Midterm Report

Prepared for the
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior
Colleges

Pasadena City College
1570 E. Colorado Blvd.
Pasadena, CA 91106-2003

October 15, 2005

Midterm Report

Prepared for the
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior
Colleges

Pasadena City College
1570 E. Colorado Blvd.
Pasadena, CA 91106-2003

October 15, 2005

Table of Contents

     1. Directions from planning documents that link planning to the college mission statement
     2. College mission statement and examples of a program, unit and area mission statement
     3. Mission statements from the Technology Plan, Academic Plan and the college's Foundation
     4. Campus Climate-Employee Survey results
     5. Employee Exit Survey
     6. Evaluation of the first edition of the rewritten planning handbook questionnaire and survey results
     7. Second edition of the planning handbook and step-by-step guides to completing the planning forms
     8. Summary of survey to evaluate the second edition of the planning handbook
     9. Computer replacement plan
     10. Map of 2004-05 college wide goals to their origins
     11. Program Review Form
     12. Program review calendar
     13. List of reports available in the Research Office to assist instructional program reviews
     14. Customer service questionnaire used for program reviews in Student and Learning Services and the survey result
     15. *Planning Ahead*, a publication used to communicate the results of the program reviews
     16. 2002-03 college strategic direction on improving communication
     17. 2003-04 Year-End Report documenting progress made on the college's goal to improve communication
     18. Memo from the President to all employees informing everyone at the college where committee minutes are posted

Table of Contents

Statement on Report Preparation

The Dean of Institutional Planning and Research, who is also the Accreditation Liaison Officer (AOL), created the initial draft of this midterm report. The draft report was sent to members of the college's Midterm Accreditation Report Steering Committee. They were asked to review the report and make recommendation as they thought appropriate. The draft of the Midterm Report was edited to reflect the Committee's comments. When the AOL and Committee agreed that the report adequately represented the college's progress on the accreditation team's recommendations and planning agendas from the college's self study, the AOL submitted the report through the President to the Board of Trustees.

The final report was sent to the Board of Trustees on September 16, 2005. The Board accepted the report and authorized its transmittal on September 21, 2005.

Dr. Stuart Wilcox, Dean
Institutional Planning and Research
Accreditation Liaison Officer

Date

Dr. James Kossler, President
Pasadena City College

Date

Dr. Jeanette Mann, President
Pasadena City College Board of Trustees

Date

Recommendations of the Accreditation Team

The following are the five recommendations identified in the Accreditation Commission's action letter.

Recommendation #1: The team recommends that the college expand its efforts to promote widespread understanding of its mission statement and develop planning processes that ensure that institutional planning and decision-making are guided by the mission statement.

Recommendation #2: The team recommends that the college link its planning and budgeting process and ensure that the results of this process are clearly communicated to all constituents.

Recommendation #3: The team recommends that the college complete and implement a comprehensive program review for all areas and that the results are incorporated into the planning and budgeting process.

Recommendation #4: The team recommends that the college's governance process empower constituents by ensuring that communication flows from and to all college entities.

Recommendation #5: The team recommends that the college provide evidence that all campus constituents are working to restore collegiality and integrity in their relationships.

Response to the Recommendations

Recommendation #1: The team recommends that the college expand its efforts to promote widespread understanding of its mission statement and develop planning processes that ensure that institutional planning and decision-making are guided by the mission statement.

Progress Made on the Recommendation:

The college employed several strategies to promote a widespread understanding of the college's mission statement. In Spring 2002, the college's mission statement was reviewed and revised by a shared governance committee that included community members. A new mission statement, that focuses on successful student learning, was adopted by the Board of Trustees on June 19, 2002. Wide distribution of the new mission statement has been accomplished by sending it to all college offices, giving it to all new employees (including hourly unclassified), distributing it as part of the planning process, giving it to all new faculty at their new employee orientation, posting it on the college's website and printing it on page one of the college catalog.

To help ensure that institutional planning and decision-making are guided by the college's mission statement, the planning instructions were rewritten and the processes modified. Specifically, in Fall of 2003, the college's mission statement was added to the packet of forms and documents distributed to all managers at the beginning of each annual planning cycle. The planning instructions were modified to direct the planning teams at all three levels of planning used at the college (program, unit and area) to begin the planning process by reviewing the college's mission statement. Each planning team is then instructed to create its own program/unit/area mission statement that is in support of the college's mission statement. (See Appendix 1 for planning instructions that link planning to the college's mission statement and see Appendix 2 for the college's mission statement and examples of a program, unit and area mission statement.) The college's mission statement is now routinely included in the packet of materials sent to the college's Strategic Planning Team prior to its annual spring planning retreat to develop college strategic directions and annual goals. The mission statement is then reviewed at the retreat. As can be seen from the above, the college's mission statement now has a central role in guiding the planning process.

The college's mission statement has also guided the development of the mission statements of specialized areas of the college . Specifically, the college has been developing comprehensive Technology and Educational Plans. Both of these specialized plans have their own mission statements that are derived from and support the college's mission statement. (See Appendix 3 for relevant excerpts from these documents.) Lastly, the mission of the college's foundation has been rewritten to support the college's mission statement. (See Appendix 3 for a copy of the College Foundation's mission)

Analysis of Results Achieved to Date:

It is believed that the college is now in full compliance with this recommendation and with Accreditation Standard 1.3 which focuses on the college mission statement guiding the planning process and decision-making. As a result of the changes made, the college

mission statement has become much more prominent on campus. It has been distributed to all college offices and all new employees. The college's mission statement now plays a central role in the planning process because the mission statement is one of the documents distributed and reviewed in order to start the planning process. The college's mission statement has also guided the development of supporting mission statements for each of the college's programs, units and areas as well as those of specialized plans and the college foundation. These individual mission statements in turn guide the decisions made at each planning level of the college.

Many of the procedures that have been put in place to communicate the mission statement utilize existing processes, such as its distribution as part of the annual planning process or giving it to new employees as part of their hiring process. Integrating the mission statement into these routine processes reinforces the central role of the college's mission statement.

The college evaluated the effectiveness of its efforts to communicate the mission statement and to integrate it into the planning process by asking questions about the mission statement on a campus climate survey. The survey was distributed in Spring 2005. In response to the question, "Do you understand the College's mission statement?" , 56% of the responding employees indicated they understood it "a lot" or "very much". Another 25% responded they understood the mission "some". Nineteen per cent indicated they understood it "a little" or "not at all". More detailed analyses found that the 19% who did not understand the mission statement are primarily hourly faculty and hourly classified employees. A related question asked employees to indicate to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the statement, "I am committed to meeting the college's mission". Eighty-eight percent responded "strongly agree" or "agree", 11% were "neutral" and 1% "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed". To the statement, "employees at PCC are committed to meeting the College's mission". 55% strongly agreed or agreed, 35% were neutral and 11% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The 11% that disagreed with the statement were primarily full-time faculty, classified and managers. (See Appendix 4 for results of the campus climate survey.) In comparing the responses to the last two questions. Employees indicated they perceive themselves as being more strongly committed to the college mission statement (88%) than they perceive other employees (55%). This discrepancy between how employees perceive themselves as opposed to how they perceive other employees has been termed the "perception gap".

In addition, questions about the college's mission statement have been included on a recently developed exit survey that is given to all individuals leaving employment with the college. Thirty-six of the exit surveys have been returned, three (8%) of which were from individuals whose employment was either terminated or in the process of being terminated. The survey asks each individual to rate how adequately the college and department mission statements were communicated to them. In regard to the college mission statement forty-six percent responded "excellent" or "good". Forty percent rated the communication of the college's mission statement as "fair" and 14% rated it as "marginal" or "very poor". In regard to communicating the department's mission statement, philosophy and goals, 58% rated the communication as "excellent" or "good", 25% rated it "fair" and 17% rated it as "marginal" or "very poor". (See Appendix 5 for the employee exit survey.)

Additional Plans Related to this Recommendation:

The college will work on developing ways to communicate more effectively an understanding of its mission statement to hourly employees in order to reduce the 19% who responded they did not understand the college mission statement. As more effective means of communicating to hourly employees are developed, the per cent of employees, who respond on the exit survey that the college or department mission statements were not well communicated to them, will decrease.

The college recognizes that there will be a continual need to communicate the content of the mission statement to the campus community. However, with the many steps taken to date, the college has made significant strides to communicate the college mission statement and to integrate it into the planning process.

The college's mission statement is scheduled to be reviewed again during the 2006-07 year.

Recommendation #2: The team recommends that the college link its planning and budgeting process and ensure that the results of this process are clearly communicated to all constituents.

Progress Made on the Recommendation:

The first part of this recommendation, to link planning and budgeting, has been addressed in the following manner. The college's Planning and Budgeting Process Development Consultative Committee (PBPDCC) met weekly for four months during Spring 2003 to evaluate the planning process. As the PBPDCC evaluated the process, it found that campus constituents had many misconceptions about the college budget and its linkage to the planning process. The PBPDCC decided a new more user-friendly planning handbook needed to be written to correct the misconceptions and to clearly explain the linkage between the planning and budgeting processes. In September 2003, the first edition of a new planning handbook, entitled *The Planning Process at Pasadena City College,* was distributed. The new handbook contains sections entitled:

- How does planning relate to budgeting?

- How much of the budget is available to fund planning?

- How do individuals connect resources so plans are implemented?

- How do emergencies relate to planning and budgeting?

- How do PFE, VTEA, matriculation and other categorical funds relate to planning?

To evaluate the new handbook's effectiveness, a survey was sent to all unit and area managers in December 2003. The results of the survey were distributed to Unit Managers and the PBPDCC. (See Appendix 6 for the evaluation questionnaire and survey results.) Based upon the feedback about the first edition and the survey results, a second edition of the planning handbook was written. (See Appendix 7 for the second edition of the planning handbook.) This second edition consists of three chapters. Chapter One explains the planning process used at Pasadena City College and addresses the questions individuals most frequently asked. Chapter Two provides step-by-step instructions on how to complete the planning forms for annual program, unit and area plans. Chapter Three explains how to conduct a program review and how to complete the program review forms. The second edition of the handbook was distributed at the beginning of the Fall 2004. In December 2004, a survey was distributed to evaluate this second edition of the handbook. The results indicated the document was helpful and explained issues previously not well understood. However, it was found that not all managers read the document (See Appendix 8 for the results of the second evaluation survey.) To make the handbook as accessible as possible, and thus increase the likelihood of managers reading it, the handbook has been made available online.

Steps have also been taken to link the college's Technology and Academic Master Plans to the annual planning process. Procedures have been developed by which the specialized Technology Plan is annually updated from the area plans. The purpose of these new procedures was to integrate the specialized Technology Plan with the general college planning process. On June 16, 2004, the Board of Trustees approved this process by which

the Technology Plan is updated annually from the area plans. The Board also approved a draft of the Technology Plan. The college's Academic Planning Committee completed a preliminary draft of an Educational Plan in Spring 2005. It is being revised and should go to the Board of Trustees in Fall 2005.

While the planning handbook describes in general terms the planning and budgeting connections, a specific example of how the planning and budgeting are linked is the computer replacement portion of the college's Technology Plan. The replacement plan commits $900,000 annually to purchase new desktop computers such that no student will use a computer more than three years old and no employee will use a computer more than five years old. (See Appendix 9 for a copy of the computer replacement portion of the Technology Plan.) This linkage between the Technology Plan and the budget was approved by the Board of Trustees on July 21, 2004.

The second part of Recommendation #2 focuses on ensuring that the results of the planning budgeting process are clearly communicated to all constituents. Presentations have been made at many meetings to communicate and clarify the planning procedures. At multiple Management Team meetings, attendees were reminded to communicate their own plan and the plans of higher planning levels to their staff. Managers have been reminded of how the general planning process and the college budget are linked. The Dean of Institutional Planning and Research also met with Instructional Division Deans and the Faculty Technology Committee to discuss aspects of the planning process.

As a result of the evaluation of the planning process by the PBPDCC, a change was made to help communicate the results of the planning process to all constituents. Specifically, a section in the new handbook was created entitled, "How Should I Communicate the Program, Unit and Area Plan Results to Others?" In this section directions are given to map the disposition of program goals to the unit plan and unit goals to the area plan. A new "mapping" form was also provided. These maps are to be shared with lower planning levels. The intention was to communicate better information about each goal and whether it was included or not in the next higher level plan. (See Appendix 10 for an example of a map of the area goals of the President's Area and the map of the 2004-05 College Wide Goals to their origins.)

Analysis of Results Achieved to Date:

This recommendation and the related accreditation standards have been addressed. Specifically, the college's planning handbook was rewritten to explain how planning and budget processes are linked. An evaluation of the first draft of the planning handbook found that the planning process and budgeting were explained in detail. While favorable, the evaluation survey provided recommendations that led to a second edition of the planning handbook. Therefore, one specific result achieved to date is a rewritten planning handbook that clarifies the linkages between the planning and budgeting processes.

To improve the communication of the results of the planning process, a new form and instructions have been added to the planning documents. Managers have been directed to communicate the results of the planning process to their staff. Even though managers report that they have communicated their plans to their unit and program members, employees often informally report they do not know what resulted from the plans their

program developed. In order to evaluate the extent to which employees now understand the planning process and the results of the planning process, various questions were asked on the college's campus climate survey. Specifically, employees were asked, "Do you understand the planning process?" to which 21% responded "very much" or "a lot", 33% indicated "some" and 46% responded "a little" or "not at all". The campus climate survey also asked, "Are the results of the college's planning process available to you?". The results were very similar to the above. Twenty-one percent responded "very much" or a lot", 34% said "some" and 45% indicated "a little" or "not at all". These results indicate that about half of the employees understand and know the results of the college's planning process and half do not. More in-depth analysis of faculty and classified identified that twice as many of the full-time employees understand the planning process as compared to part-time employees. Thus, while more effort needs to be made to explain the planning process, particular focus must be directed at hourly employees.

Additional Plans the Institution has Developed:

Managers will be directed to explain the planning process to the staff and relay the results of the planning process to them, particularly making efforts to reach part-time employees. Efforts will also be made to improve the two-way communication of plans being communicated up the hierarchy of the college and information about the disposition of the plans down the hierarchy of the college. Efforts will also be made to publicize the availability of the handbook and to encourage its use. The Campus Climate Survey found that 45%-46% of the employees either did not understand the planning process or did not feel the results of the process were available to them. Therefore, at a Management Team meeting, managers will receive training on how to communicate this information to employees. In addition, the Institutional Planning and Research Office will require that the form, which maps the disposition of each goal, be turned in with each Unit and Area Plan.

The results of the campus climate survey will be shared with managers at one of the monthly Management Team meetings. The survey is scheduled to be done again in Spring 2007. The results of the Spring 2005 survey will be compared to those of Spring 2007 to determine if a larger percentage of employees understand the planning process.

The college anticipates that it will need to communicate continually the linkage between planning and budgeting to the campus community, particularly to hourly employees. However, based upon the variety of actions that have been taken to date, and the processes established to evaluate how well the planning and budgeting processes are communicated and understood, the college believes it has substantially met the recommendation and standards.

Recommendation #3: The team recommends that the college complete and implement a comprehensive program review for all areas and that the results are incorporated into the planning and budgeting process.

Progress Made on the Recommendation:

The college has expanded its program review process to include all areas of the college. The full implementation was phased-in over a three year period. The Instructional Area began doing program reviews in Fall 2002, then Student and Learning Services and the President's Area in Fall 2003, and lastly the Administrative Services Area in Fall 2004. (See Appendix 7, chapter 3 for the program review instructions and Appendix 11 for the program review form.) Each of the College's programs has been assigned to a year during which they will do their review. All programs have been scheduled to complete their review by Spring 2007, prior to the college working on its next accreditation self-study during 2007-08 (See Appendix 12 for the program review calendar.) The college's Executive Committee, which consists of the President and the college's six senior administrators, has placed an emphasis on doing program review and is monitoring the progress of the process.

Phasing-in the implementation of program review was done so the college's Institutional Planning and Research Office could work with each segment to develop reports and/or surveys needed by the programs for their reviews. A series of reports focusing on enrollments, section counts, etc., was developed to specifically help instructional programs do their reviews. (See Appendix 13 for a list of reports created to assist the Instructional programs with the data they would need for their program reviews). In Spring 2003, the Dean of Institutional Planning and Research met with the managers of Student and Learning Services to discuss the program review process and to help the programs prepare to do their reviews in the 2003-04 year. As a result of the meeting, a customer service questionnaire was developed. In Fall 2003, Student and Learning Services programs began using the survey. By the end of the term 1,666 questionnaires were completed by students. The Institutional Planning and Research Office tabulated the surveys and presented a summary report of the findings. (See Appendix 14 for the customer service questionnaire and survey results.)

Program reviews are fully integrated into the planning and budgeting process. They are the most basic level and form the foundation of the planning process. Specifically, the college divides itself into four levels of planning ranging from the smallest functional group (program) through units (groups of programs) to areas (groups of units) to the College as a whole. In the years that a program conducts a program review, the program review is used in developing the unit plan. During the years between program reviews, an annual program plan is created by reviewing and updating the previous program review. This annual program plan is used in developing the unit plan during the years between program reviews. Consequently, the program review and annual program plan are equally integrated into the college planning process and share the same linkages to budgeting. It is worth pointing out that this annual program planning cycle provides an opportunity to annually assess the progress being made on the program review's goals and objectives and to update or adjust the goals as necessary.

Training on how to do program review has also been provided. The April, 2003 edition of the WASC publication, *Accreditation Notes,* which focused on how to conduct a program

review, has been distributed to all managers. Each fall term, all Unit managers, who have a program review scheduled to be done in during the year are sent a memo reminding them of the task and referring them to Chapter 3 of the planning handbook. The chapter provides: (1) An overview of what program review is and what the components are of a program review, i.e., define a program's mission, collect data, analyze the data, evaluate the program, set goals and objectives for improving the program, annually evaluate progress made on the goals and objectives; and (2) Step-by-step instructions for completing the program review form. During the 2003-04 year, the Dean of Institutional Planning and Research met with several programs to give individualized training on how to do their program reviews. In Fall 2004, two training sessions on how to conduct a program review were conducted. All managers with a review scheduled during the year were instructed to attend a session. At the sessions the program review process was discussed, questions answered and examples of good reviews were distributed.

To communicate the results of the program reviews, a publication entitled *Planning Ahead* was created and distributed college wide. (See Appendix 15 for a copy of the *Planning Ahead* publication.)

Analysis of Results Achieved to Date:

All areas of the college are now engaged in doing program reviews. Instructional programs have completed their third review cycle, Student and Learning Services and the President's Area have completed two cycles. Administrative Services have finished their first program reviews. To date, seventy program reviews have been completed. The program review process has been supported with the development of manuals, forms, questionnaires and data reports. Many training sessions have been held. Program reviews are tightly integrated into the planning and budgeting process. They form the foundation of the planning process and are reviewed and updated annually through the planning process.

As program reviews are submitted, they are reviewed by the Institutional Planning and Research Office. It has been noted that there is considerable variation in the depth of analysis and quality of the program reviews. In an effort to improve the overall quality of the reviews, the best program reviews have been identified as models for what a quality review should be like.

Additional Plans the Institution has Developed:

For three years, the emphasis has been on developing the planning process and involving the entire college in the program review process. During the coming years, emphasis will be placed on improving the quality of the program reviews. In addition, program reviews will be used to focus attention on developing student learning outcomes.

The completion and submission of the planning forms is in the process of becoming an online process. The online planning forms were demonstrated at a Management Team meeting on August 17, 2005. Use of the online version is voluntary for the Fall 2005 planning cycle and will be mandatory for the Fall 2006 cycle.

The college's Executive Committee will continue to monitor the completion of the scheduled program reviews.

Recommendation #4: The team recommends that the college's governance process empower constituents by ensuring that communication flows from and to all college entities.

Progress Made on the Recommendation:

To address this recommendation, the shared governance bodies (Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Associated Student Body and Management Association) and the college's Executive Committee have enacted new strategies aimed at strengthening communication and thereby empowering their constituents. The importance of effective communication was recognized and actions were initiated by the college even before this accreditation recommendation was made. Evidence of this is that a new strategic direction to improve communication among the college communities was added in Spring 2002 for the 2002-03 planning cycle. (See Appendix 16 for the 2002-03 college strategic direction on improving communication.) In the 2003-04 planning cycle, a specific college-wide goal to improve communication was added. It states, "all members of the campus community will strengthen connections and communication within the college." A year-end report that documents what the college has done on each of its planning goals is annually presented to the Board of Trustees. The 2003-04 report documents what was done to improve communication during that year. (See Appendix 17, specifically strategic direction VII, goal 3-17 for a description of things done to improve communication.)

The college's President has led the efforts to improve the communication process by posting the topics discussed each week at the Executive Committee's meetings on an electronic notice board that is part of the college's e-mail system. The President also coordinated the posting of other committee's minutes to various notice boards and then issued a memo in March 2004 to inform the entire college where to obtain meeting minutes. Fourteen committees and organizations were listed along with the location of their posted information. (See Appendix 18 for a copy of the memo.) To enhance communication further and simultaneously strengthen collegiality, the President has initiated the practice of having a team of college leaders visit each instructional division during the Fall term. The team discusses campus issues and answers questions. The team consists of: the college President, Academic Senate President, Classified Senate President, the leader of the Management Association and the college's three Vice-Presidents. Communication has also been increased between the Executive Committee and the Board of Trustees. For example, monthly reports are given to the Board on the progress that has been made on each of the five accreditation recommendations. (See Appendix 19 for an example of a monthly report.)

On June 5, 2005, the College President held a town-hall meeting with faculty to discuss various topics of concern. The free form format was chosen to facilitate a two-way communication and because town-hall meetings with the President were one of the recommendations that came out of the committee studying issues of collegiality and integrity at the college. (See recommendation #5 from the Accreditation Team.)

The Academic Senate adopted a goal of "improved communication" and has employed a variety of initiatives to achieve it. At the most basic level, the Academic Senate leadership has met with many divisions across campus to inform their constituents of who they are and what they do. The Senate has held several roundtable discussions between the Academic

Senate President, College President and groups of randomly selected faculty as a vehicle to encourage communication and the free exchange of ideas. In addition, a new faculty handbook was developed and sent to all faculty. (See Appendix 20 for a copy of the new faculty handbook.) The Academic Senate has distributed written summaries of its meetings. These, *Senate Summaries*, are sent to the faculty, Board of Trustees, Division Deans, Executive Committee members, and posted on the Senate's website. The Academic Senate has made significant strides in improving the communication between itself and other campus organizations. For example, a standing report from the Curriculum and Instruction Committee has been added to the Senate's meeting agendas. The Academic Senate annually has a fall retreat to which they have begun inviting the Classified Senate Executive Board and a representative from the Associated Students. Perhaps most significant is the improvement in its working relationship with the Classified Senate. The two Senates now have representatives at each other's regular meetings. The two Senates are so enthusiastic about the improvement in communication that they did a presentation about their process at the November 2004 Community College League of California Conference.

The Classified Senate has implemented a number of steps to foster and to improve communication with its constituency and with the various shared governance groups. To improve communication between the senators and their constituents, each senator received a list of classified staff with whom they are supposed to personally communicate. A list of the Classified Senate members and their contact information has been made available on the Classified Senate's web page. The minutes and agendas for Classified Senate meetings are posted on the college's electronic notice board. The Classified Senate's meetings provide an opportunity for the staff to ask questions. Additionally, the Classified Senate has adopted a process of inviting guest speakers to its monthly meetings and encourages questions during the audience participation section of its open meeting. This helps answer questions employees have and/or direct individuals to the appropriate source to have their questions answered. During department meetings, Senators are encouraged to discuss various relevant issues and disseminate information to members of their group.

The Management Association has promoted the strengthening of communication through a series of meetings and retreats. The Management Association has been utilizing its time in the management team's meetings to communicate with its constituents. For example:

- In April 2003, the accreditation recommendations were discussed and reviewed by all managers in attendance.

- In May 2003, the college's 2003-04 Strategic Directions and Annual Goals were distributed along with tables that mapped each goal to its origins. The Managers were asked to share the college-wide goals and tables with their units and to use the tables to communicate the results of the planning process.

- In August 2003, managers were informed about the college budget, new travel policy and procedures, the planning process time line for the year and changes to the planning process, bond funded projects, parking during the Fall semester plus many other topics.

- In August 2005, an entire four hour Management Team retreat was dedicated to

communicating to managers important information and upcoming events at the college. (See Appendix 21 for examples of agendas from Management Team meetings.)

In addition, the Director of the Management Association has begun distributing synopses of shared governance meetings.

To strengthen communication between students and the Associated Students (AS), the AS has run advertisements in the school newspaper, *Courier,* and the college announcement flier, *Crier,* about AS elections and other upcoming events. The AS representative to the College Coordinating Council has reported the activities and the information received from the Council back to the AS Board. Additionally, the AS has increased the number of classroom and "in the quad" student surveys concerning student services. For the 2004-05 school year, the AS went through a structural reorganization to add more Vice-Presidents who have responsibilities to attend specific college meetings and to communicate the results of the meetings to the AS Board.

In the Progress Report submitted to WASC in October 2004, three items were listed under "Additional Plans the Institution has Developed". They are: (1) The college's Public Information Office regularly posts summaries of the Board of Trustee meetings to the Campus Bulletin, a daily electronic announcement board. (2) The college President has again sent his memo informing the college about where to locate the minutes of various committees. (3) A campus climate survey has been used to collect baseline data for the evaluation of the effectiveness of various communication techniques used. All three have been completed.

Analysis of Results Achieved to Date:
The College has significantly improved communication on campus. This is likely due to the multi-modality approach of multiple groups using a variety of different activities to improve communication to all college entities. For example:

- The college used the planning process by developing a strategic direction focused on communication.
- Minutes from committee meetings are posted electronically for all to review.
- Management Team meetings are used to communicate consistent information to all managers who are in turn asked to share the information with faculty and staff.
- The Academic Senate has started a new publication.
- Presentations have been made at meetings.
- Open discussions have been held .
- Representatives from the Academic and Classified Senates now attend each other's regular meetings.

The former President of the Classified Senate has stated that the distribution of the Academic Senate Summaries has enabled the Classified Senate to communicate immediately any concerns they have on items in the Summary to the representative of the Academic Senate who attends their meetings. In addition, the joint presentation by the two senates at the November 2004 Community College League of California Conference

documents their improved communication as well as a spirit of collegiality. Collectively, this variety of approaches by all shared governance groups has improved communication.

On the Campus Climate Survey, some questions were asked about communication on campus. (See appendix 4 for the results of the Campus Climate Survey.) When asked to indicate how often they personally went out of their way to communicate information to other employees, 77% of the respondents said they did it "very often" or "often". However, when asked to indicate how often other employees went out of their way to communicate information to another employee, only 31% responded "very often" or "often".   Generally, individuals consistently perceived themselves as communicating or treating others better than others communicated or treated them. This "perception gap" may in part explain employee perceptions of inadequate communication at the college. Thus, the reported lack of communication at the college may be more an issue of perception than fact.

The Campus Climate Survey also asked employees to indicate two things they would like to improve at the college. Communication was the third most frequently selected item behind promotional advancement opportunities and employee morale.

Additional Plans the Institution has Developed:

The College recognizes there will always be room for improvement in communication and will continue to strive to improve communication among campus entities. However, results of the Campus Climate Survey indicate that a lack of communication may be more a matter of perception than fact. Some additional steps the college intends to take are:

- To communicate annually to the campus the information the college President originally distributed about where to locate the minutes of various committees.
- The college's Campus Climate Survey of employees will be administered in Spring 2007. The results will be compared to those of the Spring 2005 administration to determine if opinions about communication on campus have changed.

Recommendation #5: The team recommends that the college provide evidence that all campus constituents are working to restore collegiality and integrity in their relationships.

Progress Made on the Recommendation:

It was decided that before the college could begin to restore collegiality and integrity, it first had to learn about and understand the issues surrounding collegiality and integrity and what these terms meant to the college community. A series of focus groups and one-to-one interviews with various campus constituents were selected as the methods to acquire this understanding because it allowed for the exploration of the topic and a greater understanding of the related issues.

Seventeen campus constituent groups were identified based upon: 1) shared governance structure, 2) unions, and 3) employee/student classifications. There were six shared governance based constituent groups: the leaderships of the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Management Association, Associated Student Board, and all members of the Executive Committee and the Board of Trustees. There were four union based constituent groups: the leadership of ISSU, CSEA-facilities, CSEA-POA, and CTA. From the employee/student classifications, two randomly selected faculty groups, two randomly selected classified groups, two randomly selected student groups, and one randomly selected management group comprised the constituent groups.

Three constituent groups (CSEA-POA, Executive Committee, and the Board of Trustees) provided input to the study through one-to-one interviews instead of focus groups. The CSEA-POA leadership worked on different shifts so that it was not feasible to bring the leadership together for a focus group. The Executive Committee is comprised of top Administrators and their supervisor, the President. Since interviewing employees with their supervisor could inhibit the employees from freely expressing their opinions, they were interviewed individually. The entire Board of Trustees could not convene as a focus group because the Brown Act prohibits more than three Board members from meeting together outside a public forum and a public forum would not have been conducive to Board members freely expressing their opinions about college collegiality and integrity.

The focus groups were conducted from April 2003 through July 2003. The fact they were conducted over several months was actually good because issues of the moment, i.e., issues that were on people's minds in one month and which were not issues months later, tended to get dropped and only those issues stable over time were retained. The focus group sessions were comprised of two to fifteen individuals. Two note takers and the IPRO Senior Research Analyst, who functioned as the facilitator, attended each focus group. The one-to-one interviews were conducted by the Senior Research Analyst. No sessions or interviews were tape-recorded; no names were recorded by the note-takers; and no individuals were identified in the notes. One hundred twenty individuals were involved in the focus groups or interviews.

Comments regarding collegiality and integrity were collected from the focus group and interview participants. The comments were compiled into a report for each constituent group. The reports summarized each group's perceptions and opinions regarding

collegiality and integrity at PCC. The purpose of the individual reports was to reflect the participants' sentiments, thus the comments contained in the report were not verbatim but were distillations of comments. Each focus group was reconvened between October 2003 and April 2004 to review, edit, and validate the accuracy of its summary report. For the groups that were interviewed, each participant individually reviewed, edited, and validated his/her own individual statements. IPRO then edited the reports based upon the validated statements. The validated reports were used by the Dean and staff of the IPRO to produce a *Collegiality and Integrity College-Wide Summary Report* that summarized the issues common across the college's constituent groups. (See Appendix 22 for a copy of the college-wide report.) The report identifies seven specific themes through which collegiality and integrity are manifested and also identifies five approaches to improving collegiality and integrity. The report was distributed to all of the constituent groups leaders.

A half-day retreat was held in June 2004 to validate the college-wide report, to discuss what "collegiality and integrity" means to PCC, and to develop a process to start addressing the issues. The retreat attendees comprised representatives of the shared governance groups, the Board of Trustees, the Executive Committee and unions. Consultants were hired to facilitate the retreat. At the retreat, there was general consensus that the themes identified in the college summary report were accurate. The attendees also agreed that they were the appropriate group to address the issue of collegiality and integrity. A steering committee was formed to develop specific recommendations on how to restore collegiality and integrity at the college. The attendees decided that a one-page summary of the college-wide summary report should be created and distributed college-wide. (See Appendix 23 for a copy of the one-page summary report.) The one-page summary was distributed college-wide two times. First in Summer 2004 and again in Fall 2004.

In October 2004, the Steering Committee created at the June retreat, began to meet weekly. The Committee met for five months discussing the findings of the focus groups. The result was the development of twelve specific recommendations intended to improve collegiality and integrity at the college. The Steering Committee's report was released in March 2005. (See Appendix 24 for a copy of the *Collegiality and Integrity Steering Committee's Report.*) The report was distributed to all attendees at the original June 2004 retreat with permission to disseminate it as they chose. The college immediately began to address some of the recommendations. Three of the recommendations: #1 for the President to hold town-hall meetings, #7 for each side of the negotiating table to teach the other side the negotiation process their side requires them to follow and #9 which called for training about the shared governance process at the college, have already been acted upon.

While the focus groups have been the primary method to address the issues of collegiality and integrity, they are not the only actions taken by the college. For example, to build collegiality, a college strategic direction to identify the college's core values was adopted for the 2005-06 planning cycle. The college has also hired a consultant to work with the Financial Aid Office and the Fiscal Services Office to bring a more harmonious functioning between the two offices in their shared responsibility of distributing funds to students. Another example are memorandums of understanding (MOU) that were negotiated with each collective bargaining unit. These MOUs guaranteed no lay-offs during

the State budget crisis of 2003-04 and 2004-05 in exchange for the college being able to move employees temporarily into vacant positions. Employees have reported that these MOUs have increased their feelings of job security and belief in the integrity of the college.

Analysis of Results Achieved to Date:

The college recognizes the importance of creating the best work environment possible; consequently, it has invested a significant amount of time and energy working on this recommendation.   Over 120 individuals representing hundreds of staff hours and including 17 different campus constituent groups have been involved in clarifying what collegiality and integrity mean to Pasadena City College, and the manner in which the concepts manifest themselves at the college. It is very interesting to note that only one of the identified themes from the collegiality and integrity focus groups and interviews was unanimous across students, faculty, classified staff, managers and the Board of Trustees and that was that "PCC is a great place to work or study." The consultants who facilitated the half-day retreat on collegiality and integrity in June 2004 said this was a very encouraging finding.

In addition, no-lay-off MOUs were signed with collective bargaining units. The MOUs are tangible evidence that constituents are working together collegially and with integrity. The MOUs were agreed to for two consecutive years. As the College and State budget improved the MOUs became unnecessary. They ended June 30, 2005.

Anecdotally, employees have reported that they feel the college has already made progress in restoring collegiality and integrity. The very acts of conducting the focus groups, printing a report and distributing a summary that acknowledges employees' concerns has been beneficial at raising the awareness and sensitivity to these issues which has produced improvement in the collegiality and integrity of college relationships. Therefore, there is ample evidence that all campus constituents are engaged in working on this recommendation.

Additional Plans the Institution has Developed:

The college now has twelve specific recommendations for steps that can be taken to improve collegiality and integrity at the college. Three of the twelve recommendations (25%) have already been acted upon. In the future the college will continue to enact the recommendations of the Collegiality and Integrity Steering Committee.

In September 2005, the original committee that attended the June 2004 retreat on collegiality and integrity will be reconvened to discuss who on campus will take responsibility for enacting the recommendations of the Steering Committee.

Responses to Self-identified Issues

Each of the thirty planning agendas in the Self Study were assigned to one of the seven members of the college's Executive Committee. In some cases the same planning agenda was assigned to two or more committee members. The Executive Committee members monitored and reported on the progress made on each planning agenda.

The following table lists each planning agenda and the status (completed, nearly completed or in progress) of each. A brief comment explains the actions taken on each planning agenda. Each planning agenda has an "ID Number" that refers to the specific accreditation standard that generated the planning agenda. These same ID Numbers were used in the Self Study to identify each planning agenda. Of the 30 planning agendas, 18 have been completed, 4 are nearly completed and 8 and in progress.

ID NUMBER	PLANNING AGENDA	PROGRESS STATUS AND COMMENTS
1.1	The Dean of Institutional Planning and Research will coordinate a review and revision of the mission statement in spring 2002.	**Completed:** A new mission statement was adopted by the Board of Trustees on June 19, 2002
1.3	The Institutional Planning and Research Office will coordinate regular reviews of the mission statement to coincide with the Integrated Planning Process.	**Completed:** The College's mission statement was reviewed in 2002 and a new statement adopted in June 2002. The mission statement is scheduled to be reviewed again during the 2006-07 year prior to the next accreditation self-study in 2007-08.
2.2	The Academic Senate in consultation with the Office of Instruction will complete and publish a new Faculty Handbook.	**Completed:** In September 2002 a new Faculty Handbook was published.
2.3	The Academic Senate will ask the District and the faculty bargaining unit to review the "Student Evaluation of Teachers" form to determine whether it sufficiently addresses the issue of presenting material fairly and objectively.	**In Progress:** Negotiations on a new faculty evaluation process began with the faculty bargaining unit (CTA) during the 2004-05 negotiations. A draft of an evaluation process has been developed and is scheduled to be presented to the Academic Senate on September 12, 2005. A new faculty evaluation process should be finalized during the negotiations of the 2005-06 year.
	The Academic Senate will ask the District and the appropriate employee representation groups to consider developing a statement on the obligation of administrators and classified staff to present material fairly and objectively to students and others.	The Academic Senate has withdrawn this item.
2.4	The President's Office in consultation with constituent groups will develop an expanded policy on nepotism and conflict of interest.	**Nearly Completed:** The Academic Senate developed a new policy (#6022) on Conflicts of Interest Resulting from Consensual Relationships. It was adopted by the Board of Trustees on February 2, 2005. A separate policy on nepotism is under development; however, parts of other policies deal with nepotism in the hiring process, such as the Classified Hiring Policy (#6200.1, section 4b).

3A.4	The Institutional Planning and Research Office will communicate to the campus community the results of program evaluations. The results will be easily accessible to all interested faculty and staff. The evaluation process will provide feedback to ensure accountability and change.	**In Progress:** The summaries of the program reviews submitted during 2003-04 were published during February 2005 in a document entitled, *Planning Ahead*. The document was distributed college wide. PFE funds are handled as if each project is a grant. PFE projects are evaluated annually. The results of the evaluations are shared at a Board of Trustee retreat and in a document entitled, *PFE Evaluation Ratings*, which is distributed to the PFE Steering Committee.
3A.4	The Vice Presidents of Administrative Services and Student and Learning Services will create and implement a program review process for non-instructional programs.	**Completed:** A calendar for program reviews was created. It contains all of the programs at the college. An instructional handbook and forms for program review were created and distributed. Student and Learning Services have completed 10 program reviews, Administrative Services has submitted 5 and the President's Area has completed 3 reviews of their programs. The program review process has been institutionalized as part of the annual planning process.
3B.1	The Institutional Planning and Research Office will continue to implement the planning process as it has developed, will review its recommendation for the creation of the Integrated Master Plan, and will communicate to the college community discussions and decisions at all levels of the planning process.	**Nearly Completed:** The planning process is now fully implemented with program reviews, annual plans produced by the college's programs, units and areas. A specific document identified as the Integrated Master Plan has not been developed. The necessity of an Integrated Master Plan has come into question as the college's Technology and Educational Master plans have been integrated with the general college planning process. The committee that created the planning process will be reconvened to review the need of an integrated master plan. To foster the communication of plans to all levels of the planning process, specific directions were written in the Planning Handbook and on the Planning forms about how to share the results of the planning process.

3B.2	The Institutional Planning and Research Office will review the details of the Planning Handbook and either follow the process described or revise the process to reflect current practices.	**In Progress:** The college's Planning and Budgeting Process Development Consultative Committee (PBPDCC) met weekly for four months to evaluate the planning process. It was recommended that a new, more user-friendly planning handbook be written. The first edition came out in September 2003. Following an evaluation of the effectiveness of the revised handbook, a second edition was released in September 2004. It is still undecided if a document entitled, Integrated Master Plan, should be produced or whether the Area Plans along with the Technology, Educational and Facilities Master Plans constitute the college's integrated plan. The PBPDCC will be reconvened to consider this and other issues.
4A.1	The Institutional Planning and Research Office will study the causes of declining African American student enrollment and matriculation rates.	**Completed:** It was found that African American enrollment was not declining. Indeed numbers have been stable while the Hispanic and Asian enrollments have grown causing African Americans to become a smaller percentage of the total enrollment at the College. The data show that, based upon their proportion in the population, African Americans are over represented at the College. The results were reported in *Research Findings* of December 2002. (See Appendix 25 for a copy of the *Research Findings*.)
4A.2	The Office of Instruction will seek and evaluate additional methods to help under prepared students and English language learners to master essential skills.	**In Progress:** Additional methods to help under-prepared students have been identified. Special scheduling of classes is being reviewed. Also, additional changes in course offerings have been proposed to the Curriculum and Instruction Committee for the English language learners. Specifically, lab classes (English 1000X) have been attached to sections of English classes to give additional English practice. The writing center has updated its equipment and software. What remains unfinished is the evaluation of these additional methods.

4A.4	The Office of Instruction will seek additional ways to provide for technological upgrades to support the educational programs.	**Completed:** In 2002-03, labs in Visual Arts and Media Studies and Business and Computer Technology were upgraded using PFE funds. In 2003-04, the English Writing lab and additional Business labs were updated. In July 2004, the College adopted a Desktop Computer Replacement Plan that committed $900,000 annually to the purchase of new desktop computers such that no student would use a computer more than three years old and no employee would use a computer more than five years old.
4D.3	The Office of Instruction and the Program/Unit/Area Planning Teams will address consistency between faculty-written syllabi and the Course Outline of Record. The Office of Instruction in consultation with the Curriculum and Instruction Committee will review credit/no credit grading. When a course cannot be taken with this option, it will be communicated to students. The Office of Instruction and the Program Planning Teams will evaluate the variety of laboratory requirements to ensure consistency with the Carnegie Unit.	**Completed:** The review of all course syllabi and outlines of record were completed in Fall 2002. **Completed:** The review of all courses graded credit/no credit was completed in Spring 2004. The grading options available for each course are communicated to students in the class schedule, the college web pages and class syllabi. **Completed:** The review of lab requirements was completed during the Fall 2003 term. New courses are checked as they are reviewed through the curriculum and instruction approval process.
4D.6	The Office of Instruction will fully implement the new Web-based course approval process and ensure that all faculty, division deans, and appropriate staff are fully trained to use the system.	**Completed:** A web-based curriculum management system (WebCMS) was installed and has been in use since Fall 2002. Training is provided for new faculty and others as needed.

5.5	The Community Education Center and college Assessment Center will select approved tests and complete the validation of their assessment instruments for the noncredit program.	**Nearly Completed:** The Community Education Center is now using assessment instruments that are on the Chancellor's approved list. Specifically, the CLSA is used for ESL assessment and Acuplacer for math and English. The validation of the instruments for the noncredit programs is in progress.
6.1	The Library and Learning Resources divisions will work collaboratively with the Campus Technology Committee to study technology needs. DSP&S will be invited to advise the Committee regarding the specific needs of disabled students.	**Completed:** The Assistant Dean for the Library represented instruction in developing the Campus Technology Plan and played a major role in drafting the Technology Plan. The College's specialist in media for the disabled was added to the Campus Technology Committee as a resource representative.
6.2A	The Library and Learning Resources divisions will work collaboratively within the planning process and the Campus Technology Committee to ensure an effective replacement cycle not only for college microcomputers and servers, but also for college network infrastructure and other campus systems.	**Nearly Completed:** In July 2004, the College adopted a Desktop Computer Replacement Plan that committed $900,000 annually to the purchase of new desktop computers such that no student would use a computer more than three years old and no employee would use a computer more than five years old. A replacement cycle for the college network infrastructure and other campus systems still needs to be developed. A consultant has been hired who is currently reviewing the current status of the college's network infrastructure and making recommendations
6.2B	Computing Services, Media Services, and Management Information Services will hold interdepartmental staff meetings on a regular basis to foster better communication among areas.	**Completed:** The managers of the three offices meet with the three Vice Presidents on alternate Mondays to coordinate the work of the three offices and to improve communication. Highlights from the meetings are shared during staff meetings. All three offices that support technology are represented on the Campus Technology Committee, thus fostering better communication.

6.3	The Media Center and Music Library and Lab will expand access to their collections through the Web-based catalog system.	**Completed:** The Music Library and Lab are now fully integrated with the web-based catalog system of the College's library. Music Library holdings can be looked-up online. The Music Library now functions as a branch of the main college library. The Media Center is also fully integrated with the web based library catalog system.
6.4	The Media Center will enhance and expand the Technology Training Center program and increase the number and support of smart classrooms.	**Completed:** The Media Center has expanded its training offerings by adding workshops during the Winter and Summer intersessions in addition to those in the Fall and Spring terms. During 2004-05 the number of workshops was increased by more than 30 sessions. With respect to smart classrooms, a new media services technician was hired in August 2004. The primary responsibility of this person is to support smart classrooms. In addition, a project to establish standards for future smart classrooms has begun.
6.7	Computing Services, Media Services, and Management Information Services will use the Campus Technology Committee as a conduit for information and will meet periodically with divisions and areas to discuss their technological needs and the impact on the college in general.	**Completed:** Computing Services, Media Services and Management Information Services are members of the Campus Technology Committee and regularly report on activities in their areas. Technology requested in Unit and Area Plans are reviewed and analyzed by the three offices listed above. The managers of the offices meet with the Unit or Area manager to clarify questions and to assure that the technology requested integrates with the college in general. This process has been institutionalized and will thus be ongoing.
6.7	The Music Library and Lab will conduct a student survey each semester. Issues raised by students will be integrated into the program planning process.	**Completed:** A survey was administered in Fall 2002. The results were incorporated into the 2003-04 program plans.

7A.1	The Human Resources office in consultation with area managers will develop a process for determining adequate administrative and classified staffing levels, paying particular attention to areas which have indicated a need.	**In Progress:** As yet a specific process for determining adequate administrative and classified staffing levels has not been developed. The budget problems of 2003-04 led to open staff positions not being immediately filled. During 2003-04 and 2004-05 a reassignment M.O.U. was used to deal with staffing issues in areas where there were vacant positions because of a hiring freeze. Currently, positions are being filled to the extent feasible based upon State budget and /or college conditions.
7A.2	The Office of Human Resources will finalize the management hiring policy and procedures.	**Completed:** On March 25, 2003 the Board of Trustees adopted a board policy on management hiring, #6300.
9A.2	The members of the Budget Committee (Renamed the Resource Allocation Committee) will share results of the budget allocation process with their constituents.	**Completed:** The Resource Allocation Committee (Budget Committee) has been meeting monthly to review the status of the State Budget and the PCC budget allocation process. At a recent meeting of the committee, it went over and prioritized a list of requests for new budget allocations.
9A.3	The Office of Instruction will complete revisions of the Academic Master Plan.	**In Progress:** The first draft of the plan, which has been renamed to be the Educational Master Plan, was submitted to the College Coordinating Council in Spring 2005. It is currently being reviewed and revised. A final draft is expected by the end of Fall 2005.

9A.4	The planning process will be reviewed as called for in Planning Agenda 3B.2.	**In Progress:** The college's Planning and Budgeting Process Development Consultative Committee (PBPDCC) met weekly for four months to evaluate the planning process. It was recommended that a new more user-friendly planning handbook be written. The first edition came out in September 2003. Following an evaluation of the effectiveness of the revised handbook, a second edition was released in September 2004. A Campus Climate-Employee survey administered in May 2005 asked employees questions about how well the planning process is understood, whether the results of the planning process are communicated to them and whether planning guides decision-making.
9A.6	The Integrated College System Committee will formulate a recommendation regarding a possible integrated financial system.	**Completed:** The Integrated College System Committee met for five months. It made visits to three other college sites in its investigations. The final recommendation was not to purchase an integrated system at that time, but rather wait a few years until the web based systems were more developed and then revisit the issue of acquiring an integrated computer system.
10B.4	Human Resources will establish and arrange a more effective process for completing evaluations in a timely manner.	**In Progress:** Human Resources has become more aggressive in working with the Executive Committee to assure the timely completion of evaluations. Human Resources has been reviewing management evaluations and creating lists of missing and in process evaluations. The Colleges Executive Committee has been monitoring the completion of manager evaluations. Faculty evaluations are completed in a timely manner. The evaluation process has been a subject of negotiations between the CTA and District in 2004-05 and will continue in 2005-06.

10B.10	The Associated Students Board in consultation with the Office of Student Affairs will create a single document combining all governing rules and regulations.	**Completed:** The Associated Student Board has accomplished the task of bringing together their governing rules and regulations. The Supreme Council is pursuing bylaw updates as needed.

Appendices

1. Directions from planning documents that link planning to the college mission statement
2. College mission statement and examples of the program, unit and area mission statement
3. Mission statements from the Technology Plan, Educational Plan draft and the college's Foundation
4. Campus Climate-Employee Survey results
5. Employee Exit Survey
6. Evaluation of the first edition of the rewritten planning handbook questionnaire and survey results
7. Second edition of the planning handbook and step-by-step guides to completing the planning forms
8. Summary of survey to evaluate the second edition of the planning handbook
9. Computer replacement plan
10. Map of 2004-05 college wide goals to their origins
11. Program Review Form
12. Program review calendar
13. List of reports available in the Research Office to assist instructional program reviews
14. Customer service questionnaire used for program reviews in Student and Learning Services and the survey results
15. *Planning Ahead*, a publication used to communicate the results of the program reviews
16. 2002-03 college strategic direction on improving communication
17. 2003-04 Year-End Report documenting progress made on the college's goal to improve communication
18. Memo from the President to all employees informing everyone where committee minutes are posted
19. Example of monthly report to the Board of Trustees on the progress made on each of the five accreditation recommendations
20. New faculty handbook created to improve communication with faculty
21. Examples of Management Team meetings that focused on improving communication
22. College wide report on restoring collegiality and integrity
23. One page summary of the college wide report on restoring collegiality and integrity
24. Collegiality and Integrity Steering Committee's Report and recommendations
25. *Research Findings* produced in response to planning agenda 4A.1