EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

Cuyamaca College
900 Rancho San Diego Parkway
El Cajon, CA 92019
www.cuyamaca.edu

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 Cuyamaca College
from October 14 – 17, 2013

Dr. Rachel Rosenthal
Chair

VISITING TEAM ROSTER

Administration:
Dr. Rachel Rosenthal (Chair)
President
Folsom Lake College

Mr. Bryon Bell (Assistant)
Vice President, Student Services
Folsom Lake College

Other Appointee:
Ms. Cathie Browning
Research Assistant
American River College

Academic:
Dr. Celia Cruz-Johnson
Reading Instructor
San Jose City College Administration:

Academic:
Dr. Jeffrey Lamb
Dean, School of English and Foreign Languages
City College of San Francisco-Ocean Campus

Academic:
Dr. Adam Karp
Dean, Fine & Applied Arts
American River College

Academic:
Ms. Susan Murata
Head Librarian
Kapiolani Community College

Administration:
Dr. Arvid Spor
Vice President of Student Services
Citrus College

Administration:
Dr. Gilbert Stork
Superintendent/President
Cuesta College

Administration:
Ms. Deborah Wallace
Associate Vice President Financial Services
CSU Northridge

Academic:
Dr. Ian Walton
Mathematics Faculty Emeritus
Mission College

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT

INSTITUTION: Cuyamaca College

DATES OF VISIT: October 14 – 17, 2013

TEAM CHAIR: Rachel Rosenthal, Ed.D.
                      President, Folsom Lake College

An eleven-member accreditation team visited Cuyamaca College (CC) from October 14–17, 2013, for the purpose of evaluating how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes, analyzing how well the College is meeting the Commission standards, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the status of the College.

In preparation for the visit, team members attended an all-day training session on September 6, 2013, conducted by the ACCJC and studied Commission materials prepared for visiting teams. The team members were divided up by standard with a lead and at least one second assigned to each chapter. Team members read the College's self-study report, including the recommendations from the 2007 visiting team, and assessed the online evidence provided by the College. The team also reviewed Annual Reports and Annual Fiscal Reports submitted to the ACCJC by CC, interim reports submitted since the previous comprehensive review, and Commission action letters for this period. There were no complaints filed with ACCJC concerning CC for review by the team.

Prior to the visit, team members completed two written assignments in regards to Cuyamaca College's 2013 Evaluation Report and began identifying areas for further investigation during the site visit. Team members were also asked to submit requests for individual and group appointments, and any additional evidence required, to the Team Assistant.

Since Cuyamaca College is one of the two colleges in the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District, the two primary leads for Standard IV chapters met on Sunday, October 13. The leads met with the chair to share initial observations, review District-related standards, and prepare for a joint meeting with Grossmont College's Standard IV team. Both Standard IV teams attended meetings at the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District (GCCCD) office on Monday, October 14.

During the course of the four-day on-site visit, the team met with over 80 faculty, staff, administrators, and students, attended committee meetings, attended a GCCCD Board of Trustees meeting and met with Trustees. The team chair met with the GCCCD chancellor, Cuyamaca College President, various District administrators, and the Team Chair of the Grossmont College team. The team attended three open meetings to allow for comment from any member of the campus or local community.

The Cuyamaca College team found the self-study report well organized and thorough, providing appropriate and sufficient information for the team to begin its review. The College was exceptionally well prepared for the team's visit and provided excellent logistical support both before and during the visit. The team's accommodations, both on-site and at the hotel were well equipped, with a large conference table, computers and a printer. College staff members were extremely helpful to team members and were readily available for interviews and follow-up conversations.

To conclude the visit, the team met at length in the hotel's team room on the evening of Wednesday, October 16, to review findings and evidence and to finalize the recommendations and commendations. On Thursday, October 17, both team chairs met with GCCCD Chancellor Miles, followed by individual meetings with their respective College presidents. The visit concluded with the well-attended Exit Report, which occurred at 12:30 p.m. on Thursday, October 17, 2013 at the College's Digital Theater.

MAJOR FINDINGS

As a result of the October 2013 visit, the team recognized numerous notable aspects of the institution:

Commendations

College

1. The team commends the College for comprehensive improvements in communication and dialogue made throughout the participative governance process, especially those engaging classified staff.

2. The team commends the College for fostering a culture of students first, and providing exemplary service to students despite budget constraints

3. The team commends the College for its well-maintained grounds and facilities that promote a positive teaching and learning environment and support sustainability.

4. The team commends Student Services for their pervasive and vigorous commitment to the use of SLO assessment data results that have led to program improvement and the advancement of student learning.

5. The team commends the College on the level of engagement and participation of its students in its governance and decision-making process.

6. The team commends the College for creating an environment of empowerment, as evidenced by the numerous faculty and staff who voluntarily served in interim leadership roles, allowing programs and services to function during times of transition.

District

1. The team commends the Colleges, including both College presidents, the District, the Chancellor, the Governing Board, and the constituency leaders, for implementing strategies that promoted an environment of open communication, transparency, and trust that improved dialog. This includes the Governing Board modeling of a culture of civility and transparency, stabilizing the leadership of the GCCCD, and initiating an evaluation process that includes the Colleges and community stakeholders. These actions led to mutually respectful and improved relationships, thus facilitating collaboration among the colleges and District.

Recommendations

As a result of the October 2013 visit, the team made the following eight recommendations.

Recommendations to Improve:

College

Recommendation 1:
Planning and Decision Making Process
In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends the College clarify and strengthen the review, assessment, planning, and communication roles between and among the planning and decision-making entities to better inform the college community and align the governance decision-making structures with resource allocation decisions (Standard I.B.6, IV.A.5).

Recommendation 2:
Distance Education
In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that student learning outcomes results and student achievement performance for courses and programs offered in a distance education modality be regularly and systematically assessed in the Program Review process (Standards II.A.1.a, II.A.2.a).

Recommendation 3:
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment
In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the College disaggregate Student Learning Outcomes assessment results by instructional modality to support institutional planning and provide evidence of student achievement of those outcomes (Standard II.A.1.c, II.A.2, II.A.2.e).

Recommendation 4:
Course Outlines
In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the College consistently ensure student learning outcomes from the institution's officially approved course outlines are clearly identified on each course syllabus, and are distinguished from course objectives (Standard II.A.6).

Recommendation 5:
Learning Support Services
In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the College provide coordinated planning and assessment of tutoring and learning support services to ensure adequate access to the library, tutoring, and other learning support services, regardless of their location or means of delivery (Standard II.C.1.c).

College and District

Recommendation 9:
Leadership and Governance
In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends the District and the Governing Board regularly evaluate its policies and practices, and revise them as necessary along established timelines (IV.B.1.e).

Recommendations to Correct Deficiencies:

College

Recommendation 6:
Curriculum Review
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College implement an ongoing, systematic review process of course outlines to ensure currency and relevancy for all disciplines (II.A.2.e.).

Recommendation 7:
Staffing Plans
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College assess and analyze the level and diversity of its full-time faculty and staff. It further recommends that the College use the results of that assessment to develop, adopt, fund, and implement long-range staffing and resource allocation plans that will ensure a sufficient number of qualified, diverse, full-time faculty and staff to foster the institution's mission and purposes, assure the integrity and quality of its programs, and maintain services to students (Standard III.A.2, III.A.4.b, III.A.6, IV.B.3.c).

College and District

Recommendation 8:
Human Resources
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the District and the College include, as a required component of the formal evaluations of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes, a means to evaluate effectiveness in producing those outcomes (Standard III.A.1.c).

INTRODUCTION

Cuyamaca College is located in East San Diego County of Rancho San Diego, California, on a 165-acre site. It opened in 1978 as the second college in the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District (GCCCD) with an enrollment of 1,947 students and nine Associate Degree programs and is the primary community college for eastern San Diego County residents. The GCCCD's southern border is Mexico and encompasses several Native American reservations. The name "Cuyamaca" is an Indian word selected by the Board of Trustees to reflect the region's unique history and heritage and has been interpreted in various ways, including "above rain," "beyond rain," and "place where the rain comes from heaven."

The initial plan was for Cuyamaca College to be primarily vocational and accommodate the special occupational programs for the District. However, rapid growth of the adjacent Rancho San Diego community in the 1990's resulted in greater growth potential than was originally planned. Growth in student enrollment led to an expansion of the physical facilities and the scope of educational programs. The goal of becoming a fully comprehensive college became firmly established and has been the cornerstone of the college educational master plan ever since.

Today, Cuyamaca College offers 140 degrees and certificates to its more than 9,000 students. The College offers credit, significant non-credit, and workforce training programs, all based at the College. There are no off-campus sites where 50 percent or more of a program are offered. The College is also home to the privately funded Heritage of the Americas Museum, a 20-acre physical educational facility with a fitness center, gym, tennis and volleyball courts, soccer and ball fields, Olympic track, and an impressive Water Conservation Garden. The College is recognized for its well-maintained grounds and facilities, especially the Grand Lawn, that promote a positive teaching and learning environment and support sustainability.

Cuyamaca College's unduplicated credit student headcount enrollment declined from over 10,000 in fall 2010 to 8,700 in fall 2012 or approximately 15 percent, since fall 2010. This decline is in direct response to the downturn in the economy and decreased funding levels. At the same time, the percentage of Hispanic and refugee students continued to increase. Of note is that the number of refugees from the Middle East has continued to increase in El Cajon, which is already the second largest Iraqi refugee community in the United States.

Cuyamaca College has a sound history of strategic planning based on a systematic and informed process. The College currently functions under its 2010-2016 Strategic Plan, District wide 2012 Educational Master Plan, and 2012 Facilities Master Plan. Over the last several years, the College redesigned its Integrated Planning Model and transitioned to an annual Program Review driven planning process for Instruction, Student Services, and Administrative Services areas. This new model is designed to ensure Student Learning Outcomes assessment findings were informing planning and resource allocation decisions.

In the last several years, responsible fiscal stewardship, coupled with funds secured through the 2002 passage of local Proposition R, a $208M construction bond measure, have provided the College with the resources necessary to construct the Business and Technology Building (Building E), Communication Arts Building (Building B), and expand the Learning Resource Center (Building C). A $398M Proposition V local bond measure, passed in 2012, will help to

identify and plan the construction of future buildings, and address facility, infrastructure and technology needs.

RESPONSES TO PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS

In October 2007, Cuyamaca College underwent a comprehensive evaluation by an ACCJC Evaluation Team. Informed by that site visit and the College's Self Study, ACCJC reaffirmed the accreditation of Cuyamaca College and established six recommendations. The Commission also requested a Progress Report due in fall of 2009, followed by a Focused Midterm Report in fall of 2010.

The Progress Report (later retitled Follow-Up Report) was submitted in October of 2009, and addressed 2007 Recommendation 6: District Leadership and Governance. The Follow-Up Report was accepted by ACCJC in January of 2010.

In October of 2010, the College submitted a Focused Midterm Report on all of the recommendations from the 2007 comprehensive review-with special emphasis on 2007 Recommendation 1: Student Learning Outcomes and 2007 Recommendation 5: Dialogue. In its January 2011, the Commission took action to accept the report and noted that the College had resolved Recommendations 1 and 5.

The following section summarizes the College's responses to the 2007 recommendations and includes any additional work that has occurred since the submission of the 2010 Midterm Report.

Recommendation 1: Student Learning Outcomes

The team recommends that the College complete the process of identifying Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees, identify SLOs for student services, and other areas of the College, and develop and implement methods for assessing student achievement of those outcomes. The assessment results should be used to guide improvement (Standards I.B.1, I.B.7, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.f, II.A.3.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.c, II.B.4., II.C.2, III.A.1.c).

In its January 31, 2011 action letter, the Commission found that the College demonstrated it had achieved the Development level on the Commission's Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness. By doing so, the Commission found the College had addressed Recommendation 1, and resolved the deficiencies noted. This level of compliance has been sustained and increased since 2011.

The 2013 team found that the College has a plan in place to ensure that Student Learning Outcomes will be identified and have ongoing assessments for all courses, programs, certificates, and degrees by the end of fall 2013. The College has made significant progress towards achieving a regular cycle of assessment and improvement, most notably in Student Services, Math, Science, and English as a Second Language through the establishment of a

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (SLOAC). SLOAC was established to broaden scope from Instruction to include Student Services and Administrative Services. In addition, the College's current cycle of evaluation is based upon SLOs and other sources of data (i.e., survey results), which inform program reviews for instruction, student services, and administrative services. These results are then considered by College wide committees for ranking. In 2010, the College created the Academic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (APIE) Taskforce to review and improve programs and services. The outcome was the creation of a streamlined planning model for all programs and services.

That action letter also noted the need for colleges to be at the Proficiency level on the Commission's Rubric by fall 2012. The College's compliance with current expectations is discussed further in the narrative for Standard II.

Recommendation 2: Program Review
The team recommends that the College complete the program review process for all student services and other areas of the College. The College should provide evidence that the program review process evaluates the achievement of student learning outcomes, along with other assessments that yield quantitative and qualitative data for analysis, and use the results of these evaluations as the basis of improvement (Standards I.B, II.1.a, II.B.1, II.B.4).

The team found that in fall 2011, the Program Review process was redesigned for the entire College, including instruction, student services, and administrative services. All three divisions now complete an annual Program Review, and all departments are required to report on SLO assessment results and subsequent changes to improve student learning. Evidence as to the efficacy of this redesign was presented through interviews and the 2012 College Institutional Effectiveness Survey, which indicated that faculty, staff and managers find the College's program review and planning model effective in evaluating programs and services.

The College has addressed this recommendation and has resolved the noted deficiencies.

Recommendation 3: Resources
The team recommends that the College and the District ensure that the number of full-time faculty and staff is adequate to support the instructional needs and student support services to improve student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission of the institution (Standards II.C.1.a, III.A.2).

The 2007 team linked its recommendation to anticipated growth and the attendant need for additional staff resources. Given the ensuing years of state and District funding reductions, it was problematic for the team to objectively determine whether or how the College had addressed this previous recommendation; the situation had changed. For these reasons, the team finds the deficiencies noted with Recommendation 3 in 2007 were resolved.

The team found, however, that maintaining full-time faculty staffing levels is a current challenge for the College, as retirements and resignations have outstripped full-time faculty

hiring. For a discussion concerning the current need for Cuyamaca College to implement planning for staffing levels that are linked to resource allocation and to changing needs at the College, please refer to the narrative in Standard III.A.

Recommendation 4: Communication
The team recommends that the College improve communication with classified staff by engaging in dialogue that contributes to increased participation in planning and decision-making. This dialogue must include formal and informal communication links leading to equally accessible information and contributions by classified staff to plans and decisions leading institutional change and improvement (Standards I.B.1, I.B.4, III.A.4, IV.A.1, IV.A.3).

The team found that communication with classified staff dramatically improved since 2007. As evidenced by the Self Evaluation Report, interviews during the site visit, and employee surveys, classified involvement on shared governance committees, both at the College and District levels, has significantly increased.

As noted in the Self Evaluation Report, the College's primary governance body, the Institutional Effectiveness and Resource Council now incorporates a tri-chair system involving the College President, Academic Senate President, and Classified Senate Vice President. The President meets twice per month with the Classified Senate Vice-President and Academic Senate President, once as a regular meeting and once to preview the Governing Board meeting agenda.

The team noted the marked improvement in levels of engagement and dialogue by classified staff members. The role of classified staff members is evident at both the College and District levels as evidenced by the GCCCD Governance Handbook for Effective Decision-Making, classified presence on District Services Leadership Council, new website for Classified Senate, and classified participation in District and College committees and taskforces.

The College has addressed this recommendation and has resolved the noted deficiencies.

Recommendation 5: Dialogue
The team recommends that the College, the chancellor, and District develop and implement strategies for the improvement of dialogue among the various entities in the District, leading to improved relationships and collaboration among and between the colleges and the District (Standard IV.A.1, IV.A. 2, IV.A.3, IV.B.2).

The Commission found this recommendation was addressed and the deficiencies resolved with the 2010 Focused Midterm Report. The team confirmed that the requisite level of compliance has been sustained since that time and improvements continue. District wide collaboration occurred during development of the Educational and Facilities Master Plans, as well as on the District Accreditation Coordinating Committee. The 2013 team confirmed that relationships and collaboration between the Colleges and between and among the Colleges and District, have reached a positive and notable level.

Recommendation 6: District Leadership and Governance
The team recommends that the District, using appropriate consultation, develop and implement policies and procedures that lead to effective leadership and governance throughout the District. Specifically, the Board of Trustees must
- *establish and implement a formal process for consistent and regular self-evaluation for inclusion in its policies and by-laws (Standard IV.B.l.g).*
- *establish and implement formal policies and procedures for the selection of and regular evaluation of the College President (Standard IV.B.l.j).*

The team confirmed that this recommendation has been addressed, consistent with Cuyamaca College's 2009 Follow-Up Report. The Board has established a formal process for consistent and regular self-evaluation in its Board Policy 2745 and Administrative Procedure 2745. In addition, Board Policies 7111/7112 and Administrative Procedures 7111/7112 were utilized in the hiring and subsequent evaluation of the Cuyamaca College President in 2011.

The College has addressed this recommendation and has resolved the noted deficiencies.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges' Accreditation Reference Handbook (Revised July 2013) contains Eligibility Requirements, a list of twenty one required elements regarding the institution's eligibility for accreditation. The team found that the College met all eligibility requirements.

1. **Authority:** The evaluation team confirmed that Cuyamaca College is a public two-year College operating under the authority of the State of California and governed by a 5-member Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District Board of Trustees. The College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges and is authorized by the State of California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to operate as an educational institution and to offer two-year courses of study leading to certificates and degrees.

2. **Mission:**
   The evaluation team confirmed Cuyamaca College's mission statement was reviewed and revised and approved by the Board in July 2012 and is appropriate to a degree-granting institution of higher education and the constituency it serves. It was noted, however, that the mission statement does not specifically include the offering of degrees. The mission statement, along with the vision and values statement, is broadly communicated to the public via the College's homepage, published in the catalog (online and print), and is posted around campus.

3. **Governing Board:**
   The evaluation team confirmed that the governing board for the College is the 5-member Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District (GCCCD) Board of Trustees. The Board has two non-voting student members and is responsible for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the institution and for ensuring that the institution's mission is being carried out. Its membership is sufficient in size and composition to fulfill all Board responsibilities.

   The GCCCD Board is an independent policy-making body reflecting constituent and public interests in Board activities and decision-making. Board members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interests in the College. The Board adheres to a policy governing conflicts of interest, assuring that those interests are disclosed and that they do not interfere with the impartiality of the governing board members or outweigh their greater duty to ensure academic and fiscal integrity of the College.

4. **Chief Executive Officer:**
   Since his appointment by the Board in July 1, 2011, Dr. Mark Zacovic has been the president and Chief Executive Officer at Cuyamaca College. He is a full-time administrator who does not serve on the governing board of the GCCCD. He has the requisite authority to administer board policies.

5. **Administrative Capacity:**
The team confirmed the College has a 15-member administrative staff that supports the necessary services for an institution of its size, mission, scope, and purpose. The team noted, however, a high rate of turnover of administrative staff and over the past several years, multiple interim administrators. At the time of the visit, the College had recently hired two new permanent vice presidents.

6. **Status:**
Cuyamaca College is fully operational and has been in continuous service since 1978 as the second college in the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District. Since 2007, the College has experienced swings in enrollment due to the state economy and concomitant funding levels. Enrollment increased from 9,346 in 2007 to 10,237 in 2010, then declined in fall 2012 to 8,670. Cuyamaca College serves a diverse multi-ethnic population seeking certificates, degrees, transfer, and personal enrichment opportunities.

7. **Degrees:**
Cuyamaca College offers 73 associate degrees and 68 certificates in a wide range of courses that fulfill program requirements for Associate of Art and Associate of Science degrees or certificates. Cuyamaca College offers an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT), Associate in Arts (AA) degree, and Associate in Science (AS) degrees, Certificates of Achievement (CA), Certificates of Completion, Academic Subject Certificates (ASC), and Certificates of Competence. In addition, the College offers non-credit courses in nine designated areas and a fee-based program.

8. **Educational Programs:**
The principal degrees of Cuyamaca College are congruent with its mission to prepare students to meet personal enrichment goals, rigorous degree requirements and employment standards, and for lives of ethical and social responsibility. The degrees are based on recognized higher education disciplines, represent two years of full-time academic work, are conducted at levels of quality and rigor appropriate to the degrees offered, and culminate in identified student outcomes. Faculty committees ensure that programs are of appropriate length and content and are conducted at levels appropriate to the degrees offered.

9. **Academic Credit:**
Cuyamaca College awards academic credit based upon generally accepted practices in degree-granting institutions of higher education. The College employs AP 4020, dated June 13, 2012, to define credit aligned with the standard Carnegie unit: one semester hour (one credit) is one classroom or direct faculty instruction per week.

10. **Student Learning Achievement:**
All programs at Cuyamaca College have student learning outcomes at the degree and program level, and learning competencies at the course level and are published in the catalog. All course competencies are assessed by instructors and grades awarded based on student attainment of the outcomes. Students are required to attain at least a 2.0 grade point ratio in all the courses required for degrees and certificates. Student achievement

outcomes regarding completion rates, graduation rates, and numbers of degrees are posted on the District Research and Planning department's website.

11. General Education:
All associate degrees at Cuyamaca College require successful completion of General Education courses. Associate degrees require a minimum of 22 credits of General Education: six credits in language and rationality, four in natural science, three in humanities, three in social and behavioral sciences, and six in natural science or humanities or social and behavioral sciences.

In 2010, four new General Education Student Learning Outcomes were developed and approved by the Faculty Senate and the College's shared governance committees. General education course listings are found in the catalog in the categories listed below.

1. Language and Rationality
2. Natural Science
3. Humanities
4. Social and Behavioral Sciences

12. Academic Freedom:
Academic integrity of the teaching-learning process is assured through Board Policy 4030 on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or world views, making clear the institution's commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.

13. Faculty:
The evaluation team confirmed that Cuyamaca College employs qualified faculty with full-time responsibilities for program development, program delivery, and learning support. Faculty responsibilities are listed in position descriptions in job advertisements, and include student advising and professional development.

14. Student Services:
Cuyamaca College provides a range of student services consistent with its student population supporting student learning and development within the context of the institutional mission.

15. Admissions:
The evaluation team confirmed that Cuyamaca College has admission policies consistent with its mission to provide open access. Policies are accessible and publicized online, in the College catalog, in the schedule of classes, and in Board policies. Admission to the College is open to all individuals who are 18 years of age or who have graduated from high school.

16. Information Learning Resources:
Cuyamaca College provides students and staff with access to adequate information and learning resources and services to support its mission and all educational programs.

17. Financial Resources:
Cuyamaca College has funding that is adequate to support student learning programs and services, improve institutional effectiveness, and assure financial stability. The budget is balanced and reflects reserves in excess of 5 percent.

18. Financial Accountability:
Annual financial audits are conducted by externally contracted certified public accountants and all audits since 2007 have been unqualified. The Board of Trustees review these audit reports annually. The financial audit and management responses to any exceptions are reviewed and discussed in public sessions.

19. Institutional Planning:
Under the direction of the President, the Institutional Effectiveness and Resource Council (IERC) systematically coordinates and facilitates institutional planning and program evaluation for all programs and services. All Instruction, Student Services and Administrative Service programs complete annual program reviews that include plans for improvement aligned with the College's Strategic Plan for 2010-16.

20. Public Information:
The College publishes an official Catalog, which includes the following: general information such as official name and address, telephone numbers, and website URL; mission, vision and values statements; admission, eligibility, attendance, tuition/fee and registration requirements; degrees, programs and length of programs, courses; financial aid policies, refund policies; academic freedom; and student-support services, regulations, and available learning resources. The Catalog also lists College policies and procedures; institutional and program student learning outcomes; as well as academic credentials of faculty and administrators and names of advisory committees and members.

21. Relations with Accrediting Commission:
Cuyamaca College has consistently adhered to the eligibility requirements, Accreditation Standards, and policies of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Consistent with ACCJC policies, the College publishes accurate information regarding its accreditation status and complaint procedures, both on the website and in the catalog.

STANDARD I
Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Standard IA-Mission

General Observations

Cuyamaca College has a mission statement that defines the institution's broad educational purposes, its intended population, and its commitment to achieving it. In general, the mission statement sets the groundwork for the College's strategic plan, vision, values, and areas of focus that are central to its integrated planning efforts. The mission statement is reviewed by the Institutional Effectiveness and Resource Council (IERC), approved by the Board of Trustees, and adjusted periodically to meet the needs of the College and the community. The mission statement is widely distributed and appears on the College web site and in program review documents. In this way, student learning programs and services align with the College's character and student population. It is clear that there are linkages between the mission statement, planning, and decision-making.

Findings and Evidence

The mission statement of the institution, "The mission of Cuyamaca College is to serve a diverse community of students who seek to benefit from the College's wide range of educational programs and services." is embedded in the vision, mission and values statements and only becomes effective as a planning tool when considered in conjunction with the supporting assertions that follow, "To facilitate this mission, Cuyamaca College provides a comprehensive range of support services including: outreach and access initiatives, academic and learning resources, student development programs, and multicultural and co-curricular activities" in addition to the Five Areas of Focus defined as: Student Access, Learning and Student Success, Value and Support of Employees, Economic and Community Development, and Fiscal and Physical Resources. A random check of recent program review documents reveals that areas within the institution include both parts essentially as the mission statement. Of note is that the mission statement describes the College's role as providing transfer education, career technical education, general education and basic skills courses but does not specifically mention the offering of degrees.

Cuyamaca College offers courses, certificates, and degrees that meet the student learning needs of the student population, approximately 75 percent of which live inside the District. Courses are available for students wishing to transfer to a university, pursue career and technical education pathways, general education needs, as well as developmental education. The College offers 74 Associate of Arts/Sciences Degrees plus 70 certificate credit programs, non-credit, community, contract education, and fee-based offerings are made available through Continuing Education and Workforce Training (CEWT) (I.A.1).

The mission statement was last reviewed by the College and approved by the Board in 2012. The mission statement is published in the catalog (online and print) and is posted around campus (I.A.2).

According to BP 1200, the College reviews its mission statement on a regular basis. The mission statement has been updated periodically, every three to five years over the last twelve. Beginning in 2012, the IERC committed to an annual review of the mission statement which occurred in both 2012 and 2013 at IERC's annual planning retreat. The institution does comment that they will review the mission statement again prior to the next 2016-2022 Strategic Plan. To fully meet this standard the College should document which committee will review the mission statement and the actual frequency of the reviews (I.A.3).

The Cuyamaca College mission statement is central to all program reviews and is verified by the Instructional Program Review and Planning Committee (IPRPC), Student Services Program Review and Planning Committee (SSPRPC), Administrative Services Program Review and Planning Committee (ASPRPC), and the IERC (I.A.4).

Conclusion

The College's mission statement defines the institution's educational purposes, with the noted exception of awarding degrees; its intended population, and its commitment to achieving it. In general, the mission statement sets the groundwork for the College's vision, values, and areas of focus, and strategic plan, all of which are central to its integrated planning efforts. The College's mission statement connects to individual department mission statements to instructional and student services mission statements. This alignment, in conjunction with Student Learning Outcomes linkages to Program Review and resource allocations, is key to integrated planning and places the institution's mission at the core of planning and decision-making.

The College meets this Standard.

Recommendations for Improvement
None

Recommendations to Meet the Standard
None

Standard I.B-Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations
Dialogue regarding institutional effectiveness is occurring throughout the College. In 2010, the College formed the Academic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (APIE) Taskforce to pursue more effective integration of planning process and promote dialogue.

The College has set goals which are reported every year in the Annual Implementation Plan (AIP), derived from the 2010 – 2016 Strategic Plan. The College utilizes Key Performance Indicators to measure the status of each goal. Reports to College constituents occurred at the spring 2013 Flex Day using the College Dashboard to communicate accomplishments made toward the College's goals.

Ongoing planning is noted in the College's Institutional Effectiveness Model and embraced in the college wide use of annual program reviews. Faculty, staff, and administrators indicated in a 2012 College Institutional Effectiveness Survey that the College's program review and planning model is effective in evaluating programs and services.

The institutional effectiveness cycle is ongoing and encourages annual re-evaluation through the program review format. Results of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) assessments and program reviews are posted online for public viewing.

Findings and Evidence
Minutes from the ASPRPC, IPRPC, SSPRPC, SLOAC, and IERC indicate that the College has a robust, ongoing dialogue regarding the improvement of student learning (I.B.1).

The goals for Cuyamaca College are set forth in the 2011 – 2016 Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan has a yearly timeframe that is spelled out in the Annual Implementation Plan which contains objectives that are addressed through activities that originate from program reviews. The Strategic Plan was developed with input from a broad base of community constituents with outcomes announced annually (I.B.2).

The cycle of evaluation at the College begins with SLOs and other sources of data (i.e., survey results) that inform program reviews. Completed program reviews are forwarded to their respective program review and planning committee and then to college wide committees such as the Technology Committee for review and ranking. The next step is to send the ranked recommendations to the IERC for discussion and ranking before sending it to the President's Cabinet for consideration and potential funding. Interviews confirmed, however, that it is not evident that assessment data is being broadly reviewed and used for improvement at the institutional level.

Institutionally-set standards for student achievement for student course completion, fall-to-fall student retention, degree completions, transfers to four-year institutions, and certificate

completions were established in spring 2013, and are noted below. Standards were based upon longitudinal data provided to the College from the office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness. The team found the standards to be reasonable and appropriate for their student population.

Assessment and progress, both quantitative and qualitative, regarding these specific student achievement metrics as well as other effectiveness measures, are considered in the determination of the College's Annual Improvement Plan for the following year. Institutional effectiveness is also communicated to students and the public through the posting of the College's Student Success Scorecard results on the institution's webpage (I.B.3).

	Institution-Set Standard	Fall 2012 Actuals
Course completion	71%	71.6%
Fall-to-fall retention	40%	47.4%
Degree completions	475	474
Certificate completions	224	242
Transfers to Four-Year Institutions	822	1,363
Job placement Rates		Unknown
Licensure exam passage rate		Unknown

Faculty, classified, managers, and students are involved in the planning process from program reviews to the Strategic Plan. The IERC is co-chaired by the Academic Senate President, College President, and the Vice President of the Classified Senate. The IERC makes funding recommendations to the President's Cabinet. The effectiveness of prior year program review recommendations are assessed and addressed in current year program reviews (I.B.4).

The College collects, disseminates, and posts assessment data on the College's webpage and on the intranet. Examples of posted information include Fact Books, Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC), and the program review data warehouse (I.B.5). Each of the three program review and planning committees ask program review authors for feedback on how to improve the program review process at the completion the program review process (I.B.6).

In 2010, the College created the Academic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (APIE) Taskforce to review, streamline, and improve programs and services. The outcome was the creation of a restructured annual Program Review and Integrated Planning model for all programs and services. It is not evident, however, that systematic evaluation and integrated planning will occur without further evaluation and revisions to the process (I.B.7).

Conclusion

The Integrated Planning Model appears to work well as information flows from the Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative program reviews to the college wide committees for input and additional rankings which are then forwarded to the IERC for consideration. The IERC makes final recommendations regarding Annual Implementation Plan priorities based upon Program Review findings, student learning outcomes assessments, Educational Master Plan priorities and Strategic Plan priorities. These recommendations are then forwarded to the President's Cabinet for consideration and action. However, the information flowing back to IERC and other constituent groups seems to not be as robust. To be more effective, the College should consider methods to more fully inform constituent groups of decision-making outcomes.

The College meets this standard.

Recommendations to Improve:

Recommendation 1:
Planning and Decision Making Process
In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends the College clarify and strengthen the review, assessment, planning, and communication roles between and among the planning and decision-making entities to better inform the college community and align the governance decision-making structures with resource allocation decisions (Standard I.B.6, IV.A.5).

Recommendations to Meet the Standards:
None

STANDARD II
Student Learning Programs and Services

Standard IIA – Instructional Programs

General Observations
The College provides a comprehensive range of offerings of credit and non-credit courses and programs, transfer, general education programs and services, workforce training through contract education, continuing education via community education, and basic skills or developmental programs to students in east San Diego County. The College has a particular focus on providing English as a Second Language courses in order to serve an increasing population of refugees.

Findings and Evidence
All course offerings, regardless of location or means of delivery, align with the College's mission to provide high quality programs and are regularly assessed through the College's curriculum and program review processes. CTE programs have advisory committees who annually review program offerings and make recommendations for improvement and relevance base on industry needs (II.A.1).

The College seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students. The College has reduced noncredit offerings in the face of statewide budget challenges, but still focuses on maintaining English as a Second Language courses to provide literacy skills to a growing immigrant population. Community Education offerings depend on input provided by community leaders who review offerings and propose recommendations for improvement. Grant funded programs include a sustainability plan to identify where programming will eventually reside: noncredit, community education, or credit. Contract Education responds to learning needs of local employers as well as public and private institutions (II.A.1.a).

Through the program review process, departments identify program level outcomes and indicate how they are linked to instruction and College goals, and report on the status of their assessment. The assessment findings inform the department and College's priorities to improve student learning for the following year through the College's Integrated Planning Model. The College meets the varied needs of students relative to the assessment and orientation process to identify students' levels of English, Math, Reading, and/or ESL preparedness (II.A.1.a).

The College seeks to ensure that its delivery systems and methods of instruction are compatible with objectives and course content through regular instructor evaluations, college wide surveys, and departmental meetings. Faculty discuss course objectives and SLOs to determine appropriate mode of delivery, consistent with specific guidelines in the DE Instructions and DE Proposal forms. For example, after reviewing the data, the Math Department discovered that basic skills math was not successful in an online format, and ceased this delivery option. The Math Department still offers other courses in a blended

22

format. Business and History faculty offer online sections to provide greater access and opportunities for success, while Math and Science faculty research indicates that students are more successful in face-to-face classes. Prior to teaching online, instructors are asked to receive training in online teaching and pedagogy and course materials management. The stated process for approving a course for DE delivery modality involves submitting a DE supplemental form for review by the Distance Education committee and approval by the Curriculum Committee (II.A.1.b).

The College is in transition regarding the housing of SLO assessment data and currently there is inconsistency as to where this data resides. Some instructional departments have uploaded their data to a homegrown repository while other departments store the data on their office computers. In order to facilitate and streamline process of documenting SLO assessment data, the District has purchased the software TracDat, and some departments have uploaded their SLO assessment data into this system. Interviews with faculty confirm that individual departments are using SLO assessment data to identify student learning needs and using assessment results to make improvements. However, it is not evident that the assessment data is being disaggregated by modality, and reviewed and used for improvement through dialog or other means at the institutional level (II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c).

The Academic Senate passed a resolution on December 4, 2003 to ensure that SLO was a faculty-driven process. The Self Evaluation Report states that all courses and instructional programs have identified SLOs and that it is anticipated that by the end of fall 2013 100% of active courses will be conducting ongoing assessment. The College has made progress towards achieving a regular cycle of assessment and improvement, most notably in Math, Science, and English as a Second Language through the establishment of a Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (SLOAC). SLOAC was established to broaden scope from Instruction to include Student Services and Administrative Services.

Several examples were presented of how student learning outcomes assessment has informed improvements in student learning. One is in the Biology Department, where results led faculty to revise the assessment process. Another example is in American Sign Language in which the faculty revised assessment of fingerspelling skills. The Math department has used assessment results to modify the sequence of instruction, moving linear equations earlier in the semester to allow additional time for mastery. The Math department has also used assessment results to inform the decision to change from using a spiral instructional approach to a sequential approach for introducing mathematical concepts (II.A.1.c).

The Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District research office provides annual enrollment reports that track key performance indicators such as persistence, completion, and improvement rates that are sorted by ethnicity, age, and gender. Interviews with faculty confirmed that departments hold at least one meeting each semester to discuss curriculum, course offerings, and student learning achievements. Some departments, such as Math and World Languages, meet more frequently to continue this dialog. In the case of the Math department, faculty have used this dialog to implement strategies for improving student

learning. For example, the Gear Up program has yielded improved success rates among disabled students. In addition, African American and non-Hispanic students participating in the Statistics Academy have demonstrated a significantly higher transfer level pass rate as compared to students who completed traditional Statistics (II.A.1.c).

The College has procedures for identifying, approving, and evaluating course and program SLOs. A random review of TracDat and local SLO inventory, however, found that certain course level SLOs have not been reviewed since 1998, while others were updated within the last year. Individual departments are engaged in identifying student learning outcomes, yet from an institutional perspective the SLOAC and curriculum committee lack established procedures to ensure that SLOs are identified in a consistent manner (II.A.2.a).

The role of faculty is central with regard to identifying SLOs. An SLO Coordinator and Accreditation Liaison Officer co-chair the SLOAC. Faculty are responsible for determining competency levels and SLOs. CTE advisory committees are relied upon to identify core concepts to inform SLOs and SLO assessment. Historically, faculty initially redefined course objectives as student learning outcomes. Realizing the difficulty of assessing a dozen or more SLOs per course, and with a revised understanding of the difference between objectives and outcomes, faculty have revised course SLOs to focus on higher level skills (II.A.2.b).

The Curriculum Committee, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, reviews course outlines and programs to validate compliance with District policies and procedures. Each proposal in reviewed for breadth, depth, and rigor, examining the content, objectives, and SLOs. A separate committee reviews requests for Distance Education (DE) approval via a supplemental DE form and reports their findings to the Curriculum Committee. The DE approval form is appended to the course outline of record, yet there is no indication on the course outline that the course has been approved for DE. Through interviews, the team also confirmed that faculty members are aware of the need for regular, effective contact with students in online classes and understand the difference between correspondence and distance education.

Appropriate breadth of programs is assured through general education requirements, and synthesis of learning is assured through the inclusion of critical thinking. As confirmed through interviews with faculty and staff, CTE programs have advisory committees who annually review program offerings and make recommendations for improvement and relevance base on job trends and industry needs. Statewide minimum qualifications are used for hiring faculty and administrators, and the regular faculty evaluation process includes management, peer, and student components. The Articulation Officer works with four-year institutions to verify that lower division and transfer-level courses meet articulation and transfer requirements. The articulation officer also works with Grossmont College to align courses for the benefit of students attending both colleges in the District (II.A.2.c).

The College delivers courses in a variety of teaching methodologies, term lengths, and formats. Classrooms are equipped with "smart" technology for displaying materials

electronically on screen. Courses are rotated between regular and online delivery methods or offered online if there are multiple sections. The Online Teaching and Learning Committee has developed a set of recommended preparations, endorsed by Academic Senate and Instructional Council for use by all online instructors, which includes specific instructions requiring instructors to utilize a student authentication system that provides a secure login and password.

During Professional Development Week, faculty are trained on new instructional techniques that meet the diverse needs and learning styles of students. The "High Tech Center" offers assistance to students with disabilities by providing adaptive equipment to accommodate their learning needs. Basic skills areas participate in the California Acceleration Project, which includes multiple pathways for students to achieve their learning goals. The Student Success and Basic Skills Committee supports innovative projects designed to support students' diverse learning styles. Instructors often change their teaching methodologies based on current research findings or assessment results. Based on evidence from interviews with faculty, one example is the in the Math department where instructors are incorporating a "flipped" learning model, whereby students are held accountable for viewing lecture material outside of class so that class time may be dedicated to meeting individualized student learning needs. Also, World Languages faculty employ methodologies for establishing similar classroom dynamics for focusing on communicative language skills development (II.A.2.d).

As stated in the Self-Evaluation Report and confirmed through interviews with faculty, courses are not subject to review on a regular and systematic cycle. Faculty members in all disciplines engage in a combined annual program review and academic planning process, which is outcomes based. Interviews with faculty and staff revealed that the annual planning documents are scored and ranked using a common rubric and the College website houses all institutional planning documents. The program review and planning processes have been facilitated by the College's adoption of TracDat to review and monitor SLO assessment, but the team noted that the student learning outcomes assessments are not disaggregated by modality. Lack of an ongoing, systematic process to ensure course currency and relevance, combined with the lack of disaggregated results regarding student learning outcomes assessments by modality, hinder the College's ability to implement a process that could more fully inform planning and budgeting decisions at the institutional level (II.A.2.e).

In spring 2013, a taskforce was established to evaluate, streamline, and improve the overall Instructional Program Review process. Recommendations were presented to IPRPC for implementation in fall 2013. It was confirmed through interviews with faculty and staff that the previous process did not include a mechanism for integrated planning at the institutional level. And while the newly adopted program review processes' goal is to streamline and improve the Program Review process, it is not evident that systematic evaluation and integrated planning will occur without further revisions to the process (II.A.2.f).

The World Languages Department is the only area that uses departmental exams. Interviews with faculty confirmed that the department holds monthly meetings and engages in meaningful communication to ensure the effectiveness of these instruments and to minimize test biases (II.A.2.g).

The Self-Evaluation Report states that criteria for the evaluation of SLOs and subsequent credit awards are stated in the College Catalog, as well as in the official course outlines and individual instructor syllabi. The Faculty handbook includes a guide for syllabi and instructional deans' offices maintain copies of all current syllabi. Instructors are required to submit syllabi to the dean's office by the second week of instruction each semester. Through a random sampling of course syllabi in deans' offices, the team discovered that some syllabi do not distinguish between student learning outcomes and student learning objectives (e.g. Geography 120), while others combine objectives and outcomes as a single entity, (e.g. Engineering 200, Biology 130). The College should take steps to ensure student learning outcomes are clearly identified on each syllabus, and are distinguished from course objectives (II.A.2.h).

Degrees and certificates are awarded based on student achievement of learning outcomes. The Curriculum Committee reviews program (degree or certificate) proposals to ensure that course level SLOs map to degree or certificate SLOs (II.A.2.i).

General Education (GE) is a component of all academic and vocational programs and is clearly stated in the catalog. The Curriculum Committee approves all courses for GE through an application process that maps the course SLOs directly to the College GE SLOs. GE areas include the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. Associate programs require a minimum of 22 semester units of GE and two activity classes. GE outcomes are mapped to GE classes across all academic disciplines and address information competency, scientific and quantitative reasoning, analytical and critical thinking, and the ability to acquire knowledge and insight through a broad range of activities and experiences. Evidence from class syllabi, clubs and student organizations, as well as 2012 institutional effectiveness survey indicate that GE requirements for Associate Degree programs promote a student's ability to be an effective citizen and to appreciate and embrace ethical principles (II.A.3.a, II.A.3.b, II.A.3.c).

The College offers 37 major program categories leading to more than 73 Associate Degrees, 50 certificates of achievement, and 18 certificates of specialization. All degree programs include a focused area consisting of a minimum of 18 units. Details for each degree are stated in the College Catalog (II.A.4).

Students completing CTE programs demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards. Advisory committees recommend curriculum changes that enable programs to better meet industry standards and participate in the Program Review process for CTE programs. CEWT also helps students prepare for licensure and certification exams (II.A.5).

As noted in the 2007 team report, the team found that course syllabi do not consistently demonstrate a clear understanding of the distinction between objectives and outcomes. Upon review of course syllabi, the team found inconsistencies in terminology (outcomes versus objectives), definitions, and alignment between the course outlines of record and the syllabi. This inconsistency does not give clear and accurate information about regarding student learning outcomes. The curriculum committee has implemented a revised course outline format, which clarifies the distinction between objectives and student learning outcomes. This new format is designed to enable faculty to more clearly distinguish between student learning outcomes and objectives.

The team advises, however, that student learning outcomes from the institution's officially approved course outlines be applied in a consistent manner on all course syllabi. In order to maintain compliance with Standards into the future, the College will need to ensure that all course syllabi are clear in this area (II.A.6).

Transfer and articulation agreements are made clear to students (II.A.6.a).

When programs are eliminated or significantly changed, the College makes appropriate arrangements for enrolled students to complete their education in a timely manner with minimal disruption (II.A.6.b).

The College presents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently through its catalogs, statements, and publications, including in electronic formats (II.A.6.c).

Academic integrity of the teaching-learning process is assured through board policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs, and making clear the institution's commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge. Faculty members distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline, and they present data and information fairly and objectively. The College establishes and publishes policies for student academic honesty and consequences for dishonesty.

The College requires conformity to codes of conduct for staff, faculty, administrators, or students (II.A.7.a, II.A.7.b, II.A.7.c).

The College does not offer curricula in any foreign locations (II.A.8).

Conclusion
The team verified that the College offers high-quality instructional programs and its programs and services reflect both a breadth and depth appropriate for an institution of its size. The College has made substantive efforts to improve the planning and resources allocation process and ensure that there are ongoing Student Learning Outcomes assessments for all courses and programs and that these assessments are a foundational criterion for planning.

The team also found, however, that course outlines did not always reflect official course outcomes and that not all course syllabi stated the student learning outcomes. In addition, student achievement metrics for courses and programs were not aggregated by modality and therefore not regularly and systematically assessed in the Program Review process.

The College partially meets this Standard.

Recommendations to Improve:

Recommendation 2:
Distance Education
In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that student learning outcomes results and student achievement performance for courses and programs offered in a distance education modality be regularly and systematically assessed in the Program Review process (Standard II.A.1.a, II.A.2.a).

Recommendation 3:
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment
In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the College disaggregate Student Learning Outcomes assessment results by instructional modality to support institutional planning and provide evidence of student achievement of those outcomes (Standard II.A.1.c, II.A.2, II.A.2.e).

Recommendation 4:
Course Outlines
In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the College consistently ensure student learning outcomes from the institution's officially approved course outlines are clearly identified on each course syllabus, and are distinguished from course objectives (Standard II.A.6).

Recommendations to Meet the Standards:

Recommendation 6:
Curriculum Review
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College implement an ongoing, systematic review process of course outlines to ensure currency and relevancy for all disciplines (II.A.2.e).

Standard IIB – Student Support Services

General Observations
Cuyamaca College recruits and admits a diverse student body as outlined in the College's mission statement. The College assures the quality of its student support services through SLO assessment and program review processes and by surveys administered to students (CCSSE) and faculty (CCFSSE).

The College publishes a catalog annually and makes it available in hard copy and online. The 2013 – 2014 catalog lists all of the required categories listed under Standards II.B.2.a-c with the exception of the Academic Freedom Statement.

All College policies and procedures are found online at the College's website. Selected policies most relevant to students are found in the catalog as well as online.

The support needs of the students are assessed through SLOs, program reviews, and satisfaction surveys. Availability of support services to students on campus is comprehensive. The College offers a full array of online interactive services to meet student needs. Information is available online for all student services programs of which almost 70 percent is interactive.

The College promotes student understanding of diversity through campus celebrations and events such as Black history month, women's history month, diversity awareness, and Veteran's week. The Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee creates and sponsors campus events.

Admission to the College is open to all individuals who are 18 years of age or who have graduated from high school. Placement instruments have been assessed for validity by the Research Office. The College recently switched to Accuplacer as a placement tool. Student records are imaged in the Student Record System which is backed up nightly. Copies of the data are stored on campus and at the District office. Hard copies are sent to Iron Mountain to be disposed of in a secure manner.

The admissions process is open to all high school graduates as well as students who have not graduated but are at least 18 years old. Annual unduplicated headcounts for fall 2012 and spring 2013 have hovered around 9,000 students with over 60% indicating that they intend to transfer as noted in a spring 2012 Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) survey. The survey also noted that more than 75% of students also indicated that they are seeking to obtain either an Associate Degree or a Certificate.

The College offers services that meet the needs of the general student population such as admissions and records, orientation to the College, assessment of English and math skills for placement, counseling, financial aid, transfer, and access to a student health center. The

College also offers services to students with unique needs such as veterans, disabled, educationally or economically disadvantaged individuals, and single parents.

Student Services relies upon student learning outcomes (SLO) assessment and annual program review results to improve services (II.B).

Findings and Evidence
The quality of student support services is assessed through the ongoing use of SLOs. By fall 2012, all Student Services programs had reached the level of sustainable continuous quality improvement with most programs having completed two full cycles. In addition to utilizing SLO results, the College uses results from program reviews, point of service surveys, and findings from the CCSSE and Community College Faculty Survey of Student Engagement surveys (II.B.1).

Cuyamaca College provides an annual catalog that contains all of the information required by the Commission with the exception of the Academic Freedom Statement. The statement can be found in Board Policy 4030, and in the faculty handbook. The catalog also contains information on how to apply, fees associated with attendance, listings of courses, degrees, certificates, and transfer requirements academic regulations, statements on academic honesty and nondiscrimination, acceptance of transfer credits, on how to file grievance and complaint procedures (California chancellor's Office, Office of Civil Rights, and ACCJC), sexual harassment definition and reporting process, and the timeline and process of a refund of fees. All board policies and procedures are located on the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District website (II.B.2.a, II.B.2.b, II.B.2.c, II.B.2.d).

The team reviewed the College's procedures regarding the student complaint process, which is made available both online and in hard copy for students. The College website provides the established procedures for resolving complaints from not only prospective and current students, but also community members. Also included on the website are links for submitting complaints directly to the California Community College Chancellor's Office and the Commission. Cuyamaca College had received only one complaint in the last five years and the team verified that the appropriate procedure was followed.

As noted above, in recent years student services programs have utilized multiple sources to assess student needs through CCSSE, point of service surveys, SLOs, program reviews, CCFSSE in addition to data provided by the District research office and reports from the State Chancellor's Office Scorecard and the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) (II.B.3).

Equitable access is available on campus to all programs and services and to most programs and services through the College website. Available services include: Admissions and Records, Assessment, Articulation, Athletics, Bookstore, CalWORKs, Counseling, Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS), Extended Opportunities Programs and services (EOPS), Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education (CARE), The UP! Program,

Financial Aid and Scholarship, Health and Wellness Center, Help Desk, High School and Community Relations, Library, Student Affairs, The Associated Student Government of Cuyamaca College (ASGCC), Student Computer Labs, Tutoring, Transfer Center, and Veteran Services (II.B.3.a).

Students engage in personal and civic growth opportunities with ASGCC and the Inter-Club Council, and through counseling courses such as COUN 140 – Life Skills and Personal Adjustment (II.B.3.b).

Cuyamaca College counselors provide a wealth of general and program specific services to students in spite of funding reductions that have occurred over the past couple of years. Counselors maintain and enhance skills by attending professional development opportunities to address the needs of students. Recent training opportunities include Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Blackboard, Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS), and Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). Counseling faculty have assessed student development and services through program review and data from the 2012 Cuyamaca College Institutional Effectiveness Survey. Counseling program review results led to the employment of an Arabic speaking peer advisor, additional computers for the Career/Transfer Center, and training on suicide prevention and PTSD (II.B.3.c).

The College created a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Committee to increase awareness of and support for diversity on campus. One notable outcome was the creation of a contemplation room in the Student Center for students for daily prayer use. In spring 2012, the ASGCC held a Diversity Dialogue event which focused on promoting social justice (II.B.3.d).

Cuyamaca College is now using Accuplacer for Mathematic and English placement assessment. The College had been using the UC/CSU Mathematics Diagnostic Testing Project (MDTP) and APS Reading and Writing Test for mathematics and English course placement, and the Combined English Language Skills Assessment (CELSA) for ESL (II.B.3.e).

The College retains electronic images of all paper documents and stores them in the Student Record System which is backed up nightly. Backup copies of the documents are stored on campus and at the District office. Paper copies are sent to Iron Mountain for shredding and disposal (II.B.3.f).

Student services programs have vigorously addressed the SLO process in the past couple of years and have now completed two full cycles of assessment and have attained Sustained Continuous Quality Improvement. The team noted a pervasive commitment to the use of SLO assessment data results that have led to program improvement and the advancement of student learning (II.B.4).

Conclusion

Cuyamaca College meets all of the Standard and sub-Standards listed in Standard IIB with the exception of the Academic Freedom statement which was not posted in the College catalog.

The College meets this Standard.

Recommendations to Improve

None

Recommendations to Meet the Standards

None

Standard IIC – Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

The library and other learning support services contribute significantly to student learning and overall student success. Support services include the library, general tutoring center, writing center, instructional media services, instructional technology services, help desk, and the open computer lab. Program specific labs for tutoring and computer resources are provided for STEM, Graphic Design, CAD, CIS and the Cisco lab students. Distance learning is fully supported via remote access to the Help Desk, library services, databases, and for online reference and library instruction. The tutoring and writing center are working towards an online tutoring system to provide equal access to their distance education students.

At least two cycles of assessment have been completed for all areas of learning support and the departments have used the results to plan and implement improvements.

Challenges faced by the library and learning support services include a decrease in general resource allocation, and the inability to fill vacancies or positions that have been frozen due to budget decreases.

Findings and Evidence

The Library houses a collection sufficient to support the diverse needs of its student learners. There are three full-time librarians, one part-time librarian, and four classified staff. Over 90,000 users per year walk into the library that is open 44 hours per week, Monday through Thursday, from 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. The library physically houses 33,948 print titles, 263 periodicals, 77 audio recordings, and 1556 video recordings. The library also provides online access to 27,955 electronic books and 12 electronic databases, 3 of which are streaming, to support the instructional programs with sufficient quantity, currency, depth and variety. All but 11 percent of the video recordings are close captioned, and all streaming video databases are close captioned. Special collections include the Children's collection of 1640 books, the Law collection comprising of 189 titles and 5826 volumes of law materials, and the ESL collection of 234 titles.

The Reserves collection has 1700 print and non-print materials, most of which are donated texts from campus faculty. The library purchases a small percentage of books and DVDs for the reserves collection. The reserves collection is heavily utilized with over 11,000 items circulating per year from 21,000 total items loaned out. According to the 2012 Institutional Effectiveness survey, 77 percent of full-time faculty, 86 percent of staff, 100 percent of administrators and 82 percent of students agree that the resources are adequate to meet the needs of student learning. A separate library survey was implemented in fall 2012 and will be continued annually. Over 93 percent of all surveyed were satisfied with the services offered. The library has 33 computers for student use, but while the self-evaluation notes that all computers on campus have been updated with Windows 7, the operating system on these

computers were Windows XP. The library meets the standard regarding library equipment and materials to support student learning (II.C.1.a).

General tutoring is available from 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday in the Learning and Technology Resource Center for group workshops on a walk-in basis and by appointment for one-on-one sessions. STEM students have access to tutoring at the STEM Achievement Center during the hours of 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday on a walk-in basis in Building H. STEM tutoring is also available as the Aftermath Workshop for basic skills and at-risk students on Fridays from 9 a.m. to noon. The Reading, Writing and ESL Center is also open for one-on-one 30 minute appointments between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 6:30 p.m. on Monday, 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, and from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Friday.

Tutoring and learning support has decreased with budget constraints, and one-on-one tutors are only available by appointment. The Tutoring Center has proactively coordinated group study sessions and discipline specific workshops. This keeps costs at a minimum by utilizing only one tutor for multiple students in one group session.

The library provides a variety of ongoing instruction to enable students to develop skills in information competency. The College's Instruction Librarian provides instruction in multiple formats: specialized instruction tailored to meet requirements for course assignments; instruction for LIR 110 "Research Methods in an Online World" that is a fully online course; Research guides that are developed in collaboration with other faculty; and web and video tutorials that are available and accessible to all students. Librarians work with faculty to provide orientations and teach course specific library instruction focusing on information competency skills. The LIR 110 class is taught by the librarian that focuses on information competency in an eight-week, one-unit course offered every semester for up to two sections. Eight course SLOs are assessed and the results have been used to make improvements to improve student learning. Factors taken into account include trends in the Internet environment and the changing resource formats such as eBooks or streaming video. Faculty incorporate information competency into their curriculum using the library Research Guides. The librarians have also created web and video tutorials containing information about evaluating websites, "Evaluating the quality of information on the Internet," "Evaluating Web Content," and "Guide to Critical thinking about what you see on the Web," and a video on "Advanced Information Literacy."

The library assesses information competency with five SLOs. The librarians have utilized a number of assessment methods including pre and post-tests, a reference desk survey card, and the library survey and formulate the results using their SLO matrix. The assessments measure whether students are able to evaluate resources and to determine the reliability, validity, and authority of the selected resource. Two cycles of assessment have been completed for each SLO. The library meets this standard (II.C.1.b).

The College provides very limited access to online tutoring or other means to receive learning support assistance for distance learning students. The Institutional Effectiveness survey results show that many were dissatisfied in 2012 with Q39 "Access to Learning

support services (tutoring, computer labs, etc.) is adequate to meet educational needs." Results show that 50 percent of full-time faculty agreed, 56 percent of administrators agreed, and 78 percent of students agreed. The College has made provisions to have alternate arrangements to service as many students as possible. The College partially meets the standard for tutoring and learning support (II.C.1.a, II.C.1.c).

The library is open 44 hours a week, Monday through Friday and closed on weekends. Since the last site visit, library hours have decreased from 63 hours to 48 hours, and in fall 2012 down to 44 hours. Despite the brevity of hours, 90,000 students per year utilize the various services of the library. All students have 24/7 access to electronic resources through the library website or by obtaining materials from other libraries via interlibrary loan. Reference service is available in person for 43 hours per week and available 24/7 through Question Point, an online reference query service supported by eight other libraries within the region. Students have access to tutoring and other learning support services that are provided in multiple locations, however many of the services are by appointment only as described in Standard II.C.1.a above. The Self Evaluation Report described only the access to the library, but did not cover whether access was adequate to the other learning support services. The evidence does not show the College has assessed the need for more comprehensive or coordinated tutorial services or developed a funding strategy to continue the services with regularity. The self-study and the site visit confirm these services are heavily used. The College partially meets the standard in providing adequate access to the learning support services such as tutoring and access to the writing center (II.C.1.c).

The College meets the standard for providing effective maintenance and security for its library and learning support services. The Library and other support services are secured by alarm or by key cards. Full-time staff members of the library have a code to turn off the alarm and each entry is logged whenever there is activity. The books and materials are secured by an electronic book detection system. The maintenance of the computers, printers, hardware, software, and the network falls under the purview of Instructional Technology or Instructional Media services, and is part of a regular review and replacement cycle of five years. Book and material maintenance is managed by the librarians and staff, and items weeded from the collection are determined by the Collection development policy guidelines. Security checks are regularly performed by San Diego County Sheriffs, as the District's contracted law enforcement officials (II.C.1.d).

The College participates in a variety of state and regional consortia that are beneficial in affording the College access to shared resources that are significantly more cost effective. There is documented evidence of formal agreements that provide services at a consortium pricing and these services are evaluated on a regular basis. The College meets this standard (II.C.1.e).

The library and other learning support programs use a number of assessment tools to evaluate their services, including pre and post tools, student surveys, reference desk survey cards, program review, institutional surveys, and program specific surveys. Evidence of evaluation is reviewed on a regular, ongoing basis and discussed in the annual program review. Institutional Effectiveness surveys that were administered in 2007, 2012, and 2013 have been

assessed as a basis for improvement. Surveys specific to the Library (2012) and for Technology training (2012) provide additional evidence. Since 2008, the Writing center has assessed their data to show that "students achieve competence in reading, writing, and related skills essential to their work at the college and beyond". Assessment data is used as the basis for revisions and improvements (II.C.2).

Conclusion

The evidence and site visit show that the quality of the library, tutoring, writing center, and other learning support services are very high and there is heavy demand for the services. The College does not, however, provide distance learning students access to online tutoring or other means for learning support assistance.

The College meets this standard.

Recommendations to Improve

Recommendation 5:
Learning Support Services
In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the College provide coordinated planning and assessment of tutoring and learning support services to ensure adequate access to the library, tutoring, and other learning support services, regardless of their location or means of delivery (Standard II.C.1.c).

Recommendations to Meet the Standards
None

STANDARD III
Resources

Standard IIIA – Human Resources

General Observations

The team found evidence that Cuyamaca College strives to employ qualified personnel to support learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The College has standardized hiring practices in place, per GCCCD Board Policies and Administrative Procedures. Their employees are evaluated regularly and, when possible, are given opportunities for internal and external professional development. They make positive efforts to encourage diversity and consideration for Human Resources is embedded into the College's new annual Program Review and Integrated Planning process.

Findings and Evidence

The team found that the criteria, qualifications and procedures for the selection of faculty, staff and administrators are clearly defined and documented. The College verified that minimum qualifications are met as evidenced by administrative procedures and equivalency instructions. The Self Evaluation Report noted that the College conducts compliance training with managers and supervisors, which was confirmed through interviews. In addition, there is evidence that job descriptions relate to the institution mission and goals. Nevertheless, there is a process outlined for performance evaluations of employees through the District's Performance Appraisal Program (III.A.1).

Cuyamaca College uses several key resources to guide them in their hiring processes to assure that the qualifications for each position are closely matched with specific programmatic needs: Minimum Qualifications, Equal Employment Opportunity Plan Document, United Faculty Agreement, Classified Staff Employment Agreement (CSEA) Contract, Administration Association Handbook, Hiring Regular Faculty Procedure Manual, and the Hiring Staff Procedures. The analysis and discussion of need is done through the Program Review process. In this way, hiring needs originate from the Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative units via the Program Review Process. For faculty positions, the requests are ranked by the IPRPC and the SSPRPC, then endorsed by the Academic Senate, forwarded to the IERC, then finally submitted to President's Cabinet.

Faculty hiring committees include faculty, staff and administrators. The Academic Senate appoints subject-area experts to the hiring committees. In order to decide on a well-qualified candidate, screening criteria are based on the job announcement, Human Resources staff verifies that applicants meet the required minimum qualifications, interviews questions are related to subject matter in addition to teaching strategies and methodology. Faculty positions include interview questions and a teaching methods demonstration to assist in determining if the candidates have sufficient knowledge in their subject area to be effective.

Jobs are advertised for a minimum of 30 days and various targeted organizations and publications are identified for posting. Degrees awarded from non-US institutions are screened by the Human Resources staff for minimum qualifications and applicants must have their academic records reviewed by one of two outside agencies. As a safeguard and a means to ensure overall quality and adherence to the process, Human Resources and the EEO Office regularly review all hiring processes (III.A.1.a).

Cuyamaca College regularly evaluates all personnel. The process for evaluating faculty, staff, and administration is clearly spelled out in appropriate union contracts, board policy, and related resources such as the Performance Appraisal Program. They have a formalized notification system to ensure that evaluations take place. When an employee's evaluation summary indicates a low level of performance, the College has a process for developing an improvement plan.

For faculty, the institution has a Tenure Review Committee that is chaired by a tenured faculty member. The faculty evaluation process includes class visitations, peer and administration input, and student evaluations. All information is provided to the faculty member in a summary report. For classified staff, the CSEA Agreement provides policies for evaluation that include the immediate supervisor, a meeting with the employee, and a summative report. Any strengths or weaknesses are noted and employees are given specific recommendations for improvement (III.A.1.b).

Faculty are the driving force behind Student Learning Outcomes and outcomes assessment. Their faculty evaluation has three components for soliciting feedback on teaching and learning effectiveness and there are questions in the student evaluation forms geared to solicit feedback on outcomes attainment. Also, the Peer/Manager Instructor Evaluation has two questions related to learning outcomes.

Through interviews, the team found that it is possible for a faculty member to opt out of outcomes assessment and that the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) does not necessitate faculty participation in outcomes assessment. There are sections in the Student Evaluation questions and the Peer Review questions that refer to student learning, but they do not specifically address Student Learning Outcomes (III.A.1.c).

The institution has a code of ethics for the Board, all employees, and several Board policies related to conduct. The Institutional Effectiveness Survey indicates that the College does an effective job of fostering an environment of ethical behavior (III.A.1.d).

Maintaining and improving full-time to part-time faculty staffing ratios, as well staff and administrative levels, remain as challenges for the College. Though referenced at the time in the context of anticipated College growth, a similar issue was acknowledged in the 2007 Team Report and Recommendation 3, "...ensure that the number of full-time faculty and staff is adequate to support the instructional needs and student support services… " As evidenced in the College's Self Evaluation Report and verified by the team, the College is providing

instruction and services to meet the needs of students; staff and faculty work diligently to fill needs created by retirements and resignations. However, in order to sustain current levels of service, the College must commit to a staffing plan, linked to resource allocation, which addresses the numbers and diversity of faculty and staff.

The College has hired faculty and staff in recent years, but not at a pace to keep abreast with staffing losses. The team found there was no clear evidence of a master staffing plan that reviews and analyzes their needs based on the size and scope of the institution. The assessment of current and near-future needs for hiring should take place on an institutional level and not just through the hiring requests within unit-level program reviews, thus ensuring prioritization within the budget allocation (III.A.2).

The District develops personnel policies and procedures that are posted on the District website. However, the processes that are used to develop them are somewhat unclear. The institution relies on EEO language in announcements, professional development materials, and EEO polices and employment practices. The Equal Employment Opportunity Plan was last written in 2009 and was under revision in 2012. The EEO Plan outlines an Advisory Committee, its membership, a grievance procedure, training procedures, and workforce analysis (III.A.3.a).

The team was able to confirm through staff interviews, that employee records are maintained and properly secured behind two locked doors to ensure confidentiality and materials entered into computers have a security code. Only certain personnel have access to employee files, however, employees are allowed to view their personnel records under the constraints as set forth in Human Resources and in collective bargaining agreements. In addition, the Employment Services Department keeps an official personnel file for each employee that is locked at the close of each business day. Only authorized personnel are permitted access and files do not leave the premises. The institution has clearly stated language about privacy for faculty and staff. Employees must set up an appointment to review their personnel files and must present identification (III.A.3.b).

The institution relies on its mission statement, adherence to the GCCCD Equal Employment Opportunity Plan, the College's Diversity Equity and Inclusion Committee (DEIC), and the District's Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Council to foster an appreciation for diversity. In particular the DEIC is "charged with building a culture of inclusivity…" The institution, through their updated EEO Plan, has focused on equal employment opportunity in recruitment and hiring policies and practices. The report mentions that the College tracks and analyzes its employment equity record via the EEO Plan and uses the information to create awareness among its employees. However, except for the 2012 Cuyamaca College Institutional Effectiveness Survey, it is unclear how the institution assesses whether or not their policies and practices are effective. The Report mentions, "College policies and practices are measured through the efforts of the DEIC." The team noted through interviews that the DEIC is a newer committee, formed in 2011, and "efforts are currently underway to improve diversity and inclusivity" (Standard III.A.4).

There are programs and services at the institution which support understanding and concern for issues of equity and diversity through the College Hour, student clubs, Performing Arts Department events, supported by District's DEI Council and the College's DEIC. The team was able to confirm, through staff interviews and additional evidence provided, that the institution employs "Diversity Dialogues". These workshops focus on a variety of diversity awareness and social justice topics. In addition, the Cultural Competency Student Institute conducts workshop series that gives students an opportunity to prepare themselves for professional practice in culturally diverse settings.

The team noted various efforts, such as a series of professional development activities (Dialogue on Diversity), Safe Spaces, Contemplation Rooms, and gender-neutral bathrooms, are some of the ways in which Cuyamaca College fosters an appreciation for diversity. In addition, the DEIC has presented to the Board of Trustees on diversity (III.A.4.a).

The institution provided a wealth of evidence regarding employment equity. Examples include: a series of Board Policies, commitment to inclusivity in the College's mission statement (Diversity and Social Harmony), an EEO Plan, disaggregated data related to staffing, training on equitable hiring practices, and a series of campus activities designed to create an open and inclusive environment. The disaggregated data on staffing levels between 2007 and 2012, available on the Human Resources website, provides employment information from the State Chancellor's Office, and the EEO Plan includes a Work Force Analysis and a Utilization Analysis. The College has also administered the Cuyamaca College Institutional Effectiveness Survey that includes results that suggest the College is committed to providing learning and working environments that ensure and promote diversity and equity. However, the College's employment record does not show a proportionate hiring of a diverse workforce relative to their community (III.A.4.b).

To ensure that the institution demonstrates integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff and students, the accreditation report highlights increased communication and transparency. In 2009-2010, through the creation of a College Intranet, communications regarding budget forums, meetings with the chancellor, joint meetings with the Board and the District wide Strategic Planning and Budget Council, and the development of the EEO Plan were made available.

The Evaluation Report also mentions, "Dramatically improved communication with classified staff" through increased awareness of staff roles in participatory governance. A grievance procedure is outlined in the Equal Employment Opportunity Plan to address any mistreatment of personnel and students. And, the team was able to confirm that the institution has student discipline policies in place, including due process procedures (Standard III.4.c).

The College allows faculty and staff an opportunity to create their individual professional development activities, but there was no evidence provided that the institution used the results as a basis for improvement. Although the College has a methodology for evaluating

its professional development programs, there is currently no specified budget to support Professional Development activities. Nevertheless, the District and College share responsibility for providing ongoing professional development in conjunction with mandated training. A staff development plan is submitted to the state on a periodic basis (III.A.5).

The College provides personnel with appropriate opportunities for professional development; consistent with its mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs. Cuyamaca College hosts a Professional Development Week prior to the start of each semester. The District provides funding for part-time faculty in support of backfilling full-time faculty on sabbatical leaves of absence. The Classified Professional Development Committee funds professional development opportunities for classified staff. The team was able to confirm through interviews with personnel staff that administrators are required to attend managerial and leadership training events sponsored by the District Employment Services Office, including, but not limited to, sexual harassment prevention training. Technology training facilitates instruction and offers workshops on how to use technology in the classroom. Additionally, there is a library of videos and online training activities that have been approved by the Professional Development Committee.

Both the Classified Senate and the Academic Senate are involved in the development of the annual training calendar. Additionally, there is a Professional Development Committee (PDC) that has representation from all constituent groups. PDC surveys all employees to gather input on training and has developed a new website that gives a definition of professional development, information on the number of hours required, all the necessary forms, and a calendar of events. All faculty are required to participate in professional development. Policies related to professional development are consistent with the College Mission Statement, programming is presented on campus, and academic staff is allocated time to participate in professional development activities (III.A.5.a).

The PDC assesses professional development activities for faculty and staff at Cuyamaca College. The District Services Leadership Council addresses the needs of classified training and development by analyzing survey results and feedback from training sessions. The same is true for training for the administration. They collect and evaluate "flex week statistics." Faculty and staff create individual professional development activity plans that are submitted to the PDC for final approval (Standard III.A.5.b).

Planning for human resources is included in the College's Integrated Planning Model which is based upon the annual program review process. The College, as outlined in the Self Evaluation, has a mechanism for human resources planning that integrates the College mission, prioritizes needs, aligns with course and program offerings and assesses outcomes as a basis for ongoing and continuous improvement. The team was also able to identify evidence that Human Resources planning is integrated into strategic planning (2010-2016 Strategic Plan and the EMP).

The institution's integrated planning processes provide evidence that the decisions about human resources are informed by the evaluation of program and service needs. Despite this integration, data regarding current staffing levels and interviews confirmed that the College is challenged to maintain the faculty, staff, and administrative levels necessary to sustain program and service needs. The College is advised to systematically assess the effective use of human resources at not only at the unit level, as provided in program reviews, but at the institutional level, to ensure the identification and prioritization of areas of greatest current and future hiring needs (Standard III.A.6).

Conclusion
The College is challenged by the maintenance and improvement of full-time faculty, as well as staff and administrative levels to support instructional needs and student support services and keep abreast with staffing losses. Retirements and resignations have exceeded full-time faculty hiring. The College is providing instruction and services to meet the needs of students, with a hardworking staff that is willing to cover additional assignments from unfilled positions. However, to sustain current levels of service, the College must commit to a staffing plan, linked to resource allocation, which analyzes human resource needs based upon the size, scope, and changing needs of the institution.

A similar issue was acknowledged in the 2007 Team Report but was referenced in the context of staffing for anticipated College growth and the attendant need for additional staff resources. The anticipated growth following the 2007 team visit did not occur due to state and District funding reductions. As a result, the team found that deficiency resolved.

The District's Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Council and College's Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee is advised to regularly assess whether its policies and practices are effective, communicate the results of those assessments, and utilize the assessment results to support the College's personnel and promote an appropriate understanding of issues related to equity and diversity.

The College partially meets this Standard.

Recommendations to Improve
None

Recommendations to Meet the Standard:

Recommendation 7:
Staffing Plans
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College assess and analyze the level and diversity of its full-time faculty and staff. It further recommends that the College use the results of that assessment to develop, adopt, fund, and implement long-range staffing and resource allocation plans that will ensure a sufficient number of qualified, diverse, full-time faculty and staff to foster the institution's mission and purposes, assure the integrity and

quality of its programs, and maintain services to students (Standard III.A.4.b, III.A.6, IV.B.3.c).

Recommendation 8:
Human Resources
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the District and the College include, as a required component of the formal evaluations of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes, a means to evaluate effectiveness in producing those outcomes (Standard III.A.1.c).

Standard III. B-Physical Resources

General Observations
Cuyamaca College strives to use its physical resources to support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness in an environment that is integrated with institutional planning. This is true, too, for long-range capital plans. Regardless of means of delivery, the College works to provide safe and sufficient resources. Their facilities are constructed and maintained to ensure access, safety, security and a healthy learning and work environment.

Findings and Evidence
The Facilities Master Plan, the overarching physical resources plan of the College, is reviewed on a regular basis and integrated with institutional planning. It is evident that the College provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support its programs and services. Monthly meetings of the Facilities Operations Committee ensure that campus safety and Emergency Operations planning is discussed. There was no evidence or minutes available, however, to support these meetings in the Self Evaluation report.

Staff interviews confirmed that the Facilities Planning Committee receives regular updates from the Director of Facilities on progress toward completion of various projects. This committee is also involved in prioritization of facilities related projects that originate from the Program Review Process (III.B.1).

Due to budget constraints, maintenance and repairs for existing facilities are a challenge for the College. Interviews with Facilities and administrative staff revealed that the institution continues to be understaffed and have limited funds available to provide adequate maintenance and repairs. The College is commended for its well-maintained grounds and facilities; however, staffing ratios should be examined to assess the sustainability of College's current staffing levels to ensure the College facilities are safe and maintained in their current state.

In order to provide basic levels of service, the Facilities Department prioritizes work based on criteria as outlined for safety and emergency needs at the department level.

A healthful learning and working environment is a priority for the College. Staff interviews confirmed that the College has a Sustainability Plan for construction projects, produces an annual sustainability report, employs a recycling coordinator, hosts a Sustainability Conference, and has several energy reduction projects (including a recent 30% reduction in savings on water based upon building automation). The facilities staff noted that planning for future buildings will meet or exceed current sustainability standards.

All facilities are constructed and maintained to ensure access, safety, security, and a healthy learning environment. Buildings are constructed to meet state standards by the Department of State Architect (DSA) and the Field Act of 1933. All new and remodeled facilities are

fully accessible and meet or exceed all ADA standards and building codes. The Facilities Operations Committee also conducts trainings on emergency preparedness in conjunction with the District Public Safety Department to ensure safety (III.B.1.a, III.B.1.b).

Long-range capital plans support the institutional improvement goals as presented in several of the College's plans, including the Strategic Plan 2010-2016, Facilities Master Plan, Educational Master Plan. With the passage of local construction bonds, facility rental income and funds allocated specifically to the student center, the College is positioned to implement new facilities and modernize existing buildings. The passage of Proposition V will provide some relief to the budgetary constraints and total cost of ownership with respect to facilities.

Cuyamaca College determines the sufficiency of its classrooms, lecture halls, laboratories and other facilities by using data from the space allocation report through the CCC Space Inventory Report, the Facilities Master Plan, the EMP, and the Five Year Construction Plan. The Program Review process is the primary vehicle to plan and to evaluate whether or not facilities meet the needs of programs and services. The Facilities Director confirms that all periodic inspections by city, county, state and federal system are current and performed by the regulatory agencies and qualified contractors. Additionally, there are two main committees related to facilities needs, the District Safety Committee (DSC) and the Facility Operation Committee (FOC). While the primary means of considering the needs of programs and services is through the Program Review process, the institution also relies on other short and long term plans, such as the Educational Master Plan, and Facilities Master Plan.

The College uses the Unsafe Condition Report for faculty and staff to report safety issues. This report is given to the DSC and the FOC for resolution following the criteria available on the website under Health and Safety. They utilize the Act 1000 system for work orders. Additionally, the District Strategic Planning and Budget Council meets monthly and serves in an advisory capacity to the chancellor. The Facilities Operations Committee meets monthly to determine District and construction program staff to coordinate facilities repair, upgrades, and construction. An annual program review systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and ensures review, communication and prioritization of resources materializes, leading to continuous improvement and institutional effectiveness. The planning and review process appears to be ongoing with sufficient dialog and evaluation (III.B.2, III.B.2.a).

One way in which the institution evaluates the effectiveness of facilities and equipment in meeting the need of programs and services is that each division reviews and documents its equipment and maintenance needs in their annual Program Review. These requests are compiled and reviewed by the Facilities Planning Committee. Departments check the results of the Program Review annually. All facilities requests that are generated through this process are reviewed, analyzed, and prioritized by the Facility Planning Committee. Additionally, the College submits, annually, the Five-Year Scheduled Maintenance Plan to the state.

The team was able to confirm that the program review process is the means through which needs are determined for equipment replacement and maintenance. There was also evidence, through staff interviews, that categorical and technology funding is also allocated through program review (III.B.2.b).

Conclusion
The College meets this Standard.

Recommendations to Improve
None

Recommendations to Meet the Standard
None

Standard III.C-Technology Resources

General Observations
Technology resources are adequate at the College and support institutional effectiveness. Several committees are involved in the planning of technology resources, with the Technology Plan 2013-2018 being the overarching plan. The Blackboard Learning Management System provides the platform to support students, distance learning, instructors and course structure. Technology planning is integrated with the mission of the College and the institution's planning.

Findings and Evidence
The College provides for varied and adequate technical training and support through the Help Desk, Library, an email-based service, and tutoring centers. Student readiness, student orientation, instructor preparation, accessibility and faculty evaluations are all components of an effective technology plan as provided by the College. The Technology Plan also documents refresh cycles for computers and equipment. Interviews with staff confirmed that technology needs are being met, however; budget constraints have hampered the College's ability to maintain existing equipment.

The quality of training related to information technology is evident for students, faculty and staff. The College has a full-time instructional technology design specialist. The campus feels that the College provides sufficient technology resources to support its educational programs and services as evidenced in the Institutional Effectiveness Survey (III.C, III.C.1.a, III.C.1.b).

In 2011, the College revised its technology planning model and recognized that systematic plans to replace and upgrade technology and equipment to meet institutional needs was critical to institutional effectiveness. The College has outlined criteria for technology support, including, acquisition and maintenance. Several committees, utilizing a shared governance approach, share in the responsibility of institutional planning and assessment (III.C.1.c, d).

Institutional programs and services are enhanced by the distribution and utilization of technology resources as evidenced in student learning outcomes, student service outcomes and administrative unit outcomes. The Self Evaluation states that technology support areas are evaluated using a variety of tools. The Learning and Technology Resources Program Review helps ensure there is ongoing assessment of goals on an annual basis, with results being reported to the IERC. Staff working in technology confirmed that there is ongoing dialog with administrators with respect to institutional planning. In addition, staff noted that planning is realistic and there appears to be a culture of conservatism due to the decline in budgets and economic uncertainty. It was evident that technology staff are dedicated to maintaining existing technology and equipment (Standard III.C.2).

Conclusion
The College meets this Standard.

Recommendations to Improve
None

Recommendations to Meet the Standard
None

Standard IIID-Financial Resources

General Observations
The College follows a clearly defined budgeting model and the Self Evaluation states that the distributions of resources across the District are integrated with institutional planning. Processes are in place to coordinate all planning efforts and support the vision and mission of the campus. Goals are stated throughout the standard in the descriptive summaries; with the assessment of the goals analyzed utilizing the Institutional Effectiveness Survey.

Findings and Evidence
The College's Strategic Plan 2010-2016 integrates and supports all institutional planning. The budget process is driven by the College's Strategic Plan and aligns the instructional and indirect support services of the College. The IERC provides the framework for the evaluative process, which includes continuous quality improvement.

The institution takes a conservative approach to its budget development and planning. Expenditure requirements and resource allocations, including various categorical programs and grants are represented in the annual budget which is communicated to the Governing Board and the campus through open forums.

The College's financial obligations are included in annual financial planning and provide for current and future year obligations. Dialog and dissemination of the budget is widespread and clearly defined. In an effort to help ensure future obligations are met, the District sets aside five percent of the district's baseline total budget in excess of the five percent contingency reserve held at the college (III.D.1, III.D.1.a-d).

The College depends on state funding to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. Once the budget is established in concert with the College's vision and mission and linkage to institutional priorities, controls exist in the IFAS financial system to ensure expenditures do not exceed resources. As required, the College must complete the annual CCFS 311 and CCFS 320 reports and make sure audit findings are addressed as a part of the annual external audit. During the most recent audit, the District and the College received an unqualified opinion for major programs and there were no material weaknesses identified in internal controls over financial reporting.

The Strategic Plan helps to ensure that the College remains fiscally solvent and there is evidence that spending priorities are thoughtfully considered and communicated. Financial information is disseminated in various ways. The College's website has evidence that resource allocations as well as budget priorities are transparent and presented in a manner that is understandable. Interviews and a review of staffing levels suggested, however, that the College should ensure that decisions regarding hiring priorities are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness in enabling the College to sustain current levels of service. Planning retreats are also a dynamic part of the process to review how the institution's mission and goals are strategically tied to the financial planning process. There

is evidence in presentations to the campus by the College President that show the planning model and how it is integrated to institutional objectives.

Despite the recent state wide downturn in the economic climate, the District and College maintains adequate reserves and insurance. The District and College has consistently maintained a balanced budget and the prudent five percent reserve as recommended by the Chancellor's Office. Cash flow is monitored on a regular basis to ensure payroll and expenditure obligations are met. State wide deferrals force the District to temporarily borrow cash during certain months from the San Diego County Office of Education.

In addition, the College consistently evaluates its financial management with the external audit, program review, and various committees. Audit findings, if any, are addressed prior to presentation to the Board of Trustees with accompanying corrective action plans (III.D.2, III.D.2.a-e).

The College has managed its limited resources effectively in spite of the drastic fluctuations in the state of California appropriations for community colleges. Financial risk is mitigated with the institution maintaining sufficient insurance coverage, monitoring cash flows and setting aside additional reserve funds. Sound financial practices, including maintaining the prudent five percent reserve, and balanced budgets, the College is in good fiscal health (III.D.3.a).

It is apparent that the College exercises sound fiscal oversight as evidenced in the annual audit reports. The College has consistently maintained an unqualified opinion, meaning that the institutions financial statements are sound, fairly and appropriately presented, and in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) (III.D.3.b).

The District and College consistently review short and long-term obligations as evidenced in the Adoption Budget Booklet. In consideration of its long-term liabilities, including the Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB), the Budget Allocation Task Force is discussing the possibility of setting aside funds. Currently, the District and College manage funding retirees' benefits on a "pay as you go basis" and has hired a third party to perform the actuarial studies. The Colleges' other long-term obligations are bond indebtedness. The Vice Chancellor of Business Services provides oversight of the sale and repayment of the bonds and the Citizen's Bond Oversight committee receives the financial information (III.D.3.c, d, e).

According to the Self Evaluation, the College has implemented a default prevention plan for student borrowing to help keep the loan and default rates low. The plan was implemented as a preventive measure early this year so there was no evidence to support how the plan is working to help ensure compliance with federal requirements (III.D.3.f).

The College has made provisions to ensure that contractual agreements with external entities meet institutional policies and goals. The District's Purchasing Department is responsible for

the completeness and of contracts and all purchasing functions. Potential risk is mitigated with use of standard language for contracts established by legal counsel. Purchasing policies are also in place and the District employs the proper controls for the bidding process.

Financial resource management is consistent throughout the District and College, and the Governing Board approves the District and College's budgets. The Integrated Financial and Administrative Solution (IFAS) is the College's financial management system and users can access dashboards to review and monitor expenditures and budgets. The Institutional Effectiveness and Resource Council (IERC) serves as the overarching decision-making group of the campus. Priorities for budget allocations are set in accordance with the institution's vision, mission and goals. (III.D, III.D.3.g, h).

The College integrates financial resources planning with strategic planning. There is evidence as noted in the Self Evaluation that assessment and improvements to the institution are ongoing, meaningful and communicated (Standard III.D.4).

Conclusion
The College meets this Standard.

Recommendations to Improve
None

Recommendations to Meet the Standard
None

STANDARD IV
Leadership and Governance

Standard IVA–Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

Cuyamaca College is a part of the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District (GCCCD) and falls under the oversight of the GCCCD Governing Board. The Governing board is responsible for establishing policies that assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution (BP 2200). The Governing Board consists of a five-member board elected by Trustee areas and two student Trustees, one from each of the colleges in the District. Elections are conducted every two years, in even-numbered years, and terms are staggered so that three of the Trustees are elected in one election and two in the next election (BP 2100).

The College has both a structure and a culture that encourage effective participation of all constituencies. Official participant groups include the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, the Associated Student Government (ASGCC), and the Administrative Council. Participation of classified staff has been successfully enhanced as a result of the 2007 Visiting Team Recommendation 4. In interviews, classified, student and faculty leaders all expressed satisfaction with the level and quality of their participation. The constituency organizations hold regular meetings, post agendas and make minutes available on the District's Intranet. They also appoint representatives to a wide array of additional College committees. Several committees employ the tri-chair concept with classified staff, faculty and administrators serving as co-chairs, including the highest level governance committee at the College, the Institutional Effectiveness Resource Council (IERC).

In addition, collaborative activities are used to maximize participation for specific projects such as the development of the 2010 – 2016 Strategic Plan. Constituents also participate with the Board of Trustees in their special topic workshop sessions. The Cuyamaca College Organizational and Governance Handbook describes both the philosophy of governance at the College as well as operational details. District governance structure is described in the GCCCD Governance Handbook.

For "academic and professional" recommendations that originate with the Academic Senate, the internal Cuyamaca College process "relies primarily" on the Academic Senate. For those issues that continue to the District and Board of Trustees, five areas have been designated for "mutual agreement" with the Academic Senate.

Findings and Evidence

The College has a comprehensive governance structure that encourages all members of the college community to take initiative in improving institutional excellence by participating in

committees or serving as constituent representatives on governance groups. The choice of the Institutional Effectiveness Resource Council as the top-level governance committee serves to emphasize that the purpose is continuous improvement in the institution's ability to promote student learning (IV.A).

Faculty, classified staff, administrators and students all participate in leadership through their representative bodies in the governance process (Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Administrative Council and Associated Student Government). Faculty, staff and student leaders all spoke enthusiastically about their participation, and the positive changes made to respond to 2007 Visiting Team Recommendations 4, 5 and 6. Individuals can serve on these governance bodies directly, or on a wide variety of other committees and task forces.

The District's intranet is used to post agendas and minutes from all committees. All employees can also participate in less structured activities such as the twice yearly convocations. Other examples include the spring 2009 Convocation in which initial ideas were generated for the 2010 – 2016 Strategic Plan, including five core focus areas for the College. There are planning committees in many areas that send recommendations to the Institutional Effectiveness Resource Council (such as Facilities, Environmental Sustainability, Technology, and Program Review and Planning Committees for Administrative Services, for Instruction, and for Student Services). Responses to the 2012 Institutional Effectiveness Survey for Employees indicated general satisfaction with the level of participation in activities that improve student learning and institutional effectiveness (IV.A.1).

The College has a participatory governance document that thoughtfully describes both the philosophy and the structure of participation (Shared Governance Handbook). The handbook begins with a set of principles and then defines the roles of groups that participate in the decision-making process. It also contains organizational charts and a complete list of committees with their charge and composition. Regularly updated organizational charts are also available online (IV.A.2).

Faculty, administrators, classified staff and students exercise a substantial role in planning and budgeting through their respective program review and planning committee (Instructional, Student Services or Administrative). These committees perform annual, critical self-analysis, and through that process interact with virtually every College employee. Their reports are supported by institutional research data and are submitted to the Institutional Effectiveness and Resource Committee. Results of the 2012 Institutional Effectiveness Survey indicate that there is potential to broaden and improve understanding of budget data and financial planning and the Self Evaluation Report states that the College continues to work on this goal (IV.A.2.a).

Board Policy 4020 specifies the role of the College Academic Senate in program, curriculum and course development and insures that the institution relies on its faculty expertise. Board policy states that the development and review of curricular offerings are subject to mutual

agreement with the Academic Senate (as are four other "academic and professional" matters). For issues that are determined solely within the Cuyamaca College environment, general principle five in the Cuyamaca College Shared Governance Handbook states that the President will rely primarily on the recommendation from of the Academic Senate in all "10 + 1" academic and professional areas. The Curriculum, General Education and Academic Policies and Procedures Committees are under the authority of the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate also reviews the planning recommendations of the three program review and planning committees. In addition to the three program review and planning committees, there are committees such as Technology Planning, Workforce Development, Online Teaching and Learning and Basic Skills where members play a leadership role in developing recommendations about student learning (IV.A.2.b).

The GCCCD Board of Trustees has three policies (BP 2510, 2515, 2510) that promote participation in local decision making. College governance procedures are detailed in the Shared Governance handbook and create a structure for administrators, faculty, staff and students to work together for the good of Cuyamaca College. The interaction of this process with the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District and the Board of Trustees is described in the GCCCD Governance Handbook for effective decision making. This handbook includes the vision, mission and values of the District and "a philosophy of participatory governance that engages primary institutional stakeholders in decision-making processes" (IV.A.3).

The College displays honesty and integrity in its relationships with all external agencies and in particular with the expectations of ACCJC. In 2011, all Board members attended an ACCJC Governing Board training workshop while accreditation team members from both colleges attended an ACCJC Regional Accreditation workshop. Prior to the team visit, the College President awarded certificates, hung to form an accreditation "Hall of Fame," to the nearly 150 College faculty and staff members who participated in ACCJC's Accreditation Basics online workshop (IV.A.4).

The Institutional Effectiveness and Resource Council regularly reviews the effectiveness of program review and planning processes, develops annual actionable improvement plans including key performance indicators, and communicates them to the College community as a basis for improvement. Some structural adjustments have been made as a result of this, for example combining committees. The College Policies and Procedures Committee regularly reviews the Governance Handbook and considers the findings for incorporation into the longer term development of the Strategic Plan. Interviews with College staff members confirmed, however, a lack of clarity regarding the roles and responsibilities between and among the planning and decision-making entities of the College. The College should consider additional methods to more fully inform the constituent groups of the role, responsibilities and outcomes of the decision-making planning process (IV.A.5).

Conclusion

The Integrated Planning Model appears to work well and inform the Annual Implementation Plan priorities based upon Program Review findings, student learning outcomes assessments, Educational Master Plan priorities and Strategic Plan priorities. However, the information flowing back to IERC and other constituent groups seems to not be as robust. To be more effective, the College should consider methods to more fully inform constituent groups of the role, responsibilities and outcomes of the decision-making planning process.

The College meets this Standard.

Recommendations to Improve

See Recommendation 1

Recommendations to Meet the Standard

None

Standard IVB–Board and Administrative Organization

Findings and Evidence

The Governing Board recognizes its role and responsibilities for establishing policies that assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution (BP 2200 – Board Duties and Responsibilities, BP 4020 – Program, Curriculum, and Course Development, and BP/AP 6300 – Fiscal Management). The Governing Board also clearly delineates the authority and scope of responsibilities of the chancellor (BP 2430 – Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor). Within the scope of BP 2430, the chancellor delegates to the College Presidents the authority and responsibility to run the affairs of each college, respectively (IV.B).

As part of the Governing Board's response to Recommendation 6 from 2007, the Trustees revised BP/AP 7111 – College President Selection in July 2008 and utilized the process in the recruitment that resulted in the July 2011 selection of the current President at Cuyamaca College. In addition, the Governing Board approved BP/AP 7112 – College President Evaluation in December 2008 and has applied the provisions of the evaluation process to the President of Cuyamaca College annually since 2012. A component of the evaluation process includes feedback from designated employee and community representatives (IV.B.1).

The Governing Board is an elected body that reflects the public interest in its activities and decisions when implementing BP 2200. Once the Governing Board reaches a decision, it acts as a single body in the best interest of the GCCCD. The Governing Board has adopted a policy of election by Trustee area which was implemented in November 2012. The current Trustees are active in their individual professional development as Trustees, support each other and the chancellor in addressing the strategic directions of the District, and act as a whole (IV.B.1.a).

The Governing Board has established policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services. These policies are developed and revised according to the provisions of BP/AP 2410, the actions documented in the minutes of the District Executive Council (DEC), and College priorities are funded according to the District resource allocation formula (IV.B.1.b).

The Governing Board ensures that it is an independent decision-making body and not subject to the actions of any other entity. Policies are in place to support this including BP 4020 – Program and Curriculum Development, BP 4025 – Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education. The application of these policies is substantiated by minutes of the meetings of the Governing Board. Other policies such as BP 2200 – Board Duties and Responsibilities include establishing ethical and legal standards for College operations, as well as monitoring institutional performance and educational quality. The Governing Board's responsibilities include financial integrity and establishing policies and procedures regulating District business activities and financial obligations. These are guided by BP

6320, BP/AP 6340, and BP/AP 6400. Once the Governing Board acts on its agenda items, these actions are final (IV.B.1.c).

The Governing Board publishes the policies and administrative procedures specifying the number of members, governing Board duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures, as well as other Board Policies. These are accessed on the Governing Board website within Chapter 2 of the Board policy manual. The related policies in this chapter are BP 2010, BP 2015, BP 2105, BP 2110, BP 2200, BP 2210, BP 2310, BP 2315, and BP 2410 (IV.B.1.d).

The Governing Board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and administrative procedures. The schedule for the systematic review of Board policies is covered by BP/AP 2410 and AP 2510 and is posted on the District's website. These BP/APs indicate that policies, bylaws, and practices are to be evaluated and revised at least every six years. Updates to the Board Policies and Administrative Procedures appear frequently on the governing board meeting agendas, however, not all policies have been reviewed and updated according to the schedule. (See Parking Policy BP 6750—2001; Classified Supervisors and Managers BP 7260—2001 and Resignations BP 7350: 2001 for example). While the District has been staying current on the CCLC policy updates, it does not follow AP 2410 as written, which defines a chapter by a chapter review over a six-year period (IV.B.1.e).

The Governing Board has a program for Board development and new member orientation which is imbedded in BP/AP 2740. New Trustees are encouraged to attend the Trustee orientation meetings at the CCLC annual Trustees conference, the ACCCA conference, and the Accreditation Institute. Governing Board meeting minutes indicate that two new members of the Board elected in November 2010 attended new Trustee training in February 2011. The Governing Board has demonstrated its commitment to ongoing development by broadly participating in a variety of Board training opportunities as well as integrating itself into the campus and community activities of the College and GCCCD. In addition, new Trustees meet individually with the leadership from the Classified Senate, Academic Senate, District officials, and College administrators. Governing Board membership is governed by BP 2010, the staggering of Board elections and Trustee-area elections is covered within BP/AP 2100, election procedures of Student Trustees is outlined in BP/AP 2105, and the procedure for filling Trustee vacancies is included in BP/AP 2110 (IV.B.1.f).

As part of the Governing Board's response to Recommendation 6 from 2007, the Trustees updated BP/AP 2745 – Board Evaluation in November 2011 and implemented the process in 2012. A standard Governing Board self-evaluation occurs annually, while a comprehensive Governing Board self-evaluation occurs every two years. A comprehensive Board self-evaluation occurred in 2012 and included a written self-assessment, feedback from College and community stakeholders, and verbal analysis of Governing Board goal achievement. The evaluation instrument incorporates criteria contained in the District's Board Policies regarding Governing Board operations, as well as criteria defining Governing Board effectiveness. The Governing Board has demonstrated its use of the evaluation results to

continuously improve Governing Board effectiveness. In addition, Board minutes verify that Governing Board goals are updated each year to reflect needs that emerge from the evaluation process (IV.B.1.g).

The Governing Board has an established code of ethics stated in BP 2715 which was last revised in February 2012. This policy outlines the governing Board's commitment to ethical behavior and indicates various levels of sanction should a violation of the policy occur. Possible actions range from a public statement by the Governing Board in which the Governing Board expresses concern with regard to a behavior, to censorship that prompts a referral to the San Diego County District Attorney. The Governing Board also received additional training in March 2012 on Conflicts of Interest Law which was provided by District legal counsel (IV.B.1.h).

The Governing Board has demonstrated that it is informed and involved with the Accreditation process. The chancellor ensures that the District complies with the Accreditation process, Standards of ACCJC, and other District programs that seek special accreditation. The Governing Board reviewed the new Accreditation Standards by attending the ACCJC Training Workshop in October 2011. In addition, Governing Board members attended a training session on Accreditation at CCLC statewide workshops. The Governing Board has committed to annually reviewing how it meets the recommendation for best practices outlined in "Guide to Accreditation for Governing Board." The Governing Board's involvement in Accreditation processes is outline in BP/AP 3200. The Governing Board receives Accreditation updates through presentations, discussions, and approval of various reports. In January 2012, the governing Board heard a special report from a representative from ACCJC which included training for Governing Board members. Individual Trustees have participated in the drafting of language for Standard IV during the preparation of the Institutional Self-Evaluation. The Governing Board's self-evaluation process includes questions related to their awareness and understanding of their roles as related to the Accreditation Standards, Policies, and Eligibility Requirements (IV.B.1.i).

The Governing Board utilizes the provisions of BP 2431 – Chancellor Selection to guide the selection process for naming a new chancellor. The Governing Board establishes a search procedure that is fair and complies with all regulations, and it establishes qualifications for the position and search timeline. The Governing Board implemented this procedure in 2009 when selecting the current chancellor. The Governing Board transfers full authority and responsibility to administer the business of the GCCCD as provided in BP 2430 which is widely understood by both District and College constituencies. From responses gathered by the Governing Board during its most recent comprehensive self-evaluation in 2012, which included feedback from College and community stakeholders, the Governing Board was commended for its focus at the policy level. The Governing Board regularly evaluates the chancellor as provided for in BP 2435. Criteria for the evaluation is based on board policies, chancellor's job description, and performance goals and objectives developed by the Governing Board in conjunction with the chancellor. The evaluation process is publicly

documented by the action of the Governing Board to issue a second three-year contract to the chancellor in July 2012 (IV.B.1.j).

The President has primary responsibility for the College and ensures that the College implements board policies and procedures relevant to the operation of the College. The President directly oversees the President's Cabinet, which includes the Vice President of Instruction, Vice President of Student Services, and Vice President of Administrative services. He provides leadership to the Administrative Council that includes the President's Cabinet, five Deans, two Associate Deans, one Assistant Dean, two Managers, and four Directors. Authority is delegated to the President's Cabinet in alignment with their job functions and responsibilities (IV.B.2.a).

Working in collaboration with governance bodies through the Cabinet, Administrative Council, SLOAC, IERC and the Academic Senate, the President has established an integrated planning framework that guides the allocation of resources through the College's program review process. The integrated planning framework takes into consideration Student Learning Outcomes assessment and analysis, which are part of the program review. Each unit presents its prioritized resource requests and is given a "score". The President and the IERC review the scores and develops the prioritization for the College's resource allocation plan. Proposed budgets are presented to the governing board in an open public meeting. The President has also discussed the topic of student success with the governing board and this discussion will become a regular part of the board meetings (IV.B.2.b).

Under Board Policy 7113, the Board delegates to the President the primary responsibility to "lead, direct, and supervise the college, and administer programs and operations in compliance with legal requirements and policies." The President has an excellent relationship with the Board, and keeps the Board apprised of changing statutes and regulations. The President works closely with the chancellor to assure the practices of the College are consistent with the mission of the College and the District and aligns the implementation of statutes and regulations of the governing board (IV.B.2.c).

The President serves as tri-chair of the IERC along with the Academic Senate President and Classified Senate Vice President. He also works closely with the Vice President of Administrative Services, to ensure good financial management and accountability. The IERC develops the prioritization for the College's resource allocation plan based on information provided from the program reviews and recommends those priorities to the president. The President reviews the priorities with the chancellor and a final decision is made (IV.B.2.d).

The President is actively involved in organizations locally, regionally, and statewide. He has worked on multiple bond campaigns and garnered community support by inviting the governing board and community to participate in College events that are open to the public. A quarterly College publication, the Cuyamaca Chronicle, is distributed to the campus and local community (IV.B.2.e).

The GCCCD policy-making body is the publicly elected Governing Board whose authority is defined by the California Education Code. Its primary role is to provide oversight and direction to the District. In turn, the governing Board established a Policy Manual for the GCCCD that outlines the process by which policies are adopted, revised, or repealed. This document is readily available on the District/College websites. The governing Board appoints a chancellor per BP 2431 whose authority and responsibility is clearly defined in BP 2430. At the College level, authority and responsibility for implementing board policies and administrative procedures, as well as the chancellor's directives, rest with the College President as provided for in BP 7113. The District delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the District from those of the Colleges by means of the District Map of Functional Responsibilities. In comparing the results of the 2012 and 2013 Cuyamaca College Institutional Effectiveness Survey there was a significant positive shift in level of agreement among all constituent groups that there were clear divisions of authority and responsibility between the Governing Board, District Office, and the College (IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a).

The GCCCD provides centralized services to the two Colleges in the areas of human resources, fiscal affairs, information technology, and research and planning. Since the current chancellor's arrival in 2009, there has been much progress to strengthen the relationship between and among the College and District Services. Annual survey feedback is the primary method of assessing effectiveness of the organizational and operational structure. The most recent survey, the 2013 Cuyamaca College Institutional Effectiveness Survey, indicated that the constituent groups at Cuyamaca College responded favorably as to the degree to which the District was providing effective services. The College is encouraged to employ additional evaluation methods, beyond a constituent survey, to ensure that resources are being adequately distributed between and among the colleges and the District (IV.B.3.b).

The GCCCD currently distributes resources among the District Office, Grossmont College, and Cuyamaca College by means of a resource allocation formula agreed to by the District and both Colleges in 1998. During the state fiscal crisis that began in 2008, the ability of the District to fund Cuyamaca College at the level necessary to ensure adequate implementation of the 2004-2010 Strategic Plan has been challenging. Although current funding allows the College to maintain operations, there was concern expressed by Cuyamaca College constituent groups, and confirmed by data regarding current staffing levels, concerning the adequacy of resources being allocated to the College. This was supported by the results of the 2012 and 2013 Cuyamaca College Institutional Effectiveness Survey which indicated a very low percentage of agreement that the College received adequate financial support to effectively carry out its mission. The current funding model is in the review process at the District level by the Budget Allocation Taskforce (BAT). The BAT is addressing the income allocation formula, budget transparency, improving related communication, and automation. The District should be encouraged to complete this review process as soon as possible in order to produce a revised funding model that has District and College support and will improve the confidence that the process is fair and equitable. In addition, to supplement

constituent survey input, the District and College should establish within the budget allocation model certain evaluation indicators which can be used to assess equitability and adequacy of budgets (IV.B.3.c).

The policies and procedures for the District and College fiscal controls are outlined in BP/AP 6100. The Chancellor consults regularly with the District's Vice Chancellor for Business Services, who is charged with the development, approval, and control of the District budget and expenditures. The chancellor and vice chancellor submit quarterly financial reports to the Governing Board at regular Trustee meetings and to the chancellor's Extended Cabinet meetings. The governing Board reviews and approves the list of expenditures at each monthly Governing Board meeting. Both Tentative and Adoption Budgets are available through the District Business Services website. Year end balances meet state guidelines of 5% of the unrestricted General Fund. Since the last Accreditation site visit in 2007, annual comprehensive audits have been underlined unqualified (IV.B.3.d).

The chancellor delegates full authority and responsibility to the College President to implement and administer District policies and administrative procedures with interference from the chancellor as outlined in BP 7113. The chancellor, in turn, holds the President accountable for all College operations. The President demonstrates accountability through a monthly written and verbal report to the Governing Board, weekly Chancellor's Cabinet meetings, and biweekly meetings with the Chancellor (IV.B.3.e).

Within the organizational structure of the GCCCD, the chancellor and District staff comprise the only organizational entity connected directly to the Governing Board and the College President. The District Office acts as a liaison between the College and the governing Board. Information from the Chancellor's Office flows in two directions. Communication from the Governing Board via the District Office is share electronically by way of the Internet and Intranet.

Through extensive participation on committees and councils, the President communicates with campus and community constituents regarding their ideas, issues, and concerns. The President shares information with the Chancellor's Executive Cabinet, and the chancellor, in turn, shares this information with the governing Board.

In addition, attendance at Governing Board meetings by College administrators, faculty, and staff promotes effective dialogue directly to the governing Board. According to the results of the 2012 Cuyamaca College Institutional Effectiveness Survey, a strong "agreement" response from constituent group supported the "Chancellor and District offices provide appropriate and timely financial information to Cuyamaca College employees" as well as the "Chancellor fosters communication among the Governing Board, College personnel, and students" (IV.B.3.f).

The District and College roles, governance, decisions, and processes undergo periodic evaluation as a result of a commitment to the share governance process. The Chancellor's

Office prepared an update to the GCCCD Governance Handbook for Effective Decision Making 2013. This publication includes the administrative structure and the District and College levels as well as the District committees, their charges and compositions. Committee deliberations, recommendations, decisions, and directives are published and available through the Intranet, as well as formal reports. Results of the annual institutional effectiveness assessments are posted on the District and College Intranet (IV.B.3.g).

Conclusion
The College is challenged by the maintenance and improvement of full-time and part-time faculty staffing ratios, as well as staff and administrative levels to support instructional needs and student support services. The College is providing instruction and services to meet the needs of students, however, to sustain current levels of service the College must ensure that the decision-making structures are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness.

Regular evaluation of Board policies and practices, consistent with the District's published schedule, is also a challenge. Although updates on Board Policies and Administrative Procedures are regularly included on the governing board meeting agendas, the Governing Board does not evaluate its policies and practices consistent with its six-year cycle.

The College partially meets this Standard.

Recommendations to Improve

Recommendation 9:
Leadership and Governance
In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends the District and the Governing Board regularly evaluate its policies and practices, and revise them as necessary along established timelines (IV.B.1.e).

Recommendations to Meet the Standard

See Recommendation 7