lab, and other labs that support the college's instructional programs in discipline-specific activities. Limited services are available for students through the Tracey Center.

Findings and Evidence

The Library is in transition to a new facility beginning this summer while the original facility undergoes major renovation and expansion. Accessibility, access, and security issues that have been identified as non-compliance issues and concerns will be addressed in this renovation. The new building will provide additional seating, collaborative study areas and additional classroom space so that the Library instruction program can be expanded. The team concurs with the Library staff that additional resources will be needed to accommodate the instructional as well as staffing demands of a new facility (Standard IIC.1b; IIC.1c).

The Library uses a variety of quantitative and qualitative measures to assess services as well as the quality, quantity and variety of the collections. The Library uses surveys to assess students and staff use, solicits feedback from reference transactions, and monitors highly used items to determine collection development priorities. The integration of library instruction with divisional faculty also contributes to the evaluation of collections and services.

While the institution has not identified institutional-level information competencies, the Library has identified program level student learning outcomes and assessments. Through an instruction program of credit classes, drop-in workshops, course integrated instruction and one-on-one instruction at the reference desk, librarians are actively

involved in library instruction as well as in developing information competency skills in students. All of the library and learning services have strong liaisons with teaching faculty, and the team found solid anecdotal evidence that these programs are well-integrated into the educational objectives of the college (Standard II.C.1, b).

Expanded Library hours had been funded with PFE funding and the withdrawal of these categorical funds has had an impact on hours in the evening and on weekends. In addition, remote campus sites such as the Tracy Center do not have a Library presence or service; however, plans are underway for a library when the center is completed. In the interim, multi-purpose computer labs can be used to access all student services as well as the Library website. Van delivery provides resources several times a week. While this is not the optimum service option, it fulfills a need for print materials. The Library website with its extensive databases and electronic resources also provides needed resources. Currently, Library instruction is not provided at this Center.

The college has designated college funding to support the Library's periodical subscriptions and some media resources. The books and database budgets are funded exclusively from lottery funds. Other sources of funding for learning resource centers include the general fund, the Appreciative Inquiry process, and grant resources. While lottery funding has been a significant funding source for the Library resources, it is tenuous. Since so many of the print resources as well as extensive online resources are funded exclusively with lottery funding, the team strongly encourages the college to examine the feasibility of a contingency plan for continued, sustainable resources.

Other Learning and Support Services are spread throughout the campus and at various locations. While the split of the Math-Science tutoring and Reading/Writing/tutoring centers provided much needed space, it is apparent from the hub of activity at the Reading and Writing Learning Center that these facilities are not well equipped to handle the needs of all the students they serve.

Conclusion

The college has met this standard.

With the advent of the remodeled Library, and the anticipated growth in services and use when it is completed, it is clear that additional resources will be needed to accommodate the demands of a new facility. Planning agendas and program review provide an opportunity to clarify the impact of a new facility of staffing and identify resource needs.

STANDARD III

Resources

A. Human Resources

General Comments

The evaluation visiting team visited offices, classrooms and labs and observed that San Joaquin Delta College has a diverse student population. The team examined documents and conducted interviews to understand personnel policies and procedures and reviewed the evaluation of the services provided by Human Resources. The Human Resources area has identified its role in the recruitment/selection, classification/pay, records maintenance, staff development, labor contract administration, grievance resolution and employee relations issues.

Findings and Evidence

San Joaquin Delta College asserts that it hires qualified managers, faculty, and classified staff that support learning programs and services according to Board policies BP 2032 (Managers) and BP 4011 (Classified), and BP 3002 (Faculty). The college has established procedures for selecting personnel. The college uses program reviews as well as the Appreciative Inquiry (AI) process to identify and advance staffing needs. In addition, the entitlement process as well as automatic replacement process identifies faculty for replacement and to meet the college's 75/25 obligation.

However, the team could not validate the District's current 75/25 obligation in the documentation provided or in interviews with administrators, faculty or staff.

For those positions that are not automatically moved up to the hiring process through AI and entitlement, managers provide information through their program reviews. Then, the AI process is accessed to request funding for the position. Although the AI process has been successful in creating dialogue and collaboration among staff, the team is not able to verify that the AI process is an integrated planning process, as defined in the standards of accreditation (Standard III.A).

Positions are announced through online and print sources in order to secure a broad pool of applicants. There has been concern reiterated from the last self-study that faculty recruitment notices are not posted adequately in discipline-specific resources. Another concern is that the timeline from the posting of a position to the hire date is excessive and far exceeds the six weeks identified in the hiring procedure. There is a perception that these practices result in the loss of viable candidates in the hiring pools (Standard III.A.3a).

Currently, the college convenes the hiring team and all members receive an orientation regarding fair and legal hiring issues and the guidelines for screening and interviewing candidates. The Faculty hiring procedure was revised in 2007; however, the management hiring procedure has not been revised in 13 years, and the classified procedure has not been revised in the last ten years (Standard III.A.3a).

The college has an “Ethics Standard for Professional Managers” (Board Policy 2035) as well as a “Faculty Ethics Statement” that has been adapted from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The college also has a policy addressing academic freedom and faculty responsibilities. Board Policy 1041 “Standards of Good Practice” is considered by the Board as a “proposed code of ethics,” but because the policy has no enforcement component, the team questions whether this policy can be considered an ethics statement. There is no formal ethics statement for the classified staff; however, the Board Policy 4420 on suspension or dismissal is considered as policy for all staff including classified staff.

The college has established a systematic evaluation process for all classes of employees, and although the team could not find quantifiable evidence, it appeared from *ad hoc* staff interviews that many staff are being evaluated in a consistent manner. Human Resources sends reminders that evaluations are due, but several managers remarked that the timelines are often inaccurate. The visiting team observed that there are no consequences for managers that do not complete their evaluations in a timely manner. The college presently incorporates evaluation of teaching effectiveness in the faculty evaluation process, but the assessment of the responsibility of faculty, librarians and counselors in achieving student success has not been developed (Standard III.A.1.c). The college acquired Evaluation/Tracking/Reporting Module software in 2004 and although managers were trained in December 2004, the system has not been used to provide accountability (Standard 7.B1;7.B2).

The college provides staff development activities through the funding of conferences as well as through activities in the Professional Development Center (PDC). Interviews with several staff validated that staff development through the PDC is valued at the college. While surveys have been gathered to assess particular workshops, no systematic evaluation of professional development programs have been developed to use as a basis for improvement (Standard III.A.5b).

Conclusion

The college has not met this standard in its entirety. Although the self study reports that, “the college has developed comprehensive and detailed policies and procedures that speak to a wide range of equity and diversity,” the team could not validate the existence of comprehensive and detailed policies and procedures including a program review, Student Equity Plan or a Faculty and Staff Diversity Plan. Issues identified in the previous team’s recommendations regarding Human Resources practices remain

unresolved. In addition, a continuing concern of faculty and staff regarding gender and ethnic inequities is a cause for ongoing evaluation.

It is clear that the lack of a stable, management team as well as instability in institutional planning and reflective evaluation have had an impact on the institution's ability to fully address the former team's recommendation as well as this standard.

Recommendation

4. The team recommends that the college meet the urgent need to establish a stable management team. Longevity of the team, particularly at the vice presidential level, will help resolve the perceived deficiencies in effective communication, comprehensive planning, and collaborative dialogue (Standard IIIA.1;III.A.2).

B. Physical Resources

General Comments

Overall, the college thoughtfully uses its physical resources in planning and preparing for the future. District policies, campus procedures, and some campus participation committees are in place to provide annual review and improvement. Physical facilities are maintained to provide safe and clean learning and work environments.

Findings & Evidence

San Joaquin Delta College is comprised of 165 acres in the heart of the San Joaquin Valley. In addition, there are several campus centers: Manteca offers an active farm lab, Mountain Ranch offers a natural resources lab, and Tracy Center offers a learning center. The District Educational Masters Plan and Campus Facilities Master Plan are meant to work together to plan growth for the college and its centers, but the college notes that the linkage of the two needs to be clarified. The documents have not been updated for over five years. However, an extensive facilities plan was produced in July 2005 that details the facilities planning for the main campus as well as the center expansions and updates into the community. This study was informed by the Teaching Environment Task Force.

The successful passing of Measure L (\$250 million bond) will fund modernization, relocation of the center and some new construction (Standard III.B.1a). Interviews confirmed that the Citizen's Oversight Committee meets quarterly not only to oversee appropriate expenditures but to hear updates on the projects themselves. The ADA compliance problems are being addressed through many of the renovation projects. For example, the Goleman Library Renovation, which is scheduled to go to bid in summer 2008, will address all the internal compliance issues for that facility. Similarly, the new Gateway project breaks ground next week to begin constructing a one-stop student services center. Site access problems are being addressed through this project's plans

(Standard III.B.1.b). The main concern with the Measure L dollars is their reduced building power in response to materials and labor cost fluctuations.

There is some concern about both the prioritization of the Tracey Center as a current project and the delay involved in seeking appropriate land for the new facility. However, ongoing construction efforts to move to the new location are underway, and the expectation is that early in Fall 2008, the offerings will be phased out of Tracey High School and into facilities owned and operated by the college. General education and transfer courses are offered at the Center with the support of a substantial array of services. For example, counseling, financial aid, and DSP&S have a presence there; the library does not but the computer lab allows online access. Books on loan are also coordinated for the students.

On-going efforts regularly address campus safety and maintenance efforts as well as district transportation needs to ensure a quality learning environment. Various department, committees, and plans help campus planning and progress in these areas impacting effective stewardship of physical resources. The Scheduled Maintenance Plan was updated last year with plans spelled out to 2014 for the prioritized infrastructure plans that need first attention. The main problem is that there are never enough dollars to address all the facilities issues. Recently, Facilities and Planning submitted a three-year proposal to the AI process to start accumulating dollars for the replacement of a campus bus that is too costly to address in any one fiscal year (Standard III.B.1).

One area identified in the self study that needs improvement is the work order system and its interaction with the campus community. The work orders are prioritized and addressed, but upgraded software is not effectively integrated on campus to allow necessary tracking and monitoring to occur. The appropriate managers cannot readily review progress and completion data that would allow for more timely follow-up and planning efforts. Correcting this integration problem is itself a high priority. Plans are in place to address scheduled maintenance and Measure L renovations into the future, but ongoing program reviews and AI Strategic Planning and Budget Process does not yet directly integrate with the facilities planning process (Standard III.B.2).

A lingering challenge for effective facilities planning is the two separate functions of effective facilities management: operations and expansion. Often, the same personnel are charged with both tasks, even though each demands unique skills sets. When skills, abilities, and available funding are not effectively aligned with the dual functions, it is more likely that details and deadlines can be overlooked. To mitigate against such possibilities, the College often needs to rely on outside contractors to tend to the growth and expansion aspects of facilities. A more integrated process that better links instructional and service needs with planning and budget development would help the college address priorities most efficiently while also utilizing the strengths of their employees.

Conclusion

The college has not met this standard. The college is doing an effective job maintaining an aging campus while also working to expand facilities to meet growing need. The challenges of such a charge are extensive: stretching bond measures dollars, balancing immediate priority with regular updates and maintenance, and aligning the right people to the right task to maximize service and potential. Although more integrated planning will help the College as a whole, the physical resources are being effectively maintained.

Recommendation

See Recommendation 3.

C. Technology Resources

General Comments

San Joaquin Delta College is very fortunate to have a cadre of uniquely talented information specialists who provide technological support to meet current demands and needs of both students and staff. This specialized commitment has been recognized by several state and national organizations.

Findings and Evidence

However commendable, these efforts do not compensate for the lack of a current and inclusive college strategic master plan that would provide for a systematic integration of technology within the organizational structure (Standard IIIC.2). Although not mentioned within the self study, a separate technology design plan (Master Telecommunications Design Standard and User Technology Guide, 2007) has been developed and is currently being utilized to direct the activities of the technological staff and to provide for consistent technology standards across campus.

Importantly, because of the lack of comprehensive merger with institution-wide planning efforts, there are limited linkages with student learning outcomes and no structure for feedback, evaluation, and improvement. The self study reports that technology planning is guided by the college's Education and Student Services Master Plan; technology decisions are generally based on educational needs, infrastructure, cost, and available funding. However, the last update was completed in 2002, and there is no provision within the current institutional milieu to evaluate the existing IT infrastructure, nor evaluate existing needs, services, or performance, nor link short- or long-term decision-making to broader learning outcomes. With constant and frequent technology changes and with the additional importance of their effects on learning outcomes, essential

linkage to institutional planning and up-to-date master plans is vital (Standard IIIC.1a; Standard IIIC.2).

Without prescribed and accurate assessment of technological policies and practices within a broader strategic master plan, San Joaquin Delta College will continue to rely on separate information formulated in a vacuum or based on distinct sets of circumstances such as requirements within Measure L. As a result, the significance of learning outcomes relationships with technological resources remains problematic. Necessary direct linkages with institutional goals/objectives and with continuous evaluation/improvement are non-existent.

Conclusion

Based on evidentiary documentation, San Joaquin Delta College has minimally met the accreditation standards for Standard IIIC (Technology Resources). The institution has not demonstrated effective integration of technology resources and needs with learning outcomes (Standard IIIC), nor is there evidence of a cycle of continuous evaluation and improvement. Additionally, those crucial cohesive efforts linking learning outcomes with technology for campus-wide improvements have not been fully incorporated within the institutional culture and not documented in the self-study.

Recommendation

See Recommendation 3.

STANDARD III D

Financial Resources

General Comments

The self study and follow up inquiries provide evidence that financial resources are used effectively to support the mission of the college. Financial planning is partially integrated with institutional planning. The annual fiscal planning process follows a calendar for each budget year and involves appropriate committees through a system that primarily focuses on proposals submitted by individual departments. Requests for project funding must include a rationale showing how the proposed support the college's mission and goals.

Findings and Evidence

The financial planning process is partially based on a newly-implemented Appreciative Inquiry (AI) software tracking system. AI software shows how a department's proposed project would support the mission and support of programs. Proposals are chosen through a ranking process involving faculty, administrators and staff participating in the Budget Development Process (Standard IIID.2.a).

However, while it appears to focus on new programs and projects, the AI Budget Development Process has not been fully integrated with Institutional Planning.

The college conforms to established financial management control processes that ensure the financial integrity of the college's procurements and the responsible use of financial resources (Standard IIID.2.b). Annual audits have resulted in no material findings in recent years. Appropriate levels of controls are adhered to.

The college receives revenues from a variety of sources including state appropriations, tuition and fees, special funds, federal funds including grants, and payments for services rendered. The college has reserves greater than five percent of non-restricted funds in excess of budgeted and actual expenditures as evidenced by annual audits and has completed the California Chancellor's Office Sound Fiscal Management Self-Assessment Checklist intended to provide for early detection of fiscal difficulties. The checklist enables internal assessment and preventative actions to be taken as well as provides information signaling when the System Office should intervene with technical and

administrative assistance, as appropriate. An examination of the last four years of external audits revealed no material findings (Standard IIID.2.d., Standard IIID.2.g).

Conclusion

The college has not entirely met this standard. Additional effort is needed to link the budget process with the institutional planning and program review that are necessary for achieving continuous improvement. Further, institutional planning should reflect a realistic assessment of the availability of financial resources development of financial resources, partnership, and expenditure requirements (Standard IIID.2.b).

Recommendation

See Recommendation 3.

STANDARD IV

Leadership and Governance

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Comments

One recommendation from the 2002 self-study report was that “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.” The college has made progress towards the goal. The President’s Council was tasked in 2005 to define and redefine the roles of the respective governance committees, including streamlining some committees and eliminating others. The institution defined the president’s Council and developed annual reporting. Key campus committees have developed goals that are made public and broadly discussed. The institution and Board has worked together on the Measure L Bond Issue and prioritizing needs and goals. The efforts of the Chief Executive officer to positively address the campus need for dialogue and evaluation by using the AI process should be commended. The campus-wide positive response and respect for the Appreciative Inquiry (AI) process is significant and commendable. The effort should be reinvigorated and sustained through adherence to the original process.

Two areas of concern have emerged. With four of the five vice presidents currently serving in an interim role, the college remains in transition in establishing clear roles for senior leadership. In addition, ongoing challenges involving the Board of Trustees have raised questions about the appropriate role of the Board and also about the conduct of the Board.

Findings and Evidence

The college recently amended an Administrative Procedure (AP 2430, amended 3-11-08) listing the current committees that are part of the governance structure of the college. The college has a Board Policy, BP 2400, that outlines an inclusive process for faculty, staff and students to provide input to the president and the Board (Standard IV.A.2).

In 2003, the college adopted a new approach to dialog, the Appreciative Inquiry (AI) Strategic Planning and Budget Process. The college community is very supportive of this concept, and articulated during the site visit the positive impact of this approach to working together. Outcomes from the AI process include a revision to the college’s Mission Statement, Vision Statement and Strategic Goals (Standard IV.A.1). Campus

efforts have been improved through the AI process producing a palpable culture change. The written policy for participation in decision-making processes (BP 2400) and the use

of AI have allowed the college to make progress in defining the roles of different participants in the decision-making processes. The AI process involved widespread, well planned and documented and inclusive governance processes. This process produced valuable dialogue and investigation of issues, but produced little planning.

The college has designed and supported a process of dialogue and action that addresses student learning outcomes, particularly the response to plagiarism, updating curriculum and purchasing CurricUNET as an attempt to document SLOs. The Professional Development Center is identified as a key source for ethics training.

Evidence of the development of leadership and continuous institutional improvement includes the development of new and innovative strategies to improve student success such as the DERTF (Developmental Education Review Task Force), creation of the Student Success Coordinator position, and the exemplary PDC (Professional Development Center). The use of truly representative participation on committees such as the President's Council and the Budget and Planning Committee indicates healthy collegiality and mutual respect. The governance and decision-making committees have been through a process of review and re-evaluation for the past three years resulting in changes to committee structure, function and members. The Academic Senate sets annual goals, evaluates and communicates progress towards these goals. Other campus committees would benefit from replicating this model, creating annual goals, and making self evaluations public in order to further improve their work. At this point, the planning agenda for Standard IVA predominately states a continuation of present practices rather than identification of measurable action plans to improve specific areas.

Conclusion

The college has made substantial progress in addressing the recommendation from the 2002 Report and in clarifying decision-making roles and processes; however, the college only partially meets this standard. The next step in this iterative process will be to implement measurable action plans to evaluate the effectiveness of the revisions to the decision-making infrastructure.

B. Board and Administrative Organization

General Comments

The seven-person Board of Trustees has a long period of continuous service. The newest member of the Board has served for more than ten years with some members of the board having served for more than thirty years. The years of continuous service as a unit are both a strength and weakness of the current board. The combined years of experience provide a depth of knowledge about the history and mission of the college, but the

complexity of the longstanding relationships between the Board members at times poses significant challenges. All seven of the Board members were on the Board when the current president was hired in 2002.

The college has an administrative structure in place including five vice presidents. One current challenge noted is that four of the five vice presidents are currently serving in an interim role with searches for the permanent vacancies underway, indicating a need for greater continuity and stability for the senior leadership team.

Findings and Evidence

The Board of Trustees is an independent, policy-making body (Standard IVB.1). The members of the Board are elected by the people of the San Joaquin Delta College district, and are thus directly responsible to the people of the district (Standard IV.B.1.a). The duties and responsibilities of the Board are detailed in Board Policy (BP) 1040. The Board establishes policies for the entire college (Standard IVB.1.b). BP 1040(3) states that one duty of the Board is “to adopt policies and procedures for the governance of the District and to review them periodically.” The Board Policies are not easily accessible on the college web site, nor is there any indication the policies are reviewed and updated systematically as BP 1040 requires (Standard IV.B.1.d). Some of the specific policies are in need of significant revision, and some policies discussed below need to be added. Particularly with respect to BP 1041, Board of Trustees Standards of Good Practice, the Board is systematically ignoring existing policy.

The Board selects and evaluates the president (Standard IV.B.1; IV.B.1.j). The Board does not have a clearly defined, formal, written policy for selection of the president. The college most recently engaged the services of the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) to coordinate the hiring of the current president in 2002.

The Board recently completed its evaluation of the president. The Board does not have a clearly defined written policy for evaluating the president. ACCT assists the Board and the president in the evaluation process. In recent months and weeks, the evaluation of the president and decision to extend his contract appears to have been a very public and divisive issue for the Board and the college. In addition to numerous articles in the local media questioning the handling of the process, the campus community expressed serious concerns about the conduct of the Board in conducting the evaluation. Board members also publicly aired serious allegations about their colleagues, including an assertion that the Brown Act was violated in discussing the president’s contract extension and that privacy laws may have been violated by disclosing the contents of the president’s evaluation with the media.

The Board’s handling of the evaluation of the president and the decision to extend his contract did not reflect the public interest in board activities and decisions (Standard IV.B.1.a). Further, the evaluation of the president appears to be only the most recent

reflection of a division on the Board that is having a very corrosive impact on the operations of the college.

Although the Board has a policy for board conduct entitled “Board of Trustees Standards of Good Practice” (BP 1041, last amended in 1999). The Board has not been abiding by the standards it has set for itself. Board Good Practice Standard 2 states: “The Board shall maintain consistent oversight of the college as a policy setting board with emphasis on instructional quality, operational efficiency, and fiscal stability.” Unfortunately, numerous interviews with students, faculty, staff and administrators reinforced the perception that the Board is not focusing on policy, but has devolved into a group reduced to infighting and micromanagement of college operations. Students noted a perception that the Board does not regularly solicit their input. Board Good Practice Standard 6 notes that “Board members will act honestly and openly at all times, following the letter and content of the Brown Act, and maintain the confidentiality of privileged executive session information.” The allegations swirling around the evaluation of the president are wholly inconsistent with Board Good Practice Standard 6. Board Good Practice Standard 8 emphasizes that the Board “will promote a healthy working relationship with the Superintendent/President through supportive, open, and honest communication and regular evaluation.” The recent events involving the evaluation of the president are the most recent indication of the Board not complying with this Standard.

The Board does not have a written code of ethics (Standard IV.B.1.h). The Board has included the issue of an ethics policy on board agendas, but has not actually pursued discussion during the board meetings. While Board members noted a desire to have a workshop on ethics, there are no actual plans. In light of the numerous recent examples of alleged misconduct by members of the Board and non-compliance with its own Standards of Good Practice, the absence of a Board Code of Ethics with specific enforcement provisions for violation of the code is a significant issue for the Board and the college. In addition, current BP 1041 Standard 13 calls for a “biennial self-evaluation of its [the Board’s] performance and function as a Board.” Evidence that a self-evaluation has occurred has not emerged. Even if it has occurred, the results of the self-evaluation have not been made public, and the opportunities for campus-wide participation in assisting the Board in its self-evaluation are not provided for in a written policy.

Members of the college community suggested that the current Board challenges may also have an impact on the selection and retention of Vice Presidents to assume permanent duties currently performed by interim or acting Vice Presidents. Given the public nature of the ongoing issues involving the Board, potential candidates may be concerned about the future of the college.

Conclusion

The college does not meet this standard. The conduct of the Board poses a significant challenge to the college’s achieving its mission. In spite of the intervention by a facilitator from ACCT and a special session on the Brown Act at a recent Board retreat,

the interactions among the members of the Board appear to be increasingly contentious, and this ongoing strife among Board members is a major distraction to the college

community. The lack of written board policies involving the hiring and evaluation of the president and addressing board ethics and self-evaluation has exacerbated problems involving the Board. The Board has consistently failed to live up to its own standards of good practice.

Recommendation

1. The team recommends that the Board of Trustees develops a systematic process to review and revise existing Board Policies, establish and adhere to an acceptable code of ethics (Standards IV.B.1; IV.B. 1.a; IV.B.1.b-h.).
2. The team recommends that the Board of Trustees establish and monitor itself as a policy-making body, reaffirm delegation of operational authority to the Superintendent/President, and actively support the authority of management for the administration of the college. (Standard IVB; IVB.1.e).
4. The team recommends that the college meet the urgent need to establish a stable management team. Longevity of the team, particularly at the vice presidential level, will help resolve the perceived deficiencies in effective communication, comprehensive planning, and collaborative dialogue (Standard IIIA.1;III.A.2).