



SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Office of the Chancellor

CITY COLLEGE – MESA COLLEGE – MIRAMAR COLLEGE – CONTINUING EDUCATION

DISTRICT GOVERNANCE COUNCIL

September 2, 2015

3:00 p.m. – Room 245

AGENDA

- *1.0 Review Minutes of August 19, 2015
- *2.0 Review of Board Agenda for September 10, 2015
- 3.0 Additional Agenda Items
- 4.0 State Budget Update Carroll/Dowd
- 5.0 SDCCD 2015-16 Adopted Budget Carroll/Dowd
- 6.0 Districtwide Integrated Planning Framework Model Neault
- *7.0 Review of AP 4200.1 Surbrook
- 8.0 Safety Issues on Campus Hubbard
- 9.0 Roundtable

*Attachments

BOARD MEETING scheduled: Thursday, September 10, 2015 – 4:00 p.m.
District Office – Rooms 235/245

Next DGC MEETING scheduled: Wednesday, September 16, 2015 – 3:00 p.m.
District Office – Room 245

Visitors and observers are welcome. The District Governance Council (DGC) follows an open process and conducts open meetings. However, because of limited space, we ask that visitors sit in the extra chairs provided against the walls to leave room available at the table for voting DGC members. Your help is appreciated.



SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CITY COLLEGE – MESA COLLEGE – MIRAMAR COLLEGE – CONTINUING EDUCATION

DISTRICT GOVERNANCE COUNCIL MINUTES

August 19, 2015

Present: Beebe, Beresford, Bocaya, Bulger, Cortez, Dowd, Fremland, Harris, Hsieh, Kovrig, Liewen, Light, Luster, Manis, McMahon, Neault, Rogers (for Surbrook), Watkins, Weinroth, and Chairperson Chancellor Carroll

Absent: Hubbard, Schmeltz, Surbrook

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of July 15, 2015, were approved.

2. REVIEW OF BOARD AGENDA

The agenda for the August 27, 2015, Board Meeting was opened for review by Chancellor Carroll. Each item was discussed and satisfied.

3. STATE BUDGET UPDATE

Executive Vice Chancellor Dowd explained that the SDCCD is expected to receive approximately \$80 million in combined Restricted and Unrestricted Funds as a result of the State's enacted 2015-2016 Budget. Some of the contributing factors to the District receiving the largest increase ever in an annual budget are:

- Continuing Education's Career Development/College Preparation (CDCP) rate now being funded at the credit rate per FTES resulting in a \$9.0 million increase to continuous apportionment revenue for the District;
- COLA of approximately \$2.1 million and Access/Growth funding of approximately \$6.7 million;
- One-time funds in excess of \$23.0 million for mandated claims owed the District, which is part of the Governor's promise to eliminate the "wall of debt" to education;
- SSSP funding, which is at its highest this year with approximately \$18.8 million and Equity funding in excess of \$6.0 million for the District to support student success and equity; and
- In addition, the 15 pilot Baccalaureate programs will each receive approximately \$350,000 in one-time funds to support initial set up of the 15 programs.

4. FACILITIES POLICIES

Vice Chancellor Manis introduced the council to nine new Board Policies highlighted by the Annual Safety Report and asked for feedback. No questions were raised. These policies will go for the first of two readings at the upcoming Board meeting on August 27, 2015.

5. COLLEGE PROMISE CAMPAIGN

Chancellor Carroll discussed President Obama's campaign for free community colleges, explaining that former US Undersecretary of Education, Martha Kanter is serving as Executive Director of the national campaign. She and Second Lady Jill Biden are working with states to form individual advocacy committees. California's committee is almost complete and is expected to be underway in the fall. Dr. Carroll added that with half of California community college students receiving BOG waivers for tuition, California is already half way to a commission free system.

6. DISTRICT STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Vice Chancellor Bulger opened discussion regarding the District strategic planning committee starting with requesting feedback from each of the District's institutions about an update to the membership list. Please send updates to sbulger@sdccd.edu. Further plans are to study specific institutions' strategic plans and see how these individual plans can be synthesized to develop the District plan.

7. DISCUSSION OF PRINTED SCHEDULE

Rob Fremland opened discussion regarding the printed schedule, questioning whether it was worth the expense of printing or should be eliminated. Chancellor Carroll explained that there were two factors to be considered regarding printed schedules. One is determining what drives timelines and deadlines for inclusion in and completion of the schedule. She asked Vice Chancellors Bulger and Neault to review the current process to find ways to improve upon it.

The second factor is the purpose and use of the schedule. Chancellor Carroll noted several important reasons that the printed schedule is needed. The mailing out of schedules is a unique way to reach the community at large and many find that it is easier to leaf through a paper schedule rather than through thousands of classes online. The paper schedules are used in classrooms and counseling for career guidance, including transition from adult education to college credit courses. She noted that evaluations of the printed schedule have taken place in the past showing that the printed schedule is still valued, and a recent evaluation has been done with a report coming sometime this fall.

8. FACULTY HIRING PROCESS REVIEW

Rob Fremland also started discussion on review of the faculty hiring process, citing AP 4200.1 - EMPLOYMENT OF COLLEGE FACULTY which states that the Academic Senates will review the hiring process yearly and make recommendations to the Board of Trustees on any changes needed.

BOARD MEETING

Thursday, September 10, 2015

2:50 p.m. Call to Order – Room 235/245

Followed by Closed Session – Room 300

4:00 p.m. Regular Business Meeting – Room 235/245

9 BOARD POLICIES

9.01 Consideration and adoption of the following new Chapter 3 – General Institution Board Policies, Attachments A-I (First Reading August 27, 2015):

- A. BP 3500 Campus Safety
- B. BP 3501 Campus Security and Access
- C. BP 3505 Emergency Response Plan
- D. BP 3510 Workplace Violence Plan
- E. BP 3515 Reporting of Crimes
- F. BP 3518 Child Abuse Reporting
- G. BP 3520 Local Law Enforcement
- H. BP 3530 Weapons on Campus
- I. BP 3550 Drug Free Environment and Drug Prevention Program

11 INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES

11.01 In the matter of the District's health occupations programs, authority is requested to enter into agreements with health care agencies for use of clinical facilities by students enrolled in District health occupations programs during the 2015-2016 fiscal year.

12 STUDENT SERVICES

12.01 Authority to designate September 17, 2015, as Constitution Day at City, Mesa, Miramar Colleges and Continuing Education

13 BUDGET AND FINANCE

13.01 In the matter of San Diego Miramar College providing In-Service training for the City of San Diego Fire-Rescue Department, authority is requested to renew the existing agreement for an additional five years to provide monthly training for the City of San Diego Fire-Rescue Department's personnel.

13.02 In the matter of an agreement with the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) for San Diego Miramar College to provide law enforcement in-service courses, authority is requested to enter into an agreement with the Commission on POST to provide in-service courses to be delivered in the 2015-2016 fiscal year; and, to accept, budget and spend \$314,030 in the 2015-2016 General Fund/Restricted Budget.

13.03 PUBLIC HEARING: On the San Diego Community College District proposed budget for 2015-16. In accordance with Section 58301 of the Title 5 California Code of Regulations, and pursuant to notice duly given, any taxpayer in the District may appear and publicly comment on the proposed 2015-16 fiscal year budget or any item(s) thereof. Under California Law, the 2015-16 fiscal year budget may not be finally adopted by the Board of Trustees until after this public hearing has been held.

13.04 Consideration and approval of the 2015-2016 District Adopted Budget.

13.05 Approval of purchase orders prepared during the period of July 1, 2015, through July 31, 2015.

14 HUMAN RESOURCES

- 14.01** Certification of short-term personnel service effective on or after September 11, 2015, per California Education Code Section 88003.
- 14.02** Approval of academic, classified, substitute and student personnel actions relating to appointments, assignment changes, salary changes, status changes, leaves of absence, separations and volunteerism during the period August 1, 2015, through August 31, 2015.
- 14.03** Consideration and approval of Employment Agreement for Chancellor Constance M. Carroll.
- 14.04** In the matter of the Assessment and Orientation Office at San Diego Mesa College, authority is requested to establish a 12-month, 1.0 Student Services Assistant, Range 16, Step C, \$65,452 (Salary and Benefits) in the AFT Guild Office Technical Unit.
- 14.05** In the matter of the Dean of Student Success and Equity Office at San Diego Mesa College, authority is requested to establish a 12-month, 1.0 Administrative Technician, Range 22, Step C, \$73,365 (Salary and Benefits) in the AFT Guild Office Technical Unit.
- 14.06** In the matter of the Institutional Effectiveness Office at San Diego Mesa College, authority is requested to establish a 12-month, 1.0 Research Associate, Range 28, Step F, \$95,673 (Salary and Benefits) in the AFT Guild Office Technical Unit.
- 14.07** In the matter of the Institutional Effectiveness Office at San Diego Mesa College, authority is requested to establish a 12-month, 1.0 Senior Clerical Assistant, Range 18, Step C, \$67,730 (Salary and Benefits) in the AFT Guild Office Technical Unit.
- 14.08** In the matter of Student Services at San Diego Mesa College, authority is requested to establish a 1.0 11-month General/Career Counselor, Step G, Class 3, 11-month, \$109,431 (Salary and Benefits) in the AFT Faculty Unit.
- 14.09** In the matter of the Transfer, Evaluations, and Career Center (TEC) at San Diego Mesa College, authority is requested to establish a 12-month, 1.0 Student Services Assistant, Range 16, Step C, \$65,452 (Salary and Benefits) in the AFT Guild Office Technical Unit.
- 14.10** In the matter of Student Services at San Diego Miramar College, effective September 1, 2015, (contingent upon review by Human Resources) authority is requested to establish 6.0 new positions to support the implementation of Student Success and Student Equity.
- 14.11** In the matter regarding reorganization of the Administrative Services Office at San Diego Continuing Education, effective January 1, 2016, authority is requested to establish a 1.0 restricted Dean position, Range 18 (\$8,030.10-\$12,118.93) Management Unit per the attached Organization Chart.
- 14.12** In the matter regarding reorganization of the Office of Instruction and Student Services at San Diego Continuing Education, effective January 1, 2016, authority is requested to establish a 1.0 Research and Planning Analyst position, Range 13 (\$5,700.34 - \$8,423.29) Supervisory and Professional Unit per the attached Organization Chart.



SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Administrative Procedure

Chapter 7 – Human Resources

4200.1 - EMPLOYMENT OF COLLEGE FACULTY

1.0 PURPOSE/SCOPE

1. The objective of this procedure is to employ faculty for contract positions who are highly qualified, skilled in teaching, can serve the needs of a diverse student population, and who are sensitive to the cultural and ethnic diversity of the San Diego community.
2. The Board of Trustees for the San Diego Community College District has the legal authority and public responsibility for ensuring an effective hiring process.
3. The District's Managers and Faculty derive their authority from the Board and bear the responsibility for implementing this hiring policy.
4. The Academic Senates have the legal responsibility and authority to develop the hiring criteria, policies and procedures jointly with the representatives of the Board.
5. The Faculty derives its authority from their expertise as teachers and as subject matter specialists as noted in Assembly Bill 1725. The Faculty has an inherent professional responsibility in the development and implementation of policies and procedures governing the hiring process and in determining the professional requirements of faculty positions and evaluating the preparedness of candidates.

2.0 DISTRICT EEO RESPONSIBILITIES

1. It is the responsibility of the Board of Trustees, Management, Staff, and Faculty to ensure that Equal Employment Opportunity procedures are used as an integral part of the hiring process.
2. All participants in the hiring process shall receive training in EEO procedures and shall become knowledgeable about the District's EEO policies and procedures.
3. The District EEO Office shall cooperate with the EEO Site Compliance Officer and the Academic Senate to recruit, train, and maintain a suitable pool of Faculty members to serve as EEO Representatives and to implement the EEO policies and procedures.

3.0 ESTABLISHING THE POSITION

1. Identification of positions to be filled is processed according to site procedures.

2. The Department and the Dean shall be responsible for the preparation of the Job Description. The Job Description shall include all appropriate criteria contained in Title 5, Part VI of the California Code of Regulations and Education Code §87360 (see District Procedure 4201). A job announcement may list additional qualifications so long as this does not have an adverse impact on the recruitment of qualified individuals or the additional qualifications can be validated as *bona fide* occupational qualifications (Title V, Part VI, §53022).
3. The Selection Committee shall be responsible for the review and final drafting of the Job Description.
4. The EEO Site Compliance Officer shall review the final draft of the Job Description. If the Site EEO Compliance Officer makes changes in the Job Description, it shall be returned to the Department for review. After review, the completed Job Description shall be forwarded to the District Equal Employment Opportunity Officer for final review.

4.0 THE SELECTION COMMITTEE

1. The Dean and the Department Chairperson complete the "Selection Committee Roster" and forward it for sign-off by the President.
2. The Dean convenes the Selection Committee.
3. Composition of the Selection Committee:
 - a. The Dean;
 - b. The Department Chairperson or other program coordinator;
 - c. Up to three discipline specialists certified by the Dean and the Department Chairperson from the Department or from related Departments as defined by the Academic Senate.
 - d. When appropriate, a representative from private industry or faculty from another campus and/or institution;
 - e. The EEO Representative, who is a subject matter expert will be appointed by the District Equal Employment Opportunity Officer. The EEO Representative shall be certified by the District Equal Employment Opportunity Officer and will be a voting member.
4. All members of the Selection Committee shall elect a Chairperson from those listed in paragraph 3. a, b, or c. The chairperson must be trained in a module on hiring procedures, presented by District Human Resources, and accepts the legal and logistical responsibilities as prescribed by District policy. Responsibility of the chairperson is outlined in Personnel Manual Section 4210.
5. Serving as a Selection Committee Chairperson shall be considered as duties within the scope of the Managers' or Faculty members' job description and regular assignment.

5.0 RECRUITMENT

1. Human Resources will coordinate a recruitment campaign with the Selection Committee Chairperson and the Dean. The Selection Committee Chairperson will review all promotional materials prior to release and distribution.
2. General recruitment strategies will be conducted by Human Resources for the College sites involved in recruitment. Specific recruitment activities; e.g., professional conferences and advertisements in professional publications, will be funded with the ratification of the President.

6.0 SCREENING AND NOMINATING PROCESS

1. Human Resources shall be responsible for the collection of all applicable documents from applicants for the vacancy as stipulated in the Job Description, such as the following:
 - a. The District Application Form;
 - b. College Placement Folder, or letters of recommendation, references, transcripts, and vitae;
 - c. Supplemental Application form;
 - d. and other material specified in the Job Description.
2. Applicants who declare an equivalency to the specified qualifications in the Job Description shall be asked to submit an Equivalency Evaluation Form to Human Resources which will forward same to the Chairperson of the Selection Committee for consideration by the Selection Committee.
3. Human Resources shall inform the Selection Committee Chairperson of the ethnic diversity of the applicant pool. Before proceeding with the screening of the applications, the Selection Committee Chairperson shall present the Diversity Profile to the College President for approval and signature. If the President does not approve the pool submitted because a failure to obtain projected representation for a monitored group is due to discriminatory hiring procedures, the Selection Committee Chairperson and the College President shall agree to extend the recruitment period, re-initiate the hiring process, or cancel the position. (Title V, Part VI, §53023[b]).
4. Human Resources shall present to the Selection Committee only those application packets which are complete.
5. Each candidate shall be evaluated with respect to validated criteria established by the Job Description. The criteria shall address, but are not limited to, issues such as the following:
 - a. Subject area knowledge and competency;
 - b. Teaching and communication skills;
 - c. Commitment to professional growth and service;
 - d. Overall professional effectiveness;
 - e. Sensitivity to and understanding of the diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural, disability, and ethnic backgrounds of the student body;
 - f. Teaching demonstration.
6. In coordination with the Selection Committee Chairperson, Human Resources shall establish screening dates and shall notify the Selection Committee Chairperson when the applicant pool is ready for screening.
7. Human Resources shall provide screening packets for each member of the Selection Committee. The screening packets shall contain only criteria established by the Job Description. The Selection Committee screens and selects candidates based solely on the criteria established by the Job Description in accordance with the San Diego Community College District Policy 4100.

7.0 THE NOMINATING PROCESS

1. The Selection Committee Chairperson shall prepare the San Diego Community College District Interview Selection Summary Form for signatures of the committee members and submit it to Human Resources. Human Resources will prepare a report on the diversity of the slate of candidates nominated for

interview. The President shall review the slate of candidates nominated for interview and may request of the Selection Committee Chairperson further recruitment efforts by Human Resources and the Selection Committee.

2. Human Resources shall coordinate with the Selection Committee Chairperson a schedule of interview dates for the candidates selected.
3. The Committee shall interview each candidate selected and discuss his/her strengths and weaknesses relative to the criteria established during the preparation of the Job Description. The Committee may, in extraordinary situations, request a second interview. The Committee may also check the references of the finalists. The Committee will formulate its recommendations in terms of strengths and weaknesses and shall submit an unranked or a ranked list of the best qualified finalist(s) to the President of the College. If the Committee chooses to rank the finalists, the ranking must be validated as required under the Federal Uniform Guidelines on Employment Selection Procedures.
4. The Selection Committee shall also recommend the process to be followed in the event the candidate offered the position does not accept.

8.0 THE SELECTION PROCESS

1. The President shall review the recommendations of the Committee and shall review each applicant's application file and references. The President may also make independent inquiries and conduct interviews with the finalists.
2. The selection of the finalist to be recommended to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees shall be made by the College President, in joint consultation with the Selection Committee Chair, the area administrator, and other members of the Selection Committee, as agreed upon by the Committee. If the President does not choose one of the candidates recommended by the Committee, he/she will meet with the Committee to discuss these issues. The President may request further review by the Committee. If the Selection Committee and the President cannot reach agreement as to a candidate, the President shall put his/her objection in writing to the Committee and the position shall be reopened. (Title V, Part VI, Section §53024[g]).
3. The College President shall forward the nomination(s) to the Chancellor. The Chancellor shall review and approve, in writing, the College President's nomination(s). Human Resources shall provide the Chancellor with appropriate documentation for review. A copy of the nomination(s) letter shall be forwarded to the District Equal Employment Opportunity Officer. If the District Equal Employment Opportunity Officer finds evidence of discrimination, at any level of the process, an appeal must be filed within twenty-four (24) hours to the Chancellor.
4. The approved nomination(s) shall be sent to Human Resources for immediate action and contact of the nominees approved.
5. Human Resources shall have all information regarding benefits and tentative salary placement available to the nominee(s) when contact is made. Human Resources shall inform the College President and Selection Committee Chairperson immediately of the response of the nominee(s).

9.0 REVIEW AND EVALUATION

1. The Academic Senates will review yearly the hiring process. The Senates, after consultation with the Departments, will make recommendations to the Board of Trustees on necessary changes in hiring policies.

10.0 FORMS/ REFERENCES

Appropriate forms are available from Administration and Human Resources.

Adopted: October 30, 2007

SUPERSEDES:

Procedure 4200.1, 9/11/85, 8/25/87, 9/1/1991



REPORT OF THE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
TASK FORCE
ON ACCREDITATION

2015

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
Brice W. Harris, Chancellor

CONNECT WITH US

CaliforniaCommunityColleges.cccco.edu

scorecard.cccco.edu

salarysurfer.cccco.edu

adegreewithaguarantee.com

stepforward.cccco.edu

doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu

icanaffordcollege.com



facebook.com/CACommColleges
facebook.com/icanaffordcollege



twitter.com/CalCommColleges
twitter.com/DrBriceWHarris
twitter.com/WorkforceVan
twitter.com/ICANAFRDCOLLEGE



youtube.com/CACommunityColleges
youtube.com/user/ICANAFFORDCOLLEGE



instagram.com/CaliforniaCommunityColleges



Table of Contents

Part I. Preface.....	1
Part II. Introduction: History and Background	2
Part III: Ideal Attributes of an Accrediting Organization.....	5
Part IV: Findings & Recommendations ...	8
Part V: Concluding Statements of the Task-force	9
Accreditation Task Force Members.....	10
Appendices	
Appendix A: Crosswalk of Accreditation Recommendations 2009–2014	12
Appendix B: ACCJC Actions on California Community Colleges: February 2005 to July 2015.....	21
Appendix C: Recommendations Accreditation Task Force	30
Appendix D: ASCCC Adopted Accreditation Resolutions.....	32
Appendix E: RP Group Focusing Accreditation on Quality Improvement ...	41
Appendix F: CEOCCC Recommendations to ACCJC June 2014.....	185
Appendix G: BSA Accreditation Audit June 2014	188

2015 TASK FORCE ON ACCREDITATION

I. Preface

The California Community College System is strongly committed to peer accreditation. Evaluation through peer expertise helps to ensure informed and fair review of programs and services and benefits all institutions that take part by promoting and ensuring both quality and compliance. A credible and effective accreditation process allows the California Community Colleges to demonstrate assurance of quality and integrity and assists all institutions in improving the delivery of their services for the system's 2.1 million students.

Because of this commitment to peer accreditation, CEOs, faculty members, administrators, staff, trustees, and others have been active members of accreditation evaluation teams and have served as members of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Accreditation Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). Although the WASC region also includes Hawaii and the Western Pacific, the California institutions constitute the overwhelming majority of colleges within this region. After a long history of supportive, professional relationships and productive, professional evaluation processes, serious problems have emerged. For at least the past eight years, the accreditation process has been a subject of con-

cern throughout the California Community Colleges. Consistent calls for reform of the accrediting process and change on the part of the accrediting commission have been raised by the Chancellor's Office, administrative organizations, faculty groups, classified staff, and voices outside the college system.

The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office convened the 2015 Task Force on Accreditation to address these serious concerns. The charge of the task force was to evaluate the current state of accreditation of community colleges in California and to recommend to the Chancellor and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges possible courses of action that will best serve students within the 113-college system. In approaching this charge, the task force determined that, rather than focus primarily on past difficulties, its report should be aspirational and should identify the qualities that would constitute an ideal accrediting agent. The members of the task force represent various constituent groups within the community college system, including administration, faculty, trustees, accreditation liaison officers, and the Chancellor's Office. This broadly representative group unanimously endorses the content and recommendations of this report.

II. Introduction: History and Background

Accreditation in the United States

Voluntary accreditation has been an important aspect of higher education systems throughout the United States for more than one hundred years. Effective accreditation serves the public interest by ensuring quality education for students, by assuring policymakers and taxpayers that resources are invested in high-quality institutions, and by ensuring the integrity of the entire system of higher education through meaningful self-regulation. Institutions must be accredited to participate in federal student aid programs; in turn, accreditors must be recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education on the basis of the standards and review processes that office applies to institutions.

Regional accrediting organizations were first established to distinguish collegiate study from secondary schooling and had begun to recognize institutions as accredited based on defined standards by the 1930s. With the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, accreditation agencies were deputized to certify the suitability of individual colleges and universities to provide quality education for students whose studies were funded through taxpayer dollars, an assignment further formalized through the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Accreditation of higher education institutions occurs regionally, but accrediting agencies are reviewed nationally. Each regional accreditor is dependent on recognition by the U.S. Department of Education. Recognition review by the U.S. Department of Education normally takes place every five years. U.S. Department of Education staff makes recommendations to the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity (NACIQI), which in turn recommends action to the U.S. Secretary of Education.

The United States is divided into six regions for purposes of accreditation: Higher Learning Commission North Central Association (NCA-HLC), Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE), New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC),

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), Commission on Colleges Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), and Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). Of the six regions, only WASC is subdivided into separate commissions for community and junior colleges (Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges) and for institutions offering bachelor's and higher degrees (WASC Senior College and University Commission).

Effective accreditation serves the public interest by ensuring quality education for students, by assuring policymakers and taxpayers that resources are invested in high-quality institutions, and by ensuring the integrity of the entire system of higher education through meaningful self-regulation.

As years have passed, the recognition criteria for regional accreditors by the federal government have become increasingly specific and compliance-oriented, leading to a more aggressive accountability function and an increased focus on detailed outputs. In 1984, the Southern Accreditation Commission adopted standards focused on institutional effectiveness, and other regions eventually followed suit. In 1992 the Higher Education Amendments increased the accountability function of accreditation and required accreditors to give greater focus to evidence of institutional quality and to review compliance with a growing list of increasingly detailed federal regulations. For example, whereas in the past colleges could maintain accreditation by affirming that their libraries contained an appropriate number of volumes, the modern approach requires a demonstration that the library's materials and services support positive student outcomes.

The California Community Colleges' Significance and Commitment to Institutional Quality

Community colleges are the primary point of access to higher education in California and across the nation. One in every four community college students in the United States attends a California community college, and 29 percent of University of California and 51 percent of California State University graduates started at a California community college. In addition to preparation for transfer, the college system provides workforce training and certificate and degree programs as well as basic skills instruction in English and math.

To help meet the demand for the additional college-educated workers that California will need in the coming decade, the California Community Colleges Board of Governors announced that it will seek to increase the number of students who earn certificates or degrees or who transfer to four-year institutions by 227,247 over the next ten incoming freshmen classes. This ambitious goal demonstrates an effort to establish clear markers for measuring the effectiveness of the system's Student Success Initiative.

In further demonstration of the system's commitment to institutional quality and to the accreditation process, in Fall 2014 the Chancellor's Office took advantage of the first infusion of post-recession funding to create an Institutional Effectiveness Division and initiated the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative. The primary mission of this new division and of the initiative that it oversees is to assist colleges in improving their overall effectiveness and in meeting accreditation standards. As these efforts show, the California community colleges continue to acknowledge their own roles and responsibilities in regard to self-reflective quality assurance and to participation in and improvement of the accreditation process.

Accreditation Under the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

While an increasing federal focus on compliance and accountability has placed new pressures on all regional accreditors, the reaction of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

(ACCJC) to these pressures has led to more frequent sanctions than those issued by any other similar body. Between February 2005 and July 2015, all but 37 of the California community colleges were placed on some level of sanction, two-thirds of the total colleges in the system. Although many of these institutions were removed from sanction relatively quickly, the numbers are inordinately high compared to the frequency of sanctions under other accreditors. According to the June 2014 State Audit Report of California Community College Accreditation, between 2009 and 2013 the ACCJC issued 143 sanctions out of the 269 accreditation actions it took. This sanction rate is approximately 53 percent, compared to approximately 12 percent sanction rates within the other six regional accreditors. The quantity and frequency of sanctions issued by the ACCJC, in conjunction with other controversial actions and practices of this accreditor, have led to frequent calls for reform of the accrediting process from member institutions of the ACCJC.

A variety of reports, resolutions, and recommendations have been issued by individual organizations and through joint efforts. Since 2007, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has adopted numerous resolutions expressing concerns about accreditation processes. A task force formed by the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges in 2009, with representatives from various system constituencies, met for more than a year, surveyed college presidents and accreditation liaison officers, and developed a report with seven recommendations that were sent to ACCJC in Spring 2010. In 2011, the Research and Planning Group for the California Community Colleges issued a report with bold observations regarding the ways in which California's accrediting process compared to other regional processes and significant recommendations for improving California's process. The Chief Executive Officers of the California Community Colleges conducted multiple forums for CEOs to meet and discuss concerns with accrediting commissioners and staff, surveyed members, and sent formal recommendations to the commission in June 2014 and then revalidated those recommendations in May 2015. Finally, in 2014 the California State Auditor produced an extensive

critique of the accreditation process that contained a variety of recommendations for reform. [See Appendix A: Crosswalk of Accreditation Recommendations 2009-2014.]

In addition, a second representative Chancellor's Office task force met in 2013 for more than nine months, reviewed research about other national regional accrediting commissions, best practices in accreditation, and feedback from the field, and worked to develop an additional report with further recommendations. The report was expected to contain both a critique of the current accrediting process and suggestions for improvement. A variety of circumstances at the time prevented the completion of this report, and therefore it was never finalized or published.

The time has come for the California Community Colleges to address the wide range of outstanding and consistent issues that have been raised regarding accreditation and begin building a structure that is sustainable for the future.

Many of these efforts have acknowledged the responsibilities of the community college system and of individual institutions for aspects of the accreditation process and suggested various changes and improvements in these areas. Members of the 2013 Chancellor's Office Task Force, for example, reported that they strove for a collection of recommendations directed specifically to colleges and toward cooperative efforts between colleges and the accrediting commission. In this effort, as in many others, California community colleges have consistently acknowledged their own roles and responsibilities in regard to improving the accreditation process.

Yet despite the many calls for reform from the community college system as a whole and from individual constituent groups, the ACCJC has shown little

evidence of its willingness or ability to address and resolve concerns that have been raised. In spite of the many overtures on the part of the member colleges and their representatives to work with the accrediting commission in resolving issues and improving processes, the ACCJC has made no significant effort to engage in meaningful or lasting reform. As a result, the concerns raised in the 2010 Task Force Report persist, the accrediting process for California community colleges has lost credibility with the system, and calls for change have intensified.

Across the six regional accrediting commissions, the ACCJC is the only regional accreditor devoted solely to two-year colleges. In light of the increasingly blurred lines between two- and four-year colleges, this structure has come into question. With the passage of Senate Bill 850 (Block, 2014), which authorized the California Community Colleges to engage in a pilot program for offering baccalaureate degrees, the system is now entering a new era. The creation of baccalaureate degree programs will present not only new opportunities but also new challenges. These new degrees offered by the community colleges must meet standards consistent with comparable degrees offered by other institutions of higher education. Though the pilot baccalaureate degree program is only in its initial stages, already pressure is building for expansion. The community college system requires an accrediting agency that understands and can accommodate these new challenges and that can provide credible, consistent accreditation that encompasses all programs offered by its colleges.

For these reasons, the time has come for the California Community Colleges to address the wide range of outstanding and consistent issues that have been raised regarding accreditation and begin building a structure that is sustainable for the future. To this end, the 2015 Task Force on Accreditation offers the following description of the kind of accreditor that is needed to assist the California Community Colleges as the system moves into a new era. The community college system can accept no less than an accreditor that will work in a collegial and transparent manner to ensure the integrity and quality of its institutions and to protect the interests of the State of California and the students that the system serves.

Part III: Ideal Attributes of an Accrediting Organization

Since 2007 in the various reports, resolutions, and other documents generated by constituent groups within the California Community Colleges, a number of common and consistent issues regarding accreditation have arisen. The crosswalk included as Appendix A of this report groups the recommendations made in these documents into a set of frequently stated themes that highlight the areas that the community college system has identified as the most serious causes for concern: transparency, collegiality, and consistency. If one considers the fundamental bases of these ongoing concerns, the themes embody and delineate the standards that the California Community Colleges need our accrediting agent to meet. These standards are enumerated in the following section of this report.

A. The accreditor emphasizes improvement rather than compliance.

The accreditor remains focused on its core mission of ensuring institutional quality and improvement.

The accreditation process guides and promotes academic and institutional quality, excellent teaching, and student success. On a broad level, the purpose of accreditation is to ensure for the public and for students the integrity of a system of higher education; at the level of an individual institution, the purpose is to improve the institution and to ensure quality. In no case is accreditation used to punish or weaken institutions. In its communications and in dealings with member colleges, the accreditor encourages and supports progress and positive development at the institution.

B. The accreditor demonstrates collegiality and consistency in all of its actions with member institutions and constituent groups.

All institutions receive consistent and equitable treatment.

In order to establish and maintain credibility, the accreditation process avoids any appearance of

inconsistency or inequity, whether intentional or unintentional. Accreditation standards consist of language that may be open to interpretation, but that language is interpreted and applied in the same ways in all instances. Likewise, the expectations for the evidence required and employed to support either positive or negative statements regarding an institution are consistent; one institution cannot be held to a different or higher standard of evidence than another. Information regarding visiting team findings or commission decisions is also shared in the same degree and manner for all institutions.

The accreditor avoids any actual or appearance of conflict of interest at all levels of the accreditation process.

The accrediting agent takes caution to avoid any appearance of conflict of interest in all areas, from the constitution of visiting teams to the members of the commission making final decisions. Whenever any hint of conflict of interest arises, the accreditor takes immediate and transparent action to remove that potential conflict.

C. Accreditation reports that indicate deficiencies include clear expectations for correction and allow reasonable opportunities for improvement.

The accreditor clearly identifies deficiencies and their level of significance.

The extent and types of deficiencies in a report regarding any institution are clearly identified. Such a report indicates which deficiencies need immediate remediation and which are less severe. All institutions are treated equitably regarding time for remediation and opportunities for appeal.

Sanctions are never an immediate or first response to deficiencies.

Institutions are given informal notice of potential deficiencies and opportunity to correct them before any sanction is issued. Sanctions are in no case an immediate or first response to deficiencies identified

by the accreditor. In addition, extensions for and exceptions to full compliance with standards are issued for institutions that can demonstrate good cause. Institutions are allowed adequate opportunities to correct deficiencies in a non-threatening environment in order for the accrediting process to remain focused on improvement and success.

D. The accrediting process and accreditor actions and decisions are transparent

The accreditor seeks meaningful participation and input from member institutions and constituent groups before making decisions with regard to its policies and processes, including decisions on issues such as the development of new standards.

Decisions made by the accreditor are responsive to the needs and interests of member institutions and system constituent groups. Decision-making regarding accreditation processes is transparent and allows for meaningful input and participation. The accreditor does not dismiss or selectively solicit public input in establishing or revising policies regarding issues such as the development and approval of new standards. The accreditor's response to negative input has no appearance of being dismissive or retaliatory.

Processes for appointment of commissioners, appointment of accreditor staff and leadership, and appointment of visiting team members are open, clear, and well defined and involve meaningful participation from member institutions.

The accreditor includes member institutions in processes that lead to the appointment of commissioners, accreditor staff and leadership, and visiting team members. Only the meaningful participation of member institutions in such appointments can ensure the responsiveness and transparency of the accreditor. These processes in all cases are clearly defined, consistent, and open.

In addition, system constituent groups organized at the state level are appropriately involved in the recruitment of visiting team members. Such partic-

ipation helps to expand the pool of potential team members, establishing greater system-wide participation in accreditation processes while ensuring the appropriate and inclusive representation necessary for authentic peer evaluation.

Decisions regarding the accreditation status of individual institutions are discussed and decided with the involvement of all appropriate parties and based on documented evidence.

Decisions regarding the accreditation status of institutions carry high stakes for those institutions and for the students they serve. If an institution is to receive a sanction, the decision to issue that sanction is justified and supported in terms that are clear and well defined for all parties involved with the institution. The president of any institution whose accreditation status is under consideration is allowed sufficient time to answer accreditor concerns and to speak on behalf of the institution. The chair of the visiting team for the institution is also consulted regarding any deviation on the part of the accreditor from the findings of the visiting team.

Records and evidence used in making decisions on accreditation status are shared in publicly available documents.

Decisions regarding accreditation status are based on documentation that is ultimately available to the public. Documented support for a decision regarding an institution's status is produced for public review, thus avoiding any appearance that the decision was arbitrary or unjustified.

A standard appeal process regarding issued sanctions exists.

No process that may impact the accreditation status of an institution exists without a means for appeal. The appeal process allows the institution facing sanction to provide evidence of institutional progress and to refute the findings of the accreditor. In order to ensure the integrity of this process, the appeal panel is completely independent of the accreditor and does not consist of the same body or individuals involved in issuing the sanction.

E. The regional accreditor demonstrates and maintains consistency with federal accreditation mandates and regional accreditor peers.

The accreditor implements and applies standards in a manner consistent with federal accreditation mandates and other regional accrediting agencies. The accreditor follows proven and established best practices for accreditation shared among other accrediting agencies.

The various regional accrediting bodies serving the United States have developed, through many years of experience, effective practices for accreditation based on peer review. The accreditor takes advantage of this experience and employs the proven best practices established by similar bodies.

F. The accreditor provides quality training to commissioners, visiting team members, and member institutions that is inclusive of all groups involved in the accreditation process.

The accreditor includes all the various system constituent groups in the development of training activities and other assistance to institutions.

Because all constituent groups are expected to participate in accreditation processes, members of all campus constituencies require professional development and training regarding accreditation. The accreditor works collaboratively with all constituencies and their statewide organizations to develop appropriate and meaningful training activities and to ensure that such training is readily available and effective.

The composition of visiting teams includes equitable representation of the various constituencies within the system.

An accreditation visit represents an evaluation by one's peers. Although an effective visiting team requires members with experience in accreditation processes, this requirement is not allowed to unbalance the composition of the team in favor of specific perspectives or areas of expertise. To ensure that

visiting teams are properly balanced and representative while still including sufficient experience with regard to the content and quality of accreditation reviews, a broad, qualified pool of potential team members is established, trained, and utilized.

G. The accreditor is responsive to and collaborates with CCC constituent groups.

The accreditor is responsive to all institutional representatives and system constituent groups, not merely to the college presidents of member institutions, and works with the various system constituent groups to resolve issues and concerns.

College presidents, as the administrative leaders of their institutions, clearly have and rightly should have a very significant voice in accreditation processes and in communication with and direction of the accreditor. However, chancellors, vice-presidents, and other administrators, in addition to trustees, faculty groups, staff, and students, all have a substantial interest in accreditation processes and decisions as well. The accreditor is responsive to all constituencies as appropriate in order to fully serve member institutions and the system as a whole.

H. The accreditor respects the roles and responsibilities of college and system constituent groups.

The accreditor remains within its purview and stated purpose and respects boundaries established by state law and regulation regarding the roles and responsibilities of all constituent groups.

In any educational institution, various constituencies are granted important roles and responsibilities. All of these roles and responsibilities are respected and supported by the accreditor. The legally granted and proper functions and rights of governing boards, administration, faculty, exclusive representatives or bargaining units, and other constituencies are not undermined by accreditation requirements. The accreditor does not attempt to alter or supersede the defined roles of constituencies within the college but rather accepts and works within the college's structure insofar as that structure is reflective of the

system's requirements and practices as prescribed in statute and regulation.

I. Member institutions have a formal process for periodic evaluation of the accreditor.

The accreditor provides a pathway for open, candid feedback about commission policies, processes and staff.

The accreditor provides a channel for candid input from its member institutions and from all constituent groups regarding both accreditation policies and processes as well as the performance of the accreditor's staff.

The periodic evaluation of the accreditor extends to all aspects of the accreditor's performance, including but not limited to organizational leadership and decision-making processes.

The formal evaluation process for the accreditor is not an internal review; it is driven by feedback from member institutions. This review encompasses all accreditation processes and policies, functioning of the accreditor's staff, consistency of decision-making, team selection process, effectiveness of training, responsiveness to feedback, and all other areas related to the accreditor's overall performance.

The accreditor responds to findings of the formal evaluation in a prompt, thorough, and meaningful way.

Just as member institutions must respond to the accreditor's recommendations, the accreditor addresses the findings of its periodic evaluation promptly and thoroughly and must demonstrate clear improvement or correction in areas of concern raised by the evaluation.

Part IV: Findings & Recommendations

The following recommendations of the 2015 Task Force on Accreditation are informed by the practices, record, and structure of the other five regional accrediting bodies, which offer, in the view of the task force, a preferable overall format and process to the one currently employed by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). The recommendations are also informed by the difficult history of actions, process, and climate afforded by the ACCJC.

The task force finds that:

- The structure of accreditation in this region no longer meets the current and anticipated needs of the California Community Colleges.
- The ACCJC has consistently failed to meet the expectations outlined in section three of this report.
- On several occasions the ACCJC has promised changes and has offered reports detailing their efforts to address concerns, but these promises and reports have led to few significant improvements.
- The California Community College system and its member institutions have lost confidence in the ACCJC.

For these reasons, and to address chronic issues, to promote confidence in and respect for the accreditation process, and to position the regional accreditor for the future development of California's community colleges, **the task force recommends the following course of action to the Chancellor and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges:**

1. The Chancellor's Office should investigate all available avenues for establishing a new model for accreditation, including options such as the following:
 - a. Form a combined single accrediting commission with community colleges joining WASC Senior College and University Commission, in keeping with the prevalent model for regional accreditation.
 - b. Identify other regional accreditors that could serve the California Community Colleges.

2. The Chancellor's Office should evaluate possible accrediting agents for the California Community Colleges in a thorough yet expeditious manner and, working through the system's established consultation processes, bring a recommendation for action to the Board of Governors by Spring 2016.
3. Until a new accrediting agent for the system is identified, system constituencies should continue to work in a cooperative and proactive manner with the ACCJC to ensure the continuity of the accreditation process for all colleges within the system.

Part V: Concluding Statement of the Task Force

The central focus of accreditation processes should be on providing excellent teaching and learning opportunities and on academic integrity. The current accreditor for the California Community Colleges has failed to maintain such a focus. Over the past several years, numerous system constituencies have raised consistent concerns regarding various aspects of the accreditation process and the performance of the accrediting commission, especially in areas related to transparency, collegiality, and consistency. This task force finds little evidence that the accrediting commission has the ability or willingness to address these concerns.

In addition, developments such as associate degrees for transfer and the beginnings of a community college baccalaureate degree effort have led California community colleges to become more integrated with 4-year colleges and universities. For this reason, the community colleges system would benefit from a closer, more formalized collaboration with the other institutions of higher education in the region, including service on evaluation teams.

Further delay in resolving the issues with the accreditor will have adverse effects on our colleges, on our students, and on California's economy and future and will prevent the timely development of the robust accreditation structure that other regions enjoy and that California lacks. The task force therefore urges the Chancellor and the Board of Governors to seek other accrediting options that would provide the collaborative and credible approach to accreditation that the California Community Colleges require and deserve.

Accreditation Task Force Members

Chair

Pamela D. Walker, Ed.D.

Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

Members

Stephen Blum, J.D.

Trustee

Ventura CCD

Stan Carrizosa, M.A.

Superintendent/President

College of the Sequoias

Richard Hansen, M.A.

Secretary

Faculty Association of California Community Colleges

Cindy Miles, Ph.D.

Chancellor

Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCD

David Morse, Ph.D.

President

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Meridith Randall, J.D.

Vice President of Instruction

Shasta College

Mary Kay Rudolph, Ed.D.

Vice President of Academic Affairs/

Assistant Superintendent

Santa Rosa Junior College

Ron Travenick, Ed.D.

Vice President of Student Services

Ohlone College

Joanne Waddell, M.A.

President

Los Angeles College Faculty Guild AFT 1521

Local 1521



CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE

1102 Q Street, Suite 4554
Sacramento, CA 95811

californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu

v.081315

SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CHANCELLOR'S GOALS AND OBJECTIVES 2015-2016

Submitted to the Board of Trustees

Dr. Constance M. Carroll
Chancellor

As always, my annual goals and objectives are intended to supplement the basic duties and responsibilities of the position of chancellor. The basic responsibilities have been developed over the years and are understood as expectations. Some of the responsibilities are also codified in statute. The goals and objectives that are presented below are the priorities I have established in addition to the regular responsibilities of the position. Because of the magnitude of goals established in the previous year, some are being continued, with modifications, in 2015-16.

My goals and objectives for the coming year emphasize planning, as well as specific developments and innovations, made possible in large measure by the significant improvements in financial resources. However, it will also be important for me to strike a balance between expansion into existing or new areas and the need to be conservative in view of some continuing financial constraints.

1. Provide leadership in planning for improving infrastructure and pursuing new directions. Specifically, increasing the number of full-time faculty is a strong imperative at the state level and continues to be a goal within the SDCCD. This is reflected in the goals below. Planning will include:

- a) Increasing and replacing full-time faculty positions, credit and noncredit;
- b) Increasing or replacing selected classified staff and administrative positions;
- c) Implementing new programs, especially:
 - Mesa College bachelor's degree program
 - City College "social justice" thematic programs
 - Miramar College co-curricular and high school developments
 - Continuing Education Career Development College Preparation (CDCP)
 - Districtwide institutionalization of learning communities
 - Districtwide planning for future baccalaureate programs
- d) Strengthening existing and developing new workforce education efforts;
- e) Determining the appropriate level of collegiate and pre-collegiate credit vs. noncredit in Basic Skills and developing a coordinative plan for assigning students;

- f) Monitoring and ensuring successful new directions for Military Education; and
- g) Making operational adjustments appropriate to the funding level.

2. Develop budget plans and strategies to address stabilization and future needs (ongoing).

I will focus my efforts on budget outcomes by:

- a) Carefully monitoring state funding affecting fiscal year 2015-2016, ensuring maintenance of a balanced budget, adequate reserves, less reliance on one-time funding, continuing strategies to address compliance with the 50% Law, and other state and federal requirements;
- b) Developing a long-term plan for funding the steep increase in the employer contribution to the state retirement program CalSTRS, as well as increases in PERS;
- c) Analyzing and reducing the SDCCD structural budget deficit that is annually created by ongoing reductions and fluctuations in state funding; and
- d) Ensuring the full ramp-up and implementation of the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) project to provide a new integrated data system for the District.

3. Provide support for the planning activities, decisions, and functions of the Board of Trustees (ongoing).

During the course of 2015-2016, I intend to focus on the Board's planning and decision-making functions by:

- a) Highlighting the Board at the national conference of the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) that will take place in San Diego in the fall;
- b) Highlighting the Board at other national, state, and local events through presentations, publications, and discussions;
- c) Scheduling and implementing a fifth joint SDCCD/San Diego Unified School District Board meeting;
- d) Completing and publishing plans to ensure the positive outcomes of the joint SDCCD/San Diego Unified School District Board meeting;
- e) Planning and scheduling a joint meeting with the San Diego Workforce Partnership; and
- f) Hosting a second meeting and celebration for members of the community who serve on the many campus industry and program advisory committees so that the Board can honor them for their service.

4. Provide leadership for institutionalizing instructional and student services initiatives.

I will focus on ensuring comprehensive and coordinated strategies within the District for these programs by:

- a) Ensuring the development of routine reports and research on important instructional programs (e.g., online education, transfer degrees, campus scheduling patterns, etc.);
- b) Ensuring the development of routine reports and research on student success and completion, and student equity;
- c) Monitoring districtwide progress and coordinating activities regarding the state grants in Student Success and Support Programs (SSSP) and Student Equity; and
- d) Tracking progress through regular reports and ensuring the success of the regional Career Pathways Trust grant and other workforce initiatives.

5. Provide continuing leadership and support for the bond programs and other facilities projects (ongoing).

As the \$1.555 billion bond program moves toward its final years, it will continue to require careful oversight and attention by the chancellor. During 2014-2015, I plan to focus on the facilities area by:

- a) Ensuring the continued progress of the accelerated construction schedule for Propositions S and N as it nears completion;
- b) Moving forward with more surplus property lease agreements to ensure a revenue stream for maintaining Propositions S and N construction projects;
- c) Continuing my personal support, participation, and attention to ensure the successful operation of the Citizens' Oversight Committee for Propositions S and N;
- d) Planning for a retrospective celebration and communication strategy for the completion of Propositions S and N; and
- e) Developing plans for a capital campaign to fund performing arts facilities at City, Mesa, and Miramar colleges, and Continuing Education.

6. Provide leadership for setting and achieving enrollment management goals (ongoing).

This remains a volatile area of state policy, which requires close attention. Therefore, enrollment management will continue to be the primary "business" of the District and will become even more critical in the volatile years ahead when enrollment is expected to "soften" in the wake of reduced unemployment. Thus far, the SDCCD has maintained strong enrollments, as well as our planned enrollment growth by 1% to 2% over the funded FTES cap. I plan to focus on enrollment management by:

- a) Expanding the effort to analyze and take action on districtwide research pertaining to enrollment patterns and needs;
- b) Supporting enrollment growth at the campuses, especially plans for the growth of Miramar College;
- c) Determining the optimal balance between on-campus and online courses and programs;
- d) Continuing to adjust registration priorities for students, as well as constraints on course repetition, in line with new state regulations and directions;
- e) Continuing the review of major course and program requirements throughout the District to ensure that they are in sync with the CSU, UC, and SB 1440 transfer degree requirements; and
- f) Ensuring the implementation of the optimal and affordable size, configuration, and support services needed for the semesters and optional sessions.

7. Participate in community activities (ongoing).

Because ours is a community college organization, it is important for the chancellor to participate in a variety of community activities in order to highlight the District, as well as to encourage community connections. I will continue to do this by:

- a) Participating in key community organizations and continuing my service on the boards of the University of San Diego, the San Diego Foundation, Biocom, the San Diego Opera (Student Ticket Initiative co-chair), Catfish Club, Museum of Man, etc.;
- b) Attending and making presentations at community functions;
- c) Encouraging and facilitating the participation of Board members and leaders within the District in community functions;
- d) Expanding publications, e-mail blasts, and social media notices for the community's information; and
- e) Encouraging community, business, and legislative leaders to visit the institutions of our District, including special Board workshops.

8. Participate in appropriate national, regional and state activities (ongoing).

It is important for me as chancellor to participate in national, regional, and California activities and projects. However, my participation will continue to include only those activities that have relevance to our District and to my work as a community college leader

and member of the higher education community. I plan to ensure that my emphasis will always be the San Diego community, while I will participate in other arenas by:

- a) Attending and making presentations at national, regional, and California meetings and conferences;
- b) Continuing my service on the boards of the National Council on the Humanities/National Endowment for the Humanities, League for Innovation, the National Institute for Leadership Development, the Community College Humanities Association, and others;
- c) Writing articles and, if possible, monographs; and
- d) Participating in other higher education projects.

9. Special Goal from Board of Trustees (continuing goal):

Mentor and support new and existing District leaders and positively manage leadership turnover.

10. Special Goal from Board of Trustees (continuing goal):

Develop and implement plans that will:

- a) Ensure a diverse applicant pool that reflects the diversity of the student population, positions, as appropriate;
- b) Educate and ensure that hiring personnel appreciate the value of a diverse workforce;
- c) Result in increased diversity in the faculty, administration and staff in the colleges, Continuing Education and the District offices; and
- d) Include a mentoring program to be initiated upon hiring employees, as appropriate.
- e) Work with the academic senate – and faculty union as appropriate – to create a structure and to secure funding for a meaningful, districtwide professional development academy emphasizing effective pedagogy for working with diverse student population, including students with disabilities and developmental students.

Developments and details of implementations will be shared periodically with the Board.