SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

San Luis Obispo, California

SUPPLEMENTAL MID-TERM REPORT

DECEMBER 20, 2011

ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE

Dr. Gilbert H. Stork, Superintendent/President, *Ex-Officio*

Dr. Cathleen Greiner, ALO/Vice President of Academic Affairs

Dr. Kevin Bontenbal, Academic Senate President, Faculty, Library

Dr. Greg Baxley, Faculty, Chemistry

Mr. Ryan Cartnal, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment

Ms. Beth-Ann Dumas, Immediate Past Academic Senate Vice President, Faculty, Speech Communication

Mr. Christopher Green, Director of Fiscal Services

Mr. Steve Leone, Immediate Past Academic Senate President, Faculty, English

Ms. Sandee McLaughlin, Executive Dean, NCC and SCC Centers

Dr. Pamela Ralston, Dean of Academic Affairs

Dr. Debra Stakes, Faculty, Earth Science and Oceanography

Ms. Deborah Wulff, Dean of Academic Affairs

Mr. John Cascamo, Dean of Academic Affairs

Statement of Report Preparation

Cuesta College is providing a Supplemental Mid-Term Report to summarize the actions taken by the college to address recommendations made by the previous comprehensive team (2008). The college addressed these recommendations in prior follow-up reports and is now providing an overview of these recommendations and updating actions taken by the college to sustain progress.

The Supplemental Mid-Term report provides information on the following recommendations from the 2008 comprehensive visit:

1: Mission Statement

3: Student Learning Outcomes

4: Library and Learning Support Services

5: Human Resources

8: Board of Trustees Evaluation and Policies

9: Leadership and Governance.

Certification

This Supplemental Mid-Term Report is submitted to the ACCJC for the purpose of assisting in the determination of the institution's accreditation status.

We certify that there was consultation with the college community in preparing this supplemental report and believe that this report accurately reflects that nature and substance of this institution.

_____   _____

Gilbert H. Stork, Ed.D.   Date

Superintendent/President

_____   _____

A. Cathleen Greiner, Ph.D.   Date

Assistant Superintendent/Vice President of Academic Affairs

_____   _____

Kevin Bontenbal, Ed.D.   Date

Academic Senate President

_____   _____

Patrick Mullen   Date

President, Board of Trustees

Action to Address Recommendation from the 2008 Comprehensive Visit

Citation from Visiting Team Findings

Actions to Sustain Progress

Action to Address Recommendation from 2008 Comprehensive Visit

Recommendation 1: Mission Statement
To improve, the team recommends that the college integrate more frequent reviews of the mission statement as it implements other institutional planning activities (Standard 1.A, 1.A.1, 1.A.3.).

Mission Statement Review

On April 28, 2009, Cuesta College completed a full review and update of the district mission, vision, and values statements. The President/Superintendent conducted nine open-invitation strategic planning forums to gather input from members of all campus constituent groups, and the campus-wide Strategic Planning Committee drafted the new statements based on the results of the forums and a series of campus surveys. The updates were approved by the District Board of Trustees on July 22, 2009. Furthermore, Cuesta is committed to a five-year strategic planning cycle which includes annual reviews of the district mission, vision, and values statements based on the changing demographics of our student population and the results of campus-wide assessment of institutional planning activities.

Annual Review of Mission, Vision, and Values Statements

As of Fall 2009, the district mission, vision, and values statements will be reviewed annually by the Strategic Planning Committee based on input received from the assessment of the following institutional planning activities:
- Accounting Report Community College data on campus student demographics
- Institutional Effectiveness Outcomes assessment results
- Operational planning produced by institutional planning committees: Shared Governance Council (which is as of 2010 College Council), Planning & Budget Committee, Technology Committee, Enrollment Management Committee, Student Learning Outcomes & Assessment Committee, Institutional Program Plan & Review Committee, and Strategic Planning Committee.

Cuesta College has resolved the issues identified by this recommendation. The College revised its mission, vision, values statements after a year-long process. Furthermore, the College has developed an annual cycle and process for review of the district mission, vision, values statements as a primary component of institutional planning. Finally, the Strategic Planning Committee is now responsible for annual review and for ensuring the integration of the mission, values, and vision statements into all institutional planning activities.

Direct Citation from Visiting Team Findings, November 2009

The ACCJC Visiting Team wrote the following assessment after reviewing Cuesta's documentation:

> "The visiting team found progress related to the review of the college mission statement. On April 28, 2009, and after a yearlong process, the college completed a full review and update of the district mission, vision and values statements. The updates were approved by the district board of trustees on July 22, 2009. The college has fully implemented the recommendation and resolved the deficiency."

Actions to Sustain Progress

The college continues to review and implement the mission, vision and values statement of 2009. The mission statement played a central role in creating and implementing the 2010-13 Strategic Plan. "The Mission, Vision and Values are the touchstones for the entire (integrated) planning process. All College plans and operations should be consistent with these foundational documents."   The Strategic Plan contains action plans and operations to "effectively address the mission of the College." (Cuesta College 2010-2013 Strategic Plan, p.3) (Ev. 1.1)

The first reference in the 2011-16 Educational Master Plan (EMP) is the College's mission, vision and values. The EMP "not only provides the college with general direction in support of achieving its vision and mission, but also is a focal point of integration for all of the college's planning over the next five years." The college superintendent/president notes "the EMP incorporates our core vision, values and mission which builds on the rich history of Cuesta College" (Cuesta College, 2011-2016 Educational Master Plan, p.2 and p.ii). (Ev. 1.2)

The Strategic Planning Committee meeting in May 2011 reviewed the mission, vision and values and determined that no changes were warranted. (Ev. 1.3) At the October 2011 joint retreat of the Educational Master Plan Working Group and Strategic Planning Committee, the college's mission statement was a foundational reference to ensure integration between the EMP and updating the Strategic Plan. The mission statement is at the core of the Cuesta College Integrated Planning Model (Cuesta College, 2011-2016 Educational Master Plan, p. 7). (Ev. 1.4)

Evidence

Evidence to support Cuesta's sustainable response to this recommendation is as follows:

1.1   2010-13 Strategic Plan, adopted by the Board of Trustees, September 28, 2010
1.2   2011-16 Educational Master Plan, adopted by the Board of Trustees, September 7, 2011
1.3   Strategic Planning Meeting Minutes, May 9, 2011
1.4   Cuesta College Integrated Planning Model, 2011-16 Educational Master Plan, September 7, 2011

Action to Address Recommendation from 2008 Comprehensive Visit

Recommendation 3: Student Learning Outcomes

To meet standards, the team recommends that the college ensure that student learning outcomes are fully institutionalized as a core element of college operations, with specific focus on curriculum, program development, libraries and on-line resources.

Additionally, it is recommended that the college develop a policy for program discontinuance and a policy for academic freedom.

(Standards II.A.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.6.b, II.A.7, II.C.1.b, II.C.1.c, II.C.2)

Institutionalizing Student Learning Outcomes

In the Accreditation Follow-up Report dated October 2009, Cuesta College noted immediate actions were taken in Spring 2009 to address the recommendation. The Instructional Program Planning and Review (IPPR) Template, now called the Institutional Planning and Review Template, was updated to include an extended narrative analysis of course and program-level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) outcomes assessment results and plans for improvement in courses and programs.

Included in the updated version was 5 year Comprehensive Program Plan and Review (CPPR), which requires comprehensive reporting of program- and course-level outcomes, and the Annual Program Planning Worksheet (APPW), which requires reporting of program-level assessments as an integral part of developing annual program unit and area plans. All college programs (whether instructional, student service, or administrative) must complete the APPW and CPPR on regular cycles. Therefore, the institutional adoption of the forms results in a systematic reporting of SLOs and assessment as well as a formal integration of SLO assessment results into the program review and unit planning process.

In addition, the APPW and CPPR templates both require that connections be identified between program outcomes and other college plans such as the college mission statement, the Strategic Plan, and the Educational Master Plan so that program-planning is aligned with institution-wide planning. The APPW and CPPR also require the review of institutional effectiveness data, such as the ARCC report, as part of the assessment of program outcomes and effectiveness. These program review documents respond to current college plans and also contribute to future planning. For example, portions of the current Educational Master Plan were developed based on elements from recently completed program review documents. In addition, the assessment reports in these documents are also used as one part of justification for the budget allocation process as well as one source for recommendations about actions that be taken throughout the institution to encourage student success. For example, the college has recently created a 100% faculty reassignment Technology Resource Instructor position, a, largely as a result the reports in the program planning and review documents

The institutionalization of assessment also includes evaluation of the IPPR templates through college-wide surveys about the effectiveness of the document structure. The results from these surveys have guided changes and updates to the template itself. Each year the IPPR Committee

surveys the college community and reviews and updates the IPPR. Based on its most recent revision in Spring 2011, for example, the template was updated to include a report of any specific SLO-driven changes to programs and units that may require the allocation of funds. In addition, many prompts were edited for clarity. In short, the continual adjustments of the planning documents have provided means for the reporting of SLOs and their assessment results to improve short and long-range planning as well as budget allocation.

Additional information about the institution-wide integration of student learning outcomes is included in the response to the visiting team, which can be found below.

Program Discontinuance

During 2002-2004, the Academic Senate drafted and approved a program discontinuance process and policy entitled the Cuesta College Program Viability Policy. The draft was sent to the President for approval in 2004, but the process was not approved by the Board of Trustees and was not used until Spring 2009 when there was a proposal to discontinue the Dental Hygiene program. Using the process and template embedded in the Program Viability Policy, a Dean proposed the discontinuation of this program to the Shared Governance Council (SGC), and based on a cost-benefit analysis provided by the proposal, the SGC approved the discontinuance of the Dental Hygiene program.

In Spring 2009, the Academic Senate formulated a Program Discontinuance Task Force comprised of the Academic Senate President, Academic Senate Vice President, Curriculum Chair, and a Dean. The Task Force met over the summer to review the Program Viability Policy, and as a result of this review, the Task Force is currently updating the policy to include separate definitions and processes for Program Suspension, Program Discontinuance, and Program Revitalization. This update of policy, now called the Cuesta College Program Discontinuance Policy, will be completed by the end of Fall 2009 and approved to be implemented in Spring 2010.

Academic Freedom Policy

Cuesta College has two existing academic freedom polices published in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (Article III) and in Board Policy (1565).

Citation from visiting team

Institutionalizing Student Learning Outcomes & Assessment

The ACCJC Visiting Team wrote the following assessment after reviewing Cuesta's documentation:

> "The college has made some limited progress with this recommendation, but still lacks a faculty SLO liaison. The team confirmed that SLOs, when they are stated to exist, are a part of all program planning and program reviews. There is also stated assessment of the SLOs to validate allocation of resources. Further, there are some program and course level SLOs and the assessment results are linked to program goals. However, the information regarding the extent to which SLOs for courses and programs have been defined and data are collected is based on self-reported responses to a survey administered by the Office of Institutional Research. The statements regarding the number and percentage of courses with SLOs are all based on the results of the Annual Program Planning Worksheet (APPW) and the results of the survey, which had a low

response rate. There is no system that actually captures the SLOs and the data assumed to be collected that can be verified."

"The information from the assessment results is stated as driving program improvement planning and validating future staffing and other funding needs. However, documentation of evidence for the statements could not be verified and was not available at the time of the visit. The college has not implemented the recommendation and resolved the deficiency."

Program Discontinuance, Academic Freedom

"The team found the college without a board approved program discontinuance policy, but it has a program viability policy which was approved in 2004. The program viability policy has a program discontinuance process and template which was recently used to eliminate a dental hygiene program in April 2009. There is a program discontinuance task force continuing to review the existing program viability policy. This task force will present the update of the program viability policy to the academic senate during the 2009-2010, with college-wide acceptance of a program discontinuance policy expected in spring 2010. The college has partially implemented the recommendation."

Actions to sustain progress

Evidence of Sustainability of SLO Assessment:

Academic Affairs

In response to the 2008 Midterm report, the Academic Senate Council and the Vice President of Academic Affairs advocated for the reinstatement of reassigned time for a faculty Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment (SLOA) Liaison or Coordinator. The position was approved, but the appointment was not made until Spring 2010 due to budgetary concerns. In Spring 2010, a 20% reassign time position of SLOA Liaison was instituted for a faculty member who had previously served in the same position. The appointment produced the Institutional Assessment Plan (the SLO-IAP, approved by the Academic Senate Council May 2010) (Ev. 3.1) and the SLO Principles Statement. (Ev. 3.2) This latter document is a joint resolution between the Academic Senate Council, the CCFT faculty bargaining unit and the administration detailing how SLO assessments and assessment data will be used by the college for improvement of student learning.

Two faculty SLOA Co-Coordinators have each been appointed at 30% reassigned time for the period of Fall 2010 through Spring 2012. The primary responsibilities of the co-coordinators is to assist faculty in implementing the SLOA IAP via training at individual or program levels, providing models of best-practices, and incorporating SLOA information in the Institutional Program Planning and Review (IPPR) documents. The co-coordinators also maintain the SLOA website and publish a monthly SLOA newsletter. (Ev.3.3, 3.4) The co-coordinators are assessing and reporting on the college's progress towards the Proficiency level as determined by the ACCJC Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness. The VPAA and Academic Senate President will determine if the SLO coordinator positions are needed after the current appointments end in Spring 2012. This assessment will be completed by February 28, 2012.

The SLOA Faculty Liaison, working with the SLOA Committee, developed a plan to satisfy this planning agenda item in Spring 2010. The Academic Senate Council approved the Institutional Assessment Plan (the SLO-IAP) in May 2010. The SLO-IAP makes recommendations for the implementation of a student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessment cycle that will guide planning for improvements of courses and instructional programs and be integrated with IPPR documents. The plan provides alternative assessment models and a timeline for advancing to the proficiency stage of SLO assessment. The SLO-IAP calls for the development of a SLO assessment cycle (SLOAC) for course-level and program-level SLOs. Each cycle concludes with the initiation of another cycle for continuous program improvement. The SLO-IAP includes guidelines and templates for documenting SLO assessment results and potential plans for improvement. In addition, the IPPR documents were improved (in Fall 2010) in terms of the reporting of progress on course and program SLO assessment results. The SLO-IAP is expected to improve the integration, tracking and analysis of SLO assessments at the course and program levels.

In addition, a number of other items related to the integration of SLO assessment across campus has been implemented since 2008:
1. The Academic Senate Council and the faculty bargaining unit have each communicated the expectation that faculty will have SLO statements on all syllabi beginning in Fall 2011.
2. The Academic Senate Council passed a proposal requesting one course from each program to submit the Course and Program Assessment Summary form to the SLOA co-coordinators by May 25, 2011. An assessment cycle calendar for each program will be submitted at the same time. These documents will be used by the SLOA co-coordinators to help assess the progress made towards the ACCJC proficiency level.
3. Standardized forms for reporting of SLO assessment data (CPAS forms) have been approved and distributed to all instructional faculty.
4. The communication of information regarding SLO assessments has been improved by the creation of a monthly newsletter sent to faculty and staff.
5. Workshops and presentations regarding SLO assessments continue to be provided.

In Spring 2011, the SLO co-coordinators assessed the progress of SLO assessments, the utility of the SLOA sections of the IPPR, (Ev. 3.5) and the effectiveness of SLO-IAP for instructional programs. This assessment was conducted to determine progress towards the proficiency level as specified by the ACCJC Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness, and incorporated the results from the annual ACCJC SLO survey administered in May.

A specific example illustrates ongoing progress and attention. The use of SLOs and Assessment is in the 2010-2011 Comprehensive Program and Plan Review (CPPR) from the English as a Second Language (ESL) division. All ESL levels completed Student Learning Outcome Assessments by spring 2011. The curriculum for ESL 005, 006A and 006B underwent revisions in fall 2010. In January 2011 these revisions were approved and new courses were implemented in fall 2011. Three courses (ESL 005, 006 and 045) have been updated to reflect SLOA data analysis and recommendations made as a result of SLOA collaboration.(Ev.3.6, Ev. 3.7)

At the college-wide level, the ACCJC SLO Survey showed that assessment of student learning outcomes increased from 35% in 2010 to 57% in 2011. The college will continue to make progress towards the proficiency level of SLO assessment and implement measures to improve student learning.

Student Services

All Student Services programs at the College have student learning outcomes and each of these programs have completed at least one, and in some instances two, assessment cycles as of Spring 2011. The Student Services Department displays their SLOs on posters in the Student Services building. All Student Services SLOs and Assessments are recorded in the SLO tracking forms similar in design to those in the instructional IPPR documents and are required part of the unit plans, APPWs and the overall Cluster Plan. All 2008/2009 and 2009/2010 Student Services unit/department documents have been compiled and published in the Student Services Annual Student Learning Outcome and Assessment Manual. The results are shared with key stakeholders within the college community and presented at the Board of Trustees Meeting each year.

A specific example is an assessment of the in-person student orientation. Analyzing and discussing student survey results by the counselors led to streamlining the content of the "Orientation Booklet" and changing planning worksheets for 2011. Currently, the Student Services Assessment Report 2009-2010 and Student Learning Outcomes Planning for 2010-2011for each of the units is available on the Student Services website. (Ev. 3.8)

Program Discontinuance

The college completed approval of the Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance Policy by the Academic Senate on April 23, 2010 and as Board Policy 4021 in July 2010, in compliance with title 5, Section 51022. (Ev. 3.9) The policy was utilized in Fall 2011 and the first programs considered sent to College Council on September 13, 2011., (Ev. 3.10) Of the three programs, two were assessed as discontinued and sent to the Curriculum Committee for formal processing. The Fashion Design and Merchandising program is currently in Stage Four of this policy. Evaluation of the Institutional Program and Plan Review (IPPR) content and data analysis serves to initiate the procedure. The College Council has agenized an assessment of the procedure for Spring 2012.

Academic Freedom Policy

Cuesta College publishes the district academic freedom policy in Article 3.1.3 of the District Collective Bargaining Agreement (approved by the Board of Trustees June 2011) (Ev. 3.11) and a general academic freedom policy statement in Board Policy 1565.

Evidence

Ev. 3.1 Passage of the Institutional Assessment Plan (IAP) in Spring 2010 by the Academic Senate

Ev. 3.2   Principle Statement

Ev. 3.3 SLOA Webpage

Ev. 3.4 Newsletters

Ev. 3.5 Integration of SLOA reporting with Institutional Program Planning and Review

Ev. 3.6 ACCJC survey

Ev. 3.7 ESL CPPR

Ev. 3.8 Student Services Website

Ev. 3.9 Board Policy 4021

Ev. 3.10 College Council Minutes

Ev. 3.11 Academic Freedom Policy 1565

Recommendation 4: Library and Learning Support Services

To meet the standard, the team recommends the college and its libraries develop and implement an on-going formal assessment of their library services, on-line services, and student learning outcomes (Standards II.C.1.b., II.C.1.c, II.C.2).

Since April 2009, the College Library has formalized the assessment of library services, collections, online resources, and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). The Library has also instituted a timeline for completing these assessments on an annual basis, and all of this work has been conducted by the Library Assessment Committee (LAC).

The Library Assessment Committee (LAC)

The Library Assessment Committee (LAC) formed in April of 2009 to direct and formalize the assessment of library services, collections, online services, and SLOs and to make annual recommendations for improvement to services and SLOs. The LAC consists of at least two librarians, one staff member from Technical Services, an English Division faculty liaison, and the Library Director. This committee has a number of tasks. For one, the committee assesses library and learning support service SLOs to make recommendations for improvement. In addition, they review the results of the Library Data Report (LDR) to make recommendations for improvement to program planning for Library and Learning Support Services. The LDR standardizes the collection and dissemination of library-related data and provides a single library data source from which the LAC—and anyone in the library—can draw data for assessment and reporting purposes. Another annual source of assessment data is the Library Satisfaction Survey, which is used to collect input from students and faculty on the importance of, and their satisfaction with, various aspects of library services, collections, facilities, and information competency instruction. The LAC analyzes the results of the Library Satisfaction Survey, as well as effectiveness surveys of faculty and students using the online workbook and Searchpath Tutorial, to identify areas for improvement to library services and online resources and to ensure that services and collections support Library and Learning Support Services program SLOs.

Information Competence Requirement: The English 201A Library Research Workbook

Information competency is the core element of the Library's SLOs, which state that 1)an information-literate student is able to conceptualize and communicate a research topic or information need and to know when expert assistance is necessary; 2) to synthesize material and evaluate whether information need has been successfully satisfied; 3) and to locate, use, and evaluate library and information resources relevant to class assignments and personal information needs. These Library and Learning Support Services SLOs are reviewed regularly and systematically with use of the Institutional Program Plan and Review Template and Process, which includes the reporting and review of SLOs on the Annual Program Plan Worksheet (APPW). This annual assessment of Library SLOs assists in the improvement of the Library Research Workbook on an annual basis, as well as Library and Learning Support Services, and the LAC regularly assesses the effectiveness of the English 201A Workbook as the means to satisfy the information competency requirement for all students. To assist in this effort, the library began providing aggregate results in May 2009 for the 201A Library Research Workbook tests to the English Department and to the LAC. These results are used by the LAC to ensure that the

completion of the Library Research Workbook and Exam contributes to a successful achievement of Library Program SLOs and to a fulfillment of the Information Competency Requirement of the College.

Information Competence Requirement: Online resources

The library has moved aggressively within funding constraints to address the needs of distance learners by acquiring more than 10,000 e-books and a number of online databases. In addition, the library has developed online tools to enhance the information competence of our students, including Subject Guides, a customized Searchpath Tutorial, and an online Research Skills class (LIBT 212.) In Fall 2008, in response to requests from English faculty, the Library began a pilot program to provide the English 201A Library Research Workbook in an online version for use in selected English 201A classes. This online resource version of the Library Research Workbook has been reviewed, approved, and implemented for the Fall 2009 semester, and this resource and other library online resources are reviewed on an annual basis by the LAC based on the assessment of Library and Learning Support Services SLOs.

Information Competence Requirement: Library Orientations

Cuesta librarians conduct information literacy orientations for English 201A students and for many subject research areas including economics, business, construction technology, fine arts and academic skills. Analysis and improvement of these orientations is now more systematic and ongoing. In the February 2009, the library held a Librarian Information Competence Workshop, which was attended by eleven of thirteen Cuesta librarians. This workshop gave librarians involved in conducting orientations the opportunity to share successful teaching strategies and assess the success of library orientations. The need for feedback on orientations was discussed and an orientation survey titled "What Worked/What Didn't" was suggested as a way to provide ongoing data for future improvement to library orientations. This survey was drafted in spring, approved by the LAC in May 2009, and instituted in orientations beginning in the Fall semester of 2009. The results of this survey are used by individual librarians to inform their teaching methods and by the LAC to inform recommendations for improving the workbook and information competence instruction.

The College has resolved the issues identified by this recommendation. The Library maintains an assessment cycle for library services, collections, online resources, SLOs, and information competency instruction, but much of that effort has been ad hoc and not well documented. To ensure compliance with the standards identified by this recommendation, the Library has implemented an assessment cycle which systematizes and documents current practices, and the Library Assessment Committee (LAC) is now responsible for outlining an ongoing, evidence-based process of assessment that assists in the improvement of library services. The Library collects data, such as usage statistics for collections and patron survey results in one location, called the Library Data Report (LDR). This enables the comparison and sharing of data on all aspects of library services.

Direct Citation from Visiting Team Findings, November 2009

The ACCJC Visiting Team wrote the following assessment after reviewing Cuesta's documentation:

"The team found a formal assessment process and procedures in place to assess library services, collections, online resources and student learning outcomes (SLOs). A Library Assessment Committee (LAC) has been established to ensure ongoing assessment of services and resources. In addition, the library instituted a timeline for completing the assessments on an annual basis. The college has fully implemented the recommendation and resolved the deficiency."

Actions to sustain progress

Progress in sustained assessment is happening in a number of areas.

Library Data Report (Ev. 4.1)

Since 2009, Library staff have worked to populate the Library Data Report—now called Annual Data Report--by linking from the Data Report table of contents to collections of data developed for internal and external reporting purposes. As a result, most data on library collections and services are now easily available to any library employee and to the Library Assessment Committee for use in analyzing and improving services. In the past three years, as funding for collections has diminished, most of the use of the data has been by the collections coordinator, who accesses the data to inform decisions on additions to or deletions from the collection.

Library Orientation Survey (Ev. 4.2)

Since this survey was developed in 2009, it has been administered thirty-eight times in a cross-section of library information competency orientations. Use of the survey results has to date been by individual librarians, who use the results to ensure that the topics covered in orientations are meeting the needs of students in the classes, and that resources and strategies are presented in a clear and meaningful way to students.

Workbook Test Scores

A second component of the ongoing assessment of information competence instruction is the tests administered to students in English 201A after they have completed the Workbook, which is the chief information competency instruction means for this required course. Test scores (Ev. 4.3) are shared at the end of each semester with English 201A faculty, the English chair, the Library Assessment Committee, and the Workbook editor, who use the results to identify Workbook topics which may need more attention in class, or for which the test questions may need to be re-thought.

Library Satisfaction Survey

This survey was developed by the Library Assessment Committee in 2009 and updated several times before being administered in 2010. The response (Ev. 4.4) was insufficient for assessment purposes; in deliberating about how to improve results, the LAC became aware of a pilot project in the California Community Colleges to develop a student survey on libraries and technology. That survey, The California Community College Library and Technology Engagement Survey (Ev. 4.5) has been slow to develop, but has now been assessed by a statewide task force, and will become the Cuesta library's baseline assessment survey in 2012. In early 2012, the Library

Assessment Committee will meet to determine which questions from the Library Satisfaction Survey we will use to augment the questions in the statewide survey.

Reduced Hours Survey (Ev. 4.6)

Library staff will continue to survey library users as issues arise which require user input. One such survey was administered in Fall 2011, when budget shortfalls and a lack of Federal Work study-eligible student workers threatened library hours at the San Luis Obispo campus. A link to the Reduced Hours Survey was placed on the library home page, and paper copies were available at service desks in the library. The 2010 responses demonstrated a clear need to provide additional funding, and when funding was made available we were able to restore the hours identified as the highest priorities by our student responders.

Evidence

4.1   [Library Data Report](#)

4.2   [Library Orientation Survey](#)

4.3   [Workbook Test Fall 2011](#)

4.4   [Library Satisfaction Survey Response](#)

4.5   [CCC Library and Technology Engagement Survey](#)

4.6   [Reduced Hours Survey](#)

Action to Address Recommendations from 2008 Comprehensive Visit

Recommendation 5: Human Resources

To meet standards, the team recommends the college define and establish the assessment mechanisms to effectively produce and assess student learning outcomes (Standard III.A.1.c).

Assessment Mechanism to Produce and Assess Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs): The IPPR Template and Process

In May of 2009 the Academic Senate, the Planning and Budget Committee, and the former Shared Governance Council approved the Institutional Program Planning and Review (IPPR) Template, which is the primary reporting document for course-level and program-level student learning outcomes. (Ev. 5.1) The Institutional Program Planning and Review (IPPR) Template and process include two sections specific to the recommendation. The first section, "Curriculum Review: Outcomes and Assessment," explains the process for reviewing and reporting course-level SLOs in the two components embedded in the IPPR Template: the 2 or 5-year Comprehensive Program Plan and Review (CPPR) and the Annual Program Plan Worksheet (APPW). The second section, "Program Student Learning Outcomes and Assessments," explains the process for reviewing and reporting the program-level SLOs and provides explanation for how to describe the program-level SLOs assessment mechanisms in the CPPR/APPW. This section also explains how to report any recommended changes and/or updates for the overall program on the CPPR/APPW. The APPW tracks and evaluates the development of SLOs and the respective assessment methods on an annual basis.

Production of SLOs

The complete process by which SLOs are produced begins with a review of the already established course outline of record (COR), which includes course learning objectives, topics and scope for meeting the course learning objectives, and assessment methods. The CORs are approved by the Curriculum Committee and used as the pedagogical basis for instruction of each course. Faculty are required to place on their syllabi Student Learning Outcomes and/or learning objectives. Course-level student learning outcomes (SLOs) are developed from the learning objectives on the CORs, and the corresponding program outcomes are developed from the specific course outcomes.

Analysis of program and course-level SLOs are an integral part of the Comprehensive Program Planning and Review (CPPR) document and the Annual Program Planning Worksheet (APPW). Methods of assessing SLOs vary by academic discipline, and each assessment tool is integrated into the CPPR/APPW. The CPPR and APPW processes also include an analysis of enrollment and demographic trends as well as student retention, success and persistence rates. Faculty use the measures identified in the program and course-level SLOs as well as completion rates, progress in course sequences, transfer rates, retention rates, and distribution of earned grades to guide improvements to courses and programs. The process of rewriting CORs and program descriptions through the mechanism of the IPPR Template and Process affords the College the opportunities to further develop and assess SLOs.

Direct Citation from Visiting Team Findings, November 2009

The ACCJC Visiting Team wrote the following assessment after reviewing Cuesta's documentation:

> "The team found the college resolving this recommendation. The Institutional Program Planning and Review Committee (IPPRC) is responsible for providing technical assistance to constituents when they are completing the Institutional Program and Planning Review template (IPPR). Analysis of course and program-level SLOs is stated as being an integral part of the program reviews by way of the Comprehensive Program and Planning Reviews (CPPR) and the Annual Program and Planning Worksheet (APPW). The CCP also includes an analysis of enrollment and demographic trends as well as student retention, success, and persistence rates. College faculty use the measures identified in the course and program level SLOs, as well as completion rates, progress in course sequences, transfer rates, retention rates, and distribution of earned grades to guide improvements to courses and programs. The college will continue to assess course and program level student learning outcomes on an annual basis with the use of the APPW, and the CPPR on a 2-5 year cycle. Although the college has developed the mechanism of using the Institutional Program and Planning Review (IPPR) template to produce and assess SLOs, the approval by the academic senate, the planning and budget committee and the shared governance council didn't occur until May 2009; and, it is too early to evaluate or document ongoing results and implementation outcomes. The college has partially implemented the recommendation. "

Actions to Sustain Progress

Cuesta College is moving forward on multiple fronts to ensure that faculty are participating in the production of SLOs at the program and course-level in their disciplines, departments, and/or divisions.   This framework is made up of the Institutional Assessment Plan (IAP) (Ev. 5.2), the Course and Program Assessment Summary (CPAS) (Ev. 5.3) and Program Mapping and the cycle for assessment. The SLOA co-coordinators provide training to faculty on identifying and producing SLO's, have overseen the assessment process of SLOs (the percentage has increased year over year and is noted in the Response to Recommendation 3), and conduct workshops during FLEX days. An example of their outreach is working with Career Technical Advisory Boards to discuss and assist them in advising improvements for learning and curriculum. The SLOA Co-coordinators produce a newsletter, updating faculty on information and progress (cf. Recommendation 3). The goal of the college is to assess student learning at the level of proficiency in compliance with ACCJC rubric by 2012.

The commitment to SLOs and assessment was agreed to in the Principles Statement for SLOs and Assessment, a document defining the College's commitment to use SLO and which was signed by the Academic Senate, Cuesta College Federation of Teachers (CCFT), AFT Local # 4909, and the College Administration in May 2010. (Ev. 5.4) The part-time faculty also participate in "the ongoing process of developing and assessing student learning outcomes (SLOS) as determined by my division" and an arrangement was reached between CCFT and San Luis Obispo County Community College District to provide payment for this activity. The agreement

was ratified with the new contract in July 2011 and the SLOA pay timesheet is referenced in Appendix B-5. (Ev. 5.5)

The Academic Senate moved forward in addressing CurricuNet the issue of the addendum module for reporting SLOS during 2010. Due in large part to ACCJC standards to make SLOs public, the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment (SLOA) Committee proposed "that the Student Learning Outcomes for all courses be included in the CurricuNet information database."(Ev. 5.6) CurricuNet was fully implemented in fall 2011, and the Curriculum Committee continues to facilitate dialogue about the inclusion of SLOs for new courses, major course revisions, and as a result of the comprehensive program and planning review (CPPR) process.

All changes to peer and unit manager evaluation forms of faculty must be negotiated with the collective bargaining unit, so a survey of proposals for possible change to the faculty evaluation forms will be shared with faculty in the 2009-2010 academic year.

The College has processes in place to effectively produce and assess SLO's – SLOA Coordinators, Curricu-net as permanent central record, IPPR, Curriculum Committee review of course outline etc.

Evidence
5.1 Institutional Program and Planning Review (IPPR)
5.2 Institutional Assessment Plan (IAP)
5.3 Course and Program Assessment Survey (CPAS)
5.4 Principle Statement of Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment
5.5 Cuesta College Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Pay Timesheet, Appendix B-5, Collective Bargaining Agreement, July 2011.
5.6 March 12, 2010 Academic Senate Minutes

Action to Address Recommendations from 2008 Comprehensive Visit

Recommendation 8: Board of Trustees Evaluation and Policies

To meet standards, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees conduct its annual self-evaluation no later than June 2009 and yearly thereafter. Also, the team recommends that a process and timeline be established for regular review of current board policies and development of new policies as needed. (Standards IV.A.1., IV.A.3., IV.B.1.b., IV.B.1.e., IV.B.1.g., IV.B.1.j., IV.B.2.a.)

Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation

In 2008, the Board directed Dr. Pelham (former Superintendent/President) to develop a self-evaluation tool, who did so with the assistance of the former Director of District Services, Community College League of California and the Executive Assistant to the Superintendent/President and Board of Trustees. (Ev. 8-1, 8-2, 8-3) The Board of Trustees revised and implemented its annual self-evaluation process in 2009. In the spirit of its board policy on self-evaluation (BP1035) (Ev 8-4), the Board began conducting self-critiques at the end of each monthly board meeting in March 2007. (Ev 8-4, 8-5) The Board of Trustees is committed to this self-evaluation process and the ultimate goal of improving District operations and policies for the benefit of the students of Cuesta College, the employees, and citizens of the San Luis Obispo County Community College District.

The Board conducts its annual self-evaluation in June of each year and publishes the results as part of the approved meeting minutes, which are available to the public. (Ev 8-7, 8-8, 8-9)

Board Policies: Cycle of Review and Development of New Policies

The visiting team recommended that a process and timeline be established for regular review of current board policies and develop new policies as needed. The District is a member of the Community College League of California Policy and Procedure Service and uses its templates as a model for the District's board policy and administrative procedure. The Board authorized the renumbering of board policy and administrative procedure to reflect that of the League in August 2010. (Ev 8-10) The Board approved Board Policy 2410 and Administrative Procedure 2410, in March 2011. (Ev 8-11) The Administrative Procedure provides clear direction regarding the regular review of board policy as well as a time table for review. (Ev 8-12). The procedure also contains a chart designed to assist users in understanding the flow of the review process, which also supports shared governance processes.

Direct Citation from Visiting Team Findings, November 2010

The ACCJC Visiting Team wrote the following assessment after reviewing Cuesta's documentation:

> "The team observed that the Board of Trustees has conducted two self-evaluations since the October 2009 follow-up visit in addition to the review and updating of eight Board Policies. Under the guidance of the Interim Superintendent/President, the Board of Trustees developed an improved self-evaluation format, which was implemented for the first time in June 2010, and is now scheduled as an annual evaluation. The college also adopted the formatting and numbering system provided by the Community College League of California (CCLC) along with the service which will provide twice-yearly updates on existing policies and procedures. The CCLC template has been adopted as the model to guide these discussions, and the Interim Superintendent/President and the Board of Trustees have committed to develop the timelines needed for a regular cycle of Board Policy Review. The college has implemented the recommendation and resolved the deficiency." Examples include a joint meeting with the Trustees from Allen Handcokc college with training on the brown act, a review of the 4 accreditation standards one during each of 4 board meetings; and the trustees updated the 2011 board Goals taking into account the 2011-2016 EMP Core Principles.

Actions to Sustain Progress

Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation

Dr. Stork, Superintendent/President began his assessment of the Board Self-Evaluation process and Board Professional Development in early 2010. To enhance the effectiveness of the annual self-evaluation, Dr. Stork, in concert with the Board, developed a schedule for an annual review and development of focused, measureable, and attainable Board Goals. (Ev 8-13, 8-14, 8-15, 8-16) In addition to developing the Board Goals, in 2011, Dr. Stork and Board President, Pat Mullen developed an annual calendar which incorporated scheduled elements of Board professional development, which include the annual self-evaluation and the development of Board goals.

The Board continues to include a monthly critique, targeted to the continual improvement of Board meetings and the general responsibilities and effectiveness of the Board as outlined and suggested by the Community College League of California, Standard Eight, and Board Goals. The annual Board professional development schedule and the Board goals are included in the monthly critique item. The Board has implemented a quarterly review of Board Goals to focus its activity throughout the year and enhance its annual self-assessment. (Ev 8-17, 8-18)

Board Policies: Cycle of Review and Development of New Policies

The Board has revised and implemented Board policy (BP 2410) Board Policy and Administrative Procedure, Purposes and Objectives. The Administrative Procedure clearly defines the process for review and development of board policy and administrative procedure to include the review of the biennial updates received from the Community College League of California. A schedule for

review has also been implemented at part of the procedure. It clearly sets the targets for regular departmental review of Board policy based on the respective chapters and areas of responsibility. The Board is committed to regularly reviewing Board policy to ensure appropriate compliance with state and federal regulations and to benefit the students, staff, faculty, and the community the District serves.

During the past year (October 2010 through 2011), the Board of Trustees reviewed, revised, and/or approved five policies/procedures :

- 1620 Trustee Orientation
- 2715 Ethics
- 2410 Administrative Procedure, Purposes and Objectives (Major change)
- 1034 Student Trustee
- 6025 to 5200 Student Health Services

Prior to that, the Board had reviewed and updated eight Board policies between submitting the October 2009 Follow‑Up Report and the October 2010 report.

Evidence

8‑1 Board of Trustees workshop minutes, July 29, 2008

8‑2 Board of Trustees minutes, November 11, 2008, Board self‑evaluation tool

8‑3 Board of Trustees minutes, January 14, 2009, Board self-evaluation tool

8‑4 Board Policy BP1035, Board Evaluation

8-5 Board of Trustees minutes, February 7, 2007, Monthly Board Evaluation/Critique

8-6 Board of Trustees minutes, March 7, 2007, Monthly Board Evaluation/Critique

8-7 Board of Trustees minutes, June 3, 2009, Board self-evaluation

8-8 Board of Trustees minutes, June 9, 2010, Board self-evaluation

8-9 Board of Trustees minutes, July 6, 2011, Board self-evaluation

8-10 Board of Trustees minutes, August 4, 2010, Renumbering of Board Policy

8-11 Board Policy 2410, Administrative Procedure, Purposes and Objectives

8-12 Administrative Procedure 2410, Administrative Procedure, Purposes and Objectives

8-13 Board of Trustees minutes, July 7, 2010, Board Goals

8-14 Board of Trustees minutes, June 8, 2011, Board Goals

8-15 Board of Trustees minutes, July 6, 2011, Board Goals

8-16 Board of Trustees minutes, Agust 3, 2011, Board Goals

8-17 Board of Trustees minutes, November 3, 2010, Board professional development

8-18 Board Development Plan

Action to Address Recommendations from 2008 Comprehensive Visit

Recommendation 9: Leadership and Governance

> ***To meet standards, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees delegate full responsibility and authority to the Superintendent/President to implement and administer board policies and the effective operation of the institution. To improve college decision making and institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the college review and establish ongoing assessment of its college governance structures, processes, roles and responsibilities (Standard IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.5, IV.B.1, IV.B.1.b, IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.b, IV.B.2.c).***

In 2009 and 2010, the College reviewed and implemented changes to the major institutional planning committees to improve the governance structure of the College. Significant changes were made as a result of: Level II Technical Assist, committee self‑evaluations, surveys, and subcommittee taskforce recommendations, and the 2010-2013 Strategic Plan. Three central college committees, Planning and Budget, Enrollment Management and College Council (formerly called the Shared Governance Council) made changes to scope, purpose, and composition to increase effectiveness. A systematic and sustainable cycle of assessment is set in place for the College's governance structures. Assessment information is used to improve college decision-making and institutional effectiveness.

Direct Citation from Visiting Team, November 2010

The ACCJC Visiting Team wrote the following assessment after reviewing Cuesta's documentation:

> "Since the October 2009 visit, the college has taken the recommendation to examine the roles and responsibilities of its college governance structures seriously. The team found evidence that the Board of Trustees delegation of full responsibility and authority to the Superintendent/President made in October 7, 2009 (Board Policy 2430) has started to function in recent months as intended to clarify the role and responsibilities of this position. Three subsequent Board Policy updates in April 2010 and July 2010 now state that the Superintendent/President has full authority to implement policies as designated by the Board of Trustees. The most prominent evidence for the implementation and effectiveness of this delegation of authority was the recent completion of the 2010-2013 Strategic Plan that the Interim Superintendent/President led. The team was also able to identify a number of other changes with summer session offerings, classified staffing, incentive plans for faculty, along with collaborative approaches to project management guided by the Interim Superintendent/President that were supported by the college and the Board. Most telling has been the positive shift by faculty and the Board of Trustees to support the Interim Superintendent/President's intentions of addressing the seriousness of all the recommendations made by the Commission.
>
> A second a major shift by the college in exploring roles and responsibilities has been the transition from the problematic Shared Governance Council to the more focused and functional College Council implemented in August 2010 for the 2010-2011 academic year. This change resulted from recommendations that emerged during a Technical Assistance II visit conducted by Scott Lay, President and CEO of the

Community College League of California, and Mark Wade Lieu, then President of the State Academic Senate President. Subsequent discussions by the task force charged with identifying the role and responsibilities of a new governance council have more clearly defined the makeup and functionality of the College Council. Due to the newness of this new governance group, the team could not evaluate whether it is indeed effective. More time is needed before an evaluation of the effectiveness of this new structure can be conducted.

As a result of these processes, the college also recognized the need to examine and identify roles and responsibilities across all primary institutional planning committees, and has specified this with Goal 1.B in the 2010-2013 Strategic Plan along with additional objectives (Goal 1.A) to review and develop improved review and assessment strategies for its participatory governance processes. This work is currently being coordinated by the Interim Superintendent/President and the President of the Academic Senate, and as observed with the work on the other recommendations, the team observed a new willingness to address the recommendation seriously. The college has implemented the recommendation and resolved the deficiency.

Actions to Sustain Progress

As indicated in the submission of the 2010 Follow-Up Report, Cuesta College established the clear authority of the Superintendent/President to implement and administer Board policies and administrative procedures and to manage the effective operation of the College. The College has also improved decision making and institutional effectiveness by assessing its governance structures, processes, roles and responsibilities and making improvements based on that evaluation. ACCJC recognized that the College met this recommendation, and Cuesta College has continued to move forward and sustain progress on leadership and governance concerns (EV. 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, 9.5).

Furthermore, the College has worked to redefine and update the reporting relationships between and among committees (EV. 9.6). The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on College Leadership (Strategic Planning Subcommittee) has worked with the Superintendent/President and the Academic Senate President to continue efforts to improve college governance (EV. 9.7, 9.8). The Subcommittee has drafted The Proposal to Improve the District's Committee Structure, as described in Strategic Goal 1.B of the 2010-2013 Strategic Plan. The Proposal recommends centralizing two college-wide committees, Planning and Budget and College Council, and defines two conceptual layers of committees, Content Committees and Representational Committees, and establishes the reporting lines, assessment procedures and best practices for committee and governance work. The proposed changes are being vetted and are anticipated to be implemented in Spring 2012 (EV. 9.9, 9.10). Following college-wide approval, a Governance and Leadership manual will be developed and commencing Fall 2012, training based on the manual will be offered to committee chairs (EV. 9.11, 9.12, 9.13).

Cuesta College is committed to continued improvement in its leadership and governance practices. The following actions as noted below reflect that effective commitment.

1) The filling of the Superintendent/President position permanently (November 2011) further reinforces the establishment of the authority of the position.

2) The 2011 Mid-term Report documents the Superintendent/President's continued authority for decision making.

3) Strategic Planning Subcommittee was convened September 2010. Meetings to develop tools, surveys and resources and to establish retreat outcomes scheduled throughout the term, culminating in two college-wide retreat preparation meetings where participants were oriented to the purpose and format of the pending retreat (November 8 and 10, 2010). Readings on the 2010-2013 Strategic Plan and best practice documents were shared with retreat attendees.

4) On January 13, 2011, the Strategic Planning Subcommittee held a Leadership Retreat to assess committee work and participatory governance. Attendees formed six groups to propose six models for the new committee structure. Themes that emerged as a result include: a central committee to which all committee work is reported; the need for integration; separation of planning and budget; the need for chair training; more dialogue about "what does it mean to be a representative on a committee?". Following the retreat, a survey was sent to attendees to gain additional insight as to what is recommended for the new committee structure, and those have also results informed the work in this document.

5) The data results were gathered and informed the Strategic Planning Subcommittee, whose work was set aside until Fall 2011 to complete the Accreditation Follow Up Report. That group met throughout Fall 2011 to draft The Proposal to Improve the District's Committee Structure (current draft 12/15/2011 included here as evidence).

6) Following approval of the Proposal the Leadership Retreat Subcommittee will reconvene to draft the manual and plan the trainings (meetings to be scheduled February, March and April 2012).

7) Annual committee chair trainings will be offered.

8) The Leadership and Governance manual will be assessed and revised on a bi-annual basis.

9) On-going annual evaluation of committees that includes annual goal setting and mid-year and end-of-year assessment will continue.

Evidence

9‑1 [Board of Trustees minutes, Oct. 7, 2009: Approval of Board Policy 2430 update](#)

9‑2 [Board Policy 2400](#)

9‑3 [Board of Trustees minutes, July 7, 2010: Approval of Board Policy 4020 update](#)

9.4 [Dr. Gil Stork's Opening Day speech, Jan. 15, 2010: "The Future of Cuesta College is in Our Hands," pp. 22‑23](#)

9.5 [SGC Minutes, April 13, 2010](#)

9. 6 [Leadership Retreat Exit Survey, Jan. 2011](#)

9.7 [Leadership Retreat Follow-up Results, Jan. 2011](#)

9.8 [Shared Governance Committee (SGC) minutes, Sept. 22, 2009: SGC forms taskforce to assess SGC](#)

9‑9 [SGC minutes, Sept. 15, 2009: SGC assessment and presentation of survey results](#)

9‑10 [Technical Assist II Visitation Report prepared by Mark Wade Lieu and Scott Lay: Oct. 2009](#)

9.11 [Strategic Planning Subcommittee notes, Sept. 27, 2011](#)

9.12 [Strategic Planning Subcommittee notes, Oct. 11, 2011](#)

9.13 [Draft Proposal to Improve the District's Committee Structure (12/14/2011)](#)