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INTRODUCTION

In October 2010, a team representing the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges conducted a comprehensive evaluation of Evergreen Valley College, one of two colleges in the San Jose/Evergreen Community College District, as part of the institution’s request for reaffirmation of accreditation.

At its January meeting, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) placed Evergreen Valley College on Warning with the stipulation that Evergreen submit a follow-up report by October 15, 2011. The follow-up report would address progress made on several 2004 college recommendations, the 2010 college recommendations, 2010 shared district recommendations, and two Commission concerns. The follow-up report would be followed by a visit of representatives from the Commission in November 2011.

For the follow-up visit to Evergreen Valley College, a three member accreditation team visited the college and district office on November 8 and 9, 2011 for the purpose of conducting a follow-up visit concerning nine recommendations from the college’s 2004 accreditation visit, five college recommendations from the fall 2010 visit, six 2010 shared district recommendations, and two Commission concerns. The Evergreen Valley College evaluation team was also joined by a team visiting San Jose City College to evaluate their progress on their follow-up report. The two teams joined together for the visit to the district office to assess progress on the shared district recommendations.

The team visiting Evergreen Valley College received the follow-up progress report prior to their visit to the college and found it to be complete and thorough. In addition, team members also received an addendum to the October follow-up report which provided latest information concerning progress made for the college recommendations. The team confirmed that the follow-up report was compiled through broad participation by the college community including staff, faculty, college administration, and district administration.

In its follow-up report, Evergreen Valley College provided examples, evidence, and data to demonstrate progress in meeting its recommendations. Upon arrival at the college, the team met with several members of the college community including the college President, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, Vice President of Student Affairs, Vice President of Administrative Services, Academic Senate President, shared governance and planning committees, and other key faculty and staff members. The team found these meetings to be very helpful and informative in validating Evergreen Valley College’s progress in meeting the Commission’s recommendations.

The team also visited the district office with the team visiting San Jose City College and met with several district personnel including the Chancellor, The Director of Finance, Director of Research, key district office staff, and several board members.
The team commends the college for providing a comprehensive follow-up report that addresses the Commission’s recommendations and for providing documentation and evidence during the visit that allowed the team to make informed recommendations. The college is also commended for their willingness to engage in open and honest dialogue concerning college and district issues.

**College Responses to the Commission’s 2004 Recommendations:**

**2004 Recommendation 1:** The college and district should establish and maintain an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes. The college and district should assure that systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation of college and district policies and procedures, implemented by written policy. The Board of Trustees should establish and maintain governance structures, processes, and practices to assure that the Board of Trustees, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution and that these processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institutions’ constituencies. (Standards I.B.1, IV.A.1, IV.A. 2, and IV.A.3)

**Findings and Evidence:**
The College has addressed this recommendation in a number of ways, including but not limited to, the development of a “Shared Governance Decision Making Handbook” and through a number of all-college gatherings known as “First Thursdays.” With regard to the revision of board policies, there is the beginning of a process (albeit no board policy defining the types or percentage of board policies to be reviewed annually) under the leadership of the Chancellor and District Office, in which 20 percent of all Board policies will be reviewed on a yearly basis. Those policies which are thought to be in need of possible review and revision will be sent to and through the collegial consultation process before they are recommended for change by the Chancellor and sent to the board of their approval.

The board not only initiated a Self-Evaluation process but included both internal and external constituencies, as well as the board itself. A comprehensive survey was developed to assess the degree to which the board was carrying out the appropriate roles of a Board of Trustees and to ascertain both the strengths and weaknesses of the board. As a result of this survey, the board proposed the development of a work plan based on the findings. At the November 8, 2011 meeting of the Board of Trustees, the board adopted the work plan, of which the first five points in the plan concerned themselves with the “Six Shared Recommendations” included in the 2010 Accreditation Review, namely planning, the role of the board, relations with the Chancellor, the measuring of accomplishments against board goals, and finances. The only area not put forth in this Work Plan is the revision to the present Ethics policy, specifically, the concept of sanctions.
to enforce any violations of this policy. The proposed revisions of the Ethics Policy will come to the board for approval in early spring 2012. The proposed revisions are intended to include sanctions for board members who violate their policy.

Conclusion:
The College has made significant progress in establishing and maintaining an ongoing, collegial and self-reflective dialogue and has fully addressed this recommendation.

2004 Recommendation 3: The team recommends that the college provide adequate, stable, permanent, qualified administrative leadership to support Instruction and Student Services. (Standards II.B. and III.A.2)

Findings and Evidence:
Evergreen Valley College recently hired a new President that began his tenure in June 2011. However, the previous president served the college from 2005 to 2010. The new president is becoming well versed in the issues involving accreditation for the college and has implemented several changes to bring the college into compliance.

Other key vacancies for top level administrative positions have included the Vice President of Academic Affairs who left late last spring. A new VP of Academic Affairs was identified from the administrative ranks and this person also serves as the Accreditation Liaison Officer. The Vice President of Student Services has been in her current position since 2008. A new Vice President of Administrative Services was hired in June 2011 to provide campus financial and facility oversight. Of the seven Dean positions, four are filled by interim staff and one position is currently vacant. Some of these vacancies are due to recent promotions within the college; one is due to retirement and one left for a promotion at another college.

Although the college has experienced administrative turnover, it currently has adequate administrative support to support student learning and instruction and to support the college's mission.

Conclusion:
Budget constraints have played a role in the college’s ability to fill positions. The President is committed to ensuring that the college provides training opportunities for new administrators through its Dean’s Academy. The VP of Administrative Services, VP of Academic Affairs, and the Dean for Math, Science and Engineering have been in the district for several years. This staffing provides needed institutional memory. The college meets this standard.
2004 Recommendation 4: The team recommends that the college, in collaboration with the district, develop a written and clearly understood resource allocation model through a collaborative process with dialogue between the district and the college constituencies using board priorities and college plans to develop the budget. (Standards II.C.1, III.D. 1, III.D.1, II.D.I.b, and III.D.1.g)

Findings and Evidence:
Beginning in December 2010, the District Budget Committee (DBC) initiated the development of a new budget allocation system. Although several planning meetings have been held to develop a new resource allocation model, the district has yet to propose a final model for the allocation of resources. The current model allows for a decentralized budget planning process beginning at the campus level (College Budget Committee) and funneling up to the District Budget Committee. The colleges have representation on the District Budget Committee which makes recommendations to the Chancellor.

At Evergreen Valley College, the college follows a detailed budget planning process that outlines the steps and timelines to develop budget requests and recommendations. The College Budget Committee has broad representation and is afforded input into the budgeting process. Data and research is evident in the process and used to formulate priorities.

Conclusion:
The current process at the district level provides for allocations based on FTES percentages at the colleges. The new district allocation model is being designed to allow for productivity and other needs identified by the colleges; however it is not finalized. There is evidence that there is communication between the college and district for budget planning. The recently revised college’s budget planning process is integrated with its priorities (Commitment to Action) and aligned to its mission statement. Therefore, the college meets this standard.

2004 Recommendation 5: The team recommends that the college complete the process of identifying learning outcomes for courses, instructional and student support programs; developing appropriate direct measures of student learning; compile, disseminate, and reflect on those measured outcomes, and take appropriate action based on those outcomes to improve student learning and associated college practices that support student learning. (Standards II.A.3, II.A.5, II.A.6, II.B.4, and II.C.2)

Findings and Evidence:
Interviews, follow-up reports and a review of available evidence, including curriculum revision schedules, meeting minutes, and other data suggest that the college continues to make progress
toward identifying learning outcomes for courses and instructional programs. Approximately seventy-eight percent of all courses have student learning outcomes, and levers are in place to inactivate all course outline records that do not contain SLOs by January 2012. Student learning outcomes have been established for all student affairs programs. The college has not developed institutional level student learning outcomes, and by extension no mapping exists to link the outcomes between the course, program and institutional level.

Assessment instruments/tools, assessment schedules, and standard reporting forms are currently in development for identified learning outcomes. The college is not yet assessing student learning outcomes, or utilizing assessment results as part of continual improvement efforts on an institutional scale. The college recognizes a need to establish an SLO Coordinator position as part of efforts aimed at accelerating progress in this area to meet proficiency by 2012.

**Conclusion:**
The team recognizes that the college continues to make progress toward completing course and program-level student learning outcomes; and has accelerated institutional dialogue and efforts related to the development of learning outcome assessment instruments. However, further development work will be required before the college is in a position to actively compile, disseminate, reflect and take action based upon assessment results. The college, therefore; has not fully addressed this recommendation and therefore, only partially meets this standard.

**2004 Recommendation 12:** *Integrate the college Technology Master Plan into a comprehensive strategic plan for the entire college. Combine the objectives of the technology plans of the two colleges into a District Technology Master Plan. (Standards III.C.1.a, III.C.1.c, III.C.1.d, and III.C.2)*

**Findings and Evidence:**
Evergreen Valley College completed the development of a comprehensive technology master plan in fall 2011. The composition of the plan includes linkages to the college’s educational master plan as well as clear integration with its strategic plan through direct mapping to its CTA’s (Commitments to Action). Interviews with college and district staff confirmed that a District Technology Master Plan does not exist. As such, the integration of the objectives or priorities contained in these two plans into a comprehensive district plan has not yet occurred.

**Conclusion:**
The college has developed a college Technology Master Plan that is integrated with its most recent Strategic Plan; however, the plan’s objectives and/or priorities have not been integrated into a comprehensive District Technology Plan. While the college has fully responded to this
recommendation, the absence of a comprehensive District Technology Plan suggests the college has only partially met the standard.

**2004 Recommendation 13:** *Integrate the priorities of technology planning into the budget development process to assure that the results of technology assessment and planning effectively improve the use of technology at the college.* (Standard III.C.1.b)

**Findings and Evidence:**
Evergreen Valley College completed the development of a comprehensive Technology Master Plan in fall 2011. The composition of the plan includes linkages to the college’s educational master plan as well as clear integration with its strategic plan through direct mapping to its CTA’s (Commitments to Action). Through this integration and established resource allocation processes, the college has adequately integrated the plan’s priorities into the budget development process.

**Conclusion:**
The college has developed a Technology Master Plan that is integrated with its most recent Strategic Plan. Through the integration of these plans, the college now possesses the means for assessing the effectiveness of technology utilization at Evergreen Valley College. The college has fully addressed this recommendation.

**2004 Recommendation 14:** *Resource allocation should be a collaborative process with dialogue between the district and the college constituencies using board priorities and college plans to develop the budget. This process should result in written procedures for the initial allocations for the district office, San Jose City College and Evergreen Valley College and the on-campus allocations.* (Standards III.D.1, III.D.1.a, III.D.1.b, and III.D.1.d)

**Findings and Evidence:**
The district and key college constituents have begun the process of developing a district allocation model. The District Budget Committee has been meeting monthly to develop a new allocation model that will outline procedures for allocations to the district, San Jose City College, and Evergreen Valley College and will follow board priorities. A new interim Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services was recently appointed and will lead the development of a new district allocation model.

Evergreen Valley College recently reconstituted its college budget planning process that is integrated with its strategic planning and program review processes. The addition of the position
of Vice President of Administrative Services will provide oversight in the budget process and expenditure of college allocated funds.

Conclusion:
The team found evidence of dialogue between college constituencies and the college and district office through the College Budget Committee and the District Budget Committee. Current procedures for allocation are primarily based upon FTES generated by the colleges. On campus allocations follow the College Budget Planning Process. However, the district is in the beginning stages of developing a new district allocation model that will clearly outline the budget allocation for the two colleges and the district. The college partially meets this standard.

2004 Recommendation 15: The college and the district should act expeditiously and with due diligence to respond to recommendations made by the Commission. (Standard IV.A.4)

Findings and Evidence:
The college has taken very seriously the multiplicity of recommendations made by the Commission since the last self study report as is evidenced by the following documents: the two Progress Reports in 2005 and 2006, a Midterm Report in 2007, and the comprehensive 2011 Follow-up Report. This latter report makes clear that the college has addressed every item in the “Future Plans” sections of each of the 20 recommendations identified in the EVC 2007 Midterm Report.

Conclusion:
The team found that Evergreen Valley College has responded with hard work and diligence to the recommendations made by the Commission. The college meets this standard.

2004 Recommendation 20: The team recommends that the Board of Trustees adhere to its policy of conducting regular self-evaluation and uses the results of the self-evaluation to improve Board functioning. (Standard IV.B.1.g)

Findings and Evidence:
The Board of Trustees first established a Self-Evaluation Committee to develop a process and criteria for the evaluation of the board. This committee recommended, and the full board approved, a survey to evaluate the roles and responsibilities of the board. The survey focused on two areas: (1) Board Operations and (2) Shared Accreditation Findings. The committee reported on the findings of the survey (which was sent not only to board members, but to a representative sample of external and internal constituencies) and proposed the development of a Work Plan on
the findings designed to build on the strengths of the board and to address areas of weakness. On Nov. 8, 2011, the Board adopted such a Work Plan, with the first five areas focusing on the “Six Shared Recommendations” included in the 2010 Accreditation Review, including the following: planning, the role of the board, relations between the chancellor and the board, measuring board accomplishments against board goals, and finance. The only one of the six recommendations not included in this Work Plan is a revised board policy on Ethics.

Conclusion:
The San Jose/Evergreen Community College District Board of Trustees is to be commended for taking this recommendation seriously and developing a plan, which, if continually reviewed and updated, will continually improve the functioning of the board. This standard has been fully met.

2010 Recommendation 1: In order to fully meet the standard, the college should integrate and publish a systematic review process within the college’s strategic plan for all of the college’s planning processes (including resource allocations) for effectiveness of all departments, programs, and services and implement any modifications based on evaluation results.
(Supports I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.7, II.B.3, III.D.1.a, III.D.2.g, and III.D.3)

Findings and Evidence: In fall 2010 and spring 2011, Evergreen Valley College reviewed its mission statement and Commitments to Action as part of its institutional planning and review process. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee worked with the College Budget Committee in developing a revised College Budget and Planning Process. This new planning process was a result of the college’s commitment to align its planning and budgeting to its mission and to college priorities. The budget and planning process maps the approval requirements for each program, department, and division of the college. The new process includes the results of program review.

As a result of the college’s evaluation of its planning processes, a new and revised Program Review Self-Study Document Criteria was developed that is published and describes the procedure and criteria for individual program reviews. The Program Review Self-Study Document Criteria is linked to the college’s mission statement, its Strategic Initiatives, and its Commitments to Action.

The team further found that the college has updated it program review calendar whereby instructional programs are reviewed every six years, student services programs every three years, and CTE programs every two years. The college also has plans for annual updates as part of the program review and planning process that will be institutionalized over the next year.
The team was also provided an example of changes and modifications for individual programs identified as a result of the program review process that have been incorporated into these programs.

**Conclusion:**
The new College Budget and Planning Process incorporates the review of all programs as justification for budget priorities. This review includes evidence and data to justify requests. The college meets this standard.

**2010 Recommendation 2:** The team recognizes that progress has occurred with identification of course level student learning outcomes; however, the team recommends that efforts be accelerated to complete SLO identification and expand recurrent cycles of authentic assessment and improvement for all instructional and student services programs, with campus-wide dialogue on results, in order to reach proficiency level by 2012. Furthermore, faculty and others directly responsible for student progress towards achieving student learning outcomes should have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.7, II.A, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.f, II.B, II.B.4, and III.A.1.c)

**Findings and Evidence:**
Interviews, follow-up reports and a review of available evidence, including curriculum revision schedules, meeting minutes, and other data suggest that the college continues to make progress toward identifying learning outcomes for courses and instructional programs. Approximately seventy-eight percent of all courses have student learning outcomes, and levers are in place to inactivate all course outline records that do not contain SLOs by January 2012. Student learning outcomes have been established for all student affairs programs. The college has not developed institutional level student learning outcomes, and by extension, no mapping exists to link the outcomes between the course, program and institutional level.

Assessment instruments, assessment schedules, and standard reporting forms are currently in development for identified learning outcomes. The college is not yet assessing student learning outcomes, or utilizing assessment results as part of continual improvement efforts on an institutional scale. The college recognizes a need to establish an SLO Coordinator position as part of efforts aimed at accelerating progress in this area to meet proficiency by 2012.

**Conclusion:**
The team recognizes that the college continues to make progress toward completing course and program-level student learning outcomes; and has accelerated institutional dialogue and efforts
related to the development of learning outcome assessment instruments. However, further development work will be required before the college is in a position to actively compile, disseminate, reflect and take action based upon assessment results. Further, the evaluation of those who are directly responsible for student progress toward achieving student learning outcomes does not include a mechanism for assessing effectiveness in producing those outcomes. The college, therefore, has not fully addressed this recommendation and therefore, only partially meets this standard.

2010 Recommendation 3: In order to meet the standard and improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the college develop a college-wide professional code of ethics that is aligned with the stated mission and values, and reflective of activity to support continuous improvement in all instructional, operational, and service areas. (Standards II.A.7.c, III.A.1.b, and III.A.1.d)

Findings and Evidence: Evergreen Valley College has developed a Code of Ethics policy that will be incorporated into the college catalog. The policy has been approved by the college’s shared governance groups and has been approved by the College Council and will be published in its college catalog and related documents.

Conclusion:
The college will meet this standard when it publishes and implements the Code of Ethics policy.

2010 Recommendation 4: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the college complete the review and revision of all course outlines of record and ensure that the catalog information regarding currently offered courses and programs is accurate. This action should be implemented to ensure currency, relevancy, and instructional quality. (Standards II.A, II.A.2.e, II.A.6.c, II.B.2.a, II.B.2.b)

Findings and Evidence:
Interviews with Curriculum Committee members, a review of committee minutes and analysis of the college’s active course inventory were conducted to determine the degree to which the college has completed the review and revision of its active course curriculum. A review of sample course outlines of record (COR’s) indicate that since 2004, all course outlines include student learning outcomes and methods of assessing these outcomes. The analysis of the active course inventory, however, indicates that approximately 20% of currently active courses have not been reviewed / revised during or after 2004, and therefore do not include SLOs. The College intends to inactivate all out-of-date courses that do not contain SLOs by January 2012.
Conclusion:
While the college has established a Spring 2012 deadline for all course outlines of record that have not been reviewed/revised prior to 2004, it has not completed the review and revision of all course outlines of records. The college, therefore; has not fully complied with the recommendation and by extension, does not fully meet the standard.

2010 Recommendation 5: In order to fully meet the standard, the college needs to develop a recurring evaluation process of its budgeting and other financial management systems. Furthermore, Evergreen Valley College should incorporate total cost of ownership projections with their facilities planning reports for specifically planned projects. (Standards III.B, III.B.2, III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b, III.D.1, III.D.1.a, III.D.1.b, III.D.1.c, III.D.1.d, III.D.2.c, and III.d.2.g)

Findings and Evidence:
A new Vice President of Administrative Services was hired in June 2011 and as part of his responsibilities oversees the college’s budget expenditures to include equipment and supply purchases through the purchase order process. In addition, he manages hourly positions, performs new classified and instructional staffing analysis, and oversees the operation of the college business office, ASB accounts, and scholarships. The college uses the Analytic financial system to develop its budget and information is then imported into the Datatel MIS system.

The college has not yet evaluated its financial management system and is relying on the district for assistance in this area.

Total Cost of Ownership has been implemented with the new construction projects on the campus. The district architect has been charged with this process and will supply operation and management costs for the life of new facilities. Staffing needs are identified as well as equipment needs. The district has hired a consulting firm to provide input into the cost of ownership for its new facilities. In addition, the VP of Administrative Services identifies costs for service and repairs for it facility rental program.

Conclusion:
Due to the fact that the college/district has yet to evaluate its financial management system, the college partially meets this standard.

2010 Shared District Recommendation 1: The district, in collaboration with San Jose City College and Evergreen Valley College, should develop and implement a plan that will provide the necessary resources to increase college and district research capacity to analyze progress
toward achieving institutional goals and objectives including improvements in student achievement and student learning. (Standards I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, II.A.2.c, II.A.2.e, IV.B.3.b, and IV.B.3)

Findings and Evidence:
At the time of the previous visit, the district and the colleges had little or no research capacity. The district Executive Director of Research and Institutional Effectiveness position was vacant and there were no campus based personnel assigned responsibility for institutional research. Shortly after the visit, the vacant executive director position was filled on an interim basis. That individual has worked to support the chancellor, the board, and the two colleges in revitalizing efforts related to data availability and data use. Recently, the district posted the recruitment for the permanent position.

Both colleges have created user groups that focus on the use of data for institutional effectiveness and program review. These groups have helped to define the data needs and the requirements for effective access to that data. The groups have also begun to serve in a train-the-trainer role to introduce faculty and managers to the data tools that are available. These data tools include the Data Reporting Portal developed for the colleges and the CalPASS data access portal that accesses college data through the California Community College Chancellor’s Office Data Mart and Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data.

These data sources provide faculty and managers with much of the data needed for program review and for some elements of the student success and effectiveness agenda. Some desired data elements in the program review templates do not yet have data sources and others require the user to consolidate data from different sources. There is an expressed desire to improve data access to more directly support the program review, planning, and assessment process through an interface that directly links the data to these templates and/or performance metrics identified by the college.

Future institutional research needs and the technological and software support needed for effective use of data have been the topic of organizational planning sessions involving both district and college personnel and were also included in a consultant evaluation of future information technology needs. However, no final decision has been made on the preferred approach to future expansion of research capacity nor has a plan been developed to create that capacity.

Conclusion:
While there has been significant improvement in the accessibility of data for program review and assessment and a demonstrated commitment to the importance of expanding research and analysis capacity and creating a climate that relies on data driven decisions, a specific plan for achieving increased capacity has not yet been developed.
Until that plan is developed and implemented, the colleges and district have not yet fully addressed the recommendation and do not yet fully comply with the standards related to institutional research capacity.

**2010 Shared District Recommendation 2:** *In order to fully meet the standard, the district and Board of Trustees must act timely and decisively on current fiscal data trends in order to ensure short term and long term financial solvency and an adequate reserve to meet emergencies and unforeseen circumstances.* (Standards III.D.1, III.D.1.c, III.D.2.c, and IV.B.1.c)

**Findings and Evidence:**
On February 12, 2011, the Board of Trustees held a special study session focused on fiscal resources. At that meeting, the board adopted budgetary principles that would guide the budget reduction strategies of district administration. In addition to implementing a mandatory 7.0% reserve, the Board also adopted assumptions that would be used in building the budget for 2011-12. As a result of these and other actions, the adopted budget for 2011-12 has a projected ending fund balance of 9.0%.

Should the district see the probable mid-year trigger cuts in 2011/12, with an additional loss of revenue as high as $1.4 million; the projected ending fund balance would still be above the 7% threshold set by the board.

The board clearly identified a plan for meeting its “short-range” obligations in 2011-12. By establishing a minimum 7% reserve, and creating immediate and long term budget reduction and revenue enhancement strategies such as the public/private development of district owned properties, the board has also set guidelines for future financial stability.

Although the 2012-13 projected ending balance shows a fund balance of 4.5%, this projection does not factor-in any future application of the aforementioned strategies to maintain the minimum 7% reserve. This is not unexpected as two of the strategies involve employee salary and benefit reductions which must be negotiated.

**Conclusion:**
Based on the budgetary planning for 2011-12, and assuming the board’s reserve-mandate is ongoing, the district has put in place both the short range and long range plans to maintain financial stability, and the district now meets the accreditation standards.

**Commission Concern 1 (Financial Resources and Planning):** *With respect to Financial Resources, the chancellor and the president, in their presentation to the Commission, noted that the district’s 5% reserve is planned to be used to meet the district’s Other Post Employment*
Benefits obligation, but has not been allocated for this purpose. The Commission requires institutions to clearly identify and plan for payment of liabilities and future obligations. The Commission requests that the San José-Evergreen Community College District demonstrate how it plans to fund the Annual Required Contribution for its Other Post Employment Benefits. Should the district not now be in a position to fund the ARC payment, it should describe its plans to address this long term obligation. (Eligibility Requirement 17, Standard III.D.1.b, III.D.1.c)

Findings and Evidence:
On May 14, 2009, the district issued $46,775,000 of OPEB bonds to fund a portion of its retiree benefits liability. Of this amount, $39,957,416 was placed in a trust fund and the monies restricted to only be used to pay retiree benefits. The Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL) as of July 1, 2009 was $38,044,800. Given that the amount set-aside exceeded the AAL, it would appear that the district has established a plan to meet its OPEB obligations to its retirees and current employees.

The district has established a debt service schedule for the repayment of its OPEB bonds. Though 2011-12, bond repayment is made from monies from funds other than the general fund. However, in 2012-13, the general fund will begin to pick up some of the repayment costs. In 2012-13 the cost to the general fund will be $992,873, and in 2013-14, that amount increases to $2,251,000. These increased costs have been included in the current long-term financial planning and projections.

The Board of Trustees stated to the team that the district will meet these obligations while adhering to the newly established 7% reserve. As long as the district stays committed to the principles and mandates established by the board in its February 12, 2011 special study session, and reduction-steps will be taken to insure that the district’s general fund ending fund balance maintains a minimum 7% reserve, then the district has a plan for addressing the repayment of it liabilities and long-term obligations.

Conclusion:
The college and district now meet the eligibility requirement and accreditation standards.

2010 Shared District Recommendation 3: In order to fully meet the standards, the team recommends the Board of Trustees continue improving its performance. Specifically the board needs to engage with the chancellor in order to establish a climate of trust and respect and allow the chancellor to fully exercise the authority of the position and to improve the effectiveness of the district. (Standards IV.B.1, IV.B.1.f, and IV.B.1.j)
Findings and Evidence:
At the time of the last accreditation visit, the chancellor was newly hired after a period of leadership turmoil. While there was evidence that the board recognized its policy making role and was working with the new chancellor to create an effective working relationship, there was also evidence that historically the board and chancellor relationship had not met the expected accreditation standards. The recommendation focused on ensuring that the board and the new leadership would work together to create a productive and effective leadership climate.

Over the past year the board has engaged in a series of internal discussions aimed at creating this working relationship. Included were consultant-led workshops on board governance, study sessions conducted by the ACCJC, attendance at state and national trustee conferences and workshops, and on-going discussions with the chancellor. As a part of the evaluation of the chancellor, specific goals were agreed upon and formed the basis for the annual evaluation of the chancellor. This process has been continued into the second year of the chancellor's tenure.

The follow-up reports and respondents during our visit observed distinct positive changes in both the working relationship and the climate. The chancellor has been provided the opportunity to begin building her team and has been supported in that process by the board. The board is perceived to have moved away from operational matters to more of a policy focus while still maintaining its proper oversight and leadership role. It appears to be increasingly exercising that oversight properly through its relationship with the chancellor and the key leadership. At the same time it has demonstrated, particularly through its comprehensive self-evaluation process, a willingness to monitor its effectiveness and make improvements in board governance and leadership.

The overall effect of the improved board and chancellor relationship has been a re-engagement of much of the college community around the issues of meeting accreditation standards, of creating a student success agenda, and of moving the colleges and district forward. While much work remains to be done the governance processes and creation of the climate of mutual trust and respect have significantly improved.

Conclusion:
The college and district are in compliance with the standards related to board and chancellor governance. The processes that have been developed and put in place need to be sustained and continually monitored and improved. These process improvements, the better working relationship with the chancellor, and the creation of a more stable leadership team within the district and colleges will provide the necessary structure and climate to enable both colleges to effectively serve the citizens of San Jose.

2010 Shared District Recommendation 4: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees complete a thorough self-evaluation annually as stated
in board policy. The board should also regularly evaluate its practices and policies. Among the performance issues to be included in the self-evaluation, the board needs to address its responsibility to protect the long-term financial health of the district and colleges, and to allocate resources necessary to support the proper functioning of the district and colleges. (Standards III.D.1.c, III.D.2.c, IV.B.1.c, IV.B.1.d, IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.g, IV.B.1.h, IV.B.3.cc, and IV.B.3.d)

Findings and Evidence: As a matter of first priority, the Board of Trustees evaluated their financial condition and established a policy of requiring a 7% operating reserve for the district. The board also adopted a set of budget principles that would guide the creation of budgets going forward. The chancellor through the shared governance budget process made recommendations to the Board to bring the district in compliance with the new reserve policy, these recommendations included the difficult decisions of program reductions and personnel layoffs. The board, after appropriate open debate and discussion, adopted the budget measures necessary to reach the reserve goals.

To address the broader requirements of board self-evaluation, the Board of Trustees created a new Self-Evaluation Committee. This committee, working with the Interim Executive Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness and the chancellor, developed a comprehensive 360 degree evaluation process. An extensive survey instrument addressing all areas of board responsibility and the issues raised through the accreditation reports was completed not only by all board members but also by an extensive cohort of respondents from among the various district wide constituents. A written analysis of the results highlighted not only the board’s perceptions of their strengths and weaknesses but also contrasted board perceptions with those of the various constituencies.

The survey results and subsequent analysis were discussed in open study sessions in a frank manner that focused on using the data to develop an action plan for the board for the upcoming year. That plan was developed and reviewed in several iterations between the self-evaluation committee and the full board in an open transparent environment. The action plan included items directly related to the recommendations from the accrediting commission as well as other items that related to improving board performance based on the evaluation. The final action plan was then adopted (November 8, 2011) by the entire board with the intention that the board would regularly review the planned actions over the course of upcoming meetings. A dashboard was developed to monitor and communicate the progress in achieving the plan.

The board intends to repeat this process using the initial survey results as a baseline to measure improvement while also documenting progress in achieving their planned actions. By taking this comprehensive approach to self-evaluation, the board has modeled good practice for the college communities. Data from a variety of sources was collected, analyzed, and discussed in an open and frank manner. The results then informed an action plan and a mechanism put in place to monitor progress toward that implementation.
Conclusion: The college and district fully meet the accreditation standards related to board self-evaluation. The board is to be commended for the comprehensive approach it has taken for its self-evaluation and for the openness in which it shared, discussed, and used the evaluation data to create its action plan.

2010 Shared District Recommendation 5: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends the Board of Trustees systematically review and revise the board policy manual to ensure that policies are up to date. This process should include a robust ethics policy that establishes steps to be taken should a board member violate this policy. The policy update should include the development of a policy on evaluation of the college presidents. (Standards IV.B.1, IV.B.1.f, IV.B.1.h, and IV.B.1.j)

Findings and Evidence:
The district has recently identified four board policies that were reviewed and revised by the Board of Trustees. These policies include a policy for the evaluation of the college presidents, a policy on district travel, a policy on access for Disabled Students Programs & Services students, and a revision to the board Code of Ethics policy which is currently in collegial consultation. These four policies were considered most crucial for the district. Each policy was taken through the shared governance process at each of the colleges.

The revised board Code of Ethics policy is scheduled to be adopted between December 2011 and March 2012.

Furthermore, the team found that aside from these four board policies, there has not been a policy review schedule approved by the Board of Trustees. Although the chancellor and board have identified a goal of reviewing 20% of the board policies each year, a formal schedule has not been identified.

Conclusion:
The team recognizes that much progress has been made in this area and appreciates the district identifying its most crucial policies that needed review and update. When the district adopts the revised ethics policy and determines a specific schedule for policy review and implements it, the college will have met this standard.

2010 Shared District Recommendation 6: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the functions of the district and colleges be clearly delineated and mapped through dialogue and improved communication. This delineation must include operational responsibilities as well as procedures that provide specific guidance to all district and college
personnel. There should also be regular and systematic evaluation of the district’s functions, governance, decision making structure, and communication. This activity must be central to the district’s continuous improvement efforts in assisting the colleges to meet educational goals. (Standards IV.A.2, IV.B.3, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.f, and IV.B.3.g)

Findings and Evidence:
The colleges and district have mapped and agreed to functions that are primary to college or district. The adopted plan was modeled after the Rancho Santiago Community College District (another two-college district in California). The taskforce representatives solicited input from college and district personnel about the model as it was being developed. Due to recent changes related to the responsibility for facilities and maintenance, clarity will be required moving forward. An evaluation of district governance or functional effectiveness has not occurred.

Conclusion:
There has been significant progress over the year on delineating functions between the college and the district through inclusive and collegial processes. How widely understood this delineation is and how effective it is remains unclear. The college and district, therefore, have not fully responded to this recommendation.

Commission Concern 2 (Board and CEO Roles and Responsibilities): The Accreditation Standards (IV.B.1, IV.B.2 and IV.B.3) require that the governing board be responsible for setting policies and that the chief administrator(s) responsibilities (chancellor and college presidents) be assigned responsibilities for the effective operation of the institution(s). In order to meet these Standards, the San Jose-Evergreen Board of Trustees must adhere to their appropriate roles at all times and allow the primary leadership of the district to be the responsibility of the chancellor and the primary leadership of the two colleges to be the responsibility of the respective college presidents.

Findings and Evidence:
See shared recommendation 3 (Board Governance)

Conclusion:
The colleges are in compliance with the standards related to board and chancellor governance. The processes that have been developed and put in place need to be sustained and continually monitored and improved.