

Golden West College Follow-Up Report Summary

March 14, 2014

Prepared by: Kay Nguyen, Administrative Director of
Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness;
Accreditation Liaison Officer

District Recommendation 1

District Recommendation 1: To meet the Standard, and as recommended by the 2007 team, the team recommends that faculty and others directly responsible for student progress towards achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes

(Standard III.A.1.c)

Response to District Recommendation 1

What we have accomplished:

Integration of SLOs in employee's evaluation

- FT Faculty – Use of SLOs
- PT Faculty – 1) Existence of SLOs in Syllabi, 2) Class assignments contribution to SLOs achievement
- Management – Demonstrate “supports of faculty and staff in implementation of Student Learning Outcomes as a measure of student success and of teaching excellence”

Conclusion:

- This recommendation is fully addressed and the college meets this standard.

District Recommendation 2

District Recommendation 2: To meet the Standards, and as recommended by the 2007 team, the team recommends that the Board and district follow their policies regarding the delegation of authority to the Chancellor for effective operation of the district and to the college presidents for the effective operation of the colleges. Further, the team recommends that the district develop administrative procedures that effectively carry out delegation of authority to the Chancellor and the college presidents. (*Standards IV.B.1.j, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.g*)

Response to District Recommendation 2

What we have accomplished:

- Revision or creation of 8 Board Policies and 7 Administrative Procedures pertaining to:
 - Delegation of Authority to CEO/Presidents
 - General Counsel
 - Designation of Authorized Signatures
 - Bids and Contracts
 - Construction Contracts
 - Contracts for Independent Contractors/Professional Experts

Conclusion:

- This recommendation is fully addressed and the college meets this standard.

District Recommendation 3

District Recommendation 3: To meet the Standard, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees follow its established process for self-evaluation of Board performance as published in its board policy.

(Standard IV.B.1.g)

Response to Recommendation 3

What we have accomplished:

Board evaluation process as stated in BP 2745

Action	Timeline
(1) Review and approve procedures	September, odd number years
(2) Review and approve evaluation instrument	September, odd number years
(3) Board members complete and submit evaluation responses	10 days prior to evaluation meeting
(4) Board Secretary tabulates responses and presents them to Board President	Prior to evaluation meeting
(5) Board President presents evaluation results to Board in writing	Prior to evaluation meeting
(6) Board President/designee presides over discussion of evaluation results	October study session (or special meeting)
(7) Public/District constituencies provide input during self-evaluation	Prior to evaluation meeting
(8) Action(s) taken as a result of evaluation summary in public meeting	Prior to date of next review cycle
(9) Board Accreditation Committee develops of process/measures to address areas of improvement	Prior to date of next review cycle
(10) Board Accreditation Committee reports back with results in public meeting	Prior to date of next review cycle
(11) Evaluation identifies accomplishments, goals and plans (optional)	

[Survey Results of District Employees Regarding the Board of Trustees](#)

Conclusion:

This recommendation is fully addressed and the college meets this standard.

Recommendation 4

District Recommendation 4: To meet the Standards, and as recommended by the 2007 team, the team recommends that the Board implement a process for the evaluation of its policies and procedures according to an identified timeline and revise the policies as necessary. (*Standard IV.B.1.e*)

Response to District Recommendation 4

What we have accomplished:

- The District has followed the process defined in BP 2410 and AP 2410 for revision of existing Board Policies and Administrative Procedures.
- The District and the Board of Trustees completed a full review and revision of all of its existing BPs and APs and created new ones, as needed.
- A schedule for continued review and updating for the next four-year cycle Fall 2014-Spring 2018 has been established and will be followed.
- [Status and Revision Schedule of Board Policies and Administrative Procedures Chapters 1 to 6](#)

Conclusion:

- This recommendation is fully addressed and the college meets this standard.

Commission Recommendation 1

Commission Recommendation 1: To meet the Standards, the District needs to examine the role of the four board employees who report directly to the Board of Trustees to ensure there is no conflict with the delegation of authority of the Chancellor and the college presidents. (*Standard IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b*)

Response to Commission Recommendation 1

What we have accomplished:

- BP 2200 (Board Duties and Responsibilities) was revised and changed the reporting relationship of the Board Secretary from reporting exclusively to the Board of Trustees to a dual reporting relationship to both the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor. The Chancellor and the Board of Trustees work together to hire and evaluate the Board Secretary
- Job description was discussed and approved at the 02/05/14 BoT meeting

Conclusion:

- Yes. This recommendation was fully addressed and the college meets the standard.

College Recommendation 2

College Recommendation 2: In order to fully meet the standards and improve institutional planning, the College must implement a process to more specifically create and link objectives that lead to accomplishment of the institutional goals and improvement in Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). (*Standards I.A.1, I.A.4, I.B.1-7, III.B.2.b*)

Response to College Recommendation 2

What we have accomplished:

- Linking objectives from Program Review with KPIs
- The College has improved the process in three ways:
 - 1) Revision of the Planning and Decision Making Guide that emphasizes the college goals and key performance indicators as focal points;
 - 2) Revision of the resource allocation rubric to ensure that the College make budget decisions that meaningfully impact college goals and improve KPIs
 - 3) Integration of KPI metrics with three College's main planning documents.

Conclusion:

This recommendation has been addressed and the college meets this standard.

College Recommendation 3

College Recommendation 3: In order to meet the standard, it is recommended that the College complete the process of mapping or aligning the course-level SLOs with program-level SLOs and general education SLOs and expedite the process of assessing the SLOs. (*Standards II.A.2.f, II.A.2., II.A.2.i, ER 10, ER 19*)

Response to College Recommendation 3

What we have accomplished:

- Over 92% of the College active courses have been mapped to program, GE, or ISLOs.
- The college has increased the completion of course SLO assessments from 35-40% in Spring 2013 to 70% in fall 2013.
- Program SLO assessment has increased from 56% in spring 2013 to 84% in spring 2014.
- The College anticipates 75% completion of Course SLO assessment by the end of spring 2014, moving the College to the level of proficiency.

Conclusion:

- This recommendation has been addressed and the college meets this standard.

College Recommendation 4

College Recommendation 4: In order to the meet the standard, it is recommended that the College ensure that all students receive a course syllabus containing course-level student learning outcomes, properly labeled for all courses, regardless of delivered modality. (*Standard II.A.6*)

Response to College Recommendation 4

What we have accomplished:

- 100% of course syllabi were posted by the first week of winter intersession.
- Currently, over 95% of spring 2014 sections have their syllabi posted on myGWC .
- Academic Senate Faculty Resources Page has guides on faculty onboarding, SLO assessment process, syllabi posting, and other relevant information to support new and current faculty.

Conclusion:

This recommendation has been addressed and the college meets the standard.

College Recommendation 5

College Recommendation 5: In order to meet the standard, the College must develop and implement a policy and/or procedures for measuring the program length and intended outcomes of degrees and certificates offered by the College. (*Standards II.A, II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.2.h, II.A.6a-c*)

Response to College Recommendation 5

What we have accomplished:

- All program duration and course taking sequences have been identified and designed.
- 2014-2015 Catalog will reflect these changes.

Conclusion:

This recommendation has been addressed and the college meets the standard.

College Recommendation 6

College Recommendation 6: In order to meet the standards, the College must develop financial planning processes that include the following:

- a. Consider its long-range financial priorities when making short range financial plans.
- b. Develop financial plans that are integrated with and support all institutional plans
- c. As was noted by the 2000 and 2007 evaluation teams, the College must develop an enrollment management plan in order to maintain the financial viability of the organization (*Standards III.D.1.a, III.D.1.c*)

Response to College Recommendation 6

What we have accomplished:

- Draft of Long Range Financial Plan
- Draft of Enrollment Management Plan with Fiscal Implications
- Revision of Planning and Decision Making Guide
- Revision of Resource Allocation Rubric
- Development of Staffing Master Plan framework

These integrated plans will be approved and implemented in time to influence the 2014-2015 budget.

Conclusion:

This recommendation has been addressed and the college meets the standard.

Additional Information

Link to Follow-Up Report

<http://www.goldenwestcollege.edu/accreditation2014/>