



Executive Summary Accreditation Survey Results

Methodology

The College Research Office worked with the 2008 Accreditation self-study teams to construct a 67 question online survey to collect information about employee's knowledge of, participation in, and support for various processes and practices related to the accreditation standards. The survey was available to the campus from August 15 through September 19, 2008.

Demographics of Respondents

A total of 188 employees responded to the survey, which represents a return rate close to 30%. The median number of years worked at the College by respondents was between 6 and 7.9 years. Sixty-two percent of the respondents were female, 32% of the respondents were male, and 6% declined to state their gender. Seventy-five of the respondents were full-time faculty (a response rate of almost 40%), 68 respondents were classified staff (a 30% response rate), 26 respondents were adjunct faculty (a 10% response rate) and 9 administrators responded (a 53% response rate). Ten respondents declined to state their employee classification. This overview primarily considers results from all respondents, faculty respondents, full-time faculty respondents, and classified respondents due to the low response rates among adjunct faculty and the low number of administrators on campus, which would make interpretation among those groups problematic.

Overview of Results

The survey results overall were very positive and reflected generally **high levels of satisfaction** with, and relatively **high levels of participation** in, processes and practices related to the accreditation standards. Areas in this analysis identified as strengths are those items for which 75% or more of all respondents (3 out of 4) agreed or strongly agreed that the statement described their experience at the College.

Well over 50% of the respondents indicated they strongly agreed or agreed with most of the statements in the survey and the survey did not identify any critical areas of dissatisfaction. However, because the College strives "to provide the best overall education in California's community Colleges" and "is committed to teaching excellence, student success, and educational leadership", possible areas for **improvement in services and processes** were identified as items for which more than 20% of respondents (1 out of 5) disagreed or strongly disagreed that the statement described their experience at the College. There were no items for which 25% or more of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed. Possible areas for **enhanced communication** were identified as items for which more than 20% (1 out of 5) of the respondents responded "Don't Know".

Particular areas of strength (in alpha order by standard) are enumerated below.

Standard One: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

- communication of performance to the internal community
- high participation rates in planning processes
- implementation of College goals
- Mission and Vision statement's identification of its educational objectives
- use of a defined evaluation and planning process to set priorities

Standard Two: Student Learning Programs and Services

- teaching practices
- understanding of student learning outcomes and outcomes assessment
- College website

Standard Three: Resources

- access to CRC police
- diversity and equity including campus climate, the College's commitment to and support of equity and diversity, and the College's provision of equal opportunity for all students
- responsiveness of the District "Help Desk"
- high participation rates in on-campus and off-campus professional development activities
- hiring processes
- maintenance of College facilities
- performance evaluation processes with respect to their accuracy, utility, and adherence to contract guidelines
- safe and healthy learning and working environment
- responsiveness to security issues
- support of students' ability to complete their educational goals within a reasonable time
- support for participation in professional development
- support of academic freedom

Standard Four: Leadership and Governance

- Presidential leadership

Possible Opportunities for Further Dialogue

Possible opportunities for further dialogue and exploration with regard to **services and processes** (as indicated by items for which more than 20% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that a statement reflected their experience at the College) are enumerated below.

Services and Process

Standard Three

- accessibility of facilities
- professional development for classified staff
- sufficiency of staff to support student use of technology

Possible opportunities for further dialogue with regard to the **communication** of services and processes (as indicated by items for which more than 20% of respondents responded “Don’t Know” to a statement) are enumerated below.

Communication

Standard One

- communication of its performance to the external community it serves
- communication of the PrOF process and its relationship to program improvement

Standard Three

- communication about the evaluation processes for the various constituency groups

Caveats

The purpose of this overview is to help the self-study teams derive meaning from the attached data. The survey results are to augment and complement other sources of information relevant to the processes and practices included in the accreditation standards and to provide information about the College’s awareness of and participation in these processes and practices. The perceptions in many cases will support other sources of information and can be included in the self-study as confirmatory evidence. In cases where the perceptions in the survey seem inconsistent with other sources of data, the survey results should be cited and the analysis and planning agenda should respond to the apparent contradiction. There are multiple reasons why perceptions may not reflect other sources of evidence such as (1) expectation levels of respondents, (2) the communication of practices and processes to the respondents, (3) the possibility that the survey respondents do not accurately reflect the College population, (4) the College may already have made efforts to improve but the implementation and effects of these improvements are not yet known to the College community, and (5) the respondent’s role at the College as it relates to the question.

It is important to note that the percentages provided in the overview have different contexts. Most percentages reflect the opinions of all respondents. In certain cases, percentages reflect the opinions of all faculty, full-time faculty, or classified respondents. In several instances, the percentages were calculated after removing those who indicated a lack of knowledge in the area.

Future Plans

As noted above, the self-study teams will be using the results of this survey as one source of input into their descriptions, analyses, and planning agendas. In addition, the College Research Office will be editing and administering the survey on a bi-annual basis. This will allow the College to utilize these results as benchmarks against which to assess progress.

The Research Office has also evaluated and will be adjusting the survey instrument and methodology in future iterations to encourage a higher response rate from adjunct faculty so the College can better understand, and draw conclusions about, this important constituency group. A review of the adjunct faculty responses, although not statistically significant, affirmed most of the previously identified strengths in the areas most relevant to their job classification including campus climate, diversity and equity, the mission statement, the website, maintenance of facilities, academic freedom, the efficacy and accuracy of their evaluations, participation in professional development, teaching methods, and the understanding of student learning outcomes and assessment.

A similar review of the administrative responses, although not statistically significant, revealed a strong knowledge base with regard to all items, as indicated by the very small number of “Don’t Know” responses. In addition, most of the administrative respondents agreed or strongly agreed that most of the statements described their experience at the College. The Research Office will be validating the full participation of this constituency group in the survey.

Highlights of Standard One Responses

Strengths

Mission and Vision

There is extensive awareness of, and support for, the College’s Mission and Vision statement as indicated by the fact that 95.7% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the College had a publicized mission statement that defines its educational objectives. In addition, 84% of **respondents who indicated awareness of the process used to generate the statement** agreed or strongly agreed that the process was effective.

Planning

There was solid support for the process by which the College sets goals as indicated by the fact that 75% of respondents indicated they agreed or strongly agreed these processes were effective. In addition, close to 75% of respondents stated they agreed or strongly agreed that the College’s implementation of its goals and objectives was satisfactory. Furthermore, there appears to be broad participation in the planning processes at the College as indicated by the fact that 75% of respondents stated that they had participated in one or more planning activities at the College. Finally, almost 75% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the College adequately communicates its performance to the internal community.

Outcomes and Outcomes Assessment

There seems to be fairly broad and strong understanding of the definition of Student Learning or Service Area Outcomes and outcomes assessment as indicated by the fact that 84% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they understood Student Learning or Service Area Outcomes. Only 11.7% of respondents indicated they did **not** understand the concept of outcomes assessment. More than 80% of **respondents familiar with the outcomes dialogue opportunities** at the College agreed or strongly agreed that they were sufficient. In addition, 65% of all survey respondents, and over 97% of all faculty respondents, indicated they had participated in the **development** of student learning or service area outcomes. Finally, close to 50% of all respondents, and 72% of full-time faculty respondents, indicated they had already engaged in the **formal assessment** of student learning or service area outcomes.

Possible Opportunities for Improvement in Services or Processes

There were no items relevant to Standard One for which more than 20% of respondents **disagreed or strongly disagreed** that the statements related to the Standard reflected their experience at the College.

Possible Opportunities for Improvement in Communication

There are two areas that might be considered as opportunities for improvement with regard to the **communication** of services and processes related to Standard One as indicated by more than 20% of respondents answering “**Don’t Know**” in response to a statement related to the Standard.

Possible Opportunities for Improvement in Communication (Standard One)

Awareness of Planning Processes

The survey results indicate that a significant percentage of the respondents were **not aware of various components of the planning and evaluation processes** at the College. Although almost 37% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the Program Review process (PrOF) has facilitated program improvement, over 25% of all respondents (35.3% of classified respondents) indicated “Don’t Know” in response to this statement. Similarly, although over 65% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the process used to develop the new mission and vision statement was appropriate, over 20% of all respondents (33.8% of classified respondents) indicated “Don’t Know” in response to this statement. In addition, although 75% of all respondents indicated they had participate in planning activities at the College, a smaller percentage of classified respondents indicated they had participated in planning activities at the College (52.9%) compared with full-time faculty respondents (97.3%).

Communication of Performance to the Community

Although almost 44% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the College adequately communicates its performance to the external community, 26.7% of the respondents were not aware of how the College communicates its performance to the external community it serves.

Highlights of Standard Two Responses

Strengths

Teaching

The survey results indicate several strengths with respect to teaching practices utilized at the College. In particular, 99% of the teachers who responded indicated they always or usually utilized a variety of strategies and tools to assess student learning. Over 94% indicated they always or usually used a variety of techniques to address various learning styles and 94.2% indicated they always or usually included a variety of perspectives in their instruction. Over 87% of respondents who had taught a GE course indicated they always or usually utilized learning and assessment activities that required writing. Similarly, 82.9% of the teachers who responded indicated they always or usually used groups, and 80.3% indicated they always or usually utilized Internet resources in their face-to-face classes.

College Website

Most respondents were aware of the information on the CRC website (98.9%), and almost 80% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed the website was sufficient to meet the needs of the College.

Outcomes and Outcomes Assessment

There seems to be fairly broad and strong understanding of Student Learning or Service Area Outcomes and outcomes assessment as indicated by the fact that 84% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they understood Student Learning or Service Area Outcomes. Only 11.7% of respondents indicated they did **not** understand the concept of outcomes assessment. More than 80% of **respondents familiar with the outcomes dialogue opportunities** at the College agreed or strongly agreed that they were sufficient. In addition, 65% of all survey respondents, and over 97% of all faculty respondents, indicated they had participated in the **development** of student learning or service area outcomes. Finally, close to 50% of all respondents, and 72% of full-time faculty respondents, indicated they had already engaged in the **formal assessment** of student learning or service area outcomes.

Possible Opportunities for Improvement in Services or Processes (Standard Two)

There were no items relevant to Standard Two for which more than 20% of respondents **disagreed or strongly disagreed** that the statements related to the Standard reflected their experience at the College.

Possible Opportunities for Improvement in Communication

There were no items relevant to Standard Two for which more than 20% of respondents indicated “**Don’t Know**” to the statements related to the Standard.

Highlights of Standard Three Responses

Strengths

Diversity and Equity

Over 95.7% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the College acknowledged diversity, 93.1% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the College had a **welcoming and positive environment**, 86.5% agreed or strongly agreed that the College had a **commitment to equity and diversity**, and 82.4% agreed or strongly agreed that the College provided **equal opportunity for students**.

Academic Freedom

Over 91% of those who did **not** respond “Don’t Know” to the statement about academic freedom (83% of all respondents) agreed or strongly agreed that the College supported academic freedom.

Efficacy of Processes

Close to 85% of all respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the District’s “**Help Desk**” responded to service requests in a timely manner. Eighty four percent agreed or strongly agreed that their **evaluations adhered to the contract** and close to 82% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed they were satisfied with the **accuracy and utility of their evaluations**. Over 75% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the **hiring processes** selected individuals who advanced the mission of the College. In addition, 80% of all respondents agreed or strongly agreed that **classes are scheduled** in such a way that student can complete their educational goals within a reasonable time.

Professional Development

Almost 75% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the College provides sufficient support for them to participate in professional development activities. Close to 80% of respondents indicated they had participated in on-campus professional development activities during the previous three years. Similarly, close to 80% of respondents indicated they had participated in on-campus professional development activities during the previous three years.

Facilities

Almost 82% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the facilities at the College are well-maintained and 78.7% agreed or strongly agreed that the facilities provide a safe and healthy learning and working environment.

Safety and Security

Just over 82% of all respondents agreed or strongly agreed that access to the CRC Police is adequate and 75.9% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the College sufficiently addresses security issues.

Possible Opportunities for Improvement in Services and Processes (Standard Three)

There are three possible opportunities for improvement in processes at the College based on the fact that more than 20% of respondents **disagreed or strongly disagreed** that a statement related to the Standard reflected their experience at the College.

Accessibility of Facilities

Although almost 56% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that campus buildings have sufficient accommodations for persons with disabilities, almost 22% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement.

Sufficiency of staff to support student use of technology

Although close to 50% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the College has sufficient staff to support students' use of technology, almost 21% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement.

Participation in Professional Development by Classified Staff

Although over 64% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that technology training is sufficient, almost 20% of classified respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. In addition, only 60% of classified respondents indicated they had participated in on-campus professional development opportunities during the previous three years (compared with 80% overall). A similar difference was evidenced when examining participation rates in off-campus professional development opportunities.

Possible Opportunities for Improvement in Communication

There is one possible opportunity for improvement in the communication of processes relative to Standard Three based on the fact that more than 20% of respondents indicated "Don't Know" in response to a statement related to the Standard.

Evaluation Process Awareness

Although approximately 45% indicated they agreed or strongly agreed that the various evaluation processes met the needs of the College, over 20% of the respondents did not know whether the these processes adequately meet the needs of the College.

Highlights of Standard Four Responses

Strengths

Presidential Leadership

Almost 81% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the CRC President provided appropriate leadership for the College.

Possible Opportunities for Improvement in Processes

There were no items relevant to Standard Four for which more than 20% of respondents **disagreed or strongly disagreed** that the statements related to the Standard reflected their experience at the College.

Possible Opportunities for Improvement in Communication

There were no items relevant to Standard Four for which more than 20% of respondents indicated "**Don't Know**" to the statements related to the Standard.

Summary of Anecdotal Comments

Thirty-eight respondents took the time to expand on their responses to the survey.

- Five respondents expanded on the positive environment at the campus, extolling the college's focus on student learning, its student centeredness, and its friendliness.
- Five respondents expanded on their concerns relative to meeting the needs of students with disabilities.
- Six respondents cited issues with respect to receiving adequate support from their manager/supervisor.
- Four respondents commented on unethical behavior that has allegedly occurred on campus.
- Several comments related to workload came forward in various contexts including shared governance, the ability to participate in professional development, and the efficacy of the department chair structure.
- Three respondents expressed concerns about the equity and transparency of hiring processes
- Three respondents cited the need to enhance the flow of information on campus.
- Three respondents expressed concerns about the financial support available to support program development, tutoring, and instruction.

More detail about these comments is available upon request.