

Fullerton College
North Orange County Community College District

Midterm 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

March, 2014

Fullerton College Midterm 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

Ned Doffoney, Ed.D, Chancellor

Jeffrey P. Brown, President, Board of Trustees

Samuel Foster, Ph.D., President, Faculty Senate

Ericka Adakai, President, Classified Senate

Joseph Victor, President, Associated Students

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Certification 2

Report Preparation 4

District Recommendation #1 5

District Recommendation #2 16

District Recommendation #3 22

College Recommendation #1 26

College Recommendation #2 29

College Recommendation #3 36

College Recommendation #4 40

College Recommendation #5 44

Response to Self-identified Issues (formerly planning agendas)..... 47

Appendix A: Evidence for District Recommendations 56

Appendix B: Evidence for College Recommendations 63

Report Preparation

This Midterm Report includes narrative analysis and evidence that demonstrates the resolution of deficiencies, describes progress on recommendations for improvement, and identifies the status of Fullerton College's self-identified improvement plans from the College's 2011 Institutional Self Evaluation.

A task force was formed to complete the Midterm Report. Dr. Sam Foster, Dr. Janice Chadwick, and Dr. Marcus Wilson represented the FC Faculty, Dr. Terry Giugni, Dr. Jamail Carter, Dr. Toni DuBois, Ms. Claudette Dain and Dr. Ann Hovey represented the management staff, and Ms. Ericka Adakai represented the classified staff. The task force worked with the various constituent groups of the college to ensure that the report represents the opinions of the whole of the college. In addition to the input from the members of the task force, the draft of the Midterm Report was distributed to the Faculty Senate, the Deans' Council, the Classified Senate, the Associate Students, and the President's Advisory Council for input.

The North Orange County Community College District Board of Trustees received a draft copy of the Midterm Report with supporting documents as an information item at the December 10, 2013 Board meeting and received the final Report for acceptance at the March 11, 2014 Board meeting.

Response to Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letter

District Recommendation #1

In order to meet the Standards, the Team recommends the district, in concert with the colleges, further define and align planning, governance, and decision-making processes to provide improved clarity to its structure, function, and linkages. (Standards IB.3; IB.4; IB.6; IVA.3; IVB.3.a; Eligibility Requirement 19)

Descriptive Summary

The commission's recommendation directs the North Orange County Community College District (NOCCCD) to articulate and align both district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes. The two sets of processes – planning and governance/decision-making – were addressed separately albeit with similar processes.

Assessment of District-level Planning and the Creation of the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*

When this recommendation was received in June 2011, the *NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2009-2011* (D1-01) was at the end of its term and NOCCCD was mid-way through the development of the *NOCCCD 2011 Comprehensive Master Plan*.

(<http://www.nocccd.edu/masterplan/index.html>, D1-02) Although these two key documents provide evidence that district-level planning was taking place, the visiting team correctly identified that NOCCCD had neither clearly articulated district-level planning processes nor had described how the components of district-level planning were connected to one another and to campus planning processes.

In late spring 2011 the Chancellor, two College Presidents, and the Provost of the School of Continuing Education appointed 40 representatives to serve on an Ad Hoc District Planning Committee. (D1-03) In July, this Committee met for the purposes of confirming the District Strategic Directions for the *NOCCCD 2011 Comprehensive Master Plan* and to review a proposed process for working toward resolution of the ACCJC District Recommendations. The Chancellor assigned the District Director of Information Services with facilitating this process in collaboration with a consultant.

The challenge was to develop a process that would complete the task on an accelerated timeline while still providing multiple opportunities for feedback. To meet this challenge, a process was used that combined the use of core teams called workgroups for preparing initial drafts combined with broad distribution of multiple drafts district-wide. (D1-04) This approach was used to develop three documents that are central to NOCCCD's response to the ACCJC District Recommendations:

- *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* (D1-05)
- *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* (D1-06)
- *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012* (D2-01)

The timeline for the development of these three documents is approximately the same. Despite the similarities in processes and timelines, each document is described separately in this Midterm Report to enhance clarity.

The following describes the process for the development of the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*.

Integrated Planning Workgroup: The Integrated Planning Workgroup was composed of faculty leaders and administrators from the Ad Hoc District Planning Committee chosen for their familiarity with or interest in planning concepts and processes. The Integrated Planning Workgroup functioned as a small, task-focused cadre of writers and first readers. In its first meeting (D1-07), the Integrated Planning Workgroup was charged with:

- Describing and evaluating current district-level planning processes;
- Comparing the current processes to integrated planning processes in other districts;
- Recommending solutions to identified gaps in the planning processes; and
- Creating a manual to guide district-level integrated planning.

Also in its first meeting, when the Integrated Planning Workgroup compared the components typically found in integrated planning cycles with current district-level planning, they identified the need to develop:

- Charts showing the timeline and process for all current district-level planning processes;
- A process for District Services Administrative Review;
- A process to assess and document progress on District Strategic Directions; and
- A process to assess planning and governance/decision-making processes.

New and revised district-level planning processes were developed through small group discussions. Recommendations from the small group were then reviewed by the larger Integrated Planning Workgroup. The *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* was revised three times within the Integrated Planning Workgroup before this document was distributed to a larger audience. (D1-08, D1-09, D1-10) In this way, when NOCCCD constituencies were reviewing and critiquing the descriptions of current district-level planning processes in the drafts of the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*, they were also reviewing and critiquing recommended revisions and additions to district-level planning processes. The following iterative process was completed to prepare the document:

- Distribution of a draft to all employees for review and comment; (D1-11, D1-12)
- Integration of feedback to prepare a revised draft;
- Distribution of the revised draft to Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council for circulation to constituencies for review and comment; (D1-13, D1-14, D1-15)
- Integration of feedback to prepare a revised draft;

- Second distribution of the draft to all employees via site CEOs and to the Board for review and comment; (D1-16, D1-17, D1-18)
- Integration of feedback to prepare a revised draft; and
- Second distribution to Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council for circulation to constituencies review and comment. (D1-19, D1-20)

The input from this final round of feedback was incorporated into the document to prepare the penultimate draft of the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*. This draft was presented to the Board for review and comment. (D1-21) Following the integration of their comments, the final document was prepared. The Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council approved the final draft on February 13, 2012. (D1-22) The completed *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* was presented to the Board for information on February 28, 2012. (D1-23)

The *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* begins with a description of the NOCCCD integrated planning model. Following that overview is a description of the process and timeline for each of these components in the model:

- District Mission Statement
- Comprehensive Master Plan
- District-wide Strategic Plan
- District Services Administrative Review
- Budget Allocation
- Plan Implementation
- Assessment of Progress on District Strategic Directions
- Assessment of the Planning and Decision-making Processes

Each of NOCCCD's entities -- Cypress College, Fullerton College and the School of Continuing Education -- also has an integrated planning process in which the components are linked to one another. The planning processes at each NOCCCD entity link to district-level planning in two ways:

- The District Strategic Directions establish the district-wide institutional goals. The campuses in turn develop site-specific goals, objectives, and action plans that collectively contribute to the achievement of the District Strategic Directions.
- The annual Progress Report details progress on District Strategic Directions and District Objectives as well as campus goals and objectives. Two iterations of this have been completed. The first was the *NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2011-12 Final Report* (D1-24) which was presented to the Board on August 28, 2012 (D1-25) to make the final report on the previous strategic plan. The second was the *NOCCCD 2013 Progress Report on the District-wide Strategic Plan 2012-2014* (D1-26) presented to the Board on August 27, 2013 (D1-27) which was the first progress report on the current strategic plan. (D1-28)

The *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* was used to create a Planning Calendar of Activities for each year from 2012 through 2020. (D1-29) Annual updates to this document track progress on each activity described in the manual by month and by responsible group or individual. Each annual calendar links to evidence of the completion or modification of each activity. (D1-30, D1-31)

The *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* describes two processes designed to maintain the credibility of the document as a reliable resource:

- The *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* is reviewed annually to determine if minor changes are needed, such as changes in descriptions, timelines, or processes. The first review was completed in April 2013. As a result of this review, the *NOCCCD 2013 Integrated Planning Manual* was prepared. (D1-32) Future annual reviews are scheduled in the Planning Calendar of Activities. (D1-29)
- The *NOCCCD Integrated Planning Manual* will also be updated every three years to reflect changes that result from the formal assessment of the planning processes. Refer to the response to District Recommendation #3 for a description of this assessment process. As noted in the Planning Calendar of Activities, this formal assessment is scheduled for 2015. (D1-33)

Assessment of District-level Governance and Decision-Making and the Creation of the North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment

When this ACCJC recommendation was received in June 2011, NOCCCD had in place documents to describe the purpose and membership of the two primary district-level governance groups: District Planning Council and the Chancellor's Cabinet. (D1-34) However, the visiting team correctly noted that these documents did not describe the flow of recommendations and did not include explanations of the purpose and membership of organizational groups.

As a result of failing to explain governance/decision-making processes so that they are transparent across NOCCCD, lack of trust was often cited as a characteristic of the dynamics within NOCCCD. Without trust, a positive collegial culture is difficult to establish because constituents often perceive that decisions are reached without consultation as opposed to being reached through a partnership of Board members, faculty, staff, administration, and students.

As part of the effort to reduce tensions and increase trust across NOCCCD, in July 2011, the 40 members of the Ad Hoc District Planning Committee were interviewed to ascertain their current concerns and their visions for NOCCCD's future. (Refer to <http://www.nocccd.edu/masterplan/index.html> Chapter 2, page 2-80 and the Appendix, pages A-2 through A-5, D1-02) The following nine themes describe the group's collective vision of NOCCCD's potential in the next decade:

1. NOCCCD will be student-centered.
2. Each NOCCCD campus will have a distinctive identity.
3. NOCCCD will be innovative.
4. NOCCCD will be courageous.
5. NOCCCD will communicate effectively.
6. NOCCCD will be characterized by mutual respect for all sites.
7. NOCCCD will be proactively compliant.
8. NOCCCD will have strong educational partnerships.
9. NOCCCD will reflect the community.

The fifth theme is of particular relevance to governance and decision-making. The specific suggestions offered in the interviews to strengthen trust in NOCCCD leadership were to:

- Clearly define roles for employees at all levels of NOCCCD;
- Clearly articulate decision-making processes;
- Develop goals and priorities through collaboration;
- Develop systems of accountability to ensure consistent adherence to those goals and priorities;
- Rely on data to make decisions and set priorities; and
- Create venues for representatives of the sites to collaborate with each other for the benefit of students district-wide.

To follow-up on some of these suggestions, the *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* was developed to clarify the roles and responsibilities of constituent groups as well as the processes that are used to make decisions in the NOCCCD.

The Chancellor assigned the District Director of Information Services to co-facilitate with a consultant the development of the *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment*. Faced with the same challenge to develop a process that would complete the task on an accelerated timeline while still providing multiple opportunities for feedback, a process was used that is similar to the process previously described in this response to District Recommendation #1 regarding the development of the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*.

The following is a summary of the process used to develop the *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment*.

Decision Making Workgroup: The Decision Making Workgroup was composed of faculty leaders and administrators from the Ad Hoc District Planning Committee and other representatives chosen for their familiarity with or interest in governance/decision-making processes. This workgroup functioned as a small, task-focused cadre of writers and first readers. The Decision Making Workgroup was charged with:

- Clarifying and describing the purpose, membership, and reporting structure of current district-level governance/decision-making processes;

- Evaluating the effectiveness of current district-level governance/decision-making processes;
- Identifying gaps in the district-level governance/decision-making processes and recommending strategies to fill those gaps; and
- Creating a manual to describe the structure, function, and alignment of district-level governance/decision-making processes.

In their first meeting, the Decision Making Workgroup agreed that it was their task to develop a document that would describe the mechanisms by which NOCCCD ensures that there are opportunities for meaningful collaboration and that the voices of the constituent groups are heard in making decisions. Other tasks completed by the Decision Making Workgroup in their first meeting were:

- Defined the role of each constituency from the Board to students to frame the governance/decision-making processes;
- Developed a list of current district-level governance and decision-making groups;
- Defined the purpose, membership, and reporting structure for each existing district-level governance and decision-making group;
- Reviewed the list of current groups and identified that instructional and student services were two areas where a district-level governance/decision-making group needed be added; and
- Recommended changes to the current district-level governance/decision-making structure, such as:
 - o Renaming groups to better describe their function;
 - o Revising/articulating groups' purposes to narrow and/or expand the group's purview; and
 - o Clarifying the group or position that received each group's recommendations. (D1-35, D1-36)

As with the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*, these recommended changes to governance and decision-making groups were used to draft the *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment*. This manual was revised five times within the Decision Making Workgroup before this document was distributed to a larger audience. (D1-37, D1-38, D1-39, D1-40, D1-41) The task for the Decision Making Workgroup and larger audiences when they responded to drafts of the *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* included the review and critique these recommended changes in governance and decision-making groups. The following iterative process was completed to prepare the document:

- Distribution of a draft to all employees for review and comment; (D1-42, D1-43)
- Integration of feedback to prepare a revised draft;
- Distribution of the revised draft to Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council for circulation to constituencies for review and comment; (D1-44, D1-15)
- Integration of feedback to prepare a revised draft;
- Second distribution of the draft to all employees via site CEOs and to the Board for review and comment; (D1-16, D1-17, D1-18)

- Integration of feedback to prepare a revised draft; and
- Second distribution to Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council for circulation to constituencies for review and comment. (D1-19, D1-20)

The input from this final round of feedback was incorporated into the document to prepare the penultimate draft of the *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment*. This draft was presented to the Board for review and comment. (D1-21)

Following the integration of their comments, the final document was prepared. The Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council approved the final draft on February 13, 2012. (D1-22) The completed *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* was presented to the Board for information on February 28, 2012. (D1-23)

The *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* begins by making the distinction between governance, organizational, and ad hoc groups. Following this explanation, the manual describes the processes by which recommendations to the Chancellor are developed by describing:

- The structure and function of each group that contributes to the development of those recommendations and
- The alignment of the groups to one another for each of the groups listed below.

NOCCCD Governance Groups

District Consultation Council

Sub-committees:

Council on Budget and Facilities
 District Curriculum Coordinating Committee
 Institutional Effectiveness Coordinating Council
 Technology Coordinating Council

NOCCCD Organizational Groups

Chancellor’s Staff

Banner Steering Committee

Sub-committees:

Student Team

myGateway Steering Committee

Budget Officers

District Agenda Committee

District Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee

District Facilities Committee

District Grants and Resource Development Committee

District Services Committee

District Staff Development Committee

District Technology Roundtable

Learning Management System Steering Team

The *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* was used to augment the Planning Calendar of Activities for each year from 2012 through 2020. (D1-29) Annual updates to this document track progress on each activity described in the manual by month and by responsible group or individual. Each annual calendar links to evidence of the completion or modification of each activity. (D1-30, D1-31)

NOCCCD communicated the components and organization of district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes articulated in the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and the *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* to the entire district community and assessed the effectiveness of that communication through the following activities:

- Conducted a presentation at Cypress College entitled “How to Participate in Planning, Decision Making and Budgeting in the North Orange County Community College District” on April 20, 2012. (D1-45)
- Conducted a presentation at School of Continuing Education entitled “How to Participate in Planning, Decision Making and Budgeting in the North Orange County Community College District” on May 2, 2012. (D1-46)
- Presented the “Board Role in Planning, Decision Making and Budgeting in the North Orange County Community College District” to the Board at their retreat on July 21, 2012. (D1-47)
- Conducted a presentation at Fullerton College entitled “How to Participate in Planning, Decision Making and Budgeting in the North Orange County Community College District” on February 21, 2013. (D1-48)
- Included in the annual *NOCCCD District Services/District-wide Communications Satisfaction Survey 2013* questions regarding the understanding and effectiveness of district-level planning, governance and decision-making processes to assess the effectiveness of the trainings. (D1-49, D1-50)

In order to maintain the *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* as a reliable resource, the document will be reviewed both annually and on a three-year-cycle:

- The *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* is reviewed annually to determine if minor changes are needed, such as changes in descriptions, timelines, or processes. The first review was completed in April 2013. As a result of this review, the *NOCCCD 2013 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* was prepared. (D1-51)
- The *NOCCCD Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* will also be updated every three years to reflect changes that result from the formal assessment of the governance/decision making processes. Refer to the *NOCCCD 2013 Integrated Planning Manual* and the response to District Recommendation #3 for a description of the assessment process. As noted in the Planning Calendar of Activities, this formal assessment is scheduled for 2015. (D1-33)

Evaluation

NOCCCD has successfully accomplished the following since receiving ACCJC District Recommendation #1 two years and four months ago:

- Conducted the district-wide dialogue needed to review and revise its district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes,
- Produced two documents that articulate the function, structure, and linkages of these processes,
- Developed a planning calendar of activities to track task completion,
- Collected evidence of the completion of all activities outlined in the two documents,
- Communicated the contents of the two documents district-wide,
- Reviewed and revised the two documents to reflect minor changes, such as in descriptions, timelines, or processes,
- Implemented all new and revised planning processes as scheduled including the development of the *NOCCCD Strategic Plan 2012-2014*, and
- Implemented the revised governance and decision-making structure.

A formal assessment of the planning and governance/decision making processes is scheduled for 2015. (D1-33)

NOCCCD is committed to following the timeline and process charts in the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* as evidenced by the following:

- Creation of a Planning Calendar of Activities to track progress on all tasks identified in the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and the *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment*. (D1-29) Links to the evidence that documents completion of the tasks are embedded in the annual calendars. (D1-30, D1-31)

- Completion of the *NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2011-12 Final Report*, which was presented to the Board on August 28, 2012 to close the loop on the previous strategic planning cycle. (D1-24, D1-25)
- Completion of the *NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2012-2014*, which is a key component in the NOCCCD integrated planning process. (D1-28) This document was presented and approved at District Consultation Council on April 23, 2012 (D1-52) and presented to the Board for information on May 8, 2012. (D1-53)
- Completion of the *NOCCCD 2013 Progress Report on the District-wide Strategic Plan 2012-14* which assessed progress on the District-wide Strategic Plan and District Strategic Directions. (D1-26) This document was presented to the Board on August 27, 2013. (D1-27) The Board provided feedback that will be used to improve the progress report for Fall 2014. (D1-54)
- Completion of one cycle of the District Services Administrative Review as described in the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*. (D1-55) The results of these administrative reviews were accepted at the District Services Committee and reviewed at Chancellor's Staff as noted in the 2012 Planning Calendar of Activities. (D1-30) Although funding requests did not emerge from the process this year, when such requests are forwarded through District Services Administrative Reviews, the District Services Committee will recommend funding priorities to the Council on Budget and Facilities.
- Completion of two cycles of Budget Development as described in the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*. The annual Budget Calendar of Activities is used each year to track progress by month and responsible group or individual. (D1-56, D1-57)
- Revision of the Proposed Budget Document to indicate how planning is linked to resource allocation. (D1-58, D1-59)

NOCCCD is committed to implementing changes in title, purpose, and reporting structure of the governance/decision-making groups outlined in the *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* as evidenced by the following.

- Replaced Chancellor's Cabinet meetings with District Consultation Council meetings beginning February 27, 2012. (D1-60)
- Replaced District Planning Council meetings with Council on Budget and Facilities meetings beginning March 12, 2012. (D1-61)
- Replaced Technology Coordinating Council meetings with Technology Advisory Committee meetings November 15, 2011. (D1-62)

- Formed the Institutional Effectiveness Coordinating Council that began meeting on April 16, 2012. (D1-63) One of the accomplishments of this group is the development of the *District-wide Institutional Effectiveness Report and Inventory of Programs and Services to Address the Achievement Gap*, a task assigned to this group in the *NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2012 – 2014*. (D1-64)
- Posted meeting materials and minutes for all governance groups on the NOCCCD intranet (myGateway). (D1-65)

The Board of Trustees is committed to the ongoing improvement of NOCCCD planning and governance/decision-making processes as evidenced by the Chancellor’s goals for the past three years.

- The Chancellor’s 2011 -2012 goals included:

Meet Accreditation Standards

- Present a Program Discontinuance Board Policy to the Board for consideration.
- Create and implement a District planning process that:
 - o Is data-driven
 - o Is transparent
 - o Is inclusive
 - o Identifies responsible individuals for continuous oversight improvement, and ongoing evaluation
 - o Is documented in a district-wide Governance Assessment Report
 - o Satisfies the accreditation recommendations
- Ensure that District planning integrates research from Cypress College, Fullerton College, and the School of Continuing Education to demonstrate district-wide institutional effectiveness and resource allocation. (D1-66)

- The Chancellor’s 2012-2013 goals included:

Continue with Accreditation Compliance

- Ensure continuous oversight, improvement, and ongoing evaluation.
- Document in a District-wide Governance Assessment Report.
- Ensure that District planning integrates research from Cypress College, Fullerton College, and the School of Continuing Education to demonstrate District-wide institutional effectiveness and resource allocation. (D1-67)

- The Chancellor’s 2013-2014 goals include:

Continue with Accreditation Compliance

- Ensure continuous oversight, improvement, and ongoing evaluation.

- Document in a District-wide Governance Assessment Report.
- Ensure that District planning integrates research from Cypress College, Fullerton College, and the School of Continuing Education to demonstrate District-wide institutional effectiveness and resource allocation. (D1-68)

Next Steps

1. NOCCCD will evaluate the effectiveness of the district-wide presentations that described the components and organization of district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes and will use that feedback as the basis for improvement in such presentations.
2. NOCCCD will maintain the Planning Calendar of Activities to track completion of the tasks identified in the *NOCCCD 2013 Integrated Planning Manual* and the *NOCCCD 2013 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment*.

District Recommendation #2

To fully meet the Standards, the Team recommends the district clearly delineate its budget allocation model, communicate the model to campus constituencies, and provide clarity as to its link to district planning. (Standards IB.3; IB.4; IID.1.a; IVB.3.a; Eligibility Requirement 17)

Descriptive Summary

This recommendation directs NOCCCD to develop clear descriptions of the NOCCCD budget allocation model as well as the connection between district-level budget allocations and planning. Given the simultaneous efforts to review, assess, and articulate district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes, the decision was made to develop two descriptions of the NOCCCD budget allocation model. The first description, intended for a general audience, is included in the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and in the subsequent revision produced in April 2013 with minor updates. (D1-05, D1-32) The second and more technical description of the NOCCCD budget allocation model is presented in a separate document, the *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012* and in the April 2013 revision of this manual which includes minor updates. (D2-01, D2-02)

In addition to the district-level budget allocation model described in these manuals, each NOCCCD campus also has a budget allocation model for the internal distribution of funds, including evidence of how budget allocations are linked to campus and district-level planning.

The development, review, and revision process used to produce the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* is described in the response to District Recommendation #1 in this Midterm Report and will not be repeated here. A similar process was followed to develop the *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012*. The process combined the use of a core team called the Budget Allocation Workgroup to prepare initial drafts followed by multiple cycles of broad distribution of drafts for review, comment, and revision. (D1-04)

The following describes the process used to develop the *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012*.

Budget Allocation Workgroup: The Budget Allocation Workgroup was composed of faculty leaders and administrators from the Ad Hoc District Planning Committee chosen for their familiarity with or interest in the budget allocation model and budgeting processes. The Budget Allocation Workgroup functioned as a small, task-focused cadre of writers and first readers. In its first meeting, (D2-03) the Budget Allocation Workgroup was charged with the task of preparing a description of the current NOCCCD budget allocation model that could be widely understood. Also in its first meeting, the Budget Allocation Workgroup completed these tasks:

- Reviewed the elements commonly found in a budget allocation handbook;
- Identified which common elements should be included in this budget allocation handbook;
- Provided feedback on sample table of contents from other district budget allocation handbooks;
- Discussed a flowchart or graphic to illustrate the NOCCCD budget allocation model; and
- Discussed a process and schedule for review and assessment of the NOCCCD budget allocation model to be included in the *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012*.

Since the task was to explain the current NOCCCD budget allocation model rather than evaluate the current NOCCCD budget allocation model, this Budget Allocation Workgroup explained the evaluation component but did not evaluate the current model during this process.

Once the document was drafted and reviewed by this core group, input from larger audiences was sought. The *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012* and/or components of the handbook were revised a total of five times within the Budget Allocation Workgroup before the document was distributed to a larger audience. (D2-04, D2-04, D2-05, D2-06, D2-07, D2-08, D2-09, D2-10, D2-11) Following these revisions by the workgroup, an iterative process was used to prepare the final document:

- Distribution of a draft to all employees for review and comment; (D2-12)
- Integration of the feedback to prepare a revised draft;
- Distribution of the revised draft to Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council for circulation for review and comment;
- Integration of the feedback to prepare a revised draft;
- Second distribution of the draft to all employees for review and comment;
- Integration of the feedback to prepare a revised draft; and
- Second distribution of the draft to Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council and to the Board for review and comment. (D1-16)

The input from this final round of feedback was incorporated into the document to prepare the penultimate draft of the *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012*. This draft was presented to the Board for review and comment. Following the integration of their comments, the final document was prepared. The Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council approved the final draft on February 13, 2012. (D1-22) The completed *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012* was presented to the Board for information on February 28, 2012. (D1-23)

The *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012* has three general sections:

- First is a general description of NOCCCD's Council on Budget and Facilities, the timeline and process for budget development, and a list of the board policies and administrative procedures that guide budget development.
- Second is a graphical overview of the budget allocation process followed by an explanation of each component within the graphic.
- Third is the evaluation component that describes how NOCCCD works toward continuous quality improvement in budget allocation processes by assessing the effectiveness of resource allocations as they relate to the NOCCCD Mission and District Strategic Directions. As an overview of this process, the Council on Budget and Facilities continually evaluates the allocation model process and the allocations that are formula-driven. (D2-13, D2-14, D2-15, D2-16, D2-17, D2-18, D2-19, D2-20, D2-21) The resulting assessment report is presented to the District Consultation Council. (D2-22, D2-23, D2-24) Each site provides input into this process via their respective representative(s) on the District Consultation Council and on the Council on Budget and Facilities.

The *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012* was used to create a Budget Calendar of Activities for each year from 2012 through 2020. (D2-25) Annual updates to this document track progress on each activity described in the manual by month and by responsible group or individual. Each annual calendar links to evidence of the completion or modification of each activity. (D1-56, D1-57)

To communicate the NOCCCD budget allocation model to campus constituencies, the *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012* and subsequent revisions are posted on the NOCCCD website. (<http://www.nocccd.edu/Accreditation.htm>) In addition, the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Facilities and the District Director of Fiscal Affairs conduct annual campus-wide meetings at each site to review the NOCCCD budget allocation model. These meetings were conducted in spring 2012 and spring 2013 as documented in the 2012 and 2013 annual Budget Calendar of Activities. (D1-56, D1-57) Future presentations are scheduled for each spring in the Budget Calendar of Activities. (D2-25) The information presented includes any changes to the model that occurred as a result of the model's evaluation component.

Regarding the links between budget allocations and planning, in general, all of the District Strategic Directions are plans intended to increase student success; similarly, the purpose of the NOCCCD budget allocation model is to fund the programs and services that both directly and indirectly promote student success. Students' needs are the foundation of decisions regarding the expansion and contraction of the budget allocations.

In addition to this general link between planning and budget allocations, NOCCCD ensures direct links between specific budget allocations and the District Strategic Directions in the following three ways.

1. A Strategic Plan Fund was created as a component of NOCCCD's budget allocation model as one transparent mechanism to align planning with resource allocations. Proposals for resources from the Strategic Plan Fund require that the project contribute to achievement of a District Strategic Direction. This annual process is tracked on the Budget Calendar of Activities each year. (D1-56, D1-57)
2. NOCCCD's annual Proposed Budget Document has been modified to indicate the alignment of resources with planning. (D1-58, D1-59) As appropriate, NOCCCD entities will identify and link budgets and expenditures directly related to achievement of specific District Strategic Directions by using a unique identifying budget code. Dollars spent in this way will be included in the Proposed Budget Presentation to the Board. This information was most recently reported to the Board on September 10, 2013. (D2-26)
3. The budget allocation processes at each campus include links to campus goals, each of which align with District Strategic Directions.

Evaluation

In the two years and four months since NOCCCD received ACCJC District Recommendation #2, NOCCCD has successfully completed the following activities:

- Prepared two different levels of descriptions of the NOCCCD budget allocation process;
- Developed a Budget Calendar of Activities to track task completion;
- Collected evidence of the completion of all the activities outlined in the manual;
- Communicated the contents of the manual district-wide;
- Created the *NOCCCD Budget Central* website as a repository for all budget related documents;
- Established a Strategic Plan Fund to clearly link resource allocations and planning;
- Revised the Proposed Budget Document to demonstrate clear links between budget and planning;
- Completed two cycles of budget allocation model review and revision; and
- Revised the manual to reflect minor changes, such as in descriptions, timelines, or processes.

A general description of the NOCCCD budget allocation model is included in the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and in the manual's April 2013 update. (D1-05, D1-32) A more technical description is presented in the *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012* and the associated April 2013 update. (D2-01, D2-02)

To clearly communicate the NOCCCD budget allocation model to campus constituencies the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Facilities and the District Director of Fiscal Affairs conduct annual campus-wide meetings at each site. The meetings held in the past two years are:

- Cypress College April 26, 2012 (D2-27)
- Fullerton College May 3, 2012 & May 8, 2012 (D2-27)
- School of Continuing Education May 17, 2012 (D2-27)
- Cypress College April 25, 2013 (D2-28)
- Fullerton College April 30, 2013 (D2-29)
- School of Continuing Education May 23, 2013 (D2-30)

To provide transparency to staff, students and members of the public regarding the budget and budget process, the *NOCCCD Budget Central* website was created and is linked directly to the NOCCCD website. This repository contains information about the state and local budget as well as links to other resource information. (<http://www.nocccd.edu/BudgetNews.htm>) The *NOCCCD Budget Central* website was announced to staff in the back-to-school mailing in 2013. (D2-31)

Proposals were solicited for the process by which the Strategic Plan Fund process would evaluate and select projects for funding and the assessment of effectiveness following the project completion. The District Consultation Council completed the following steps in the development, implementation and assessment of this process.

- Developed and approved of the Strategic Plan Fund Process in November 2012 (D2-32, D2-33, D2-34) and solicited proposals in December 2012. (D2-35)
- Reviewed, scored and approved funding for proposals in February 2013. (D2-36)
- Reviewed Strategic Plan Fund Progress Reports in September 2013. (D2-37)

In the September 2013 meeting the District Consultation Council reviewed and revised the Strategic Plan Fund process. (D2-38) The process is scheduled to begin again on November 1, 2013 with the district-wide solicitation of proposals.

The Council on Budget and Facilities began meeting beginning March 12, 2012. (D1-61) Over the last year and a half the Council has evaluated the allocation model and component parts of the model including categorical program allocations such as DSPS, faculty additional load and part-time faculty salary allocations (termed extended day allocation at NOCCCD), and allocation of FTES targets to the campuses. In some cases, it was decided that the allocation model was sufficient and would not be changed. (D2-13, D2-14, D2-15, D2-16, D2-17, D2-18, D2-19, D2-20, D2-21) Two allocation model changes, Extended Day and DSP&S, were forwarded to the District Consultation Council for consideration. (D2-22, D2-24) District Consultation Council approved the change to the Extended Day allocation at the meeting of May 20, 2013 (D2-23) and to the DSP&S allocation at the meeting of June 24, 2013. (D2-24)

The process for assessing the descriptions of the budget process is described in the response to District Recommendation #3 in this Midterm Report. The process for assessing the effectiveness of the budget allocation model itself is described in the *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook*

2012 and April 2013 update. (D2-01, D2-02) The processes that have been developed and completed thus far are documented in the Budget Calendar of Activities for the 2012 and 2013 budget years. (D1-56, D1-57)

Next Steps

1. Vice Chancellor of Finance and Facilities and the District Director of Fiscal Affairs will continue to conduct annual campus-wide meetings at each site to describe the NOCCCD budget allocation model.
2. NOCCCD will follow the timeline and process charts in the *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2013* by tracking the activities and documenting progress using the Budget Calendar of Activities.
3. NOCCCD will assess the budget allocation process following the timeline and processes outlined in the *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2013* and will implement recommended changes based on that assessment.
4. NOCCCD will assess the effectiveness of the budget allocation model in allocating resources to support the District Strategic Directions as described in the *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2013* and will implement recommended changes based on that assessment.
5. NOCCCD entities will identify and link budgets and expenditures directly related to achievement of specific District Strategic Directions by using a unique identifying budget code. Dollars spent in this way will be reported along with the Proposed Budget Presentation to the Board.

District Recommendation #3

In order to meet the Standards, the Team recommends that the district conduct regular analysis and evaluation of its district planning, governance, and decision-making processes in order to assess the efficacy of these systems and ensure their effectiveness. Results of these analyses and findings should be broadly communicated across the institutions and used as a basis for improvement, as appropriate. (Standards IVA.5; IVB.3.g)

In response to District Recommendation #1, in fall 2011 both district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes were reviewed and revised as needed. The venues for providing input varied and included both small workgroup meetings as well as discussions in larger venues across NOCCCD. (D1-07, D1-10, D1-11, D1-16)

During this dialogue, numerous clarifications and revisions were made to district-level planning including:

- Articulation of the purpose, process for each component in district-level planning;
- Development of a graphic to depict the links between/among district-level planning processes; and
- Addition of processes for
 - District Services Administrative Review;
 - Assessing and documenting progress on District Strategic Directions; and
 - Assessing planning and decision-making processes.

Also during this dialogue, numerous clarifications and revisions were made to district-level governance/decision-making processes including:

- Articulation of the purpose, membership, and reporting structure of each district-level governance and organizational group; and
- Revision of the names of some NOCCCD governance and operational groups to better describe their function.

Implementation of new and revised processes began immediately after approval of the revised and new processes on February 13, 2012. (D1-22)

One of the newly developed facets of district-level planning is a mechanism for assessing district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes. Refer to the last page of this Midterm Report for an excerpt from the *NOCCCD 2013 Integrated Planning Manual* that describes the assessment process. An overview of that process follows.

NOCCCD has scheduled a formal assessment of planning and governance/decision-making processes every three years with the first assessment commencing in September 2015. That process is documented in the 2015 Planning Calendar of Activities developed based on the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and the *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment*. (D1-33) The assessment will include a Planning and Decision-making Workgroup gathering district-wide input followed by preparing an assessment report to be submitted to the District Consultation Council. The District Consultation Council will review the assessment report and recommend revisions to planning, governance and/or decision-making processes as warranted. Changes to the planning, governance and

decision-making processes, if any, will be documented with revisions to the *NOCCCD Integrated Planning Manual* and the *NOCCCD Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment*.

In addition to this formal assessment every three years, the current version of the *NOCCCD Integrated Planning Manual* and the *NOCCCD Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* is reviewed annually and revised as needed. This annual review is conducted to incorporate minor changes, such as in descriptions, timelines, or processes, and is done to maintain the credibility of these documents as valuable, viable resources. The first of these annual reviews was conducted in April 2013 and as a result, revised versions of the *NOCCCD Integrated Planning Manual* and the *NOCCCD Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* were produced. (D3-01, D1-32, D1-51) These changes were presented to the District Consultation Council at the meeting on April 22, 2013. (D2-22)

The *NOCCCD 2013 Integrated Planning Manual* and the *NOCCCD 2013 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* are housed online to provide ready access to all NOCCCD constituents. (<http://www.nocccd.edu/Accreditation.htm> , D3-02)

Evaluation

In the two years and four months since NOCCCD received ACCJC District Recommendation #3, NOCCCD has successfully:

- Evaluated current district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes;
- Sought and evaluated district-wide input on recommended changes and additions to these processes;
- Designed a process for assessing district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes;
- Implemented the revised and new processes;
- Conducted the first *NOCCCD District Services/District-wide Communications Satisfaction Survey 2013* assessment which included questions regarding the understanding and effectiveness of district-level planning, governance and decision-making processes; (D1-49, D1-50) and
- Developed a Planning Calendar of Activities and a Budget Calendar of Activities for tracking progress and documenting evidence of tasks being completed or modified.

These new and revised processes, including the mechanisms for assessing district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes, are being implemented. NOCCCD is committed to the assessing planning, governance and decision-making processes as evidenced by the following.

- Identified and scheduled a process for the formal assessment of district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes; (D1-29, D1-30, D1-31, D1-32, D1-49, D1-50, D1-51)
- Assigned responsibility for this assessment to specific offices in the *NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2012-2014* and in the Planning Calendar of Activities; (D1-28, D1-29, D1-30, D1-31)
- Included the production of an annual progress report as an Action Plan in the *NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2012-2014*; (D1-28)

- Completed the *NOCCCD 2013 Progress Report on the District-wide Strategic Plan 2012-2014; and* (D1-26)
- Completed the first annual review of the manuals in April 2013. (D1-32, D1-51)

Next Steps

1. NOCCCD will assess the processes for planning and governance/decision-making in September 2015 following the timeline and process outlined in the current version of the *NOCCCD Integrated Planning Manual* and will use the results of that assessment to improve district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes.
2. NOCCCD will annually review and incorporate minor changes to the *NOCCCD Integrated Planning Manual* and the *NOCCCD Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment*.
3. NOCCCD will distribute the analysis of the assessment of district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes as well as any recommended revisions of these processes to all NOCCCD employees.

Timeline and Process for Assessing the Planning and Decision-making Processes

September 2015, 2018

District Consultation Council convenes a Planning and Decision-Making Processes Workgroup comprised of representatives from each of the Coordinating Councils.

The Planning and Decision-Making Processes Workgroup develops a mechanism for soliciting feedback on the components of the integrated planning model and decision-making processes from the groups and individuals who are directly involved in implementing planning and decision-making. This workgroup presents this to District Consultation Council.



October 2015, 2018

Feedback from District Consultation Council about the process for soliciting feedback is incorporated and the Planning and Decision-Making Processes Workgroup implements the process.



November – December 2015, 2018

The Planning and Decision-Making Processes Workgroup considers the feedback from the groups and individuals who are directly involved in implementing planning and decision-making processes and prepares a Planning and Decision-making Processes Assessment Report. This Report may include recommended changes to the planning and/or decision-making processes.

The Planning and Decision-Making Process Workgroup forwards the Planning and Decision-making Processes Assessment Report to District Consultation Council for review and comment.

The Planning and Decision-Making Process Workgroup incorporates the feedback as warranted and forwards the Planning and Decision-making Processes Assessment Report to the Chancellor.



February 2016, 2019

The Chancellor reviews the Planning and Decision-making Processes Assessment Report with District Consultation Council and determines which changes will be made in the planning and decision-making processes, if any.

The Chancellor prepares an information report on this assessment for the Board and the resulting changes to the planning and decision-making processes, if any. This report is also distributed district-wide.

The District Director of Public and Governmental Affairs prepares an updated version of the *North Orange County Community College District Integrated Planning Manual* and the *Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* as needed.

College Recommendation 1

In order to meet the Standard and to fully address Recommendation 4 of the previous visiting Team report, the Team recommends that the institution develop, adopt, and implement an action plan and timeline for employee diversity with an emphasis on strategies geared toward attracting diverse applicants and facilitating career advancement for underrepresented groups within the organization. (Standard III.A.4.a, III.A.4.b, III.A.4.c)

III.A.4.a. The institution creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel.

III.A.4.b. The institution regularly assesses that its record in employment equity and diversity is consistent with its mission.

III.A.4.c. The institution subscribes to, advocates, and demonstrates integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff and students.

Overview

A detailed response to this Recommendation was provided in the Fullerton College Follow-up Report dated March 15, 2012 and the college received notification on July 2, 2012 indicating that the response was sufficient. At that point in time the college had developed, adopted and implemented an action plan with timelines for employee diversity emphasizing strategies geared toward attracting diverse applicants and facilitating career advancement for underrepresented groups within the organization.

Analysis of Results Achieved

The *Campus Diversity Plan* compiled in 2012 in response to this recommendation from the 2011 Accreditation visiting team, addresses the need for appropriate programs, practices, and services to support Fullerton College's diverse staff, emphasizing strategies designed to attract diverse applicants for available positions at the college and providing opportunities for current employees to advance their careers at the college (C1-01)

The goals of the campus diversity plan include:

- Maintaining an environment where all individuals are treated with respect
- Providing opportunities for faculty, staff, and managers to learn about various cultures present on campus
- Inviting community outside of the college to embrace the culture of diversity present on campus
- Attracting diverse applicants for positions at the college by presenting a welcoming environment

The underpinnings of this campus diversity plan is that it is the responsibility of all faculty, staff, managers, and students to promote a college environment that continuously welcomes and celebrates diversity. A multi-faceted approach to accomplishing this objective has been established. Activities related to this approach to diversity are divided into four categories aligned with the four stated goals: 1) activities for students; 2) activities for employees; 3) activities for the community; and 4) activities directed to potential employees (C1-02).

The goals and activities continue to be maintained and activities have been enhanced in recent years. The *Campus Diversity Plan* originally compiled in 2012, remains unchanged, however, the Plan's Activities listing has been updated to report progress on various activities. Additionally, new activities have been added in the four sections which are part of the campus diversity goals (C1-03).

The Campus Diversity Committee continues to meet regularly. During the 2012-13 year the Committee developed a list of goals, objectives, and action plans. These were presented to the President's Advisory Council in October 2013 for endorsement and were accepted by the College President. During the 2013-14 academic year the Committee has focused on implementing the plan which they have done through workshops, discussions with faculty, and collaboration with the Staff Development Committee (C1-04, C1-05).

One example of a campus wide activity is Worldfest which takes place in April each year. Worldfest is a collaborative event including displays, music, dance, educational activities, and food from the various cultures of the world. Student clubs as well as classes participate in this festival in the center quadrangle of the campus where they are able to learn about different cultures and question beliefs or customs. Vigorous debate is oftentimes taking place as divergent thinking is encouraged (<http://cadena.fullcoll.edu/Worldfest/default.html> C1-06).

One of the most noteworthy activities that brings the surrounding community onto the campus is the annual *Dia de los Muertos* or Day of the Dead. The holiday celebrated in Mexico and other parts of the world focuses on gatherings of family and friends to pray for and remember friends and family members who have died. Students, faculty and community members build altars or small shrines called *ofrendas* which include pictures of deceased relatives, candles and usually a Christian cross. Traditional music, dancing, and food are also part of the event. Community members join in the celebration each year. In 2013, as Fullerton College continued to celebrate its centennial, the Muckenthaler Cultural Center of Fullerton was invited to join in *Dia de los Muertos* which proved to be a wonderful collaboration (C1-07).

Fullerton College continues to focus on attracting a diverse faculty, staff, and administration to serve its diverse student population. Since 2012, each brochure announcing an opening at the college includes this statement: "Fullerton College is a designated Hispanic-Serving Institution authorized under Title V of the Higher Education Act. The College recognizes the value of diversity in the academic environment of students, as well as faculty and staff, in promoting

mutual understanding and respect, and in providing suitable role models for students.” By adding this language to the description of the College, those considering a position with FC know that diversity is a core value of the College. The Human Resources Department at the North Orange County Community College District has also expanded the number of diverse publications used for advertising open positions with the intention of attracting a wider pool of qualified applicants for positions within the District.

The atmosphere at the College remains respectful and welcoming to all individuals. As new faculty members are hired for 2014-15 and beyond, the College will continue to hire qualified individuals from diverse backgrounds.

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.

Overview

A detailed response to this Recommendation was provided in the Fullerton College Follow-up Report dated March 15, 2012. The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) notification of July 2, 2012 indicated that the college's "warning" status was removed. However, a second Follow-up Report was required by March 15, 2013 to address this recommendation. On July 3, 2013 ACCJC sent a letter to the college indicating acceptance of the second Follow-up Report and noting that the college had actively accelerated Student Learning Outcome (SLO) assessment and the use of assessment results in the improvement of student learning. The letter also stated that Instructional and Student Services programs have committed to using SLOs as success indicators and that the college has allocated sufficient resources to the

task and implemented institutional processes to use SLO assessments in the improvement of student learning.

Analysis of Results Achieved

Under the guidance of the Fullerton College Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment (SLOA) Committee 98% of active courses and 80% of programs have SLOs and assessments in place. The remaining 2% of active courses are currently going through the curriculum process for approval of the assessments. With the three-year window for assessment, ongoing assessment of SLOs is occurring in 82% of courses, 80% of programs, and 100% of the College's institutional SLOs.

Course-level SLOs are assessed on cyclic bases with a set of courses being assessed each semester. The following semester faculty members participate in self-reflective discussion of the results at various venues. Upon analysis, changes such as modifications to curriculum, teaching methods, and additions or changes in resources used are made to improve learning. Changes are implemented in subsequent semesters and the cycle is repeated. SLOs at course, program, and institutional levels are linked, thus, assessment is occurring at all levels.

The procedures for SLO processes are outlined in a Faculty Senate-approved handbook and in report forms (C2-01). Using the report forms, Academic and Student Services departments report on progress of assessments and appropriate changes to improve student learning. Overall progress on SLOs for both academic and student service departments are reported through the College's program review process that occurs on a three year cycle.

Fullerton College utilizes CurricUNET to help manage the curriculum process. This process includes a page for SLOs and assessments for courses and programs. The current curriculum process requires that all courses and programs have SLOs and assessments included or updated and approved by the Curriculum Committee (C2-02).

Dialog on outcomes assessment results occur on many levels including department and division meetings, training sessions, meetings purposefully scheduled to facilitate the self-reflective process, and informal conversations between discipline faculty members. Reflective discussions at these meetings result in many decisions about changing instruction to improve student learning. Some teams hold special retreats targeting reflective dialogue about results and methods that can be used to improve learning (C2-03).

Conversations also occur across the college by various committees involved in improving the quality of instruction. This includes the Curriculum Committee discussions on the measurement of the effectiveness of curriculum, and the SLOA Committee discussions on assessment methods, processes, and linkages of SLO levels (C2-04). The assessment results are further discussed by Faculty Senate and the President's Advisory Council (PAC) (C2-05&06). PAC is the central planning council that meets twice each month during the academic year. Student

Learning including SLO assessments and improvement of student learning is a standing agenda item (C2-07).

During the program review process, departments discuss findings, evaluate student achievement, and analyze progress towards goals as part of the review and improvement process (C2-08). These conversations are continued as the Program Review Committee evaluates the self-studies and reports their findings to Faculty Senate and the President's Advisory Council.

The Staff Development Committee offers workshops addressing various aspects of the SLO assessment process (C2-09). These workshops provide a forum for training and dialogue. Different aspects of the SLO process and the use of SLO assessment results to improve student learning have also been topics of discussion at College-wide forums. One such forum on the assessment of institutional-level SLOs occurred during the Fall 2013 convocation (C2-10).

The college's *Integrated Planning Manual* describes how program review fits into the college's integrated planning and budget process. SLO assessment at course and program-levels is a significant part of the program review process, playing an important role in the college's integrated planning process. The program review process has fully integrated SLO assessment at course and program-levels into the campus planning and resource allocation model. Every program on campus does a review on a three-year cycle. Included in each program's self-study are a description of the program's SLO assessment results and an account of how these results were used to improve student learning. SLO analysis is then used as part of the justification for resource allocation requests (C2-11).

The Program Review Committee submits readers' reports of the self-studies along with resource requests supported by the data presented in the reviews to Faculty Senate for approval. Once approved by Faculty Senate, the same documents are presented to the President's Advisory Council (PAC) for discussion and endorsement. After approval by the President, the supported resource requests are prioritized by the Planning and Budget Steering Committee (PBSC) who present a budget allocation recommendation to PAC. PAC reviews PBSC's recommendation and makes a subsequent recommendation to the President. Once approved by the President the appropriate funds are allocated or appropriate plans are made for the upcoming budget cycle. Through this process, SLO assessment results have become an integrated part of planning and budget allocation.

Since 2006, the College has supported a faculty Campus SLO Coordinator with reassigned time ranging from 50% to 100%, based on the needs of the campus. Additionally, in 2009 the Faculty Senate created an SLO Assessment Committee, chaired by the SLO Coordinator. The SLO Assessment Committee has representatives from each division on campus to ensure broad-based input. Division representatives on the committee receive one unit of reassigned time each semester. The SLOA Committee makes recommendations regarding resources needed to improve the ability of the campus to use assessment results to improve student learning. Recently,

the committee recommended that the College obtain a software package to facilitate aggregation of data, increase effectiveness in achieving learning outcomes, and assist in reporting results from SLO assessments (C2-12)

In 2012 the Faculty Senate approved new course-level and program-level assessment worksheets to facilitate the reporting and analysis of assessment results. The new worksheets streamlined the reporting process, and allow faculty to focus on student learning. Worksheets are completed for each course-level and program-level SLO at least once during each program review cycle (every three years).

The assessment worksheets facilitate discussions about student learning at multiple levels. Assessment results from each course and program-level SLOs are discussed by faculty members who teach in that area, or, if a course is taught by a single faculty member, he or she may choose other colleagues in the same field/program for discussion of results and planning for future improvements. Faculty members discuss what they learned from the assessment results and formulate a plan to increase student learning and outcome success. Completed worksheets, with improvement plans, are submitted to department coordinators and division SLO coordinators (C2-13).

Division SLO Coordinators aggregate and summarize information from assessment worksheets for reporting purposes and use in assessing institutional SLOs. Summarized results are stored on a password-protected SharePoint website that can be accessed by the Campus SLO Coordinator and each of the Division SLO Coordinators, allowing the campus to track learning outcomes success at the course, program, and institutional level.

Although the process used to collect and consolidate assessment data works, the SLOA committee has come to realize some inefficiency which may be improved by utilization of a software package. The current method of pulling reports is time consuming and requires input from many individuals, such as the division SLOA coordinator. Doing analysis of whether a student is meeting SLOs for a program or at the institutional-level requires assessment of courses within many divisions or across the institution. The software packages the SLOA committee has evaluated will help solve both of these issues. The ability to more efficiently pull reports across many disciplines will enhance Fullerton College's conversations about student learning.

During Fall 2013, the SLOA Committee completed the evaluation of various software packages to effectively use SLO assessment results and generate reports to communicate with the campus and external communities. The SLOA committee made a recommendation to the Curriculum Committee and conversations took place in Faculty Senate. The Vice President of Instruction is working with the Faculty Senate President to organize forums and webinars during the spring 2014 semester to help inform faculty on the use of the software package and the benefits it will bring to faculty and the institution.

Fullerton College has adopted an integrated hierarchical pathway to assess the success of students in achieving learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels. All course-level SLOs within a program must relate to at least one program-level SLO (PSLO), and each PSLO must align with at least one institutional-level SLO (ISLO) (C2-14). The philosophy is that, as students complete courses, the learning outcomes they achieve should relate directly to the desired learning outcomes for the program (PSLOs) in which they are enrolled. Likewise, students who complete programs at Fullerton College should achieve a set of core institutional learning outcomes (ISLOs) reflective of the educational values of the college.

To achieve the integration of learning outcomes at multiple levels, the PSLO assessment worksheets include a matrix that aligns each PSLO with course and institutional-level learning outcomes. One benefit of the integrated alignment is that since closely related programs share similar coursework and/or learning outcomes, faculty can share and compare student success across multiple programs. For example, in the Business Department, majors in business management and majors in marketing share some common courses. By establishing common learning outcomes for both programs, Business faculty can compare and contrast success rates and learning from an aggregated pool of “business” students. Numerous other examples of intradepartmental and inter-program collaboration may be found throughout the campus. These higher-level connections help faculty collect data from larger sample sizes, and allow students to benefit from learning outcomes assessment and planning from multiple disciplines.

Students at Fullerton College are informed of the goals, purposes, and learning outcomes of the college and its courses and programs through multiple means. Course-level SLOs are published in class syllabi and on the college’s SLO website organized by division. As of the Fall 2013 semester, 94% of the course sections taught by the college included SLOs in their syllabi, and 98% of all active courses had their SLOs published online. Additionally, all course-level SLOs are required to be included in the course outline of record (COR), and are stored with the COR in CurricUNET software. Program and institutional-level SLOs are published and regularly updated on the college’s SLO website, and are included in the online version of the college catalog (C2-15). The Program SLOs are stored with the Program description in CurricUNET Software. Currently 80% of Fullerton College’s programs have SLOs 46% are embedded in CurricUNET, and 34% are embedded with program descriptions in the 2013-2014 Course Catalog.

The SLO website acts as a repository for the Fullerton College Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Preferred Practice Handbook, and the templates for reporting instructional and non-instructional assessment of SLOs. Additional resources such as links to on-campus SLO presentations and links to other California community college SLO websites are also available on the website.

The SLOA Committee believes it is important for students to understand SLOs at the course, program and institutional level. The FC Associated Students circulate an annual survey to

students to assess awareness of various campus resources and activities. To assess student awareness of SLOs at all levels and their purposes on campus, questions assessing this awareness will be included in future surveys.

Fullerton College has met proficiency and continues to move toward Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement as described in ACCJC's Rubric. The college has ongoing assessments in place for 82% of its courses, 80% of its programs, 93% of its Student Support activities, and 100% of its Institutional SLOs.

While a majority of FC courses in the course inventory are taught each semester, there are still courses in the inventory which have not been taught recently. As the 6 year curriculum review process is completed in each academic program, inactive courses will be deleted or updated to include SLOs and reflect current teaching practices and industry standards. All courses being taught at FC have SLOs listed on the syllabi and as the remaining courses come up for review, 100% of the courses in the course inventory will have SLOs on the syllabi.

Dialogue in regard to attainment of Institutional SLOs is expanding and evaluation by the Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee (IREC) of the effectiveness of the process is taking place. The IREC conducted the first step of this analysis during the Fall 2013 semester. Dialogues are occurring across campus at multiple levels regarding the use of SLO assessment to improve student learning. In Fall of 2011, the college developed a Student Success Committee with the primary function of involving the campus community in conversations about improving student success. Involvement of the Student Success Committee in the dialogue of using SLO assessment for continuous quality improvement of student learning is an obvious next step in fine-tuning organizational structures to support student learning.

Fullerton College continues to work towards developing a sustainable plan for the utilization of SLOs in the improvement of student learning, planning and allocation of resources. This plan includes the mapping and refinement of CSLOs, PSLOs and ISLOs assessment process throughout the college, enabling FC to achieve continuous quality improvement of all SLOs. Outlined below are Fullerton College's next steps with approximate timelines included.

1. The VPI will purchase eLumen software to house all SLOs and modify SLO assessment plans accordingly. The SLOA Coordinator will develop training sessions for faculty and staff for documentation, entry and evaluation of new software. Pilot use of software in fall 2014 with the intention of rolling out software to entire campus in spring 2015.
2. The SLOA Coordinator will schedule training sessions for faculty of remaining courses and programs that have not established action plans to improve student learning with the Division SLO representative and/or the SLO Coordinator. This will occur during the spring 2014 semester.
3. The SLOA Committee will map course level SLOs to program and institutional SLOs. PSLOs have been mapped to ISLOs, and input of linkages between all CSLOs and ISLOs will be established by spring 2015.

4. The SLOA Coordinator will review and revise training procedures for SLOA committee faculty members. The coordinator will develop a training manual in conjunction with the SLOA Committee during the spring 2014 and fall 2014 semesters.
5. The SLOA Coordinator will review and revise the SLO faculty handbook to include software implementation. This will start spring 2014 and finish during fall 2014. Links to videos and step-by-step instructions will be added to the training handbook.
6. The VPI will hold multi-discipline discussions of outcomes to improve programs such as STEM, Basic Skills, Honors, Transfer Achievement Program, and Entering Scholars Program.
7. The VPI and the SLOA Coordinator will continue to schedule at least one event per semester for campus-wide SLO discussions with faculty and staff.
8. The SLO Committee will review the evaluation currently being conducted by the IREC on the SLO process to determine appropriate changes which could be made to improve the use of SLO assessment data for planning and budgeting purposes.

College Recommendation 3

In order to meet the Standards, to fully address Recommendation 3 of the previous visiting Team report, and to advance to the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement on the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness for planning and program review, the Team recommends that the institution complete a full cycle of adoption, implementation, and evaluation for its institutional planning, budgeting, program review, and resource allocation processes. (Standards I.B.3, I.B.4, I. B.6, I.B.7, II.D.1, II.D.1.a, II.D.1.d)

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.

I.B.6. The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

I.B.7. The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services and library and other learning support services.

III.D.1. The institution relies upon its mission and goals as the foundation for financial planning.

III.D.1.a. Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning.

III.D.1.d. The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development, with all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets.

Overview

A detailed response to this Recommendation was provided in the Fullerton College Follow-up Report dated March 15, 2012 and the college received notification on July 2, 2012 indicating that the response was sufficient. At that time the college had made tremendous progress in enhancing its institutional planning, budgeting, program review, and resource allocation processes. Since that time, the college has continued to assure the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes and has intensified regular evaluation of those processes as well as the bodies put in place to carry out various aspects of the college's integrated planning method.

Analysis of Results Achieved

Recognizing the need for an individual person responsible for guiding and coordinating the planning processes at the college, the FC President expanded the responsibilities of the Director of Institutional Research to include planning. In October 2011, the position of Director of Institutional Research and Planning was filled by the previous Director of Research providing continuity to the planning work that had already begun. Sadly, the Director of Institutional Research and Planning passed away in May 2012. To address the college's need for constant research and planning, the Dean of Business and CIS became the Interim Director of Research and the VP of Student Services/Accreditation Liaison Officer was responsible for coordinating the planning process of the college. On July 1, 2013, a permanent Director of Institutional Research and Planning was hired.

After the March 2011 site visit, Fullerton College opted to modify its planning process to make it more integrated, useful, and understandable to the college community. To begin the process of moving from a more or less stand-alone program review process to a more robust process foundational to the integrated planning process, the Deans' Council met to identify common themes or areas of concern from the instructional and student services program reviews. Eight concepts were identified through that procedure and those concepts were presented to the President's Advisory Council (PAC) for consideration. From discussion at the PAC, three college goals were identified including:

1. Fullerton College will improve student learning and achievement.
2. Fullerton College will reduce the Achievement Gap.
3. Fullerton College will strengthen connections with the community.

Subsequent to the adoption of the college goals, the PAC met to establish objectives to reach the stated goals. Once the objectives were accepted, each area of the college was asked to identify action plans to meet the objectives. During this transitional period from the previous planning process to the new planning process, \$100,000 was set aside from one-time funds to support action plans that required funding. The Planning and Budget Steering Committee (PBSC) was tasked with reviewing the action plans and making a recommendation to PAC for allocating funds.

A significant enhancement to the planning process has been the establishment of a Program Review Committee (PRC) which reports to the FC Faculty Senate. The PRC formed in 2010 with twelve voting members including faculty members, classified staff members and managers. Originally, the PRC was comprised of 12 voting members and four resource members. In spring 2013, the committee expanded to include a voting faculty member from each division with a total of 19 voting members and five resource members. The PRC designs self-study documents, reads and evaluates program review reports, and provides feedback to writers about the reports.

A key purpose for the committee is to identify common themes found across the various program reviews for use in the planning and budgeting process throughout the college.

The PRC completed a tremendous amount of work in the summer and fall of 2011 enabling the college to implement a two-year program review cycle during fall of 2011. All instructional programs at the college completed the new mixed-methods program review document before the end of the Fall 2011 semester. In February 2012, the instructional program reviews were read by members of the PRC and a reader's report was completed for each review. A compilation of the reader's reports was drafted by the chair of the PRC and presented to Faculty Senate for approval before being presented to the President's Advisory Council for endorsement. A listing of requests for resources accompanied the PRC report which was reviewed by the Planning and Budget Steering Committee for recommendations to PAC on the allocation of resources.

In fall of 2012, all of the student services program, student support programs and administrative areas of the college completed a similar mixed-methods program review. Two different templates were developed to address the unique needs of these areas. The Student Services Division of the college had done program reviews in a different format since 2008 and had compiled Student Learning Outcomes and Service Area Outcomes on a separate document. With the adoption of the new template, the SLOs and SAOs are incorporated into one document. Just as is done for the instructional areas, the reviews were read by members of the PRC and a final readers' report and request for resources were presented to Faculty Senate for approval, to PAC for endorsement, and to the Planning and Budget Steering Committee for recommendations for funding.

In spring of 2013, the Program Review Committee evaluated their forms and procedures and determined that the two-year cycle was not the most effective strategy. The chair of the PRC presented the findings and rationale for a change to the FC Faculty Senate in May 2013. The Faculty Senate approved a change to a three-year cycle for program review as follows: review of instructional programs in year one; review of administrative and student support programs in year two; and all programs collect data, assess, and make improvements in year three (C3-01). Currently, in the third year of the cycle, the PRC is addressing adoption of vendor software for housing program review data and reports, focusing on improving the process through the development of clearer templates and instructions, and expanding communication with the campus to better inform all constituents of the process and the outcomes.

The Planning and Budget Steering Committee (PBSC) is chaired by the Vice President of Administrative Services and the Director of Institutional Research and Planning. With the passing of the college's Director of IRP and the resignation of the VPAS, the PBSC went through a transition of leadership. Under the direction of the new VPAS, the PBSC established a clearer mission and purpose, as well as functional guidelines (C3-02). Tasked with allocating funding for action items designated through the program review process, the PBSC also developed a rubric for evaluating those action items (C3-03).

While the rubric developed by the Planning and Budget Steering Committee makes the resource allocation process more equitable and transparent, the Committee members determined that additional information from the Program Review Committee would enhance the resource allocation process. In October of 2013, members of PBSC met with members of the Program Review Committee to discuss strategies for improved communication between the committees for the purpose of a better informed resource allocation process (C3-04).

The college Director of Institutional Research and Planning co-chairs the Planning and Budget Steering Committee. Fall 2013 was his first semester with the PBSC and he began working with the committee on enhancing the college's planning calendar and has added a component to the evaluation of PBSC whereby each committee member is asked to complete an anonymous survey at the conclusion of each meeting (C3-05). This evaluation instrument may be used to improve the outcomes from the PBSC,

Participation in the planning process at FC has increased tremendously in the last three years. Where planning was previously done in silos, the process has been copiously integrated so that all staff, faculty, management, students and most importantly, committee members have the opportunity to understand their role in the process. Program Review is a foundational portion of the planning process and has been embraced more wholeheartedly by the campus community.

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.

Overview

A detailed response to this Recommendation was provided in the Fullerton College Follow-up Report dated March 15, 2012. The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) notification of July 2, 2012 indicated that the college's "warning" status was removed. However, a second Follow-up Report was required by March 15, 2013 to address this recommendation. On July 3, 2013 ACCJC sent a letter to the college indicating acceptance of the second Follow-up Report and noting that the college had met the requirement to implement and strengthen its planning process to include systematic reporting on critical college indicators that measure the College's achievement of its goals, evaluating actions taken based on assessment results, engaging more constituents in the process, regularly evaluating the effectiveness of

planning processes, and providing transparency through broad communication of the planning processes and results.

Analysis of Results Achieved

As noted in the institution's 2013 Follow-up Report and in the preceding response to college Recommendation 3 in the March 2012 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, approved by the college President, 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. All college constituent groups and programs were asked to contribute strategic action plans to accomplish the identified objectives for the upcoming two years. The action plans were reviewed by the Planning and Budget Steering Committee and the President's Executive Staff. A number of the plans requiring additional resources were approved by the President and funded for the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters (C4-01).

In February of 2013 the President's Advisory Council revisited the college's goals and objectives looking ahead to the 2013-2015 academic years. After discussion with all campus constituency groups, it was decided that the college goals would remain unchanged; however, the objectives were modified to better reflect the current environment of the college. These were endorsed by the PAC and approved by the President (C4-02, C4-03).

Additional action plans were funded for the 2013-2014 academic year. Progress toward the Strategic Action Plans

(<http://www.fullcoll.edu/sites/all/userfiles/FC%20Strategic%20Plan%20Document%202011-2013%20FINAL.pdf>) is reported to the college community, including the Board of Trustees each year along with the presentation of the College's Annual Report

(<http://www.fullcoll.edu/sites/all/userfiles/FC%2012-13%20Annual%20Report.pdf>) and the Institutional Effectiveness Report (<http://www.fullcoll.edu/sites/all/userfiles/2012-13%20FC%20IER.pdf>) (C4-04, C4-05 & C4-06). 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..

To enhance the evaluation of the institutional effectiveness of the college's integrated planning processes, Fullerton College developed an Institutional Research Committee (IRC) in late spring of 2011. The Committee is a sub-committee of the Faculty Senate. Initially, the IRC was to serve as the Institutional Review Board for the college; contribute to the research agenda for the college; review research and evaluation information for the college; and serve as the meta-process evaluation arm of the college. In October 2013, with unanimous approval of the Faculty Senate, the IRC changed its name to the Institutional Research and Effectiveness committee (IREC) and refined its function to more accurately portray and clarify its purpose on campus (C4-07).

The IREC has completed a full review of the processes used for Instructional Program Review. This review was completed in sequential steps and outcome information was shared with the Program Review Committee. Based on the IREC review, the Program Review Committee made changes to improve its process. In addition to Instructional Program Review, the IREC completed a review of the Student Learning Outcomes/Assessments process in December 2013.

The IREC is completing a systematic assessment of the Fullerton College planning process. The existence and functions of the IREC are gradually becoming known to the campus as a whole. Early attempts to survey committees and other planning groups on campus yielded, in some cases, relatively low survey return rates and questions about the authority of the IREC. The IREC is working through this issue and discussing ways to both broaden the awareness of the group and increase responsiveness to the group's inquiries. In Spring 2014, the Deans' Council, the FC Faculty Senate, the Planning and Budget Steering Committee, and the President's Advisory Council completed the self-assessment from the IREC and selected members of each group will participate in focus groups to garner additional information about the effectiveness of each group (C4-08).

In addition to the input from the IREC, 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 committee's procedures in the subsequent academic year.

In order to expand the opportunities for all constituents to engage in collaborative inquiry about strategies and programs taking place at the college, the Student Success Committee (SSC) was formed in the fall of 2011. The mission of the SSC is 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 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 (C2-11).

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 includes the District's Strategic Plan as the foundation of FC's goals and objectives. Descriptions of the program review process, budget allocation procedures, reports to the community, and assessment of planning and decision-making processes are all included in the Planning Manual, along with a description of the FC participatory governance structure and the FC councils and committees. The college's Director of Institutional Research and Planning is responsible for maintaining the Manual and updating it annually with modifications or further clarifications to the planning process of the college.

College Recommendation 5

In order to meet the Standard, the Team recommends that “total cost of ownership” of new facilities be incorporated in the college’s institutional planning and budget practices, adopting a multi-year perspective. (Standard III.B.2.a, III.C.1.c, III.C.2)

III.B.2.a. Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.

III.C.1.c. The institution systematically plans, acquires, maintains, and upgrades or replaces technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs.

III.C.2. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and uses the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement.

Overview

A detailed response to this Recommendation was provided in the Fullerton College Follow-up Report dated March 15, 2012 and the college received notification on July 2, 2012 indicating that the response was sufficient. At that point in time the college had developed a plan to address “total cost of ownership” of new facilities which was incorporated into the college’s institutional planning and budget practices.

Analysis of Results Achieved

The “total cost of ownership” (TCO) for new and renovated facilities and new technology infrastructure and equipment was developed by the Facilities and Safety Committee which was originally formed to address emergency data and communication needs on campus. The college’s Instructional Technology Committee and Technology Implementation Planning Committee were charged with the overall planning, maintenance, and operational needs of the college’s technological infrastructure and equipment. The college incorporated these processes into its overall institutional planning and budgeting practices. The Planning and Budget Steering Committee (PBSC) serves as the primary recommending body to the President’s Advisory Council (PAC) on matters regarding planning and matters related to Fullerton College’s fiscal resource allocations (C5-01)

Upon further review of the college’s TCO plan, it was determined that the college’s Program Review process already incorporated much of the same data and information that the TCO model was requesting. The College modified its TCO plan to focus on items that have more of a significant impact on long-term, ongoing planning and budgeting practices. Therefore, the TCO plan has been revised to assess staffing levels in the Maintenance & Operations area in terms of the total number of full-time equivalent personnel, specifically evaluating the most significant ongoing expenditures related to maintaining a new or newly modernized facility (C5-02).

The state's recent fiscal crisis limited the college's ability to address some of its needs in a timely manner. Now that the budget situation has somewhat stabilized, the college will utilize its newly revised TCO model to assess items that have been deferred over the last several years of declining budgets, starting with an analysis of custodial staffing levels in comparison with new or modernized facilities brought online within the last few years (C5-03). Once these assessments have been completed, they will be incorporated into the College's institutional planning and budgeting practices after initial review by the PBSC. Thus, the college's first TCO priority is to essentially "catch-up" on the needs that have been deferred throughout the budget crisis and to utilize its newly revised TCO model, adopting a multi-year perspective, at the initial point of design planning for any new or renovated facilities.

As described in the FC Spring 2012 Follow-up Report, the formation of a new Facilities & Safety Committee was proposed as a shared governance committee. The President's Advisory Council (PAC) did not endorse the creation of another shared governance committee. Therefore, the former Vice President of Administrative Services (VPAS) formed the Facilities & Safety Advisory Group which reported directly to him. After the resignation of the VPAS, the Group continued to meet as scheduled, under the direction of the new VPAS, until the end of March 2013 (C5-04). At that time, the Group was dissolved upon evaluation of its effectiveness by the new VPAS, the Director of Campus Safety, the former Director of Physical Plant & Facilities, the Manager of Maintenance & Operations, and in consultation with the Executive Management Team (C5-05). The individuals mentioned above collectively agreed that the Group was not effectively addressing the issues that it was originally established to address.

To more appropriately address the needs of the college, two separate committees, a Safety Committee and an Emergency Preparedness Committee were formed to address the broader campus aspect of Safety and Emergency Preparedness. The Director of Physical Plant & Facilities facilitates and chairs the new Safety Committee which assesses the college's needs and provides recommendations for resource allocations and future facilities planning.

The Emergency Preparedness Committee is chaired by the Director of Campus Safety. The college has enhanced and expanded the Emergency Preparedness Committee to ensure participation by the broader campus community. The Emergency Preparedness Committee plans campus wide drills, enhancing mass notification and communication systems, and systematically evaluates its drills and communication systems to ensure continuous quality improvement (C5-06).

A significant step in addressing emergency and communication needs was the installation of emergency telephones in every classroom. After concerns by faculty were shared with the college's Executive Management Team, an allocation from carryover funds of \$40,000 was designated for the purchase and installation of telephones in each classroom in 2011. The telephones allow for emergency calling from a classroom and for centralized mass emergency notification into classrooms. The system was initially tested in spring of 2012 and has been used

in campus wide emergency drills since that time. In fall 2013, the broadcast feature of the phones was used to notify the campus of non-hazardous fumes surrounding the college and again to alert the campus of police activity in the area.

Fullerton College had three technology committees each focused on a different aspect of technology on campus. After discussions with the committee chairs and the Executive Management Team of the College, a new subcommittee of the President's Advisory Council was created to better incorporate the work of the three separate committees. The Fullerton College Technology Committee has members from all constituent groups on campus and met for the first time in spring 2013. During the course of this preliminary meeting the purpose of the committee was discussed and the progress made by previous committees was reviewed.

While the committee was adjourned over the summer the committee's charge was re-evaluated by college administration and the completion of a technology plan was made the highest priority for the committee's service during the 2013-2014 academic year. The committee's co-chairs met over the course of the summer to gather and review resources to provide the committee with data for the purposes of an environmental scan, and a tentative plan was formulated to guide the committee's progress.

Meeting once a month during the fall semester, the Fullerton College Technology Committee has established a SharePoint site to share research and other resources, with the ultimate goal of developing a tool within SharePoint to record input from constituency groups. Each member of the committee is serving as a communications conduit between their constituent group and the committee as the plan is developed. A draft outline for the plan has been developed and each member is contributing to the plan. A set of beginning assumptions for the plan has been identified, with the intention of building on and updating the draft of the prior technology plan. It is anticipated that a plan will be completed by the end of the 2013-2014 academic year and ready for review and approval by constituent groups.

Response to Self-Identified Improvement Plans (Planning Agenda)

1. The college will continue to revise and implement the FC Planning Model to more closely integrate the SLO assessment, program review, planning and budgeting and to refine processes for evaluating the effectiveness of data-driven planning and resource allocations. (I.B.3)

Fullerton College has revised and enhanced its planning process through a series of deliberate steps to sustain a clear prescribed method for using data to make decisions, integrating college processes, and purposefully linking planning and budgeting. The planning process, as well as the individual components of the process, is regularly evaluated for effectiveness and modifications are made in an effort to continuously improve.

At the time of the Spring 2011 Self-study and site visit the Fullerton College community was struggling to understand the college planning process and constituents were discussing options to better integrate planning and budget. There was general recognition that the program review format needed improvement and SLO assessment needed to be linked to program review. The Program Review Committee had just been established by the Faculty Senate and was working on developing a mixed-methods self-study template for all areas of the college to complete. The template incorporated SLO assessment into the program review process. The instructional departments were the first to complete the new program review in fall of 2011.

The Program Review Committee prepared a final reader's report along with a request for resources which were identified through the process and supported by the data. After approval by the Faculty Senate and endorsement by the President's Advisory Council, the request for resources was given to the Planning and Budget Steering Committee for consideration of funding. In fall of 2012, the other departments of the college completed a similar mixed-methods program review which incorporated SLOAs for areas of student services. The templates for Student Services and for administrative areas were modified to better serve the needs of those areas. Program review has become an integral part of the planning process at the college. The incorporation of SLOAs into the process has strengthened college planning and provided a clearer link between the college mission and the college budget.

The establishment of the Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee (IREC) has also enhanced college planning by providing a formal evaluation procedure for campus committees and processes. Through surveys, directed conversations, and focus groups, the IREC has assisted committees across campus in revising methods to better reach their goals.

In August of 2013, the President's Executive Staff, the college Deans, the leadership of the Faculty Senate, and the chairs of the campus committees were invited to a planning retreat. The retreat was singularly focused on FC's planning process. Participants identified strengths and weaknesses in the planning process and completed a gap analysis determining strategic objectives, current standings, deficiencies, and actions plans. As a result of the planning retreat a

listing of improvements needed in the planning process was compiled and responsible individuals were identified.

Evaluations from the August 2013 planning retreat indicated a high level of satisfaction with the dialogue at the retreat, the gap analysis completed, and the identification of improvements to the planning process. Therefore, a second planning retreat was scheduled in January 2014. Again, committee chairs, members of the President's Advisory Council, leadership of the Faculty Senate and the college Deans participated in dynamic conversations about additional areas of the planning process that might be improved, as well as methods of providing additional understanding and transparency to the integrated planning process.

The FC *Integrated Planning Manual* has been helpful in clarifying the planning process for all constituents. The original planning model, drawn in the 2011 self-study, proved to be confusing and a simpler model was included in the new Manual. As processes are refined, the Manual will be updated so that it will be a clear and understandable process for the entire campus community.

Fullerton College has made tremendous progress in developing a robust, integrated planning process. The challenge that remains is to ensure that the program review process, which is a foundation of the planning process, is embraced by the college constituents and that all decision makers use the information gleaned through program review for allocation of human resources and physical resources throughout the campus. Dissemination of the Program Review Reports to a larger audience will assist in this endeavor as will evidence of decisions being made based on program review.

2. The college will continue to implement the student equity plan and develop additional plans, strategies, and funding opportunities to address the achievement gap and the needs of underprepared students. (II.A.1.a, II.A.2.d)

The college has continued to utilize the 2008 Student Equity Plan in the development of plans and strategies to address the achievement gap. The college is well-positioned for future funding opportunities as a Hispanic Serving Institution. Since re-establishing the college goals in 2011, eliminating the achievement gap has been one of the three primary goals.

The changing demographics of Fullerton College students over the past decade demonstrate a significant increase in the various groups of students that experience the achievement gap as defined in research and discussions on campus. For the 2002-03 academic year, 42% of the student population at FC were White, 29% were Hispanic, and 3.6% were African American. By 2012-13, 26% of FC students were White, 47% Hispanic, and 3.5% African American.

The socio-economic status of Fullerton College students has also changed dramatically. The Federal Pell Grant is awarded to eligible, low-income students who need money to attend college. In 2002-03, 2,886 students received a Federal Pell Grant in the amount of \$6,694,231. In 2012-13, 6,398 received it in the amount of \$21,013,455, indicating an increase of 122% in the number

of students receiving Pell Grants. Of the more than 18,400 individual students who applied to Fullerton College for fall 2013, 52% are the first in their families to attend college.

The achievement gap is produced from both social and school-based factors and exists before students step foot on the Fullerton College campus. The diverse demographic student profile at Fullerton College reflects a wide variance in academic preparation, learning styles, economic backgrounds, race, age, ethnicity, and work and family obligations. This means that the college must approach the elimination of the achievement gap with numerous methods and strategies. One program or pathway is not beneficial for all students.

Numerous meetings with community members, neighboring high school districts, campus constituencies, and students have yielded many excellent ideas and strategies to eliminate the achievement gap at Fullerton College. The college has also concentrated on bringing instruction and student services faculty, staff, and managers together consistently for planning, early implementation, program operation, and program evaluation and enhancement in an effort to better serve students. Fullerton College has proceeded quickly from the broad concept of “integrating student services with instruction” to developing clear and concrete goals and programs, leading to transformative change and documented accomplishments.

By working collaboratively, the college has moved from a culture of blame to a culture of success. Data released from the California State University (CSU) system in October 2013 indicate that Fullerton College transferred more Latino students to the CSU than any of the state’s other 111 community colleges. During the 2012-2013 academic year, 443 Latino students from FC transferred to the CSU system, a 5% increase from the previous year. The college is ranked fourth in the state in the number of total CSU transfers.

Fullerton College will begin working on a new Student Equity Plan once guidelines arrive from the California Community College Chancellors Office (CCCCO) describing the necessary components and formatting required by the passage of SB 1456, the Student Success Act. Conversations have already begun about determining and mitigating disproportionate impact in Student Success and Support Programs. The report will be due to the CCCCCO by October 2014.

The college’s Student Equity Committee reports to the Faculty Senate. The mission and purpose of the Student Equity Committee is to develop and recommend policies, programs, and strategies that promote equity in student success, retention, degree and certificate completion and transfer. The Student Equity Committee will work with the Student Success and Support Program Committee (formerly the Matriculation Committee) to develop the college’s new Student Equity Plan.

3. The college will continue to implement SLO's at the course and program levels and improve their assessment. As stated in I.B.3, the college will continue to revise and improve the integration of SLOA data into the college planning model. (II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.i)

The SLO assessment process at FC is now well established, and the SLOA process is underway. As of Fall 2013, nearly all courses have established SLOs and a process is in place to complete identification of SLOs for remaining courses. Assessment and improvement in learning continues throughout the campus at all levels. Assessment and plans for improvement for all courses, programs and institutional outcomes are in place and will have completed a full cycle by spring of 2015. In addition, documentation of all PSLOs will appear in both CurricUNET and the Course Catalog during the same timeframe.

The college SLOA Coordinator and the SLOA Committee, along with the Vice President of Instruction continue to work on improving the techniques for assessing SLOs and for managing the ongoing process to sustain enhancements through SLO analysis. A number of issues have been identified which will advance the college's ability to maintain an environment focused on student success.

An initial challenge has been faculty reluctance to embrace the assessment process and questioning of the value of the SLO process as a mechanism for continuous improvement of courses and programs. Some faculty members are new to the assessment process and tend to focus more on the operational processes such as implementation, data collection, and report writing rather than on what can be extracted from the reports to improve student success. While many departments and divisions have meaningful discussions about authentic data and outcomes, not all divisions have undertaken this activity.

Through various discussions on campus it was determined that additional dialogue at the institutional level about the assessment of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes would be beneficial. At the Fall 2013 Convocation a campus wide forum was held to discuss ISLO assessment. The forum was attended by faculty members, staff, and administrators from Instructional and Student Services Divisions. The SLOA Committee plans to hold at least one campus wide forum per semester, inviting all stakeholders to participate in discussions of data-driven outcomes as they relate to core competencies of the college and to student success.

At the Fall 2013 forum a discussion ensued around the topic of an organized approach to data collection and report writing, the idea of a software management system was mentioned. The method currently used to house SLOA data is of concern. Faculty members tend to work alone on their assessments and develop a silo mentality in regards to how the data may be used by others on campus. The college currently retains both course and program level data at the division level, resulting in decentralization of the data. Collecting data for reports and mapping course and program level outcomes is cumbersome. The college is currently investigating options to purchase a software management system to facilitate SLOA data management.

Another dimension of SLO assessments is that of shared rubrics. A number of departments on campus meet to discuss and share rubrics; however, individual faculty members have the freedom to choose a rubric which is most beneficial for a particular course. The college is developing a series of workshops to improve the implementation of SLOA rubrics through shared ideas and methodologies. As a coordinated effort between the Staff Development Committee and the SLOA Coordinator and Committee, a timeline for workshops will be developed before the end of the spring 2014 semester for implementation in fall 2014. The possibility of engaging Southern California experts in SLO assessment rubrics could serve to move faculty and staff discussions forward in this area. As FC continues to map course, program, and institutional SLOs, additional training sessions will be offered for the development of new course SLOs and for training of new faculty.

All Instructional and Student Support Services program reviews report on student learning outcomes and assessment. Data include which outcomes were assessed, when the assessment took place, and plans for improvement based on the assessment, which are integrated into the development of short and long term goals. The Program Review Committee reads the reviews and identifies themes and threads common to the entire campus and writes a report, along with a request for resources, for ratification by the Faculty Senate. The same reports are then sent to the President's Advisory Council for endorsement and to the Planning and Budget Steering Committee for funding recommendation.

The Program Review Committee is currently streamlining the process of making the final report with goals and the request for resources information available to all appropriate stakeholders on campus. The method for prioritization of budget requests for both short and long term goals is now under discussion by the Program Review Committee. Joint committee meetings between the Program Review Committee and the Planning and Budget Steering committee provide direction in how programs and divisions might prioritize budget requests.

The SLOA process is robust and program review is integrated into the planning and budget process. Widespread acknowledgment across campus is needed to clarify that program reviews are an integral part of the planning cycle. The allocation of one-time funds recommended by PBSC is only one outcome of program review. Faculty, classified staff, and management hiring processes are also informed by program reviews as are capital requests.

Fullerton College continues to work towards utilizing SLOs in the improvement of student learning, planning and allocation of resources. The college has met proficiency and continues to work toward Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement as described in ACCJC's Rubric. The college has ongoing assessments in place for 82% of its courses, 80% of its programs, 93% of its Student Support activities, and 100% of its Institutional SLOs. Dialogue has expanded and occurs regularly in regard to the attainment of Institutional SLOs. The SLO Committee will work with the Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee (IREC) to evaluate the

effectiveness of the SLO assessment process. The IREC conducted the first step of the analysis in fall 2013.

Dialogues are occurring across campus at multiple levels regarding the use of SLO assessment to improve student learning. In fall of 2011, the college developed a Student Success Committee with the primary function of involving the campus community in conversations about improving student success. Involvement of the Student Success Committee in the dialogue of using SLO assessment for continuous quality improvement of student learning in an obvious next step in fine-tuning organizational structures to support student learning.

4. The college will develop budget allocations to provide consistent funding for ongoing planned maintenance. In addition, the college will conduct a comprehensive assessment of safety and emergency communications and provide consistent funding to address safety and access issues related to facilities. (III.B.1.a, III.B.1.b)

As the college prepared its 2011 Self-Study, a need for physical resources was identified. Although one-time allocations had been used to address a number of needs, consistent funding was recognized as an area for improvement. In order to assure effective utilization of physical resources and ongoing support to programs and services, a long-term resource allocation commitment was needed to support effective planning in this area.

In addition to the physical resource needs, the college noted that additional training and drills needed to be conducted in order to address emergency preparedness, and that consistent funding should be provided to address safety and access issues related to facilities. Through the Facilities & Safety Advisory Group, the Campus Safety department, Facilities and Maintenance department, and the Academic Computing Technologies group, the college conducted an assessment of safety and emergency communications and implemented a number of measures in this area, including radio and telephone communications, dissemination of emergency preparedness information, a centralized access control mechanism, and exterior emergency telephones.

In order to develop budget allocations to provide consistent funding for ongoing planned maintenance, the college sets funds aside, into the Capital Outlay Fund, on an annual basis. Also, as available, scheduled maintenance allocations from the State and/or the District are set aside in the Capital Outlay Fund to address planned scheduled maintenance projects. Recent examples of ongoing planned maintenance that has been performed from these allocations have been the Quad Renovation Project which primarily addressed drainage problems and tripping hazards, and a campus-wide painting project which addressed much-needed exterior maintenance for a number of buildings throughout the campus.

Two additional planned maintenance projects which have already been funded will be addressed during the 2013-14 or 2014-15 fiscal years. These are the rebuilding of the 2000 building exterior stairs and the removal of property known as the Gigliotti Property. The 2000 building

exterior stairs project will address safety and access issues and the Gigliotti Property project, which includes demolition of existing property and resurfacing/paving will address parking concerns.

To address safety and emergency communications, the college has increased the number of campus-wide emergency drills performed in order to raise awareness and enhance preparedness in the event of potential emergencies for all students, faculty, and staff. Accordingly, the college participates in the annual state-wide Great Shake-out drill conducted in the fall semester and has conducted an active shooter drill in the spring semester. In addition to these larger drills, the college conducts regular emergency radio roll-call drills to ensure the effectiveness of its emergency equipment and to provide regular training to faculty and staff in proper emergency radio protocol. Additional radios have also been added in recent years, as a result of the college's comprehensive emergency preparedness and safety assessment. Another action item which resulted from the college's comprehensive assessment was the installation of telephones in every classroom allowing for mass emergency notification into a classroom and for emergency calling from within a classroom.

The college has incorporated safety and emergency planning into its exterior facilities planning through the installation of emergency telephones, known as "blue phones", and through the implementation of an emergency lock-down system. Exterior blue phones have been installed near the Wilshire Center, on the exterior of the newly renovated 700 building, and in the newly renovated Parking Lot 10, south of the 2000 building.

The college allocated resources toward the purchase of a One-Command System which allows for a centralized emergency lock-down by Campus Safety, in the event of an emergency requiring lock-down. This feature is available for all new facilities which have an electronic locking mechanism. Campus Safety has incorporated this protocol into the applicable campus-wide emergency drills. In addition, for long-term future planning purposes, this system will allow for integration with any new facility renovations or new buildings allowing broader utilization of the locking mechanism.

Every office, classroom and meeting room throughout the college has an Emergency flip chart which provides a quick-reference tool for students, faculty, staff, and visitors of what to do in the case of an emergency. These flip charts are updated as necessary. The charts, along with additional trainings and drills, have increased awareness to the campus community and have aided in emphasizing the joint responsibility for safety.

5. The college will develop a technology plan that addresses existing and near-future campus technology needs and will identify consistent funding to carry out that plan. The college will also incorporate a formal Assistive and Adaptive Technology Plan into the overall technology plan. (III.C.1, III.C.1.c)

During the academic year 2011-12 three on-campus committees contributed to the development of an allocation plan, an inventory of existing hard and soft technology assets, and a prioritization of technical needs. In an effort to ensure that instructional needs were being evaluated and communicated by those groups most closely involved in instruction, the Faculty Senate formed a subcommittee, the Instructional Technology Committee. This group met regularly throughout the academic year and was charged by the Senate with the task of soliciting input from its constituent members and identifying technological needs for effective instruction.

The Technology Implementation and Planning Committee (TIPC) was formed as a subcommittee of the President's Advisory Council (PAC) to solicit and evaluate input from all constituent groups on campus and to make recommendations to the PAC on the prioritization of technology needs. This committee was also charged with the development of a technology plan for the college as a whole, in support of Fullerton College and North Orange County Community College District goals and objectives. The members of the TIPC represented all constituent groups across the college, in addition to representation from the Faculty Senate's ITC committee, thus ensuring an effective communication link between the two committees. So that technical needs associated with off-campus instruction would be considered and integrated into the committee's deliberations, representatives from the college's Distance Education committee were also included.

Based on input from all constituencies it was determined that there was an immediate and critical need to upgrade and update existing technology. Working with the TIPC, representatives from Academic Computing Technology (ACT) completed a physical inventory and documentation of all existing computing equipment and infrastructure on campus. Equipment was evaluated on the basis of operating needs within the functional area, age of equipment, and the ability to support existing and anticipated near-future campus usage. A common desktop specification was developed as a uniform minimum standard for all purchases.

Assessment of infrastructure needs had revealed the need for new switches, core switches, and servers, the failure of which could affect the ongoing vitality of the college network. Based on the current technical inventory and an evaluation of near-future needs, a prioritized list of urgent technical purchases was developed, with an estimated purchase price for the needs determined to be most immediate. The recommendation included expenditures to update the existing inventory of desktop computers, with the recommendation for the college to maintain an inventory of desktops that is no older than three years at any time.

In view of the need to leverage long-term technical progress against short-term needs, the proposal included investment in the college infrastructure. This plan was approved by the Academic Senate and presented to the President's Advisory Council as a recommended action item in mid-spring 2012. Upon approval of the recommendation, the college allocated a sum of \$500,000 to fund the suggested purchases and accomplish the recommended course of action, with purchases completed at the end of the academic year.

While the committee structure of the previous academic year had resulted in definitive action in the short-term, the separation of tasks between the committees had made communications and feedback unwieldy and cumbersome, delaying the completion of a technology plan for the college. A draft document was produced but never finalized. During the academic year 2012-13 an evaluation of the structure and assessment of planning needs resulted in a collaborative decision to reintegrate the committees.

The President's Advisory Council replaced the Technology and Implementation Committee with a new subcommittee, the Fullerton College Technology Committee. Members were solicited from all constituent groups, the administrative and faculty Co-Chairs were identified, and the first meeting of the committee was scheduled just prior to the end of the academic year. During the course of this preliminary meeting the purpose of the committee was discussed and the progress made by previous committees was reviewed.

While the committee was adjourned over the summer the committee's charge was re-evaluated by college administration and the completion of a technology plan was made the highest priority for the committee's service during the 2013-2014 academic year. The committee's co-chairs met over the course of the summer to gather and review resources to make available to the committee for the purposes of an environmental scan, and a tentative plan was formulated to guide the committee's progress.

Meeting once a month during the fall semester, the Fullerton College Technology Committee has established a SharePoint site for the sharing of research and other resources, with the ultimate goal of developing a tool within SharePoint to record input from constituency groups. Each member of the committee is serving as a communications conduit between their constituent group and the committee as the plan is developed. A draft outline for the plan has been developed and each member is contributing to the plan. A set of beginning assumptions for the plan has been identified, with the intention of building on and updating the draft of the prior technology plan. It is anticipated that a plan will be completed by the end of the 2013-2014 academic year and ready for review and approval by constituent groups.

Evidence for Response to ACCJC District Recommendation #1

References:

- *North Orange County Community College District (NOCCCD) 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*
- *NOCCCD 2013 Integrated Planning Manual*
- *NOCCCD 2012 Decision-Making Resource Manual: Structure, Functions and Alignment*
- *NOCCCD 2013 Decision-Making Resource Manual: Structure, Functions and Alignment*

D1- 01	<i>NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2009-11</i>
D1-02	<i>NOCCCD 2011 Comprehensive Master Plan</i>
D1-03	Members of the Ad Hoc District Planning Committee
D1-04	Accreditation Workgroup Participants
D1-05	<i>NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual</i>
D1-06	<i>NOCCCD 2012 Decision-Making Resource Manual: Structure, Functions and Alignment</i>
D1-07	September 16, 2011 Integrated Planning Workgroup agenda, sign-in sheet, and handouts
D1-08	E-mail distributing draft 1 of the Integrated Planning Manual
D1-09	E-mail distributing draft 2 of the Integrated Planning Manual
D1-10	October 21, 2012 Integrated Planning Workgroup agenda and sign-in sheet
D1-11	E-mail from CEOs distributing the Integrated Planning Manual for the first district-wide review
D1-12	Responses to feedback from the first district-wide review
D1-13	November 28, 2011 Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council agenda
D1-14	November 28, 2011 Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council minutes
D1-15	December 12, 2011 Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council minutes

- D1-16 E-mail from CEOs distributing all three manuals for the second district-wide review
- D1-17 January 6, 2012 Board Letter distributing the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and the *NOCCCD 2012 Decision-Making Resource Manual: Structure, Functions and Alignment*
- D1-18 Responses to feedback from the second district-wide review
- D1-19 January 23, 2012 Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council agenda
- D1-20 January 23, 2012 Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council minutes
- D1-21 January 24, 2012 Board Agenda and Minutes
- D1-22 February 13, 2012 Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council minutes
- D1-23 February 28, 2012 Board Minutes
- D1-24 *NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2011-12 Final Report*
- D1-25 August 28, 2012 Board Minutes
- D1-26 *NOCCCD 2013 Progress Report on the District-wide Strategic Plan 2012-2014*
- D1-27 August 27, 2013 Board Minutes
- D1-28 *NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2012-2014*
- D1-29 Planning Calendar of Activities 2012-2020
- D1-30 2012 Planning Calendar of Activities with links to evidence
- D1-31 2013 Planning Calendar of Activities with links to evidence
- D1-32 *NOCCCD 2013 Integrated Planning Manual*
- D1-33 2015 Planning Calendar of Activities
- D1-34 Chancellor's Cabinet and District Planning Council Purpose and Operational Guidelines
- D1-35 September 16, 2011 Decision Making Workgroup agenda, sign-in sheet, and handouts
- D1-36 October 21, 2011 Decision Making Workgroup agenda and sign-in sheet

- D1-37 E-mail distributing draft 1 of the Decision Making Manual
- D1-38 E-mail distributing draft 2 of the Decision Making Manual
- D1-39 Responses to feedback on draft 2 of the Decision Making Manual
- D1-40 E-mail distributing draft 3 of the Decision Making Manual
- D1-41 E-mail distributing draft 4 of the Decision Making Manual
- D1-42 E-mail from CEOs distributing the Decision Making Manual for the first district-wide review
- D1-43 Responses to feedback from the first district-wide review
- D1-44 December 12, 2011 Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council agenda
- D1-45 Meeting agenda and presentation “How to Participate in Planning, Decision Making and budgeting in the NOCCCD” for Cypress College on April 20, 2012
- D1-46 Email invitation and presentation “How to Participate in Planning, Decision Making and budgeting in the NOCCCD” for the School of Continuing Education on May 2, 2012
- D1-47 “Board Role in Planning, Decision Making and Budgeting in the NOCCCD” presentation on July 21, 2012
- D1-48 Email invitation and presentation “How to Participate in Planning, Decision Making and budgeting in the NOCCCD” for Fullerton College on February 21, 2013
- D1-49 Email from Chancellor Doffoney to all district employees asking participation in the NOCCCD District Services/Districtwide Communications Satisfaction Survey 2013
- D1-50 *NOCCCD District Services/Districtwide Communications Satisfaction Survey 2013*
- D1-51 *NOCCCD 2013 Decision-Making Resource Manual: Structure, Functions and Alignment*
- D1-52 April 23, 2012 District Consultation Council minutes
- D1-53 May 8, 2012 Board Minutes

- D1-54 Responses to Feedback on *NOCCCD 2013 Progress Report on the District-wide Strategic Plan* from Board of Trustees 9/7/2013
- D1-55 *District Services Administrative Review Procedure*
- D1-56 2012 Budget Calendar of Activities with links to evidence
- D1-57 2013 Budget Calendar of Activities with links to evidence
- D1-58 *Proposed Budget & Financial Report 2012-2013*
- D1-59 *Proposed Budget & Financial Report 2013-2014*
- D1-60 February 27, 2012 District Consultation Council agenda and minutes
- D1-61 March 12, 2012 Council on Budget & Facilities agenda and minutes
- D1-62 November 15, 2011 Technology Advisory Committee agenda & minutes
- D1-63 April 16, 2012 Institutional Effectiveness minutes
- D1-64 *District-wide Institutional Effectiveness Report & Inventory of Programs and Services to Address the Achievement Gap*
- D1-65 Screenshots of myGateway access to Council materials (District Consultation Council, District Curriculum Coordinating Committee, Institutional Effectiveness Coordinating Council, Technology Coordinating Council and Council on Budget & Facilities)
- D1-66 August 23, 2011 Board minutes and Chancellor's 2011-12 Goals
- D1-67 Chancellor's 2012-13 Goals
- D1-68 Chancellor's 2013-14 Goals

Evidence for Response to ACCJC District Recommendation #2

References:

- *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012*
- *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2013*

D2-01	<i>NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012</i>
D2-02	<i>NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2013</i>
D2-03	September 16, 2011 Resource Allocation Workgroup agenda, sign-in sheet, and handouts
D2-04	E-mail distributing the first draft of the Budget Allocation Handbook
D2-05	E-mail distributing the second draft of the Budget Allocation Handbook
D2-06	E-mail distributing the third draft of the Budget Allocation Handbook
D2-07	E-mail distributing the proposed NOCCCD budget allocation model description for the Integrated Planning Manual
D2-08	E-mail distributing the fourth draft of the Budget Allocation Handbook
D2-09	October 21, 2011 Resource Allocation Workgroup agenda and sign-in sheet
D2-10	E-mail distributing draft 5 of the Budget Allocation Handbook
D2-11	Responses to feedback on the Budget Allocation Handbook
D2-12	E-mail from CEOs distributing the Budget Allocation Handbook for the first district-wide review
D2-13	April 9, 2012 Council on Budget & Facilities Minutes
D2-14	May 14, 2012 Council on Budget & Facilities Minutes
D2-15	November 19, 2012 Council on Budget & Facilities Minutes
D2-16	December 10, 2012 Council on Budget & Facilities Minutes
D2-17	February 11, 2013 Council on Budget & Facilities Minutes
D2-18	April 8, 2013 Council on Budget & Facilities Minutes
D2-19	May 13, 2013 Council on Budget & Facilities Minutes

- D2-20 June 10, 2013 Council on Budget & Facilities Minutes
- D2-21 August 12, 2013 Council on Budget & Facilities Minutes
- D2-22 April 22, 2013 District Consultation Council Minutes
- D2-23 May 20, 2013 District Consultation Council Minutes
- D2-24 June 24, 2013 District Consultation Council Minutes
- D2-25 Budget Calendar of Activities 2012-2020
- D2-26 September 10, 2013 Proposed Budget Presentation made to the Board
- D2-27 2012 NOCCCD Budget Allocation Model Forum flyer
- D2-28 2013 NOCCCD Budget Allocation Model Forum flyer
- D2-29 Sign in sheet from 2012 NOCCCD Budget Allocation Model Forum at Fullerton College April 30, 2013
- D2-30 Sign in sheet from 2012 NOCCCD Budget Allocation Model Forum at the School of Continuing Education May 23, 2013
- D2-31 NOCCCD Budget Central announcement flyer
- D2-32 September 24, 2012 District Consultation Council Minutes
- D2-33 November 26, 2012 District Consultation Council Minutes
- D2-34 *Strategic Plan Fund: Process and Selection Criteria* November 26, 2012
- D2-35 Email soliciting Strategic Plan Fund Proposals December 3, 2012
- D2-36 February 25, 2013 District Consultation Council Minutes
- D2-37 September 23, 2013 District Consultation Council Minutes
- D2-38 *Strategic Plan Fund: Process and Selection Criteria* September 23, 2013

Other evidence for District Recommendation #2 is included in the evidence cited for District Recommendations #1.

Evidence for Response to ACCJC District Recommendation #3

- D3- 01 Example email soliciting input to revisions of the *NOCCCD Integrated Planning Manual* and the *NOCCCD Decision-Making Resource Manual: Structure, Functions and Alignment* manuals
- D3-02 Email announcing posting of the revised *NOCCCD Integrated Planning Manual*, the *NOCCCD Decision-Making Resource Manual: Structure, Functions and Alignment*, and the *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook* online at: <http://www.nocccd.edu/Accreditation.htm>

Other evidence for District Recommendation #3 is included in the evidence cited for District Recommendations #1 and #2.

Evidence for College Recommendation 1

- C1-01 Campus Diversity Plan Narrative
- C1-02 Campus Diversity Plan Activities
- C1-03 2013-14 Campus Diversity Plan Activities
- C1-04 Goals of Campus Diversity Committee
- C1-05 PAC Minutes October 8, 2013
- C1-06 Worldfest description
- C1-07 Dia de los Muertos Event flyer October 31, 2013

Evidence for College Recommendation 2

- C2-01 Faculty Senate Handbook – Procedures for SLOs
- C2-02 Current curriculum process requiring SLOs
- C2-03 Division/Department reflective dialogue
- C2-04 SLOA Committee Minutes
- C2-05 Faculty Senate Minutes
- C2-06 President’s Advisory Council Minutes
- C2-07 President’s Advisory Council Agenda
- C2-08 Program Review template
- C2-09 Staff Development Workshops on SLOs
- C2-10 Convocation Fall 2013 session on ISLOs
- C2-11 *FC Integrated Planning Manual*
- C2-12 SLOA Committee recommendation of software
- C2-13 SLO worksheet
- C2-14 Integrated hierarchical pathway to assess Learning Outcomes
- C2-15 Link to 2013-14 College Catalog

Evidence for College Recommendation 3

- C3-01 Faculty Senate Minutes
- C3-02 Planning and Budget Steering Committee Mission
- C3-03 Planning and Budget Steering Committee Rubric
- C3-04 Minutes from joint meeting of Planning and Budget Steering Committee and Program Review Committee
- C3-05 Evaluation instrument for Planning and Budget Steering Committee Meetings

Evidence for College Recommendation 4

- C4-01 Goals Endorsed PAC Minutes May 2011
- C4-02 College Goals & Objectives 2013-2015
- C4-03 Endorsement of Goals & Objectives PAC Minutes February 2013
- C4-04 Strategic Plan Final Report for 2011-2013
- C4-05 Annual Report to the Community 2012-2013
- C4-06 Institutional Effectiveness Report 2012-13
- C4-07 Mission and Purpose of the Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee
- C4-08 IREC Self-Reflective Instrument

Evidence for College Recommendation 5

- C5-01 Planning and Budget Steering Committee Mission and Purpose
- C5-02 Total Cost of Ownership Model
- C5-03 Analysis of Custodial Levels
- C5-04 Facility and Safety Committee
- C5-05 Memo to Dissolve Facilities and Safety Committee
- C5-06 Emergency Preparedness Committee Description