

**SPECIAL MEETING  
SHARED CONSULTATION COUNCIL  
Thursday, October 7, 2010  
12:00– 12:50 p.m.  
Room 214**

**AGENDA**

<b>ORDER OF AGENDA</b>	<b>OUTCOME</b>	<b>TIME</b>
1. Call to Order	Action	1 min
2. Public Comment		
3. Approval of Agenda	Action	1 min
4. Accreditation Oversight Committee Report – Stavenga/Vess (Enclosure)	2 <sup>nd</sup> Reading	40 mins
5. SCC Sub-Committee Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enrollment Management (Stavenga)</li> </ul>	Information	8 mins
6. Adjournment at _____		

**QUORUM = 12 Members**

**Standing Members:**

<i>Raj Chopra, Co-Chair, Superintendent/President</i>	<i>Mark Sisson, Arts &amp; Communications</i>
<i>Angelina Stuart, Co-Chair, Academic Senate President</i>	<i>Corey Breininger, Bus., Professional &amp; Tech. Ed.</i>
	<i>Vacant, Continuing Ed., Economic &amp; Workforce Dev.</i>
<i>Mark Meadows, VP for Academic Affairs</i>	
<i>Nicholas Alioto, VP for Business &amp; Financial Affairs</i>	<i>Scott Finn, Counseling &amp; Personal Development</i>
<i>Michael Kerns, VP for Human Resources</i>	<i>Jennifer Harper, Health, Exercise &amp; Athletics</i>
<i>Angelica Suarez, VP for Student Affairs</i>	<i>Randy Beach (for Leslie Yoder), Language &amp; Literature</i>
	<i>Lukas Buehler, Mathematics, Science &amp; Engineering</i>
<i>Manuel Lopez, ASO President</i>	<i>Vacant, Social Sciences &amp; Humanities</i>
<i>*Victoria Lopez, Presiding Chair, Council of Chairs</i>	<i>Diane Gustafson, Instructional Support Services</i>
<i>Trish Axsom, Academic Affairs at Large</i>	<i>Terry Davis, SCCDAA Rep.</i>
<i>Irma Alvarez, Center Rep., (HEC, SY, OM, NC)</i>	<i>Andy MacNeill, SCEA Rep.</i>
<i>Bea Zamora-Aguilar, Student Services at Large</i>	<i>Bruce MacNinch, CSEA Rep.</i>
	<i>Patti Blevins, Confidential Rep.</i>
<i>Recorder: Gail Brown</i>	<i>Debbie Trujillo, Classified Administrator Rep.</i>
<i>Guest: Mink Stavenga</i>	
<i>Guest: Ron Vess</i>	

\*non voting member

Approved by SCC on \_\_\_\_\_



**FINAL DRAFT 9/30/10 for Constituency Approval**

**Follow Up Report**

*Submitted to the Accrediting Commission  
For Community and Junior Colleges,  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges  
October 15, 2010*

Southwestern Community College District  
900 Otoy Lakes Road  
Chula Vista, CA 91910

## Table of Contents

### **CERTIFICATION OF FOLLOW UP REPORT STATEMENT OF REPORT PREPARATION RESPONSES TO WASC RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **WASC Recommendation Five**

Description of Progress  
Analysis of Progress  
Additional Plans  
Evidence

#### **WASC Recommendation Six**

Description of Progress  
Analysis of Progress  
Additional Plans  
Evidence

#### **WASC Recommendation Eight (B)**

Description of Progress  
Analysis of Progress  
Additional Plans  
Evidence

#### **WASC Recommendation Nine**

Description of Progress  
Analysis of Progress  
Additional Plans  
Evidence

#### **WASC Recommendation Ten**

Description of Progress  
Analysis of Progress  
Additional Plans  
Evidence

### **DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE**

Alphabetical  
By Recommendation

DRAFT



## Certification of Accreditation Follow Up Report

October 13, 2010

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges  
Western Association of Schools

From: Southwestern Community College District  
900 Otay Lakes Road  
Chula Vista, CA 91910-7299

The Accreditation Follow Up Report is submitted for the purpose of addressing the recommendations cited in the Commission letter and providing a statement of progress on those recommendations.

We certify that there was broad participation by the College community, and we believe the Follow Up Report accurately reflects the facts and events herein described as of September 30, 2010. Facts and events after September 30 will be addressed in an addendum to this Follow Up Report.

Signed:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Yolanda Salcido, Governing Board President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Raj K. Chopra, Ph.D., Superintendent/President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Angelina E. Stuart, Academic Senate President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ron Vess, Accreditation Faculty Co-Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Terry Davis, Southwestern Community College District Administrators Association

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bruce MacNinch, President, Classified School Employees Association

\_\_\_\_\_  
Andrew MacNeill, President, Southwestern College Education Association

\_\_\_\_\_  
Manual R. Lopez, Associated Student Organization President, Student Trustee

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mink Stavenga, Accreditation Liaison Officer

## 1. Statement of Report Preparation

This report is submitted to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges in response to the Action Letter dated January 29, 2010 whereby Southwestern College was placed on probation (see Action Letter). The College has made progress to comply with the initial recommendations (5, 6, 8(b), 9, and 10) required by the Commission for the October 2010 Follow Up Report, and welcomes the opportunity to identify progress to date and provide action plans on areas still in need of attention.

After receiving the Commission's Action Letter on February 1, 2010, town hall forums were scheduled at the Chula Vista campus and each Higher Education Center (HEC) campus to assist with disseminating the findings and recommendations of the Commission to the college community, students, and community at large. The College Superintendent/President, a Cabinet member and/or the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) attended each forum to discuss the recommendations and answer questions raised by the audience. All constituent groups expressed a desire to work together to correct the deficiencies expressed in the site visit team report.

To address the inquiries the College began to receive regarding the College's probationary status, a set of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) was developed and posted on the College website (See FAQs). The FAQs were made available to all constituencies in order for them to provide the most up-to-date information to students.

A committee of key College personnel was convened to assist in addressing the recommendations and findings cited in both the Commission Letter and the Evaluation Report. The Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) worked with the Academic Senate President (AS President) and the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) to identify faculty, staff, students, and administrators to serve on this committee. The members selected represent a cross-constituency of individuals who hold historical College reference, previously worked on the self-study, have prior experience working on Accreditation Teams, and/or co-chaired Steering Committees.

The committee held their first meeting on February 4, 2010 (see February 4<sup>th</sup> minutes) and reached consensus on the following outcomes: 1) committee composition (see Committee Composition); 2) name (see February 4 meeting minutes); 3) purpose, mission and vision statement (see Committee Composition vision statement); 4) formation of work groups to address the ten (10) individual ACCJC recommendations (see Work group composition); and 5) preparation of the meeting schedule (see Weekly Activity Calendar).

The mission and vision statement of the Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC) are as follows:

**Mission:** Oversight and coordination of Southwestern College's ongoing accreditation process; development and review of responses to ACCJC recommendations and action plans.

**Vision:** Achieve ongoing reaffirmation of accreditation.\*

\*This vision statement was subsequently changed to read as follows:

*Ensure that the college is meeting the AACJC Standards to achieve ongoing reaffirmation of accreditation.*

The composition of the AOC includes Co-Leads for each respective work group and work group members representing all constituencies. To ensure broad representation, and to start rebuilding an environment of trust and respect, each consistency group was asked to appoint its own representatives. The initial members were as follows (full titles of members are listed in the appendices):

Mink Stavenga, Accreditation Liaison Officer  
(AOC Co-Chair)

Valerie Goodwin-Colbert (Academic Senate)

Angelina E. Stuart (Academic Senate)

Philip Lopez (faculty)

Michele Fenlon (classified)

Kathy Tyner (administrator)

Randy Beach (faculty)

Margie Stinson (faculty, SLOs)

Angelica Suarez (administrator)

Nicholas Alioto (administrator)

Gilbert Songalia (student)

Ron Vess, Faculty

(AOC Co-Chair)

Diane Gustafson (faculty)

Alexis Davidson (faculty)

Mia McClellan (administrator)

Bruce MacNintch (classified)

Terry Davis (administrator)

Kimberlie Rader (confidential)

Marsha Rutter (adjunct faculty)

Mark Meadows (administrator)

Michael Kerns (administrator)

Veronica Burton (faculty)

There has been some change in composition of the membership as new leaders of the constituent groups came on board for the 2010–2011 Academic Year. A list of current members of the AOC is also shown in the appendices.

The AOC formed ten work groups to address the ten recommendations identified in the Commission's Action Letter. Co-Leads and members for each work group were identified by the AOC, and faculty, staff, administrators, and students were invited to join any work group in which they had interest in participating. Work group Co-Leads dialogued within their work groups to interpret the recommendation, plan strategy, and develop a meeting schedule and timeline. In addition, the Accreditation Office prepared guides for the work groups to follow as they addressed each recommendation. (See Work group guides).

The Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC) was later recognized as an official standing committee of the College and moved under the Shared Consultation Council (SCC) on February 18, 2010 (See SCC agenda and minutes), the College's shared planning and decision making committee. A process for recommendation, communication, and approval was developed by the members (See approval flow chart & operating procedures). This approval process included the work groups, AOC, SCC, President's Cabinet, and finally the Governing Board where required. The Governing Board's role in the approval process was to act as a policy-making body. Defining a process, as well as a clear path to consultation, proved beneficial in addressing shared planning and decision making.

On March 1, 2010, a special Governing Board meeting was scheduled to: 1) update the Board on the findings of the Accrediting Commission and 2) to describe the plan and timeline developed by College leaders to address each of the recommendations by their respective due dates. The update was provided by the ALO and Faculty Co-Chair (see March presentation). Subsequent status reports were provided to the Governing Board by the AOC Co-Chairs at a special board

meeting on April 28, 2010 (see April presentation), as well as regular board meetings on July 14, 2010 (see July presentation) and September 8, 2010 (See September presentation). During the July Governing Board meeting Board members requested a status report of our response to Recommendation 6 regarding Technology. The Co-Lead of Work Group 6, the Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs, provided the update on August 11, 2010 (see August WG6 presentation). In addition, a one-hour Accreditation Presentation was made to the entire college during the Opening Day Program (see OD Presentation) on August 16, 2010. The AOC Co-Chairs presented a final draft of the Follow Up Report to the Governing Board on September 29, 2010.

In an effort to create transparent processes and communications, all AOC minutes and agendas were posted to the Outlook Email system (Public Folders-see screen shot), the College website (see screen shot), and BlackBoard (see screen shot). The Superintendent/President provided accreditation updates to the college community and the community-at-large (See Updates). The Governing Board highlighted the accreditation progress and accomplishments in its monthly GB News (see Newsletters). The ALO and the Community & Media Relations Office (see communications) prepared a variety of communiqués to keep the college community and community-at-large informed and up-to-date. Constituencies were updated and informed through their respective representatives on the work groups and the AOC. Effort was made to use the College website as a central location in which to post all communications, reports, newsletters, and minutes in order to make information accessible to both internal and external parties.

The meetings of the AOC were occasions for robust dialogue. Bringing everyone to the table to work through issues brought constituency points-of-view to the forefront. Although agreement was sometimes difficult to reach, and topics were sometimes brought back for further discussion, many committee members exhibited commitment to the process. The AOC met throughout the spring semester on the second, third, and fourth Wednesdays of each month.

It became evident to the AOC that all of the Commission's recommendations, even though addressed individually, are interdependent. It was determined the review of the mission statement, integrated planning, and program review should be addressed together by combining Work Groups 1, 2, and 3. Details on these activities will be provided in the March 15, 2011 Follow Up Report.

The ALO recognized the need to continue AOC meetings during the summer session when most faculty would be off-contract (see SU/10 Agendas and Minutes). Funding was identified and provided for faculty to participate in the AOC meetings during the summer. AOC summer meetings were conducted twice a month (AOC meeting minutes) so that the rate of progress could be maintained.

The individual work groups assigned to address the recommendations due by October 15, 2010 submitted their draft reports on June 23, 2010. These drafts were initially distributed among the AOC members for input and comments. The drafts were constantly updated as progress was made and a Pre-Final Draft of this Follow Up Report was eventually distributed to the entire college community on August 25, 2010.

The Accreditation Office was responsible for forwarding all input to each work group Co-Lead for discussion and/or inclusion. The community members were encouraged to direct their comments and suggestions to the Accreditation Office.

The timelines for final completion and approval of the report are attached (See timeline). The full Governing Board reviewed the content of this Follow Up Report at a special Governing Board meeting on September 29, 2010. After final edits are completed and supporting evidence is collected the Governing Board President and the Superintendent/President are expected to provide their final approvals on October 13, 2010.

Throughout the process of preparing this report the ALO consulted regularly with ACCJC staff for clarification and direction. The Accreditation Oversight Committee Co-Chairs held regular meetings with the Superintendent/President to seek advice, communicate progress, and solicit input (See agendas). In addition, consultants from Professional Personnel Leasing, Inc. (PPL) were retained in early September to provide suggestions and advice regarding this Follow Up Report, and to provide accreditation assistance to the College as it works to resolve all ten recommendations by March 15, 2011.

---

Raj K. Chopra, Ph.D.  
Superintendent/President, Southwestern College

**Evidence:**

AOC Minutes: February 4, 2010  
AOC Committee Composition  
AOC Vision Statement  
AOC Work Group Composition  
AOC Facilities Weekly Activity Calendar  
AOC Work Group Guides  
SCC Agenda and Minutes: February 18, 2010  
AOC Process and Approval Chart  
AOC FAQs  
GB March Presentation  
GB April Presentation  
GB July Presentation  
GB September Presentation  
GB August Work Group 6 Presentation  
AOC Opening Day Presentation  
Public Folders (AOC)  
SWCCD Accreditation Link  
SWCCD Black Board AOC Link  
Dr. Chopra Community Updates  
GB Newsletters



Outreach  
General

AOC Agendas and Minutes: Summer Meetings  
Follow Up Report Project Timeline  
Dr. Chopra Agendas  
GB Agenda approving PPL Contract

DRAFT

## 2. Responses to Team Recommendations

The College's response to the Accrediting Commission Recommendations follows below.

### a. Recommendation Five:

*The team recommends that, in order to comply with the Commission's policies on distance learning and substantive change, the college submit a substantive change report for those programs that currently offer more than 50 percent of a program through distance education [Eligibility Requirement 21].*

To assist in addressing Recommendation 5, Southwestern College's Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC), established Work Group 5 representing a cross-constituency from all sectors of the campus community.

Work Group (5) Membership:

Eva Hedger (administration)  
Viara Giraffe (administration)  
Michele Fenlon (classified)  
Diane Gustafson (faculty)

Mink Stavenga (administration)  
Mary Wylie (administration)  
Lisa Ballesteros (faculty)  
Gloria Castro (classified)

The work group was charged with researching, preparing, and submitting a Substantive Change Proposal for Distance Education. The Proposal was submitted to the Commission's Substantive Change Committee for review at its June meeting. On July 13, 2010, the College received confirmation that the Proposal had been accepted.

#### **Relevant Excerpts from the Evaluation Report:**

*The college was not able to provide documentation that a substantive change proposal to allow more than 50 percent of a program using distance learning had been submitted and approved despite having such a program in place.*

The College was not in compliance with Eligibility Requirement 21 cited below:

#### **Commission Eligibility Requirement 21:**

*The institution provides assurance that it adheres to the eligibility requirements and accreditation standards and policies of the Commission, describes itself in identical terms to all its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accredited status, and agrees to disclose information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities. The institution will comply with Commission requests, directives, decisions, and policies, and will make complete, accurate, and honest disclosure. Failure to do so is sufficient reason, in and of itself, for the Commission to impose a sanction, or to deny or revoke candidacy or accreditation.*

#### **Resolution of Recommendation 5:**

A Substantive Change Proposal was submitted on May 5, 2010. The College received confirmation that the substantive change was accepted by the Commission (See ACCJC letter of

acceptance). Based on the acceptance of the Substantive Change Proposal, full compliance with this recommendation has been achieved.

**Description of Progress:**

During the Site Visit Team exit interview, the College learned that it was considered to be out of compliance with one of the Accrediting Commission's eligibility requirements. ACCJC Accredited Colleges are required to submit for approval a Substantive Change Proposal in advance of offering 50 percent of a program using a distance learning mode of delivery.

Southwestern College responded promptly to the comments from the visiting accreditation team during the exit interview. On October 21, 2009 (See screen shot of calendar) the ALO met with the Self Study Accreditation Steering Committee Co-Chairs and other key personnel to develop a strategy for submitting a Substantive Change Proposal to the Commission. A work group was identified to explore the courses and programs that were offered at 50 percent using a distance learning mode of delivery.

During the period leading up to the Commission's Action Letter, the Office of Instructional Support Services (ISS) conducted research and prepared data to submit for the required Substantive Change Proposal. A complete audit was conducted of all distance education programs offered by Southwestern College. In addition, the College examined the curriculum approval process which applies to all College locations.

After the Commission's Action Letter was received in early February, the Substantive Change work group was assigned Recommendation 5 and became an official work group of the Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC). Work Group 5 was tasked with addressing the submission of a Substantive Change Proposal for Distance Education. The preliminary report was completed in March 2010 and was distributed to the college constituencies for input and review. After constituency feedback was reviewed and incorporated by Work Group 5, the draft proposal was then submitted to the AOC for review and approval and to the campus Shared Consultation Council for input and approval as well. After receiving AOC and SCC approval, the ALO submitted the draft report to representatives from WASC. Their feedback and recommendations were incorporated into the proposal. The report was completed and finalized in May 2010 and submitted to the Accrediting Commission's Substantive Change Committee on May 5, 2010 for their June meeting (See Substantive Change Report).

**Analysis of Results:**

The College was notified on July 13, 2010 with an official letter of confirmation that the Commission had approved its Substantive Change Proposal (See Commission Letter).

The College will continue to monitor programs to preclude such substantive change violations from happening in the future. The Office of Instructional Support Services and the Curriculum Committee have been tasked with the monitoring responsibilities.

## **Additional Plans:**

Commencing with the 2010/2011 academic year, Southwestern College's Office of Instructional Support Services (ISS) will review new Distance Education Course Proposals and make a determination whether or not the action being requested would potentially require that a Substantive Change Proposal be filed with the ACCJC. If a Substantive Change Proposal is triggered, the Office of ISS will inform the Curriculum Committee (CC) of this situation and ask that the CC take this into consideration as it reviews the new Distance Education course. If the CC approves the new Distance Education course, the Office of ISS will work with the program generating the new Distance Education course to make an assessment whether or not the program can adequately meet the requirements of an ACCJC Substantive Change Proposal. If it is determined that the program proposing to offer 50% of the units via Distance Education is ready to submit a Substantive Change Proposal, it will be prepared by the Office of ISS and presented to the ACCJC for approval.

As per the Substantive Change Committee's recommendation, any future Substantive Change Proposals related to distance education will contain a comparative analysis of face-to-face and distance education student success and retention. Future proposals will also address the ability of new distance education programs to provide equivalent levels of student services as those provided in the face-to-face program offerings.

### **Evidence:**

- Substantive Change Proposal to add courses that constitute 50% or more of a program offered through a mode of distance education or electronic delivery, submitted for approval on May 5, 2010.
- ACCJC Substantive Change Committee Approval Letter.

### **b. Recommendation Six:**

*As previously identified in the 1996 and 2003 ACCJC WASC Accreditation Reports, the team recommends that the college implement a Technology Plan that is integrated with the Strategic Plan and college goals; relies on Program Review; and provides reliable budgetary process for renewing technology and for providing appropriate technology staffing, support, and training college wide [II.C.1.a, III.C.1.a, and II.C.1.c].*

To assist in addressing Recommendation 6, SWC's Accreditation Oversight Committee established Work Group 6 representing a cross-constituency from all sectors of the college community. Work Group 6 Co-Leads started meeting on March 3, 2010. Additional constituent group members were added later in the spring semester.

### **Work Group (6) Membership:**

Nicholas Alioto (administration)  
Tom Luibel (faculty)  
Larry Lambert (classified)  
Christopher Martinez (classified)

Terry Davis (administration)  
Caree Lesh (faculty)  
Tom Bugzavich (classified)

The work group was charged with developing and implementing a Technology Plan that supports college goals. Once approved, the Technology Plan will be integrated with the Strategic Plan and program review process. The program review process will drive technology planning and will inform the budgetary process to support the upgrading of technology, provide for appropriate technology staffing, and offer training opportunities college-wide.

**Relevant Excerpts from the Evaluation Report:**

*The College supplies technology to support the needs of learning, teaching, and operational systems. However, technology, professional support, and technical staffing levels appear to have been reduced significantly by recent budget cuts.*

*The College currently is assuring that technology support is meeting college needs (III.C.1.a). Committees are in place, but there is question regarding efficacy. The structure for technology services is not effective and the ability for Computer Support Services to replace computers is stymied by these processes, as evidenced by the inadequate Technology Plan 2005–2010.*

*The team feels that technology support, facilities, hardware, and software are not supporting the operation of the college. Staffing levels seem to be inadequate for the size of the institution. The college is not planning, acquiring, maintaining, upgrading, or replacing technology infrastructure or equipment to meet college needs, as evidenced by a college-wide crisis of outdated equipment. There is also no evidence that this plan has been properly vetted through the appropriate committees (III.C.1.c).*

*The team observed that technology planning is not aligned with college planning. Administrative program review is vital in this area and is conspicuously absent. While efforts have been initiated to integrate the college technology plan with other plans at the college, no evidence of evaluation, assessment, or analysis of how well they integrate or their efficacy was found (III.C.2).*

**Resolution of Recommendation 6:**

Although the College has made progress towards complying with Recommendation 6, the required integration with the Strategic Plan, Mission Statement, and Institutional Program Review is not expected to be fully resolved until March 2011. Work Group 2 has made progress towards developing an integrated model for college planning.

**Description of Progress:**

The Division of Business and Financial Affairs was given oversight of the Computer Systems and Services (CSS) Department so that it would report directly to a Vice President.

In January 2010, all faculty, staff and administrators were invited to review the current technology plan and were asked to verify their current needs in the areas of hardware, software, maintenance and programming. Those requests were submitted to CSS. Subsequent to the WASC Team visit, approximately 752 new computers were installed based on the 2005–2010 Technology Plan.

An additional 791 computers were purchased and installed during summer 2010. In addition to the new computers and in order to ensure that the technology infrastructure continues to support the College needs, the following purchases were made:

Item	Cost (\$)
Upgrade/Replace Storage Area Network	\$304,722
Upgrade/Replace Back-up System	\$116,501
Replace and Add Blades	\$44,133
Purchase additional WebAdvisor Licenses and update IBM AIX system to address performance problems in registration	\$88,755

During the past two years, the College has invested in desktop systems as part of a concerted effort to upgrade faculty, staff, and instructional lab systems. The College will continue working to develop upgrade and replacement cycles for these systems during the 2010-2011 planning and prioritization process. Additionally, the College will explore resource management approaches such as supporting multiple levels of systems and recycling systems as ways to deploy systems more cost effectively. The process for input of technology recommendations identified by the Institutional Program Review process is now part of the draft Technology Plan (Exhibit 1).

In summary, the College has made a financial investment in excess of \$2.1 million in technology replacement and enhancement in the past twelve months to upgrade instructional technology and to ensure the College's infrastructure can support present and future information technology.

The staffing level and skill set required for the present and future needs of technology within the Computer Systems and Services Department will require a thorough evaluative process of current and future needs of the College. A consulting firm, WTC Inc., has been hired to assess the skill sets, training requirements and staffing needs of Computer Systems and Services staff, and assess the technology needs of the College. The consulting firm is revising the 2005-2010 Technology Plan with input from college constituencies. The consulting firm identified two community colleges whose technology plans had recently received favorable commendations in WASC site visit reports. In the meantime, the College recruited and filled a programmer position to provide assistance in the web and Colleague programming areas.

The consulting firm emailed an initial survey regarding technology needs and concerns to all employees as well as to student leadership. Those surveys were returned directly to the consulting firm. The consulting firm conducted two "open-door" forums in late spring so that individuals could provide input and/or express concerns. With the assistance of the SCC Technology Committee and Accreditation Work Group 6, twelve constituencies were identified to meet with the consulting firm in order to participate and provide input in the development of the new Technology Plan. Those constituencies were:

- Associated Student Organization Executive Committee
- Academic Technology Committee
- SCC Technology Committee
- AOC Work Group 6
- Deans Council
- Cabinet
- Council of Chairs

- Classified Executive Committee
- Student Services Council
- CSS Staff
- Business Directors Council
- Center Deans/Directors and their technology coordinators

The consulting firm conducted group, in-person, and/or teleconference calls with members of constituent groups and distributed surveys to each in order to ensure confidential input as well as to ensure that anyone not in attendance had an opportunity for input. The consulting firm's analysis of the Computer System & Services Department is expected to be completed before the end of October, 2010.

In the current budgeting process, budget assumptions were submitted to fill a vacant software trainer position in Staff Development and to increase the staff development training budget for Computer Systems and Services. Both of these recommendations were accepted and were included in the College 2010-2011 budget which was approved by the Governing Board on September 8, 2010 (see GB Agenda).

#### **Analysis of Results:**

The College has made progress on several issues related to the enhancement of technology. The College mission statement is currently under review to ensure the integration of technology components as prescribed by WASC Recommendations 1, 2, 3 & 6. The linkage of technology needs with other key processes such as strategic priorities and budgeting will be initiated through the program review process. The institutional planning processes including the process for determining technology needs will be evaluated yearly to ensure comprehensive participation by all constituent groups.

The College has identified and implemented funding for a technology replacement and improvement plan. The College has also made a major upgrade to the college data center with the addition of several servers and data storage capacity. In addition, a formalized replacement component has been implemented to ensure the timely replacement of instructional and administrative technology.

#### **Additional Plans:**

The draft technology plan will continue to be reviewed by constituent groups within the College and a final plan will be presented to the Governing Board before the end of this year. During this review, the workgroups that are developing processes for integrated planning and budgeting will work in conjunction with Work Group 6 to ensure that the interdependency between budgeting, program review and technology acquisition and shared planning and decision making is in place. Additionally, the College plans to implement an electronic purchase order system. This will ensure the timely purchasing process driven by institutional program review.

The proposed Computer Replacement Process originally presented for approval in 2008 will be examined and analyzed in regards to purpose, scope, background, procedure, annual budget

recommendation, and transition. This process will support and integrate the Strategic Plan and college goals and will rely on Program Review as recommended by the WASC Evaluation Report. Work Group 6 will recommend that this process be re-submitted through the consultation process.

By March 2011 the College intends to have its new Technology Plan implemented and integrated with the Strategic Plan and college goals. Work Group 6 will work closely with the work group charged with responding to the need for integrated planning to ensure that the Technology Plan is fully integrated. It is also intended that the new Plan will rely on Program Review and will provide a reliable budgetary process for renewing and/or upgrading technology and for providing appropriate technology staffing, support, and training.

**Evidence:**

Invoices from Purchases

Inventory Report

WTC Contract and weekly reports

Existing Technology Purchase Flowchart

Flowchart depicting Technology Plan Revision Process

Draft technology purchase policy/procedures

Draft Technology Plan

CSS Audit Results

Documentation of individuals who participated in revision process and/or provided input

**Recommendation Eight (B):**

*The team further recommends that the college establish and follow a written process and structure providing faculty, staff, administrators, and students a substantial voice in decision making processes [IV.A; and IV.B.2.b].*

The AOC separated Recommendation 8 into 8 (a), “fostering and environment of trust and respect” and 8 (b), “shared decision making” as outlined in the WASC Action Letter in order to address the development of approved written policy and procedure for shared planning and decision making. The College has identified Recommendation 8 (a) as the section to be met by the March 2011 deadline. A series of events have taken place since the October 2009 WASC site visit that has caused a schism challenging efforts to foster “an environment of trust and respect.” The College is committed to addressing these issues and the results of our efforts will be reported in the March 2011 Follow Up Report. Professional Personnel Leasing, Inc. (PPL) was retained in early September 2010 to assist in addressing Recommendation 8 (a).

To address this recommendation by October 2010 Work Group 8 (b) was charged with reviewing, revising, and strengthening the language of Policy 2510: Shared Decision Making, and developing an accompanying procedure to provide “faculty, staff, administrators, and students a substantial voice in decision making processes.”

Work Group 8 (b) represents a cross-constituency from all sectors of the campus community.



## Current Work Group 8 (b) Membership:

### Faculty:

Valerie Goodwin-Colbert (Past Academic Senate President)  
Randy Beach (Academic Senate President-Elect)  
Angelina Stuart (current Academic Senate President)  
Diane Gustafson (Work Group 8 Co-Lead)

### Staff:

Bruce MacNinch (Classified Staff Union President)  
Patti Blevins (Confidential staff)

### Administrators:

Dr. Mark Meadows (Vice President for Academic Affairs)  
Michael Kerns (Vice President for Human Resources)  
Terry Davis (Administrator's Association President)  
Joel Levine (Dean for Language & Literature)

### Student Representative: (new to the committee since May)

Manuel López, Jr., ASO President

### Relevant Excerpts from the Evaluation Report:

*In response to the last visit, the college created policies for more widespread input. Faculty and administration were given a prescribed role in governance and a voice in their areas of responsibility and expertise. Policies provided for student and staff input. However, college constituents report that, subsequent to the hiring of the current Superintendent/President, the policies which specify how information is brought forward from one committee or task force to the next level in the process have not been followed (IV.A.2, IV.A.3).*

*Despite policies and processes designed for college-wide participating in decision making, these structures have not resulted in everyone working together for the good of the college. As a result of a collective inability to work together, the college has not carried through on many important issues identified in the last accreditation cycle. Faculty and students appear to want the last word on college decisions; administration appears to take a hard-line top-down approach to decisions [IV.A.1].*

*The 2003 team recommendations include "...that the college define the purpose and function of collegial consultation committees and councils, effectively involving faculty, staff, administrators, and students..." as well as ensuring a "...support environment of trust and respect for all employees..." While such consultation committees have either been instituted or re-purposed, it is apparent their purpose and function is unclear, and, in the midst of this confusion, collegial processes are rendered ineffective (IV.A.2). It could be construed that the college either is making a good faith effort to address the recommendation and foster collegiality, or that the college is merely, paying lip service; it is evident that too many within the campus community presume the latter. The obvious adversarial climate that exists on campus is destructive and disruptive to student learning. The college does not meet Standard IV.A. [2009 WASC Evaluation Report, pp. 33-34].*

## **Resolution of Recommendation 8(b):**

Policy 2510 has been reviewed and modified to meet the October 15 deadline; in addition, procedures for 2510 have been created, reviewed, and are pending approval by the Governing Board on October 13, 2010. Resolution of Recommendation 8(b), as related to the establishment of written policy and procedures, are living documents that may change as the College addresses the first part of the recommendation regarding building trust relationships. The College is investigating additional methods to support the implementation of the newly written definitions. One of the methods the College is exploring is the development of a Shared Planning and Decision Making Handbook.

## **Description of Progress:**

Policy 0009: Shared Governance Philosophy and Policy 0011: Academic Senate Shared Governance Guidelines were replaced in January 2007 by Policy 2510: Participation in Local Decision Making; however, the new policy did not contain the 10 + 1 Agreement and had not gone through proper consultation with the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate President (AS President), Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA), and the Vice President for Human Resources (VPHR) met in October 2009 to discuss how to proceed with their mutual concern regarding of the current shared governance policy and the lack of procedures. It was decided that the District Policy 2510 needed to be revised, accompanying procedures needed to be developed, and that all stakeholders should be involved in the process.

In December 2009, invitations were sent to representatives of staff, faculty, and administrators to form the Shared Governance Policy & Procedure Task Group. In that same month, the AS President collected policies and procedures from other California Community Colleges that dealt with Shared Governance, Delegation of Authority, and the Role and Scope of the Academic Senate.

On January 28, 2010 the Shared Governance Policy and Procedure Task Group met to develop a statement of purpose, tasks to be accomplished, a timeline, meeting structure, and an aggressive spring 2010 meeting schedule. The purpose was to revise District Policy 2510 and to develop procedures that were deemed necessary to modify and implement the policy.

The Southwestern College Education Association (SCEA) President and Work Group 8 Co-Chairs, joined the group after the WASC evaluation report was received at the beginning of February when the work groups were created. The Shared Governance Policy & Procedure Task Group then became Work Group 8B.

From January 28, 2010 and continuing through summer, meetings occurred every two to three weeks in order to stay on task to revise District Policy 2510 and develop corresponding procedures.

## **Resolution:**

During that time the task group accomplished the following goals:

- Revised and renamed Policy 2510: Participation in Local Decision Making, now called District Policy 2510: Shared Planning and Decision Making.
- Developed District Procedures 2510: Shared Planning and Decision making to accompany revised policy.
- Developed a new District Policy: The Role and Scope of Academic Senate: 10 + 1 Agreement.
- Developed a new corresponding District Procedure: The Role and Scope of Academic Senate: 10 + 1 Agreement.

The revised and new policies and procedures were sent out in late April and early May to the college community for review, consultation, and input. The VPHR and Human Resources Compliance Coordinator presented the approved policy and procedures as recommended language to the Governing Board Policy Review Committee (made up of two SWC Governing Board members) on May 19, 2010. At that meeting, the President of the Governing Board directed that Procedures for Policy 2510 be returned to the workgroup as there was no language for staff, students and administrators as required by Recommendation 8.

A Work Group 8 Co-Lead and most of Work Group 8B membership met on July 6, 2010 to discuss necessary changes to the documents. It was agreed that Policy and Procedure 2510 needed revision to include representation from all constituencies in line with Recommendation 8 guidelines. The recommendation to change Policy and Procedure 2510 was then taken to the AOC, where after some discussion, it was approved, revised, and forwarded to SCC for approval as a separate item from the Academic Senate 10 + 1 Agreement. Revised Policy 2510 language with all the drafted changes was sent out to each constituency group for approval before it was forwarded to the SCC for approval.

At the AOC meeting on July 14, 2010, it was decided that Policy 2510 needed to be bifurcated from the new 10 + 1 Agreement because the 10 + 1 Agreement requires agreement between only two bodies, the Governing Board or its sole designee and the Academic Senate, not constituency approval. The new 10 + 1 Agreement policy and procedures were drafted and titled "The Role and the Scope of the Academic Senate: 10 + 1 Agreement."

At the August 5, 2010 SCC Retreat, a presentation on participatory decision making was given by Scott Lay, President and CEO of the CCLC, and Jane Patton, President of the Statewide Academic Senate. The Governing Board was invited and all attended along with all constituency leaders and committee members. After this presentation, there was an Accreditation report in which the ALO reported that Policy 2510 was ready for SCC review and approval. However, he stated that the Academic Senate had given its approval for Policy 2510 to proceed through the process for Governing Board approval only if the new "Role and the Scope of the Academic Senate: 10 + 1" Policy and Procedures was approved simultaneously. The SCC reviewed, discussed, edited and approved new Policy 2510 language with only minor changes: a friendly amendment to include the items of student purview under each of the student sections in policy and procedures, and a change of the language "shared governance" to "participatory decision making" throughout the documents. At the SCC retreat, the new 10 + 1 Agreement policy was shared for information only and forwarded through the consultation process, which included approval by the Governing Board designee, Superintendent/President, and the Academic Senate. This new 10 + 1 Agreement policy was then given its own unique policy number, 2515, by Human Resources.

Appropriate consultation for Policy 2515 continued when the Superintendent/President and the AS President met on July 26, 2010, to discuss Policy 2515 and its procedures as they relate to participatory decision making. The Superintendent/President reported that he was “in principle, in agreement with having this agreement in policy.” He requested that the AS President meet with the VPAA and VPHR to work on the legal language and then bring it back to him once agreed upon. The VPAA, VPHR, and AS President met on August 5, 2010 to review the draft language of the proposed 10 +1 Agreement policy and procedure.

The revised Policy and Procedures 2515 were approved by the Academic Senate Executive Committee on August 11, 2010. Copies of these documents were provided to the VPAA and the VPHR as well as to the Superintendent/President on August 12, 2010. Subsequently, these documents were agreed upon by the Superintendent/President and the AS President on August 20, 2010.

On August 24, 2010, the following policies and procedures regarding participatory decision making were presented to the Governing Board Policy Review Committee (GBPR):

- 1) 2510: Shared Planning and Decision Making
- 2) 2515: The Role & Scope of the Academic Senate: 10 + 1 Agreement

At that meeting, Policy 2515: Role and Scope of the Academic Senate: 10 + 1 Agreement was reviewed by the GBPR Committee and a recommendation was made to move the Policy to the next Governing Board meeting. On August 26, the GBPR Committee reconvened to review, approve, and recommend moving Policy and Procedure 2510 for a first reading at the next Governing Board meeting. The September 8, 2010 Governing Board meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m. as per Policy 2310: Regular Meetings of the Governing Board, which states that the Governing Board meeting “shall be adjourned by 10:00 p.m. unless otherwise specified.” As a result, the first reading of these policies and procedures did not take place.

Both Policy 2510 and its procedures for Shared Planning and Decision Making and Policy 2515 and its procedures “The Role & The Scope of the Academic Senate: 10 + 1 Agreement” will be placed on the Governing Board agenda for first reading at the next available Governing Board meeting on September 29, 2010 with second reading and approval anticipated at the October 13, 2010 Board meeting.

### **Analysis of the Results:**

Since the changes described above are in the process of implementation, the college community has not had the opportunity to put the policy and procedures into practice. Behaviors, attitudes, and process alignment can be evaluated as early as fall 2010. The changes in Policy 2510, the creation of the procedures for 2510, the creation of Policy 2515 as well as corresponding procedures for 2515, and the changes in the process for approval of these documents reflect a move towards more participatory decision making by all stakeholders.

## **Additional Plans:**

The AOC will consider recommendations from Work Group 8 (b) to request that the Governing Board revise policy 2310 to allow for the completion of the agenda. Policy 2310 states that the Governing Board meeting “shall be adjourned by 10:00 p.m. unless otherwise specified.” As a result, some agenda items are not always covered, including reports from constituency leaders, vice presidents, Superintendent/President, and the Governing Board. A second recommendation to the Governing Board will include the placement of constituency leader reports at the beginning of the agenda in order to a) provide the Governing Board the benefit of important information before taking action on agenda items and b) sharing information with members of the public who may be unable to stay until the end of the meeting. These revisions to the policy are encouraged in the spirit of Recommendation 8 to “provide faculty, staff, administrators, and students a substantial voice in decision making processes.”

At the AOC meeting on August 25, 2010, it was suggested that the College now develop a Shared Planning and Decision Making Handbook. Work Group 2 Co-Leads stated that they had already been working on a draft for a Shared Planning and Decision Making Handbook. They will bring this forward to a future AOC meeting. Such a Handbook will establish a clearer process for shared planning and decision making. The President of the Governing Board has also expressed to the VPHR at the Governing Board Policy Committee on August 26, 2010, the Board’s interest in seeing such a document created for the College. It is expected that the Shared Planning and Decision Making Handbook will be a living document that the College constituencies will review and update on a cyclical basis.

### **Evidence:**

Minutes of the Shared Governance Policy and Procedure Task Group 01/28/10, 2/18/10  
Revised District Policy 2510: Shared Planning and Decision making  
New District Procedures 2510: Shared Planning and Decision making  
New District Policy 2515: Role and Scope of the Academic Senate: 10 + 1 Agreement  
New District Procedures 2515: Role and Scope of the Academic Senate: 10 + 1 Agreement  
Minutes of Work Group 8B meetings  
Minutes of AOC meeting 07/14/10  
Minutes of the SCC Retreat 08/05/10  
Minutes of the Governing Board Policy Review Committee 08/24/10, 08/26/10  
Governing Board Agenda 09/08/10

### **c. Recommendation Nine:**

*As previously identified in the 2003 ACCJC WASC Accreditation Report, the team recommends the Governing Board adhere to its role as a policy-making body and not interfere with the authority and responsibility of the Superintendent/President for college operations. The team further recommends that the Governing Board act as a whole once it reaches a decision and as an advocate for the college [IV.B.1.a and IV.B.1.j].*

To assist in addressing Recommendation 9, SWC Accreditation Oversight Committee established Work Group 9 representing a cross-constituency from all sectors of the college community.

**Work Group (9) Membership:**

Ron Vess (faculty)

Patti Blevins (confidential)

Michele Fenlon (classified)

Mink Stavenga (administration)

Kimberlie Rader (confidential)

Bruce MacNintch (classified)

The work group worked closely with the Superintendent/President to make sure the Governing Board was in agreement with the direction it was taking.

**Relevant Excerpts from the Evaluation Report:**

*There is disagreement among trustees on how the Board's role as a policy-making body reflecting the public interest is manifest. Some see themselves as budget watchdogs attending to small details of the operations of the District. Several interpret their role as a conduit for concerns from the college community, seeing a need to meet privately with college personnel (IV.B.1.a, IV.B.1.c).*

*There seems to be confusion among the board members over its role in setting college goals versus setting board and superintendent/president goals (IV.B.1.b).*

*The Board has an approved policy specifically delegating operational functions of the college to the Superintendent/President. Nevertheless, some college policies are inconsistent with the effective application of this policy. There is evidence that the Board has been kept apprised of the development of the self study (IV.B.1.i, IV.B.1.j).*

*Another example of Board interference occurred in 2006 when the Board insinuated itself into the hiring of the Vice President of Academic Affairs by not accepting the recommendation of the Superintendent/President and interviewing three finalists. As an apparent result of the Board selecting its own candidate, the Superintendent/President resigned. The current Superintendent/President reports that the Board elected to retain the right to interview finalists for vice president positions in its policy.*

*According to multiple sources, under the current Superintendent/President the Board has not interviewed candidate in the hiring of the last four vice presidents. Trustees reported that they wanted the policy to remain in place until the newly hired Superintendent/President was established; the Superintendent/President has left the policy in place to build trust (IV.B.1.j).*

*Trustees interact regularly with college staff and think this direct communication is important; they report feedback to the rest of the Board and Superintendent/President. The Board reports that it seeks communication between its members and the college staff (IV.B.1.j).*

**Resolution of Recommendation 9:**

Progress has been made towards addressing this recommendation. The Board has participated in two training sessions specifically addressing issues identified in this recommendation and several Governing Board policies and procedures have been revised in response to issues identified in the Evaluation Report.

**Description of Progress:**

The Superintendent/President, the ALO, and the Governing Board of the Southwestern Community College District responded to the findings and recommendations of the site visitors

and Accrediting Commission. In early March 2010, the ALO met with the Superintendent/President to develop goals, objectives, and timelines in order to address the recommendations regarding the Governing Board. The strategy included the scheduling of two separate Board training sessions. The first Board training session was sponsored by the Community College League of California and included the Superintendent/President and each of the Board members. Several outcomes were achieved as a result of the first training session (CCLC Board Training) which took place on May 18, 2010:

- 1) The Board was given the opportunity to review and discuss its prescribed role with an objective and knowledgeable facilitator, Bill McGinnis;
- 2) The facilitator was aware and familiar with the concerns expressed in the Accreditation Report;
- 3) The Trustees were given handouts and guides to assist them throughout their tenure as members of the Governing Board; and
- 4) Trustees were provided training on topics that included the following:
  - Ground Rules for discussions, meetings, and interactions
  - Board Governance
  - Board Goals
  - Accreditation Standards and Commission Recommendations
  - Achieving High Performance
  - Board Accountability

All five Governing Board members also attended a presentation made at a Shared Consultation Council Retreat on August 5, 2010 (See SCC Agenda and Minutes) by the President of the CCLC, Scott Lay, and the President of the Statewide Academic Senate, Jane Patton. The presentation focused on shared decision making in California Community Colleges and addressed the roles of the Governing Board, the Administration, and faculty in the process (See SCC Presentation on Shared Governance-Rosalva).

The ALO also arranged for an intensive Board training session by Dr. Barbara A. Beno, President of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, on September 23, 2010, which was attended by the Superintendent/President and all Governing Board members. Dr. Beno communicated in advance with the CCLC facilitator to make sure that they were not duplicating their efforts. Dr. Beno's presentation is included in the appendices (See Beno Presentation materials).

The Superintendent/President's Office scheduled periodic Special Governing Board meetings to stay abreast of progress and Accreditation Oversight Committee work group updates. During the Special Governing Board meetings, the trustees were able to discuss their concerns and receive feedback to their questions regarding the report as a whole, and this standard in particular. As a result of the Visiting Team's report, the College has taken a closer look at policies related to the Governing Board and their role in fulfilling the requirements of service to the College. Following the release of the Commissions Actions, the Governing Board took the following

actions: 1) discontinued participation on the SCC Budget Committee (formerly known as the College Budget Task Force) and 2) deleted Policy 2432, Selection of Vice Presidents. In addition, the work groups assigned to this recommendation followed up on other instances of Governing Board involvement mentioned in the evaluation report. It was confirmed that Board members no longer serve on, or sit in on, College committee meetings and at several Governing Board meetings it was made clear that communications between Board members and College staff need to be channeled through the Superintendent/President's Office.

The following table provides a status report of relevant policies and/or procedures which have been reviewed, revised, approved, or eliminated:

#	Policy/Procedure	Status	GB Approval Date
2432	Selection of Vice Presidents	Eliminated	May 12, 2010
2710	Conflict of Interest Procedure	Approved	June 9, 2010
6100	Delegation of Authority Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs (VPBFA)	Approved	April 14, 2010

**Analysis of Results:**

As a result of the activities described above, there is awareness among constituency groups that the role of Governing Board is to be a policy-making body and that it is not to interfere with the authority and responsibility of the Superintendent/President for College operations as stated in District Policy 2430 Delegation of Authority.

More work needs to be done (see additional plans below) to address all of the standards cited in the Evaluation Report. The Co-Chairs of the Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC) are committed to working with the Superintendent/President and the Governing Board to ensure that the concerns expressed in the Evaluation Report are addressed on an ongoing basis. The AOC is now a permanent standing committee of the Shared Consultation Council (SCC), the College's principal shared governance vehicle, and will continue to make recommendations to remain in compliance with the ACCJC Standards.

**Additional Plans:**

- In preparing the 2010–2011 budget assumptions, additional funding was approved for ongoing workshops and training sessions for the Governing Board (See Accreditation Budget).
- As mentioned in the previous Recommendation 8(b), plans are underway to develop a College Shared Planning and Decision Making Handbook. This handbook would further clarify the role of the Governing Board and its individual members.
- The AOC, as a standing sub-committee of the SCC, is charged with ongoing oversight of the recommendations provided in the Evaluation Report Findings that led to this recommendation. The AOC will be responsible for bringing any potential deviation from the ACCJC Standards to the attention of the Governing Board, through the Superintendent/President, so that corrective action can be taken. The Accreditation Oversight Committee's vision is to "Ensure that the college is meeting the AACJC Standards to achieve ongoing reaffirmation of accreditation." The AOC takes this charge very seriously and is committed to working to remain in compliance with the ACCJC Standards.



**Evidence:**

- CCLC Board Training
- ACCJC Board Training
- Roster
- Agenda
- Expenditure
- Documents, handouts, materials, self assessment
- Revised District Policy 6100: Delegation of Authority to VPBFA
- GBA&PPRC Agenda
- GBA&PPRC Minutes
- Governing Board Minutes: April 14, 2010
  - Legal Counsel (approval)
  - Parliamentarian (approval)
  - District Policy 6100 (approval)
  - 2010 Accreditation Budget Addendum

**d. Recommendation Ten:**

*The Team recommends that the Governing Board establish and implement a formal procedure for handling potential conflict of interest and ethics policy violations and document adherence to the protocol [IV.B.1.a and IV.B.1.j].*

To assist in addressing Recommendation 10, SWC Accreditation Oversight Committee established Work Group 10 representing a cross-constituency from all sectors of the college community (see WG 10 membership list).

**Work Group (10) Membership:**

- |                              |                                |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Ron Vess (faculty)           | Mink Stavenga (administration) |
| Patti Blevins (confidential) | Kimberlie Rader (confidential) |
| Michele Fenlon (classified)  | Bruce MacNintch (classified)   |

The work group worked with the Superintendent/President to assure the Governing Board was in agreement with the direction it was taking.

**Relevant Excerpts from the Evaluation Report:**

*An ethics code and policy are in place, but the self study indicates that the Board does not deal with violations effectively. There is at least the appearance of a conflict of interest with a board member and senior administrator of the District having a personal relationship and with trustees sitting on another board that is responsible for the oversight of a fellow trustee’s employer. However, there is no evidence that a recusal process is followed when decisions arise that may be impacted by these conflicts (IV.B.1.h).*

**Resolution of Recommendation 10:**

Progress has been made towards addressing this recommendation. The new Procedure 2710: Conflict of Interest was approved by the Governing Board on June 9, 2010. A revised Code of Ethics Policy and a new accompanying procedure (Policy and Procedure 2715: Code of Ethics), are in the final phases of approval.

### **Description of Progress:**

A subcommittee of Work Groups 9 & 10 was formed to review the two Governing Board Policies referenced in Recommendation 10: No. 2710: Conflict of Interest and No. 2715: Code of Ethics. Upon review of the existing policies, the WASC recommendations, and sample policies and procedures from the Community College League of California (CCLC) and other community college districts, the subcommittee determined the following:

1. No revisions were necessary to Policy 2710: Conflict of Interest, which was approved by the Governing Board in March 2008 (Item 17A).
2. Procedure 2710: Conflict of Interest, needed to be drafted by the work group and recommended to the Governing Board;
3. Policy 2715: Code of Ethics, approved by the Governing Board in March 2008, required revision; and
4. Procedure 2715: Code of Ethics, needed to be drafted by the work group and recommended to the Governing Board.

In addition to the policies and procedures described above there has been an awareness on the part of the Governing Board to recuse themselves from any Governing Board agenda items that would potentially be regarded as a conflict of interest (See Governing Board examples of recusal-Meeting Minutes).

### **Analysis of Results:**

#### ▪ Procedure 2710: Conflict of Interest

The work group found that the majority of California community colleges with a Conflict of Interest procedure used the sample language provided by the CCLC, and therefore, decided to use similar language.

Because the WASC recommendation specifically stated the Board should “establish and implement a formal procedure for handling potential conflict of interest,” the work group decided to strengthen the CCLC language in two ways:

1. Include a reference to Government Code Section 1097 which states the legal consequences of violations of conflict of interest laws; and
2. Include a procedure for monitoring and handling allegations of conflict of interest. The work group used as its model the language provided in the CCLC sample Policy 2715 regarding potential violations of the Governing Board code of ethics.

The Governing Board approved this Procedure at its June 9, 2010 meeting.

#### ▪ Policy 2715: Code of Ethics

This policy, initially adopted by the Governing Board in March 2008, incorporated language regarding the process for handling violations. The work group removed this procedural language from the Policy. In addition to using the existing policy and the CCLC sample policy as a template, the work group also used as resources the Code of Ethics policies and procedures of West Hills Community College District and Mira Costa Community College

District. The revised Policy 2715 was approved by the Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC) on July 14, 2010 and by the Governing Board Policy Review Committee on August 24, 2010. It will go before the Governing Board for first reading at a special meeting on September 29, 2010; second reading and approval is expected to occur at the Board Meeting on October 13, 2010.

▪ Procedure 2715: Code of Ethics

The new Code of Ethics Procedure 2715 is a comprehensive document supporting the Code of Ethics Policy. The work group recommended language stating the Governing Board's commitment to the importance of using and complying with the Code of Ethics. Again, the Code of Ethics policies and procedures of West Hills Community College District and Mira Costa Community College District were vital resources. Noting the WASC Team's recommendation to include a procedure for monitoring and handling violations of the Code of Ethics, the work group used as its model the language provided in the CCLC sample Policy 2715 regarding potential violations of the Governing Board Code of Ethics. The new procedure No. 2715 was approved by the AOC on July 14, 2010 and by the Governing Board Policy Review Committee on August 24, 2010. It will go before the full Board for first reading on September 29, 2010; second reading and approval is expected to occur at the Board Meeting on October 13, 2010. The new Code of Ethics Procedure, once approved by the Governing Board, will address how the policy will be enforced and how sanctions will be determined if the Policy is violated.

In order to avoid any potential appearances of conflicts of interest, Governing Board members have followed a recusal process when decisions arose that may have been impacted by these conflicts.

**Additional Plans:**

- The Code of Ethics Policy and Procedure is scheduled for a first reading at the September 29, 2010 Governing Board meeting and is scheduled for a second reading and anticipated approval at the Governing Board meeting on October 13, 2010.
- The work group determined that a Conflict of Interest Code would enhance the policy and procedures and has begun to develop the language.

**Evidence:**

1. Letter from Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges to Dr. Raj K. Chopra, President Southwestern College, January 29, 2010 – Commission action to impose Probation on Southwestern College.
2. Process for Policy and Procedure development and review (Flow Chart) – March 15, 2010
3. Timeline for Work Group 9 & 10 – March 16, 2010
4. Meeting Notes Work Group 9 & 10 March 12, 2010 – Discussion of history and development of Board Policy and Procedure.
5. Meeting Notes Work Group 9 & 10 March 23, 2010 – The group's two recommendations will be put in writing for presentation to AOC on 3/24/10.

6. Meeting Notes Work Group 9 & 10 April 13, 2010— developing language regarding the Code of Ethics Policy 2715 and Conflict of Interest Policy 2710.
7. Meeting Notes Work Group 9 & 10 April 20, 2010— Draft procedures for Policy 2710: Conflict of Interest was reviewed and discussed. The draft incorporates language from the CCLC.
8. Description of violations from Evaluation Report; Southwestern College accreditation visit. This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited Southwestern College on October 5–8, 2009, p. 35, 38.
9. Community College League of California, Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Subscription Service. Models available via web access:  
<http://www.ccleague.org/files/public/HowToGuide.pdf> Board Policy 2710 & 2715, Administrative Policy 2710 & 2715, October 2007.
10. Governing Board Minutes for Approval of Governing Board Policy 2710— Conflict of Interest, March 12, 2008.
11. Governing Board Minutes for Approval of Procedures regarding Board Policy 2710— Conflict of Interest, June 9, 2010.
12. E-mail from Patti J. Blevins, Human Resources Compliance Coordinator, Message Re: Policies, dated August 17, 2010. Message states, “The Governing Board Policy Committee (Not the GBA&PPRC) will have to approve before they go to full Board”. And, “September 8 is the Governing Board meeting for first reading for 3 policies— Code of Ethics, Shared Planning and 10+1.”
13. Governing Board minutes noting Recusal

DRAFT

## Concluding Statement

It is the opinion of the college community and the signatories to this Follow Up Report that the Southwestern Community College District has made progress responding to the recommendations in the Commission's Action Letter and the Site Visit Team's Evaluation Report.

College constituent groups are committed to addressing the recommendations and implementing the changes that are necessary to address the recommendations.

Although not required for inclusion in this Follow Up Report, work groups have been formed and are addressing the remaining recommendations by March 15, 2011.

On behalf of all College constituents, the Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC) wants to assure the Commission that each one of the recommendations is being addressed. Several recommendations are in need of some external assistance, hence the retention of Professional Personnel Leasing, Inc. (PPL) to assist the College with professional advice on additional courses of action.

As identified in the Statement of Report Preparation the College understands that all of the Commission's recommendations are inter-related and need to be successfully resolved simultaneously. Recommendation 6, and its integration with the Strategic Plan, Program Review, and budgetary actions, is a case in point. The Technology Plan cannot be integrated with institutional plans until those recommendations are addressed.

The Southwestern Community College District recognizes that much work needs to be done to come into compliance with the ACCJC Standards and believes that it is on track to do so within the timelines established by the Commission.

In addition, all of the College's constituent groups are working together toward our common vision to ensure that the college is meeting the AACJC Standards to achieve ongoing reaffirmation of accreditation. Our ultimate goal is to provide students with the best possible educational opportunities for achieving success.



## Enrollment Management Plan Update

Presented by:

**Dr. Mink Stavenga**  
Dean of Instructional Support Services  
Southwestern College

September 2010



### Briefing Outline

- About the Enrollment Management Committee  
Why We Had to Act
- Results of Our Efforts



## What is Enrollment Management

❖ Enrollment management is a comprehensive and coordinated process that enables a college to identify enrollment goals that are allied with its mission, its strategic plan, its environment, and its resources, and to reach those goals through the effective integration of administrative processes, student services, curriculum planning, and market analysis.

❖ Christine Kerlin



## Why we had to act

- The former plan expired
- The former plan was incomplete
- The former plan was not integrated
- There was no follow-up with the former plan



### Result of Our Efforts

- Four workgroups were formed to address the following areas:
  - Academic Program Management and Institutional Support
  - Course Scheduling
  - Student Services/Support Services
  - Academic Program Marketing, Recruitment and Retention.
  
- Groups consisted of faculty, administrators, staff and students



### Result of Our Efforts

- A robust plan has been drafted.
  
- This plan is integrated with:
  - The Strategic Plan
  - The Facilities Plan
  - The Technology Plan
  - The Aslanian Market Analysis





### What Do You Need to Do?

- The Draft will be available for a 1<sup>st</sup> reading by SCC on October 21
- Share the draft with members of your constituent groups.
- Return any feedback or recommended changes by November 4 to the Eva Hedger at [ehedger@swccd.edu](mailto:ehedger@swccd.edu). Suggestions will be implemented by the EMC for the 2<sup>nd</sup> reading at SCC on November 18.



### Southwestern College



*"Enroll Today... Succeed Tomorrow"*