DATE: November 6, 2016

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

FROM: Dr. Cheryl A. Marshall

SUBJECT: Report of Follow-Up Visit Team to Pasadena City College, October 19, 2016

Introduction:
At its June 2015 meeting, the Commission took action to impose probation on Pasadena City College and required a Follow-Up Report and visit in October 2016. An evaluation team visit was conducted at Pasadena City College (PCC) in October, 2016 with four members of the original visiting team: Dr. Cheryl A. Marshall (Lead), Duncan Graham, Sandy McGlothlin, and Rebecca Tillberg. The purpose of the visit was to verify that the College had addressed the recommendations made by the evaluation team, resolved the deficiencies noted in those recommendations, and meets the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies. The team reviewed the Follow-Up Report along with supporting evidence and conducted a site visit on October 19, 2016. The college was well prepared for the visit providing additional evidence and arranging for interviews as requested by the team. Over the course of the day the team met with the College President and Vice Presidents, members of the academic and classified senates, and members of related committees and work groups.

New leadership across the College has made meaningful progress since the visit in 2015. The majority of interim positions have been filled bringing stability, accountability, and productivity. The culture was consistently described as collegial and transparent across all employee groups. Integrated planning processes with a strong connection to resource allocation have taken shape and have been evaluated and improved upon. The College is to be commended for the significant and positive changes in the culture over a short period of time.

Specifically, the team reviewed evidence of resolving the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: In order to meet the Standards, and as noted in Recommendations #1 and #2 (2009), the team recommends that the College systematically evaluate and improve all of its planning processes, including full integration of program review (instructional, student services, and administrative services) into the planning processes, and the use of program review and the planning processes to determine the allocation of resources and to make decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness. (Standard I.B.3; I.B.4; I.B.6; I.B.7; II.A.2.e and f; III.A.6; III.B.2.b; III.C.2; III.D.4 and Eligibility Requirement 19)

Recommendation 2: In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College create and implement a plan to ensure the regular evaluation of all employees based upon intervals consistent with College policies. (Standard III.A.1.b)

Recommendation 3: In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College standardize its performance evaluation process for adjunct faculty, and that the College include assessment of student learning outcomes in its performance evaluations of adjunct faculty, staff, and management employees who are directly responsible for student progress toward achieving those learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.1.c)

Recommendation 4: In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College constituents follow their approved codes of ethics and that all constituent groups embrace and demonstrate compliance with Board Policy 2715-Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice, AP 3050-Professional Ethics of Faculty, AP 3060-Professional Ethics of Management, and AP 3070-Professional Ethics of Classified Staff. (Standards III.A.1.d; III.A.3; III.A.4.c; IV.A and IV.B.1.e and h)

Recommendation 5: In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College focus on stabilizing its administrative organizational structure and complete the selection processes to fill the interim, acting and vacant administrative positions with permanent appointments. (Standard III.A.2; Eligibility Requirement 5)

Recommendation 6: In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College, through participatory governance, develop and implement a comprehensive, coordinated professional development program for all personnel, regularly assess the effectiveness of the program, and use the assessment results as the basis for continuous improvement. (Standards III.A.5.a and b)

Recommendation 7: In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that institutional leaders use transparent participatory processes; follow Board policies for soliciting input from all constituent groups for institutional decision making; and model collegial communication specifically among the Board, President and Academic Senate, for the goal of working together to demonstrate an environment of empowerment, innovation and institutional excellence for the good of the institution. (Standards IV.A.1; IV.A.3 and IV.B.1.e)

Recommendation 8: In order to meet the Standards, and as noted in Recommendation #6 (2009), the team recommends that the institution regularly and systematically evaluates organization structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness, communicates those evaluations to the College, and uses the results of those evaluations as a basis for improvement. (Standard IV.A.5)

Improving Institutional Effectiveness:

In its report, the team identified needs for improving institutional effectiveness and provided Recommendation 9. This recommendation does not identify current areas of deficiency in institutional practice, but highlights areas of practice for which College attention is needed. The Commission requires that institutions address recommendations for increasing institutional effectiveness as an aspect of maintaining compliance with Standards and engaging in continuous quality improvement. The Commission therefore requests Pasadena City College to include its response to Recommendation 9 in its October 1, 2016 Follow-Up Report.

<u>Recommendation 9:</u> In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that all Student Affairs departments and service programs conduct annual outcomes assessments, and that a regular program review cycle be clearly established and communicated to all student service programs. (Standard II.B.4)

Team Analysis of College Responses to the 2015 Evaluation Team Recommendations

Recommendation 1: In order to meet the Standards, and as noted in Recommendations #1 and #2 (2009), the team recommends that the College systematically evaluate and improve all of its planning processes, including full integration of program review (instructional, student services, and administrative services) into the planning processes, and the use of program review and the planning processes to determine the allocation of resources and to make decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness. (Standard I.B.3; I.B.4; I.B.6; I.B.7; II.A.2.e and f; III.A.6; III.B.2.b; III.C.2; III.D.4 and Eligibility Requirement 19)

Findings and Evidence: Pasadena City College has taken proactive steps to systematically evaluate and improve all of its planning process as outlined in existing Board Policy 3250. The College has addressed Recommendation 1 with two Integrated Planning Sessions that combined members from the Institutional Effectiveness Planning and Priorities and Budget and Resource Allocation Committees. The discussions appear to be robust and action oriented. The Integrated Planning Model chart and annual calendar show compliance.

The College has strengthened the connection between planning and program review with resource allocation through a new budget request process for prioritizing needs. Through a series of budget forums, requests are discussed with members of the campus community. All requests are then presented during an annual Budget Retreat to the Budget and Resource Allocation Committee, the College Council, and the President. The result is a list of vetted priorities developed using a transparent, collegial process.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee administered an assessment of the Budget Retreat in 2016 that showed a notable increase in awareness of the budget allocation process. Suggestions from the assessment will be incorporated into revisions for the subsequent Budget Retreat. Assessments were done with every step of the integrated planning model.

Conclusion: It is clear from interviews and additional evidence presented that PCC has fulfilled the expectations of Recommendation 1. The College will need to continue the cycle incorporating improvements to remain in compliance. It now meets the Standard.

Recommendation 2: In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College create and implement a plan to ensure the regular evaluation of all employees based upon intervals consistent with College policies. (Standard III.A.1.b)

Findings and Evidence: The College has a new Vice President of Human Resources who has developed master personnel lists which are sub-divided by faculty, adjunct, administrative and classified staff. Previously, many managers had their own lists of personnel needing evaluations and this had not been centralized through the Human Resources department. Since July 2016 the College has gone from 54% of the staff evaluated to at least 77% completion. The percentage may increase since evaluations conducted prior to fall 2016 are still being reviewed and summarized.

The HR Department is working on further improvements to the evaluation process. Technicians are being cross trained for efficiency to keep on task with evaluations. Streamlining the tracking process is underway through integration of data on a spreadsheet with data in Banner which will eliminate double-entry and reduce the possibility of error. Future goals include aligning evaluation with the Educational Master Plan to help all employees realize their work contributes to the mission and goals of the College and to student success.

The HR Department staff is fully committed to sustaining the regular evaluation of all employees through collaboration with department deans and managers who are now evaluated in part based on their regular evaluation of their staff. It is still the duty of the HR department to send reminders to staff when performance evaluations are due. Additional staff needs are being reviewed and the goal is to have the department fully staffed by the end of the Spring 2016 semester.

Conclusion: Pasadena City College has addressed the recommendation, corrected the deficiencies and now meets the Commission's Standards. The cycle and timeline will need to be maintained in order to remain in compliance.

Recommendation 3: **In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College standardize its performance evaluation process for adjunct faculty, and that the College include assessment of student learning outcomes in its performance evaluations of adjunct faculty, staff, and management employees who are directly responsible for student progress toward achieving those learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.1.c)**

Findings and Evidence: The Vice President of Human Resources and the Vice President of Instruction have collaborated to standardize the evaluation process for adjunct faculty and have incorporated the assessment of student learning outcomes as a part of that process for employees who are directly responsible for student progress toward achieving those learning outcomes. The evaluation process now consists of visitation, student evaluation and a self-evaluation instead of only one of these factors. Evidentiary resources were provided in the form of adjunct, management, and classified evaluation documents, SLO Assessment responsibilities, MOU of Non-Contract Employees, and SLO lead stipend documentation that regular student learning outcomes are part of performance evaluations. A further step to increase adjunct faculty participation in student learning outcomes assessment was changing the cycle from a four-semester evaluation cycle to every six-semesters. Adjunct faculty hold that SLO assessment is not part of their job, however the College has developed processes that have successfully encouraged adjunct faculty to conduct SLO assessment and to evaluate the results. The Vice Presidents are also filtering the master list of adjunct faculty to determine an appropriate and regular evaluation cycle. The backlog of uncompleted evaluations has been substantially reduced.

Conclusion: Pasadena City College is in the process of fully addressing the recommendation, correcting the deficiencies and now meets the Standard.

Recommendation 4: **In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College constituents follow their approved codes of ethics and that all constituent groups embrace and demonstrate compliance with Board Policy 2715-Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice, AP 3050-Professional Ethics of Faculty, AP 3060-Professional Ethics of Management, and AP 3070-Professional Ethics of Classified Staff. (Standards III.A.1.d; III.A.3; III.A.4.c; IV.A and IV.B.1.e and h)**

Findings and Evidence: During the 2015 site visit, evidence gathered through interviews and document review revealed deficiencies in civility, collegiality and ethical behavior. In fact, the Spring 2015 Campus Climate Survey Summary identified "Improving Employee Morale and Shared Governance Processes" as top priorities.

In response, the College formed the Accreditation Work Group on Ethics. Their analysis identified three main causes for unethical behavior:
- Lack of Cohesion: The institution lacked a cohesive, universal ethics policy that applied to the entire PCC community
- Lack of Evaluation of Procedures: Existing Administrative Procedures on Ethics were incomplete for some constituency groups, and all constituency groups would benefit from reviewing/revising the applicable APs
- Lack of Awareness and Training: All employees needed professional development and training to acquire a better understanding of ethics policies, procedures, and practices

The Ethics Work Group outlined a plan of action to address all three findings, and over the course of a year accomplished a great deal to increase awareness by all constituency groups of the importance of civility among employees. The collaborative development of a "Summary Ethics Statement" that applied to all groups, "Meeting Norms" for committees developed by the Governance Work Group, a new College president that fosters and demonstrates ethical and civil behaviors, and campus-wide increase of awareness training has made a major impact in the improvement of ethical behavior. This is evidenced by the 2016 Campus Climate Survey which showed marked improvement in "team spirit," treating each other in a professional manner and treating each other with respect. The Summary Ethics Statement is posted in all meeting rooms across the campus, and the Meetings Norms have been adopted by the College Council, which will direct its reporting committees to adopt. The Academic and Classified Senates have adopted the Meeting Norms as well.

The Board reviewed its Ethics policies and procedures and there are now consequences for board members who violate the policy. The same is true for the academic senate, classified senate, management group, faculty union and classified union.

Further progress will be assessed through a Campus Climate Survey administered in spring 2017 by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

Conclusion: Although the work done to date indicates the College continues to definitely move in the right direction, these efforts will require continued vigilance and patience as a cultural shift of this magnitude will take a few years to complete. With its work to date and given a

continuation of effort, the College has fulfilled the expectations of Recommendation 4 and now meets Standards.

Recommendation 5: **In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College focus on stabilizing its administrative organizational structure and complete the selection processes to fill the interim, acting and vacant administrative positions with permanent appointments. (Standard III.A.2; Eligibility Requirement 5)**

Findings and Evidence: At the time of the site visit in 2015, significant areas of concern were the unclear organizational structure and the number of interim and vacant positions. The structure appeared to be in transition to a model proposed by the previous President and was a topic of much contention. Since the spring of 2015, the Board and the College have taken steps to reorganize into a collegially developed administrative structure and to fill the majority of positions. The College is to be commended in taking a very participatory approach to the new reorganization including vetting by the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, the Board, and through open forums to discuss and obtain feedback on a proposed reorganization. The College provided evidence of the transparent process, including a clear organization chart.

New leadership is in place across the College. A permanent President was selected in April 2015 and he brings a wealth of academic, accreditation, and leadership experience that has benefitted the College. Three new Vice Presidents are in place, two of whom came from outside the institution. Four of five academic dean positions have been filled and vacant positions are being advertised and filled as needed. Although the recommendation calls for filling vacant and interim positions, there have been only a few failed searches and it is clear that the College is not interested in "settling" for an appointment in order to fill a position but would rather continue the search process to get a highly qualified person.

Conclusion: The College has responded to the requirements of Recommendation 5. With the participatory process of a college-wide reorganization, mindful and intentional hires have been made to fill critical administrative positions with highly qualified individuals, resulting in a stabilized administrative team. It now meets the Standards.

Recommendation 6: **In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College, through participatory governance, develop and implement a comprehensive, coordinated professional development program for all personnel, regularly assess the effectiveness of the program, and use the assessment results as the basis for continuous improvement. (Standards III.A.5.a and b)**

Findings and Evidence: PCC has systematically responded to the Recommendation. A new Board Policy (BP 7160) and new Administrative Procedure (AP7160) were developed and adopted. The new Professional Development Standing Committee is located under the College Council, and is defined in AP7160 as a representative shared governance committee. Membership includes faculty, classified staff, managers, a vice president, and a student. The new committee is scheduled to meet twice a month.

A separate Professional Development Implementation Group was established to "coordinate, implement, and evaluate the activities approved by the Professional Development Oversight Committee. In addition, AP7160 provides for three subcommittees, one for each constituency group (faculty, classified staff, and managers). AP7160 does not make clear a specific responsibility to evaluate the professional development needs of all employee groups, but instead provides a more generic direction: "Working with the college's constituency groups to identify professional learning needs." AP7160 calls for "Assessment of professional development activities," but not of the over-all professional development needs of the various employee groups on campus.

Professional Development participates in program review. The committee sets goals and identifies professional learning needs. An 'Action/Solution' identified in the PD Program Review Update is 'Develop Annual Professional Development Needs Assessment for all constituent groups – faculty, staff and managers.' Implementation of this Action/Solution would meet the Recommendation.

Professional development effectively includes classified staff: professional development activities are planned specifically for staff, with input from staff, reflecting the interests and needs of staff, and are then evaluated with surveys, with plans for improvement in the next cycle.

Staffing will be adequate for professional development when the new Professional Development Director is hired. Equity funds are identified to provide ongoing support for the position.

Conclusion: The College has responded to the requirements of the recommendation and meets the Commission's Standards. PCC has restructured professional development so that it is a coordinated, college-wide effort led by a representative Standing Committee that reports to the College Council. Classified staff and their needs have been effectively incorporated into the development of professional development activities. Systematic evaluation of activities as well as the over-all professional development program is done through surveys and program review. The results of the evaluation are used to set goals and make improvements in the professional development program.

Recommendation 7: **In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that institutional leaders use transparent participatory processes; follow Board policies for soliciting input from all constituent groups for institutional decision making; and model collegial communication specifically among the Board, President and Academic Senate, for the goal of working together to demonstrate an environment of empowerment, innovation and institutional excellence for the good of the institution. (Standards IV.A.1; IV.A.3 and IV.B.1.e)**

Findings and Evidence: As previously noted in other findings, the College has made significant progress in establishing a culture of accountability, transparency, collegiality, and ethical behavior. The consistent practices of open communication, garnering input, and collaborative decision making are transforming the culture and work environment. The work groups on Ethics and Governance have guided the development of a shared ethics statement and meeting

norms for use across the institution. The relationships between the Board, the Academic Senate, and the Faculty Association have improved with demonstrated respect for faculty voice. Additionally, for the first time in many years the Faculty Association and the College have had two successful negotiations. The new senior management team members were described as role models of ethical and collegial behavior whose impact "trickles down" through the organization. The new Academic Senate Executive Team is also demonstrating professional and collegial behavior, having reached out in a variety of ways to the Board, incorporating new faculty members into the organization, and addressing 10+1 issues as part of their agenda. Classified Staff and their Senate described meaningful changes, feeling more included in decision making. Their members are participating more fully in committees and the evaluation process now includes assessment of these responsibilities.

Communication has become a priority for the College with multiple methods being used. Board Members initiated open conversations through "Coffee Chats" with the campus community. The President holds open forums, open office hours, and is highly visible on campus. An Executive Director of Strategic Communications and Marketing was hired as part of the new administrative structure and he prepares and distributes newsletters, a Summary of Board Actions, and other clear messages. Communication and training about processes have increased to close the loop so that more constituents understand the decisions and results.

Conclusion: The College has responded to the requirements of the recommendation and will need to continue its efforts to remain in compliance. The College now meets the Standard.

Recommendation 8: In order to meet the Standards, and as noted in Recommendation #6 (2009), the team recommends that the institution regularly and systematically evaluates organization structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness, communicates those evaluations to the College, and uses the results of those evaluations as a basis for improvement. (Standard IV.A.5)

Findings and Evidence: An Accreditation Leads Work Group was formed in fall 2015 to coordinate the work of multiple Workgroups. Two Workgroups addressed Recommendation 8:
- Evaluation work group (e.g., governance committees, structures, and processes)
- College Council role/revision

During fall 2015 constituency groups were asked to review their governance policy using the Campus Climate Survey. Academic Senate and Classified Senate did so, and both made changes to their APs.

A survey instrument for committee self-evaluation was developed. The 'Shared Governance Committee Evaluation' is designed to be sent to each committee member annually. The College Council now requires each committee to set and evaluate committee goals, to make and identify changes, and to report annually to the College Council.

The locally-developed Campus Climate Survey was administered for the second time in spring 2016. The results are used to evaluate shared governance processes and structures, integrated planning processes, as well as general campus climate.

An ad hoc group of leaders of shared governance groups was convened to address the board policy about shared governance, as well as the role of the College Council. Several committees began discussions about their structure. Structure of the standing committees was changed in the case of several committees. There is a stated commitment to evaluate the efficacy of the new standing committee structure at the end of the 2016-17 academic year. In addition, efforts are underway to write new policies and procedures for shared governance.

The integrated planning processes were evaluated and major changes were recommended during 2014-15. The proposed changes were consulted through the various employee groups on campus, and agreement was reached on the new integrated planning model. The annual program review update was done for the first time in 2015-16 by a large proportion of the approximately 140 units required to do the annual update. The process was evaluated at the end of 2015-16, needed changes were identified, and modifications were put in place for the 2016-17 cycle, which is already underway. Further considerations for improving and streamlining the annual unit updates and the more detailed comprehensive program review are already being identified.

The organizational structure that supports the integrated planning processes was also changed in the last year. The new structure appears to be adequate to support the integrated planning activities of PCC.

Conclusion: The College has responded to the requirements of the recommendation and meets the Commission's Standard. Excellent efforts are underway to respond to the recommendation, including committee self-evaluations and a new, locally-developed campus climate survey. The structure of participatory governance committees has been evaluated, and several changes have been made. The structure of the administration as well as of the instructional departments has been changed to be more streamlined and supportive of college efforts to support student success. Members of the campus community who participated in interviews were very supportive of the structural changes that have been made.

Further enhancements could include an evaluation of the effectiveness of both the new administrative structure, and of the structure of the instructional departments. In addition, because there are numerous committees and subcommittees with overlapping missions, in order to increase effectiveness, an evaluation of the committee structure might identify areas where further modifications would be helpful.

Recommendation 9: In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that all Student Affairs departments and service programs conduct annual outcomes assessments, and that a regular program review cycle be clearly established and communicated to all student service programs. (Standard II.B.4)

Findings and Evidence: The Vice President for Student Services has created a culture of assessment and continuous quality improvement whereby program review and learning outcomes are part of every student services meeting. PCC student services now does annual student learning outcomes assessment and Service Area Outcomes are being done on each

Student Services program. Whereby some programs do not think they contribute to student learning, the College would improve institutional effectiveness by helping those programs create and assess outcomes.

All program reviews in Student Services are done at once in the same year. Student learning outcomes are done and reviewed annually, reviewed by the assessment committee and a summary plan due at the end of June.

Conclusion: The College has responded to the requirements of the recommendation and meets the Commission's Standard.