

Standard 3

Institutional Effectiveness



Debby at Providence Holy Cross Medical Center

DEBBY FELKEL Age 54

Debby has wanted to be a nurse for as long as she can remember. After high school, she entered a nursing college in L.A. She was married shortly after that and found it necessary to withdraw before completing the program due to the birth of her first child. She took a few night classes at GCC and planned to re-enter the program, but . . . another child was soon on the way. Debby's plans to go back to nursing school continued to be interrupted as the family eventually expanded to include nine children.

Several years ago, Debby and her husband were at their son's baseball game, across the street from the GCC campus. He suggested that perhaps it was time for her to go back to school. A neighbor (and nurse) had previously suggested GCC's Nursing Program. Debby came back to complete some necessary courses in 1997 and entered the nursing program in 1999. In May 2001, her life-long dream became a reality. With her three youngest children still in high school, Debby graduated from the nursing program. A few months later she passed the state exam to become a licensed registered nurse.

Debby currently works at Providence Holy Cross Medical Center in the maternity/child health department taking care of moms and babies and as a lactation educator. In addition to her nine children, she now also has nine grandchildren. She just can't get enough of babies! Debby credits her GCC nursing instructors as being of extraordinary caliber, and the staff as extremely supportive. She cites instructors Lynn Mizuno (microbiology) and Kindra Girard (anatomy) as her mentors, and for making it exciting to learn.



Standard 3 Committee

Chair: Scot Spicer

Writer: Edward Karpp

Faculty: Mike Allen
Michael Dulay
Ron Harlan
Jean Lecuyer
Ellen Oppenberg
Valerie Rhaney

Administration: Vicki Washington

Classified Staff: Merrilee Ahaus

Student: Henan Joof

Reviewers: Denise Ezell
Ira Heffler
Elis Lee
Dave Mack
Poorna Pal

standard 3: Institutional Effectiveness

The institution, appropriate to 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.

3A Institutional Research and Evaluation

3A.1 Institutional research is integrated with and supportive of institutional planning and evaluation.

Description

The Research and Planning Unit (RPU) is responsible for institutional research and support for collegewide planning. The staff members of the RPU participate on several governance committees, including Program Review, Student Affairs, Assessment, and Matriculation, where research requests are generated and information is disseminated. The Director of Institutional Research is a member of the Master Plan Steering Committee, which guides the work of the college Master Plan Task Force.

The RPU staff, beginning in spring 2002, report directly to the Dean of Information and Technology Services. This reporting assignment allows the RPU to work collaboratively with the staff of Administrative Information Systems on Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for planning, gathering information for databases, and MIS reporting functions. The RPU regularly publishes reports designed to inform college planning and decision-making. Annually, the RPU publishes the *Campus Profile* (Ref. 3-1), which provides the college with information on demographics, access, and success that can be used in discussions about future directions of the college. Sections of this document cover student equity in response to the Board of Governors' (BOG) mandate, the overall fiscal health of the college, student success measures, and the characteristics of local communities served by the college. The *Campus Profile* also lists and describes the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) which were defined by the college's Educational Master Plan (Ref. 3-2) and last approved in 1998.

The Educational Master Plan Task Force is in the process of modifying and updating the KPIs.

In addition to the *Campus Profile*, the RPU annually publishes *Student Views* (Ref. 3-3), a summary of the annual spring student survey. The spring survey asks students questions about their progress toward educational goals, the quality of technology on campus, satisfaction with the education they are getting, and other aspects of campus life. Every three years, the survey asks students to evaluate student services. Additionally, the RPU has conducted faculty/staff surveys on a six-year cycle to coincide with the accreditation self study: results of these surveys are reported in the *Campus Views* (Ref. 3-4) publication. For the Educational Master Plan revision process begun in 2001-2002, the RPU helped to conduct faculty and staff focus groups and provided data to inform the plan's revision.

The RPU also supports the college's evaluation efforts. For example, the RPU has provided baseline data and evaluation measures for the college's two federal Title V grants. The 1999 Title V grant for improving student outcomes has used baseline data supplied by the RPU to investigate methods of improving success in high-enrollment courses. The 2001 Title V grant for facilitating the transition between high schools, Glendale Community College, and California State University, Northridge uses baseline data and annually prepared evaluation data to measure the progress of students toward their educational goals. The RPU also provides and formats data for the Excel-based program review process. Additionally, the RPU analyzes placement test and outcomes data for the evaluation and validation of the college's English, credit and non-credit ESL, mathematics, and chemistry placement systems (see Ref. 3-5).

Evaluation

The RPU has made progress in focusing on the measurement of student outcomes and institutional effectiveness. Decision-making and planning issues are regularly informed by data provided by the RPU in publications or in requested reports. The college and the RPU have not focused on student follow-up, such as employer satisfaction and transfer success tracking. Such studies would enhance the college's assessment of institutional effectiveness.

Plan

The college plans to focus research efforts on student outcomes, planning, and follow-up.

- The RPU should continue to conduct research on matriculation outcomes, assessment validation, and student satisfaction and should continue to support college planning efforts
- Expanded research efforts should focus on student follow-up.



3A.2 The institution provides the necessary resources for effective research and evaluation.

Description

The college established a research function in 1985 and hired its first full-time institutional research staff person in 1986. Currently, the RPU staff consists of one full-time Director of Institutional Research, one full-time Planning and Research Analyst, and one part-time Planning and Research Analyst funded by the 2001 Title V grant. Student workers and data entry personnel occasionally offer additional support. The budget for special projects, used in the past for the creation and updating of placement tests as well as other matriculation-related projects, has been eliminated due to the budget cuts beginning in 2002-2003.

The RPU is permanently housed in LB 124. Before 2001-2002, the RPU reported to the Associate Dean of Instructional Services. As part of a 2001-2002 reorganization of Instructional Services, the RPU was moved under the supervision of the Dean of

Information and Technology Services. Clerical staff from Information Technology and Services (ITS) is shared with the RPU when additional clerical support is needed.

Program evaluation is coordinated by the Program Review Office, staffed by one faculty member with released time and one classified manager in Instructional Services whose assignment includes program review.

The college is finalizing the purchase of a new Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) software system, funded by bond and grant funds. The primary reason for purchasing the ERP system is the need for more accessible data and information to support college planning and decision-making.

Evaluation

Clerical support for institutional research has been an issue in the past, with occasional research projects delayed by the lack of available part-time student workers. However, the additional support provided by the move to ITS has been sufficient. The new reporting structure has also made working directly with ITS more convenient, though there has always been a strong working relationship between the RPU and ITS.

The RPU has been an integral part of the campus-wide conversations regarding the new ERP system and its reporting capabilities. The new system should improve the ability of faculty, staff, and administrators to access information. It should also improve the ability of the RPU to serve the college by providing, formatting, and analyzing information necessary for effective decision making.

Plan

As the new ERP system is implemented, the college plans to support institutional research through training, software, and hardware.

- The college should continue to ensure that the RPU has the appropriate hardware and software for its research and planning function.
- The college should ensure that training for RPU staff is sufficient in response to the purchase of the ERP system.



3A.3 The institution has developed and implemented the means for evaluating how well, and in what ways, it accomplishes its mission and purposes.

Description

The college mission and purposes are defined in its mission statement (Ref. 3-6) and its Educational Master Plan (Ref. 3-2). The 1998 Educational Master Plan includes more than 60 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) designed to measure how well the college is meeting its goals. The measurement of many of these KPIs has been incorporated into college processes. For example, instructional program review includes questions on the use of effective learning methods, on technological literacy, and on the development of thinking skills in students; these measures were derived from Educational Master Plan KPIs. Program review also includes equity measures derived from the college's Equity Plan. Additional KPIs are measured by the RPU and reported in the *Campus Profile*, including student survey results and indicators of goal completion. Other KPIs, including the number of students receiving formal orientation, classroom usage, and revenues and fund raising, are measured by individual departments.

The college measures many indicators in addition to KPIs. The KPIs in the Educational Master Plan are tied to goals, but there are many other indicators that are measured and evaluated as part of the routine assessment of the state of the college. Examples of such indicators include success by equity group, characteristics of transfer-goal students, and distributions of degrees and certificates awarded by major, all of which are reported in the *Campus Profile*.

Evaluation

A reasonable job of measuring and reporting KPIs has been accomplished by accessing college, state, and national databases, along with campuswide surveys. The college was somewhat ambitious in defining over 60 KPIs as part of the master planning process. In reality, many of these KPIs cannot be measured effectively without considerable additional resources. The current revision of the Educational

Master Plan is focusing on the establishment of realistic and effective KPIs. These KPIs will include measures of student follow-up and evaluations of student experiences, which are difficult to measure given current resources.

In order to be meaningful for the institution, KPIs require context; they cannot be isolated data points. The KPIs listed in the 1998 Educational Master Plan did not include baseline measures of current performance or benchmark measures of similar institutions' performance.

Plan

The college plans to strengthen its evaluation of how well it accomplishes its mission by defining new KPIs with baseline data and benchmarks of success.

- Incorporate baselines for KPIs in the Educational Master Plan so there is a reference point to determine whether the college is making progress.
- Incorporate benchmarks for KPIs from other institutions in the Educational Master Plan to determine how the college compares to similar institutions.
- Focus more on follow-up KPIs that measure the success of students after they leave the college.



3A.4 The institution provides evidence that its program evaluations lead to improvement of programs and services.

Description

Program evaluation is conducted through the annual program review process (Ref. 3-7). In addition to evaluating programs, program review provides programs and services with the opportunity to advocate for their needs in achieving educational excellence. Quantitative and qualitative measures are used when evaluating programs and services.

Programs and services are divided into three areas for the purposes of program review: instructional programs, student support service programs, and

administrative units. College personnel from each area have been active participants in the design of the program review document and in the definition of measures appropriate for their areas. Program review has been conducted periodically since 1992. The current instructional program review process has been conducted annually since 1998-1999. Program review for student support services (Ref. 3-8) was pilot tested in 2001-2002 and has begun with six programs in 2002-2003. Program review for administrative units, including Human Resources and Information Technology and Services, is at the early formative stage.

Currently, programs are reviewed on a six-year cycle. The instructional program review process also includes a mid-term review every three years in which programs address a subset of issues including prerequisite validation. The Program Review Committee has discussed moving to a four-year program review cycle and eliminating the two inactive years built into the current six-year cycle.

Data from program review are used by programs to make requests for resources, including new faculty positions, new technology, and new or remodeled facilities. Data from the requesting program's document are used to support their requests.

Beginning in 2002-2003, each instructional program review includes action plans to be developed by the programs in response to their stated goals. One component of each action plan is how the program will measure the success of its plans. As programs enter the next iteration of the review cycle, they are required to respond to the outcomes of their action plans from the previous document.

Evaluation

Participation in instructional program review has improved dramatically in the past six years. In the past, program review was seen as time consuming and difficult. Beginning in 2001-2002, program review documents were moved to an interactive Excel-based format, which simplified the exercise of completing the document. Additionally, beginning in 2001-2002, faculty members completing program review documents receive a stipend.

Participants in the current process feel that program review is useful. The 2001-2002 Program Review

Annual Report (Ref. 3-9) includes the results of exit surveys given to program review study coordinators. Attitudes toward program review improved between 1999-2000 and 2001-2002, with coordinators rating the process as more valuable, easier, and clearer in 2001-2002. In the college-wide 2002 faculty/staff survey, more than half of respondents who stated an opinion agreed that program review leads to program improvement.

The linkage between program review and college decision-making has improved in recent years. For example, the Academic Senate's hiring priority process now incorporates data from program review that helps prioritize faculty hiring decisions.

The validation of completed program review documents has been perceived as a weakness of the process by the Program Review Committee and others on campus. To address this weakness, the Program Review Committee is discussing strengthening the validation process by increasing the number of faculty and staff serving on validation committees from three to five and including a manager on each validation committee.

Plan

The college plans to strengthen the program review process.

- Strengthen the validation component of program review by clarifying the purview and composition of validation committees.



3B Institutional Planning

3B.1 The institution defines and publishes its planning processes and involves appropriate segments of the college community in the development of institutional plans.

Description

The planning process used by the college is a standard process in that it includes environmental scanning; analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT); determination of goals and objectives; and preparation of implementation plans. All areas

of the campus are invited to participate in the planning process at various stages.

The committee in charge of putting together and revising the Educational Master Plan is the Master Plan Task Force (MPTF), a group of over 60 people that includes all administrators at or above the associate dean level, all division chairs, and representatives from the Academic Senate, the faculty union, the classified union, and the Associated Students. It is meant to include all the leadership of the college. The process is led by a small committee, the Master Plan Steering Committee (MPSC), which organizes the work of the MPTF.

In addition, almost the entire campus participates in the development of the plan through surveys and focus groups, which are conducted in the preliminary phases of the planning process. Everyone is invited to hear the speakers who come to the college to provide information for the environmental scan; the “planning papers” (Ref. 3-10), which result from the SWOT analysis are published collegewide, and preliminary plans are posted on the college web page and open for comments. Also, specific segments of the Educational Master Plan are developed with the help of various college committees such as the Academic Senate, the Campus Computer Coordinating Committee, and others. The information technology section, in particular, requires input from a great many people, user groups, lab coordinators and technical experts. Revisions of the plan continue to rely on feedback from all the groups involved.

The most recent completed version of the Educational Master Plan was approved by the Board of Trustees in 1998. The college has been working on a revision of the plan since 2001-2002. At the time of this self study, the revised Educational Master Plan is in the draft stage, with adoption by the Board of Trustees scheduled for the January 2004, meeting. (Ref. 3-11).

The Educational Master Plan is augmented by the program review process, which is instrumental in recognizing the needs of individual departments. This process also involves the entire campus through its organizational units.

Evaluation

The MPTF is a very large and diverse group; by using such a group, all segments of the college are assured

input and participation in the development of long range plans and institutional goals. In addition, the opening of the process to collegewide comments and feedback at various stages also guarantees strong involvement of the entire college community. The institution is supportive of both the Educational Master Plan and program review through the shared governance process; it encourages participation through flex time for faculty members and overtime credit for classified employees, and it provides release time for committee chairs.

Plan

The college plans to communicate the results of the planning process more effectively.

- The college should publicize its Educational Master Plan more thoroughly and make sure that everyone on campus is familiar with it.
- The Program Review Committee should improve college awareness that several components of the program review document are derived from the goals of the Educational Master Plan.
- The program review document should be revised to reflect the goals of the 2003-2004 revision of the Educational Master Plan as soon as that plan is finalized.



3B.2 The institution defines and integrates its evaluation and planning processes to identify priorities for improvement.

Description

For almost two decades, the college has had a Research and Planning Unit, which has evaluated a variety of college parameters from student body composition to retention and success rates. Other important data such as student demand for courses come directly from the Admissions Office. This information has made important contributions to the development of institutional priorities, to decisions to expand or contract programs, and to resource allocation. We are beginning to move toward consistent application of institutional research data in guiding future decisions.

The Educational Master Plan involves not just data of that type but also “soft” data based on feedback from faculty, staff, administration, community, and private industry. The current plan, for instance, is the result of an elaborate effort to collect such information and evaluate the college from a variety of perspectives. It has also sought to incorporate estimates of future college needs based on the environmental scan; this is particularly important in rapidly changing areas such as technology.

The college has also established a Process Engineering Program (PEP) to improve its efficiency and prepare for the purchase and installation of a new Enterprise Resource Planning software system. Most of the process studies have already been completed, and the implementation of the reengineered processes is part of the current Educational Master Plan and will for the most part follow the implementation of the software itself.

Program review identifies program priorities for improvement. Programs undergoing program review define their goals and strategies to achieve those goals. Programs rank their goals according to importance and urgency. Additionally, VATEA-funded vocational programs use core indicator data to identify priorities for improvement.

Evaluation

Past actions of the institution have been somewhat reactive rather than proactive in planning for the needs of the college. However, the combined efforts of the Research and Planning Unit, the Master Plan Steering Committee, Program Review, and Process Engineering should assure the institution’s successful forward movement through the next ten years. The evaluations brought forth by these processes have helped to identify and prioritize the improvements needed for the future and so anticipate needs rather than just react to them.

Plan

The college plans to continue improving the planning process to make it more proactive.

- The college should build on the 2003-2004 revision of the Educational Master Plan and commit to a proactive approach in determining college priorities.



3B.3 The institution engages in systematic and integrated educational, financial, physical, and human resources planning and implements changes to improve programs and services.

Description

The allocation of resources at the college is, for the most part, determined by the Budget Review Committee and is based on priorities set by the president’s cabinet at its annual budget retreat. These priorities are themselves based on a number of determining factors including student demand, faculty and staff input through program review and the governance process, and priorities set through the Educational Master Plan.

These same educational priorities have driven the Facilities Master Plan and capital construction planning for the college. In accordance with state procedures, each year the district submits an update to Sacramento on its five-year construction plans. Prior to that submission, the update is reviewed and approved by the governance mechanisms of the college and then sent to the Board of Trustees. The purpose of the yearly update is to ensure that GCC is included in the state’s plan for future bond money. The college has also issued Certificates of Participation (COPs) to finance projects at GCC that the state does not support, such as parking lots and the new bookstore and campus center.

In addition, the college has recently been successful in passing a local bond issue that will make it possible to add new facilities, renovate present ones, and add student parking. The local bond funds will also serve to upgrade the information technology infrastructure and the administrative software. The bond priorities were established through the Campus Development Committee of the governance system. The college has been engaged in continuous construction activities since 1989 to meet the institution’s space and technology needs.

Until recently, no formal planning policies or procedures were in place in Human Resources. Instead, Human Resources planning was driven by the budget process and by external regulations such as AB 1725. Plans for changes in other areas of

Human Resources, such as recruitment, record keeping, workman's compensation, contract administration, safety, and release time were recommended by their respective on-campus committees and then submitted to the governing process for approval and funding before being implemented. Staff Development, directed by a constituent-based committee, provided a broad array of programs for both faculty and staff from categorical and campus funding.

The last Educational Master Plan revision, however, adopted a more comprehensive approach based on the Balanced Scorecard method of Kaplan and Norton. As a result, the plan has put a special emphasis on personnel and staff development. The hiring process will continue to be based on demand and on data from program review, but it is slated for improvement, and Staff Development has been given some strong guidelines to align it better with institutional priorities. The plan also attaches more importance to development of the working units in which personnel are grouped, such as academic divisions, and seeks to reinforce them as a way to improve college life and the quality of services.

Planning and program review have been integrated for several years. A number of pages and questions have been added to the program review document to make sure that the various educational programs are aligned with the goals of the Educational Master Plan, such as the focus on effective teaching and learning methods and the use of technology.

The Budget Process Revision Task Force, a joint task force of the Academic Senate and the college administration, has reviewed the budget process and recommended some improvements, with the goal of implementation in 2003-2004. The recommended improvements are designed specifically to improve the integration of the budget process with the goals identified by the Educational Master Plan.

Evaluation

There are two major difficulties in the integration of all aspects of planning at GCC. The first is the still too loose coupling between the Educational Master Plan and resource allocation. Budget decisions are rarely at odds with the general directions of the Educational Master Plan, but they could be better

integrated. Justifications for requests for college resources should include more thorough integration with the plan, and the decisions themselves should be based more closely on the plan.

The second problem is an old one: facilities plans have always been requested in Sacramento many years in advance. As a result, it is difficult to base them very directly on educational planning, with major revisions of the plan completed every five years. The results have not been bad for the college, but ongoing integration between the Educational Master Plan and the Facilities Plan needs further focus. One way to achieve some integration might be to require the MPTF to approve the Facilities Master Plan before it is submitted to Sacramento.

Overall, the components of a comprehensive planning system are in place and the integration of educational, fiscal, physical, and human resources planning is proceeding apace.

Plan

The college plans to use the revision of the Educational Master Plan to improve the integration of educational, financial, physical, and human resources planning.

- The revised Educational Master Plan, which begins implementation in 2003-2004, needs to be used more closely than before to determine governance and budget decisions.
- Program review should be updated in order to include questions that will align programs and services with the new version of the Educational Master Plan.
- Facilities planning should be revised to make sure that it responds to the needs expressed in the revised Educational Master Plan.
- The Educational Master Plan should come up for review every year or two to reflect changing realities. As a long range plan, it should not be a moving target, but it may still need adjustments: current budget realities in Sacramento, for instance, may force some rethinking of some institutional goals and objectives.
- Human Resources should implement the improvements recommended by the governance

process in the areas of recruitment, record keeping, workman's compensation, contract administration, safety, and release time.



3C Institutional Outcomes Assessment

3C.1 The institution specifies intended institutional outcomes and has clear documentation of their achievement

Description

The college completed its current Educational Master Plan in 1998; the plan includes 11 clearly stated goals and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for each goal. These goals and KPIs have been the focal point of much of the research conducted by the RPU and continue to be the focus as they are revised. RPU reports, including the *Campus Profile* and *Student Views*, in conjunction with reports generated by the Library, Information Technology and Services, the Service Learning Center, the Transfer Center, the Title V Office, the Professional Development Center (PDC), the Foundation Office, and others, have been used to provide data to support the college's movement toward achieving its goals.

Evaluation

In recent years, the college has made progress in changing its beliefs and behaviors regarding data and planning. The revitalization of program review and its subsequent integration into the budgeting process are keystone features of this changing culture. Concomitantly, the college has placed increased demands on many of its faculty and staff to usher this vital change along. For instance, program review study managers are required to spend a significant amount of time preparing program review reports, and three members of the college community must review and validate each report. As program review has been revised, it is now both a system for evaluation and a platform for requesting additional resources. Program review self-studies are not entirely objective evaluations of program effectiveness.

Program review needs to be revised to better suit the non-credit program at the college. Currently, the portfolio used for program evaluation does not include specific data elements that address issues unique to the non-credit program.

In the process of trying to gather data based on KPIs, the college discovered that, given current resources, some KPIs could not be measured with enough specificity. Additionally, effective student follow-up studies are difficult and expensive to conduct. The revision of the Educational Master Plan will take these difficulties into account.

Plan

The college plans to improve the measurement and reporting of institutional outcomes.

- The college should strengthen the validation component of program review in order to improve the objectivity of program review self studies.
- KPIs should be reviewed and revised so that meaningful data can be collected and used in planning.
- Program review should include measures that address issues unique to the non-credit program.



3C.2 The institution uses evidence from its evaluation and planning activities to communicate matters of quality assurance to the public.

Description

The college uses information from the RPU and state Management Information System (MIS) reporting to communicate matters of quality assurance to the Chancellor's Office, to the Federal Department of Education, and to the public. The college has entered into a Chancellor's Office consortium for reporting Student Right-to-Know data, including transfer data. Student Right-to-Know data are available to the public through summary reports prepared by the RPU (Ref. 3-12), are available upon request to the public, and are available through the Chancellor's Office Student Right-to-Know web site (<http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/tris/mis/srtk.htm>).

Internally, the RPU distributes two annual reports, the *Campus Profile* and *Student Views*, to the college. These reports highlight data relating to the KPIs of the Educational Master Plan and other information essential to the planning process. The RPU also posts these reports and others on its web site (<http://research.glendale.edu>), which is available to all campus employees.

The college's outreach office conveys matters of quality assurance to the public in numerous ways. The outreach office organizes site visits at local high schools to meet with staff and students to promote the college's excellence. In addition, the outreach office organizes annual events, such as *College: Making It Happen Day*, during which representatives from many of the college's programs host workshops and make presentations to prospective students and their families.

The college has developed relationships with high schools in the Glendale, Burbank, and Los Angeles Unified School Districts through the efforts of instructional and student services programs, through partnerships initiated by Los Angeles Unified and Glendale Unified GEAR UP grants, and through the support of the Title V grants. The college sponsors an annual Counselor Day which allows high school and college counselors to meet and exchange information about educational programs and curricula, articulation issues, and expectations for student preparation. Placement and student success measures are reported to the high school counselors at Counselor Day (Ref. 3-13). Additionally, the Title V grants support bridge programs between GCC and area high schools in English, ESL, and mathematics; another grant supports a high school bridge effort in history. Through these bridge programs, placement and student success data are shared with high school faculty.

The college's Office of Communications, Marketing and Foundation (CMF) assists in the conveyance of quality assurance to various sectors of the public by promoting the college to businesses in the community. Examples of recent activities include the Annual Glendale College Foundation Business Luncheon, a television program titled *Gateways to GCC*, and the sponsorship of various community and campus events. Recently, the PIO has started making meaningful use of the college's web presence with the *Glendale College Connection*, a biweekly Internet

publication designed to inform, build community, and provide professional recognition for the college's members.

Evaluation

The college could do a better job promoting the quality of its programs to the public. In many ways it tends to focus on "quality assurance" —a term which implies meeting minimum standards. This is unfortunate because the college, in many areas, exceeds standards outlined by the state. Research studies and RPU reports rarely inform the marketing and outreach activities of the CMF. Such reports could be used as an effective way of promoting both the institution and the quality of specific programs.

One difficulty in communicating quality assurance is the public's understanding of the context and meaning of outcome measures. For example, a high transfer rate is generally considered a positive outcome for community colleges. However, the calculation of transfer rate depends on the chosen denominator. Depending on the denominator a college chooses to report (from all students to just degree-seeking, full-time students), the same college's transfer rate could range from less than 2 percent to over 50 percent. In communicating outcome measures to the public, it is important that definitions and context are communicated as well.

The use of the college's technological resources should be expanded to convey matters of quality assurance to the public. The aforementioned *Glendale College Connection* is a thorough and thoughtful publication, but it should be sent to a wider audience.

Plan

The college plans to strengthen its reporting of outcome measures through the efforts of the PIO, the RPU, and the outreach office.

- An annual campus report should be generated that focuses exclusively on the relationship between the college's Educational Master Plan and existing student success data.
- PIO and outreach programs should work more closely with the RPU.
- A public web page should be created that contains data related to the college's quality.

- The publication *Glendale College Connection* should be made more accessible, perhaps with a direct link on the GCC home page.



3C.3 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.

Description

The college moved the RPU under the auspices of Information Technology and Services to facilitate the analysis and interpretation of data. This restructuring has enhanced the efforts of the Master Plan Steering Committee as it organizes the work of the Master Plan Task Force by making it easier to request the data needed.

The college has modified its program review model twice since its inception in 1992. The current model runs on a six-year cycle, coinciding with the accreditation cycle. The Program Review Committee has approved the change to a four-year cycle so that the year a program is reviewed is not so strongly tied to the accreditation cycle. The current program review process reported 100 percent compliance from programs in 2002.

Research has been conducted through the Academic Senate to assess various aspects of institutional effectiveness. Specifically, the Senate's research efforts have led to the establishment of two programs that focus on the ubiquitous impact of the Internet on student learning: Research Across the Curriculum (RAC) and Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC). In addition, the Senate analyzed the impact of the compressed calendar, implemented in 2001-2002, on student learning. Each of these efforts was supported by the RPU through data analysis and student and faculty surveys.

The college is currently reviewing the relationships between the Educational Master Plan, program review, and budgeting through the work of the Budget Process Revision Task Force, a jointly appointed task force including members of the Academic Senate and the college administration. The goal of this task force

is to make sure that decisions regarding college spending are based on the goals and strategies of the Educational Master Plan, and that the budgeting process includes representation from all members of the college community.

Evaluation

Educational planning has improved with each iteration. The most recent revision of the plan included a more thorough analysis of strengths and weaknesses, more involvement by college faculty and staff, and more published documents than any previous iteration. However, the results of the planning process are used more reactively than proactively. Additionally, the Educational Master Plan is not evaluated and modified as often as it should be. Fortunately, changes to the program review cycle, the linking of planning with budgeting, and the improved data access provided by the ERP should improve the planning process.

The collaboration between the Academic Senate and the RPU was an effort that drew upon the expertise of both units. The reports generated were rooted in objective data collection and scholarly interpretation, and they have been used to make meaningful changes to various programs on campus. For example, the RAC report was used to guide the library's implementation of an information literacy program that has seen steady increases in usage over the past year.

The college does not do enough to collect meaningful data from the institutions to which students transfer, nor from the local feeder high schools. This is an area that needs improvement so that the college can make meaningful assessments of its outcomes. Current models within the English and Math departments have begun to track students participating in programs designed to improve college readiness among high school students. The tracking system developed through the cooperative Title V grant with California State University, Northridge will collect data on the transition between GCC and CSUN. The college's research efforts should focus more on such areas.

Plan

The college plans to integrate planning and budgeting more closely.

- The process developed by the Budget Process Revision Task Force for integrating planning and budgeting should incorporate a means of creating a prioritized, publicly available list of college projects.

Reference Documents

- 3-1 Campus Profile
- 3-2 Educational Master Plan
- 3-3 Student Views
- 3-4 Campus Views
- 3-5 Assessment Validation Report Examples
- 3-6 Mission Statement
- 3-7 Instructional Program Review Document
- 3-8 Student Support Services Program Review Document
- 3-9 Program Review Annual Report, 2001-2002
- 3-10 Example Planning Papers from Educational Master Plan Revision
- 3-11 Educational Master Plan 2004
- 3-12 Student Right-to-Know Reports
- 3-13 Counselor Day Reports