Southwestern College
Progress Report to WASC Action Letter
(dated June 30, 2003)

Cover Sheet

To:

Dr. Darlene Pacheco, Associate Director
Accrediting Commission for Community
Junior Colleges (ACCJC)
10 Commercial Boulevard, Suite 204
Novato, CA 94949

Visiting Team:

Mr. Christopher O'Hearn (CHAIR)
Superintendent-President
Mt. San Antonio College
1100 North Grand Avenue
Walnut, CA 91789

Dr. Lucy Killea, Commissioner
Accrediting Commission for Community
And Junior Colleges
700 Front Street, #609
San Diego, CA 92101

Date of Submission:

March 12, 2004

Name of Institution:
Address:

Southwestern College
900 Otay Lakes Road
Chula Vista, CA 91910

Type of Report:

Progress Report

Table of Contents

Statement on Report Preparation

Process of Report Preparation and Consultation Methodology

Upon receiving the WASC Accreditation action letter on July 3, 2003 Southwestern College launched into a multi-phase consultation process with campus constituent groups to discuss the recommendations. The WASC Accreditation action letter brought structure to the campus dialogue and served as a guidepost that inspired action plans for the improvement of communication and services.

Preparation for the progress report began in July, 2003 with the college's Executive Management Team (EMT) reviewing the WASC recommendations, identifying possible strategies/actions, and creating stakeholder committees for each recommendation. An informal consultation process took place over the summer that included the Academic Senate Executive Committee providing input to EMT at the end of July, 2003; Classified Senate being informed of the WASC recommendations and the Instructional Administrators reviewing the recommendations and proposed strategies.

In Fall, 2003, the informal consultation process continued with the recommendations and proposed strategies/action plans being reviewed by Student Services Council and the College Leadership Council. EMT also reviewed the recommendations and the proposed strategies again.

In November, 2003 a formal review and response process began with a Governing Board-sponsored study session regarding SWC's response to the accreditation recommendations. This public forum provided a status report to the Governing Board regarding the college's progress to date in responding to the recommendations listed in the WASC action letter. In addition, various constituent groups across campus were presented with the strategies/action plans that had been defined between July and October and were given a formal opportunity for input regarding the recommendations and their corresponding strategies and timelines. These groups included the Classified Senate, CSEA (classified union), Academic Senate Executive Committee, SCEA (faculty union), Instructional Administrators, and Student Services Council.

In December 2003, stakeholder groups were officially convened and specific reporting criteria were detailed regarding the development of a formal response to the recommendations within the WASC Action Letter. Lead stakeholders were identified and the groups were provided time from December 4, 2003 through February 20, 2004 to complete the consultation process with their respective constituents, document the strategies and actions associated with their respective recommendations, review the status of action plans from the 2003 Site Visit, and submit their findings to SWC's Accreditation Liaison Officer. The responses derived from the cross campus consultation process were also made available to the stakeholder groups.

Upon collection of the information from the various stakeholder groups this progress report was developed and each stakeholder group had the opportunity to review the document prior to Governing Board review and approval on March 10, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,

_____   Date: March 11, 2004
      Norma L. Hernandez
      Interim Superintendent/President

Response to the Request of the Commission in the Action Letter

Recommendation #8
The team recommends that the Governing Board establish and monitor itself as a policy-making body, delegate operational authority to the Superintendent/President, clarify management roles, and support the authority of management in the administration of the College (Standards 10.A.3 and 10.A.4)

Progress to Date and Analysis of Results

At their annual retreat in August 2003, the Governing Board examined their role as a policy making body and the administrative role of the Superintendent/President as Chief Executive Officer of college operations. Inherent in WASC recommendation # 8 is a need to address appropriate lines of authority, create a clear definition of the policy setting role of the board, and to address the communication protocols between the board and college staff. During the annual retreat the board reaffirmed their intent to delegate authority to the CEO and their trust that the current CEO will implement policy and the Board's priorities.

Further, protocols for communication were established, specifically between board and CEO, among board members, between board and staff members, and between community members and board, that detail a code of conduct that upholds the authority of the CEO and enables the board to remain as a policy setting body. Protocols include:

- Trustees asked that the CEO is open and honest with trustees, respond to their issues and questions, phone calls and/or emails to trustees regarding issues as they arise; holds the administration accountable for their jobs;
- Board members will notify the CEO about communications they receive from staff;
- Board members will refer staff to the appropriate internal processes, and the CEO will follow-up with board members;
- Contacts from community members to trustees will either be referred to the CEO, or the trustee will contact the CEO to follow-up with the community member when appropriate. The board chair will be contacted if the contacts concern issues that are board business;
- Board members may accept invitations to meet with college committees and faculty and staff groups, but will notify the CEO, as a professional courtesy, and will refer to CEO or appropriate management any matters for action;
- Trustees requested of each other: respect, openness, understanding different perspectives, listening to each other, and to "do one's homework" and;
- CEO requested that board members be open and honest with her; the CEO and trustees work together in establishing the goals and priorities; board members notify CEO when employees and community members raise issues that she should be aware of; that trustees contact the CEO's office when they want information; that, as a courtesy, trustees notify the CEO when they will be on campus; and that individual trustees provide feedback and are a "sounding board" for the CEO.

In Fall 2003, the board continued their discussions regarding college priorities and by December 2003 formally adopted board goals. While an initial listing was developed at the August retreat, the board's further discussions resulted in the following adopted goals in December 2003:

1. Establish a comprehensive long-range planning process that would include revisiting the mission, vision, and goals of the institution.
2. Implement a series of study sessions/workshops for Board education and discussion of issues that are critical to the district.

3. Establish a process for review and update of Board policies and administrative procedures.
4. Develop policy for trustee education including new trustee orientation and trustee evaluation process.
5. Delegate responsibility for managerial processes to the CEO (i.e., personnel, bargaining, and budgeting) with clear expectations that these processes be open and involve faculty and staff in decision-making.
6. Strengthen communication with the community-at-large and business/industry.
7. Establish goals and timelines for the Interim Superintendent/President.

In summary, the Governing Board and the CEO have developed a solid working relationship that is built on direct communication, a well defined line of authority, and clear definition of their respective roles. The Governing Board has earnestly considered its paramount role as a policy setting body and has provided consistent discussion time to establish board goals and priorities in alignment with their policy setting duties. Further, each board member has, through intentional inquiry, re-affirmed their stewardship of Southwestern College by their confidence in the operational management of this institution.

Listed below is a table that represents the strategies, timeline and stakeholders involved in addressing this recommendation.

Recommendation #8

Strategies	Timeline	Stakeholders

▪ Conduct annual retreat:
     ▪ Review Governing Board (GB) roles, including CEO relations and policy setting
     ▪ Establish communication protocols
     ▪ Discuss GB goals and CEO goals
     ▪ Establish methodology for GB training/Trustee education through a series of workshops/study sessions to discuss critical issues facing the District.
	Aug 2003	▪ **Governing Board (lead)**
		 ▪ Superintendent/President

▪ Adopt GB goals and priorities
 ▪ Conduct workshops/study sessions re: education and training:
     ▪ Accreditation Progress Report
     ▪ Asset Management
     ▪ Budget Outlook
     ▪ Shared Governance
	Dec. 2003
	
	 Nov 2003
	 Dec 2003
	 Feb '03-Feb '04
	 Spring 2004	

Recommendation# 9

The team recommends that the Governing Board systematically review and update its policies, especially those on academic honesty and academic freedom, and delegate the development and implementation of corresponding procedures to the administration. (Standards 2.9 and 10.A.3)

Progress to Date and Analysis of Results

Review and Update of District Policies

The review of District policies and procedures began in October 2003. In order to bring District policies current, SWC administration recommended that the Governing Board authorize the purchase of policy templates from the Community College League Policy and Administrative Procedure Services. These templates were purchased in December 2003 and received in February 2004. District policy review and alignment with templates will begin in March 2004. The District is considering hiring a consultant to assist with the review process in May 2004.

Policy review is critical to ensuring that SWC District policies are up-to-date, relevant and in compliance with the law. All District policies will be reviewed, updated and aligned with templates from the Community College League and, most importantly, a system for annual review is being discussed and developed with the expectation of its full implementation in May 2005.

While the above information refers to the review of all District policies, the specific progress regarding Academic Freedom and Academic Integrity/Honesty is listed below:

Academic Freedom Policy

Academic Freedom Policy: The Academic Senate wrote and approved an Academic Freedom Policy in November 2000. The former Superintendent/President stopped the process when the policy came to the Executive Management Team (EMT) since he did not see a need for that policy. The same policy was taken to EMT once again in December 2003 and it was decided that the document be sent out for consultation by other campus entities such as the Instructional Administrators Council (IAC). The final document is scheduled for approval on the April 2004 Governing Board agenda. It is important to note that the Academic Freedom Policy was initially drafted by the Academic Senate Executive Committee and finalized by the full body in 2000. EMT's most current review was completed in December 2003 and the review by the IAC was completed in January 2004.

Academic Integrity/Honesty Policy

Academic Integrity/Honesty: As a first step to establish standards of integrity that will be inculcated over time into the college culture and be manifest in behavior throughout the campus community, two deans and three faculty attended the 2003 Annual Conference of the Center for Academic Integrity held at the University of San Diego in October 2003. Subsequently, the attendees formed an Academic Integrity Committee and expanded the membership to include an additional faculty member (that individual was an Accreditation co-chair for the Self Study, Standard 2) and a student (President of the Associated Student Organization- ASO). The committee has met three times (11/26/03;12/16/03; and 2/06/04) since the conference and accomplished to date the following: (1) established both short run and long run goals; (2) drafted an Academic Integrity Policy; (3) obtained sample surveys on integrity issues; one for students and for faculty; and (4) received permission to use materials from the conference.

Participants in this endeavor thus far represent faculty, Academic Senate Executive Committee, administrators, and students. The policy draft Academic Integrity will be sent first for consultation to the Academic Senate, Student Services Council, ASO, and IAC; later, to EMT and then to the Governing Board.

In summary, the College is in the process of finalizing its Academic Freedom Policy. The expectation is that the Governing Board will approve this policy in April 2004. The Academic Integrity/Honesty policy is in the development phase with a committee that is comprised with appropriate representation from college constituent groups. District policy review is underway with templates for updated and relevant policies having been purchased from the Community College League as well as a consultant being hired to work in partnership with the District to ensure that a timely and thorough review take place. Most importantly, an annual review cycle for policy updates will be established within the operational structure of the college to provide for consistent and timely evaluation of policies for their relevance and compliance with the law.

Listed below is a table that represents the strategies, timeline and stakeholders involved in addressing this recommendation.

Recommendation #9

Strategies	Timeline	Stakeholders
▪ Academic Freedom policy review process	Fall 2003	▪ **President, Academic Senate (lead)** ▪ **VP, Human Resources & Legal Affairs (lead)** ▪ Dean, Student Activities & Health Services ▪ VP, Academic Affairs ▪ VP, Student Affairs
▪ Establish annual review and update of District policies ▪ Purchase California Community College League Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Services (policy templates relevant to community college standard management operations – 1 year service)	Oct 2003 – Dec 2003	

▪ Retain consultant services and work with District to:
  ▪ Review all District policies
  ▪ Align with League templates
	May 2004	

▪ Develop system for annual review	May 2005	

Recommendation # 2

The team recommends that the College develop and implement strategies to ensure a supportive environment of trust and respect for all employees, in which the various constituent groups assume responsibility for its maintenance. (Standard 2.6)

Progress to Date and Analysis of Results

Recognizing that Southwestern College has gone through a change in administrative leadership and is facing uncertain fiscal times, the institution is committed to its certain future of continuing to provide excellent educational programs and services within a supportive environment of trust and respect for all employees. To ensure that this commitment is realized the college has developed and implemented proactive programs and venues that provide the data and dialogue needed in order to consistently address trust issues and reinforce a supportive environment. The items listed below are details of programs and initiatives that have begun this past year in an effort to establish a communication ethic and work culture at SWC that honors employees through full disclosure and thoughtful consultation:

- A Campus Climate Task Force was established with the charge of studying "those aspects of institutional atmosphere and environment that foster or impede personal, academic, and professional development". Six surveys were conducted in Fall 2003 of all college constituent groups regarding their satisfaction with their experiences at the college. During the Spring 2004 semester, the results and recommendations will be presented.

- A Cultural Institute was established to promote cultural competency in our college environment. Various workshops and activities have been conducted to benefit all college staff and students through the Staff Development and Title V offices. The results of evaluations and faculty surveys will be presented during the Spring 2004 semester. Workshops such as "Cultural Competency", "Multicultural Course Transformation in Higher Education", Local Cultural Film Festivals, and Cultural Reading Circles are just a few of the meaningful programs offered at SWC in support of understanding the cultural competence continuum.

- SWC's Human Resources Department has initiated the consultation process in revising the District's employment hiring procedures. The College's Staff Diversity Plan has been under extensive review since November 2002. The plan was written to reflect the hiring procedures at all levels throughout the college and was modeled after a plan designed and recommended by the California Community College Chancellor's Office. The latter (Chancellor's Office model), however, is currently being updated to reflect recent legislation prohibiting targeted outreach efforts in recruitment. The updated version of the plan was drafted after it went through consultation with all facets of the college including administrators, academic and classified staff, community, and the student body. The revised version includes added components that were instituted to further ensure the integrity of the recruitment process and to ensure fair and legal hiring practices. These changes included having Hiring Compliance Officers sit on each selection committee, codifications to the protocol used for checking references, and an expanded commitment to diversity and compliance with fair and equitable hiring practices. In March 2004 this revised plan will be re-introduced to the college community with a new title "Hiring Procedures Policy" and will be distributed for consultation by all constituent groups. College wide forums will be arranged to field questions and comments regarding the proposed changes. In addition, we have also instituted a practice to orient all selection committees to the recruitment process. Contrary to our past practice of orienting participants annually, we now orient every member of the selection committee collectively in a group setting. All recruitment orientations are done by the Director of Human Resources or her designee. This allows committee members to ask questions about the general process and/or specific questions regarding the position that is being recruited. This practice has proven to be more effective in facilitating a recruitment process that is consistent and fair to all applicants.

- SWC's Diversity Advisory Committee has reviewed and revised its structure and functions. The Committee has begun the process to develop a diversity initiative (Initiative of Positive Engagement in Diversity). A variety of experts regarding diversity and organizational change are being consulted as part of the committee's information gathering phase. Ultimately a consultant will be retained to provide assistance in the development of a diversity initiative. Additionally, the Committee is reviewing various college policies, programs, reports, and activities.

- The Superintendent/President and Fiscal Affairs facilitated budget forums for the college community and disseminated pertinent budget information at both the system-wide level and at the District level.

- Institutional Planning process was created by the College Management Team and consultation presentations regarding planning process have occurred with other college groups and departments.

In summary, the college community is progressing collectively in creating "a supportive environment of trust and respect for all employees". This effort has brought the various college groups together to discuss, debate, and review what has occurred in the past. From these dialogues, plans are being formulated to have a framework that is institutionalized to ensure there are policies, procedures and practices in place to provide confidence to the college community of the District's commitment to this recommendation.

Listed below is a table that represents the strategies, timeline and stakeholders involved in addressing this recommendation.

Recommendation #2

Strategies	Timeline	Stakeholders

▪ Conduct campus climate study
  ▪ Form task force
  ▪ Develop, administer, and analyze series of six customized student, faculty, and staff surveys
  ▪ Initiate action based on survey findings
	Aug 2003	▪ **VP, Student Affairs (lead)**
		▪ Coordinator, Staff Development
		▪ Director, Human Resources
		▪ Director, Institutional Research
		▪ Director, Title V
		▪ President, Academic Senate
		▪ President, Classified Senate
		▪ President, CSEA
		▪ Superintendent/President
		▪ VP, Academic Affairs
		▪ President, SCEA
		▪ Dean, Student Support Services

▪ Establish Cultural Institute ▪ Collaborative project of staff development and Title V	Aug 2003 – ongoing	
▪ Sponsor workshops, presentations and training regarding infusing cultural diversity into the classroom	Aug 2003 – ongoing	
▪ Revise employment hiring procedures ▪ Submit document for review and input by college community	Spring 2003 – Spring 2004	
▪ Develop District diversity initiative	In process	

▪ Conduct forums to communicate pertinent information
  ▪ Budget crisis forums (open to all college staff)
  ▪ CMT presentations on reorganization and planning process
	Feb – May 2003
	Oct 2003 – Jan 2004	

Recommendation # 3

The team recommends that the College establish a culture of evidence, relying on data and analysis to ensure improvement of programs and services. In particular, the College should use student learning outcomes as the means to determine institutional effectiveness and, as previously identified in the 1996 AACJS WASC Accreditation Report, develop and implement a process for program discontinuance. (Standards 3.A.3, 3.A.4, 3.C.1, 4.D.1, 5.10, and 6.7)

Progress to Date and Analysis of Results

Culture of Evidence

- **Review current process for creating annual institutional research agenda to ensure input from campus sectors**

  The Director of Institutional Research is an active member of the CMT Planning Process Group, which has developed a proposed process for institutional planning that is currently in consultation for approval by all college sectors and constituents. The proposed institutional plan would integrate all college plans and processes, including the development of the annual institutional research plan. Much of the annual research plan would be driven by the annual evaluation cycle built into the institutional plan.

- **Develop dissemination plan for research findings**

  The Office of Institutional Research is developing a schedule for the release of Research Notes, summaries of research studies undertaken by the unit. Also, the IR web site is currently being updated and expanded to include current student and college data and information regarding research studies.

Process for Program Discontinuance

- **Draft process and procedures for program discontinuance;**
- **Consult with involved entities regarding process and procedures for program discontinuance; finalize document;**
- **Implement program discontinuance process and procedures**

  A sub-committee of the Academic Senate Executive Committee, which included the Vice President for Academic Affairs, designed a process for program discontinuance which was sent in draft form to the full Academic Senate during the fall semester of 2003. The draft is now under review by other college entities. Student Services is using the document as a model for development of a discontinuance policy in their area. Once the policies for Academic Affairs and Student Services are integrated, a final review by college entities (e.g., the Academic Senate, Instructional Administrators Council, Student Services Council, Executive Management Team, etc.) will be completed. The approved document will be forwarded to the Governing Board for final adoption as College Policy.

Student Learning Outcomes

- **Continue regular review of courses, programs and services by faculty, department chairs, and school deans**

  The college Curriculum Committee, which was fundamentally restructured in January 2003, meets twice each month to review both current/ new courses/programs. The Committee is chaired by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate President Elect, and is composed of faculty representatives from each School, the Presiding Chair of the Council of Chairs, the Articulation and Assessment Officers, a School Dean, and other pertinent representatives. The Committee has begun discussion of integration of student learning outcomes in the course/program review and approval process. Various faculty and administrators have also attended workshops directly and indirectly related to student learning outcomes issues (e.g., learning communities and student retention). Discussions are being fostered in a variety of venues: curriculum committee, Academic Senate, Instructional Administrators Counsel, Executive Management Team, and the College's "Fifth Thursday"

academic forums. Our Title V grant has provided support for many of these activities. As with many California community colleges, we are grappling to define ways in which we can best create and measure student learning outcomes. As demonstrated above, SWC has been, and continues to be, proactive and vigilant in this important endeavor.

In summary, continuous improvement of college services and programs is a critical component to prudent administrative procedures. Establishing a culture of evidence at SWC where data and analysis are primarily utilized to ensure the improvement of programs and services is a priority for the college. To that end, the Office of Institutional Research plays a key role in the development and implementation of an institutional planning process that assesses institutional effectiveness through the analysis of measurable institutional goals. Decisions regarding program and services effectiveness will certainly be based upon data and analysis resulting from the institutional planning outcomes.

A process for program discontinuance has been created for academic programs and one is being developed for student services. The completed policy for program discontinuance will integrate the processes for both academic and student services programs. A draft document is being reviewed by both sectors of the college prior to creating a final policy for the consultation process.

Dialogue regarding student learning outcomes continues to be a priority for SWC. While infrastructure components such as the Curriculum Committee have been restructured to be more responsive to review of courses, programs, and services, the baseline philosophy of how to approach student learning outcomes remains a topic of passionate discussion.

Listed below is a table that represents the strategies, timeline and stakeholders involved in addressing this recommendation.

Recommendation #3

Strategies	Timeline	Stakeholders
▪ Review current process for creating annual institutional research agenda to ensure input from campus sectors	Fall 2003	▪ **Director, Institutional Research (lead)** ▪ **President, Academic Senate (lead)** ▪ **VP, Academic Affairs (lead)**
▪ Develop dissemination plan for research findings	Fall 2003	▪ Academic Program Review Committee
▪ Draft process and procedures for program discontinuance	Fall 2003	▪ Department Chairs and Faculty ▪ Director, Computer Systems & Services
▪ Consult with involved entities regarding process and procedures for program discontinuance; finalize document	Spring 2004	▪ Director, Title V ▪ Instructional Administrators
▪ Implement program discontinuance process and procedures	Fall 2004	▪ Student Services Council ▪ Student Services Program Review Subcommittee
▪ Continue regular review of courses, programs, and services by faculty, department chairs, and school deans ▪ Implement recommendations that are made as a result of program review	Ongoing	▪ VP, Human Resources & Legal Affairs ▪ VP, Student Affairs ▪ College Management Team Planning Process Group

Recommendation # 5

As previously identified in the 1996 AACJC WASC Accreditation Report, the team recommends that the College develop a comprehensive Technology Plan that ensures end-user training on the full functionality of Datatel's Colleague system; integrates the functions of instructional and Distance Learning technology support; provides a reliable budgetary process for the systematic upgrading and replacement of instructional and administrative technology.

Review and update District Technology Plan

The college has developed a number of technology plans over the past six years that need to be consolidated into a comprehensive plan that will be endorsed by the entire college community and integrated with the college master plan, educational master plan, and facilities plan. A Technology Taskforce was established and charged with this task. They have been meeting weekly and are in the process of reviewing the previous technology plans, developing a consolidated plan and staffing it through the collegial process to gain consensus and approval before being implemented. The Academic Technology Committee has agreed to work on developing an Instructional Technology Plan as well as a Distance Education/Online Learning Plan that will integrate with the above mentioned master plans. Computer Systems Services (CSS) plans to hold a security summit in the spring with the intent of identifying the issues and proposing a security policy and appropriate procedures.

Ensure end-user training on the full functionality of Datatel's Colleague system

The college has undertaken a number of strategies and actions intended to meet this recommendation including:
- Development, installation and training on the Datatel Web Advisor system;
- Development, installation and training on the online (Web Advisor) matriculation system;
- Development, installation and training on the online (Web Advisor) faculty interface to the Colleague system;
- Training on the use and management of the Colleague Student Information System; and
- Hiring consultants to conduct a gap analysis and provide training on the full use and functionality of several modules of the Colleague system.

Integrate the functions of instructional and Distance Learning technology support

A Dean of Academic Information Services was hired in 2003 and given responsibility for integrating instructional and distance learning technology support. Working with a wide variety of committees and constituent groups, including the Academic Technology Committee and the Instructional Administrators Council, a number of projects, activities and strategies have been undertaken which address this recommendation, including:
- Collaborating with the Academic Senate to reorganize the Academic Technology Committee;
- Establishment of a college-wide Technology Taskforce;
- Funding (Title V) and college-wide approval to hire an Instructional Designer to support faculty in their development and use of distance learning and instructional technology;
- Funding (College Leadership Council for Block Grant) and college-wide approval to purchase and install the enterprise edition of the Blackboard Learning System;
- Funding (College Leadership Council for Block Grant) and college-wide approval to purchase and install the Blackboard Portal System; and
- Funding (Title V and Prop AA) and college-wide approval to purchase and install smart classrooms throughout the campus.

- Exploration of a reorganization to consolidate technology support for computer labs, smart classrooms, multimedia and distance learning under one department and supervisor.

Provide a reliable budgetary process for the systematic upgrading and replacement of instructional and administrative technology

A number of initiatives, strategies and projects have been undertaken to address this recommendation, including:
- Completion of a manual college-wide computer inventory;
- Establishment of minimum standards for the operating system of Intel (Windows XP) and Macintosh (OS 10.3) computers used in labs, by faculty, staff and administrators;
- Funding (Title V, RFP53, TTIP and College Leadership Council for Block Grant) and campus-wide approval for a comprehensive computer replacement and upgrade project;
- Purchase of a remote, automated computer hardware and software inventory system;
- Establishment of a college-wide Technology Taskforce; and
- Development of an equipment replacement policy and plan (currently pending approval).

Provided below is a list of the campus groups that provided direct involvement or input in these projects, with the role they played in parenthesis:
- College Leadership Council (for consensus and funding approval of a number of projects);
- Executive Management Team (for advice, approval and/or consensus on all projects);
- Academic Technology Committee (for advice, consensus and approval of a variety of projects);
- Technology Taskforce (for review of old technology plans, development of a new technology plan and staffing the plan through the collegial process to gain consensus and approval);
- Title V Project Director (for advice, consensus and funding approval of the equipment replacement project, smart classroom project, hiring new Instructional Designer and a host of other technology-related projects);
- Instructional Administrators Council (for advice, consensus and approval of a number of projects);
- Also consulted on these projects were the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Legal Affairs, Fiscal Services, Academic Senate President, Classified Senate President, Staff Development Coordinator, faculty and classified union leaders, Instructional Designer, Instructional Systems Administrator, and Computer Systems and Services Director (for advice, consensus and approval on virtually all of the projects).

In summary, the impact of the above listed activities, strategies and projects cannot be overstated. The effect has been felt by students, faculty and staff alike. Establishment of standards, replacement and upgrade of old equipment will make it possible for the faculty to develop course materials on the same version of the operating system and applications used in computer labs and smart classrooms. This alone will be a real boon to the efficacy and efficiency of instruction at the college to say nothing of the impact on staff being able to share files and work on systems that are the same across campus.

Hiring an Instructional Designer has given our faculty a new, hands-on resource to help them with pedagogical issues related to development of distance learning courses, using instructional technology more effectively in the classroom. The instructional designer will also be helping them develop an online learning plan as well as an instructional technology plan. Included in these plans will be professional standards and guidelines on the use of instructional technology and online courses.

Establishing a policy, plan and line item on the budget for replacement and upgrade of equipment on a regular schedule will result in improved efficiency, productivity and student results.

Upgrading from the basic Blackboard online course management system, hosted off-campus by Blackboard, to the full enterprise edition of the Blackboard Learning System, hosted by the college on campus, will result in less down time, faster response time, interconnectivity with the Datatel Colleague system, interconnectivity with the Datatel Web Advisor system and more. The result will be significantly improved support for online students and faculty alike.

Purchasing and installing the Blackboard (Bb) portal system will result in vastly improved service and support to all students, faculty and staff. The system will allow a single sign-in to multiple databases and systems including the Bb learning system, Datatel Web Advisor, campus network, the Internet, Datatel student information system, the campus help desk system, and many other systems and services.

Listed below is a table that represents the strategies, timeline and stakeholders involved in addressing this recommendation.

Recommendation #5

Strategies	Timeline	Stakeholders

▪ Review and update District Technology Plan
  ▪ Establish Technology Taskforce
  ▪ Review and update the SWC Technology Plan
  ▪ Establish policies and procedures to ensure security
	Spring 2004	▪ **Dean, Academic Information Services/CSS (lead)**
		▪ Academic Technology Committee
		▪ College Leadership Council (CLC)
		▪ Coordinator, Staff Development
		▪ Director, Computer Systems & Services
		▪ Director, Title V
		▪ Instructional Designer
		▪ Instructional Systems Administrator
		▪ Instructional Administrators Council
		▪ President, Academic Senate
		▪ President, Classified Senate
		▪ VP, Academic Affairs
		▪ VP, Student Affairs
		▪ VP, Fiscal Affairs

▪ Enhance the use of Colleague and provide end-user training
  ▪ Provide online student services by installing WebAdvisor
  ▪ Provide end user training on WebAdvisor
  ▪ Purchase and install an Intranet/Portal system
  ▪ Install an online matriculation system
  ▪ Install a faculty interface to the Colleague system
	Fall 2003
	Fall 2004–ongoing	

▪ Expand and enhance online courses, services and support
  ▪ Purchase and install enterprise edition of online learning system
  ▪ Provide end user training on new system
  ▪ Hire an Instructional Designer
	Spring 2003
	Fall 2004–ongoing	

▪ Schedule regular technology inventory and create schedule for review
  ▪ Conduct manual hardware and software inventory
  ▪ Purchase and install an automated computer inventory system
	Fall 2003
	Spring 2004	

▪ Establish policy, plan and line item in annual college budget for systematic replacement of hardware, software, and related technology	Spring 2004	

Recommendation # 7

The team recommends, as previously identified in the 1996 AACJC WASC Accreditation Report that the College define and communicate budget development and budget decision-making processes to achieve College goals. (Standard 9.A.1)

Progress to Date and Analysis of Results

Budget development and budget decision-making processes at the college have become more important than ever due to the state fiscal crisis and how it has affected SWC's budget. Public forums to discuss fiscal matters and to educate college constituents have become a consistent part of the SWC administrative landscape. Further, the communication process and discussion venues for budgetary matters have been changed to disclose information and promote greater understanding of the fiscal issues facing the college. This philosophical change in approach to information regarding resource allocation is an outcome of the institution's commitment to building an environment of trust among its staff. Sharing critical information and conducting itself in alignment with stated goals and in compliance with policies and procedures is key to being a trustworthy organization. SWC is in the process of creating transparent operational systems, such as its budget development processes, that disclose information and welcome participation from college constituents.

Budget development and decision-making process

Phase I

Budget Forums are held periodically in conjunction with State Budget development events. This is done to share information on a college-wide basis with all interested individuals. This information determines to a great extent the resources that will be available for the coming year (both increases and decreases). The anticipated impact is shown graphically and sufficient time is allowed for questions and input. This was initiated on February 7, 2003 and a total of six forums have been held through February 11, 2004.

Phase II

In this year of probable budget reductions, due to mandated new costs which will exceed very meager income increases, the process for budget development will concentrate on global conversations regarding program and service priorities. Communication will involve a process for setting priorities and possible reduction versus enhancement of programs and services. Overall, SWC is looking forward to budget conditions improving in future years and the new strategic planning initiative which will support a budget development process that is based upon the achievement of college goals.

Phase III

As stated above, the budget development process will become an integral part of the strategic planning initiative with the completion of a new perpetual plan.

Process and participants in the consultation process

Groups involved include but are not limited to:

- All divisions and departments
  - Preparation and submission of requests
  - College Management Team has responsibility for coordination, participation, and submission of requests

- College Leadership Council
  - Serves as budget committee

- Reviews and recommends resource allocation
- College Leadership Task Force Subcommittee meets biweekly to provide "hands-on" input and guidance in development

- President's Cabinet
  - Assists Superintendent/President in finalization of budget based on college-wide input, CLC recommendations, and income parameters

- Strategic Planning Committee (Future)
  - Will perpetually update the College Plan upon which the annual budget will be based

In summary, the budget development process has been greatly expanded in order to empower the college community with fiscal information and decision making capabilities. The CLC Budget subcommittee members represent cross college constituents and part of their responsibility is to share fiscal information with their respective employee groups. This information and participation is especially important as our college heads into the budget process in Spring 2004.

Further, the budget education component, which is critical to promoting staff's understanding of urgent fiscal matters facing the college, has been fully implemented via budget forums that have been well attended by college employees.

As the institutional planning process becomes formalized, the resource allocation process will become more evident in the daily operations of the college. Our proposed planning process is based upon the integration of key processes (such as resource allocation) being included into institutional measurable goals.

Listed below is a table that represents the strategies, timeline and stakeholders involved in addressing this recommendation.

Recommendation #7

Strategies	Timeline	Stakeholders
▪ Establish consistent communication strategies regarding budget development and budget decision-making processes: 　▪ Reestablish purpose of CLC (an SWC committee, consisting of representatives from the various shared governance constituencies) 　▪ Establish budget oversight subcommittee that meets bi-weekly to review budget status 　▪ Conduct college-wide budget development workshops	Spring 2003 – ongoing Spring 2004	▪ **VP, Fiscal Affairs (lead)** ▪ College Leadership Council (CLC) ▪ CLC Budget Subcommittee ▪ Strategic Planning Committee
▪ Initiate institutional planning activity to integrate budget development process that is reflective of institutional goals 　▪ Consider program review recommendations in developing budget priorities	Fall 2004	

Recommendation # 10

The team recommends that the Governing Board establish and implement on-going Board training, as previously indicated in the 1996 AACJC WASC Accreditation, and includes a consistent self-evaluation process. (Standard 10.A.6)

Progress to Date and Analysis of Results

SWC's Governing Board is committed to the visionary and fiduciary responsibility it is entrusted to fulfill. To that end, the board believes that on-going training, consistent self evaluation process (complete with feedback), and public education opportunities are vital elements for this policy setting body. The following board actions have taken place this past year:

- On-going board training was one of the outcomes of the annual Governing Board retreat in August 2003. The facilitator, Cindra Smith, Ed.D., Director of Educational Services for the Community College League of California, has had an accomplished career with board development and trustee training. The emphasis of the retreat focused upon board member duties and responsibilities. In addition, Dr. Smith facilitated dialogue among SWC trustees to create priorities and goals based upon present and future college and community issues and concerns.

- Besides the opportunities to pursue on-going board training and development, the SWC trustees also developed an educational outreach series that showcases issues of concern and interest to the college internal and external constituents. These forums/study sessions are open to the public and are held on campus in the early evenings. 2003-04 topics covered at the sessions include: accreditation status report. State budget crisis and its affect on SWC operational budget, budget updates, asset management, and shared governance.

- The board's self evaluation process was also examined at the annual retreat with the intent to create an on-going cycle of performance evaluation. Between August and December 2003 the board reviewed and revised the self-evaluation instrument to include feedback and/or comments within each of the nine performance areas. In addition, an evaluation cycle was established two times per year; April/May is reserved for an evaluation workshop, led by a facilitator, to reflect, establish, or update board goals and priorities and December/January to conduct a performance review among the trustees to evaluate board achievements. In order to keep the self-evaluation component focused on continuous improvement the trustees have the opportunity at each evaluation session to discuss the feedback and comments submitted from the prior evaluation cycle.

In summary, the Governing Board has thoughtfully considered the WASC recommendation and has carefully designed and implemented an action plan that will endure and is relevant and responsive to board goals and priorities. With this implementation the board has established a process for renewal of their commitment to the stewardship of the college and for revitalization of the direction the college must take in light of educational and community changes.

Listed below is a table that represents the strategies, timeline and stakeholders involved in addressing this recommendation.

Recommendation #10

Strategies	Timeline	Stakeholders
▪ Establish Governing Board (GB) training schedule 　▪ Develop schedule of study sessions for academic year 2003-2004	Aug 2003 Nov 2003 – Spring 2004	▪ **Governing Board (lead)** ▪ Superintendent/President
▪ Review GB's self-evaluation process 　▪ Discuss during annual GB retreat 　▪ Conduct self-evaluation	Aug 2003 April/May 2004 Dec '04/Jan'05	
▪ Establish feedback cycle for self-evaluation	In process and ongoing	

Status Report on Recommendations #1, #4, #6 and Action Plans from 2003 Self Study

While the WASC action letter did not require SWC to report on recommendations #1, #4, #6 and the action plans from the 2003 self study until the mid-cycle accreditation report (2006), we felt it important that the Commission receive a brief overview on the progress made to date in these key areas.

- **Recommendation #1**
  The team recommends that the College establish and implement a process for regular review and revision of the mission statement and utilize the statement as a key planning element (Standards 1.3 and 1.4)
- **Recommendation #4**
  The team recommends that the College establish, implement, and make known to the college community its planning processes, integrating financial, facilities, technology, and human resources plans to support its Educational Master Plan. The team further recommends that the College define the purpose and function of collegial consultation committees and councils, effectively involving faculty, staff, administrators, and students from both the main campus and the Centers. (Standards 3.B.2, 3.B.3, 3.C.3, 4.B.1, 8.5, 10.A, 10.B.6, 10.B.9, and 10.B.10)

Recommendation's #1 and #4 are being addressed together because of the proposed comprehensive institutional planning process that is currently in consultation at SWC. Under the leadership of the interim Superintendent/President, the College Management Team (CMT) formed a sub committee (Planning Process Group) to study institutional planning and to propose a process for such an endeavor at SWC. The last formal strategic planning initiative occurred in 1998 and the CMT has proposed a planning approach to begin in 2004 and is in consultation with campus constituents to consider the process and ultimately adopt. The CMT endorsed planning process was created in January 2004 and has been in consultation since that time. Information and suggestions regarding the process are being noted at various meetings of employee groups on campus and at the Centers. Revisiting our mission statement, as well as defining vision, values and measurable institutional goals are the core recommendations of this proposed process. The integration of key college processes, including resource allocation (human and fiscal), Master Facilities Plan, Technology Plan, will serve as the infrastructure or building blocks of the strategic planning process. Additionally, the process suggests that the new Accreditation standards serve as the approach or foundation to the development of the institutional plan.

- **Recommendation #6**
  To ensure fairness for all employees, the team recommends that the College establish, clarify, and implement hiring, promotion, and equal employment practices and provide appropriate orientation, training, and evaluation. (Standards 2.6, 7.A.1., 7.A.2., 7.B.1., 7.B.2., 7.B.3, C.2, 7.D.1, 7.D.2)

Some of the work that has been done within this recommendation has been reported under recommendation #2 (creating a supportive environment of trust and respect for all employees). Hiring policies and procedures are under review and a draft plan entitled "Hiring Procedures Policy" is in the college consultation process. The plan has added components to further ensure the integrity of the recruitment process and to ensure fair and legal hiring practices. These changes included having Hiring Compliance Officers serve on each selection committee, modifications to the protocol used for checking references and an expanded commitment to diversity and compliance with fair and equitable hiring practices.

To provide appropriate training and evaluation processes for tenure track faculty initial steps were taken in Fall 2002. Sessions (three at various times) were held for all faculty (tenured and tenure track) to "engage in a dialog" to assist in

gaining a better perspective from those engaged in the tenure process as to their experience and opinions as to what could be done to strengthen the process. Next, a Tenure Procedures Review Committee was formed and began meeting in Spring 2003. An extensive and detailed list of objectives was established.

Subcommittees set out to investigate, in detail, specific areas such as the Tenure Review handbook, evaluation documents, professional ethics, timelines, etc. To date both a draft on "Adjunct Evaluation Process Guidelines" and a draft for the Tenure Review Coordinator position have been written. The full Committee will be discussing these drafts at their next meeting .

The initial discussion for a review of the tenure process formally began with the following: VP for Legal Affairs, VP for Academic Affairs, Academic Senate President and SCEA (faculty union) President. Forums to discuss the tenure process were open to all faculty. The Tenure Procedures Review committee membership is comprised of faculty (Academic Senate and Union members) and administrators (both VP and dean levels). Draft documents will be circulated on campus for consultation (Academic Senate, SCEA, Instructional Administrators, Student Services Council, Executive Management Team) before finalization. Changes to the tenure process will be part of the new faculty contract.

Action Plans from the 2003 Accreditation Self Study

Southwestern College identified over 350 action plans within its 2003 Self Study. These action plans have helped the college to focus on present and future improvement of programs and services. The action plans were identified specific to the ten standards of quality assessed during the 2003 self study. Each of the lead stakeholders responsible for the ten recommendations cited in the WASC action letter were provided a listing of action plans and requested to review those action plans that were relevant to their specific recommendation. During their process of addressing each recommendation the respective stakeholder leads/committee conducted an initial or cursory review of the status of the action plans. The informal reporting of the status of the action plans revealed that most of the plans were in progress. The college has developed a monitoring and tracking system for the evaluation of the action plans which will be launched in fall 2004. The status of the action plans will be recorded for the mid-cycle accreditation report to WASC in 2006.