RECOMMENDATION #4

The Pasadena City College Management Association developed a Code of Ethics (Policy 2500 Management Code of Ethics), which was approved by the majority of the Management Association's members at a meeting on June 28, 2010. Policy 2500 was approved the PACCD Board of Trustees on September 15, 2010. The Pasadena City College Classified Senate and the following college bargaining units; ISSU; CCSEA; POA; and Confidentials, agreed to a Classified Code of Ethics on August 18, 2010(Policy 2520, Classified Code of Ethics). Policy 2520 was approved by the PACCD Board of Trustees on September 15, 2010. Both policies and procedures are available on the Pasadena City College website.

RECOMMENDATION #5

The Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Management Association will be formally evaluated in two ways: 1.) a self-evaluation conducted annually and 2.) a Campus Climate survey implemented every three years. The college's Campus Climate survey has undergone significant revision with guidance from the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Management Association. One of the survey's primary purposes will be to help assess the effectiveness of each shared governance group and shared governance as a whole.

The self-evaluation performed annually will be used to guide the work of each governance group throughout the year. The results of the Campus Climate survey will be evaluated by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) which will make recommendations to the College Coordinating Council (CCC) on any needed changes or accommodations in the shared governance process.

PROJECT 90: GUIDING PCC INTO THE FUTURE

PCC's Signature Goals
Guaranteed Enrollment for In-District High School Students
Cutting-Edge Learning Environments (Pedagogy, Technology, and Facilities)
A Sustainable College Community
Degrees and Certificate Programs that Address Market-Place Needs
Premier Transfer California Community College
Dedicated to Lifelong Learning

Student Success Achievement Areas and Targets – 2010-2015

Student Success Achievements	September 2010 Baseline	2010-2011 Target	2011-2012 Target	2012-2013 Target	2013-2014 Target	2014-2015 Target
Transfers to 4-Year Institutions	PCC – 1787 - 4th in State	1787	1787	1858	1932	2048
Associate Degrees Awarded	PCC – 1655 - 7th in State	1655	2483	2648	2814	2979
Associate STEM Degrees Awarded	PCC – 362** - 3rd in State	362	400	440	490	550
Certificates Awarded (18+Units)	PCC – 1187 - 3rd in State	1306	1424	1543	1662	1781
Basic Skills Sequence Completion Rate	PCC Math – 13%*** English – 36%*** ESL – 21%***	Math – 13% English – 36% ESL – 21%	Math – 16% English – 43% ESL – 25%	Math – 18% English – 50% ESL – 29%	Math – 21% English – 58% ESL – 34%	Math – 23% English – 65% ESL – 38%

**PCC does not currently offer degrees in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM). The baseline figure 362 is defined by course-taking behavior of PCC students. i.e., these students would qualify for a STEM degree if one were offered.

***Completion rate is based on Level One entry. The number of levels in PCC's pre-transfer-level sequences: Math – 3, English – 2, and ESL – 5.

Project 90 is a five-year guide, in conjunction with the college's Educational Master Plan (EMP) currently under final development, to bring PCC to the highest level by our 90th anniversary during the 2014-2015 academic year. By focusing on the signature goals and student achievement areas, PCC is poised to be the leader in community colleges across California.

A dedicated group of fulltime faculty, adjunct faculty, division deans and Student and Learning Services deans, managers, and counselors have come together to develop strategies for achieving the goals and achievement area targets. Every voice and the full commitment of all members of the PCC community are needed to achieve this audacious task.

"The task of a great college like ours is the hardest task of all: how do we get still greater in the cause of our mission of student success?" - Dr. Mark Rocha

A Message from the President

Dear Colleagues:

As I informed you last July 8th, the Accreditation Commission of Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) took action to continue PCC on Warning status. The ACCJC therefore requires PCC to submit a second Follow-Up Report by October 15, 2010, followed by a campus visit of Commission representatives to ensure that we have acted fully on the ACCJC's recommendations for further action. In January the ACCJC will meet to decide whether to remove PCC from Warning and restore our accreditation to full status or advance it to Probation.

Inside you will find the Accreditation Scorecard which outlines our progress on meeting the recommendation requirements. The Scorecard and the narrative will provide the outline for the contents of our second Follow-up Report. Please review the scorecard and provide any response you feel necessary. The Scorecard shows a college that has acted vigorously in the last several months not only to comply with ACCJC requirements but to get better as a community college.

This Scorecard represents the hard work of literally hundreds of faculty and staff. Now you have a crucially important role in helping the cause by acting as follows:

♦ First, please read the Scorecard carefully and sensitively to make sure you comprehend it fully.
♦ Good writing requires good readers. If any part of it is not clear to you, please bring it to our attention so we can make it better. *
♦ Please let us know if there is anything you can suggest to make the Scorecard clear and comprehensible to
♦ faculty and staff.
♦ Faculty colleagues especially, please look closely at the content on program review and student learning outcomes (SLOs) . Even if you take issue with some aspect of the content itself, or I should say, especially if you take issue with some aspect of the content itself, please bring it to our attention so we can directly ad dress the issue. *

Our college has chosen the path of real transformation not mere compliance. For a great college like PCC, accreditation must not be a compliance ritual but rather a tool we use in order to get better and do better for our students. The task of a great college like ours is the hardest task of all: how do we get still greater in the cause of our mission of student success? So I have always tried to approach the reaffirmation of accreditation and, in our present case, getting the college off Warning, as a *side effect* of our continuous work of planning and improvement tied to our mission. This is why I take this work on the progress report as an opportunity.

I do want to thank again so many of you who have done so much work on the progressive accreditation actions that the Scorecard documents. Let us honor our work by finishing the tasks before us in the interests of a great community college for our students.

In hope and heart,
Mark

Mark Rocha
Superintendent-President
Pasadena City College
626-585-7201

* Please send your comments to: mwrocha@pasadena.edu, jemartinez@pasadena.edu, rbmiller@pasadena.edu, or cakollross@pasadena.edu.

Accreditation Response Scorecard

Recommendations	Where We Started March 2009	Where We Were March 2010	Where We Are October 15, 2010
#1 *The team recommends that the college develop a systematic assessment of evaluation mechanisms, i.e., program review and planning processes, to determine their effectiveness in improving student learning programs and services and administrative functions. Specifically, the college needs to implement a consistent data set for program review and process improvement. (IB.6, 1B.7)*	• Systematic assessment of evaluation mechanism not in place • Data not consistently used **0%**	• Conceptualized the Development of an Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) • Consistent data sets developed for program review and planning • Revised planning and program review processes including systematic evaluation **70%**	• IEC policy and procedures Board approved • IEC Establishment Task Force in place • Revised planning and program review processes tied to resource allocation implemented • Basic Skills, Accounting, and Enrollment Services undergoing program review **100%**
#2 *The team recommends that the college expand its assessment of student learning outcomes to include all programs, degrees, and certificates, and, if applicable, learning and support service areas. The team further recommends that the student learning outcomes assessment be incorporated into the program review; program planning, and resource allocation processes. (IB, IIA.2.e, and IIA.2.f, IIB, IIC)*	• Course level SLO assessment in progress • Minimal instructional program assessment occurring • Active Student and Learning Services program assessment in progress **25%**	• Academic Senate established SLO subcommittee to guide course and program level assessment • Redefined program definition for educational and student support services in accordance with ACCJC guidelines • Closely coordinated the work of the Accreditation Response Steering Committee with the Academic Senate SLO subcommittee **50%**	• All certificate of achievement programs will have defined student learning outcomes by the end of the Fall 2010 semester • Curriculum mapping within planning structure is underway • Curriculum and Instruction Committee (C&I) overseeing Division's creation of outcomes for degrees, majors, areas of emphasis, and transfer majors • General Education Outcomes (GEOs) developed and approved by the Academic Senate **60%**
#3 *The team recommends that the college establish and implement policies and procedures that define and ensure the quality and integrity of the distance education offerings and make these policies widely available to faculty. The institution must also submit a Substantive Change Proposal to the Commission. (IIA.1, IIA.1b)*	• Inadequate Distance Education Policies and Procedures **0%**	• 15 of 20 Policies and Procedures developed for Distance Education **75%**	• 20 Policies and Procedures developed for Distance Education • Roll out to faculty and deans completed • C&I committee orientation completed • Distance Education Office established and funded; implementing Distance Education policies and procedures **100%**
#4 *The team recommends that the college develop codes of ethics for management and classified employees. (IIIA.1.d)*	• No code of Ethics for Management and Classified **0%**	• Framework for Management and Classified Codes of Ethics established **40%**	• Codes of Ethics for Management and Classified Board of Trustees approved **100%**
#5 *The team recommends the college develop and implement formal processes for the regular evaluation of each component of its governance and decision-making structures and use the results for improvement as needed. (IVA.5)*	• Limited formal process for evaluation of each component of governance and decision-making structures **10%**	• Reviewed shared governance evaluation processes at other institutions • Incorporated the analysis and evaluation of governance and decision making in the proposed IEC structure **20%**	• Formal process implemented through shared governance group self-assessments, Campus Climate survey, President-led forums and discussion groups, College Coordinating Council, and Shared Governance (Policy 2000) **100%**

The chart to the left is the "scorecard" of the activities the college will complete by the October 15, 2010 for associated Follow-up Report #2. At a July 20, 2010 joint meeting of the Educational Master Plan Steering and Accreditation Response Steering Committees, Dr. Rocha outlined the college's progress in meeting and exceeding the recommendations set forth by ACCJC in its Spring 2009 accreditation site visit.

RECOMMENDATION #1

After an evaluation of the current program review structure, a shared governance group determined that a revision of the structure was necessary to ensure that the planning and review processes were used to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness. Table 1 illustrates the revised program review structure for the four areas of the college. The college chose to implement a new planning and program review software, TaskStream Accountability Management System (AMS). The software was acquired in June 2010, customized in July 2010, and implemented in August 2010. Rigorous group and one-on-one training occurred and continues in support of

Table 1: Program Review by Area

Instruction	Basic Skills	AA/AS degrees	Certificates	General Education	Transfer/Discipline
Student and Learning Services	Enrollment Services	Student Support Services	Learning Assistance	Engagement	Goal Achievement
Adminstrative Services	Campus Services	Fiscal Services	Technology Services		
President's Area	Shared Governance	External Relations	Institutional Effectiveness	Human Resources	

faculty, staff, managers, and administrators. The planning process will be assessed using a TaskStream AMS internal survey mechanism. When a plan is completed and submitted, the author will automatically receive a survey asking her or him to review the planning process in regard to understanding, functionality, and needed changes. The surveys will be analyzed by the Office of Institutional Planning and Research (IPRO). Any remediation or changes that need to occur to the planning process (including software, technology, and training) will be discussed with the Academic Senate, Administration, and College Coordinating Council and implemented by IPRO.

Consistent data sets were indentified through a consultative process during the 2009-2010 academic year. The data sets were developed using Chancellor's Office referential files, internal data sources, and the analysis of surveys administered by the college over the last five years. As each data set was finalized, it was uploaded into the appropriate program review and planning areas within the AMS. Every year the data sets will be updated. As part of the AMS training, faculty, staff, managers, and administrators were familiarized with the data sets and their usage for program review and planning. Additionally, as reviewers identify additional data needed for their review process, the information will be uploaded into the AMS.

RECOMMENDATION #2

The college's SLO activities have been on-going for the past several years. In order to comply with this recommendation by the October 2012 deadline, an aggressive timeline has been established. As of this writing, the academic divisions are completing their majors and areas of emphasis SLOs under the guidance of the college's Curriculum and Instruction Committee. Assessment of these SLOs will begin in Spring 2011.

The Curriculum and Instruction Committee (C&I) is overseeing the creation of outcomes for degrees, majors, areas of emphasis, and transfer majors. This work is being completed by faculty with the assistance of the Division Deans. General Education Outcomes (GEOs) were developed and approved by the Academic Senate. A Research Finding #28 has been completed that compares and analyzes five years of results from the PCC Fall Student Survey with the college's GEOs and the results from the administration of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) in Spring 2007 and Spring 2009. The findings will be used as part of the Spring 2011 review of the college's General Education.

RECOMMENDATION #3

Follow-up Report #1 provides a detailed overview of the work completed as of March 2010. Since that time, the Academic Senate Distance Education Committee has completed all of the initial policies and procedures (20). Fifteen of the twenty policies and procedures have been approved by the college's Academic Senate with the remaining five to be approved in October 2010. The District has entered into contract negotiations with the Faculty Association regarding those policies relating to working conditions.

The college has prepared a preliminary Substantive Change proposal relative to its Business and Information Technology program. The proposal will be submitted upon the Commission's notification that the college is off warning. Additional Substantive Change proposals will be prepared and submitted as the need arises. In association with the Office of Instruction, the Distance Education Director is completing an audit of all college programs to determine if other distance education substantive change proposals are required.