Organization of the Self Study
In the six years since the last accreditation self study, College of the Desert has worked toward continuous quality improvement in each of the standards. Immediately following receipt of the 2004 self study evaluation report, work began to address the recommendations. The college consistently reported its work to the commission starting with a progress report in October 2006, a focused midterm report in March 2008, a midterm visit in April 2008, and the final follow-up report in March 2009 that was accepted by the commission in June 2009 with no additional requirements. As with most public colleges during the current economic downturn, College of the Desert has been tasked in recent years to do more with less and to meet the needs of its many students with their varied educational goals. Through a comprehensive planning process and effective shared governance, the college has managed to remain true to its mission while still maintaining fiscal stability.

While dealing with state funding cutbacks, the college has been the beneficiary of a $346.5 million bond measure that has provided funds to update and upgrade existing facilities as well as to build new facilities on the main campus and new education centers to the east and west of the existing campus. Planning of these facilities has been driven by the Strategic Master Plan, the Educational Master Plan, and the Facilities Master Plan. Each of these plans was created with significant input by the practitioners who will teach and provide services in these facilities.

Themes have been prevalent in the self study, including institutional commitments, evaluation, planning, and improvement, student learning outcomes (SLOs), organization, dialogue, and institutional integrity. Beginning with institutional commitments, the college worked to refine its mission, vision, and values statements to assure that the college was clear in terms of what we do to serve our community and our students. Mission is at the core of planning including strategic planning and other institutional plans at the college level and program review at the program, area, and unit levels. Mission drives instruction and services, informing curriculum, student services support services, and resource allocation.

The theme of evaluation, planning, and improvement was a major emphasis for the institution for the last several years and is strongly present throughout all of the standards. The college has worked hard to build its culture of evidence over the past six years. Although data collection and research are currently centralized in the Information Technology and Institutional Research area, the analysis of the data and the dialogue around the data and how it affects student learning is shared throughout the organization. The college is continuing to refine what data is important and how to use it effectively for program review, evaluation, planning, and continuous process improvement.

The college’s annual plan, which drives achievement of the strategic plan, contains key performance indicators and requires progress reports three times per year to ensure that all areas are on target to achieve their goals. Decision making is focused on data-informed practices.

The theme of SLOs is becoming an integral component of the institution and its planning. Evidence of this progress is present in each of the standards. SLOs are identified for all courses and programs of study. Institutional outcomes have been created to cover all programs and services at the college. Additionally, all courses align with program
and institutional outcomes, as they enter into the assessment cycle. Faculty are learning to work with the Office of Institutional Research to obtain data specific to their programs based on assessments they are using to evaluate improvements in program and changes to curriculum.

The theme of organization is clear in the manner in which learning and learning outcomes are planned, measured, assessed, and communicated to the public. As described in Standard II, curriculum is created, assessed, and modified when necessary by faculty in a cycle that includes program review and dialogue about the process. Standard I outlines a planning process that is also organized in a cycle that begins with the college’s mission, establishes goals, objectives, and key performance indicators, includes program review in all units, and assesses their effectiveness as the foundation for establishing the goals for the following year. Standard III reflects a structure that ensures resource allocation is organized around the planning process. Standard IV makes clear that decision making is based upon a participatory process that is evaluative.

Dialogue is an essential component of all decision making and as such is a recurrent theme in each of the standards. The college has a strong culture of participatory governance that includes the utilization of dialogue as described in the accreditation themes. One of the college’s expressed values statements is to “communicate with authenticity in pursuit of broad understanding, effective dialogue, and inclusive decision making.” The college implemented dialogue training during the last self study process in 2004 and has continued to utilize the technique for effective decision making throughout the institution. Numerous committees addressing various issues and processes such as strategic planning, budget development, information technology, curriculum, research, SLOs and assessment, and program review, exist for the purpose of broad dialogue and informed decision making. This same philosophy exists for dialogue at the program, area, and unit levels. As defined, research reports and data inform the dialogue, and everyone “at the table” has an equal voice.

Institutional integrity is reflected in each area of the standards, with the shared governance structure providing the checks and balances that assure integrity in all that the college does. As stated, the college values are:

- **Student Success:** Student learning and growth are central to all we do.
- **Diversity and Inclusion:** We embrace the diversity of our community and uphold the dignity and worth of the individual.
- **Integrity:** We are open, honest, and reliable.
- **Respect:** We value the thoughts, words, and actions of our students, colleagues, and community.
- **Dedication:** Our faculty, staff, and administrators are responsible leaders who effectively implement programs in support of student learning and efficient college operations.
- **Professionalism:** We are current in our areas of expertise and embody high standards of conduct.
- **Communication:** We communicate with authenticity in pursuit of broad understanding, effective dialogue, and inclusive decision making.
- **Lifelong Learning:** Learning is essential to living for our students, faculty, and staff.

The college strives to be transparent in its planning and decision making, utilizing internal and external data scans and sharing outcomes with all campus...
The college works to provide clear expectations of our faculty, staff, and students and to provide the public with clear and effective communications.

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

IA: Mission
As part of the Strategic Master Plan process, the college’s mission, vision, and values statements were rewritten. Annually, as the first step in the planning process, they are reviewed and affirmed or amended if necessary. Establishing the mission is an organic process and must be responsive to the college’s and the community’s needs. The mission, vision, and values statements are the basis for all planning and evaluation endeavors at the college. The Educational Master Plan, Technology Plan, Facilities Master Plan, and all resource planning and allocation support our mission.

IB: Improving Institutional Effectiveness
Institutional effectiveness has been and continues to be a major area of focus for the college. Since the previous self study and subsequent reports, College of the Desert has devoted significant time and effort to improving the process designed to ensure institutional effectiveness. A Strategic Master Plan was developed as well as an Educational Master Plan, Technology Plan, and Facilities Master Plan. A new overarching strategic planning process was developed and improved to provide the integration needed as well as to link planning to resource allocation.

The college’s long-established program review process has matured into an integrated approach that encompasses both the five-year comprehensive review and an annual program review update. The process was initially established in instruction and then mirrored in all other units on campus. Program Review continues to be the locus of campus planning and resource allocation. SLOs have followed a similar path. The comprehensive planning process, which includes program review and SLO data, is designed to evaluate and assess the effectiveness and quality of the institution.

Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

Standard IIA: Instructional Programs
The college’s instructional program is guided by the Curriculum Committee, which utilizes program review information and the SLOs and assessment cycle while adhering to state and district policies. The use of CurricuNet was initiated in 2009 and will assist faculty and staff with the management and assessment of student learning, assessment, and curriculum. The instructional area delivers classes to a diverse student body and balances new class offerings between academic, basic skills, noncredit, and career/technical classes. The college also serves business and industry in the community through the Partnership and Community Education program.

Standard IIB: Student Support Services
Although the current economic crisis in California has had a devastating effect on categorical program budgets, the area has continued to provide a high level of student support and services. Dialogue and cooperation among the various Student Affairs programs and the rest of the college community have permitted the numerous programs, including matriculation, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services, Disabled Student Programs and Services, Upward Bound, outreach, student health, financial...
aid, student life, counseling, transfer services, and the career center to provide the needed support necessary for student success.

Since the 2004 Self Study, Student Affairs has developed and is beginning to assess SLOs for all of its service areas. They are also a part of the college’s robust and integrated program review process. Student Affairs has made improvements through technology so that students have increased ways to access and support their educational experiences and to be successful in achieving their academic goals.

The Cravens Student Services Center, a one-stop facility that includes the majority of Student Affairs, was opened in fall 2010 and greets students at the main entrance to the campus.

Standard IIC: Library and Learning Support Services
The recent reorganization resulted in the creation of the School of Library, Learning Resources, and Distance Education. The College of the Desert library provides library and other learning support services that support the educational programs at the college by providing a wide variety of information resources, information services, equipment, facilities, and technology to fulfill its institutional goals. The library has risen to meet the challenges created by the development of new satellite educational centers and the growth of courses offering instruction through online delivery.

The library provides online databases, electronic books, periodical articles, and reference materials. Within the last year, the library staff has begun to add online tutorials to assist students in using the online databases. As part of a “multi-agency library,” access is also provided to materials that the COD library does not generally purchase.

Standard III: Resources

Standard IIIA: Human Resources
The college, through its Human Resources department, seeks highly-qualified personnel to staff its positions and support its mission and purpose, adheres to established policies, orders staff development opportunities, encourages diversity, and incorporates human resources values and objectives into the strategic plan. The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support the college’s programs and services. The Board of Trustees has outlined policies for recruitment and hiring of personnel, and the college has developed detailed hiring policies and procedures. The college’s integrated program review process provides planning direction and supports decision making in the allocation of human resources.

Standard IIIB: Physical Resources
The college now serves over 13,000 students on our Palm Desert, Indio, and Mecca/Thermal campuses. The availability of bond funds has enabled the college to leverage its state funds in order to expedite construction of many new buildings. The college has done extensive planning to maximize the use of the bond funds, updating the facilities master plan in 2002-2003 and again in 2010 with substantial opportunity for faculty, staff, and community members to provide input. The college has been successful in integrating its institutional planning by department program reviews and strategic goals, which drives its Education Master
Plan and Facilities Master Plan. The added space that has been created as a result of the bond funds has allowed the college to meet the increased demand to meet student’s needs and is designed to integrate and promote interdisciplinary relations and student learning.

**Standard IIIIC: Technology Resources**
The institution makes decisions regarding the use of technology services, facilities, hardware, and software by examining a multitude of areas. Program review, the annual planning process, and the Facilities Master Plan are all tied to the Technology Plan and then directly linked to the Educational Master Plan. The Technology Plan is concerned with all aspects of technology at the college in accordance with, and in support of, the college’s mission. The Information Technology and Institutional Research department aims to provide the level of technology and support needed for instructional programs and college operations and is deeply committed to improvement and planning. The department provides administrative support to assure consistent, reliable, responsive services, including those in support of the college’s online offerings. The Information Technology and Institutional Research department, in collaboration with the Academic Senate’s Education Technology Committee, also acts as the clearing house for purchasing all equipment and software.

**Standard IIID: Financial Resources**
While the primary objective of institutional planning is to successfully meet the educational needs of the student body in the college’s service area in the context of the mission, a prerequisite objective of the college is to ensure the financial health and viability of the institution. Institutional planning at College of the Desert emphasizes the realistic assessment of availability of financial resources and of expenditure requirements. The college strives to manage its planning and assessment of programs and services and to incorporate the results into the operating budget. The College Planning Council reviews all planning and priorities that are produced at the unit level in order to evaluate their relationship to program review and student learning as well as their impact on the financial budget for the coming year; this process ultimately drives the budget development. Financial statements and unqualified audit opinions demonstrate that the college’s finances are expended in a manner that supports the mission and goals of the college.

**Standard IV: Leadership and Governance**

**Standard IVA: Decision-Making Roles and Processes**
College of the Desert prides itself on its multiple avenues of communication to enable participatory decision making and collegial consultation. “The College Planning Council Handbook” specifically outlines the college’s “Decision Making through Collegial Consultation” process including the various committees and their membership, role, and desired products that are involved in ongoing dialogue and collegewide decisions. The college also has numerous advisory committees and business and community partnerships through which it gathers input to assist in evaluation, planning, improvements and decision-making.

**Standard IVB: Board and Administrative Organization**
The College of the Desert Board of Trustees is an experienced five-member independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in their activities and decisions. They have established and
monitor policies that support student learning and the fiscal stability of the district. The board reviews all policy documents, financial records, and planning documents with decision, commitment, and integrity. Both the board and the president take their fiduciary responsibilities seriously. As a team, they ensure that the district goals and needs are fiscally sound.

The current president was selected and continues to be evaluated using existing policies. He is delegated appropriate authority and responsibilities as defined by policy and is responsible for planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting, and developing personnel as well as assessing institutional effectiveness. The president delegates appropriate responsibility and authority to his vice presidents, who in turn administer their areas. With participatory governance in place, there is support for effective conduct of business and decision-making at the college level.
Organization for the development of College of the Desert’s self study began in spring 2009. The college president appointed the Executive Director of Institutional Effectiveness as the Accreditation Liaison Officer. Standard II was divided into IIA and IIB and C, creating five self study teams. Co-chairs for Standard III were an academic administrator and a classified employee. For all other standards, one academic administrator and one full-time faculty member were chosen to serve as co-chairs. These ten co-chairs comprised the Steering Committee for the self study. In preparation for this undertaking, several members of the Steering Committee attended the training session presented by the ACCJC in March 2009.

Beginning in April 2009, the co-chairs first responsibility was to solicit participation for each team campuswide. Teams were comprised of faculty (full-time and adjunct), classified staff, leadership, and students. On average, each team consisted of approximately 15–20 members that represented a cross section of all campus constituencies. The Director of Student Life was particularly helpful in working with the Associated Students of College of the Desert to ensure student participation on all five teams. The task of each team was to respond to every section and subsection of the standard doing four things for each: 1) research appropriate supporting data and documentation; 2) write an evaluation based on that support material; 3) identify areas that the college does well or needs to improve; and 4) develop planning agendas to address any problems discovered. It was expected that teams would need to reach out to various additional people across the campus as needed to get a complete picture.

The Steering Committee met monthly for the 2009-2010 year, starting 20 July 2009. At that meeting, notebooks were distributed that contained various reference materials, including: the commission’s Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, writing style guidelines, and the commission’s Guide to Evaluating Institutions (including questions to guide the writing). With respect to institutional effectiveness, the Steering Committee discussed that the commission describes four progressive levels of implementation: 1) awareness, 2) development, 3) proficiency, and 4) sustainable continuous quality improvement. The committee noted that showing data is not the same as providing evidence of effectiveness. The commission expects colleges to attain level-four sustainable quality improvement for planning and SLOs. The Steering Committee also discussed the six themes described by the commission that should be addressed throughout the self study: 1) institutional integrity, 2) organization, 3) dialogue, 4) student learning outcomes, 5) institutional commitments, and 6) evaluation, planning, and improvement.

All members of the Steering Committee received College of the Desert’s 2004 self study, the resulting report, College of the Desert’s follow up progress report (October 2006), College of the Desert’s focused midterm report (May 2008), and the follow-up report of March 2009. The same items were also posted on the college Web site in order to allow access to the materials to all members throughout the development and editing process of the college’s self study. The co-chairs noted that a clear understanding of the previous self study process, recommendations, and resulting planning agendas and actions are essential to writing the current self study. The Steering Committee agreed that simply responding to the guiding questions may
limit a college’s response. At the same time, the group agreed that the writing should not be formulaic but must address the guiding questions clearly and unmistakably.

The Steering Committee was shown the Accreditation Web page that has electronic versions of all the documents distributed as well as links to other exemplary self study reports. Additionally, each team was given a Portal page on the college intranet that was designed as a way to communicate with their team members, track their progress, share resources, accumulate evidence, and manage drafts of their documents. Each team identified an administrative assistant who would provide all the needed clerical support and maintain the Portal page. The Executive Assistant to the President was designated as the support staff for the Steering Committee.

The Steering Committee determined that all teams would meet during Flex on 27 August 2009; no other Flex sessions were scheduled for the same time slot so that maximum participation would be possible. At that session, the standards, themes, rubrics, four levels of implementation, and the guiding questions were shared with each team. The Steering Committee also showed teams how to use the accreditation Web page and Portal pages.

During the fall 2009 Flex, there was also a general presentation by the faculty team leaders that provided an overview of the accreditation process and standards. The college president sent an electronic e-mail to all employees encouraging them to attend so that there would be campuswide awareness of the self study process and timeline.

All five teams worked throughout the fall 2009 semester including a full day in November that was designed as an opportunity for team members to investigate, reflect, dialogue, and discuss the guiding questions and evidence in support of the responses.

In January 2010, a Flex session was also scheduled to share progress made and to kick-off the spring semester’s self study work. Teams met regularly throughout the semester and another full day in March. During the workday in March, teams reviewed the drafts of the description sections, dialogued about the evaluation component, summarized that dialogue in writing, and wrote any necessary planning agendas. In May 2010, drafts were distributed campuswide, and focus groups were created to review each of the five standards. The focus groups were comprised of people who had not participated in writing that particular standard. This provided for additional participation throughout the college.

A full-time English professor who had served as the editor of the 2004 self study agreed again to serve in that capacity. He began his work during summer 2010 and was granted 40 percent release time for the fall semester to allow him appropriate undisturbed time to work on this project. He provided all teams with a writing style guide and spent countless hours editing and re-editing drafts provided to him by the teams. After the edits were completed, the reports were returned to the teams to ensure that no change had been made to the factual content and intent of the self study.

At the fall 2010 Flex, there was a presentation by the faculty team leaders to provide an update about the self study, gather feedback and remind all faculty members about the electronic access to the reports. During the early part of the fall semester, team
co-chairs incorporated changes based on the editing process and then redistributed the document to the team members for review and feedback. The Steering Committee met twice a month in the fall 2010 semester.

Final drafts were distributed in October 2010 to the Academic Senate and to the College Planning Council. The College Planning Council representatives further distributed the draft to their respective constituent groups and compiled feedback. Throughout the entire process, the most recent draft of all standards reports was made available campuswide on the accreditation Web site for review and feedback. During the Board of Trustees Retreat in October, the Accreditation Liaison Officer again provided an update on the self study process and assisted the board members in accessing the draft documents on the Portal for their review.

In November 2010, the self study report was finalized after thorough distribution and campuswide dialogue and feedback, and it was followed by approval of the College Planning Council and the Academic Senate. In December 2010, the Board of Trustees approved College of the Desert’s 2009 Institutional Self Study for Reaffirmation of Accreditation.
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Organization for the Self Study

Team 1 (Std. I)
Co-Chairs:
Pam LiCalsi; Dr. Doug MacIntire
Admin. Support:
Pam Chapman
Educational Administrators:
John Jaramillo; Dr. Leslie Young
FT Faculty:
Steve Beno; Ron Evans; Dr. Victor Rios;
Wendy Sanders; Ty Thomas
Adjunct Faculty:
Susan Evans; Ted Grofer
Classified Supervisor
Florante Roa
Classified:
Terri Fleck; Kim Goldberg; Joanie Peters;
Misti Santana
Student:
Aries Jaramillo

Team 2 (Std. IIA)
Co-Chairs:
Farley Herzek; Amy Dibello
Admin. Support:
Margie Eklund
Educational Administrators:
Tony DiSalvo, Dr. Jim Parvizi
FT Faculty:
Betty Baluski; Mary Boyd; David Catazarite;
Denise Diamond; Kim Dozier; Dr. Carl Farmer;
Dr. Jon Fernald; Tom Gillman; Geoff Hagopian;
Dr. Kelly Hall; Kurt Leuschner; Jeff Place; Ed Reed
Adjunct Faculty:
Jessica Bollinger; Barbara Smart
Classified Supervisor:
Christina Delgado; Dianne Russom
Classified:
Jojie Mugbuhat; Emila Rahimic
Student:
Daniel To

Team 3 (Std. IIB & IIC)
Co-Chairs:
Dr. Diane Ramirez; Dr. Rey Ortiz
Admin. Support:
Sharon Bentzen
Educational Administrators:
Dr. Nathan Church; Adrian Gonzales
FT Faculty:
Dr. Dustin Culhan; Claudia Derum; Kathlyn Enciso;
Carol Lasquade; Renate Senters
Adjunct Faculty:
Dr. Joel Murphy; Cynthia Vasquez
Classified Supervisor:
Stephanie Paramore; Revae Reynolds
Classified:
Joanne Decapite; Cynthia Garcia; Matt Housewright;
Carlos Maldonado; Maggie Negron; Donni Prince
Student:
Ryan Everling
Organization for the Self Study

**Team 4 (Std. III)**

Co-Chairs:
Dr. Edwin Deas; Tom Jones

Admin. Support:
Linda Costagliola

FT Faculty:
Dr. David George; Alejandro Jazan;
Dr. Anthony Tesch; Lisa Wilander

Adjunct Faculty:
Ralph Dorre; John Guarino; Bruce Johnson

Classified Supervisor:
Kevin Snyder

Classified:
Anita Corral; Mark Demry; Mike Hadley;
Lynn Sacher

Student:
Juan Gonzalez; Omar Ruiz

**Team 5 (Std. IV)**

Co-Chairs:
Dr. Jim Berg; Chris Nelson

Admin. Support:
Cheryl Houston

Educational Administrators:
Becky Broughton (Board Member);
John Loera

FT Faculty:
Maria Jasso; Felix Marhuenda-Donate;
Dr. Hushang Shahidi

Adjunct Faculty:
Dr. Fergus Currie; Cindy Janssen

Confidential:
Susan Kitigawa; Lee Ann Weaver

Classified Supervisor:
Wade Ellis

Classified:
Marcia Aguirre; Robert Chancey; Michael Harlow

Student:
De Lane Marianowits; Michelle Price

Many other faculty and staff were involved in the Self-Study process by serving on Focus Groups, providing input electronically, and attending presentations of many different entities and constituency groups to review and comment on the document.

The Steering Committee particularly wishes to acknowledge the help of Revae Reynolds, Executive Assistant to the President, Pam Chapman, Administrative Assistant to Pam LiCalsi and Tom Jones, Instructional Services Specialist.