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Statement on Report Preparation

College / District Preparation:

On January 31, 2005, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) informed Merritt College and the Peralta Community College District that it had reviewed the progress report the College had submitted as well as the reports of the evaluation teams which had visited the college and district on Monday, November 8, 2004. Subsequently, the Commission moved to issue a warning to all four colleges in the Peralta Community College District as a result of the district’s failure to satisfactorily address recommendations the commission made to it, and Merritt College’s failure to satisfactorily address the recommendation on research and planning.

The colleges were asked to work with the district to correct the deficiencies noted in three areas: integrated planning; long-term liability planning; and board of trustee functions. In addition, the college was asked to respond to a college recommendation on ensuring that the college’s institutional research and evaluation processes, policies and practices are integrated with and reflected in institutional planning. The commission required the college to complete a progress report by October 15, 2005, to be followed by a visit of commission representatives.

As part of the progress report submitted in October 2004, the college and the district had been working on integrated planning processes. That work continued during the fall of 2004, as a result of the January ACCJC letter. Members of the different constituencies met with the chancellor, and the consensus was to hire an outside consultant to facilitate the process.

Working Groups District

District Recommendation #1: Integrated Planning

Faculty Representatives
Joseph Bielanski, Jr. Faculty Senate President/Vista & DAS President
Evelyn Lord Faculty Senate President/Laney
Gary Perkins Faculty Senate President/Alameda
Tom Branca Faculty Senate President/Merritt
Inger Stark At-Large
Anita Black At-Large
Linda Sanford At-Large
Michael Mills PFT President

Classified Representatives
Nancy Cayton Classified Senate President/Vista
Wandra Williams Classified Senate President/Laney
District Recommendation #2: Long-term Liability Planning
Edward W. (Bill) Withrow Trustee
In September 2004, Merritt launched its own strategic planning process as detailed in the Appendix and referenced throughout Merritt College’s response to its recommendation.

Merritt has worked closely with the district on the district integrated planning recommendation process. The college has responded from its own perspective regarding its collaboration with district functions and board perspectives in these areas. The recommendations dealing with the unfunded liability and board of trustee functions have been discussed in numerous meetings between the college and district including trustees, with the personnel of the district assuming the major responsibility. The resulting document blends district and college points of view on the progress made on these three important recommendations.

In addition, committees and task forces at the college are addressing the college’s research and planning responsibilities. Documents in support of conclusions drawn are listed at the end of each recommendation and will be available in the team room for review at the time of the visit.

**Working Groups College**

**Task Force on Integrated Planning and Budgeting**
- Dr. Evelyn C. Wesley, President, Merritt College
- Dr. Carmen A. Jordan-Cox, Vice President of Student Services
- Linda Berry-Camara, Vice President of Instruction
- Dr. Gary Yee, Dean of Instruction
- Dr. Douglas Segar, Dean of Instruction
- Anthony Powell, Dean of Student Services
- David Dowell, Business Manager
- Ann Elliott, Faculty
- Anita Black, Faculty
- Bill Love, Faculty
- Horace Graham, Job Placement Coordinator
- Sadie Bradley, Principal Accounting Technician
- Brenda Hampton, Division Secretary
- Candace Freeman, President, Associated Students Merritt College

**Integrated Planning Committee (IPC)**
- Dr. Carmen A. Jordan-Cox, Vice President of Student Services
- Linda Berry-Camara, Vice President of Instruction
Anita Black          Faculty
Claire Chapin        Faculty
Ann Elliott          Faculty
Horace Graham        Job Placement Coordinator
Anika Toussant-Jackson College Research and Planning Officer
Rashad Andrews       President, Associated Students Merritt College

Title III Task Force
Dr. Audrey Trotter   Title III Planning Grant Director
Linda Berry-Camara   Vice President of Instruction
Ann Elliott          Faculty
Dr. Steve Pantell    Faculty
Anita Black          Faculty
Dr. Stacy Johnson    Faculty
Jon Drinnon          Faculty
Sandra Zehaye        Faculty
Anika Toussant-Jackson College Research and Planning Officer
Jennifer Kennedy     Grant Writer
Horace Graham        Job Placement Coordinator
Lorna Pascual        Tutorial Services Specialist
Dr. Evelyn C. Wesley President, Merritt College
Dr. Carmen A. Jordan-Cox Vice President of Student Services

Student Learning Outcomes Pilot Group
Dr. Hank Fabian       Biology Faculty
Teresa Williams       Geology Faculty
Robin Freeman         Environmental Sciences Faculty
Dr. Siri Briggs-Brown Ethnic Studies Faculty
Guy Forkner           Real Estate Faculty
Christine Olsen       Child Development Faculty
Dr. Stacy Thompson   Child Development Faculty
Sandra Zehaye         Child Development Faculty
Al Shriver            Counselor/ Dept. Chair
Kimm Blackwell       Transfer Center Director
Karen Bougae          College Nurse
Judy Adams            EOPS Coordinator
Ron Perez             EOPS Staff Assistant
Christina Tisot       DSPS Coordinator
Alice Freeman         Financial Aid Program Supervisor
Collis Carkhum        Student Activities Coordinator

Scorecard Project Task Force
Dr. Audrey Trotter   Faculty
Linda Berry-Camara   Vice President of Instruction
Dr. Hector Cordova   Dean of Instruction
Dr. Steve Pantell    Faculty
Dr. Stacy Thompson   Faculty
Tom Branca           Faculty
Anika Toussant-Jackson  College Research and Planning Officer
Courtney Loder  Assessment Coordinator
Jennifer Kennedy  Grant Writer
Dr. Evelyn Wesley  President, Merritt College
Dr. Carmen Jordan-Cox  Vice President of Student Services
Dr. Alicia Dowd  Center for Urban Education, USC
Dr. Frank Harris  Center for Urban Education, USC
Dr. Eve Vallejo  Center for Urban Education, USC

Tillery Institute Planning Group
Dr. Hector Cordova  Dean of Instruction
Linda Berry-Camara  Vice President of Instruction
Dr. Gary Yee  Dean of Instruction
Marta Zielke  Faculty
Dr. Audrey Trotter  Faculty
Anika Toussant-Jackson  College Research and Planning Officer

Signed:

___________________________
Dr. Evelyn C. Wesley
President
Merritt College
District / College
Timeline for Report Preparation 2005-06

Organizational Meetings of Response Units October 2004-ongoing

OCTOBER 25, 2004  CIPD  Strategic Planning discussed
October 15, 2004 Report to ACCJC

NOVEMBER 1, 2004  CIPD  Strategic Planning discussed

NOVEMBER 29, 2004  CIPD  Strategic Planning discussed

DECEMBER 2004  CIPD  Strategic Planning discussed
December 7, 2004 Peralta Board of Trustees workshop with Dr. David Viar, Executive Director of CCLC.

Commission Action Letter Received by Merritt College  January 31, 2005

Appointment of Accreditation Steering Committee  Ongoing

JANUARY 2005  Jan 13, 2-4pm District-wide Planning Meeting

Administrative Review and Analysis of Action Letter and Evaluation Report  February 8, 2005

FEBRUARY  Feb 8, 1-3:30pm College Presidents’ Meeting, Planning
Feb 22, 2-4pm District-wide Planning Meeting

MARCH  Mar 4, 5-9pm Board Retreat on Strategic Planning
Mar 8, 11-3pm District-wide Planning Meeting
Mar 28, 1-3pm District-wide Planning Meeting

APRIL  April 12, 2:30-4:30pm District-wide Planning Meeting
April 22, 8:30-10am District-wide Planning Meeting
April 29, 8:30-10am District-wide Planning Meeting

MAY  May 16, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting

JUNE  June 6, 3-4:30pm District-wide Planning Meeting
June 20, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting
June 24, 5-9pm Board Retreat on Strategic Planning (Mills College)
June 25, 9-3pm Board Retreat on Strategic Planning (Consultants)
June 27, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting (Consultants)
JULY
- July 18, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting (Consultants)
- July 26, 3:30-5pm Board Study Session on Strategic Planning (Consultants)
- July 28, Release of District's 13 major themes
- July 29, 2-4pm Vista Community College Leadership

Draft of District Response

AUGUST
- Aug 1, 9:30-11:30am Laney College Leadership
- Aug 1, 12:30-2:30pm College of Alameda Leadership
- Aug 8, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting (Consultants)
- Aug 25, 3-5pm Merritt College Leadership
- Aug 29, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting (Consultants)
- District Service Center Managers’ Report

First Draft of College Responses

SEPTEMBER
- Sept 6, 12pm Merritt College – Town Hall Meeting
- Sept 7, 2pm Vista Community College – Town Hall Meeting
- Sept 8, 12pm College of Alameda – Town Hall Meeting (video)
- Sept 8, 2:30pm Laney College – Town Hall Meeting
- Sept 15, 1:30-3:30pm Combined CPAC, Presidents’ and District-wide Planning Meeting (Consultants) - Draft Strategic Plan Framework with Strategic Initiatives
- Sept 27, 3:30-5pm Board Study Session on Strategic Planning (Consultants)

Report to District Office

Final Draft of College and District Responses

Editing and Final College Review of Report

Planning Meeting for Mid-Term Report

Report to District Office

Report Presented at Board Meeting

Report Mailed to Commission

Report Due to Commission

Planning Meetings for District Strategic Planning

Report Due to Commission
Progress Report of Merritt College / Peralta Community College District
October 15, 2005

**OCTOBER**
- Oct 10, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting (Consultants) – Draft Strategic Plan
- Oct 11, 3:30-5pm Board Study Session on Strategic Planning (Consultants)
- Oct 19, Professional Development Day
- Oct 24, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting (Consultants)

**ACCJC Visit**

**November 2005**
- Nov 7, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting
- Nov 21, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting

**First Draft of College Mid-Term Report**

**December**
- Dec 5, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting

**First Review of College Mid-Term Report**

**January 2006**
- Jan 9, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting
  * Possibly to change to Jan 23

**Editing/Final College Review of Mid-Term Report**

**February 15, 2006**

**Mid-Term Report to District Office**

**February 21, 2006**

**Mid-Term Report to Board**

**February 28, 2006**
- Feb 6, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting
- Feb, TBA Alameda College – Town Hall Meeting
- Feb, TBA Laney College – Town Hall Meeting
- Feb, TBA Merritt College – Town Hall Meeting
- Feb, TBA Vista Community College – Town Hall Meeting

**Mid-Term Report Due to Commission**

**March 15, 2005**
- Mar 6, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting
- April 3, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting
  Final Strategic Plan
- May 8, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting
- June 5, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting
- July 10, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting
- Aug 14, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting
  Strategic Plan Implementation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>Sept 11</td>
<td>3-5pm</td>
<td>District-wide Planning Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>Oct 16</td>
<td>3-5pm</td>
<td>District-wide Planning Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>Nov 13</td>
<td>3-5pm</td>
<td>District-wide Planning Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>Dec 4</td>
<td>3-5pm</td>
<td>District-wide Planning Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic Plan Evaluation Plan

*******************************************************
***********All meeting dates and times subject to change.
**District Recommendation One:**

The team recommends that a district-wide plan and an implementation process should be created that is strategic and systematically integrates the educational, financial, physical and human resources of the district. All planning processes should be inclusive of the four colleges and communities served by the district. The plan should include identified institutional outcomes with criteria for evaluation on a periodic basis. It is recommended that the district-wide plan integrate the educational master plans and program reviews of the colleges. The chancellor should ensure that the plan and the ongoing planning processes are communicated throughout the district. (Standards 3.B.1, 3.B.3, 3.C.3, 10.C.1, 10.C.6)

**Progress to Date**

**District Response as of September 30, 2005:**

**Creation of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee**

In October 2004, the college/district responded to recommendation #4 with a proposed model that involved the Council on Instruction, Planning, and Development (CIPD). In that report, it was indicated that the governance body at each college campus would review the model. Subsequently, in November of 2004, the steering group proposed that the colleges consolidate their recommendations through a consultative process to prepare for strategic planning that would begin in the spring of 2005. Through the consultative process it became apparent that the strategic planning process would need to encompass a larger and more representative group than the CIPD.

To this end, in January 2005 the chancellor of the Peralta Community College District called for the establishment of a strategic planning steering committee comprised of representatives from College of Alameda, Laney College, Merritt College, and Vista Community College and of staff from the district office. An “interim” steering committee determined the specific membership of the official steering committee. This official committee includes 24 voting members and 24 nonvoting ex officio members. The representation (listed under “Documents” below) reflects the desire to have an effective cross section of the colleges representing all constituencies as well as to ensure that the needs of the four colleges drive the actions developed from the planning process. Critical to the effectiveness of the committee and the integrative planning process is inclusion of representatives from the various district office departments.

The charge of the steering committee was as follows:

1) to establish a planning process;
2) to identify key issues for inclusion in the plan; and
3) to ensure that the planning process interfaces well with the four colleges and the individual plans under development at each college.

PLANNING MEETINGS
The initial interim steering committee, comprised of individuals from the four colleges and the district office, held its first planning session on January 13, 2005. Dr. Chuen-Rong Chan, associate vice chancellor for research and institutional development, and Alton Jelks, special assistant to the chancellor, facilitated the initial planning sessions. The group accepted the core charge of reviewing possible scenarios for strategic planning and for determining at what point the district would secure the services of an outside planning consultant. The group also undertook the task of reviewing steering committee membership to ensure that it reflected the various constituencies of the colleges and that the appropriate constituencies appointed members to the steering committee (i.e., college administrators, district classified senate, and district academic senate).

From January to May 2005, the steering committee met twice a month to address these and other issues important to the long-term success of the planning process, which included the following:

1. The individual mission, vision, and values statements from each college were reviewed to identify the common concepts and language in order to develop a common mission, vision, and values for the entire district.
2. Defining the planning process itself, which involved preparing various diagrams demonstrating how the process would flow and ensuring that it would be a “bottom up” process, fully engaging the needs of the colleges.
3. Strategizing on how the decisions made during the planning process would impact the priorities of the processes and procedures of the district office so that they would enhance and support the education mission of each college.

In March, the steering committee and the chancellor launched a request for proposal for a planning consultant. In June 2005, following Board approval on June 14, the district contracted the firm of Moore, Icafano, and Goltzman (MIG) to facilitate the planning process. The Request For Proposal review process included representatives of the steering committee in concert with the chancellor. The committee reached consensus on the decision.

Once the consultant began work, their team undertook the following series of steps:

1. They facilitated a second retreat for the board of trustees on June 24 and 25, 2005. (The first retreat had been held in November 2004, at which time the board reviewed their role as a governing
board.) At the June retreat, the board addressed overall issues and priorities of the district that provided guidance to the strategic planning process, and produced 12 general goals for the district;

2. MIG also immediately began facilitating the steering committee planning meetings. At the planning session, the committee worked through consensus to reach a priority list of issues to be addressed by the colleges and district office based on the 12 goals set by the Board and a 13th goal, Human Resource Development;

3. MIG conducted sessions during August to present the general district goals to a leadership team at each college, to obtain college responses to these goals, and to identify ways in which district goals reflect college goals and vice versa;

4. By late August, the steering committee developed a draft framework and strategic directions for the strategic plan and recombined some of the initial 13 goals into 7 broad district goals;

5. The consultant also scheduled town hall planning meetings at each of the colleges. During these meetings, the consultants facilitated a dialogue with the members of the general college community on the issues and priorities they felt necessitated addressing through the planning process in relation to the seven general goals that had emerged from the June retreat with the board of trustees and which had been refined; and

6. On September 12, 2005, MIG worked with the steering committee to develop an initial draft framework and strategic directions for the strategic plan related to the seven broad district goals for presentation and discussion to the Board of Trustees on September 27. An updated draft strategic plan framework was presented to the Board on October 11 and approved. This draft incorporates input the steering committee provided on September 12.

7. On the October 19 Professional Development Day, at the direction of the chancellor, the entire district is invited to come together to review progress made to date on integrated strategic planning, and to provide input on the draft strategic plan. MIG will use this feedback to further develop the strategic plan framework.

**DISTRICT OFFICE INTEGRATION ACTIVITIES**

Concurrent with the strategic planning process, a number of activities are in place that reflect the district’s efforts to engage the colleges and to integrate the needs and concerns of each in decision making, such as the following:

1. The chancellor holds monthly meetings with a variety of groups to seek their input and direction:
   - Group of Advising Faculty (GAF);
   - Chancellor’s Policy Advising Committee (CPAC);
   - President’s Meeting (each college president); and
   - Executive Cabinet (presidents and district office department heads).
The agenda for all meetings includes the opportunity for participants to share ideas and concerns and to solicit discussion and advice in an open and free-flowing dialogue.

2. The chancellor and/or the vice chancellor of finance and budget convene meetings to ensure integration of ideas and needs throughout the budget process, including the following:
   • Budget Advisory Committee, comprised of representatives from each college; and
   • Monthly meetings the vice chancellor of finance and budget holds with the colleges' business managers.

3. The Council on Instruction, Planning, and Development (CIPD) has been in existence for over fifteen years. Each college has a curriculum committee per Education Code and Board Policy Guidelines that is the direct responsibility of the college academic senates. The CIPD, with representatives from each college and staff from the district, coordinates the curriculum on a district-wide basis, provides curricular information to the Board for final adoption, and submits paperwork to the State Chancellor's Office. This committee has the current reputation of being a model district-wide committee that provides leadership and guidance and helps to facilitate college decisions regarding curriculum. The vice chancellor of educational services chairs this committee.

4. The colleges/district began work in spring of 2005 to create a Peralta Community College District Facilities Advisory Planning Committee. This group will function following the model the Council of Instruction, Planning and Development (CIPD) uses. The facilities advisory group has met twice and is in the process of designing their guidelines and purpose as well as identifying membership and areas of responsibility and developing processes. President Odell Johnson of Laney College chairs the committee, which contains four voting members from each college. Personnel from the district facilities office staff the committee. This committee will function as a coordinating body of all the facilities projects and will make recommendations to the chancellor for the trustees committee on facilities. The committee agreed on September 20, 2005, that the criteria for projects would be the same criteria as the State Chancellor's Office and the college’s educational master plan use.

5. The district marketing department convenes monthly meetings with the public information officers from each college to develop coordinated marketing efforts, participation in community events with the College Access Teams, and general community outreach.

6. The information technology department has created a steering committee for the implementation of the new PeopleSoft system. This group meets at least twice a month (more often as needed) to help guide the migration to the new system, which will impact all the technology needs of the colleges, including finance, student services, business management, and so forth. Further, a “Fit-Gap”
Team comprised of faculty and classified staff has been established to address the “fit” and the “gaps” in the PeopleSoft student administration system.

Every department of the district office undertakes a range of integration activities and a report from each appears in the section of this report under “Documentation.”

Board of Trustees’ Strategic Planning
The Board of Trustees embraced the spirit of recommendation #1 by convening three board planning sessions since October 2004:

7. March 4 & 5, 2005;
8. June 24 & 25, 2005; and
9. July 26, 2005

At the special retreats, board members had the opportunity to engage in a dialogue about the benefits of strategic planning and to express their thoughts about what the District’s plan should include. The first planning meeting in March laid the groundwork for a second planning session in June.

At the June retreat, which the consultant facilitated, trustees identified 12 strategic planning areas:

1. Integrated strategic plan;
2. Student success;
3. Increased enrollment;
4. Student support services;
5. Fiscal stability and sustainability;
6. Accountability systems;
7. Access;
8. Quality programs;
9. Physical facilities and infrastructure;
10. Partnerships;
11. Board development; and
12. District image and identity.

The strategic planning steering committee added a 13th strategic planning area, Human Resource Development, which the Board accepted on July 26, 2005. The consultant communicated these 13 planning areas to the strategic planning steering committee for consideration when developing the district-wide integrated plan.

MIG proposed that the original 13 planning directions be reformulated into 7 strategic directions. In September 2005, the steering committee accepted the seven strategic directions. The current seven strategic directions are as follows:

• Enhancing access and student success;
• Developing human resources;
• Creating effective learning environments;
• Leveraging information technology;
• Enhancing resources and budget process;
• Enhancing awareness and visibility; and
• Improving the effectiveness of district-wide communication, coordination, and collaboration.

The strategic planning process will continue through 2006 and beyond. During this initial planning period, strategic initiatives will be refined, and the processes and procedures of the district office will be adjusted and reshaped to more effectively meet the specific needs of the colleges. Further, MIG will assist the steering committee in developing criteria to evaluate progress made on the strategic plan. The budget process, as one example, has the goal of being as transparent as possible. The chancellor’s budget advisory committee is a major component of this “reshaping” of budget development. Led by the vice chancellor for finance, the budget allocation model committee (many of whose members also serve on the budget advisory committee) will continue to refine the budget process as the planning process continues.

The members of the strategic planning steering committee, the chancellor, and the board of trustees have all committed themselves to pursuing strategic planning as the foundation of change throughout the district. The overarching goal of full integration of the activities of the district office with the needs and missions of each college is well underway. The steering committee and the college constituencies are equally committed to the long-term development and implementation of strategic initiatives.

**Analysis of Results Achieved to Date**

• Approximately 40 meetings have occurred concerning strategic planning with the steering committee and/or each college community between January and October 2005;
• The district retained a planning consultant who has the experience and expertise to provide excellent support for the planning process;
• Meetings are planned through December 2006, and it is anticipated that a final strategic plan will be in place by May 2006 with full implementation by fall 2006;
• The district is developing a shared mission, vision, and values statement in conjunction with the four colleges;
• The district has renamed departments of the district office “service centers,” and they each identified steps and integrated activities undertaken during 2005 that involved and included the colleges in their work. Departments reporting include the following:
  o Educational Services;
  o General Services;
  o Finance and Budget;
Human Resources;
- International Affairs;
- Marketing, Public Relations and Communications; and
- Information Technology;

- At least two, and in some cases, three district planning meetings have occurred at each college;
- The district has prepared planning binders that include all planning materials, notes, and background information for each member of the steering committee;
- The district has identified issues as the core of the strategic plan;
- The curriculum review and approval process in CIPD has been operating for several years and provides a model for other district-wide committees;
- The new district facilities advisory committee, based upon the CIPD model, intends to address facilities planning district-wide;
- The area that needs additional work is in finance. Although several meetings have occurred in relation to finance and the budget, there is not yet a clear district-wide budget model. Complicating the work in this area has been the transition from a legacy system to the PeopleSoft system, which has necessitated focus on a smooth transition to the new system. Both the chancellor and the board of trustees have restated the commitment to expand the budget process and make it transparent. Further, efforts will be taken to formulate a district-wide information technology committee which will be charged with creation of a district-wide information technology plan.

**College Response**

In addition to faculty, staff, students and administrators being involved in the district-wide strategic planning process, Merritt College has also been engaged in a college integrated planning and budgeting process, as detailed in Merritt’s response to the College Recommendation.

**List of Documents**

1. Letter from Presidents to Planning Committee February 8, 2005;
2. Planning process;
3. Roster of steering committee;
4. List of planning meetings;
5. Shared mission, vision, and values statements;
6. Diagram of planning process;
7. Minutes of board of trustee retreats;
8. Strategic initiatives;
9. Minutes from CIPD;
10. Approved curriculum for 2004-05 sent to trustees;
11. Draft of Guidelines for the District-Wide Facilities Advisory Committee; and
12. Agendas and Minutes from Peralta Community College District Facilities Advisory Planning Committee

**District Recommendation Two:**

The team recommends that the Peralta Community College District provide a detailed and concrete plan that clearly identifies the steps, timelines and measurable actions that are being undertaken by the district to provide funding for the long-term liability posed by healthcare benefits. (Standard 9C.1)

**Progress to Date:**
**District Response as of September 30, 2005:**

The district office has developed a planned approach to reducing the unfunded liability of the district with both short- and long-term actions as follows:

1. Engaged an actuarial study that resulted in a reduction of the liability from $150,000,000 to $115,000,000;
2. Negotiated a reduction in the costs of medical benefits by changing medical carriers and by requiring a medical co-pay;
3. Designed a plan to issue up to $250 million in medical benefits bonds to fund and pay for ongoing medical benefits for both current and retired employees. The necessary steps to accomplish this are as follows:
   - Enlist an actuary to quantify the district’s current and future Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) liability;
   - Establish dedicated OPEB trust and improve matching between OPEB assets and liability profile;
   - Have board of trustees adopt an OPEB investment policy;
   - Contract with ACERA or any institutional governmental asset manager to invest OPEB trust;
   - Validate obligation by filing a petition in Superior Court of Alameda County. This gives the district the legal standing to issue the bonds;
   - Issue taxable OPEB bonds to fund the district’s OPEB obligation; and
   - Structure OPEB bonds such that debt service plus normal cost is less than the projected pay-as-you-go liability.

The District retained the actuarial firm of Bartel & Associates LLC on July 22, 2005. The Peralta Board of Trustees, on July 26, 2005, passed a resolution authorizing the district to issue up to $250 million in OPEB
bonds. On August 12, 2005, the District filed in Superior Court a petition for bond validation. The chancellor, the chairman of the board finance & audit committee, and the district's chief financial officer interviewed four investment banking firms in New York on September 8 and 9, 2005. The district will be selecting an investment firm during the next month to market and sell the bonds. The district expects the transaction to close in January 2006.

The board of trustees is also in the process of revising its investment policy. Once they have completed this, the district will have a new investment policy in place that it will then utilize to guide the investment of the proceeds from the bond sales.

**Analysis of Results Achieved to Date**

- The district, as a result of negotiations with the unions, changed and implemented union contracts in July 2004. These contracts require a medical co-pay which has been implemented and is operational; District medical benefits end at age 65 for all employees hired after July 1, 2004; and 10 years is now required for vesting of all employees hired after July 1, 2004. Previously, the requirement for vesting of academic employees had been five years.
- The district replaced Blue Cross with Interplan, a network of physicians, and Core Source as administrator of services in September 2004. This action reduced administrative costs of our medical benefit program and also allows the district to qualify for rebates which also defray district costs;
- On September 8 and 9, 2005, the chancellor, assistant vice chancellor for finance and budget, President of the Peralta Federation of Teachers (PFT), and chair of the board's committee on audit and finance traveled to New York to interview prospective investment firms.

**College Response**

Merritt College acknowledges the importance of decisive action on this recommendation on the part of the district office in moving from the pay-as-you-go strategy to full disclosure by 2006-07, per the new Government Accounting Standards Board requirements.

The change in union contracts incorporated the following: a co-pay program; the ending of district medical benefits at age 65 for those hired after July 1, 2004; and vesting time changed from five years up to ten years. All of these decisions have slowed the growth of liability. By far the most positive action taken is the proposal around the issuance of a medical benefits obligation bond. During Chancellor Harris’s tenure as Mayor of Oakland, the city successfully issued such bonds to deal with a similar situation. The hiring of Vice Chancellor of Finance Tom Smith on December 1, 2004, has added to the leadership in this investment/bond
area. The general response from Merritt faculty and staff has been a strong desire for the district to successfully resolve this issue. They are hopeful that the Chancellor’s efforts to secure bond funding are successful.

List of Documents

- Resolution of the board of trustees authorizing issuance of bonds;
- Superior Court petition for bond validation;
- Draft of board investment policy; and
- Union contracts.

District Recommendation Three A & B:

The team recommends that the Board of Trustees adhere to its appropriate functions and policy orientation, and rely upon the District Chancellor for recommendations affecting the organization of the district as well as the hiring, retention, and termination of all categories of district and college staff. The team further recommends that the Board of Trustees clearly identify and widely disseminate the roles and responsibilities assigned to the district administration and those assigned to the college administration so that the appropriate responsibility and authority and related accountability standards are established. (Standards 10A.3, 10A.4, 10C.1, 10C.2, 10C.3)

Progress to Date:

Since 2004, the board of trustees has continued to take steps to ensure that all members clearly understand its governance role. In May 2004, the vice chancellor for human resources conducted a special closed session in which she defined micro-managing, as it relates to the district, and discussed with the trustees their role and responsibilities as board members.

On September 21, 2004, the District held a candidate’s night for the eight candidates who were running for the four Board seats. College Presidents and District Service Center personnel attended to present and discuss with the potential new trustees their roles and responsibilities and the district /colleges roles, including the accreditation roles.

In continuation of that effort, on December 7, 2004, Dr. David Viar, executive director of the Community College League of California, conducted a subsequent workshop for the board of trustees, which included the four newly elected members. The meeting was open to the public and complied with the Brown Act. All board members were present. Dr. Viar discussed the district and college decision-making processes. He also specifically addressed board “micro-managing” and offered best practices on how board members can assure performance and hold the chancellor accountable without overstepping their role.
District General Counsel Thuy Thi Nguyen, on March 3, 2005, as part of an overall special retreat on strategic planning, discussed with the board in closed session the board’s role and legal requirements placed on board members in the context of several pending and potential lawsuits.

The board of trustees also discussed its role in several board retreats held in 2005. At the March retreat, the board discussed strategic planning and the role of the board in moving planning forward. To that end, the board discussed the established goals of the board to ensure they provided clear direction to the college community. At the June 24-25, 2005 session, MIG consultants led the board through a discussion in which the board acknowledged that what is needed “is a concrete statement about the way in which the college plans drive the five district service centers.” The major part of the second day of the retreat focused on “the board’s role and responsibility in strategic planning and leadership of the district by focusing on policy issues and not micromanagement of the district and colleges.”

**Analysis of Results Achieved to Date**

1. Previously, the Board of Trustees approved “request to advertise” classified positions during open sessions of board meetings. Since July 12, 2005, the board no longer approves advertisement of classified positions. As long as there is a budget in place to fund classified positions, there is no reason for the board to involve itself in approving such requests. The board would ensure accountability from the institution through the budgetary process;
2. Previously, the board of trustees approved employment of classified employees in closed session and such appointments would thereafter be announced in open session. Since July 12, 2005, the board no longer approves the employment of classified employees in either open or closed session. The board has delegated such authorization authority to the chancellor; and
3. The Board Policy Review committee is committed to separating the board policy from administrative procedures so that the board of trustees only develops and reviews board policies. The board has delegated administrative procedures to the chancellor and his staff to develop and revise. Such delegation has already occurred as evidenced by the board’s approval of several board policies in chapter one of the Board Policy Manual on July 12, 2005. The board did not approve any administrative procedures at this board meeting. In addition to revisions and development of board policies relating to board meetings and board officers, the policy review committee developed and the board approved Board Policy 1.20, a new policy that delineates the board’s role in the chancellor selection.

**College Response**
Four new trustee members were elected to the Peralta Board in November 2004. Since that time the board discussed the ACCJC recommendations at the December board orientation meeting conducted by David Viar at the March Board retreat, and at the June Board retreat. Board members have been supportive of the colleges, and are honoring their role as policy makers.

**List of Documents**

- Goals of the policy review committee, 2005;
- Board meeting agenda; timed agenda; board meeting minutes; and handout from Dr. Viar;
- The Brown Act pamphlet;
- Last board meeting agenda with “Request to Advertise”; first board meeting agenda without “Request to Advertise”; and meeting minutes;
- Last board meeting agenda with “Employment”; first board meeting agenda without “Employment” in closed session; and meeting minutes; and
- July 12, 2005 Board meeting agenda; July 12, 2005 Board meeting minutes; July 12, 2005 Board meeting materials; and Board Policy 1.20 (Chancellor Selection).
MERRITT COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION
Recommendation 1: Merritt College

The college engage in a deliberate, focused and concerted effort to identify the most effective ways to assure that its institutional research and evaluation processes, policies and practices are developed and implemented within a timely and efficient manner. (Standards 3.A.1, 3.A.2, 3.A.3, 3.A.4)

Merritt College uses a wide variety of data to inform its decision-making: student demographic data generated by the Peralta District Office of Research, data collected as part of the Integrated Planning Process, and data collected and compiled through participation in such planning and research efforts as the Title III Planning Grant, the Equity for All-Scorecard Project, and the Dale Tillery Institute, among others. Since fall of 2004, the college has actively engaged in designing an integrated planning and budgeting process that includes a focus on student learning outcomes and an overarching goal of increasing institutional effectiveness.

The Vice President for Student Services was assigned overall responsibility for leading the development and implementation of the integrated planning and budgeting process and supporting systems. In June 2005, Merritt College hired a full-time Research and Planning Officer whose responsibility has been to gather, analyze, and interpret data for various college constituencies for program planning and grant planning purposes.

To date, the college Research and Planning Officer has met with many College constituencies, including the Administrative Leadership Council, the Integrated Planning Committee, the Title III planning group, the Equity for All-Scorecard Project group, the Dale Tillery Institute group, and others. The IPC, Research and Planning Officer and Vice President of Student Services designed the proposed Annual Progress Report and Action Plan. As the College implements its integrated planning process at the unit level through creation of action plans that address institutional priorities and strategic directions, the College Research and Planning Officer’s expertise will guide us in measuring progress toward achievement of our goals.

In the section below, we use the college’s engagement in the following concurrent planning and evaluation processes as evidence of the college’s commitment to institutional research and evaluation: 1) Integrated Planning and Budgeting Process; 2) Title III Planning Grant; 3) Student Learning Outcomes; 4) Equity for All-Scorecard Project; 5) Dale Tillery Institute.
3A.1 Institutional research is integrated with and supportive of institutional planning and evaluation.

**Progress to Date**

**Integrated Planning and Budgeting Process**

The Task Force on Integrated Planning & Budgeting, under the auspices of the College Council, was created in September of 2004 to serve as the initial planning body to recommend strategies for the college to use to integrate its planning and budgeting processes. The role of the Task Force included participation in facilitated work sessions to develop a shared understanding of planning processes, create a planning agenda, and clearly define the relationship between planning and budgeting. The Task Force membership included the College President, Vice Presidents of Instruction and Student Services, Deans of Instruction and Student Services, the Business Manager, three faculty representatives, three classified representatives, and one student representative.

The Task Force on Integrated Planning and Budgeting developed the first Integrated Planning and Budgeting Model. The model was approved by the College Council on April 20, 2005.

Upon approval of the new model, the Task Force was disbanded and the Integrated Planning Committee (IPC) was created. As a subcommittee of the College Council, the charge of the IPC is to 1) conduct a situational analysis; 2) recommend 3-5 Strategic Directions to shared governance groups; 3) recommend Annual Institutional Priorities; and 4) review, analyze and comment on unit Annual Action Plans. The IPC composition is as follows: two administrators (one from instruction, one from student services), three faculty, two classified staff, one of whom is the College Research and Planning Officer, and one student.

**June and July, 2005**

The IPC held a two-day retreat (June 28-29) to review documents and identify critical issues and future directions related to the following: teaching and learning; access, success, growth and diversity; workforce and economic development; facilities; technology; budget and budget process; and community engagement. The Title III/Scorecard Project Director was invited to participate in the IPC retreats as well. Documents reviewed included the Accreditation Self Study and ACCJC Responses; College Mission, Values, and Vision; Program Reviews; College Educational Plan; College Facilities Plan; Matriculation Plan; Title III documents; and Annual Program Plans from Categorical Programs. Four Strategic Directions for the next five years were drafted: 1. Student Learning Outcomes; 2. Culture of Communication; 3. Technology and Media Resources; 4. Human, Fiscal, and Physical Resources.
On July 15, 2005, the IPC held a half-day retreat, during which it drafted 2006-07 Institutional Priorities and refined the draft institutional effectiveness statement, which follows:

As an effective institution committed to its mission, Merritt College galvanizes and organizes its human, fiscal and physical resources to ensure that students attain knowledge, master skills, and develop the appreciation, attitudes and values needed to succeed and participate responsibly in a democratic society. In this spirit, College constituents remain committed to continually examining and utilizing data as the basis for collegial dialogue and institutional decision-making.

The week of July 18, the IPC endorsed the draft 2005-06 Institutional Priorities as necessary precursors to the 2006-07 Institutional Priorities.

August 2005

- The Draft Strategic Directions and Institutional Priorities were sent to the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Associated Students of Merritt College, and Administrative Leadership Council for review and feedback from their respective Senates/Council. (Week of August 1st)

- Based on the draft Strategic Directions & Institutional Priorities, each college executive administrator developed goals for his/her respective division (i.e. President’s Office, Instruction, Student Services, and Business Services).

- Campus Summit #1 was held on August 11, 2005 to obtain campus feedback on Strategic Directions and Institutional Priorities. (Target audience: Student Services, Business Services, President’s Office Staff, non-teaching personnel in Instruction).

- Campus Summit #2/Professional Day was held on August 16, 2005 to obtain campus feedback on Strategic Directions and Institutional Priorities. (Target audience: instructional faculty).

- On August 31, 2005, the College Council received IPC’s Draft Strategic Directions and Institutional Priorities as well as feedback from the three Senates, Administrative Leadership Council and the two Campus Summits. College Council modified and endorsed the 2005-2010 Strategic Directions as well as the 2005/06 and 2006/07 Institutional Priorities.

- On August 31, 2005, the College Council reviewed the draft definition of Institutional Effectiveness and agreed that we should continue dialogue on the definition in an effort to arrive at a campus-wide shared understanding of how institutional effectiveness is defined and measured.
STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS:

STRATEGIC DIRECTION I: STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

*Improve the effectiveness of teaching and learning at Merritt College through the development and implementation of student learning outcomes for both instruction and support services.*

**STATEMENT OF INTENT**

As reflected in our mission statement, Merritt College is committed to helping students attain knowledge, master skills, and develop the appreciation, attitudes and values needed to succeed and participate responsibly in a democratic society. Towards this end, the College will:

a) identify expected outcomes as to what students should know and/or be able to do as a consequence of completing a course program or utilizing a support service;

b) systematically and routinely measure the attainment of those outcomes;

c) effectively communicate the results of this assessment; and

d) utilize the measurement/assessment data to revamp/refine courses and support services and to inform allocation of human, fiscal and physical resources.

STRATEGIC DIRECTION II: CULTURE OF COMMUNICATION

*Make clear communication and listening a way of life at Merritt College in order to arrive at truly shared values and develop an appreciation of the diverse perspectives in the College community.*

**STATEMENT OF INTENT**

Consistent with Merritt’s mission to develop appreciation and attitudes for success, provide lifelong learning opportunities, and foster a caring learning environment, we will develop a community that excels in the communication of ideas, values and decisions among all segments of the Merritt College community in a timely, efficient, free flowing manner. Towards this end, Merritt College will develop mechanisms to:

a) create a shared understanding of how institutional effectiveness is defined and measured;

b) provide regular and timely communication of ideas, information, decisions, news, priorities, action plans and progress among college constituencies; and

c) develop a feedback loop through which college constituencies can participate.

STRATEGIC DIRECTION III: TECHNOLOGY AND MEDIA RESOURCES

*Develop and maintain technological, information and media resources that support the needs of students, faculty, and staff and that are consistent with the College’s mission.*

**STATEMENT OF INTENT**

An examination of the College’s technological infrastructure and media resources suggests that there are disparities in the technology and media
available to various segments within the College community. Some of these disparities exist as result of resources managed by the district; others are specific to the Merritt College campus. These disparities impact the ability of the College to optimize quality education and opportunities for life long learning. In order to enhance student experiences, increase faculty capacity to support growth, and improve the College’s ability to provide effective instruction and College services, Merritt College will:

a) provide technology and media resources, appropriate infrastructure modifications, and staff training sufficient to eliminate the current disparities;
b) develop and implement College technology and media standards; and
c) provide training so that information and learning resources may be used effectively and efficiently.

STRATEGIC DIRECTION IV: HUMAN, FISCAL AND PHYSICAL RESOURCES
Develop an institutional approach to optimize the utilization of existing resources and develop adequate future resources to support Merritt’s mission.

STATEMENT OF INTENT
In order to enhance institutional effectiveness, attain student learning outcomes, implement more effective communication strategies, and provide appropriate technological and media resources, it is imperative that the College maximize the utilization of current human, fiscal and physical resources, invest in innovation, and develop new revenue streams. Specifically, Merritt will:

a) pursue business partnerships that effectively link our curriculum with industry needs as well as service learning opportunities for students;
b) pursue grants, gifts, donations, and additional facility rental;
c) provide faculty/staff training and mentoring as an investment in our human resources; and
d) systematically maintain and upgrade campus facilities to provide an excellent, clean, and safe environment for learning.

Next Steps

- Annual Unit Action Plans. In October of 2005, each unit will develop Annual Action Plans for 2006-07 that support Institutional Priorities and Division Goals.
- Review and Analysis. December 1, 2005-January 31, 2006: IPC reviews, analyzes & comments on Unit Action Plans. If needed, IPC refers specific Action Plans to the following shared governance committees for specialized input and refinement: CDCPD (Council of Department Chairs & Program Directors), CIC (Curriculum &
Instructional Council), Facilities Committee, Technology Committee, and Budget Committee. IPC sends draft Action Plans to the Business Services Office for preliminary financial analysis.

- **Review and Feedback.** At the January 18 College Council Meeting, the IPC will present the preliminary summary and analysis of Action Plans for 1st reading and preliminary discussion.

- **Endorsement of College Action Plans.**
  A. College Council receives feedback from Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Associated Students of Merritt College, and Administrative Leadership Council, modifies (as needed), and endorses College Action Plans.
  B. College Council forwards recommended College Action Plans to the College Budget Committee for financial analysis.
  C. College Council forwards recommended Action Plans to the College President.

- **Presidential Approval.** The College President will act on recommended Action Plans in accordance with the College Council By-Laws and availability of funding.

### Title III Planning Grant

Merritt College was awarded a Title III Planning Grant, and the Title III Task Force has made substantial progress in its planning efforts. The Task Force is comprised of 6 faculty, 2 classified staff, one of whom is the College Research and Planning Officer, 3 administrators, 1 student, and a consultant grant writer. The Task Force has spearheaded an intensive campus-wide planning effort that lays the groundwork for a successful Title III Comprehensive Development Grant to be submitted in February 2006, and generates survey information and data that informs Title III planning and the college’s ongoing strategic planning effort, as well.

The Title III Task Force has gathered data and feedback through surveys and forums. Two college/community forums were held to collect information from campus staff and community members on potential priority areas for a Title III Comprehensive Development Grant, and an informal student survey was conducted on March 28, 2005.

The Task Force has conducted an extensive review and discussion of the existing planning information and research data available to the college. These data have come from four sources: 1) planning information from Merritt’s recent accreditation self-study and ongoing strategic planning process; 2) student demographic outcomes measures data collected by the District’s Institutional Research Office; 3) relevant data and ideas from outside sources and projects, including other successful Title III projects; and 4) Scorecard Project data.

The purpose of this data analysis was to supplement and find statistical evidence for some of the trends emerging from the anecdotal evidence
collected from community stakeholders early on during the Title III planning process. The Task Force also wanted to identify any significant trends that might point toward a possible Title III project as a plan for strengthening the institution.

In addition, Task Force members have reviewed ideas and “best practices” from other funded Title III projects, as well as reports on emerging concepts in the educational field, such as K-16 articulation, student learning outcomes, learning communities, 21st century core competencies, adult learning theory, community college institutional effectiveness, and models for developmental education—all areas in which Merritt faculty and administrators have voiced a strong interest. In fall 2004, the Task Force invited a Merritt faculty member who had participated in a successful Title III project at nearby Los Medanos College to speak about the lessons learned from that grant, particularly in the grant’s focus area of developmental education.

The Task Force read reports from the field. Two important resources have been 1) *Learning for the 21st Century*, produced by the Partnership for 21st Century Learning Skills, a collaborative project launched by the U.S. Department of Education; and 2) *Improving the Transition from High School to Postsecondary Education*. This second resource is an excerpt from a paper by the widely-acknowledged educational expert, Dr. Michael Kirst.

The Task Force has also reviewed and discussed the Accreditation Self-Study, the College Profile (containing student demographic data), the district-wide Environmental Scan, and the most recent Student Satisfaction and Climate Surveys. This included an examination of data normally collected on the Peralta system, such as student demographic data according to age, race, and ethnicity; student persistence, retention, and completion rates; English language learner trends; developmental education statistics; graduation and transfer rates; trends via disciplines, programs, and departments; information from the college’s primary “feeder” schools; and local demographic trends, employment trends, poverty levels, etc.

The arrival of the Research and Planning Officer has facilitated the gathering, analysis, and interpretation of data in order to identify the areas of greatest need with which a grant could assist the College in addressing institutional goals and objectives. As a result, the Title III Task Force has been provided with research data on exempt and matriculating students and a Merritt student profile. Currently, the Task Force is focusing its efforts on designing pathways, systems, and services to maximize student success.

**Next Steps**

- The Title III Program Officer will schedule a site visit.
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- The campus community agrees on a focus for the Title III grant application.
- The Title III Task Force will craft a problem statement that reflects that focus.
- The grant application will be developed using institutional and student data as evidence to support the existence of a campus problem that can be addressed through the Title III Plan.

Student Learning Outcomes

A. Student Learning Outcomes in Instruction

In 2003, the Vice President of Instruction began working on student learning outcomes as a pilot project with faculty in Landscape Horticulture and Child Development. The objective was to test the Ruth Stiehl model with vocational faculty who were already accustomed to considering outcomes when designing and revising vocational curricula. With the integration of learning outcomes into the new accreditation standards in 2002, it became clear that all college programs, services, and the institution itself were required to reflectively identify and articulate the benefits students were expected to receive at completion of their journey through a course, program, certificate, degree and student services at the institution.

In 2004-05, the Vice Presidents of Instruction and Student Services worked with programs in their areas to facilitate the identification and articulation of student learning outcomes for courses and services.

During fall of 2004, the Vice President of Instruction selected science programs with which to work. In November 2004, the Vice President convened faculty in Biology, Geology, Chemistry, and Environmental Sciences to move forward with identifying outcomes for one course and drafting assessments to measure students’ ability to demonstrate those outcomes. The following chart is a sample of the work performed on November 12, 2004.

Environmental Studies students should be able to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Function in an interdisciplinary environment with the ability to integrate and assess information.</td>
<td>Essays or drawings showing interaction of more than one system [2 or more systems]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work in teams.</td>
<td>Reports on contributions which team members make in project presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Formulate models of complex systems, seeing interrelationships and how systems interact with one another.</td>
<td>Flow charts of projects showing multiple inputs and outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Present information and communicate to others Type 1 &amp; Type 2 errors in data analysis.</td>
<td>Reviews of new and existing data sets and identify potential errors and unclear conclusions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A class in Urban and Regional Planning was offered during spring of 2005, and included four of the learning outcomes from the Environmental Studies list above. The students’ final project was used to evaluate their success at meeting the learning outcomes for the course. Results: 67% of the 1st year students met the outcomes compared to the benchmark of 60%, and 100% of the 2nd year students met the outcomes compared to the benchmark of 80%. The analysis assisted the instructor in identifying a student who needed more help, and a student who learned more than the instructor had anticipated.

A district-wide workshop on student learning outcomes was presented on the April 7, 2005, Professional Day by Vice Presidents Linda Berry-Camara (Merritt College) and Jannett Jackson (College of Alameda). The objective of the workshop was to present the concept of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) to a wider audience district-wide, and to prepare instructional faculty for a Ruth Stiehl workshop during the August 2005 professional days. The April workshop was well-attended by over 40 faculty from all 4 Peralta Colleges. Eight instructional programs, 2 per college, were chosen to participate in the interactive workshop with Dr. Stiehl during the August 2005 professional days. The programs selected by Merritt College were Real Estate and African-American Studies.

Dr. Stiehl was invited as the Keynote Speaker for the district-wide convocation on August 15, and then as the workshop presenter on SLOs in partnership with Linda Berry-Camara, Vice President of Instruction at Merritt College. Author of *The Outcomes Primer* (2002) and *The Mapping Primer* (2005), Dr. Stiehl is a nationally acclaimed expert on identifying and assessing student learning outcomes, and has worked with colleges across the country and in Hawaii to facilitate the work of articulating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Understand how decisions are made in complex systems with degrees of uncertainties.</th>
<th>Reports on policy meetings or written implementation plans for class design projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Measure, assess, and communicate uncertainty.</td>
<td>Identify measurement goals and level of reliability of measurement methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Characterize initial or existing conditions.</td>
<td>Write project scope or baseline methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Identify goals and the consequences of action or inaction.</td>
<td>Project or policy designs and supporting arguments for implementation and possible drawbacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Make plan options in the context of whole systems in a variety of scales and different data sets.</td>
<td>Project or policy plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Perform the steps of a project:</td>
<td>Pilot in Spring 2005 to measure success:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify a project scope</td>
<td>1st year students: 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify a project goal &amp; level of reliability</td>
<td>2nd year students: 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Write an action plan to meet goal</td>
<td>Ability to apply skills and knowledge, and evaluate and revise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Evaluate outcome &amp; adopt new goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communicate each step and identify resources or capacity budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
outcomes and designing authentic assessments to measure those outcomes.

Eight instructional programs across the District have now identified learning outcomes and mapped their programs according to Ruth Stiehl’s model. On October 19, they will continue their work by drafting assessment tools to measure inside the classroom the ability to demonstrate those outcomes outside the classroom.

**Next Steps**

- Instructional participation in an interactive Professional Day workshop with Dr. Ruth Stiehl on October 19, 2005.
- In November, Merritt College instructional programs - Real Estate and African American Studies - will introduce the Ruth Stiehl model to at least one other program at Merritt College.
- During Spring 2006 term, the assessments will be pilot-tested and preliminary results reported on April 27, 2006, the District’s last professional day for the year.
- Beginning Spring 2006, student learning outcomes will be integrated into course outlines and program reviews.
B. Student Learning Outcomes in Student Services

In fall of 2004, the Vice President of Student Services initiated a process to address student learning outcomes within the Student Services Division. Four departments were selected as the first cluster within Student Services to participate in student learning outcomes assessment: DSPS, EOPS, Financial Aid and Student Activities. Each department has developed a mission statement and identified 3 student learning outcomes and assessment measures. These first cluster departments presently are collecting baseline data and implementing strategies to improve upon success rates attached to each outcome. The following is an example of the learning outcomes and assessment measures for several Student Services departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Services Unit</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DSP&amp;S</strong></td>
<td>1. Students will demonstrate self-advocacy skills regarding use of campus resources. Students will *be able to maneuver the process of setting up appropriate accommodations *demonstrate knowledge of DSPS programs and services *take advantage of priority registration</td>
<td>1.1. Focus group, DSP&amp;S students to identify self-advocacy needs and issues. 1.2. Rubric to score students' advocacy skills during a self-advocacy role play. 1.3. Data base tracking students' use of various support services. 1.4. Objective quiz administered before and after in-service workshop on the DSP&amp;S services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Students will improve writing skills upon completion of learning resources course.</td>
<td>2. Pre- and Post-test rubric to score writing sample at beginning and end of course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EOPS</strong></td>
<td>EOPS students will achieve self-sufficiency in the development, composition and revision of a Student Educational Plan.</td>
<td>Numerical tracking of successful completion of Student Educational Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Aid</strong></td>
<td>Students will know how to apply for financial aid on the web and/or the paper application without omission and error through scheduled workshops.</td>
<td>1. Pre &amp; post test regarding FAFSA application. 2. Number of correctly completed FAFSA applications. 3. Survey sample of financial aid applicants for self-report of competency in completing the application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second cluster group is composed of Health Services, Transfer Center, Counseling, and Puente. This group is in the process of developing mission statements, fine-tuning student learning outcomes and identifying assessment measures.

**Next Steps**

- **Cluster One Next Steps.** By the end of Spring 2006 all units in the first cluster will have completed data collection on each of their identified learning outcomes and developed plans to improve programs and services based on collected data.

- **Cluster Two Next Steps.** By December 2005 each unit in Cluster Two will have completed developing their Student Learning Outcome Plan, clearly specifying their departmental mission and identifying 5 learning outcomes and assessment tools.

**Equity for All-Scorecard Project**

Merritt College has been selected to participate in the Equity for All Project, a year-long partnership between The Center for Urban Education at the University of Southern California, the Lumina Foundation for Education, and the California Community College Chancellor’s Office.

The Scorecard Project seeks to identify and then close gaps in educational outcomes among minority and low-income students. Most traditional measures that guide postsecondary institutions focus on issues such as access and retention. However, these measures often focus on the student body as a whole. The Equity for All-Scorecard Project also focuses on access and outcomes, but looks at these measurements by ethnicity and gender.

At its conclusion, the project will measure outcomes produced by the four perspectives for all ethnic groups. Our goal, over the course of the project, is to examine Merritt's baseline data in order to establish measures and improvement targets relating to these four perspectives: 1) Academic Pathways; 2) Retention and Persistence; 3) Transfer Readiness; and 4) Excellence. Any inequities that occur will be easy to identify, providing opportunities to develop plans and interventions to close these gaps.

The Scorecard Project approach to institutional change is based on a participatory action research model. According to this Scorecard Project model, “... in order to bring about institutional change, individuals must see on their own, and as clearly as possible, the magnitude of inequities. They must analyze and integrate the meaning of the inequities, so that they are moved to act upon them.” In essence, the Scorecard Project requires a team of administrators, instructional faculty, and counselors to work through a participatory process to analyze diverse performance data.
Ultimately, the team will identify inequities and use the information to inform decision making.

To date, Merritt College team members have met three times with research associates from the Center for Urban Education, whose responsibility it is to collaborate with Merritt's team to achieve project goals and objectives. The meetings have been well attended by instructional faculty, counselors and administrators. The data gathered have been very insightful and are used to inform the Title III grant planning process. The team is currently completing its first perspective and has received a request from the Center for Urban Education to use its dataset of how to present data as a model for other teams to follow.

**Next Steps**

- Scorecard Project members continue to meet according to the Project Timeline.
- Interim Report on Academic Pathways (Perspective #1) will be completed October 11.
- Interim Reports on Retention (Perspective #2), Transfer Readiness (Perspective #3), and Excellence (Perspective #4) will be completed in November, January, and March, respectively.
- President’s report will be drafted in April of 2006, and an action plan developed to disseminate findings to the campus community.
- In May of 2006, the President’s report will be finalized, and the findings disseminated according to the action plan.

**Dale Tillery Institute**

In August of 2005, several Merritt faculty, administrators, and the College Research and Planning Officer attended the First Annual Dale Tillery Summer Institute for Community College Leadership and Innovation. The intent of the Institute was to provide a forum for discussing issues of equity in higher education, and to facilitate the drafting of college equity plans by the college teams.

Presentations included 1) research findings on the college experiences and perspectives of diverse students from community colleges throughout the state; 2) research on student involvement in activities such as research and mentoring that lead to greater self-efficacy; and 3) research that reveals ways in which community colleges are more fully engaging students to promote learning and achievement of educational goals.

While preparing to make a presentation on accomplishments and challenges at the college, the Merritt College Team discovered that college data does not provide complete, disaggregated information on our instructional and student service programs. For example, when citing the tremendous rise in the NCLEX pass rates for the Associate Degree
Nursing program, we asked “How did the changes that promoted excellence in the nursing program affect equity in terms of access for all students, opportunity and support, and service to the community?” A review of recent licensure accreditation documents does not help us answer these questions.

We were prompted to consider issues of equal access to programs, equal opportunities to succeed, equal treatment inside programs, equal outcomes, and adequate resources for all. We realized that the articulation of our accomplishments raises questions about equity, and that we need to devise ways to promote equity in all our planning processes on campus. The college’s participation in the Dale Tillery Institute has brought awareness that the college is at the initial data gathering stage of the inquiry process as we seek to evaluate access, success, and equity issues in our instructional programs.

Next Steps

- Review general demographic data for the college and service area.
- Work with College Research and Planning Officer to collect and analyze admissions and matriculation data for licensure programs, both for successful and unsuccessful applicants.
- Review and analyze profile of successful and unsuccessful students.
- Involve program faculty in drafting a plan to address inequities in access and success.

Progress to Date

In 2004, Merritt College was awarded a Title III Planning Grant to explore through surveys, retention rates, and course completion data areas in which a comprehensive 5-year grant could facilitate student success. To assist with this effort, President Wesley allocated funds to hire a consultant grant writer through the term of the Planning Grant. In addition, the President made a commitment to permanently fund a full-time Research and Planning Officer.

College faculty, staff, and administrators have participated in several conferences related to research and planning in order to more fully support college efforts to improve effectiveness in these areas.

In March 2005, President Wesley sent faculty and staff with the Vice President of Student Services to the 2nd annual conference on Developing Planning Models for Institutional Effectiveness in Miami, Florida. Conference participants were presented the foundations of strategic
planning, and were introduced to strategies that link the college mission, vision, environmental scans and budgeting processes into a sound plan for institutional effectiveness and community building. The college’s Task Force on Integrated Planning and Budgeting (and later the Integrated Planning Committee) used these strategies as they engaged in the process of linking planning and budgeting, and drafting strategic directions for the college.

In May 2005, a college team traveled to the University of Southern California in Los Angeles to participate in the Equity for All-Scorecard Project. The President’s promise to expand research and planning efforts and to ensure equity in college plans afforded faculty, staff, and administrators the time to become involved in these data-based initiatives that will eventually lead to data-driven program review and curriculum revision.

Finally, in August of 2005, the college sent a team of five to the Dale Tillery Institute at the University of California, Berkeley, with the objective of examining ways to ensure that social justice and equity are considered when implementing curricula and student success strategies.

Next Steps

- In December 2005 a Student Equity Plan will be submitted to the State Chancellor’s Office.
- By February 2006, the Title III Task Force will have identified focused activities and drafted a Title III Strengthening Institutions Development Grant proposal for submission.
- In May 2006, the Scorecard Project data collection and analysis will be completed and the findings disseminated to the campus community.
- In August 2006, a college equity plan will be submitted to the 2nd Annual Dale Tillery Institute.

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

Progress To Date

The Integrated Planning Committee (IPC) held a two-day retreat June 28-29, at which time it reviewed the College Mission, Values, and Vision as well as other documents to identify critical issues and future directions for the college. The four Strategic Directions for the college - Student
Learning Outcomes, Culture of Communication; Technology and Media Resources; Human, Fiscal, and Physical Resources - are directly linked to the College Mission, Values, and Vision. In July, the IPC drafted 2005-06 and 2006-07 institutional priorities that reflect the College Mission, Values, and Vision.

Each year, college units will submit Action Plans reflective of strategic directions and institutional priorities, with assessment of accomplishments of the previous year’s plans. Beginning in 2006-07, benchmarks consisting of promising practices will be included in Unit Action Plans. The agreed-upon **2005-06 institutional priorities** are as follows:

**Strategic Direction 1: Student Learning Outcomes**
- Develop agreed upon **institutional** Student Learning Outcomes.

**Strategic Direction 2: Culture of Communication**
- Implement the new Merritt Integrated Planning and Budgeting System;
- Create a shared understanding of how institutional effectiveness is defined and measured;
- Develop agreed-upon systems for communicating ideas, information, decisions, news, priorities, action plans and progress among college constituencies in a timely manner.

**Strategic Direction 3: Technology and Media Resources**
- Implement effective and efficient processes and procedures for requesting and accessing Audio-Visual equipment and publish User Guidelines;
- Inventory Audio-Visual resources on campus, assess needs, and develop an A-V Plan for Merritt;
- Inventory technology resources on campus, assess needs, and develop a Preliminary Technology Plan.

**Strategic Direction 4: Human, Fiscal, and Physical Resources**
- Explore grants and partnerships that effectively link Merritt’s curriculum with community/industry needs, and develop a comprehensive list of such opportunities;
- Evaluate Merritt’s campus facilities for proper maintenance, accessibility and utilization, and prioritize campus needs;
- Expedite the completion of the building remodel projects that are in process;
- Assess faculty and staff training and mentoring needs and create a comprehensive list.

The **2006-07 institutional priorities and division goals**, listed below, advance the 2005-06 priorities, and move the college closer towards ensuring and assessing institutional effectiveness.
**Strategic Direction 1: Student Learning Outcomes**

- Each unit will identify expected outcomes as to what students should know and/or be able to do as a consequence of completing a course program or utilizing a support service AND develop related tools and processes for assessment of same.

**Administrative Services Goal:**

By the end of 2006-2007, the administrative team and President's Office staff will:

1.1 Provide the leadership necessary for the development and implementation of administrative systems that efficiently and effectively support learning, teaching and the delivery of services.
1.2 Develop clear, focused and measurable goals with timelines and action plans for achieving the institutional priorities and strategic directions of the college.
1.3 Develop a mission statement, learning outcomes and methods for assessing each outcome for their respective areas.
1.4 Identify the human, fiscal and physical resources needed to achieve their mission and intended outcomes.

**Business Services Goal:**

1.1 By the end of the 2006-07 academic year, each business services unit will have: developed a mission statement, identified Student Learning Outcomes (SLO’s), and identified appropriate assessment tools and processes.

**Instructional Divisions & Services Goals:**

1.1 By the middle of the 2006-07 academic year, the Student Learning Outcomes model will have been introduced to designated disciplines.
1.2 By the end of the 2006-07 academic year, the SLO process will be presented to Department Chairs.
1.3 By the end of the 2006-07 academic year, a timeline will be established for engaging all instructional disciplines in identifying Student Learning Outcomes.

**Student Services Goals:**

1.1 By the end of the 2006-07 academic year, each student services unit will have: developed a mission statement, identified at least five Student learning Outcomes (SLO’s), and identified appropriate assessment tools and processes.
1.2 By the end of the 2006-07 academic year, fifty percent of the Student Services units will have: completed implementation plan for at least 3 SLO’s; collected, analyzed and disseminated data; and developed a plan to enhance programs and services based on that data.
1.3 By the end of 2006-07 academic year, each student services unit will have: identified specific service area/programmatic objectives and strategies for achieving those objectives.
Strategic Direction 2: Culture of Communication

- Each unit in the college will implement forums, systems, and opportunities for communicating ideas, information, decisions, news, priorities, action plans and progress within each unit and college-wide, AND evaluate the effectiveness of the forums and systems.

Administrative Services Goal:
- By the end of 2006-2007 the administrative team and President's Office staff will implement systems for communicating ideas, decisions, news and action plans to:
  2.1 Keep campus constituencies informed about campus life while also encouraging their participation in governance decision making processes and campus activities.
  2.2 Provide leadership, advocacy and the direction necessary to articulate the institutional priorities and strategic directions that achieve the mission, vision and values of the college.

Business Services Goal:
- 2.1 Communicate to the general college community through workshops, clear memorandum and the development of an up to date web page.

Instructional Divisions & Services Goals:
- 2.1 Improve communication regarding Schedules, Curricula, and Textbook orders.
- 2.2 Schedule regular department and division meetings.
- 2.3 Use the Merritt Website to communicate instructional matters to faculty, staff, and the community.

Student Services Goals:
- 2.1 Implement forums, systems and opportunities for communicating ideas, information, decisions, news, priorities, action plans and progress within each unit and within Student Services in a timely manner.
- 2.2 Establish a program/service for dispute/conflict resolution to assist in the management of student conflicts.

Strategic Direction 3: Technology and Media Resources

Based on the 2005-06 inventory and assessment of technology and media resources on campus and the preliminary plan, the college will
- Adopt and implement a comprehensive Technology Plan;
- Implement the newly developed Audio-Visual Plan.

Administrative Services Goal:
- By the end of 2006-2007, the administrative team and staff in the President's Office will:
  3.1 Facilitate the processes necessary to prioritize the technology and media resource needs for their respective areas.
  3.2 Conduct an assessment of the need for technology and media resource training in their respective areas.

Business Services Goal:
- 3.1 Develop clear procedures, guidelines and request forms making it easy for staff to access equipment and services.
Instructional Divisions & Services Goals:
   3.1 Audit technology access in classrooms and instructional offices.
   3.2 Facilitate creation of faculty web pages.

Student Services Goals:
   3.1 By the end of 2006-07 academic year, one hundred percent of Student Services unit coordinators and management staff will have participated in training and be able to effectively utilize the newly implemented District-wide PeopleSoft Systems as they pertain to Student Services functions.
   3.2 Student Services faculty and staff will be proficient in the use of basic office software including but not limited to Microsoft Outlook, Microsoft Word and Microsoft Excel.

**Strategic Direction 4: Human, Fiscal, and Physical Resources**
- Based on the 2005-06 exploration opportunities, establish business partnerships; create service learning initiatives; and pursue grants, gifts, donations, and additional facility rentals.
- Based on the 2005-06 evaluation and prioritization, implement facilities maintenance, accessibility, and utilization plan;
- Expedite completion of the in-process building remodel projects;
- Implement faculty and staff training and mentoring as an investment in Merritt’s human resources.

Administrative Services Goal:
   By the end of 2006-2007 the administrative team and staff in the Office of the President will:
   4.1 Lead the campus community in developing a comprehensive resource development plan to support staff development; the expansion and creation of innovative programs and services; and facilities maintenance.
   4.2 Actively engage campus constituents in updating and implementing the facilities master plan.

Business Services Goal:
   4.1 Develop goals, objectives and improvements plans.

Instructional Divisions & Services Goals:
   4.1 Ensure that facility modernization meets instructional needs of the college.
   4.2 Provide appropriate educational offerings in high growth and/or high need areas.

Student Services Goals:
   4.1 Implement collaborative programs and activities among faculty, staff and students that involve mentorship, community service and implement collaborative programs that facilitate interaction between Merritt’s off-campus and on campus constituencies.
Next Steps

- All units in the college will develop and submit 2006-07 Unit Action Plans by November for administrative review, analysis, and recommendation by the executive administrator.
- In December of 2006 the IPC reviews, analyzes and comments on Unit Action Plans.
- In January of 2006, the IPC will present Action Plans to the College Council for review and discussion.
- The College Council endorses Action Plans and forwards them to the College Budget Committee for financial analysis and to the College President for approval.

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

Progress to Date

Merritt College has, over the years, used formal program review as well as informal program evaluation to request additional resource allocation and to effect programmatic change intended to lead to greater student success. For example, Landscape Horticulture voluntarily underwent a program review process in support of its argument that program facilities are in dire need of expansion and modification. The report was submitted to the board of trustees with a request for additional funding and higher prioritization. Although the Landscape Horticulture project is not as high on the list as they had hoped, the program has been allocated 3.4 million dollars for facility reconstruction that will afford them the ability to expand instruction and services to students.

Informally, programs such as the Math program have observed a problem, such as attrition in math courses, and addressed it through curricular changes. Math department faculty created a series of unit-based supplemental math courses that students are strongly encouraged to enroll in once they sign up for the traditional algebra and statistics classes. Anecdotally, these additional classes have improved retention in math classes. The College Research and Planning Officer can provide retention data to ascertain if this is a model that should be followed for other programs with high attrition, such as chemistry.

Merritt College’s licensure programs, such as Nursing and Radiological Technology, regularly use student success rates to inform curricular revision. For example, the NCLEX pass rate for Merritt’s Associate Degree Nursing program had been steadily declining over the past decade to a low of about 50%. Last year, the AD Nursing Program Director, in collaboration with faculty, implemented several practices to improve student success. The following are strategies they employed in 2003-2005
that have led to greater retention, program completion, and higher NCLEX pass rates:

1. Increase in program pass rate. Program faculty researched and assessed success rates and program criteria of comparable AD Nursing programs throughout the state. It was discovered the Merritt’s AD Nursing programs had one of the lowest program pass rates, and certainly one of the lowest performance rates on the NCLEX. The program pass rate was raised from 70% to 75% to align with comparable programs.

2. ATI implementation during the first term and throughout the program. The ATI is a Web-based battery of tests that provides baseline data on a student’s strengths and weaknesses in critical thinking, basic math, sciences, English, and reading. The student’s performance is measured against other associate degree nursing students nationwide.

3. Academic advising based on ATI results. Students exhibiting weaknesses in one or more of the critical areas above are provided academic options by nursing faculty.

4. Mentoring/Remediation. Students whose overall performance in first-semester theory classes is between 70-75% (with 75% the minimum standard) are mentored and provided remediation opportunities to achieve the 75% minimum pass rate.

5. Mock NCLEX. During the last semester of this two-year program, students are required to take a mock NCLEX exam as preparation for taking their Board exam after graduation.

6. Boot camp. After graduation, students exhibiting weakness in one or more areas were strongly encouraged to enroll in workshops that specifically dealt with those areas.

The strategies above greatly increased the student success rate on the NCLEX (which is taken post-graduation). One hundred percent of the graduating class of 2005 took the NCLEX and passed on the first attempt. This pilot project in AD Nursing will be showcased as a model for Merritt College licensure programs that need to improve success rates.

The College’s Radiological Technology program has historically had excellent pass rates on the licensure exam. However, there have been concerns regarding their attrition rate. In 2004-05, the program instituted a peer-tutoring/mentoring strategy to improve program retention rates. Results thus far are promising, but final attrition rates can only be calculated at the end of the two-year program, in June of 2006.

**NEXT STEPS**

- Formalize the AD Nursing Mentoring/Remediation student success strategy.
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- Continue to use ATI in AD Nursing to assess beginning and on-going performance in critical areas.
- Explore creating a bridge from the Licensed Vocational Nursing program to the Associate Degree Nursing program.
- Assess results of peer-tutoring/mentoring program in Radiological Technology and make recommendation to the Dean.

SUMMARY

In the coming year, Merritt College will continue to work on the mosaic of research and planning efforts to achieve an integrated picture in which each process informs the other and leads to implementation efforts. For example, the Annual Progress Report and Unit Action Plans might segue into program review, which itself should be informed by the articulation of student learning outcomes for instruction, student services, and the institution. The Title III planning efforts are intended to lead to a 5-year grant application which, if funded, will 1) provide monies to address a college need identified through data collection, and 2) provide the impetus to institutionalize the grant efforts in order to achieve sustainability. The Scorecard Project is concentrated on data collection of student success based on ethnicity and gender, but the purpose of this data collection is to improve learning and academic success for all student populations at Merritt College. These data will assist us in shaping the Title III grant application as well as the college equity plan to be submitted to the 2nd Annual Dale Tillery Institute (August 2006) as part of the college’s commitment to Institute goals.

What has evolved from these various data collection and planning efforts is the importance of developing an integrated research agenda as part of the planning feedback loop. The establishment of a College Research Office with a full-time College Research and Planning Officer provides a critical resource for the college to identify research priorities for the institution, analyze data, and link those results to future planning and program improvement. To this end, the College Research Committee will be reconstituted, with its main charge to draft a research and implementation plan by the end of the academic year.

In addition, a preliminary technology plan will be drafted in 2005-06 using surveys, needs assessments, and Unit Action Plans. The strategic directions, institutional priorities, and unit action plans will intersect with program review, identification of student learning outcomes, and drafting of the research and implementation and technology plans. When finally compiled, all these data collection and planning efforts should lead to the development of a college educational master plan that can be used as the main reference document for resource allocation.
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