FOLLOW-UP VISIT PEER REVIEW TEAM REPORT

GROSSMONT COLLEGE
8800 Grossmont College Drive
El Cajon, CA 92020

This report represents the findings of the Peer Review Team that conducted a virtual visit to Grossmont College from April 8, 2021 to April 9, 2021. The Commission acted on the accredited status of the institution during its June 2021 meeting and this team report must be reviewed in conjunction with the Commission's Action letter.

Submitted by:

Loretta P. Adrian, Ph.D.	President	Coastline College
Name of Team Chair	Title	Institution
Dr. Marie Bruley	Professor of Mathematics	Merced College
Name of Team Member	Title	Institution
Mr. Kelly Enos	Acting Dean, Academic Affairs	LA Mission College
Name of Team Member	Title	Institution

DATE: April 25, 2021

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

FROM: Loretta P. Adrian, Team Chair

SUBJECT: Follow Up Visit to Grossmont College

Introduction:
A virtual Follow-Up Peer Review Team Visit was conducted at Grossmont College and the Grossmont Cuyamaca Community College District on April 8-9, 2021. The purpose of the visit was to determine whether the College and the District have addressed the requirements of the Commission as stipulated in the Commission Action Letter of January 27, 2020.

The team was comprised of the following members:

Loretta P. Adrian, Ph. D., President of Coastline College
Marie Bruley, Ed. D., Professor of Mathematics, Merced College
Kelly William Enos, Acting Dean of Academic Affairs, Los Angeles Mission College

The team found that the College had prepared well for the visit. A pre-visit meeting was held with the college president and the Accrediting Liaison Officer prior to the follow-up visit; multiple group meetings were arranged by the Accreditation Liaison Officer (SLO) as requested by team members and/or agreed upon earlier with the team chair. Grossmont submitted a follow-up report to ACCJC and disseminated to the team members on March 1, 2021. An addendum to the follow-up report was provided to the team on March 31, 2021. These and other documents, as well as additional information gathered during the visit, provided evidence for the significant amount of work the college and the district have done to meet the Commission compliance requirements.

Over the course of the two-day follow-up visit, the team met with more than 30 individuals during 9-10 group meetings with faculty, administrators, and professional staff:

Dr. Lynn Neault, Chancellor, Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District
Dr. Joan Ahrens, Acting Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO)/Acting Senior Dean of College Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (CPIE), Grossmont College
Professor Tate Hurvitz, Faculty Accreditation Coordinator, Grossmont College
Work Team 2 - SLO Implementation: faculty leaders on Academic Program Review, SLO Coordinator for Academic Affairs, two instructional deans, and two faculty department chairs

Work Team 3 - SLOs on Syllabi: SLO liaisons, Department Chairs (4) and Coordinators, Administrative Assistants, SLO Coordinator for Academic Affairs

Work Team 3 – SLO on Syllabi (second session): SLO Coordinators, faculty curriculum chair

Work Team 2 – SLO Implementation, Student Services: faculty leaders and representatives from Student Services Program Review Committee, Student Services Outcomes Assessment Coordinator/Program Review Chair, research and planning analyst from CPIE

Work Team 2 – SLO Implementation GOAT: SLO Coordinators

Work Team 1 – RSI: faculty, administrators, and professional development staff, Instruction Design Tech Specialist for Distance Education/Co-Chair of the OTLC Committee

Work Team 3 – SLO on Syllabi: SLO Coordinators and faculty

Tim Corcoran, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, GCCCD

Alyssa Brown, District Director of Human Resources, GCCCD

The Follow-Up Report and visit were expected to document resolution to the following ACCJC compliance recommendations:

District Requirement 1: In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires that the District ensure that all classified and management employees are systematically evaluated at stated intervals (**Standard 111.A.5**).

College Requirement: In order to meet the policy, the Commission requires the College ensure that all distance education courses demonstrate regular and substantive interaction as defined by the College (**Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education).**

College Requirement 2: In order to meet the Standards, the Commission requires that the college fully implement the assessment, collection, and use of student learning outcomes for all courses, programs, and units. Standards 11.A.3 (**Standards I.B.2, 11.A.3, 11.A.16**).

College Requirement 3: In order to meet the Standards, the Commission requires that the College ensure that, in every class section, students receive a syllabus that includes SLOs consistent with the officially approved course outline of record (**Standards I.B.2, 11.A.3, 11.A.16**).

In accordance with federal regulations, compliance requirements must be addressed and the institution must demonstrate that it aligns with Standards within two years.

Team Analysis of College Responses to the January 27, 2020 Commission's Requirements

<u>District Requirement 1</u>: **In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires that the District ensure that all classified and management employees are systematically evaluated at stated intervals (Standard 111.A.5)**

Findings and Evidence:
The District Office of Human Resources has automated staff and manager performance evaluation by integrating the process into *Workday*, the software management system already in use by the District for payroll, processing, and hiring processes. The automated performance evaluation system has improved efficiency in communication, data collection, and compliance monitoring. Staff and managers who are due for evaluation are sent notifications and links to self-evaluation forms 90 days from the due date, with notifications also going out concurrently to the appropriate managers. A series of follow-up communication is triggered until the process is completed. *Workday* allows Human Resources staff to produce status reports, which are presented monthly at the Chancellor's Cabinet meetings by the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources. The reports are then disseminated to the college management teams for review and follow-up. During the visit, the Director of Human Resources provided a tour of *Workday* and demonstrated various features of the automated system, including notification to staff who are due for evaluation, courtesy notification to the appropriate manager, and the automated completion of the evaluation instrument. Examples of status reports with completion percentages were also provided to the team.

To ensure the successful adoption of *Workday*, ongoing workshops for staff and managers are conducted by District HR. An orientation into the automated system as well as expectations regarding timely completion of performance evaluations are also included in the onboarding of newly hired staff and management. The timely completion of staff evaluations is included in the evaluation instrument for managers.

Grossmont College's completion of staff and manager evaluations has increased to 80% as of March 29, 2021 (up from 71% in February 2021 when the follow-up report was approved by the GCCD Board). Cuyamaca College's completion rate is around 81% and the District Office is at 64%. These completion rates represent a significant increase from the cumulative total completion rate of 30% during the 2019 site visit. The District Office's completion rate is lower due to management vacancies.

The Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor, and the Director of Human Resources are committed to meeting 100% completion in the future, with a short-term goal of meeting 80-90% completion rate for next year. The Vice Chancellor also plans to implement an HR scorecard to visually document and demonstrate progress in the completion of performance evaluations against district goals.

Conclusion:

The district and the colleges have satisfied this requirement.

College Requirement 1: In order to meet the policy, the Commission requires the College to ensure that all distance education courses demonstrate regular and substantive interaction as defined by the College (Policy on Distance Education).

Findings and Evidence:

Since the comprehensive visit in October 2019, Grossmont College has: 1) revised and clarified its policies and expectations related to Regular Effective Contact (REC), including a new Academic Senate approved College Policy related to distance education that includes a specific section about REC between instructor and students with examples; 2) provided focused REC professional development; and 3) established faculty and administrator course evaluators with specific training on how to evaluate REC in DE courses. Faculty are evaluated through a contractually negotiated evaluation form and receive feedback from faculty and administrator course evaluators. If a course does not meet the standards of REC, the faculty member receives feedback and recommendations that need to be addressed in writing. All these efforts have resulted in regular and substantive interaction with students by faculty teaching online courses.

The team reviewed two separate cohorts of randomly selected courses. The first was a cohort of previously approved 100% online for the distance education modality prior to COVID-19 that would normally be scheduled as a distance education course. After examining 50 randomly selected online courses, meeting with faculty, staff, and administrators, it is evident the College has reviewed, revised, and improved existing processes to ensure that faculty teaching online courses consistently provide regular and substantive interaction with students. Approximately 90% of the randomly selected online courses demonstrated regular and substantive interaction. The second cohort of distance education courses consisted of all other distance education courses offered 100% in the distance education modality as part of the College's response to COVID-19. After examining 25 randomly selected courses, approximately 50% demonstrated regular and substantive interaction with students.

Conclusion:

The College has addressed this requirement and meets the Policy on Distance Education.

College Requirement 2: In order to meet the standards, the Commission requires that the College fully implement the assessment, collection, and use of student learning outcomes for all courses, programs, and units (Standards I.B.2, II.A.3, and II.A.16).

Findings and Evidence:

Grossmont College has created organizational structures and processes that support the implementation of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) assessment, collection, and closing the loop. Outcomes assessment is overseen by the Senior Dean of College Planning and Institutional Effectiveness in collaboration with a Faculty SLO Coordinator. The Dean and the SLO Coordinator lead the Grossmont Assessment Task Force (GOAT), with the Faculty SLO Coordinator working with faculty SLO liaisons in facilitating SLO assessment activities at the department/program level. A number of workshops and training sessions on SLO assessment have been conducted and are ongoing, including the sharing of best practices in SLO assessments. Based on department needs, the SLO liaisons facilitate the work being done in departments with training modules provided in Canvas.

The College has done a lot of work focused on a "reboot" of the college's SLO assessment process, including determining where the departments are in their assessment cycles. Below is a summary of the work being done in the Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services divisions.

Academic Affairs

The team noted marked improvement in the numbers of student learning outcomes (SLO) assessments at the course level as evidenced by the SLO assessments in *Tracdat,* the college's centralized location for SLO assessment data. The college follow-up report indicated that the "participation rate in the use of *Tracdat* between 2019-2020 has increased by 74%" (p. 15). In reviewing SLO assessment data in *Tracdat*, the team lead for the review of SLO implementation noted an approximately 55% average in the proportions of courses assessed in each discipline. The team was unable to determine the percentage of overall courses and programs that have completed SLO assessments and/or have completed the SLO assessment cycle to date, and how these numbers compare to the past 1-2 years. During the interviews, it was noted that the College is not yet able to determine a baseline for overall course and program assessments. The focus in the SLO implementation efforts has been a reboot, to "meet faculty where they are," and to increase the participation rate.

The College has a six-year SLO assessment cycle. A review of the SLO Handbook, which is four years old, indicates that there are currently no structured department/program assessments within the six-year cycle, which is one of the tasks they will tackle in the planned April 30 workshop.

The Outcomes Assessment Task Force has struggled with the notion that a six-year SLO plan for assessment—which the college has been using for some time now—may be at odds with the need to strive for continuous quality improvement of teaching and learning to ensure student success. In other words, assessing a course level SLO once every six years is contrary to the objective of continuous quality improvement. This requires ongoing review of the SLO assessment cycle. In order to fulfill our objective for continuous quality improvement in teaching and learning, we need to adopt processes that will help us do this work. These processes are already in place for annual unit planning and academic program review, and outcomes assessment activities will be integrated into these processes. Therefore, while instructional services divisions will continue to use the six-year plan for the time being (the Student Services division is using a three-year plan), it is expected that assessment will take place continually and the results will be used periodically to guide curricular and instructional improvements. Program review will be the time to discuss the culmination of innovations and/or changes that were made (and the efficacy of these changes) over the six years of the assessment cycle (p. 29).

The team noted during the interviews that department practices varied in the frequency of SLO assessments within the six-year cycle as well as in how many SLOs are assessed during an assessment cycle. It is unclear how these varying timelines and processes impact mapping course SLOs to program/institutional SLOs and closing the loop.

The collection of SLO assessments is centralized in *Tracdat*, and faculty training on the use of *Tracdat* is ongoing. It was noted that there are still SLO assessments taking place outside of *Tracdat* which may not be systematically collected or monitored. The work to improve assessment practices continues as the college seeks to upgrade to *Nuventive Improve,* an upgrade to *TracDat* which integrates with Canvas. A three-hour workshop is scheduled at the end of April 2021 to reboot participation in *TracDat* and to prepare for the transition to *Nuventive*. The SLO coordinator provides training opportunities (e. g., annual planning forum and Canvas training) to fill the gaps identified by the departments through the SLO liaisons. The three-hour workshop will be used to assist departments in ensuring *TracDat* has up-to-date SLOs, mapping is done to program outcomes, and calendars for the assessment cycles are created to include a schedule of assessment, review/reflection, and implementation of improvement plans. The workshop will also address the development of department-generated assessment plans for all courses based on where the departments are currently in the six-year cycle of assessment.

The *Tracdat* upgrade to *Nuventive* will integrate SLOs into Canvas for use in Fall 2021. In preparation for the integration with Canvas, the College has urged departments to make the necessary changes to their SLOs and to input SLOs that are tied to respective courses, thereby ensuring that faculty-graded assignments can link to SLOs and produce data that can be extracted, disaggregated, and analyzed. According to the Acting ALO/Acting Senior Dean of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, the uploading of course-level SLOs into Canvas LMS has been completed as of April 2021. It is anticipated

that *Nuventive*'s link to Canvas will assist the college in assessing program and institutional outcomes that have been mapped through course SLOs. A new course *SLO Results Entry Form* has been piloted, is going through revision, and will be ready for use in Fall 2021.

Examples of curricular and instructional changes resulting from departmental dialogues around SLO assessment results were provided during the visit, e.g., in English as a Second Language (ESL). The SLO reporting form includes prompts for reflection, which are useful for departmental discussions of assessment results as well as course and program planning. Annual Unit Plans (AUP) include a summary of trends and areas for improvement provided by the College Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (CPIE). These are presented to the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Council (PIEC), the SLO coordinator, the Academic Senate, College Council, and the Council of Chairs and Coordinators. Plans for improvement will come from these committees and implemented by the SLO coordinator through the SLO liaisons.

While the Academic Affairs Division has undertaken a significant amount of work to reboot their implementation of SLO assessment, collection, and use of student learning outcomes for courses and programs, further work is needed to fill existing gaps and inconsistencies in the SLO implementation process. As previously noted, there was no structure for assessing course and program SLOs within the six-year cycle for the different instructional programs and departments but the workshop scheduled on April 30, 2021 will facilitate the creation of implementation plans/calendars for all departments. While the April 30 workshop, which is designed to get everyone updated in *Tracdat/Nuventive*, will be a starting point, the departments in Academic Affairs will need to follow through with the plans developed in the workshop. Based on input from the ALO, implementation plans and calendars will be created but evidence of that was not yet available at the time of the visit. The establishment of clear and predictable timelines and processes for all phases of the SLO implementation within the six-year SLO assessment cycle would assist in monitoring and ensuring that all courses and programs are assessed on a regular basis. The College has seen that they would benefit from completing an inventory of all courses that should have SLOs, establishing a baseline of courses and programs that have completed the SLO assessment cycle, and developing a calendar for course/program SLO assessments within the six-year SLO assessment cycle, and has indicated that this is being done as part of the work to transition to *Nuventive Improve*. As well, assessments completed outside of Tracdat should be collected, monitored, and imported to *Tracdat/Nuventive* until such time that *Tracdat/Nuventive* is fully utilized by all faculty.

Student Services

The Student Services Division has adopted a six-year program review cycle with SLO assessment to be conducted yearly, and with a three-year SLO outcomes review in the middle of the six-year program review cycle (Student Services Program Review & Assessment Cycle). Interviews indicated that the

Student Services Program Review Committee is planning to stagger the different programs as to their placement in the cycle. An inventory has been conducted to determine the status of each program with SLO assessment, collection and documentation of assessments. Because of the many departments that make up Student Services, assessment was occurring but stored in different ways, with data being collected from a variety of different sources. The different programs have identified what types of outcomes they will assess based on the type of services they offer. SLOs, SSOs, and SAOs are going to be measured using different tools appropriate for the type of outcomes being measured. In 2020, Student Services conducted a post-services survey that was sent to students. The survey was general but also included questions tailored to each program. A reporting template for use in *Tracdat* has been in the design process and will be implemented in the 2021-2022 school year. A summary of the outcomes will be placed in the Annual Unit Plan (AUP).

A representative from the Student Services Program Review Committee indicated that while there are plans to stagger the programs in beginning their structured three-year outcomes review within the six-year program review cycle, a calendar has not yet been determined for the staggering of these programs on the cycle. The implementation of the annual survey has initiated the yearly assessment, which should include reflection, discussion, and action.

The Student Services division would benefit from finalizing and documenting its SSO assessment implementation plans, including a calendar for various phases of the assessment cycle specific to the programs/units beyond the general six- year cycle and clearly showing how SSO assessments will be collected and analyzed in all student services programs/units; and how the assessment data will be used for improvement and planning.

Administrative Services

The College has a plan for rolling out assessment of SAOs in the Summer of 2021 and incorporating a summary of the results in the AUP similar to the other divisions beginning in the 2021-2022 school year. A centralized reporting mechanism for *TracDat/Nuventive Improve* has been identified and, through the SLO coordinator and SLO liaison, the various segments of Administrative Services are working to ensure SAOs are identified for all departments and appropriate assessment methods are developed. Some of the departments have completed assessments using surveys and inventories. The SLO coordinator is working with the Administrative Services Division to develop a calendar for their assessment cycle. The Administrative Services Division plans to mirror the Student Services Division outcomes assessment, with surveys tailored for each department. The surveys will be administered in the Summer of 2021 and disseminated annually thereafter. All areas have plans in place to integrate the summary of outcomes assessment into their respective AUPs. CPIE will assist in evaluating the assessment process for Administrative Services in conjunction with the SLO coordinator.

Full implementation of SAO assessment is anticipated to take place through the summer with evidence of a full cycle of assessment to come in the next academic year, 2021-22.

The Administrative Services Division would benefit from finalizing and documenting its SAO implementation plans and calendar, clearly showing how SAO assessments will be collected in all administrative programs/units, and how the assessment data will be used for improvement and planning.

College Wide

Grossmont College has recently developed the integration of SLO progress in the Annual Unit Plans (AUP) in all divisions with a summary of SLO/SSO/SAO assessed, overarching themes, trends, and actions taken due to analysis of SLO data reported therein. Summaries are exported to the SLO coordinator and shared with appropriate program review committees to assess the process and make appropriate improvements. Academic Affairs initiated the use of AUPs in the 2020-2021 school year but all divisions have drafts that will be implemented in the Fall of 2021. CPIE shares results of the AUP analysis at the annual planning forum and with the College Council to inform College planning. The College is prepared to include the AUP analysis from CPIE in the development of the next strategic plan. This process of integration into the planning process is designed to facilitate closing the loop on their cycles of assessment and, as all divisions come online with the AUP process, evidence of closing the loop is expected to become more readily available.

The program review handbooks for Academic Affairs and Student Services have SLO/SSO assessment reporting forms that prompt reflection on the SLO/SSO/SAO assessments and serve as a tool for engaging dialogue centered around improvement. The future of these ongoing cycles of improvement will be seen as all divisions engage in the full implementation of SLO/SSO/SAO assessment and program review and as the draft AUPs are utilized by all divisions.

The SLO collection plan through *Tracdat/Nuventive Improve* will ensure the systematic collection of assessment data. The College has plans to reboot the cycle of assessment for all departments in Academic Affairs through *Nuventive* in the 2020-2021 academic year. A baseline number of courses assessed is not yet being monitored, but additional evidence from the college gave proportions for each area in Academic Affairs based on *Tracdat*. The SLO coordinator indicated that there were assessments being done outside of *Tracdat* but there is no inventory of that work being done. The average of the proportions of courses assessed in each discipline in Academic Affairs from *Tracdat* is approximately 55%. Based on the Assessment Handbook, there is a lack of structure within the six-year cycle- an issue that the College has identified and plans to address. Evidence of department/program assessment cycles were not yet available during the visit. The lack of assessment planning within the six-year cycle will make using student learning outcomes for college planning, curriculum review, and program

improvement challenging. The College has indicated that they will be using course SLOs mapped to programs for assessing program learning outcomes (PLO), however, if the course assessment cycle is not well defined then the implementation of program mapping and PLO assessments may falter.

In Student Services, an assessment was conducted utilizing surveys in all departments in the 2020-2021 school year but a plan for how to stagger the department assessment cycles within their six-year program review cycle has not yet been developed. In Administrative Services, all departments will be assessed in the summer of 2021, but a structured cycle has not yet been established because the plan to stagger departments has not yet been determined. The divisions of the college are in various states of implementation, with much of the integration with college planning to be initiated in the 2020-2021 academic year.

To ensure full implementation of outcomes assessment (SLOs/SSOs/SAOs) in all courses/programs/units within the six-year cycle, with sufficient repetition to ensure closing the loop in all departments and programs, a structure of outcomes assessment within the six-year cycle is recommended in the Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services Divisions.

Conclusion

In order to meet the standards, the Commission requires that the College demonstrates full implementation of the assessment, collection, and use of student learning outcomes in all courses, programs, and units. (Standards I.B.2, II.A.3, and II.A.16). The College has not satisfied this requirement.

College Requirement 3: In order to meet the standards, the Commission requires that the College ensure that, in every class section, students receive a syllabus that includes SLOs consistent with the officially approved course outline of record (Standard II.A.3).

Findings and Evidence:
The process of checking for alignment between the syllabi and their respective course outlines of record (COR) has been clarified and is monitored through a systematic process. The College has implemented a monitoring system whereby every semester department chairs complete and submit a form that verifies alignment of SLOs between the course syllabi and CORs. The Department Chair reviews the syllabi to check for alignment with the current COR and, if any discrepancy is found, the Chair works with the faculty member to create alignment. Department chairs are responsible for reporting on the review of the syllabi against the CORs to determine if they are consistent and submit the electronic form indicating that the check is complete. This process ensures that departments are systematically reviewing and correcting any misalignments. Administrative assistants who were interviewed during the visit indicated

that they send out reminder emails to faculty at the beginning of each term reiterating that syllabi need to be sent to them, which are then placed in a shared folder; or uploaded by the faculty into a Canvas container (assignment).

The SLO liaisons, who are typically the department chairs, have been tasked on following up with their departments to ensure that they establish a process, if they do not already have one, and to follow through with ensuring alignment when discrepancies are found. In larger departments, the coordinators review the syllabi against the CORs and report back to the chair. If the chair needs assistance in resolving misalignments, then the assistance of the division dean can be requested. The SLO coordinator maintains records of the submitted forms.

The College has taken steps to ensure that faculty have access to the updated SLOs in the current CORs by placing them on the college intranet site. The *Chairs and Coordinators Handbook* also contains instructions on notifying new faculty about placing SLOs on syllabi and indicating where to find current CORs. A curriculum management system is being adopted to make the review and update of curriculum easier and to incorporate the review of SLOs in the review of the COR, which is currently an addendum outside of the course update. Through the inventory that was done to look at alignment of syllabi with the COR, the college leadership found that there were a significant number of outdated CORs. The policy for the five- year cycle for updating courses was reaffirmed with courses subject to deletion if they are not updated following the timeline. The AUP form has a section on COR updates for the deans to fill out to make sure that courses are updated according to the timeline. The process developed has been efficient in clearing up discrepancies between syllabi and their respective CORs based on a review of a random sample of syllabi and their CORs.

Conclusion:
The College has satisfied College Requirement 3.