

Standard Three

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

The institution, appropriate in its mission and purposes as a higher education institution, develops and implements a broad-based and integrated system of research, evaluation, and planning to assess institutional effectiveness and uses the results for institutional improvement. The institution identifies institutional outcomes, which can be validated by objective evidence.

A. Institutional Research and Evaluation

A1. Institutional research is integrated with and supportive of institutional planning and evaluation.

Descriptive Summary

Cuyamaca College has a variety of institutional planning and evaluation activities that incorporate institutional research. Over the past five years the College has developed a planning culture that encourages the use of data driven assessments. The following are representative examples of these efforts.

- Both the College Strategic Planning and Academic Master Planning processes began by conducting environmental scans to provide demographic information of the area and district community. Research data were provided by both the Office of Institutional Research and Planning and the College Educational Development and Services Office (e.g. community data). (3.33)
- When the College President identified a need to develop an Academic Master Plan, endorsed by the Academic Senate, institutional research data were provided for all facets of the project: including enrollment trends and projections, student demographic data, district recruitment information, and community perceptions. Again, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning provided the data (3.14).
- The Innovation and Planning Council is the primary comprehensive planning

body chaired by the College President, and it publishes an annual *Report Card* that demonstrates progress in achieving annual implementation goals for all administrative areas (e.g. Student Services, Instruction, College Educational Development and Services, Business Office, President's Office, etc.). The results are typically based on both quantitative and qualitative data prepared with the assistance of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (3.1).

- Both the Student Services and Instruction units of the College administration utilize research data for Instructional Program Review and Student Services Evaluation. Reviews are conducted on a regular basis (3.7, 3.10).

Analysis

Institutional research is highly integrated into campus planning. All Program Review, Academic Master Planning, and Facilities Planning recommendations must be data driven. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning, has readily provided the data for such recommendations. In addition, the same office provides regular reports to the Innovation and Planning Council on College performance and issues to be addressed through the planning process. Seventy three percent of faculty and sixty nine percent of staff agreed that institutional research is integrated with institutional planning and evaluation (3.25).

Institutional research is highly supportive of institutional planning and evaluation. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning is highly responsive to requests from college committees, departments, and individuals. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning consistently provides data in a clear and concise format and is eager to offer further clarification if requested to do so. Lastly, this office has been proactive in identifying and conducting research projects, which have provided the College with

Standard Three

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

valuable information about topics such as employment and transfer statistics. For these reasons, 77% of faculty and 61% of staff agreed that institutional research documents provide information, that is helpful in planning and program evaluation (3.25).

Plan

Improve distribution of information to faculty and staff regarding the research request process. (For instance, relatively few people are currently aware requests can be made on-line). Further review and clarification of the research request form is recommended.

A2. The institution provides the necessary resources for effective research and evaluation.

Descriptive Summary

Institutional research and evaluation is done through the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning supports Institutional Planning, Assessment and Placement, Program Review, and many other projects. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning currently consists of a Senior Director, a research manager, two research analysts, and a secretary, with the district funding most of the staffing. One quarter of an analyst position is funded by Cuyamaca College's matriculation funds and another quarter is funded by Cuyamaca College's Partnership for Excellence fund. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning is housed at District Annex. The District also provides resources in the form of computers, printers and basic software. The District also allocates operational funds to the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, some of which have been used to purchase statistical, database, and scanning software (3.34).

The Office of Institutional Research and Planning is currently working on 64 projects and has completed 299 projects since

October 1995 (personal interview (with whom???)). These reports and lists of projects are available on the District Web Site or at the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (3.33).

Analysis

The Office of Institutional Research and Planning provides both routine and ad hoc reports to the District and both Colleges. Examples of routine reports include data for program review, enrollment trends and tracking studies. Ad hoc requests come from the Chancellor and the College Presidents. At any one time there are typically more than fifty projects in the queue. The staffing is insufficient to handle all requested projects in a timely manner. Requests have to be prioritized and for some projects only charts and tables are produced without accompanying reports. The research manager position is funded through outside grants. The budget for supplies, equipment, and travel is limited, and is also supplemented with grant money. To address its heavy workload and provide more efficient service, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning is in the process of developing a user queryable database to help with routine requests (3.34).

The Office of Institutional Research and Planning has a web site that offers easy access to data that has been compiled for anyone to review (3.33).

The process for requesting data for a new study from the Office of Institutional Research & Planning is not clear to everyone on campus and the form that is used to request data is not user friendly. Many people on campus are not aware that the office exists and how it can help them compile the data they may need for a project.

Standard Three

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Plan

There are plans to automate many of the recursive projects that the Office of Institutional Research and Planning receives. This should become a high priority for this office. Increases in staff and budget would assist the Office of Institutional Research and Planning in carrying out its function.

Revising the form used to request data would help in clarifying what data are needed. Awareness of the Office and its functions need to be increased throughout the College community, possibly through a staff development workshop.

A3. *The institution has developed and implemented the means for evaluating how well, and in what ways, it accomplishes its mission and purposes.*

Descriptive Summary

Cuyamaca College's mission is to provide leadership for the community's future through innovative educational experiences and environments for learning. The College's mission is designed to maximize the opportunity for development of student intellectual, social, and personal skills.

The College has developed a number of methods to evaluate how well and in what manner it accomplishes the mission and goals. Primarily, the College President, in conjunction with the College Innovation and Planning Council, provides for regular and focused evaluation. A college *Report Card* is published annually which documents student demographic profiles and needs, as well as improvements made in accomplishing key mission priorities (3.1). This includes, but is not limited to, student retention and persistence, student enrollment in transfer, vocational and personal development programs, curriculum development, resource development and other related areas of institutional

effectiveness. At the Fall convocation, the College President, provides performance data on the College's progress for the previous year. These data are presented to the Governing Board at a regularly scheduled Board meeting. Outcome data are both quantitative and qualitative and reflects multi-year trends for each evaluation measure.

The College mission is achieved through the provision of comprehensive programs of transfer, vocational, general education, and personal development offerings in addition to a wide array of student services. To evaluate how well these instructional and student service areas are functioning, the college uses a variety of methods including:

- *Federal Student Right to Know* data in college publications (3.28),
- Data regarding student employment for vocational areas (3.12),
- Comprehensive Program Review systems (in both Student Services and Instruction) (3.6, 3.7, 3.10), and
- Academic Master Planning evaluation and reporting (3.16).

Analysis

In an informal survey of Cuyamaca College faculty and staff, 50% of respondents indicated that in the past 5 – 7 years they were part of a group or committee charged with evaluating how well and in what capacity Cuyamaca College accomplishes its mission and goals. During the same time frame, twenty three percent of respondents indicated that they had initiated a recommendation for evaluation. These results indicate that the institution has provided a positive environment where self-evaluation is an on going process (3.25).

Cuyamaca College effectively evaluates how well it has accomplished its goals. This evaluation is accomplished through mechanisms such as publication of the *Annual Report Card*, by the College President, as well as the Academic Master Planning process where each department

Standard Three

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

has a chance to evaluate whether the department has accomplished its goals (3.1, 3.16).

Plan

Continue processes as currently structured.

A4. The institution provides evidence that its program evaluations lead to improvement of programs and services.

Descriptive Summary

Program Review is intended to provide a regular opportunity for both student and instructional services to evaluate their programs in order to make effective decisions concerning the future direction of these programs. The processes are data-driven and outcome-based to ensure that the results of the Program Review will be relevant and useful for each program. Ultimately, the program review processes are action-oriented. Department chairs and coordinators use the program review to develop an action plan that feeds into the Academic Master Planning process. Academic Master Plan recommendations are forwarded to the Innovation and Planning Council to use in development of plans and College-wide priorities. Likewise, results and recommendations from student services are forwarded to the Innovation and Planning Council for purposes of program improvement. The program review processes are intended to contribute in a positive way toward attaining the goals of the College (3.6, 3.7, 3.10, 3.15).

In the instructional area, after each program review has been refined and finalized, and the action plan for the department has been determined, the *Program Review Summary and Action Plan* are forwarded to the following individuals and shared governance groups: the Academic Senate, the Academic Master Planning Committee, the Vice Presidents, and the President. Each program review provides input for the Academic Master Planning process and

ultimately to the overall college prioritization and budgeting processes through the Innovation and Planning Council (3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10).

Both the Student and Instructional Services Program Reviews require regular progress reports that document accomplishments since previous reviews. Program Review recommendations are to be funded and implemented through the College budgeting and planning bodies which includes the Innovation and Planning Council, College Budget Committee, Academic Master Planning Committee, Vice President areas for instruction and student services, and economic development and business units (3.35).

Analysis

The Program Review process is integrated into the overall planning processes of the College. Participants in the Academic Master Planning and Program Review processes indicated that they were confident that Program Review meets its goal of improving programs and services. According to surveys completed by faculty, the process is effective (3.25).

A survey developed by the Standard Three Accreditation team was conducted to determine familiarity of faculty and staff throughout the College with the Program Review process. Many members of the faculty and staff were not aware of any programs or services that were improved as a result of Program Review. However, those that were familiar with the process were able to give examples of changes that had been made as a result of Program Review and did not identify any cases where Program Review recommendations were ignored (3.26).

Plan

Continue the program review process as currently structured.

Standard Three

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

B. Institutional Planning

B1. The institution defines and publishes its planning processes and involves appropriate segments of the college community in the development of institutional plans.

Descriptive Summary

The planning process for Cuyamaca College, as stated in our *Organizational and Governance Structures* handbook, is based on two key components,

- Participation in plan development and decision-making, and
- Implementation.

The *Organizational and Governance Structures* handbook is published annually, and it details the governance structure of councils and committees, while defining the composition and charge of each one. The purpose of the shared governance structure is to provide each constituency group the opportunity to participate in the planning process, initiatives, and development of policies and procedures of the college through their representatives. Constituency groups, as represented on the various committees and councils provide input through defined channels of communication, and their input is considered in the final governance and planning decisions of the college (3.30).

To facilitate development of planning and review documents by the Cuyamaca College staff, there are documents entitled *Academic Master Planning Instructions and Template*, as well as *Program Review Instructions and Template* for both Instructional Services and Student Services 3.7, 3.8 3.9, 3.10, 3.16).

Analysis

Results from the *Cuyamaca College Faculty and Staff Accreditation Surveys, Spring 2000*, indicate that 69.4% of staff and 74.6% of faculty agree that the College defines and disseminates its planning process adequately. While this same survey indicates that 73.2% of staff and 65% of faculty agree that the College involves appropriate segments of the College community in planning, there seems to be a debate about the definition of “college community (3.25)”. In a separate survey developed and administered by the Standard Three Accreditation team, there were many comments implying that the College could do a better job of encouraging greater involvement of the College community (3.26). While new faculty and staff are encouraged to get involved in the planning process, many of these people do not understand the process.

Vocational departments do an admirable job of including community and industry representatives on their advisory committees that serve as their planning bodies. While academic/transfer departments are not required to establish advisory committees, many faculty and staff members feel that these departments would also benefit from appropriate community input.

The Innovation and Planning Council (IPC), which helps in putting together the College Strategic Plan ‘Learning for the Future,’ did an effective job of encouraging all faculty and staff, including part-time employees, to participate (through brainstorming sessions and surveys) in the development of this plan. The IPC compiled the resulting data to develop a new College Strategic Plan. This new plan was presented at the Spring 2001 convocation and is currently being published (3.1).

Standard Three

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Plan

The College needs to continue its innovative approach for including all staff and faculty in the overall planning process of the College while assuming all new faculty and staff are aware of and understand the planning processes that take place. Academic and transfer departments on campus should be encouraged to establish advisory committees after first finding out what aspects of the community the departments should be reaching out to. This would then help these departments in their planning processes. The College community includes, but is not limited to, local businesses and industry, alumni, students, local universities and part-time faculty and staff.

B2. The institution defines and integrates its evaluation and planning processes to identify priorities for improvement.

Descriptive Summary

Since 1994, with the creation of the College Innovation and Planning Council, a system has been established to integrate evaluation and planning activities used to identify priorities for improvements in college programs and services.

In the instructional unit, the planning and evaluation procedures have been integrated via the establishment of an Academic Master Planning process and oversight committee. Since 1995, a process has been carried out whereby all instructional departments, on an annual basis, propose goals and objectives to address emerging needs or improve programs. Proposed objectives target the full range of educational improvement activities, including, but not limited to, curriculum development, instructional support service innovations, technology use and program development. Recommendations from instructional program review (a data-driven evaluation process) are incorporated into the

department plans. Departments are also asked to submit a progress report on accomplishments or challenges since the last department plan was submitted (3.16).

The Academic Master Planning Committee, as a shared governance committee, evaluates individual department activities and makes implementation recommendations for each of them. A criteria-based system is used for this purpose. The President's Cabinet uses these recommendations to assist in determining finding priorities for the College. Thus, planning drives budget to ensure a process of ongoing program improvement (3.17).

In student services, evaluation of programs and services take place on a regular fiscal year cycle with coordination and oversight by the Student Service Program Review Committee (3.9, 3.10).

The recommendations of unit planning committees (Student Services, Academic Master Planning and Facilities) are forwarded to the College Innovation and Planning Council. College-wide objectives for implementation are identified annually and are prioritized and incorporated into the *Annual Implementation Plan* for the year. Through this process, implementation objectives are reviewed and coordinated with the college strategic plan goals. Evaluation is an integral component of the process. The Innovation and Planning Council evaluates the previous year's programs and writes an annual report that is presented to the Governing Board, community, and all other College constituencies (3.1).

Analysis

Since the last accreditation site visit in 1995, there has been a major effort College-wide to utilize planning processes to implement institutional improvements. Results of the *Cuyamaca College Faculty and Staff Accreditation Surveys*, Spring 2000 indicate

Standard Three

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

that 69.4% of respondents agree that the College defines and disseminates its planning procedures adequately; among staff, the level rises to 74.6%. Clearly, planning processes are highly visible within the College community (3.26).

As part of the survey sent to faculty and staff at Cuyamaca College by the Standard 3 Accreditation Team, respondents overwhelmingly indicated that based on their experiences, program review recommendations had been seriously considered within the planning processes and had been given high priority. More importantly, all respondents felt that the recommendations had been implemented and acted upon to improve services. One representative statement from faculty read as follows:

“In the Technology Planning Subcommittee, program review recommendations were heavily weighted when departments presented ideas for technological advancements in their classrooms. Similarly, in sitting on the Academic Master Planning meetings, program review recommendations were frequently cited as the motivation behind program plans.” (3.26)

It was also noted that respondents from different College units such as Student Services and Instruction appeared equally conversant about their respective internal planning processes (e.g., Matriculation for Student services, and Academic Master Planning for Instruction).

In terms of appraising the effectiveness of planning to improve services, internal discussions by Academic Master Planning Committee members do suggest the need to strengthen inter-unit dialogue regarding priorities. It is generally well understood, however, that priority recommendations from all units (e.g. Instruction, Student Services, Business Services, College Development) are channeled to the College Innovation and Planning Council (IPC) where all

constituencies are represented, including United Faculty, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, students and administration.

Plan

The IPC monitors and coordinates inter-unit recommendations and assists in setting priorities for their implementation. A feedback process also needs to be established to communicate the actions of the IPC to the College community.

B3. The institution engages in systematic and integrated educational, financial, physical, and human resources planning and implements changes to improve programs and services.

Descriptive Summary

Cuyamaca College has developed a systematic approach to educational, financial, physical, and human resources planning. As described in the previous section, the Instructional and Student Service units conduct annual internal planning activities via the Student Services Council and the Academic Master Planning Committee. Based on internal assessment and goals, all units prepare staffing recommendations for consideration by the College Innovation and Planning Council. For example, in Instruction, the Academic Master Planning Committee assesses needs for full-time faculty positions using a data-based process that is designed to address the College Strategic Plan values. Thus, human resource planning takes place at both unit and institutional levels. Based on the recommendations of the Innovation and Planning Council, unit budgets that incorporate recommendations for new classified and faculty staff positions are forwarded to the College Budget Committee.

In the area of facilities planning, the College Campus Master Plan Committee, chaired by the President, has the responsibility of developing, monitoring and implementing

Standard Three

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

College facilities building and remodeling projects based on the *Educational and Facilities Master Plan*. An integral part of facilities planning is the tie-in with Academic Master Planning. College facilities are planned on the basis of student enrollment projections (provided in part through the Office of Institutional Research and Planning), and program development plans. Most recently, these activities led to submission of a Final Project Proposal to the state for the building of a Science/Technology building and an Initial Project Proposal for a Communication Arts Building. Both projects were the result of ongoing Facilities Master Planning activities (3.29).

Analysis

The integration of educational, financial, physical and human resource planning and implementation has been a major challenge over the past five years. As indicated in the description, steps have been taken to ensure that recommendations from various College units and areas for program improvement lead to implementation. More difficult has been the effort to coordinate parallel planning processes. For instance, in the last two years, the Academic Master Planning and Instructional Technology Committees have met jointly during priority setting periods prior to budget development. In this way, investments in technology improvement are tied to instructional program needs and development. In 2000-01, Instruction and Student Service representatives have come together on the Student Success Task Force to collaborate on strategies that will enhance student retention, persistence and transfer.

Plan

Efforts to coordinate parallel planning processes should be continued and expanded to facilitate College-wide initiatives that will enhance institutional effectiveness.

C. Institutional Outcomes Assessment

C1. The institution specifies intended institutional outcomes and has clear documentation of their achievement.

Descriptive Summary

At Cuyamaca College, intended institutional outcomes are determined via the College's strategic planning process (3.1). The primary focal point for this process is the Innovation and Planning Council, where data and recommendations from the various committees and shared governance groups are reviewed, discussed and evaluated prior to establishing a desired institutional outcome. The Academic Master Planning Committee, Instructional Technology Committee, Instructional Program Review and Student Services Program Review Committees are among the more significant committees which feed their recommendations into the decision-making processes of the Innovation and Planning Council (3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 3.14, 3.15, 3.16, 3.17, 3.23). Research data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning also contribute substantially to making decisions about desired outcomes (3.20, 3.21, 3.22). When a proposed outcome falls within the purview of the Academic Senate—i.e., in a decision that touches upon academic and/or professional matters—a draft of the outcome proposal will be forwarded to the senate for feedback, endorsement, and, when appropriate, approval as well.

Beginning in 1998-99, the Partnership for Excellence has been an important factor in the setting of institutional outcomes for all of the California Community Colleges (3.4). This state-mandated program entails substantial financial investment by the state in exchange for credible improvements in five areas of student and performance outcomes: Degrees and Certificates, Transfer, Course Completion, Workforce Development, and Basic Skills. At Cuyamaca College, the determination of

Standard Three

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

intended outcomes for achieving Partnership for Excellence goals takes place within the Strategic Planning process described above.

Analysis

Every few years the District and the Colleges devise new strategic plans. Under the leadership of the Innovation and Planning Council, Cuyamaca College is in the process of devising a new Strategic Plan for 2001-2004. The process began with a college-wide activity in Fall 2000 in which all staff were divided into small focus groups and asked to suggest activities that address the eight values in the current plan. These activities, 217 total, have been compiled and distributed in the form of a survey (3.25). All staff have been asked to rank the importance of each activity. The process will identify the activities that all staff considers most important for the future development of the college. These activities will be incorporated into the new strategic plan.

The District and Cuyamaca College both annually evaluate the success of their strategic plans with the assistance of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. The District's plan has five areas of focus; Cuyamaca College's plan has eight values. Each area or value has specific criteria by which to measure outcomes (3.19, 3.1). The Office of Institutional Research and Planning provides data to help the District and the College evaluate their performance with respect to each criterion (3.20, 3.21, 3.22). As an example, to evaluate Academic Excellence at Cuyamaca College, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning gathered the following data that covered a three-year period:

- enrollment in basic skills courses,
- the number of General Education and vocational course offerings,
- ratio of part-time to full-time faculty,
- student performance and retention, and

- transfer student performance at San Diego State University.

Both the District and Cuyamaca College use the data to evaluate which strategies have been effective in meeting the values in their strategic plans. The evaluation process is instrumental in prioritizing values and selecting strategies for the following academic year.

The Academic Master Plan Committee requests that all departments submit a progress report each year as part of their department plan (3.14, 3.15, 3.16, 3.17). In the progress report, the status of completion for each objective from the preceding year is noted. One of three categories—completed, in progress, or not completed—is checked; space is available for comments. In this manner the department itself and the committee can assess progress toward educational objectives. Additionally, the committee annually reviews and modifies its planning forms and its criteria and procedures for prioritization of departmental objectives. The planning process has become more efficient and more effective each year.

The Instructional Program Review process has also evolved each year (3.6, 3.7, 3.8). The data supplied by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning to the programs under review are much more extensive and complete than in prior years. The departments undergoing review give informal feedback to the Instructional Program Review Committee regarding the process. Because the program review process is very time consuming, one improvement has been to supply data to the departments early in the process and to allow more time for completion of the forms. The committee annually reviews and modifies its forms, process, and procedures.

The Student Services Program Review process is a modification of the statewide Student Services Program Review model (3.9, 3.10, 3.24). The latest revision of the instrument and procedures was done in Spring 2000. Because programs are

Standard Three

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

reviewed on a five-year cycle, a mid-cycle review, which will consist of an analysis and a progress report, is planned. The process itself will be reviewed and modified at least every five years prior to the beginning of the next review cycle.

Plan

The Innovation and Planning Council needs to continue its vital work in formulating a long-range strategic plan and in developing an annual implementation plan to achieve targeted institutional outcomes. Continued and possibly expanded support will be needed from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning in order to evaluate outcomes.

The Academic Master Plan Committee also needs to continue its work in annually evaluating department plans and in making the recommendations that drive the allocation of resources in the budget process.

The Instructional and Student Services Program Review Committees as well need to continue their systematic evaluation of each program on a regular basis. Their recommendations are essential in assisting the development of each program.

C2. The institution uses information from its evaluation and planning activities to communicate matters of quality assurance to the public.

Descriptive Summary

The College documents outcomes and communicates these outcomes via print and the Web to interested constituents. Faculty, administrators, staff, and the Governing Board use outcomes to guide decision-making about instruction, budget, and policy. Outcomes are also shared with students and the community.

Good communication processes are evident in the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. A regular *Research in Brief*

newsletter that summarizes research results is distributed to Grossmont-Cuyamaca faculty and staff (3.21). The information is also available on the Web site of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (3.21, 3.33). The Web site also includes reports, presentations, strategic plans, a district factbook, and information about the office and the committee that guides it. Annual strategic planning outcomes are published in the College's *Annual Report*, prepared by the IPC and the President's office.

Information relevant to students and the press is shared in print via press releases and publications such as the *Federal Student Right to Know* and the student newspaper, the *Coyote Express* (3.5).

The Governing Board publishes minutes and shares highlights in *The Courier*, a bulletin published regularly and distributed to faculty and staff (3.27). In addition, agendas, minutes and the meeting schedule are published and posted on the District Web Site. Community involvement is encouraged during the open session of all Governing Board meetings.

In a shared-governance environment, information sharing is essential to guide decision-making. Committees prepare and publish reports, which are then shared with decision-makers and related committees. For example, each academic department completes an Instructional Program Review every five years (3.7). In this review, departments provide a profile of their program, assess progress toward goals in the departmental plan, explain how the program supports the values outlined in the *Cuyamaca College Strategic Plan*, and provide information about enrollment, student success, staff, facilities, and future outcomes and plans (3.1, 3.23). The Technology Plan and budgets are guided by the *Academic Master Plan* and the *Academic Master Plan* is guided by department plans (3.15).

Many departments also share quality matters with students and community, often

Standard Three

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

in creative ways. The Fine Arts department, for example, displays student work on bulletin boards located around the campus and in special exhibits. The Horticulture department publishes a newsletter that highlights accomplishments of the department. The Computer Information Systems Department publishes student work from its Web Development major via the Web. Vocational departments meet with advisory committees to share goals and outcomes and gather input from professionals in the field. This kind of communication supports rich dialog that both strengthens and markets our programs.

Analysis

The College does a good job of communicating matters of quality assurance to the public. Traditional print publications such as the *Cuyamaca College Catalog*, *Federal Student Right to Know*, and the *Annual Report Card* are important ways of communicating matters of quality to the public, as are press releases and the College Web site (3.1, 3.5, 3.28).

One indicator of effective communication is that 74.6 % of faculty and 69.4% of staff agreed that the College defines and disseminates its planning process adequately (3.25).

Another significant indicator of effective communication is the increasing use of the Web to share planning and evaluation information with the public. In 2000, for example, the following changes were made to the District and College Web sites:

- The district added a Web page that links to news releases (http://www.gcccd.net/intergov/News/news_releases.htm),
- The district placed a draft of the Districtwide Strategic Plan online (http://www-admin.gcccd.cc.ca.us/research/Planning/new_page_1.htm), which includes a Report Card section that outlines evaluation measures, and

- The Cuyamaca College site was revised to include a prominent link to its master plan (<http://www.cuyamaca.net/administration/masterplan.asp>).

It is clear that the College understands the importance of the Web as a communications tool. The challenge will be to keep expanded online offerings current and well organized.

Plan

The college should continue to publish print materials that convey quality assurance to the public as well as expand Web offerings that highlight these areas.

C3. The institution systematically reviews and modifies, as appropriate, its institutional research efforts, evaluation processes, institutional plans, and planning processes to determine their ongoing utility for assessing institutional effectiveness.

Descriptive Summary

The Office of Institutional Research and Planning supports the planning and evaluation functions of the district and colleges (3.20, 3.21, 3.22). It supplies data for projects such as validation of assessment and placement tools, course prerequisite validation, student outcomes, campus climate, and review of academic programs. The Research Advisory Committee prioritizes research projects. Suggestions for modification of process and effectiveness of research projects come from the Research Advisory Committee and from user feedback.

The district-wide Strategic Planning Committee develops a strategic plan for the district every few years (3.19). Annual action plans are derived from the strategic plan, an evolving document that is reviewed and modified as needed. The success of

Standard Three

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

the plan is delineated in a *Report Card*, which includes specific measures of the five areas of focus of the plan, namely, Learning and Academic Excellence, Student Access, Diversity, Economic and Community Development, and Human, Fiscal, and Physical Resources.

Cuyamaca College develops its own strategic plan, the current one covering the period from 1995-2000 and entitled "Learning for the Future" (3.1). The Innovation and Planning Council derives an Annual Implementation Plan from the strategic plan. The success of the plan is delineated in an *Annual Report*, which summarizes the previous year's accomplishments and notes the status of completion of the plan objectives.

The Academic Master Planning Committee annually develops an educational plan for academic programs and services (3.14, 3.15, 3.16, 3.17). Included in the annual plan is a summary of the previous year's accomplishments and achievement of objectives. Toward the end of its cycle in the spring semester, the Academic Master Planning Committee performs an evaluation of its process and makes recommendations for changes for the ensuing academic year.

The Instructional Program Review Committee conducts an evaluation of each academic program every five years (3.6, 3.7, 3.8). The process is data driven and outcome based. The objective of the evaluation is to assess the status of each program regarding enrollment, student access and success, cost efficiency, and overall achievement of mission. The Program Review Committee reviews its own process and receives input from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning to make improvements in its process.

The Student Services Program Review Committee has conducted an evaluation of each student services program every six to nine years (3.9, 3.10, 3.24). The criteria for evaluation depend on the nature of the program. The objectives of each program

are systematically evaluated and followed with specific recommendations. The Student Services Program Review Committee reviews its own process and considers participant feedback in making modifications to its process.

In Fall 2001 the Effective Communications Work Group was established to help facilitate students' access to appropriate offices as well as assist faculty and staff in better understanding department functions. This will be accomplished through the *Who, What and Where Directory* (3.31, 3.32).

Each of the following activities are periodically modified as needed:

- Instructional Program Review was restructured five years ago.
- The Innovation and Planning Council annually revisits the evaluation measures to be used for the college annual implementation plan.
- The Academic Master Planning Committee revises procedures for both planning and progress reporting as deemed necessary.
- The Effective Communications Work Group updates the directory annually.

Analysis

The effectiveness of Cuyamaca College's research and planning efforts are evidenced in the considerable increases in enrollment, course offerings, programs, hiring of new faculty and staff, acquisition of new equipment and technology, and building projects.

While this explosion of growth and productivity is gratifying and invigorating, there are indications that this success may have some liabilities as well. For example, many faculty are "stretching" themselves considerably as a result of the following growth-related phenomena: (1) greater faculty participation in the increased numbers of shared-governance committees; (2) larger class sizes; (3) increased

Standard Three

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

investment of time and energy for implementing new technology in courses; (4) increased efforts by faculty to attract and manage grants; (5) increased numbers of under-prepared students.

Though most of the above-cited phenomena are in themselves welcome, they also remind us that success needs careful management and continual “fine-tuning”—a theme that our College President emphasized during our Staff Development Convocation for Spring 2001. As we continue to grow, some “fine-tuning” will also need to be applied to our processes for determining intended institutional outcomes—especially for managing the burgeoning number of committees and committee members on which our strategic planning depends.

Now that success is charging through the gates, how do we keep our planning processes from getting trampled by it? The Innovation and Planning Council has already planned and projected significant increases in faculty and staff during the coming years. However, increases in the number of personnel will not necessarily make it easier to staff more and more committees—especially if all other aspects of our College’s enterprise continue to expand as well. Furthermore, effective communication among increasing numbers of College personnel will only become more, rather than less, complex—and this too will affect the character and efficiency of our decision-making processes. Communication will continue to improve through The Effective Communications Work Group and the *Who, What and Where Directory*. We have rapidly grown from a small college to a mid-sized college, and it appears that we are on our way to becoming a large college.

Plan

In order to ensure the future effectiveness of our processes for determining desired institutional outcomes, we will need to do the following: (1) annually reassess our

committee structures and functions; (2) consider possibilities for streamlining committee structures; (3) explore strategies for attracting more individuals into the committees which “feed into” the planning process; (4) pinpoint and propose/implement remedies for College-wide “communication gaps”; (5) pinpoint and propose/implement remedies for any shortcomings in communication with the constituent organizations (e.g., Academic Senate, Classified Senate, etc.).

Some of the above—in particular, numbers (1) and (2)—are already established in the annual routine of the Innovation and Planning Council, where a regular reassessment of our decision-making processes takes place during the annual revision and updating of our Governance Document—a task in which all constituent groups participate. Although numbers (3) through (5) have taken place on an “as needed” basis, there may be value in establishing a more routinely recurrent review of those areas.

Resources

- 3.1 Cuyamaca College Strategic Plan & Report Card
- 3.2 Demographics Reports
- 3.3 Statewide Student Follow-up Survey
- 3.4 Partnership for Excellence
- 3.5 Student Right to Know
- 3.6 Instructional Program Review summaries
- 3.7 Instructional Program Review report example
- 3.8 Instructional Program Review Instructions/Template
- 3.9 Student Services Program Review Schedule

Standard Three

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

- 3.10 Student Services Program Review Reports
- 3.11 Student Success & Outreach Plan
- 3.12 Student Outcomes, 1995
- 3.13 Student Handbook
- 3.14 5-year Academic Master Plan
- 3.15 Department Academic Master Plans
- 3.16 Academic Master Plan Instructions/process
- 3.17 Academic Master Plan Rankings
- 3.18 Blank budget planning form
- 3.19 District Strategic Plan
- 3.20 Reports on success, retention and persistence
- 3.21 Institutional research studies on web
- 3.22 Institutional research projects (past & current)
- 3.23 Technology Plans
- 3.24 Student Services Program Review/Instructions
- 3.25 Faculty & Staff Accreditation Survey
- 3.26 Standard 3 Accreditation Survey
- 3.27 The Courier
- 3.28 College Catalog
- 3.29 Academic Master Plan 2000-2001
- 3.30 Organizational and Governance Structures Handbook
- 3.31 The Who, What and Where Directory
- 3.32 Effective Communications Work Group Plan
- 3.33 <http://www.gcccd.net/research>
- 3.34 Personal interview with Brad Philips
- 3.35 Personal interviews with members of Program Review Committee