

Follow-Up Visit Report

De Anza College
21250 Stevens Creek Blvd.
Cupertino, CA 95014

A Confidential Report Prepared for the Accrediting Commission
for Community and Junior Colleges
This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited

De Anza College

on

October 24-25, 2012

By

Willard Clark Lewallen, Chair
Hartnell Community College District

Alma Johnson-Hawkins, Team Member
Los Angeles Pierce College

Lisa Putnam, Team Member
Moorpark College

Introduction and Overview

In October of 2011, a team representing the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges conducted a comprehensive evaluation of De Anza College (DC), a college in the Foothill-De Anza Community College District. At its January 2012 meeting, the Commission acted to reaffirm accreditation to DC. The Commission required that DC submit a Follow-Up Report in October 2012 addressing three recommendations contained in the 2011 visiting team's report.

A three member follow-up team visited DC on October 24-25, 2012 for the purpose of conducting a follow-up visit on the three recommendations cited in the Commission's January 2012 action letter. The team received the Follow-Up Report a few weeks prior to the October 2012 visit. Team members found it to be complete and thorough; addressing all the recommendations included in the Commission's action letter. The team confirmed that the Follow-Up Report was compiled through broad participation by the entire campus community including faculty, staff, students, and administration.

During the visit the accreditation team held meetings with 27 college staff members and also observed several college governance meetings. These meetings were collegial and all participants provided open, honest, and candid responses to questions and requests for information. The visiting team examined documents and evidence in support of the Follow-Up Report.

The College is commended for providing a comprehensive Follow-Up Report that thoroughly addressed the Commission's recommendations. In addition, the Report provided strong documentation and evidence to support the college's assertions contained in the Report. The college employees are commended for working collegially, collaboratively, and cooperatively to address the Commission's recommendations. The college employees are commended for their willingness to dialogue openly and honestly about complex issues and concerns in an effort to improve institutional effectiveness.

College Responses to the Commission's Recommendations

Recommendation 1: To meet the standard, the team recommends that the college mission statement clearly identify the intended student population for whom the college will provide programs and services (Standards I.A, I.A.1).

Observations and analysis of the evidence: Following receipt of the Commission's action letter, the College Council discussed the recommendation at its February 2012 meeting. At the same time the college research office initiated a review and analysis of the mission statements from all 112 California Community Colleges in an effort to determine how other colleges have identified the "intended student population." A similar approach was taken by the Educational Master Plan Committee in 2010 that resulted in the college reaffirming and updating the mission statement.

A 2013-14 timeline has been established by the College Council for the next review of the college mission and vision statements. This timeline is aligned with the sequence in the college's planning model as established in the Six-Year Planning and Assessment Cycle. The scheduled review will include an examination of the intended student population as part of the overall mission statement.

Conclusion: De Anza College provided evidence that the institution has a clearly identified plan for reviewing the mission statement that includes an examination of the intended student population to be served by its programs and services. The team concluded that the college has met the requirements of this recommendation.

Recommendation 2: In order to fully meet Standards, the team recommends that the college systematically evaluate the newly implemented integrated planning, assessment and resource allocation model. The model should also be evaluated for its effectiveness in improving programs, services and student learning. At the appropriate point in the cycle, the college should then assess its evaluation processes (Standards I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2 and III.D.1.a).

Observations and analysis of the evidence: De Anza College has provided evidence that the institution has further developed its integrated planning, assessment and resource allocation model, including a process by which the institution can evaluate their governance processes. It is clear that the institution systematically utilizes quantitative and qualitative data contained in the Program Review reports in their decision-making processes, as evidenced through the meeting minutes and other documentation of the Planning and Budget Teams (PBTs) – Instructional, Student Services, and Finance and Educational Resources.

In 2009, 2010, and 2011, De Anza College modified its Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) process based upon discussions that took place in the Student Learning Outcomes Steering Committee, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, the Planning and Budget Teams and College Council. These discussions led to the implementation of their current six-year Outcomes Based

Program Review process, which is then supported by Annual Program Review Updates (APRUs) in each of the five years between the comprehensive reviews.

Evidence of the institution's integrated planning and budgeting processes at work are found, most recently, in the current plan to respond to state budget cuts, and the passage or failure of tax propositions on the November 2012 ballot. Reduction plans are not only in place but have been reviewed by the appropriate Planning and Budget Teams. Difficult discussions have taken place, particularly in the IPBT where they are currently prioritizing position/program cuts. Evidence of this work can be found on each of the PBT's websites.

Although this evidence shows the evolution of its current planning model, it is also evident that De Anza College has made significant progress in meeting the recommendation to systematically evaluate its governance and planning model. In spring 2012, the institution developed the Annual Governance Assessment Form, which was then used by all three Planning and Budget teams (as part of a pilot; all governance committee members will participate in this assessment in spring 2012). In the Follow-Up Report, the institution details several examples of how the PBTs improved a program, a service or student learning in the past year, as reported in the Annual Governance Assessment survey.

This assessment form also allows for the PBTs to evaluate whether their processes were adequate to achieve their intended outcomes, and if not, to discuss alterations or modifications that will be implemented. All three teams reported that the committee processes are adequate to achieve intended outcomes. Additional questions on this form allow the PBTs to report back on their use of data, and to report on how the PBT incorporated the program review process into decision-making, such as in the most recent adoption of their respective program or service viability and discontinuance processes.

Finally, as this is only the second year of a six-year process, the institution has indicated a commitment to continue these ongoing assessment processes. The institution is preparing for the comprehensive evaluation of its planning processes in 2013-14. The institution states that at that point, sufficient time within the delineated six years of the planning model will have elapsed, offering the best opportunity to thoughtfully and thoroughly evaluate the model.

In follow-up conversations with members of the Planning and Budget Teams, College Planning Committee, and with the Academic Senate President and Vice President, it is clear that the planning process is both comprehensive and inclusive. It was stated, on several occasions and by several different people, that this process is working well and that everyone involved is taking their role(s) seriously. People are being asked to make difficult decisions, and they are doing so with the integrity; decisions are made based on what will best serve the De Anza College students. Once a decision is made, the groups then look for how to best work with those programs impacted by the decision, or as one person said, deal with the "human side" of a decision to cut someone's program or position.

Conclusion: Observations and analysis of the evidence indicate that De Anza College is engaged in ongoing, outcomes-based planning, assessment and resource allocation. The institution has developed, and piloted for the first time in 2011-12, a formal, annual governance

assessment process that allows for the evaluation of its governance processes, including the groups that are part of planning, assessment and resource allocation. The assessment will broaden in spring 2012, asking all governance committee members to participate. The team concluded that the College has met the requirements of this recommendation.

Recommendation 3: To meet the standard at the level of proficiency by 2012, the team recommends that the college accelerate the implementation of the SLO, SSLO and AUO assessment cycles at the course, program and institutional levels. The college should assess the effectiveness of these processes aimed at improving programs, services and student learning. Additionally, the college is reminded that the standard requires institutions to include “effectiveness in producing learning outcomes” in the evaluation of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes (Standard II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.f., II.A.2.h, II.A.2.i, and III.A.1.c).

Observation and analysis of the evidence: De Anza College received a Commission recommendation to engage in broad based dialogue directed toward establishing a process for learning outcomes assessment in 2005. In response to that recommendation a Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Coordinator was appointed to spearhead the SLO initiative in 2008. Ongoing college wide assessment and unsuccessful planning efforts resulted in the decision to assemble a SLO leadership team to assume the responsibility of developing outcomes assessment strategies. Currently the College is supporting the SLO, SSLO, and AUO initiative by providing resources to sustain three (3) coordinator positions, three (3) faculty liaison positions, and stipends to adjunct faculty.

To further ensure continued faculty participation, the college/district has successfully negotiated with the appropriate bargaining unit and faculty involvement in SLO development is evaluated through faculty peer and tenure review processes. The College also has in place a SLO Advisory Committee that provides oversight and limited guidance to the coordinators and faculty liaisons. The reporting structure of the various bodies was not clearly articulated. However, it was clear that Academic Senate initiated and supports the decision to allocate resources to achieve the goals related to implementing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), Student Services Learning Outcomes (SSLOs), and Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUOs) statements and assessment cycles in order to meet the Commission’s deadline of fall 2012.

The College decided to migrate from the Electronic Course Management System (ECMS) to TracDat to manage and record data pertaining to strategic planning and assessment processes. The change in software further slowed the college’s progress as users needed considerable training before they could begin loading data into TracDat and widespread usage began in the spring 2011.

The College also established and adopted as part of the college’s comprehensive 2010 – 2015 Educational Master Plan that Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycles (SLOACs), Student Services Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycles (SSLOAs), and Administrative Unit Outcomes Assessment Cycles (AUOACs) are components of its Six-Year Planning and Assessment Cycle. Outcomes assessments are now a fundamental part of the program review / annual program plan update and resource allocation processes.

The College provided evidence that faculty involvement in the SLO, SSLO, and AUO initiative is facilitated by participation in workshops, Academic Senate meetings, fall semester Opening Day SLO breakout sessions, SLO Convocations, and department meetings. Several faculty members were trained and they in turn trained their colleagues to write SLO statements, conduct assessments, and implement improvements. There is evidence that the College has engaged in widespread dialogue regarding SLOs, SSLOs, and AUOs through its regularly published SLO newsletter and outcomes website. The Academic Senate provides a syllabus template to faculty that guides them in listing the outcomes statements on their syllabi. The Associated Student Body also requires information on outcomes and assessment when allocating its resources for implementation of improvement plans.

The College provides evidence that documents the work of developing SLO statements for 100% of active courses at the course level with 74% assessed. SLO statements have been developed for 100% of program, certificates, and degrees with 25% assessed. The student services outcomes coordinator reports, but provides no evidence, that SSLO statements have been completed, however it was confirmed that the statements were not at a level at which they could be assessed.

Administrators and the SSLO/AUO coordinators indicate that they are developing a strategy that parallels the SLOAC process. The strategy includes more one-on-one desk side training for classified/service area staff, and training "helpshops". There is an awareness that SSLO and AUO statements and assessments lag behind SLO assessments. Many of the service areas have developed outcomes statements, identified assessments metrics, and completed surveys; however, the results are not provided as evidence.

Conclusion: Administration, faculty, staff and students have demonstrated a common understanding of the plans for completion of the SLO, SSLO, and AUO requirement as part of its Six-Year Planning Cycle. Outcome statements, assessment, and improvements are critical elements in the program review and resource allocation processes for the College. College leaders have stated that the College is intentional in establishing policies and processes that are sustainable.

"Effectiveness in producing learning outcomes" is now evaluated through faculty peer and tenure review processes.

The College provided evidence that it has accelerated its efforts to reach proficiency towards the implementation of the SLO, SSLO and AUO assessment cycles at the course, program and degree levels. The team found evidence that the College is at the proficiency level for SLOs and the college is on track to be at the proficiency level for SSLOs and AUOs. The team concluded that the College has met the requirements of this recommendation.