

**Fullerton College
North Orange County Community College District**

Follow-up Report

Submitted by:

**Fullerton College
321 E. Chapman Avenue
Fullerton, California 92832**

To:

**Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges**

February 26, 2013

Fullerton College Follow-up Report

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Rajen Vurdien, Ph.D., MBA
Fullerton College
321 E. Chapman Avenue
Fullerton, California 92832

I certify there was broad participation by the campus community and believe this Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

Signatures:

Rajen Vurdien, Ph.D., MBA, Fullerton College President

Date

Ned Doffoney, Ed.D, Chancellor

Date

Molly McClanahan, President, Board of Trustees

Date

Rolando Sanabria, Ed.D. President, Faculty Senate

Date

Catherine Parks, President, Classified Senate

Date

Daniel Moldovan, President, Associated Students

Date

Toni M. DuBois, Ph.D., VPSS, Accreditation Liaison Officer

Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Certification	2
Report Preparation	4
Response to the Commission Action Letter.....	5
College Recommendation #2.....	5
College Recommendation #4.....	XX
Appendix A: Timeframes and Activities	XX
Work Group meeting notes Rec. #2.....	XX
Work Group meeting notes Rec. #4.....	XX
Timeline for College Response to ACCJC	XX
Timeline for SLOA Tasks.....	XX
Appendix B: Evidence for College Recommendation #2	XX
Evidence of	XX
Evidence of	XX
Evidence of	XX
Evidence of	XX
Appendix C: Evidence for College Recommendation #4.....	XX
C.1: PAC Minutes 5/11/11.....	XX
C.2: 2011-12 Strategic Action Plans.....	XX
C.3: 2011-12 Annual Report.....	XX
C.4: 2011-12 Institutional Effectiveness Report.....	XX
C.5: Timeline for Program Review.....	XX
C.6: Faculty Senate Minutes 4/19/12.....	XX
C.7: PAC Minutes 5/9/12.....	XX
C.8: Funded Activities from Program Review and PBSC.....	XX
C.9: IRC Evaluation of Program Review Process—committee members.....	XX
C.10: Program Review Process Survey to Faculty	XX
C.11: IRC Survey of Committees, Groups, etc.....	XX
C.12: Technology Committee Mission and Purpose	XX
C.13: PAC Minutes 11/14/12.....	XX
C.14: PBSC Rubric for Evaluating PR Requests for Resources.....	XX
C.15: Integrated Planning Manual	XX

Report Preparation

This Follow-up Report is submitted as a progress report outlining Fullerton College's responses to the recommendations made by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) in its July 2, 2012 action letter to the Fullerton College President after the April 2012 Follow-up site visit. This Follow-up Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of progress since the April 2012 visit.

Three work groups were formed at the college to address the recommendations made by ACCJC. The first group was the Coordinating Group which was responsible for developing a timeline for the preparation of this Follow-up Report, the production of an Integrated Planning Manual for the college, and providing leadership to the other groups. The three college Vice Presidents, the Interim Director of Institutional Research and Planning, and the Faculty Senate President formed the Coordinating Group. The second group created was the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Group which was responsible for addressing College Recommendation 2 and reporting to the Coordinating Group. The third group formed was the Planning Group which was responsible for addressing College Recommendation 4 and reporting to the Coordinating Group. The SLOA and the Planning Groups are comprised of members from administration, faculty, and classified staff (A.1, A.2.)

Evidence of progress was gathered from all campus constituents including managers, faculty, classified staff, and students through the three work groups and through the various standing committees operating on campus. Draft Follow-up Reports were made available to the entire staff of the college and to the students. The drafts and final Report were reviewed by individual constituent groups and by the President's Advisory Council, a participatory governance committee representing all campus constituencies (A.3.)

The North Orange County Community College District Board of Trustees received a draft copy of the Follow-up Report with supporting documents as an information item at the February 12, 2013 Board meeting and received the final Report for acceptance at the February 26, 2013 Board meeting.

Response to the Commission Action Letter

College Recommendation 2

In order to meet the Standard, to achieve the Proficiency level in accordance with the ACCJC *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness* for student learning outcomes and timeline, and to fully address Recommendation 5 of the previous visiting Team report, the Team recommends that the institution accelerate the identification and assessment of course and program-level student learning outcomes, and use the results to make improvements in courses and programs. (Standard II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.f, II.B.4, II.C.2)

II.A.1.a. The institution identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its communities. The institution relies upon research and analysis to identify student learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes.

II.A.1.c. The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.

II.A.2.f. The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs, including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies.

II.B.4. The institution evaluates student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

II.C.2. The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

In response to the Commission's recommendation, Fullerton College has actively accelerated Student Learning Outcome (SLO) assessment and the use of assessment results in the improvement of student learning. Instructional programs and Student Services programs have made great progress in committing to SLOs as success indicators. The institution continues on a

path that assures that sufficient resources are assigned to this task and that institutional processes utilize SLO assessments in the improvement of student learning.

Fullerton College previously committed itself to identifying SLOs and SLO assessments (SLOAs) for each course. Workshops were provided for faculty and division administrators to introduce the relationship between course curricula, instructional objectives, and SLOs, and to provide the tools for developing course-level SLOs (B.1.) In 2007, the Faculty Senate implemented a policy requiring all new and revised courses to have SLOs (B.2.) Approved wording for framing course SLOs was developed and a specific page within the course file in CurricUNET was developed to allow SLOs and SLOAs to be reviewed and revised by faculty and the Curriculum Committee (B.3.)

In 2009, the Faculty Senate endorsed a plan to have all departments devise and implement SLOAs (B.4) Led by the College’s SLOA Coordinator, the College made significant progress on course-level SLOs and SLOAs during the 2009-10 and 2010-11 academic years. By March 2011, 89.6% of FC courses had SLOs and SLOAs (B.5.) The Curriculum Committee developed a procedure to expedite the process of reporting course-level and program SLOs.

Beginning with the Fall 2012 semester, a new faculty SLOA Coordinator was selected and the release time for that position was increased from 3 units per semester to 6 units per semester, affording the Coordinator more time to significantly accelerate the College’s identification and assessment of SLOs. The SLOA Coordinator worked with all Instructional Divisions of the College to gather information on SLO assessment processes. Simplified forms were created for optional use by departments and additional training was offered.

Table 1. Summary of Course Level SLO and SLOA status by Division

Division	Total Courses ¹	Active Courses ²	Active Courses with SLOs & SLOAs ³	Active Courses with ongoing assessment ⁴	Active Courses that analysis of SLOA data has been used to improve learning ⁵	Course Sections offered in Fall 2012 with SLOs in Syllabi ⁶
Business & CIS	167	70	70	70	45	100% (128/128)
Counseling & Student Development	19	15	15	15	15	100% (42/42)
Fine Arts	227	170	170	153	7	85.4% (239/280)
Humanities	126	82	49	42	42	100% (362/362)
Library Technology	2	2	2	2	2	100% (3/3)
Math & Computer	30	28	28	28	24	100% (144/144)

Science						
Natural Sciences	136	91	90	70	70	92.9% (144/155)
Physical Education	179	144	141	96	53	82.3% (116/141)
Social Sciences	175	170	166	155	98	82.4% (182/221)
Technology & Engineering	310	209	195	188	186	97.1% (237/244)
Total	1371	981	926	666	646	92.8% (1597/1720)
		94.7%	94.4%	67.9%	65.9%	

1. Total Courses represents– all courses for each division as identified in the 2012-13 catalog excluding those currently in curriculum process for deletion.
2. Active Courses includes any of the courses in the catalog that have been offered in the past two years (2010-2011, 2011-12, and Fall 2012).
3. Courses counted in preceding column that have SLOs and SLOAs in CurricUNET.
4. The number of active courses that have been or are being assessed.
5. The number of active courses in which the department has closed the loop (assessed, analyzed data, had reflective conversations, and instituted some type of change to the curriculum or pedagogy).
6. The percentage of all sections offered by the Division that had SLOs in the syllabi in fall 2012. The numbers in parentheses represent the actual sections.

Table 1 identifies active courses as those which have been offered at least once during the 2010-11 and 2011-12 academic years or in Fall 2012. Of these active courses, 67.9% have undergone or are undergoing assessment, and 65.9% have gone through at least one complete cycle of assessment and reflective dialogue followed by changes to curriculum and/or instruction. An example of this is found in the Introduction to Probability and Statistics 1 course. Assessment results identified outcomes that students' performance at 62 to 73% compared to 78 to 82% for the other SLOs. In an attempt to improve performance on these outcomes, the instructor added homework assignments, modified the emphasis of lectures, and added review quizzes to enhance student learning (B.7.) Through the work of the SLOA Committee, the goal of 100% in all areas is attainable.

Fullerton College offers 175 programs leading to a certificate or degree. Currently, 82.3% of the programs have SLOs and SLO assessments identified, 76.6% have undergone or are undergoing assessment, and 71.4% have completed at least one full cycle of assessment and reflective dialogue leading to changes to improve student learning and success.

Under the guidance of the former faculty SLO Coordinator, the College began assessment of program-level SLOs in 2009, and the efforts continue under the guidance of the current faculty SLO Coordinator. Each semester faculty members conduct assessments of SLOs for their courses and at various times meet in department or division meetings to analyze assessment data, discuss results and make determinations of what changes are needed to improve student learning (B.8.) Departments have completed assessment cycles and have initiated changes in

both curriculum and instruction in response to the results. For example, assessment of outcomes in English 100 identified that students did not understand the effective use of sources. English faculty members identified topics to more effectively convey the use of sources and have discussed these methods with faculty members who teach English 100. Individual instructors will develop their own methods of teaching the material and the department is reassessing following implementation (B.9.) Another example is found in the Chemistry Department where assessment of SLOs identified a weakness in students' understanding of chemistry at the molecular level. Faculty members determined that an increased emphasis was needed to better put across this concept, so the "Atoms First" textbook was incorporated into the course beginning in Fall 2012 (B.10.)

Fullerton College uses CurricUNET for its curriculum process. This software includes the ability to report and monitor courses and programs. CurricUNET also contains a page for SLOs and SLOAs for courses and a reporting module which allows access to reports indicating the status of SLOs and SLOAs for courses (B.11.) This feature provides for the incorporation of SLOs into all Course Outlines of Record. A similar page also exists in CurricUNET for program-level SLOs, allowing inclusion of the program-level SLOs in the catalog description of the program as well as any other electronic or printed versions of the descriptions. Reports listing course-level and program-level SLOs and SLOAs are available to students, faculty, staff, and members of the community through the SLO web page.

In addition to the information available in CurricUNET, the College SLOA Coordinator tracks progress in the development of SLOs, SLOA methodologies, planned and completed assessments, and progress on using data to make changes for improving instruction (B.12.) Faculty members provide SLOA data via the submission of SLOA tracking forms to the Division and College SLOA Coordinators. New SLOA tracking forms were developed in the summer of 2012 by the SLOA Committee. These new forms have simplified the process and provided all appropriate information for tracking progress on SLO assessments. Information contained on the submitted forms is used to update the information needed for the SLOA reports and published on the SLO website, where it is available to all members of the FC community (B.13.)

At the end of the Spring 2012 semester, the Curriculum Committee committed to including SLOs on Course Outlines of Records (CORs). The Vice President of Instruction and the Curriculum Committee developed an efficient method for including SLOs on CORs (B.14.) Faculty members include SLOs in printed course syllabi which are distributed to students at the beginning of a course. In the Fall 2012 semester, 93% of the 1,719 sections offered contained SLOs in the syllabi, indicating an increase from the Spring 2012 semester when only 63% of sections offered provided SLOs in the syllabi. (see Table I) SLOs may also be found on division and course websites (B.15.)

Use of SLO assessment at the course, program, and institutional levels is discussed campus wide and data from assessment is incorporated into the program review process which is an important part of the planning and budgeting process of the College. A thorough explanation of the College's planning, budgeting and decision-making processes may be found in the

Integrated Planning Manual which accompanies this report. The College began using a mixed-methods program review format in the Fall semester of 2011 when all instructional programs completed self-studies. Instructional support and Student Services programs are using the same mixed-methods format as they complete their self-studies during the 2012-13 academic year. By incorporating SLOs into the program review process, the individual program reviews will provide evidence of program effectiveness, and improvements by assessment of SLOs may be related to program goals. Three critical questions may be answered by the program review process: 1) What will students learn in the program; 2) What have students learned in the program; and 3) What can the program do to further enhance student learning and the student experience (B.16.)

Outcomes of program review are informed by the inclusion of SLOs and SLOAs for courses and programs. When incorporated with department and division faculty discussions about assessment results, analysis of the assessment data drives changes to curriculum and teaching methods, improving learning. Timelines for the submission of SLOAs have been incorporated into the College's Integrated Planning Calendar (B.17.)

In November 2012 a 3-hour, hands-on workshop about SLO and PSLO assessment was presented by two professionals from outside the college. One presenter was from the School of Continuing Education and the other was a member of the Executive Committee for the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges. These presenters taught attendees how to customize SLO assessment and motivated faculty to incorporate assessment into everyday work to improve student success.

Acceleration of the identification and assessment of course and program-level student learning outcomes, and the use of the results of assessment in improving student learning has been accomplished with college-wide participation. As the first full cycle of the revised program review process with the incorporation of SLOs and SLOAs is completed in Spring 2013, the College community will have an effective mechanism to evaluate the College's SLO/SLOA process. The College's Institutional Research Committee (IRC) evaluated the revised program review process in Spring and Fall of 2012 and the IRC will be asked to evaluate the SLO/SLOA process during the 2013-14 academic year to determine if changes in the process would be beneficial in improving student learning and/or in program improvements.

As previously noted, each department within the Student Services Division is completing the mixed-methods program review during the 2012-13 academic year. SLOs and SLOAs for Student Services will now be incorporated into the program review self-study. Previously, Student Services used a separate template to identify and report the assessment of SLOs and the analysis of SLOs were completed annually, allowing for the identification of gaps or needed changes to the methods used to offer services. The new incorporated method allows for a broader viewing of the Student Services' program review and assessment of SLOs.

The Library and Academic Support Center (ASC) staff members understand the importance of evaluating services to ensure that identified student needs are met. The library offers two

courses and these courses have SLOs and assessments in place. Assessment of these courses has occurred and the results have been used to improve student learning. In addition, the library has a number of Service Area Outcomes (SAO's) which are assessed regularly. Student and faculty surveys, evaluation forms, comment cards, and the study of statistics are used regularly to identify needs and evaluate service provided by the library and the ASC. Identified in the program review process as an area of "student support," the library and ASC are participating in the program review process during the 2012-12 academic year and include their SLOs in the review instrument.

In addition to participation in the program review process, the library and ASC faculty, staff, and management representatives serve on various College committees to provide input and allow for discussion of services provided or enhancements to services. Representatives from the library and ASC serve on the Curriculum Committee, the Student Success Committee, the Basic Skills Committee, and the Technology Committee.

Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) were endorsed by the President's Advisory Council (PAC) in Spring 2010 (B.18.) Departments in the Student Services Division began linking ISLOs to program SLOs for the 2009-10 year allowing for on-going assessment. The SLO Assessment Committee has clearly defined educational programs according to the ACCJC guidelines enabling divisions to work aggressively on the completion of program-level SLOs and methods of assessment for ISLOs. While a number of the College's Career and Technical Education programs assess program-level SLOs using an accumulation of skills and abilities, learned, the linking of course, program, and institutional SLOs provides an alternative method of assessment for other areas of the College. Table 2 lists the ISLOs and provides examples of both Student Services and Instructional area SLOs linked to ISLOs. Ongoing assessment, analysis of data from assessment, and reflective conversations lead to changes that improve student learning in Student Services as well as instructional departments.

Fullerton College has purposefully accelerated identification and assessment of course and program-level student learning outcomes, and has incorporated the use of the results of assessment into the mainstream improvements in courses and programs. By increasing resources devoted to SLO identification and assessment, including SLOs and SLOAs in the program review process, and by linking course and program-level SLOs to Institutional SLOs, the College has become adept in using evaluations of student learning outcomes to improve student learning and success. Incorporation of SLOs and assessment into the program review self-studies has allowed for the linking of SLOA to the planning and budget process.

College Recommendation 4

In order to meet the Standard, to fully address Recommendation 3 of the previous visiting Team report, and to fall within the required range of Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement on the ACCJS *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness* for planning, the Team recommends that the college fully implement and strengthen its institutional planning process to include: 1) reporting systematically on an agreed upon set of college wide critical indicators and measures that clearly assess the progress of College wide goals; 2) closing the planning loop by evaluating actions taken and then documenting future actions based on the evaluation results; 3) expanding efforts to engage all relevant constituents in a collaborative inquiry process that is facilitate by a broad range of College members; 4) building in mechanisms for regularly evaluating the effectiveness of planning processes; and 5) providing transparency in the institutional planning process by communicating clearly, broadly, and systematically, and by providing structured, well-defined opportunities for broad employee participation. (Standard I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4)

I.B.2. The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.

I.B.3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.

I.B.4. The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

At the time of the writing of the March 2012 Follow-up Report and the April 2012 Follow-up Site Visit, the newly revised integrated planning process at Fullerton College had not yet been through a full cycle. Significant progress had been made; however, the entire process had not been completed. The commission's recommendation has now been fully implemented and the college's institutional planning process has been strengthened.

As noted in the preceding Follow-up Report, Fullerton College opted to significantly modify its planning process at the beginning of the 2010-11 academic year. During that year, several

meetings took place to define terminology, to modify the program review process, to identify the college goals and objectives, and to better integrate planning with budgeting. The President's Advisory Council (PAC), the Faculty Senate, and the Deans' Council each conversed about preferred methods to improve the college planning process. Ultimately, the process was endorsed by the PAC and implemented.

An initial step in the revised planning process was to establish broad college goals, objectives and strategic action plans in line with the college's mission and core values as well as the District's Strategic Directions. The PAC endorsed a set of three college goals and related objectives in May of 2011 (C.1.) All college constituent groups and programs were asked to contribute strategic action plans to accomplish the identified objectives. The action plans were reviewed by the Planning and Budget Steering Committee and a number of the plans requiring additional resources were funded for the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters. Progress toward the Strategic Action Plans is reported to the college community, including the Board of Trustees each year along with the presentation of the College's Annual Report and the Institutional Effectiveness Report (C.2, C.3, C.4.)

The program review process was enhanced by the formation of the Program Review Committee in spring of 2011. The Program Review Committee is a sub-committee of the Faculty Senate. Since the establishment of this committee, the program review process has been modified; a uniform, mixed methods review format has been adopted; a handbook has been created to assist in the completion of the process and make the process more transparent; and the program review process has been deliberately linked to budgeting. Incorporation of Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment into the program review self-studies has proven to be a beneficial step in linking SLOA to the planning process.

With the revision of the program review process, program reviews are completed every two years. All Instructional Programs completed their program reviews in fall 2011 and all non-academic program reviews are being completed in fall 2012. A specific timeline for program review has been established. (C.5) The Program Review Committee divided into sub-groups and all program review self-studies were read and evaluated. A Readers' Report was completed for each review. All program review self-studies and Readers' Reports are posted on the Fullerton College web site. A final report, including the identification of common themes and a compilation of the requests for resources was accepted by the Faculty Senate at their April 19, 2012 meeting and endorsed by the President's Advisory Council at its May 9, 2012 meeting (C.6, C.7.)

One of the common themes to emerge from the program review self-studies was the need for additional supplemental instruction. To address that need quickly a supplemental instruction pilot project was instituted for the 2012-13 academic year with \$25,000 from carry-over funds.

After endorsement by the President's Advisory Council, the Program Review Final Report along with the request for resources is given to the Planning and Budget Steering Committee (PBSC). According to the FC Integrated Planning Calendar, the review by PBSC and the allocation of resources will normally occur in May of each year. The PBSC was chaired by the Vice President of Administrative Services, who resigned from his position in May 2012. An Interim Vice President began in July 2012 and worked with the PBSC to allocate resources to the action plans identified in the program review process that directly address the current college objectives. Funding was made available to various Program Review action plans in the Fall 2012 semester (Evidence: listing of plans that were awarded funding—C.8.)

Annually the Director of Institutional Research and Planning compiles the Institutional Effectiveness Report using Fall-to-Fall comparisons of student and institutional data, college Key Performance Indicators, and program-specific measures determined in collaboration with program participants, the Institutional Research Office, and the college leadership. Additionally, the Fullerton College Fact Book, the Fullerton College Environmental Scan, the Fullerton College Annual Report, and the Fullerton College Program Review Reports are used for college planning purposes and for the evaluation of initiatives developed to achieve college goals. Posting of final reports on the College's Institutional Research website provides access to the community and aids in the expanded efforts to engage all relevant constituencies in the planning, implementation, and evaluation processes (C.4.)

The Student Success Committee (SSC) was formed in fall of 2011 to provide leadership, advocacy, and institutional guidance and vision for coordinating campus wide student success efforts affecting basic skills, transfer, Career Technical Education completion, diversity and equity at the College. The SSC reports to the Faculty Senate, as well as the President's Advisory Council. Membership of the SSC includes representatives from all divisions and programs of the campus whose efforts are directed at student success (i.e. Basic Skills Committee, Staff Development Committee, Diversity Committee, and the Academic Support Center.) With the support and collaboration of the entire campus community, the committee investigates issues, gathers and shares information; consults with constituencies; operates as a repository of knowledge; and serves as a catalyst for student success and completion activities on campus.

The President's Advisory Council endorsed six initiatives for the 2012-13 academic year to be undertaken by the Student Success Committee. The initiatives include: 1) Evaluate student

success programs at Fullerton College; 2) Implement a pilot program of Supplemental Instruction in content areas outside of Basic Skills; 3) Develop supplemental methods of advising, such as electronic education plans and training faculty in academic advising; 4) Collaborate with K-12 focused on instruction and student services; 5) Increase Financial aid/Admissions information and knowledge to students; and 6) Collaborate with and support staff Development and Basic Skills Committees to provide more focused and sustained Staff Development related to student success. The Student Success Committee divided into six workgroups to address the six initiatives. Each of the workgroups identified a focused action that could be accomplished within the academic year. For example, the workgroup addressing the evaluation of student success programs have developed a rubric to be used for the selection of programs to be evaluated and are preparing to beta test the evaluation structure on one group during spring 2013.

The establishment of the Institutional Research Committee (IRC) in fall of 2010 has enhanced the evaluation of the elements of the FC Integrated Planning Process. The IRC is a sub-committee of the Faculty Senate which was instituted to identify, discuss and disseminate research data and information useful to campus constituents interested or engaged in educational and scientific research. The committee's function is four-fold: 1) function as an Institutional Review Board, 2) function as a research review committee, 3) set the research agenda for the college, and 4) function as the meta-process evaluation arm of the college. The IRC meetings and activities serve as a medium to promote a culture of inquiry and evidence at the college. The college's Institutional Review Board (IRB) is a subcommittee of the IRC that ensures compliance with Title 45 Code of Federal Regulations Part 46, implementing provisions of the National Research Act of 1974. The IRB has been formally designated to approve, monitor, and review behavioral research involving humans, using some form of risk-benefit analysis.

Since the March 2012 Follow-up Report and April 2012 Follow-up Site Visit, Fullerton College has closed the planning loop by assessing the college procedures and committee functions, and modifying practices as a result of those assessments. Additionally, the college's planning process now includes various mechanisms to regularly evaluate the effectiveness of all elements contributing to the integrated planning model.

The Institutional Research Committee (IRC) serves a significant role in assessing the effectiveness of the planning processes. Some examples of the IRC's contributions to assessment are found in their activities to date. In fall of 2011, the IRC reviewed and discussed the chapters of the District's Comprehensive Master Plan as requested by the Faculty Senate. The IRC chair presented the review to the Master Planning committee at the NOCCCD. Changes to the Master Plan were made based on this input.

The IRC also recognized a need to identify all active grants on campus to ensure their alignment with the current college goals and objectives. The IRC then reviewed the grant application and oversight process, identifying gaps in the process and needed improvements including the approval procedure and oversight of grant funded activities. The results were presented to the Faculty Senate who brought the information to the attention of the Vice President of Instruction (VPI.) The VPI, the Interim Vice President of Administrative Services, the Dean who has oversight of grants, and the Director of the Special Projects met and agreed to a revised procedure for application and monitoring of grants.

Another assessment of the IRC was that of the college's program review process for instructional areas. The IRC designed a survey about the recently modified program review process. The survey was administered to faculty members who participated in the 2011 mixed-method review developed by the Program Review Committee. Members of the Program Review Committee also completed a survey. To supplement the quantitative and qualitative data gathered, the IRC conducted a focus group with a representative sample of the Program Review Committee members to complete the evaluation. The IRC provided its results in both summary data and written reports. (C.9) Based on the information provided, the Program Review Committee instituted changes in the review process. Those changes are being applied to the Instructional Support program review process taking place in the 2012-13 academic year and will be applied to the Instructional program review process in the next cycle. The final survey about the Instructional Program Review was distributed to faculty members in November 2012 and will be analyzed by the IRC in the Spring 2013 semester (C.10.)

Currently, the IRC is reviewing the college's planning model and has begun a comprehensive evaluation of the process. A qualitative survey has been generated and distributed to all committees, groups, and administrators identified in the model. This meta-evaluation will be completed in spring of 2013 (Evidence: copy of survey instrument C.11.)

In addition to the input from the IRC, the various councils and committees of the college assess their effectiveness on a regular basis. The President's Advisory Council (PAC) and the committees that report to the PAC evaluate their processes in May of each year. Any identified deficiencies are addressed in the council or committees procedures in the subsequent academic year.

In the evaluation of the three types of technology committees on campus, disengagement was identified in the processes of the three entities, the Distance Education Advisory Committee, the Instructional Technology Committee, and the Technology Implementation Planning Committee. The assessment determined that the needs of the college would be better served by combining these three committees to form one committee: the Technology Committee. The

new committee was endorsed by the President's Advisory Council at its November 14, 2012 meeting and implemented by the College President. (Evidence: Mission and Purpose of new committee—C.12, PAC minutes 11/14/12—C.13)

Another example of procedural evaluation that resulted in a modification to a process is in the Planning and Budget Steering Committee (PBSC). In fall 2012, the PBSC determined that a set of guidelines and a measurement tool was needed to effectively evaluate the Requests for Resources from the program review process. Task forces of PBSC members were formed to develop the guidelines and the measurement tool, and the recommendations for funding were determined using the newly developed instruments. (PBSC Rubric for evaluation—C.14)

The college provides transparency in the institutional planning process by communicating clearly and systematically, and by providing structured, well-defined opportunities for participation by the entire campus community. The PAC is the major venue for participatory governance and communication of campus wide initiatives, strategies, actions, and decisions. In order to make the planning process more understandable for all members of the Fullerton College community, the *Fullerton College Integrated Planning Manual* was compiled. (C.15)

The *Fullerton College Integrated Planning Manual* offers increased transparency of the institutional planning process by providing clear communication about the components of the college planning process and the opportunities for broad employee and student participation. The first manual was distributed to the entire campus community with opportunities for input. To ensure ample time for constituent groups to review the manual, the draft of the manual was listed on the "Timeline for Responding to July 2012 ACCJC Recommendations." (A.3)

The FC Classified Senate, Faculty Senate, and the PAC formally reviewed the manual and endorsed it. The college President accepted the document as a pragmatic description of the integrated planning process taking place at Fullerton College. To preserve the reliability of the *Fullerton College Integrated Planning Manual*, the college's Director of Institutional Research and Planning will be responsible for annual updates to include changes, such as descriptions, timelines, or processes.

Appendix A: Timelines and Activities

Activity	Timeline	Responsible Party	Progress
Fullerton College commitment to identify SLOs and SLO assessments for all courses	2006 - 2012	Vice President, Instruction Dean, Academic Services Curriculum Committee SLO Assessment Committee	On Going
2009-2010 SLOA/Program Review/Planning Calendar developed	September 2009	Carol Mattson, Dean Academic Services	Completed September 14, 2009
Re-institution of Fullerton College program review process	Fall 2009	Ad hoc committee of Interim Vice President of Instruction, several deans, Faculty Senate president, Director of Institutional Research	All instructional programs and student services programs completed program reviews.
Curriculum Committee accepts a plan for batch approval of SLOs & SLOAs including mechanism for updating SLO website and CurricUNET	September 2009	Danielle Fouquette, SLO Coordinator and Carol Mattson, Dean, Academic Services	Process put in place by Curriculum Committee September 29, 2010
Review of program reviews	Spring 2010	Ad hoc committee of Interim VPI, several deans, Faculty Senate president, Director of Institutional Research Deans Council	All program reviews were reviewed. Common themes were extracted – these included dealing with underprepared students and upgrading technology and computer support.
Incorporating program review into planning	Fall 2010 – Spring 2011	Interim Vice President of Instruction, Director of Institutional Research, President's Advisory Council	Program review themes and request for resources were reviewed and submitted to President's Advisory Council (PAC). PAC sent themes and requests to Planning

			and Budget Steering Committee.
SLOA Committee developing SLO/SLOA handbook	November, 2010 – March, 2011	SLOA Committee	Complete. Faculty Senate approved March 2, 2011
Division Deans provided current list of SLOs & SLOAs on website and asked to update	November, 2010 – February, 2011	Danielle Fouquette, SLO Coordinator and Division Deans	SLO webpage updated by March 2011. Update of CurricUNET not completed
Updating of Fullerton College Planning Cycle that includes SLOs and SLOAs	Spring 2011	President, President's Advisory Council, Faculty Senate	Completed
Updating of Fullerton College Planning and Budgeting Calendar	Spring 2011	Director of Institutional Research, Planning and Budget Steering Committee	Completed
Instructional Program Reviews Completed (include SLO and SLO assessment)	Fall 2011	Department Faculty, Department Coordinators, Deans	Completed
Recommendation by Planning and Budget Steering Committee to allocate \$100K to resource requests from 2011-2012 program reviews.	Fall 2011	Planning and Budget Steering Committee	Completed
Allocation by President of \$100K to resource requests from 2011-2012 program reviews.	Fall 2011	President	Completed
Program Review Evaluation by Program Review Committee completed. Distributed to Faculty Senate, PAC, Deans, and Department Coordinators.	Spring 2012	Program Review Committee, Faculty Senate, PAC, Deans, Department Coordinators	Completed
Planning and Budget Steering Committee (PBSC) prioritizing and developing a	Fall 2012	PBSC	To be completed during Fall 2012 and recommendation made to PAC.

recommendation to be made to PAC for funding Program Review resource requests.			
Course-level SLOs to be entered into the CORs.	Spring 2012	Curriculum Committee, VPI, and Curriculum Specialist	Approved by Curriculum Committee February 15, 2012 (CII.08). Updated SLOs and SLOAs in CurricUNET and worked with Governet to turn process on. Completed.
Change SLO Assessment Committee from ad hoc committee to a standing committee under the Curriculum Committee.	Spring 2012	Faculty Senate	Approved by Faculty Senate February 16, 2012 (CII.34).
Reinstate campus-wide SLO Coordinator.	Spring 2012	VPI and Faculty Senate	Approved by Faculty Senate February 16, 2012 (CII.34). Currently recruiting to fill the position. Position filled end of Spring to start work Summer 2012.
Program-level SLOs to be entered into the catalog.	Spring 2012	Curriculum Committee, VPI, and Curriculum Specialist	Approved by Curriculum Committee February 15, 2012 (CII.08). Governet modified program page in CurricUNET for program-level SLOs. Process of entering program-level SLOs into CurricUNET is ongoing.
Complete development of program-level SLOs.	Spring 2012	SLO Assessment Committee, Curriculum Committee, College SLOA Coordinator, VPI, Faculty	A timeline for the development of program-level SLOs has been developed and presented to the Curriculum and SLOA Committees, Faculty

			Senate, and PAC (CII.08, CII.20). SLOA Committee and College SLOA Coordinator are working with faculty on the development of SLOs. As developed SLOs are being loaded into CurricUNET.
Assessment of program-level SLOs.	Spring 2012 and Fall 2012	Faculty, Deans, VPI, and SLOA Committee	Faculty are currently assessing program-level SLOs that are in place and will continue assessment Fall 2012.
Closing the loop on program-level SLOs.	Spring 2012 and Fall 2012	Faculty, Deans, VPI, and SLOA Committee	Upon completion of assessment of program-level SLOs faculty will have critical dialogue in regard to the assessment results and propose changes to curriculum and pedagogy to improve student learning. This is an ongoing process.