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STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION  
FOCUSED MIDTERM REPORT

DATE: March 2009

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges  
Of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges

FROM: College of the Desert  
43-500 Monterey Ave.  
Palm Desert, CA 92260

In a letter dated June 30, 2008, ACCJC asked College of the Desert to show resolution of recommendations 1, 2, 4, and 5 from the Team Evaluation Visit Report of 2005. Upon receipt of the letter, the President’s Cabinet assigned the Director of Institutional Research to coordinate the overall preparation of the report. The following schedule of events and responsibilities was created and the months of September and October were designated for review and initial information gathering:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan Flex</th>
<th>Feb 12 Board</th>
<th>End Feb</th>
<th>Mar 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 SLOs and Prog Rev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st draft</td>
<td>2nd draft</td>
<td>Dissemination: Draft Doc</td>
<td>Final Draft Dissemination and Approvals</td>
<td>Last Refinements</td>
<td>Send Doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Gen Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st draft</td>
<td>2nd draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Advising/Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st draft</td>
<td>2nd draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Facilities, Bond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st draft</td>
<td>2nd draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The President’s Cabinet also assigned administrative responsibility for the final written draft of each recommendation response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Administrator responsible for written draft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 SLOs and Prog Rev</td>
<td>VP Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Gen Ed</td>
<td>VP Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Advising/Counseling</td>
<td>VP Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Facilities, Bond</td>
<td>VP Business Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lead administrator for each recommendation response assembled teams from all staff constituencies. Full-time instructors, adjunct instructors, classified staff, and leadership staff all participated in the information gathering, the information synthesis and analysis, and the writing of the developing drafts. Specifically, the lead administrator for each recommendation has been:

Recommendation 1, led by Vice President of Academic Affairs, William Kelly and subsequently John Randall;

Recommendation 2 led by Vice President of Academic Affairs, William Kelly and subsequently John Randall;

Recommendation 4 led by Vice President of Student Affairs, Diane Ramirez;
Recommendation 5 led by Vice President of Business Affairs, Edwin Deas;

The Academic Senate President, Professor Doug MacIntire, the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee Chair, and the campus-wide SLO Coordinator and English Professor, Amy Dibello, were important participants in the formulation of the four responses at all stages of development.

During the months of December 2008 and January 2009, each successive draft was posted on the college Webpage and distributed through governing bodies; each draft received comment and feedback that has been accommodated into the draft; and the draft again was posted and distributed. Governing bodies such as the Cabinet, the Deans’ Council, the College Planning Council (which includes student representatives), and the Academic Senate saw and gave feedback to successive drafts a number of times.

The Board of the college was kept informed of progress on the response throughout the process, and the final draft of the document was presented to the Board in the regular mail communication of the week of March 9, 2009. Final review of the report by the Board was at the meeting of March 17, 2009, with submission of the final report to ACCJC electronically on March 17 and by mail on March 18, 2009.

Since the Team Visit in 2005, College of the Desert has used the recommendations and observations of the Evaluation Report as a catalyst for the improvement of the educational programs and services of the institution. The college is especially proud of the progress it has made in becoming an institution whose central focus is the learning and success achieved by its students. No small part of this transformation has been the institutional commitment which has resulted from the accreditation process.

Signed

______________________________  President

Jerry R. Patton
RESPONSE TO TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS AND THE COMMISSION ACTION LETTER

The following pages demonstrate the resolution of the four recommendations. Evidence and documentation which support the following pages are available in electronic format at the following web address: http://www.collegeofthedesert.edu/fs/accreditation/Pages/default.aspx

Team Recommendation 1
The college is urged to continue diligently with the efforts already underway through the program review process and to assure that all programs and organizational units develop, assess, analyze, and use student learning outcomes (SLOs) information for program improvement. The college must especially place some urgency on the need to develop a process for student services.

Outline of response to Recommendation 1:
Instruction
  Program Review
  SLOs and Program Improvements
Non-instructional units
  Program Review
  SLOs and Program Improvements
Student Services
  Program Review
  Analysis of Results Achieved to Date
  Evidence of the Results
  Additional Plans Developed
  by the College

Resolution of Recommendation
The program review process is well established at proficiency level at College of the Desert. Programs are reviewed systematically every five years; programs and organizational units develop, assess, analyze, and use SLO information for program improvement. In the summer of 2008, three members of the Curriculum Committee’s SLO Task Force spearheaded a coordinated approach to create, develop, structure, and systematize the SLO assessment cycle. The task force met once a week for six weeks and established a college-wide framework for outcomes and assessment, integrating the program review process with planning and prioritization. As a result, faculty and staff completed 100 percent of class SLOs, and assessment cycles are underway.

INSTRUCTION

Program Review
The Curriculum Committee assessed the instructional program review process and refined it to assist faculty in interpreting institutional effectiveness data. The college instituted the revised process in the spring of 2007. Programs participating in the pilot presented reports to the Curriculum Committee at the end of the spring semester. Reception by the committee was excellent, and division faculty members welcomed the new format. In the fall of 2008, nine programs completed the review process and presented their results during the spring Flex. Based on the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee Program Review Task Force, formed in the fall of 2007, the college adopted the executive summaries as part of the Program Review format in order to align SLO assessment with the planning process.

Every semester one course in every discipline across all divisions assesses SLOs. Evaluation of those assessments is recorded on Outcomes and Assessments Status Reports—OASRs. Whereas, in the classroom SLOs act as a guide for planning classroom activities, a basis for demonstrating mastery of knowledge and skills, and proof that learning has occurred, the OASRs serve as the record keeping mechanism that tracks faculty dialogue about classroom changes and program
improvements based on evaluations of the assessments. Discussion of students’ needs and curricular issues takes place every Flex during discipline breakout sessions, as well as during division meetings throughout the year, as shown by Flex records and division minutes. For example, as a result of discussion, faculty decided students performed well in a CIS course called PowerPoint in the technical aspects of presentation, but when it came to critical thinking, students were struggling. Faculty implemented changes to the curriculum in the following semester by requiring progress submissions from the students, providing more feedback more often, and providing more examples of model presentations in the early weeks of the semester. As action is taken and changes implemented, the record of improvement reflected in the OASRs becomes a permanent part of the program review report designed to guide thoughtful review of measurable outcomes. The data emerging from program assessment has become a driver for planning based on improving student learning.

As courses cycle through assessment, each assessed course SLO is identified with a program SLO within the Institution-Wide Outcomes Matrix, which is made up of three programs: General Education, Career and Technical Education, and Student Services. As courses align outcomes across the Institution-Wide Outcomes Matrix, faculty is able to identify strengths and weaknesses within the course curriculum. Using the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle, improvements can then be implemented at the program level to strengthen institution-wide outcomes. As more courses cycle through assessment, faculty and deans, in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Research, uses the data to plan and make decisions that are outcomes and evidence based. As disciplines make changes in their programs at the curriculum level, the College Planning Council uses program review to make outcomes-based decisions at the planning and prioritization level.

The college changed the status of the Program Review Task Force in the fall of 2008. It is now a standing subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee. The chair of that subcommittee is also one of the Outcomes and Assessment Committee’s (OAC) division SLO coordinators creating a link between Program Review, outcomes, and assessment. In the spring of 2009, the Program Review Subcommittee presented an improved Program Review Report Form to the OAC. The new form features SLOs as the key driver to program improvement and the inherent connection between the assessment of outcomes and program and college planning. The OAC makes reports to and works closely with the College Planning Council, by providing assessment data to ensure that student learning is at the center of the planning and prioritization process.

SLOs and Program Improvements

Systematic implementation of SLOs and SLO assessment is firmly developed at the college. A lucid, user-friendly, and effective SLO assessment cycle is well underway as evidenced by the Outcomes and Assessment Website. SLOs are defined at every level of the institution including Student Services, organizational units, courses, and programs.

In the fall of 2007, the Learning and Assessment Committee became the Curriculum SLO Task Force to increase faculty ownership of the process. At the end of the spring of 2008 semester, it was clear that systematizing and institutionalizing SLOs required greater resource allocation and wider campus effort with input from multiple constituencies. Three members of the SLO Task Force worked over the summer of 2008 to create a campus-wide structure and system for SLO completion and assessment implementation. As a result of that work, a proposal was made and subsequently adopted for a campus-wide
faculty SLO coordinator with 80 percent release time and eight division coordinators (including Student Services and every instruction division) with 20 percent release time. During the 2007–2008 school year, the Curriculum Committee had oversight of SLO development.

In the fall of 2008, the college established the OAC. It is chaired by the campus-wide SLO Coordinator and comprised of assistant coordinators from every division including Student Services and Administration. This committee reports to the Senate and the college president. By the beginning of the fall of 2008 semester, all program SLOs were defined and charted to create the Institution-Wide Outcomes Matrix that maps all college curriculum to institution-wide outcomes. Under the guidance and direction of the OAC, the entire campus community was charged with defining SLOs for the remaining courses needing them and assessing one course in every discipline. To accomplish this work, the OAC offered five in-depth, hands-on workshops during Flex:

- SLO Workshop I: Getting Started with SLOs;
- Workshop II: Refining Your Course SLOs;
- Workshop III: Getting Started with Assessment;
- SLO Workshop IV: Program Level Assessment; and
- Workshop V: Trailblazing SLOAC (Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle) Mountain.

With a timeline, structure and process in place, and with the leadership of the SLO and Division Coordinators, faculty now shares an understanding and participates fully in all parts of the SLO assessment cycle. In the fourth week of the fall of 2008 semester, the OAC sponsored an SLO Writing Bonanza for full-time and adjunct faculty. During this presentation, the OAC gave an overview of the new process and procedures for writing and assessing SLOs to over 150 faculty members. A campus-wide writing effort to complete all course SLOs followed. In the spring of 2007, 49 percent of all courses had SLOs written for them. By December 2008, 92 percent of all courses had defined SLOs. Currently, 100 percent of courses have defined SLOs. In the fall, the OAC reviewed all newly written SLOs in order to normalize and standardize the format. Faculty now shares a clear vision of SLOs and the characteristics that make them assessable. By December 2008, one course in every discipline with previously defined SLOs, 33 courses total, completed one assessment cycle. Faculty files outcomes and assessment status reports with the OAC upon completion of the cycle. The SLO coordinator reports at the full Academic Senate meetings once a month and to the Board of Trustees every semester.

The spring semester of 2009 kicked off Flex activities with a focus on assessment. The OAC added a new workshop to SLO activities:

- Workshop VI: Shining Light on Assessment; and
- Workshop VII: Meaningful Assessment.

This spring, another round of course assessments began. Every discipline added one more course to the assessment cycle.

At the beginning of every semester, faculty reports assessment data at division meetings to discuss findings and make improvements in student learning. After division meetings, discipline breakout sessions are dedicated to working with SLO assessment data. For example in an Early Childhood Education course practicum, faculty evaluated and discussed assessment and determined that a rating scale needed to be used for observations to provide feedback on developmentally appropriate play and the mentor teacher relationship. Also, they discovered the rubric
being used to grade was good, but overly complicated. In HE-001, Personal and Community Health, faculty has added a pretest in the first week of classes to establish the baseline of student knowledge and identify patterns of misconceptions about SLOs that might prevent achieving those SLOs. Additionally, based on assessment of MATH-057, College Arithmetic, faculty is in the process of rewriting the course and validating the prerequisite. As assessment data accumulates, it is recorded with the OAC and integrated into Program Review. The Executive Summary of Program Review provides a link between the assessment of SLOs and prioritizing program needs based on evidence gathered out of assessment with the goal of improving student learning.

On the second Flex day in March, the OAC sponsored an all-faculty assessment afternoon. On March 10, at Flex, the OAC held a college-wide “Assessment Shindig,” which included the history, overview, timeline of outcomes, and assessment trailblazing at the college, as well as three hands-on workshops on assessment, addressing every part of the cycle from choosing assessment tools to implementing course and program changes. Disciplines worked on assessment strategies and actions to improve learning based on assessed learning outcomes from the previous year to date.

Now, faculty fully engages in taking responsibility for systematic assessment and working within and across disciplines with other full-time and part-time faculty to make decisions about curriculum, pedagogy, planning, budgeting, and improving learning outcomes for students. The college website provides useful resources such as assessment tools and rubrics. It outlines clear, in-depth and detailed steps for the SLO assessment cycle. Faculty and staff access the Flex workshop presentations, as well as the outcomes assessment status reports and SLO forms, via the Outcomes and Assessment Website.

Course SLOs are stored as addendums to the Course Outlines of Record on the Curriculum Committee pages of the Senate Website in preparation for the new curriculum management system purchased in the fall of 2008.

The college invested in Curricunet, which is scheduled to arrive in the late spring of 2009. This will assist the OAC and the Curriculum Committee in enforcing the systematic assessment of all course SLOs and pave the path for aggregating data as courses map to the Institution-Wide Outcomes Matrix. The college designated the same resource allocation for the 2009–2010 school year in order to maintain the current structure of the OAC. This ensures that the college moves into sustainable, continuous quality improvement of student learning. Non-instructional units will fully integrate into the SLO assessment cycle in the 2009–2010 school year.

NON-INSTRUCTIONAL UNITS

Program Review
In the fall of 2007, the president presented a model and set of guidelines for non-instructional program review to the Planning Council. The council approved the model at its March of 2008 meeting. This model fills the last gap in formal program review at College of the Desert. At least one non-instructional program or department in each organizational unit in the college has completed its program review according to this new process: in Administrative Services—Payroll; in Instruction—the Center for Training and Development; in Human Resources—Recruiting and Hiring Procedures and Database and Records Management; and in Student Services—Financial Aid.

SLOs and Program Improvements
SLO assessment continues to expand in non-instructional areas. The Strategic Educational Master Plan process (described in Planning Agenda Standard I) relies on objectives resulting from unit reviews, and evidenced-
based improvements are enhanced as the non-instructional program evaluation process proceeds in all areas for institutional effectiveness.

The Non-Instructional Program Review (NIPR) process was standardized after it was piloted during the spring of 2008 by one unit in each of the vice presidential areas of responsibilities. As part of the strategic planning process, all nonacademic units utilize this defined comprehensive process on a timeline established in concert with the OAC in order to improve institutional effectiveness in the ongoing self-study process. All non-instructional units cycle through program review to evaluate areas based on the assessment of outcomes. This information can then be used to ensure we are effectively supporting learning in operations other than instruction.

Administrative Services operates under a comprehensive program review process in which all departments, divided into functions, are reviewed over a three-year cycle. The review is broken down to a functional level, even within a single department, because there are different consumers of functional services. The user perspective is key to evaluating services to make improvements.

The reviews are discussed within Administrative Services, submitted to the President’s Cabinet for information, and then the recommendations for improvement are incorporated into departmental goals for the following year and may be incorporated, as needed, into funding requests as part of the budget process.

The Human Resource Office conducts program reviews for each of its operational units on a regular cycle. These include Recruiting and Hiring Procedures; Data Base and Records Management; Employee Evaluation Administration; Workers Compensation Administration; Job Classification Development and Maintenance; Employee and Labor Relations; and Discrimination Issues.

During the fall of 2008 semester, the Human Resource Office completed a Program Review of the Recruiting and Hiring Procedures Unit. They are in the process of completing the Data Base Management Unit Review, which will be completed by the end of the spring semester of 2009. The remaining operational units will be evaluated at the rate of one or two per year with all being evaluated by 2011 or 2012. After the initial review, units will be evaluated on a five-year cycle. The result of the Recruiting and Hiring Procedures Unit Program Review identified several areas needing improvement and the need to establish benchmarks as we measure success.

Under the Office of the President, the Center for Training and Development, Information Systems, and the Public Information Office completed the Non-Instructional Program Review (NIPR); under the Office of Instruction, the Library, Technical Preparation Program, and Office of Institutional Research completed the NIPR in December 2008.

During the spring of 2009 semester, these evaluations will be reviewed and discussed. Action plans will follow.

Student Services piloted the NIPR in the Financial Aid Office during the spring of 2008 and has since established a timeline to utilize the process every other year. EOPS/CARE completed their NIPR in January 2009. Several other Student Services units will use the NIPR in the spring of 2009 on a rotating sequence established by respective Student Services deans and the Vice President of Student Services, so that all units will have implemented the NIPR by the end of 2010. Additionally, Student Services will have implemented the second round of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement in the spring of 2010.
Program and unit reviews address purpose, mission, goals, and function as driven by users in order to assess quality, need, structure and future of services in each area. The administrative leader in that area maintains data reported in each review. Decisions regarding planning and prioritization are based on the formal evaluation of non-instructional units as they contribute to the achievement of SLOs.

In the fall of 2009, a representative from non-instructional units will join the OAC in order to foster communication of program review results in all areas of the college. As non-instructional units cycle through the assessment process, the college president is better equipped to guide institutional improvement to ensure that educational planning is integrated with resources planning and distribution to achieve SLOs.

**STUDENT SERVICES**

**Program Review**
The college placed special urgency on the need to develop a program review process for Student Services.

A program review process for Student Services Division was established in 2006–2007 that incorporates an annual, biannual, and a comprehensive division review. Student Services is scheduled to have finished a complete cycle of its comprehensive program review by 2010.

In the spring of 2008, the Financial Aid Office completed a NIPR piloting the format for other units to emulate. Student Services has scheduled a biannual implementation plan covering all areas. To date, EOPS/CARE has completed their report for spring 2009.

In November of 2008, the state categorical programs of DSPS, EOPS/CARE, and matriculation (general counseling, orientation, assessment, advising, admission, prerequisites and/or corequisites, research and evaluation, and follow-up) completed an internal program review in preparation for a site visit in April of 2009 from the Chancellor’s Office to evaluate respective effectiveness. This preparation involved the Institutional Researcher and the Information Services department working together to provide necessary Student Services statistical data and information. This teamwork has been very beneficial for all three entities to understand what each contributes to compliance issues and student success.

The coordinated communication between Student Services units, Information Services, and the Institutional Researcher provides an invaluable flow of information providing a mechanism for data to serve as the basis of Student Services program improvement. The need for expanded services from the Office of Institutional Research was recognized as the number one priority in the institutional priority process, resulting in the hiring of an additional full-time researcher in the late fall of 2008, providing 2.0 FTEs in the Office of Institutional Research.

**SLO and Program Improvements**
Student Services has completed SLOs for 100 percent of its units and the division. Student Services unit SLOs/Student Service Outcomes were developed and vetted in a collaborative environment in the Student Services Coordinating Council, reflecting and emanating from the divisional goals and SLOs. All Student Services’ SLOs are on the College of the Desert Intranet “portal” in unit reports.

The EOPS/CARE Coordinator, with 20 percent release time approved by the Chancellor’s Office, represents Student Services as the SLO liaison on the district-wide OAC. Through the EOPS/CARE Coordinator’s liaison leadership and activities, Student Services has been more comprehensively and reciprocally integrated into the rubrics and assessments of instructional SLOs. The EOPS/CARE Coordinator
facilitates the understanding of Student Services Student Service Outcomes and SLOs in the institutional dialogue of SLOs—as evidenced in the stated Student Services SLOs that Instructional SLOs now reference.

Student Services has identified assessment criteria and rubrics for 100 percent of all its units and the division. Nearly half have completed a cycle of assessment, evaluation, and planning of their respective unit SLOs with the remaining half of the units in various stages of assessments. One hundred percent of the units are targeted to complete this SLO cycle by 2010, as reflected in the planning activities of each unit and the division as a whole.

Evidence of the Results
Outcomes assessment and evaluation of last year has led to the following examples of improvements in Student Services and its units this year, which will continue in the assessment cycle. Examples:

- Discontinuation of an assistive reading software package in the Academic Skills Center (ASC) as it was revealed to be a distraction rather than a support for learning. Reading faculty and the ASC Coordinator continue the dialogue regarding identification and requirement of hours students need to be successful in the course.
- Continuation of the expansion for student use of customized lab assignments in the ASC.
- Increase in the ASL lab attendance by changing the course assignment from credit bearing to open noncredit for more student access. Enrollments have increased.
- Increase the training for lab personnel and more support materials offered to students using ReadOn software in the ASC.
- Revision of tutoring assessment criteria in EOPS/CARE SLOs to include all EOPS students rather than those with only low GPAs as students with high GPAs utilized tutoring more frequently than those with low GPAs.
- In the Intensive English Academy, with assessments of SLOs conducted at each level, 92 percent of all students passed into the next Intensive English Academy level.
- In the Intensive English Academy, 88 percent of matriculated students placed into ESL 50B or higher.
- In International Education, a survey revealed a composite 88.6 percent rate of students across nine indicators of student satisfaction, with the range being 81 percent understanding the Student Education Plan and 93 percent availing themselves of opportunities to meet other students at orientation. Activities to increase these rates are addressed in goals for this year, which include emphasis on housing and increased acculturation opportunities.
- Redesign and additional amendments to the Associated Students of College of the Desert Constitution and Bylaws resulted in 100 percent of requests for student representation in shared governance committees to be filled.
- Career Center partnered with Tech Prep staff to develop an Air Conditioning/Heating career pathway.

The “Student Services Compendium” is a reference and resource notebook that contains all the reports, description of evidence, goals, and program review. The comprehensive report prepared for the Chancellor’s Office site visit in April of 2009 includes: EOPS/CARE, DSPS, Matriculation, and CalWORKS. It is the product of available research and identification of needed research to be provided to Student Services for categorical program reviews.
Evidentiary References

Primary References (location as noted):

Outcomes and Assessment website:
http://www.collegeofthedesert.edu/fs/fsr/oas/Pages/default.aspx

Curriculum Committee general website:
http://www.collegeofthedesert.edu/fs/fsr/senate/cc/Pages/default.aspx

Curriculum Committee interior website with minutes (use logon given on last page of report):
http://campus.collegeofthedesert.edu/Committees/as/CurCom/default.aspx

Secondary References (location: Office of Instruction):

Outcomes and Assessment Training Workshops, 2005–present
Division Meeting Minutes (location: division Offices)
Instructional Deans’ Meetings Minutes
Academic Senate Minutes
Instructional Deans Retreat Minutes, August 2008
Program Review reports, 2005 through present
Flex Activity Handouts: 2007–present
Academic Senate minutes, December 11, 2008
Student Services Coordinating Council minutes
Student Services Compendium of Unit Profiles and Annual EOY Reports, 2007–2008
Financial Aid Non-Instructional Program Review Pilot, 2008
College of the Desert Non-Instructional Program Review Procedures & Format

Additional Plans
Developed by the College
Student Services SLO development is completed with assessment rubrics established for each unit. Student Services and Instruction have a standardized college-wide process of SLO development and monitoring for institutional planning and improvement. The CIO, the CSSO and the SLO Coordinator and other instructional and student services leadership have reviewed, been provided personal presentations, and are pursuing the use of software packages to e-catalogue and create a data warehouse of SLOs for institutional standardization and ease of user access to assessment rubrics, evaluation, outcomes and the facilitation of electronic reporting for planning and development. The e-cataloguing enables standardization within the institution of SLOs imbedded or as requirements for disciplines other than the one from which the SLO was derived. For instance, the SLOs for English 1A are pulled from the e-catalogue and restated in a discipline’s assessment rubrics requiring English 1A competency. Students are assessed individually in their evaluations of attaining these learning outcomes, and reports are generated according to the needs of the faculty and institution. The favored software is “elumen” contingent upon budgetary funding availability.

The NIPR began in the spring of 2008. One unit in each of the vice presidential areas of responsibilities assessed programs. The findings from these reports will be disseminated via vice presidents to related constituents. In the fall of 2009, non-instructional units will add a representative to the OAC to foster coordinated efforts in making improvements for institutional effectiveness based on student learning.
Team Recommendation 2
To achieve an appropriate balance of courses in the curriculum and a schedule of classes that meets student needs, the college must assure that the general education philosophy and the criteria, standards, and process for identifying requirements for general education courses are established and approved through the college’s shared governance bodies and the Board of Trustees in a timely fashion.

Resolution of Recommendation
College of the Desert assures an appropriate balance of courses in the curriculum and schedule of classes through a process that establishes criteria, standards, and processes based upon a general education philosophy developed through a shared governance process.

Response
College of the Desert approves courses for general education credit through Curriculum Committee action. The Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees subsequently approve the Curriculum Committee’s actions. Four subcommittees of the Curriculum Committee were formed in the fall of 2008, one of which is the General Education Subcommittee. Members include Curriculum Committee members and the Articulation Officer. The mission of this subcommittee is one of the ongoing matters of Curriculum, to achieve the appropriate balance of courses and a schedule of classes that meets student needs. The second part of their mission is to ensure that the general education SLOs align with Title V and provide a general education philosophy that is unique to the college. Finally, this subcommittee is responsible for working with the Outcomes and Assessment Committee (OAC) to create criteria, standards, and a process for identifying general education requirements that align with general education SLOs.

The General Education Subcommittee proposed three processes to continue improving balanced curriculum appropriate to general education and a schedule of classes to meet students’ needs. In the fall of 2008, the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees approved the following processes:

- A process to determine where courses fit into the general education pattern;
- A course deactivation process; and
- A course reactivation process.

In short, faculty creating new courses and updating existing courses consults the general education requirements in the Education Code (Title 5 CCR 55063) and dialogues with faculty within the discipline and in related disciplines to make an initial determination about where courses fit into general education. The next step uses the general education SLOs as guiding principles for selecting a general education category for each course. Faculty then consults with the Articulation Officer, identifies like courses at College of the Desert, and identifies like courses at CCC, CSU, and UC. Then, faculty submits Course Outlines of Record to the General Education Subcommittee prior to Curriculum Committee and provides rationale for course placement into the general education pattern. Once approval has been granted by the General Education Subcommittee, the Course Outlines of Record go to the Curriculum Committee for final consideration. The College Articulation Officer submits these courses for approval for articulation with the appropriate institutions.

As the General Education Subcommittee evaluated the general education SLOs created under the General Education Think Tank before there was an OAC, the subcommittee determined that the approved general education SLOs were neither easily assessable nor commensurate with Title V. In the fall of 2008, as the OAC worked on the development of course and program level SLOs, it became apparent that the general education
SLOs would require revision. The General Education Subcommittee concurred. With all college constituents sharing a vision and understanding the practical application of the outcomes and assessment cycle, the General Education Subcommittee created a general education worksheet to evaluate and designate courses to categories within newly revised general education SLOs that align with Title V and both CSU and UC transfer requirements.

The worksheet establishes criteria for general education guiding principles addressing course: level, scope, integrity, generality, critical thinking, continuing study, and cultural diversity. Courses must meet all the criteria in order to be considered the appropriate depth for a general education course. The rest of the worksheet provides category definitions along the new general education SLOs: natural sciences, social and behavioral sciences, humanities, language and rationality, traditions and cultures. Faculty completes the worksheet assigning a course to a particular general education SLO by providing evidence that course objectives meet the criteria defined by the general education outcomes. A general education worksheet has passed out of Curriculum Committee and is operational. The Academic Senate and the Board have approved the new general education philosophy and general education worksheet.

To reflect the work done by the General Education Subcommittee, Curriculum Committee and the OAC, the 2009–2010 college catalog will be revised to feature general education SLOs. In the fall of 2008, the Curriculum Committee and the Catalog Advisory Group decided that the “General Education Philosophy” currently in the catalog, which follows the CCLC policy template AP 4025, was revised in the spring of 2009 to reflect general education SLOs. The newly adopted general education outcomes are under revision as the OAC and general education subcommittees agreed that the general education SLOs must correspond with general education categories commensurate with Title V as courses articulate with other institutions. The general education SLO revision will also reflect outcomes in clearly assessable language.

In the spring of 2009, the SLO Coordinator, Curriculum Chair, and the Catalog Advisory Group met to discuss the implementation of changes to catalog structure and content that reflect College of the Desert’s commitment to student learning and outcomes assessment. General Education, Career and Technical Education, and Student Services Outcomes will be publicized in the catalog. Basic Skills, Learning Communities, Technical Preparation, and general education SLOs will be featured and explained. As the institution continues to identify students’ needs through the assessment of SLOs and program review, the college will meet the varied educational needs of students consistent with their educational preparation, diversity, demographics, and economics.

Through shared governance bodies, the college is resolved that it has created a unique general education philosophy and the criteria, standards, and process for identifying general education requirements. The College of the Desert 2009–2010 “Catalog” and “Schedule of Classes” will reflect improvements in achieving institution-wide outcomes.

Evidentiary References

Primary References (location as noted):

General Education Statement, Curriculum Committee interior website (use logon given on last page of report):
http://campus.collegeofthedesert.edu/Comm ittees/as/CurCom/default.aspx

Curriculum Handbook, Curriculum Committee interior website (use logon given on last page of report):
http://campus.collegeofthedesert.edu/Comm ittees/as/CurCom/default.aspx
Outcomes and Assessment website:
http://www.collegeofthedesert.edu/fs/fsr/oa/Pages/default.aspx

Secondary References (location, Office of Instruction):

2009–2010 College of the Desert Catalog
General Education Workshops, 2005–present
Division Meeting Minutes (Location–Division Offices)
Instructional Deans’ Meetings Minutes
 Academic Senate Minutes
Flex Activity General Education activities,
Team Recommendation 4
The college must, with urgency, review the counseling and advising functions to ensure effective academic advising, general counseling services, and articulation activities.

From the Focused Midterm Report of the Evaluation Team, April 14, 2008, regarding findings of Team Recommendation 4:

Conclusion:
“The college has made significant progress in addressing the concerns in this recommendation regarding counseling, advising, and articulation. Its actions have been slowed given contract negotiations and reorganization demands, but progress has been made. Although more work is needed to ensure ongoing compliance, the staff, training, and processes are aligned to allow the college to fully address this recommendation in the next academic year.”

Resolution of Recommendation
Since the original evaluation team visit, College of the Desert has continually reviewed the counseling and advising functions and developed a systematic approach to ensure ongoing compliance, staff, training, and processes to ensure effective academic advising, general counseling services, and articulation activities.

In September of 2008, an Advising Task Force consisting of the Vice President of Student Services, the Vice President of Instruction, the Dean of Student Support Programs and Services, and the President of the Academic Senate was created. The task force established a timeline of activities and responsibilities. Arena advising was preeminent in these discussions with the faculty taking the lead to develop and establish arena advising on a regular basis. An advising handbook was written and approved through the Academic Senate, which distinguished the roles between counselors and faculty advisors. The “Advisor Handbook” was placed on the College of the Desert portal for easy access by all staff to review. During the spring of 2009, the Academic Senate President developed an advising web site now under review by the faculty through the Educational Policies Committee. Faculty development Flex activities regarding Academic Advising were held as well as presentations through a variety of venues that included all academic divisions, the Deans’ Council, and the College Forum. The Advising Subcommittee of the Matriculation Advisory Committee was established and will meet during the spring of 2009 to address ongoing advising and counseling activities in a continual capacity.

The number of general counselors has doubled since the last self-study when the college only had four full-time general counselors. A counselor handbook was established that defined the roles of counselors at the college and is used for in-service activities for all full-time and adjunct counselors.

Articulation Officer activities are performed within the scope of a full-time counselor’s job function. The college continually addresses articulation with a full-time counselor committed to a percentage of his or her time to these activities. This Articulation Officer works closely with the Articulation Specialist and sits on the Curriculum Committee and the General Education Subcommittee and keeps the faculty well informed. To assist the faculty, which is deeply involved in articulation, the Articulation Officer made an articulation presentation at the August of 2008 Flex activities. To maintain currency, the Articulation Officer attended both the Regional Southern California Intersegmental Articulation Council (SCIAC) in October of 2008 and the California Intersegmental Articulation Council (CIAC) conference in San Luis Obispo in April of 2008. Also, articulation with local high schools has increased with the formation of Cal PASS professional learning communities in the areas of healthcare, English, and mathematics.
Analysis of Results Achieved to Date
The creation of the “Advisor Handbook” significantly improved the relations between Student Services and Instruction. Delineation of the duties of faculty advisors and counselors is clear as well as the listing of support personnel and resources for advisors’ reference. More divisions are appropriately utilizing the inclusion of an assigned counselor to their respective divisions who assists them with their mutual roles in guiding students. By reading the “Advisor Handbook” as well as through in-service training, faculty advisors and deans have become more aware of the role of advisors and how advising differs from counseling. The faculty is in a better position to participate in improving its role as advisors and has moved ahead in more robust discussions of their roles and needs.

The Academic Senate Committee of Educational Policies has taken the lead in plans to provide arena-advising activities. The Senate held a Flex presentation in the spring of 2009 to further explore the concept of arena advising. The results of the Academic Senate activity will provide collaboration between Student Services and instructional faculty to provide improved faculty advising on a continuing basis.

Counseling responsibilities are clearly defined in a counselor handbook, bringing continuity to the department and clarity to the institution in planning needs.

The current Articulation Officer provides continuity to the institution, students, and colleagues. The institution is analyzing the needed amount of time necessary for articulation activities to determine appropriate workload for the Office of Articulation and make appropriate adjustments as needed.

Evidence of the Results
The results of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement that was administered during the spring of 2008 semester to a random sample of 869 credit students revealed that about 60 percent of the students said they use academic advising/planning often or sometimes, and 75 percent were very or somewhat satisfied with the services (Question 13 responses). Additionally, 95 percent said they would recommend this college to a friend or family member (Question 26), and 85 percent rated their entire educational experience at this college as excellent/good.

The Dean of Student Support Programs and Services and the President of the Academic Senate provided advisor-handbook-training during the spring of 2008 semester to all individual divisions, at a College Forum, and at a Deans’ Council meeting. One full-time counselor and the Articulation Officer jointly provided advising information and the draft of the “Advisor Handbook” at the fall of 2008 Flex faculty development activities. And electronically, advising has its own webpage on the college’s website: http://www.collegeofthedesert.edu/fs/advising/Pages/default.aspx

The current Articulation Officer has processed twenty-five CSU and six UC new course articulation agreements since the beginning of summer 2008 through the end of the fall of 2008 semester. In collaboration with the Curriculum and Catalog Specialist, the college has received approval of sixteen UC transfer course agreements, six CSU general education agreements, and five IGETC new course agreements. Additionally, the President’s Education Consortium discussions have identified the need to increase high school articulation activities with the college and are being translated into institutional priorities.

References
College of the Desert accreditation page: http://www.collegeofthedesert.edu/fs/accreditation/Pages/default.aspx
Community College Survey of Student Engagement, spring of 2008
Faculty Advising 101 power point presentation, fall Flex, Elise King and Maria Jasso
Web Resources for Faculty Advisors, August 29, 2008
Faculty Advisor Handbook, Counselor Handbook
Matriculation Advisory Committee, College Council Meeting minutes, December 15, 2008
Divisional Meeting Minutes
Joint Deans’ Meeting Minutes
College of the Desert Portal
Educational Collaborative Minutes
Articulation Agreements
ASSIST
Curriculum Committee Minutes
Fall of 2008 Flex Activities

Additional Plans Developed by the College
Utilizing the benchmarks established by the first Community College Survey of Student Engagement in spring of 2008, the college has contracted to conduct the survey every other year. The survey will next be administered during the 2009–2010 academic year. The 2008 survey yielded important data regarding students and engendered campus-wide discussion of the results. The additional comparison data from subsequent surveys will be an important part of the assessment cycle.

The President established and chairs a group entitled the Educational Consortium that meets monthly. It is comprised of: secondary school and district representatives of the three local unified school districts; College of the Desert’s instructional and student services vice presidents and several deans; the president/representatives of California State University, San Bernardino at Palm Desert Campus; and the representative of the University of California Riverside, Palm Desert. These discussions are bringing about collaborative efforts through identification of mutual needs in promoting student articulation success. Additionally, all of the unified school districts joined College of the Desert in becoming members of Cal PASS, an organization that was established via vocational education legislation, SB70 in 2005. The goal of Cal PASS is to “increase the number, efficiency, and transportability of articulation agreements between schools, ROCPS, and community colleges, for the benefit of students and Career Technical Education.” The IT/IS collaborations have yielded positive results in the ability of the three unified school districts and College of the Desert to share significant data about academic success and articulation as students move from high school to and through College of the Desert. All participants are engaged in the continuing dialogue and collaborations regarding student success data and articulation. The English and math faculty of College of the Desert and the unified school districts began informal conversations around curriculum alignment. This has been formalized with the implementation of the CalPASS Professional Learning Councils (PLC). In addition to the English and math councils, an Allied Health council is forthcoming—this will be the first Career Technical Education PLC in the state.

Additionally, the college is actively engaged in high-school-to-college pathway development and articulation. The Tech Prep coordinator, currently a 30-hour-per-week staff member funded by Perkins IV Regional Tech Prep Consortium, has been actively pursuing articulated Career Pathways development with all three of our local school districts. The Regional Tech Prep Consortium recently had their five-year plan approved by the State Chancellor’s office. The Tech Prep coordinator sits on the Articulation Workgroup of our local Educational Consortium with COD, all three local school districts, and California State University, San Bernardino. To date, the college has articulated courses in Automotive Technology, Drafting, and Environmental Design with Palm Springs Unified School District and is...
seeking approval from Coachella Unified School District. Faculty from the college and the local district met several times to complete the articulation.

The Tech Prep program underwent a program review during the spring 2008 and fall 2008 terms. Recommendations identified during the program review process led to the program being moved from the Center for Training and Development to an instructional area responsible for the majority of the career and technical programs on campus. The Tech Prep coordinator currently answers to the Dean for Applied Science and Business. Another recommendation identified in the program review has led to the approval of replacing the 30-hour-per-week position with a full-time position. The Tech Prep coordinator is working with the Dean of Applied Science and Business and the Dean, Student Support Programs and Services, to update the K–12 Articulation Handbook. It is anticipated that the handbook will be fully updated by the end of the spring 2009 term.
Team Recommendation 5
“The college needs to use its Facility Master Plan and bond-related construction program definition to engage in a specific planning endeavor to identify service-level requirements and to plan strategically for the human resource and financial resource needs that new facilities will require. (Standards I.B.4, II.A.1, II.A.2, III.A.2, III.B.2.a)

Resolution of Recommendation
In conjunction with its bond-related construction program and 2003 Educational Master Plan, the College of the Desert uses its Facility Master Plan to identify service-level requirements and to plan for the human and financial resources that the new bond-related facilities will require.

The priority for College of the Desert in relation to its expansive construction program, funded by a $346.5 million bond measure, is to ensure congruity between the Education Master Plan and Facilities Plan and to ensure that appropriate resources are committed in the budget planning process to operate the new facilities. This is particularly important in the case of new education centers being planned for the East Valley (Mecca/Thermal) and West Valley. Such integrated operating and capital expenditure planning is being made more difficult as the college faces the dichotomy of shrinking operational resources due to the serious State economic situation and a well-resourced capital budget from the bond measure. While acknowledging the difficulty, the college is, however, committed to an effective expansion program to meet growing educational needs of the valley.

Staffing requirements and financial support plans are in place for our new campus in the East Valley, which opened the spring semester of 2009. At present eleven classes are being offered, and enrollments are better than projected with 160 students occupying 255 seats in the temporary classrooms. The Mecca/Thermal Campus will likely provide a fairly modest, but steadily increasing, program of classes for at least three to five years in temporary modular buildings. There will be little or no increase in funding for faculty since, as projected at present, there will be little or no increase in the number of classes offered district wide. If there is an increase, it will be funded with growth income. The support staffing is minimal since we are only offering eight classes in the spring semester. The funds for staffing are included in the 2008–2009 college budget and in multiple-year forecasts.

The college recently completed a Strategic Master Plan that includes program recommendations for the future at the Mecca/Thermal Campus when permanent buildings are added. Using the information from this plan, a separate master plan for the Mecca/Thermal Campus outlines the programs to be offered, staffing requirements, and a cost analysis. The financial plan includes the recognition that when this location has sufficient enrollment to qualify as “center” status, under AB361, the district will receive an additional $1 million income each year. That threshold can be anticipated based on extensive demand surveys and present activity levels at the Indio facility.

In the spring semester of 2009, two new buildings have been occupied on the Palm Desert Campus including a new Nursing Building and a new Public Safety Building. Both have endowments to cover most of the maintenance costs. The balance required is included in the operating budget. The Nursing Building will be staffed by the current staff that is moving from a building to be remodeled. Therefore, there will be no additional cost for faculty. The Public Safety Building will house the present Public Safety Program being moved from various locations.

Future building projects on the Palm Desert Campus largely are focused on consolidation of existing programs and replacement of sub-
standard or temporary facilities. Consequently, increased faculty and support costs will be minimal and will be confined to state-funded growth. In addition, the development of new, highly efficient, green buildings to replace inefficient buildings should lead to quantifiable future cost avoidance in operating costs if not actual reduction in operating costs. Such savings are being calculated and reflected in multiple-year budget forecasts.

The plans for the West Valley Campus are still in the development stages. The programs to be offered there will be determined by considering our Strategic Master Plan, input from focus groups from that area, and other identified needs of the college. Construction on that site is not scheduled for at least three years. Our plan will include the ongoing financial requirements to operate that campus. The Campus Master Plan will likely reflect a college-funded core within a substantially larger campus funded by community, business, and other public agency services. It is intended that the larger campus will operate on a self-sustaining basis without recourse to the college budget.

The expansion program is likely to continue through the next five years and may not be completed until the following five-year period. That timeframe enables College of the Desert to ensure that all operational consequences—program, service, and operating costs—are incrementally built into the budget and multiple-year forecasts.

Evidentiary References

Primary References (location as noted):

*Education Master Plan:*
http://www.collegeofthedesert.edu/visitors/measureb/documentation/Pages/ProgramDocuments.aspx

*Facilities Master Plan:*
http://www.collegeofthedesert.edu/visitors/measureb/documentation/Pages/ProgramDocuments.aspx

Secondary References (location-Office of Vice President, Business Affairs):

*Annual Reports of the Citizens Bond Oversight Committee*

*Minutes of the Quarterly Meetings of the Citizens Bond Oversight Committee*


*EVC @ Mecca/Thermal Activity and Resource Projections*

*Submission to the Chancellor’s Office of Letter of Intent regarding WVC*

*Submission to the Chancellor’s Office of Application for Preliminary Approval regarding EVC @ Mecca/Thermal*

*Vision for WVC*

*(Draft) Bond Program Review*
Statement of Presentation to the Board
This page certifies that this report was presented to and reviewed by the Governing Board of College of the Desert at the meeting of March 17, 2009. The minutes of that meeting are available at by following the directions below:

1) Go to: <www.collegeofthedesert.edu>
2) Click “Faculty and Staff” tab
3) Click “Board Information” icon
4) Click “2009 DCCD Board Meeting Minutes”.

Central Evidentiary References and Posting of Follow-Up Report:
College of the Desert accreditation page:
http://www.collegeofthedesert.edu/fs/accreditation/Pages/default.aspx

Special Note regarding Web Links:
Some links in the above report require a special logon to access the College of the Desert Intranet. A special logon user name and password has been established for ACCJC.