

Fullerton College
North Orange County Community College District

Follow-up Report

Submitted by:

Fullerton College
321 E. Chapman Avenue
Fullerton, California 92832

To:

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

March 15, 2012

Follow-up Report – Certification Page

March 15, 2012

This Follow-up report is submitted to the ACCJC for the purpose of assisting in the determination of the institution’s accreditation status.

We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community and believe that this report accurately reflects that nature and substance of this institution.

Signed:

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

**Ned Doffoney, Ed.D.
Chancellor
North Orange County Community College District**

**Molly McClanahan
President, Board of Trustees
North Orange County Community College District**

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Certification..... | 2 |
| Report Preparation..... | 4 |
| Response to Commission Action Letter | |
| District Recommendation 1..... | 5 |
| District Recommendation 2..... | 20 |
| District Recommendation 3..... | 27 |
| College Recommendation 1..... | 31 |
| College Recommendation 2..... | 34 |
| College Recommendation 3..... | 40 |
| College Recommendation 4..... | 47 |
| College Recommendation 5..... | 54 |
| Appendix A: Fullerton College Campus Diversity Plan..... | 57 |
| Appendix B: Timeframes and Activities..... | 67 |
| Timeframes and Activities for College Recommendation 1..... | 67 |
| Timeframes and Activities for College Recommendation 2..... | 69 |
| Timeframes and Activities for College Recommendation 3..... | 71 |
| Timeframes and Activities for College Recommendation 4..... | 75 |
| Timeframes and Activities for College Recommendation 5..... | 80 |
| Appendix C: Listing of Evidence..... | 85 |
| Evidence for Response to District Recommendation 1..... | 86 |
| Evidence for Response to District Recommendation 2..... | 88 |
| Evidence for Response to District Recommendation 3..... | 89 |
| Evidence for Response to College Recommendation 1..... | 90 |
| Evidence for Response to College Recommendation 2..... | 90 |
| Evidence for Response to College Recommendation 3..... | 91 |
| Evidence for Response to College Recommendation 4..... | 95 |
| Evidence for Response to College Recommendation 5..... | 95 |

Report Preparation

This Follow-up Report is submitted as a progress report outlining Fullerton College's responses to the recommendations made by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

We certify that there has been considerable opportunity for the entire campus community to participate in the development of this report. We believe that this Follow-up Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of progress since the Team visit in March 2011.

Evidence of progress was gathered from all campus constituents including managers, faculty, classified staff, and students. The draft report was made available to the entire staff of the college and to the students. It was reviewed by the President's Advisory Council, a participatory governance committee representing all campus constituencies.

The North Orange County Community College Board of Trustees received a draft copy of the Follow-up Report with supporting documents as an information item at the February 14, 2012 Board meeting and the final Report at the February 28, 2012 Board meeting.

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

Ned Doffoney, Ed.D.
Chancellor, North Orange County
Community College District

Deborah Ludford
District Director
Information Services

Marcus Wilson
Acting President, Faculty Senate

Terrence D. Giugni, Ph.D.
Vice President, Instruction
Co-Accreditation Liaison Officer

Kenneth A. Meehan, Ph.D.
Director, Institutional Research and Planning
Co-Accreditation Liaison Officer

Response to 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)

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.

IV.A.3. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution's constituencies.

IV.B.3.a. The district/system clearly delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice.

Eligibility Requirement 19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation. The institution systematically evaluates and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes, including assessment of student learning outcomes. The institution provides evidence of planning for improvement of institutional structures and processes, student achievement of educational goals, and student learning. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding improvement through an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation.

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 *North Orange County Community College District District-wide Strategic Plan 2009-2011* (DI.01) was at the end of its term and NOCCCD was mid-way through the development of the *North Orange County Community College District 2011 Comprehensive Master Plan* (DI.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 with campus planning processes.

In late spring 2011 the Chancellor, two College Presidents and Provost of the School of Continuing Education appointed 40 representatives to serve on an Ad Hoc District Planning Committee (DI.03). In July, this Committee met for the purposes of confirming the District Strategic Directions for the *North Orange County Community College District 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 (DI.04). This approach was used to develop three documents that are central to NOCCCD's response to the ACCJC District Recommendations:

- *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*
- *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment*
- *North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012*

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 Follow-Up Report to enhance clarity. When the supporting evidence applies to more than one document, it is included only once.

The following is a summary of the process for the development of the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*. A chronology of the specific steps follows this summary.

Integrated Planning Workgroup: The Integrated Planning Workgroup was intentionally composed of faculty leaders and administrators chosen for their familiarity with or interest in planning concepts and processes. The Integrated Planning Workgroup did not represent each NOCCCD constituency; instead it was intended to function as a small, task-focused cadre of writers and first readers. In its first meeting (DI.05), 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 integrated planning at the district level in the NOCCCD.

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 decision-making processes.

The missing processes were developed through small group discussions. Their recommendations were then reviewed by the rest of the Integrated Planning Workgroup members. The *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* was revised three times within the Integrated Planning Workgroup before this document was distributed to a larger audience (DI.06, DI.07, DI.08). In this way, when NOCCCD constituencies were reviewing and critiquing the descriptions of current district-level planning processes in the drafts of the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*, they were also reviewing and critiquing recommended revisions and additions to district-level planning processes.

First distribution of a draft to all employees at each site: When the Integrated Planning Workgroup deemed that the draft was ready for review and comment by a larger audience, the CEOs at each site distributed the draft *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* to everyone at his/her site for their review and comment (DI.09). Responses to this feedback were returned to the campuses and this feedback was used to prepare yet another draft (DI.10).

First distribution of a draft to Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council: The resulting draft was then distributed to Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council members, each of whom represents a specific constituency. The Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council members were asked to circulate the draft to their constituencies and to share feedback received at the subsequent meeting (DI.11, DI.12). In addition to the distribution to all Fullerton College staff as indicated above information was provided and input received on the outcomes of the Integrated Planning Workgroup via the Fullerton College Faculty Senate President's Report (DI.13, DI.14, DI.15, DI.16, DI.17) sent out monthly, Fullerton College Faculty Senate meetings (DI.18, DI.19, DI.20, DI.21, DI.22) and a College wide Accreditation Forum held on January 20, 2012 (DI.23). Feedback from this review by constituent groups was incorporated to prepare another draft (DI.24).

Second distribution of a draft to all employees at each site: Once again the CEOs of each site distributed the draft to everyone at their site for review and comment (DI.25). The Chancellor distributed the draft to the Board for review and comment (DI.26).

Second distribution of a draft to Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council: Once again the feedback was incorporated into the draft *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and responses to the feedback were returned the campuses (DI.27). The resulting draft was distributed to Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council members (DI.28). The Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council members were asked to circulate the draft to their constituencies and to bring that feedback to the following meeting (DI.29).

The feedback from this final round of feedback was incorporated into the document to prepare the next draft of the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* which was presented to the Board for information (DI.30). Following the integration of their comments, the final document was approved by Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council on February 13, 2012 (DI.31). The final *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* was presented to the Board on February 28, 2012 (DI.32).

The following chronology tracks the multiple cycles of draft → distribute → feedback → re-draft.

| Date | Integrated Planning Manual Activities |
|--------------|--|
| August | <p>The following members of the Ad Hoc District Planning Committee volunteered to serve on the Integrated Planning Workgroup:</p> <p>Representing Cypress College</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lisa Clark, faculty • Rick Rams and Santanu Bandyopadhyay, administrators <p>Representing Fullerton College:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sean Chamberlin, faculty • Terry Giugni and Ken Meehan, administrators <p>Representing the School of Continuing Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vaniethia Hubbard, administrator |
| September 16 | <p>Led by the District Director of Information Services and the consultant, the Integrated Planning Workgroup completed these tasks in its first meeting (DI.05):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed the elements commonly found in a planning cycle • Identified which components of the planning cycle are currently part of district-level planning • Identified which components of the planning cycle that need to be developed • Provided feedback on drafts and samples from other district planning models that show: |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the purpose, process and timeline for each component for each planning process • the type, format and timeline for regular evaluation of planning processes • a process for communicating results of the assessment • a process for using the results to improve processes ▪ Discussed a graphic to show how the components of the district-level planning link to one another |
| October 6 | Draft 1 of the <i>North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual</i> was distributed to the Integrated Planning Workgroup for review and comment (DI.06). |
| October 12-14 | Based on feedback from the Integrated Planning Workgroup, Draft 2 was prepared and distributed to the Integrated Planning Workgroup in preparation for the second Integrated Planning Workgroup meeting (DI.07). |
| October 21 | Second meeting of the Integrated Planning Workgroup to reach consensus on various issues that were identified during the reviews (DI.08). |
| October 24 – November 2 | Based on feedback from the second meeting of the Integrated Planning Workgroup, Draft 3 was prepared. |
| November 3 | First district-wide review: The site CEOs distributed Draft 3 at their campuses with feedback due by November 18 (DI.09). |
| November 18 - 25 | Based on feedback from the district-wide review, Draft 4 was prepared and responses to all feedback were sent to the site that provided the feedback (DI.10). |
| November 24 | Draft 4 distributed to Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council (DI.11). |
| November 28 | Draft 4 introduced at Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council and discussion was slated for December 12 (DI.12). |
| December 12 | Members of Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council provided feedback on Draft 4 (DI.24). |
| December 13 – 22 | Based on feedback from Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council, Draft 5 was prepared. |
| December 22 | Second district-wide review: The site CEOs distributed Draft 5 at their campuses with feedback due by January 13 (DI.25). |
| January 6 | Draft 5 distributed to the Board for review and comment (DI.26). |
| January 13 – 19 | Based on feedback from the second district-wide review, Draft 6 was prepared and responses to all feedback were sent to the site that provided the feedback (DI.27). |
| January 19 | Draft 6 distributed to Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council (DI.28). |
| January 23 | Draft 6 discussed at Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council. No requests for |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| | changes were submitted. Final action on the <i>North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual</i> was slated for the February 13 Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council meeting (DI.29). |
| January 24 | Draft 6 presented to the Board for information (DI.30). |
| February 13 | Final <i>North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual</i> approved at the Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council meeting (DI.31). |
| February 28 | Final <i>North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual</i> presented to the Board for information (DI.32). |

The *North Orange County Community College District 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 the 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.

The *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* describes two processes to maintain the credibility of the document as a reliable resource:

- The Manual will be reviewed annually to reflecting minor changes, such as in descriptions, timelines, or processes, and

- The Manual will be updated every three years to reflect changes that result from the assessment of the planning processes. Refer to the response to District Recommendation 3 for a description of the assessment process.

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 (DI.33). These documents are distributed each year to the groups and are available online. However, the visiting team correctly noted that the current 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 and 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 collegial culture is elusive and decisions are perceived to be 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 the future of the campuses and district. (Refer to DI.02, Chapter 2, pages 2-80 and the Appendix, pages A-2 through A-5.) 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 within the district.
6. NOCCCD will be characterized by mutual respect for all sites within the district.
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 *North Orange County Community College District 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 *North Orange County Community College District 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 *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*.

The following is a summary of the process used to develop the *North Orange County Community College District Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment*. A chronology of the specific steps follows this summary.

Decision Making Workgroup: The Decision Making Workgroup was intentionally composed of faculty leaders and administrators chosen for their familiarity with or interest in governance and decision-making processes. This Decision Making Workgroup did not represent each District constituency; instead it was intended to function 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 and decision-making processes;
- Evaluating the effectiveness of current district-level governance and decision-making processes;
- Identifying gaps in the district-level governance and decision-making processes and recommending strategies to fill those gaps; and
- Creating a manual to describe the structure, function, and alignment of governance and decision-making processes at the district level in the NOCCCD.

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. During the two meetings of the Decision Making Workgroup (DI.34, DI.35), the following tasks were accomplished:

- Defined the role of constituents from the Board to students to frame the governance and 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 and decision-making group needed be added; and
- Recommended changes to the current district-level governance and decision-making structure, such as:
 - Renaming groups to better describe their function;
 - Revising/articulating groups' purposes to narrow and/or expand the group's purview; and/or
 - Clarifying the group or position who received groups' recommendations.

As with the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*, these recommended changes to governance and decision-making groups were incorporated into the drafts of the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* (DI.35, DI.36, DI.37, DI.38, DI.39, and DI.40). The task for the Decision Making Workgroup and larger audiences when they responded to drafts of the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* included the review and critique these recommended changes in governance and decision-making groups.

First distribution of a draft to all employees at each site: When the Decision Making Workgroup deemed that the draft was ready for review and comment by a larger audience, the CEOs at each site distributed the draft *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* to everyone at his/her site for their review and comment (DI.41). Responses to this feedback were returned to the campuses and this feedback was used to prepare yet another draft (DI.42).

First distribution of a draft to Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council: The resulting draft of the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* was then distributed to Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council members, each of whom represents a specific constituency. The Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council members were asked to circulate the draft to their constituencies and to share that feedback at the subsequent meeting (DI.43). In addition to the distribution to all Fullerton College staff as indicated above information was provided and input received on the outcomes of the Decision Making Workgroup via the Fullerton College Faculty Senate President's Report (DI.13, DI.14, DI.15, DI.16, DI.17) sent out monthly, Fullerton College Faculty Senate meetings (DI.18, DI.19, DI.20, DI.21, DI.22), and a College wide Accreditation Forum held on January 20, 2012 (DI.23). Feedback from this review by constituent groups was provided in the following meeting and was incorporated to prepare another draft (DI.24).

Second distribution of a draft to all employees at each site: Once again the CEOs of each site distributed the draft *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision*

Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment to everyone at their site for review and comment (DI.25). The Chancellor distributed the draft to the Board for review and comment (DI.26).

Second distribution of a draft to Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council: Once again the feedback was incorporated into the draft *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* and responses to the feedback were returned the campuses (DI.27). The resulting draft was distributed to Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council members. The Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council members were asked to circulate the draft to their constituencies (DI.28) and to bring that feedback to the following meeting (DI.29).

The feedback from this final round of feedback was incorporated into the document to prepare the next draft of the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* which was presented to the Board for information (DI.30). Following the integration of their comments, the final document was approved by Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council on February 13, 2012 (DI.31). The final *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* was presented to the Board on February 28, 2012 (DI.32).

The following chronology tracks the multiple cycles of draft → distribute → feedback → re-draft.

| Date | Decision Making Resource Manual Activities |
|--------------|---|
| August | <p>The following members of the Ad Hoc District Planning Committee volunteered to serve on the Decision Making Workgroup:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representing Cypress College <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherie Dickey, faculty • Bob Simpson and Steve Donley, administrators Representing Fullerton College <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sean Chamberlin, faculty • Dan Tesar, Mark Greenhalgh and Mike Perez, administrators Representing the School of Continuing Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fred Rocha, administrator Representing District Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fred Williams, administrator |
| September 16 | <p>Led by the District Director of Information Services and the consultant, the Decision Making Workgroup completed these tasks in its first meeting (DI.34).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed the list of current district-level governance and decision-making groups |

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified two areas where a district-level governance and decision-making group is needed: instruction and student services • Recommended changes to the current structure, including (1) the renaming of various groups and a clarifying of the purpose of the group and (2) converting the Research Team organizational group into a governance group called Institutional Effectiveness Coordinating Council and to expand the purpose of this Council to include accreditation • Provided feedback on the draft charge, composition, and meeting pattern of each District group • Brainstormed a process for the assessment of governance and decision-making processes |
| September 27 | Draft 1 of the <i>North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment</i> was distributed to the Decision Making Workgroup for review and comment with feedback due on September 30 (DI.36). |
| October 4 | Based on feedback from the Decision Making Workgroup, Draft 2 was prepared and distributed to the Decision Making Workgroup for review and comment with feedback due on October 12 (DI.37). |
| October 16 | Based on feedback from the Decision Making Workgroup (DI.38), Draft 3 was prepared and distributed to the Decision Making Workgroup in preparation for the second Decision Making Workgroup meeting (DI.39). |
| October 21 | Second meeting of the Decision Making Workgroup to reach consensus on various issues that were identified during the reviews (DI.35). |
| October 21 - 31 | Based on feedback from the second meeting of the Decision Making Workgroup, Draft 4 was prepared. |
| October 31 | Draft 4 distributed to Decision Making Workgroup with feedback due on November 4 (DI.40). |
| November 4 - 7 | Draft 5 was prepared based on feedback from the Decision Making Workgroup. |
| November 7 | First District-wide review: The site CEOs distributed Draft 5 at their campuses with feedback due by November 28 (DI.41). |
| November 28 – December 6 | Based on feedback from the District-wide review, Draft 6 was prepared and responses to all feedback were sent to the site that provided the feedback (DI.42). |
| December 8 | Draft 6 was distributed to members of Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council (DI.43). |
| December 12 | Members of Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council provided feedback on Draft 6 (DI.24). |
| December 13 – 22 | Based on feedback from Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council, Draft 7 was prepared. |

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| December 22 | Second District-wide review: The site CEOs distributed Draft 7 at their campuses with feedback due by January 13 (DI.25). |
| January 6 | Draft 5 distributed to the Board for input (DI.26). |
| January 13 – 19 | Based on feedback from the second District-wide review, Draft 8 was prepared and responses to all feedback were sent to the site that provided the feedback (DI.27). |
| January 19 | Draft 8 distributed to Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council (DI.28). |
| January 23 | Draft 8 discussed at Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council. Requests for changes were discussed. Final action on the <i>North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual : Structure, Function, and Alignment</i> was slated for the February 13 Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council meeting (DI.29). |
| January 24 | Draft 8 presented to the Board for information (DI.30). |
| February 13 | Final <i>North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment</i> approved with edits that were received at the Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council meeting (DI.31). |
| February 28 | Final <i>North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment</i> presented to the Board for information (DI.32). |

The *North Orange County Community College District 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 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

In order to maintain the *North Orange County Community College District 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 *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* will be reviewed annually to reflecting minor changes, such as in descriptions, timelines, or processes, and
- The *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* will be updated every three years to reflect changes that result from the assessment of the governance and decision making processes. Refer to the *North Orange County 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and the response to District Recommendation 3 for a description of the assessment process.

Evaluation

In the six months since NOCCCD received the ACCJC District Recommendation, NOCCCD has successfully conducted the district-wide dialogue needed to review and revise its district-level planning, governance, and decision-making processes as well as to produce the two documents that articulate the function, structure, and linkages of these processes.

Although these new and revised processes are in the earliest stages of implementation, NOCCCD's commitment to improvement is evidenced by these activities:

- The Chancellor's 2011 -2012 goals include the following:
Meet Accreditation Standards
 - Present a Program Discontinuance Board Policy to the Board for consideration.

- Create and implement a district planning process that:
 - a. is data-driven
 - b. is transparent
 - c. is inclusive
 - d. identifies responsible individuals for continuous oversight, improvement, and ongoing evaluation
 - e. is documented in a district-wide Governance Assessment Report
 - f. 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. (D1-44)
- As described in the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*, the District Strategic Directions in the *North Orange County Community College District 2011 Comprehensive Master Plan* (DI.02) approved at the January 24, 2011 Board meeting are being used as the foundation for the development of the *North Orange County Community College District-wide Strategic Plan 2012 – 2014*. The first two meetings of Strategic Plan Workgroup were January 27, 2012, and February 10, 2012 (DI.45).
- The Technical Advisory Committee revised the name of this group to “Technology Coordinating Council” in alignment with the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* (DI.46).
- The following revisions to the governance/decision-making processes documented in the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* have been implemented:
 - The newly configured District Staff Development Committee met for the first time on February 14, 2012 (DI.47);
 - Chancellor’s Cabinet meetings were replaced with District Consultation Council meetings on February 27, 2012 (DI.48); and
 - District Planning Council meetings were replaced with meetings of the Council on Budget and Facilities on March 12, 2012 (DI.49).
- The procedure for the District Services Administrative Review has been developed and accepted at the District Services Committee (DI.50).
- In a discussion of its priorities for the 2012-2013 budget, the Board of Trustees referenced the District Strategic Directions, the *District-wide Strategic Plan 2012-2014*, the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*, the *North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012*, and the Strategic Plan Fund (DI.51).

Next Steps

1. NOCCCD will communicate to the entire district community the components and organization of district-level planning, governance, and decision-making processes articulated in the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment*.
2. NOCCCD will follow the timeline and process charts in the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*.
3. NOCCCD will implement changes in title, purpose, and reporting structure of governance and decision-making groups as outlined in the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 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; IIID.1.a; IVB.3.a; Eligibility Requirement 17)

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.

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.

IV.B.3.a. The district/system clearly delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice.

Eligibility Requirement 17. Financial Resources. The institution documents a funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to support student learning programs and services, to improve institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability.

This recommendation calls for descriptions that will clearly convey the NOCCCD budget allocation model as well as identify the link between District 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 *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*. The second and more technical description of the NOCCCD budget allocation model is presented in a separate document, the *North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012*.

The NOCCCD budget allocation model is the topic for both of these descriptions. Each of NOCCCD's campuses also has a budget allocation model for the internal distribution of funds including evidence of how budget allocations are linked to campus and district planning.

The development, review, and revision process used to produce the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and the *North Orange County*

Community College District Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment is described in the response to District Recommendation 1 in this Follow-Up Report and will not be repeated here. A similar process was followed to develop, review, and revise the *North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012*. The process combined the use of a core team called the Budget Allocation Workgroup (DI.04) to prepare initial drafts followed by multiple cycles of broad distribution of drafts for review, comment, and revision as necessary.

The following is a summary of the process used to develop the *North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012*. A chronology of the specific steps follows this summary.

Budget Allocation Workgroup: The Budget Allocation Workgroup was intentionally composed of faculty leaders and administrators chosen for their familiarity with or interest in the budget allocation model and budgeting processes. This Budget Allocation Workgroup did not represent each NOCCCD constituency; instead the Budget Allocation Workgroup was intended to function as a small, task-focused cadre of writers and first readers. In its first meeting (DII.01), 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 graphic to illustrate the NOCCCD budget allocation model
- Discussed process and schedule for review and assessment of the NOCCCD budget allocation model to be included in the *North Orange County Community College District 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 *North Orange County Community College District 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 (DII.02, DII.03, DII.04, DII.05, and DII.06).

First distribution of a draft to all employees at each site: When the Budget Allocation Workgroup deemed that the draft was ready for review and comment by a larger audience, the CEOs at each site distributed the draft *Budget Allocation Handbook 2012* to everyone at his/her site for review and comment (DII.10). In addition to the distribution to all Fullerton

College staff indicated above information was provided and input received on the outcomes of the Budget Allocation Workgroup via the Fullerton College Faculty Senate President’s Report (DI.13, DI.14, DI.15, DI.16, DI.17) sent out monthly, Fullerton College Faculty Senate meetings (D.18, DI.19, DI.20, DI.21, DI.22), and a College wide Accreditation Forum held on January 20, 2012 (DI.23).

First distribution of a draft to Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council: The sixth draft of the *North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012* was distributed for to Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council members, each of whom represents a specific constituency. The Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council members provided feedback on the document in a mid-December meeting and that feedback was used to prepare the seventh draft.

Second distribution of a draft to all employees at each site: The CEOs at each site distributed this draft of the *North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012* to everyone at his/her site for review and comment with feedback due in mid-January (DI.25). The Chancellor distributed the draft to the Board of Trustees.

The feedback from this final round of feedback was incorporated into the document to prepare the final *North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012* which was presented to the Board for review and comment approved at the February 13, 2012 Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council meeting (DI.30, DI.31).

The following summarizes the multiple cycles of draft → distribute → feedback → re-draft.

| Date | Budget Allocation Handbook Activities |
|--------------|---|
| August | <p>The following members of the Ad Hoc District Planning Committee volunteered to serve on the Budget Allocation Workgroup:</p> <p>Representing Cypress College</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherie Dickey, faculty • Steve Donley and Karen Cant, administrators <p>Representing Fullerton College:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marcus Wilson, faculty • Toni DuBois, Terry Giugni, and Michael Perez, administrators <p>Representing the School of Continuing Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martha Gutierrez and Terrie Taylor, administrators <p>Representing District Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claudette Dain and Jeff Horsley, administrators |
| September 16 | Led by the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Facilities, the District Director of Information Services and the consultant, Budget Allocation Workgroup completed |

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| | <p>these tasks in its first meeting (DII.01):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 graphic to illustrate the NOCCCD budget allocation model • Discussed process and schedule for review and assessment of the NOCCCD budget allocation model to be included in the <i>North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012</i> |
| September 23 – 26 | Draft 1 of the Table of Contents circulated to the Budget Allocation Workgroup for input (DII.02). |
| September 29 | Based on feedback provided by the Budget Allocation Workgroup, Draft 2 of the Table of Contents and three example flowcharts sent to the Budget Allocation Workgroup for comment and feedback due October 7 (DII.03). |
| October 10 | Based on feedback provided by the Budget Allocation Workgroup Draft 3 of the Budget Allocation Handbook 2012 sent to Budget Allocation Workgroup for review and comment due back October 19. Draft 3 included the revised Table of Contents and flowchart plus the first draft of the narrative (DII.04). |
| October 14 | Proposed summary of the budget allocation process to be included in the <i>North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual</i> was distributed to the Budget Allocation Workgroup and Integrated Planning Workgroup for review and comment with feedback due on October 19 (DII.08). |
| October 20 | Based on input from the both the Budget Allocation and Integrated Planning workgroups, Draft 4 of the <i>North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012</i> and the section on budget for the <i>North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual</i> were developed and distributed to the workgroups (DII.05). |
| October 21 | Second meeting of the Budget Allocation Workgroup to reach consensus on various issues that were identified during the reviews (DII.09). |
| October 24 – November 30 | Based on feedback from the second meeting of the Budget Allocation Workgroup, Draft 5 was prepared and distributed to the Budget Allocation Workgroup (DII.10). |
| December 6 | Based on feedback from the Budget Allocation Workgroup, Draft 6 was prepared (DII.06). |
| December 8 | First District-wide review: The site CEOs distributed Draft 6 of the <i>North Orange</i> |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| | <i>County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012</i> to their campuses with feedback due by January 18 (DII.07). |
| December 12 | Feedback on Draft 6 was discussed and collected at Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council meeting (DI.24). |
| December 13 – 22 | Based on feedback from Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council, Draft 7 was prepared. |
| December 22 | Second District-wide review: The site CEOs distributed Draft 7 to their campuses, along with the drafts of the <i>North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual</i> and the <i>North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual</i> , with feedback due by January 13 in order to align with the feedback due dates for the other two manuals (DI.25). |
| January 6 | Draft 7 distributed to the Board for review and comment (DI.26). |
| January 13 – 19 | Based on feedback from the Trustees and the second District-wide review, Draft 8 was prepared and responses to all feedback were sent to the individuals/site that provided the feedback (DI.27). |
| January 19 | Draft 8 of the <i>North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012</i> distributed to Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council (DI.28). |
| January 23 | Draft 8 discussed at Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council. Changes were submitted. Final action on the <i>North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012</i> was slated for the February 13 Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council meeting (DI.29). |
| January 24 | Draft 8 presented to the Board for information (DI.30). |
| February 13 | Final <i>North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012</i> approved at Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council (DI.31). |
| February 28 | Final <i>North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012</i> presented to the Board for information (DI.32). |

The resulting document, the *North Orange County Community College District 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 guiding board policies and administrative procedures.

- 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. In October of each year, the Council on Budget and Facilities will evaluate the allocation model process and the allocations which are formula-driven. The resulting assessment report will be presented to the District Consultation Council. Each site will provide input into this process via their respective representative(s) on the District Council on Budget and Facilities.

To communicate the NOCCCD budget allocation model to campus constituencies, the *North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012* will be posted on the NOCCCD website. In addition, the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Facilities and the District Director of Fiscal Affairs will schedule annual campus-wide meetings at each site to present the new handbook and the NOCCCD budget allocation model. As this step will be repeated each year, the information presented will also communicate 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 for how 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, especially in the personnel and extended day categories. In addition to this general link between planning and budget allocations, NOCCCD will provide direct links between specific budget allocations and the District Strategic Directions in the following three ways.

1. A Strategic Plan Fund has been created as a component of NOCCCD's budget allocation model 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. In addition, NOCCCD's annual Proposed Budget Document will be modified to incorporate the Strategic Plan Fund as a focus of the budget document to indicate the alignment of resources with planning.
2. 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.
3. The budget allocation processes at each campus include links to campus goals, each of which align with District Strategic Directions.

Evaluation

In the six months since NOCCCD received the ACCJC District Recommendation, the NOCCCD has successfully prepared two different levels of descriptions of the NOCCCD budget allocation process. The more general description is included in the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and the more technical description is presented in a stand-alone document, the *North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012*.

Feedback on these two different levels of descriptions of the NOCCCD budget allocation process received during the cycles of reviewing and revising drafts is promising. The process for assessing these two levels of descriptions is described in the response to District Recommendation 3 in this Follow-Up Report. The process for assessing the effectiveness of the budget allocation model itself is described in the *North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012*. The processes that have been developed to fulfill the standards will be implemented in the coming year.

Next Steps

1. Vice Chancellor of Finance and Facilities and the District Director of Fiscal Affairs will conduct annual campus-wide meetings at each site to describe the NOCCCD budget allocation model.
2. NOCCCD will assess the budget allocation process following the timeline and process outlined in the *North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012* and implement any changes as a result of the assessment.
3. NOCCCD will assess the effectiveness of the budget allocation model in allocating resources to support the District Strategic Directions as described in the *North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012* and implement any changes as a result of the assessment.

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)

IV.A.5. The role of leadership and the institution's governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

IV.B.3g. The district/system regularly evaluates district/system role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

In response to District Recommendation 1, in fall 2011 both district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes were thoroughly reviewed and then revised as needed. The process of review was described in the response to District Recommendation 1 in this Follow-Up Report. The venues for providing input varied and included both small workgroup meetings as well as discussions in larger venues at the district and on the campuses (DI.05, DI.08, DI.09, DI.23 and DI.25).

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 and 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 (DI.31).

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 Follow-Up Report for an excerpt from the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* that describes the assessment process.

In summary, NOCCCD plans to conduct a formal assessment of planning and governance/decision-making processes every three years. The assessment will include 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 and governance/decision-making processes as warranted. Changes to the planning and governance/decision-making processes, if any, will be documented with revisions to the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment*.

In addition to the three year assessment, both the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* will be reviewed and updated annually. This annual review will reflect minor changes, such as in descriptions, timelines, or processes, and is being done to maintain the credibility of these documents as valuable, viable resources.

The *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* will be housed online to provide ready access to all district constituents.

Evaluation

In the six months since NOCCCD received this ACCJC District Recommendation, 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; and
- Begun implementation of the revised and new processes.

These new and revised processes, including the mechanisms for assessing processes, are at the earliest stages of implementation. However, NOCCCD has already signaled its intention to follow through on the assessment of processes with these initial steps:

- Identified how to assess planning and governance/decision-making processes;
- Assigned responsibility for the assessment to specific offices; and

- Included the production of an annual Progress Report as an Action Plan in the draft *NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2012-2014* (DIII.01).

Beyond these initial steps, approaching benchmarks that will provide evidence of the assessment of planning and governance/decision-making processes are:

- An annual review of the documents in spring 2013 and
- The first comprehensive assessment of the processes in September, 2013.

Next Steps

1. NOCCCD will assess the recently developed and/or revised processes for planning and governance/decision-making, following the timeline and process outlined in the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and will use the results of that assessment to improve district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes.
2. NOCCCD will review and revise the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* as scheduled.
3. NOCCCD will distribute the analysis and findings of the evaluation of the 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.

In response to the Recommendation from ACCJC, the College has developed an action plan to address the need for appropriate programs, practices, and services to support its diverse staff, emphasizing strategies designed to attract diverse applicants to apply for positions at the College and to provide opportunities for current underrepresented employees to advance their careers at the College. The Campus Diversity Plan was developed with these multiple goals as its foundation (CI.01).

The Campus Diversity Plan has been implemented. The Plan was created after discussions with the Diversity Committee, the Student Equity Committee, managers of the College, the District Director of Diversity, and the Vice Chancellor for Human Resources. The initial draft of the plan was sent to all employees of Fullerton College for their input. As employees responded, modifications were made to the draft document and activities and events were added to the document appendix. By initiating the discussion with the Diversity and Student Equity Committees, the work done by those groups was used to inform the plan in a shared governance model (CI.02, CI.03 and CI.04).

The activities listed in the Campus Diversity Plan appendix include activities, workshops, and events sponsored by the campus' Diversity Committee and the Cadena Cultural Center, as well as activities coordinated by a number of departments on campus. The Campus Diversity Plan is not intended to supersede any plans compiled by the Diversity Committee or the Student Equity Committee, but rather to incorporate concepts, plans and activities from those areas and others on campus into one plan focused on four goals which include: 1) maintaining an environment where all individuals are treated with respect; 2) providing opportunities for faculty, staff, and managers to learn about various cultures present on campus; 3) inviting community outside of the college to embrace the culture of diversity present on campus; and 4) attracting diverse applicants for positions at the college by presenting a welcoming environment.

The NOCCCD Human Resources is responsible for the advertising and recruiting of all permanent staff employed by the District, and the selection of staff members to serve on hiring committees is a shared responsibility of the College and various shared governance groups (e.g., CSEA, Faculty Senate, and District Management Association). The hiring committee is responsible for reviewing applications, interviewing candidates and making the final selection of a candidate who will work at Fullerton College. The College is then responsible to offer the position to the individual and the Human Resources office is responsible for processing the required documentation and to forward the selected candidate to the Board of Trustees for approval (CI.05).

All employees of Fullerton College are able to benefit from numerous supportive programs, practices, and services. The Human Resources Department is responsible for ensuring personnel policies and practices are in compliance with federal and state nondiscrimination, equal opportunity statutes and regulations, as well as processing and responding to any complaints related to discrimination and sexual harassment. In addition to the resources available through the NOCCCD Human Resources Department, all regular district employees have access to the Employee Assistance Program which offers confidential counseling on personal issues; legal information, resources and consultation; financial information; and referrals and resources for work-life needs.

Fullerton College employees also have access to professional development through the Staff Development Committee which is a subcommittee of the President's Advisory Council. The mission of the Staff Development Committee is to determine campus staff development policies; to provide oversight to and facilitate utilization of the Teaching Effectiveness Center; to determine staff development priorities and to provide materials and workshops based on survey results; to determine programs and workshops for funding; to disseminate staff development funds; and to communicate regularly with constituent groups. All members of the college community are welcome to participate in staff development activities which may lead to career advancement within the NOCCCD. Employees may also take advantage of District wide staff development activities and events for personal enrichment or career advancement.

The NOCCCD is committed to supporting the principles of equity and diversity within the academic setting and workplace. The District employs a Director of Equity and Diversity who regularly trains employees of the District on matters concerning fair treatment of all individuals on campus. The core values of the Office of Equity and Diversity include: 1) We foster and promote equal employment opportunity within the District; 2) We support diverse views of academic, socioeconomic, cultural and ethnic backgrounds of our staff and students; and 3) We are committed to providing an environment free of sexual harassment and unlawful discrimination, in which our staff and students are free to work and learn.

The District Director of Equity and Diversity provides equal employment opportunity training to all employees who will serve on hiring committees in the District, and provides in-service training for administration, faculty and staff regarding the prevention of unlawful discrimination and sexual harassment in the academic setting and work environment. In addition to providing training, the Director assists in the planning, coordination and monitoring of recruitment, selection and hiring processes to ensure equity and consistency in the recruitment of diverse

faculty and staff, as well as maintaining relationships with various community resources to promote equity and diversity within the college community. The Director is also responsible for monitoring programs and activities to ensure compliance with state and federal laws and District policies, regarding equal employment, sexual harassment, unlawful discrimination, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

The history of the NOCCCD indicates that the number of classified employees at Fullerton College mirrors the ethnicity of the students who attend the College. Although the ethnicity of the faculty at the College does not match the student population it continues to move in that direction. As more qualified individuals are educated and prepared to take full-time faculty positions at the College, FC will be a welcoming environment for them. There is no record of a candidate or employee of the NOCCCD filing a successful discrimination complaint against the District

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 state student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs, including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies.

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

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

In response to the Commission's recommendation, Fullerton College has actively accelerated its Student Learning Outcome (SLO) development and assessment. Instructional programs and Student Services have made great progress in committing to SLOs as success indicators. In June, 2011 the institution embarked on a path that will assure that there are sufficient human resources assigned to this task and that institutional processes utilize SLO assessments in the improvement of student learning.

Beginning in 2006 Fullerton College committed itself to identifying SLOs and SLO assessments (SLOAs) for each course. A series of workshops were given to introduce the faculty to the relationship between course curricula, instructional objectives, and SLOs, and faculty members were provided the tools for developing SLOs for courses (CII.01). In 2007, the Faculty Senate implemented a policy requiring all new and revised courses to have SLOs (CII.02). At that time,

approved wording for framing course SLOs was developed and a specific page within the course file in CurricUNET was developed to allow SLOs and SLOAs to be reviewed and revised by faculty and the Curriculum Committee (CII.03). In 2009, the Faculty Senate endorsed a plan to have all departments devise and implement SLOAs (CII.04). Led by the College's SLO coordinator, the College has made significant progress on course-level SLOs and SLOAs during the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 academic years, by March 2011 89.6% of our courses had SLOs and 82.4% had SLOAs in place (CII.05). During the 2011 – 2012 academic year the new Vice President, Instruction is working with deans, the Curriculum Committee, and the SLO Assessment Committee in an appraisal of the College's progress and assure that 100% of courses will have SLOs and SLOAs in place by the end of the spring 2012 semester. A procedure to expedite this process has been developed and implemented by the Curriculum Committee (CII.06).

The SLO/SLOA page within CurricUNET allows the use of a reporting module that provides access to reports showing the status of SLOs and SLOAs for specific courses (CII.07). This page will also allow for the incorporation of SLOs into all Course Outlines of Record. The Curriculum and SLO Assessment Committees will be working on instituting this during the spring 2012 semester (CII.08).

In 2009 the Faculty Senate, based on a recommendation of the Curriculum Committee, developed an ad-hoc SLO Assessment Committee with faculty representation from each division and appointed an SLOA Coordinator (CII.04, CII.09). On the recommendation of the Vice President of Instruction, Faculty Senate is being asked to convert this committee to a standing subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee and the membership to be expanded to include representation from the Student Services and other support areas (e.g., Counseling and Student Development, Library and Learning Centers, and Student Support Services) (CII.10). As indicated in the 2011 Self Study this committee will continue to develop standards and practices to facilitate faculty members' participation in the development, assessment, and utilization of assessment results in planning and improvement of student learning. This committee will also interact with the newly developed Student Success Committee and the Staff Development Committee to assure that SLO assessment plays an important role in driving student success and staff development (CII.11).

With the assistance of the former faculty SLO Coordinator, College programs began assessment of SLOs in 2009 and this effort has continued. During the semester, faculty members conduct assessments of SLOs for their courses and at various times meet in department or division meetings to analyze, discuss results, and make determinations of what changes are needed to improve student learning (CII.12). Departments have completed assessment cycles and have initiated changes in both curriculum and instruction in response to the results. For example assessment of outcomes in English 100, our transfer-level English course identified that students did not understand the effective use of sources. The English faculty identified topics to cover more effectively and have discussed these with faculty that teach this course. Instructors will develop their own methods to teach these topics and the department will reassess in the fall 2012 semester (CII.13). In chemistry assessment of SLOs identified a weakness in students understanding of chemistry at the molecular level. The faculty have determined that there needs to be increased emphasis of instruction covering this area and will incorporate the use of a

“Atoms First” textbook starting in the fall 2012 semester (CII.13). Each semester department faculty assess a different set of courses, analyze the data, engage in reflective discussions, and make changes to curriculum and methods of instruction to improve student learning and success.

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

| Division | Total Courses ¹ | Courses with SLOs ² | Courses with SLOAs ³ | Active Courses ⁴ | Courses with SLOAs completed ⁵ | Courses that SLOAs have been used to improve learning ⁶ | Courses with SLOs in Syllabi ⁷ |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|---|
| Business & CIS | 212 | 172 | 172 | 105 | 105 | 105 | 57% (64/113) ⁸ |
| Counseling & Student Development | 20 | 19 | 19 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 48% (16/33) ⁹ |
| Fine Arts | 227 | 219 | 219 | 170 | 153 | 7 | 19% (30/161) ⁹ |
| Humanities | 120 | 120 | 120 | 80 | 42 | 42 | 65% (225/347) ⁸ |
| Library Technology | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 100% (2/2) ⁸ |
| Math & Computer Science | 30 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 17 | 15 | 81% (117/144) ⁸ |
| Natural Sciences | 125 | 122 | 114 | 76 | 55 | 15 | 62% (111/178%) ⁹ |
| Physical Education | 177 | 137 | 135 | 126 | 72 | 1 | 95% (155/163) ⁹ |
| Social Sciences | 174 | 174 | 174 | 129 | 94 | 68 | 94% (235/249) ⁹ |
| Technology & Engineering | 310 | 295 | 293 | 189 | 137 | 131 | 33% (83/252) ⁹ |
| Total | 1398 | 1288 | 1275 | 919 | 691 | 400 | 63% (1038/1642) |

1. Total Courses – all courses for each division as identified in the 2011-2012 catalog.
2. Courses counted for column 1 (total courses) with SLOs in CurricUNET.
3. Courses counted for column 1 (total courses) with SLOAs in CurricUNET.
4. Active Courses includes any of the courses in the catalog that have been offered in the past two years.
5. The number of active courses that have been assessed.
6. The number of active courses that the department has closed the loop (assessed – analyze data, reflective conversations, changes to curriculum or pedagogy).
7. The percentage of all sections offered by the Division that had SLOs in the syllabi
8. Indicates numbers from fall 2011
9. Indicates numbers from spring 2012

As of January 2012, SLOs have been established in 92.1% of instructional courses and 91.2% of instructional courses have SLOAs in place (Table 1). In Table 1 we refer to active courses as those that have been offered in the past two academic years, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012, of these 75.2% have undergone or are undergoing assessment, and 43.5% have gone through a complete round of assessment, and reflective dialogue followed by changes to curriculum and/or instruction. For example, in Introduction to Probability and Statistics I, assessment results identified outcomes that students performed at 62 to 73% compared to 78 to 82% for the other SLOs. In an attempt to improve performance on these outcomes, the instructor is adding homework assignments, modifying the emphasis of lectures, and adding review quizzes to assist student learning (CII.14).

SLO, SLOAs, and Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) are identified in the Student Services Division and have been in place since 2008. The SLOs for each department within the division identify the abilities that students gain because of their encounter with the service or program and are assessed annually (CII.15). The SAOs are used by the staff to identify improvements that will be made within an academic year. The results of SLOAs and SAOs are used for the identification of gaps and changes are made to the offerings of these programs. For example in financial aid the disbursement of electronic funds has moved from monthly to weekly to better serve students, and in Health Services a misconception in the use of the Pap test was identified and is being corrected by increased attention in the RN/student educational meeting. A collaborative effort between CalWORKS staff and the county Educational Liaison has resulted in the development of guidelines for students to overcome the most common barriers. The use of these guidelines by students is resulting in increased retention.

General Education SLOs and Institutional Learning Outcomes were circulated among constituent groups and endorsed by the President's Advisory Council (PAC) in spring 2010 (CII.16, CII.17). Since the beginning of the 2009-2010 academic year Student Service's program SLOs have been tied directly to the institutional SLOs such that assessment is on-going. The SLO Assessment Committee has clearly defined educational programs according to the ACCJC guidelines so that divisions can work aggressively to complete the development of SLOs and methods of assessment for degrees, certificates, and transfer degrees during the spring 2012 semester. As instructional programs develop their program-level SLOs and SLOAs linkages will be developed to institutional SLOs following the model used by Student Services. Currently the plan is to complete development of program-level SLOs during spring 2012, start assessment during spring 2012 semester and complete assessments by all programs during the fall 2012 semester. Analysis of data from assessment and reflective conversations that lead to changes that improve student learning will occur during spring and fall 2012 (CII.08, CII.19, and CII.20).

In addition to the information about course-level SLOs and SLOAs found within CurricUNET, the SLOA Coordinator and the Vice President of Instruction's office track progress in the development of SLOs, SLOA methodologies, planned and completed assessments, and progress on using data to make changes to improve instruction (CII.21). The SLOA information is provided by divisions through their dean or their SLOA coordinator. The reports listing SLO information are published on the SLO website where it is available to students and other members of the Fullerton College community (CII.22). The Curriculum Committee has made a commitment to include SLOs on Course Outlines of Records (CORs) in a timely and appropriate

manner, and the Vice President of Instruction and the Curriculum Committee has developed a method and procedure for completing the necessary steps towards including SLOs on CORs by the end of the spring 2012 semester (CII.08). Faculty members include SLOs in printed course syllabi distributed to students at the beginning of the semester, 63% of syllabi as of the spring 2012 semester list course-level SLOs (Table 1), and they have been incorporated into division and course websites (CII.24).

The use of SLO assessment at course, program and institutional levels has been discussed campus wide and the utilization of data from assessment is part of the newly designed program review, and planning and budget processes (CII.25). The planning/review cycle has been modified as described in detail in the response to College Recommendation 3 in this follow-up report. The modified form of Program Review was enacted at the beginning of fall 2011 semester with program review for all instructional programs. Utilization of program and course level SLOs is part of this review process (CII.26). As indicated in the presentations to divisions and departments at the beginning of the fall 2011 program review cycle “Program Review will provide evidence of program effectiveness and improvements by assessment of SLOs as they relate to program goals.” The program review report is designed to give insight into the answers to these three questions: 1) What have students learned in the program under review; 2) What will students learn in the program; and 3) How can the program enhance student learning and the student experience? (CII.27)

The use of SLOs and SLOAs at both the course-level and program-level will help inform outcomes of the program review process along with the department and division faculty discussions in regard to assessment results of SLOs, and the analysis of the assessment data drives changes to curriculum and teaching methods for the improvement of learning. Worksheets and reports, submitted by faculty in departments conducting SLOA in their courses, are submitted to the SLOA committee and the timelines for submission have been incorporated into the college Planning and Budget Calendar (CII.28). Though college wide participation in the planning and reporting process remains a work-in-progress, Program Review of Student Services and Administrative Services will occur during the 2012-2013 academic year, the college expects to finalize SLOA planning and reporting procedures by the end of spring 2012 semester. As the College completes the first round of the revised program review process, program review will establish a mechanism whereby programs will be evaluated and that evaluation will include the use of course and program-level SLO assessment to improve student learning. The Program Review process will also provide a mechanism where the Fullerton College SLO/SLOA process will be evaluated.

The newly formed Institutional Review Committee is currently conducting a survey of program review self-study writers and reviewers to determine their perception of the process (CII.29). The results of these surveys will be reviewed by the IRC and their findings will be submitted to PAC by the end of the spring semester (CII.30).

The first round of the revised program review process that includes all instructional programs is currently underway with results expected out in March, 2012. The use of these results for planning and budget will begin at the end of spring 2012 with allocation of \$100,000 that has been set aside by PAC based on a recommendation from the Planning and Budget Steering

Committee and continue into the 2012-13 fiscal year through the planning process that will lead into budget development during spring 2013 (CII.31). The program review process will provide a more formal method for the use of SLO assessment results by Instruction and SLO and SAO assessment results by Student Services for the purpose of the improvement of student learning and program improvements, respectively. The IRC working with the SLO Assessment Committee are starting discussions to determine methods to be used to evaluate the effectiveness of Fullerton College's SLO/SLOA process at driving continued quality improvement of student learning (CII.32, CII.33).

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.

Fullerton College has adopted and implemented its integrated institutional program review, planning, budgeting and resource allocation process, has evaluated those budgeted activities that have been completed, and is prepared to complete the evaluation of planned activities (action plans in support of the college's strategic plan) as well as the integrated process during the spring and summer 2012 terms. In the College's responses to College Recommendation 3 and College Recommendation 4 there is some overlap. This is intentional so that each response is complete and stands on its own.

Fullerton College 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. Fullerton College assesses progress through a series of term and annual reports of institutional effectiveness and student and program success. The major assessment is the Institutional Effectiveness Report, which provides data on course retention and success, basic skills course retention and success, degrees and certificates awarded, and transfers (CIII.01). These outcomes are disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity, age and academic division and, where possible, by special programs. Additional reports include evaluation of activities funded through the basic skills initiative and through other special programs, including the Transfer Achievement Program, Puente, and a STEM grant CIII.02, CIII.03, CIII.04). Key performance indicators, including course retention and success, degrees and certificates awarded and transfers are also provided annually to each instructional program as part of program review (CIII.05). All of this information, along with an Environmental Scan (CIII.06), Student Equity Report (CIII.07), which provides outcome data disaggregated by age, gender, race/ethnicity, and disability status, and a variety of ad hoc research reports and evaluations of special programs (CIII.08), provide the basis for planning. As a result of the analysis of all of this information through Spring 2011 a broad set of 8 goals were submitted to the President's Advisory Council (CIII.09) and subsequently disseminated to all constituent groups for discussion and recommendation. The proposed goals were:

1. Fullerton College will promote excellence in learning by providing instruction and student services in general education, occupational education and developmental education that improves successful course completion and the achievement of certificates, degrees and transfers.
2. Fullerton College will address the existing Achievement Gap and the needs of underprepared students by implementing the student equity plan and by developing additional plans, strategies, and funding opportunities.
3. Fullerton College will continue to revise and implement the 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 allocation.
4. Fullerton College will continue to implement SLOs at the course and program levels and improve their assessment and continue to revise and improve the integration of SLOA data into the college planning model.
5. Fullerton College will develop budget allocations to provide consistent funding for facilities, equipment, technology, and infrastructure to adequately support instructional programs and services.
6. Fullerton 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 and will incorporate a formal Assistive and Adaptive Technology Plan into the overall technology plan.
7. Fullerton College will strengthen connections with its local community, including its cities, service organizations, high schools and transfer universities.
8. Fullerton College will promote the personal and professional growth of its faculty and staff by providing sufficient and appropriate staff development opportunities.

Recommendations from the constituent groups and discussion at the President's Advisory Council resulted in the adoption of a set of three college goals (CIII.10, CIII.11). They are:

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 discussions, at President's Advisory Council (CIII.10, CIII.11), at Deans' Council (CIII.12), at a management retreat specifically devoted to discussion of goals (CIII.13), at a President's Advisory Council retreat devoted to the strategic plan (CIII.14) and at Faculty Senate (CIII.15), resulted in the development of a set of objectives for each goal. Those objectives (CIII.16) have been widely discussed and refined, including cogent recommendations provided by the Associated Students (CIII.17).

At the beginning of the fall 2011 semester, the President's Advisory Council charged each constituent group and program with the task of developing action plans for the objectives (CIII.18). The action plans (CIII.19) were submitted to the Director of Institutional Research and brought to the Planning and Budget Steering Committee. The Planning and Budget Steering Committee made a recommendation, through the President's Advisory Council, to provide \$100,000 to support action plans (CIII.20, CIII.21). The president concurred with the President's Advisory Council's recommendation and the action plans were reviewed. A set of action plans have been selected for funding for Spring 2012 and several for Fall 2012 (CIII.22, CIII.23). A total of \$56K has been identified to support the action plans. This marked a deliberate linking of data and information to planning and budgeting.

At the same time that the strategic plan was being updated for 2012-2014 based on the fall 2009 program reviews and other college reports, the planning process and calendar were being revised by the ad hoc program review committee, the Faculty Senate, the President's Advisory Council and the Planning and Budget Steering Committee. The ad hoc program review committee was dissolved and a Faculty Senate/President's Advisory Council Program Review Committee was created in spring 2011 (CIII.24). The Program Review Committee meets biweekly (CIII.25) and has refined the program review reporting form (CIII.26), created a program review handbook (CIII.27), led a Flex Day Program Review presentation attended by over 50 program coordinators (CIII.28), and continued to provide training through Fall 2011, led by the Faculty Senate President, the Chair of the Program Review Committee and the Director of Institutional Research and Planning, in the Teaching Effectiveness Center (CIII.29).

During the fall 2011 semester the position of Director of Institutional Research was expanded with additional responsibility for educational planning. The position of Director of Institutional Research and Planning was filled in October 2011 (CIII.30).

The revised planning cycle was instituted in the beginning of fall 2011 with program review for all instructional programs (student services programs and operations will undergo program

review in fall 2012). The program reviews have been completed and are being reviewed by the Deans, Vice President, Instruction, and the Program Review Committee (CIII.31). The Program Review Committee informed by the newly completed *North Orange County Community College District 2011 Comprehensive Master Plan* (DI.02), the revised *North Orange County Community College District District-wide Strategic Plan 2012- 2014* (DIII.01), the current Fullerton College Strategic Plan (CIII.19), and other college plans, including the Technology Plan (CIII.32), will review the program reviews and identify common themes and needs. This review will provide the foundation for a draft set of college goals. These draft goals will be submitted to the President's Advisory Council and the current Strategic Plan goals will be evaluated and modified if necessary. Objectives and action plans will be developed for each goal by the appropriate constituent groups and programs for adoption by the President's Advisory Council. The action plans will be submitted to the Planning and Budget Steering Committee for funding. The Planning and Budget Steering Committee has recommended that \$100,000 be set aside for funding of action plans based on the updated Strategic Plan. The President has agreed to this recommendation. An additional \$44K not expended for action plans has been added to bring the total to \$144,000 to support action plans based on the updated Strategic Plan. This marks yet another deliberate instance where data informed decisions connected planning and budgeting.

The Director of Institutional Research and Planning systematically collects and publicizes a set of college wide critical indicators and measures (CIII.32) that clearly assess the progress of College wide goals. These indicators have been posted on the Institutional Research web site, discussed at meetings of the President's Advisory Council, and incorporated into the college's annual report (CIII.34) to the Board of Trustees and the community. These indicators, which are incorporated into the college's Fact Book (CIII.35) and Institutional Effectiveness Report (CIII.33), are tied to college goals. The indicators include degrees and certificates awarded; transfers by college, division, or program, including special programs, course retention and success rates, student persistence, and progression through sequences of courses. Annual program review data were also agreed upon and include indicators of program access/quality, resources, efficiency and effectiveness (CIII.05). Demand/access includes the number of course sections offered and the number of courses offered. Sections and courses are disaggregated into day, evening/weekend, online and short-term sections and courses. This category of key performance indicators also includes number of enrollments, number of majors, number of new majors, and FTES and WSCH generated by the program. Program resources focus on FTEF. Program efficiency includes WSCH/FTEF, average class size, average class fill rate. Program effectiveness includes course retention and success, degrees and certificates awarded and transfers. The program effectiveness measures are disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender. A complete description of the key performance indicators and a data element dictionary can be found in the Program Review Handbook (CIII.27).

These indicators are disaggregated by gender, age, and race/ethnicity. A comprehensive examination of the indicators disaggregated by gender, age, race/ethnicity and disability status is incorporated into the Student Equity Plan (CIII.36) and helps guide the work of the Student Equity Committee. These data have also been widely discussed in two flex day activities on the Achievement Gap (CIII.37) and have led directly to one of the major goals of the college's Strategic Plan. The two flex day activities, organized by the Director of Institutional Research, Faculty Senate President, Ethnic Studies Department Chair and Student Equity Committee Chair,

first examined the Achievement Gap and subsequently discussed actions that target the reduction of the Achievement Gap. Approximately 75 faculty, staff and managers attended the Flex Day activities on each occasion (CIII.38).

The Director of Institutional Research and Planning has also presented the results of the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (CIII.39) to the President's Advisory Council (CIII.40), the Deans' Council (CIII.41) and the Faculty Senate (CIII.42). The outcomes are presented, explained and discussed, and the college's self-assessment is reviewed and modified to incorporate the reviews. The Director of Institutional Research and Planning has also presented the United States Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Survey Data Feedback Report (CIII.43) to the President's Advisory Council (CIII.44). During each of these presentations, the Director takes the opportunity to discuss cohort tracking methods and the differences that arise from different cohort definitions.

Fullerton College is engaged in closing the planning loop by evaluating actions taken and documenting future actions based on the evaluation results. The major example of this activity has taken place in the evaluation of Basic Skills Initiatives program and actions (CIII.45). Every program and action funded by the Basic Skills Student Success Steering Committee has been evaluated, using both quantitative and qualitative data, and programs and actions have been modified on the basis of the evaluation results. Some interventions which did not prove to be successful have been eliminated and other programs which have demonstrated success in terms of improvement in student achievement have been expanded. The discussion about the evaluation results led to a college-wide dialogue on the issue of dealing with underprepared students. As a result of the discussion, the college created the Student Success Committee, an umbrella committee which includes in its membership representatives from existing student success committees and programs on campus in an attempt to consolidate activities and focus on interventions which have proven to be successful (CII.11). The creation of this committee was largely the result of ongoing dialog about evaluation results of special programs (CIII.46). Fullerton College has been expanding efforts to engage all relevant constituents in a collaborative inquiry process that is facilitated by a broad range of College members. For example as indicated above, during Flex Day in spring 2011, the Faculty Senate President-Elect, the Director of Institutional Research, the Chair of the Student Equity Committee and the Chair of the Ethnic Studies department organized and presented a workshop on the Achievement Gap at Fullerton College (CIII.47). The workshop was attended by over 50 faculty, managers and staff (CIII.48). The workshop was followed up with a Flex Day workshop in fall 2011 on Addressing the Achievement Gap (CIII.37), with a focus on activities and programs that are directed at the goal of the college eliminating the Achievement Gap. That workshop was attended by over 75 faculty, managers and staff and led to a set of suggested actions provided to campus programs addressing the Achievement Gap (CIII.36). Another Flex Day activity in fall 2011 was a workshop, organized by the Faculty Senate President, the Chair of the Program Review Committee and the Director of Institutional Research, on the revised program review process (CIII.28). This workshop was attended by approximately 80 deans and program coordinators and reviewed the program review process, the new program review handbook and the availability of data and information, particularly on key program performance indicators and their analysis, including trend analysis and comparison to peer programs (CIII.49). Another

example of the expanded efforts to engage all relevant constituents in a collaborative inquiry process in the inclusion, at each President's Advisory Council meeting, of agenda items (CIII.50) on "Addressing the Needs of Underprepared Students" and "Strategic Planning." Other information, including the IPEDS Data Feedback Report (CIII.41) and the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (CIII.37) are presented and discussed at the President's Advisory Council meetings (CIII.38, CIII.42) and other meetings of constituent groups (CIII.39, CIII.40). Other discussions at the President's Advisory Council and other groups, e.g., Deans' Council and Faculty Senate, have focused on the Fullerton College Institutional Effectiveness Report (CIII.01, CIII.51, and CIII.52). Another staff development activity, funded largely by the Basic Skills Initiative at Fullerton College, has been the attendance by ten faculty and staff at the Strengthening Student Success Conference annually (CIII.53).

Another set of meetings designed to share information and engage in dialogue about the information has been held with local high school partners and community groups (CIII.54). The Director of Institutional Research has made presentations, especially focused on the preparation of incoming students, at the High School Principals Luncheon and the High School Counselors Breakfast (CIII.55). Similarly, the President and Director of Institutional Research made a presentation on the Achievement Gap at Fullerton College to Los Amigos of Orange County Education Committee (CIII.56), a local influential Latino organization. Those presentations have led to continuing dialog about solutions to common challenges.

During the spring 2011 semester, the College President, President-elect of the Faculty Senate and the Director of Institutional Research began developing plans and mechanisms for regularly evaluating the effectiveness of planning processes. The College created the Institutional Research Committee to serve this function (CIII.57). The purpose of the Institutional Research Committee is fourfold. It serves as the Institutional Review Board for the college; it helps to create the research agenda for the college; it reviews research and evaluation information for the college; and it develops and implements evaluation of the effectiveness of a number of college processes, including the planning process. In spring 2011, the committee was formed and includes the Director of Institutional Research and Planning, two deans, five faculty, including the Faculty Senate President, and the Vice President, Instruction as a resource member. During the fall 2011 semester, the committee began developing the mechanisms for evaluating the college's processes. The discussion has focused on the development of surveys and the conduct of focus groups to provide systematic feedback on the effectiveness of the program review, planning and budgeting processes (CIII.58). The first of these evaluations of processes has been undertaken with the administration of a survey of participants in the Fall 2011 program review process (CII.29).

The Fullerton College Planning model is essentially a Plan-Implement-Evaluate model. Following the planning stage, the Planning and Budget Steering Committee provides budget recommendations to the President's Advisory Council to implement action plans developed to support the mission and strategic goals of the college. Those action plans which are funded are systematically evaluated to determine whether they have improved institutional effectiveness. Fullerton College is also providing transparency in the institutional planning process by communicating clearly, broadly, and systematically, and by providing structured, well-defined, opportunities for broad employee participation. The major venue for transparency and

communication is the President's Advisory Council. An ongoing agenda item on the college's planning process has resulted in broad and systematic discussion and communication of the planning agenda and the strategic plan which has resulted from the analysis of data and information (CIII.50). The representatives of the various constituent groups on the President's Advisory Council (CIII.59) are charged with reporting the discussions which take place at meetings and returning with constituents' perspectives and recommendations. These are taken into account in the further development of plans within the President's Advisory Council. Results of discussion and recommendations from the President's Advisory Council are routinely discussed at meetings of the Deans' Council, Faculty Senate, Classified Senate, Student Equity Committee, Program Review Committee, Planning and Budget Steering Committee and Basic Skills Student Success Steering Committee. Discussions at meetings of those groups are reported back to the President's Advisory Council and reflect broad employee participation. Minutes of the President's Advisory Council reflect these structured, well-defined opportunities in providing transparency in the institutional planning process (CIII.50).

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.

Fullerton College has fully implemented and strengthened its institutional planning process to include: 1) systematic reporting 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 documenting future actions based on the evaluation results; 3) expanding efforts to engage all relevant constituents in a collaborative inquiry process facilitated by a broad range of participants; 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-define, opportunities for broad employee participation. In the College's responses to College Recommendation 3 and College Recommendation 4 there is some overlap. This is intentional so that each response is complete and stands on its own.

Shortly after the departure of the previous president, an ad hoc committee of Faculty Senate leaders, the Vice President of Instruction, the Vice President of Student Services, the Director of Institutional Research and several deans came together to restore the program review process and to revitalize the planning process. In fall 2009, program reviews for all instructional and student services programs were completed using the format that had been in place during the previous program review process that had garnered an accreditation commendation in spring 2005 (CIV.01).

During spring 2010 and fall 2010 the college welcomed a new president and the ad hoc committee, along with the Dean's Council, reviewed all program reviews and met several times to extract common themes from the program reviews. A compilation of short and long-term goals was extracted from the common themes (CIV.02). The compilation of goals was widely distributed and made publicly available on the web site of the Director of Institutional Research at research.fullcoll.edu and, along with other college reports, including the Student Equity Plan (CIII.36), the Institutional Effectiveness Report (CIII.01), the Environmental Scan (CIII.06), the Basic Skills Outcomes Report (CIV.03), and the College Fact Book (CIV.04), was provided to the President's Advisory Council. Subsequently the agreed upon goals were presented to the Planning and Budget Steering Committee. As a result of the Planning and Budget Steering Committee's consideration of that information and the existing strategic plan, the Committee recommended an allocation of \$1M toward upgrading of computing infrastructure and classroom technology (CIV.05). The recommendation was presented to and endorsed by the President's Advisory Council and approved by the president (CV.06). This marked the first of several specific instances where data-informed decisions connected planning and budgeting.

The Fall 2009 program review documents, along with recent institutional effectiveness reports, recent environmental scans, the existing district strategic plan (DI.01), the previous college unit objectives (CIV.07), the college initiatives from the fall 2010 district educational master planning process (DI.02), and the planning agenda from the recent Fullerton College 2011 Comprehensive Self-Study in support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation (CIV.08), were used to develop and refine the college's strategic plan. Over the course of the 2010-2011 academic year, several committees, including the ad hoc program review committee, the Deans' Council, the Faculty Senate, and the President's Advisory Council considered the program review documents and created a set of proposed goals for the 2011-2014 strategic plan. A broad set of ten (10) goals (CIV.09), taken from a variety of college documents, were submitted to the President's Advisory Council and subsequently disseminated to all constituent groups for discussion and recommendation. The recommendations resulted in the adoption by the President's Advisory Council of a set of three college goals (CIV.10). Subsequent discussions, at President's Advisory Council, at Deans' Council, at a management retreat specifically devoted to discussion of goals, at a President's Advisory Council retreat devoted to the strategic plan and at Faculty Senate, resulted in the development of a set of objectives for each goal (CIII.14). Those objectives have

been widely discussed and refined, especially through recommendations provided by the Associated Students.

At the beginning of the fall 2011 semester, the President's Advisory Council charged each constituent group and program with the task of developing action plans for the objectives. The action plans (CIII.19) were submitted to the Director of Institutional Research and Planning and brought to the Planning and Budget Steering Committee. The Planning and Budget Steering Committee made a recommendation, through the President's Advisory Council, to provide \$100,000 to support action plans. The president concurred with President's Advisory Council's recommendation and the action plans were reviewed. Those action plans which were selected for funding (CIII.22) will be implemented in the spring 2012 or fall 2012 terms. A total of \$56K of the original \$100K was allocated in support of the selected action plans. This marked another deliberate linking of data and information to planning and budgeting.

At the same time that the strategic plan was being updated for 2011-2014 based on the fall 2009 program reviews and other college reports, the planning process and calendar were being revised by the ad hoc program review committee, the Faculty Senate and the President's Advisory Council. The ad hoc program review committee was dissolved and a Faculty Senate/President's Advisory Council Program Review Committee was created in spring 2011. The Program Review Committee (CIII.25) meets biweekly and has refined the program review reporting form (CIII.26), created a program review handbook (CIII.27), led a Flex Day Program Review presentation attended by over 50 program coordinators (CIII.28), and continues to provide training, led by the Faculty Senate President, the Chair of the Program Review Committee and the Director of Institutional Research and Planning, in the Teaching Effectiveness Center (CIII.29).

During the fall 2011 semester the position of Director of Institutional Research was expanded with additional responsibility for educational planning. The position of Director of Institutional Research and Planning was filled in October 2011 (CIII.30).

The planning cycle was reinstated in the beginning of fall 2011 with program review for all instructional programs (student services programs and operations will undergo program review in fall 2012). The revised planning cycle has thus been instituted. The program reviews were completed at the end of the fall 2011 semester (CIV.11) and are being reviewed by the Deans, Vice President, Instruction and the Program Review Committee. The Program Review Committee, informed by the *North Orange County Community College District District-wide Strategic Plan 2009-2011* (DIII.01), the Fullerton College Strategic Plan (CIII.19), and the Technology Plan (CIII.32), will review the program reviews and identify common themes and needs providing the foundation of a draft a set of college goals. These draft goals will be submitted to the President's Advisory Council and the current Strategic Plan goals will be evaluated and modified if necessary. Objectives and action plans will be developed for each goal by the appropriate constituent groups and programs for adoption by the President's Advisory

Council. The action plans will be submitted to the Planning and Budget Steering Committee for funding. The Planning and Budget Steering Committee has recommended that \$100,000 be set aside for funding of action plans based on the updated Strategic Plan. The President has agreed to this recommendation. An additional \$44K has been added to this amount from the Action Plan Fund. This marks yet another deliberate instance where data informed decisions connected planning and budgeting.

The Director of Institutional Research and Planning systematically collects and publicizes a set of college wide critical indicators and measures (CIII.32) that clearly assess the progress of College wide goals. The college wide critical indicators have been routinely included in a variety of college publications, especially the Institutional Effectiveness Report (CIII.33). These indicators have been posted on the Institutional Research web site, discussed at meetings of the President's Advisory Council, and incorporated into the college's annual report to the Board of Trustees and the community. These indicators are also incorporated into the college's Fact Book (CIII.35) and Institutional Effectiveness Report (CIII.33) and are tied to college goals. The indicators include degrees and certificates awarded; transfers by college, division, or program, including special programs, course retention and success rates, student persistence, and progression through sequences of courses. Annual program review data were also agreed upon and include indicators of program access/quality, resources, efficiency and effectiveness (CIII.05). Demand/access includes the number of course sections offered and the number of courses offered. Sections and courses are disaggregated into day, evening/weekend, online and short-term sections and courses. This category of key performance indicators also includes number of enrollments, number of majors, number of new majors, and FTES and WSCH generated by the program. Program resources focus on FTEF. Program efficiency includes WSCH/FTEF, average class size, average class fill rate. Program effectiveness includes course retention and success, degrees and certificates awarded and transfers. The program effectiveness measures are disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender. A complete description of the key performance indicators and a data element dictionary can be found in the Program Review Handbook (CIII.27).

Most of the indicators are routinely disaggregated by gender, age, and race/ethnicity. A comprehensive examination of the indicators disaggregated by gender, age, race/ethnicity and disability status is incorporated into the Student Equity Plan (CIII.36) and helps guide the work of the Student Equity Committee. These data have also been widely discussed in two flex day activities on the Achievement Gap (CIII.37) and have led directly to one of the major goals of the college's Strategic Plan. The two flex day activities, organized by the Director of Institutional Research, Faculty Senate President, Ethnic Studies Department Chair and Student Equity Committee Chair, first examined the Achievement Gap and subsequently discussed actions directed at the reduction of the Achievement Gap. Approximately 75 faculty, staff and managers attended the Flex Day activities on each occasion (CIII.38).

The Director of Institutional Research and Planning has also presented the results of the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (CIII.39) to the President's Advisory Council, the Deans' Council and the Faculty Senate. The outcomes are presented, explained and discussed, and the college's self-assessment is reviewed and modified to incorporate the reviews. The Director of Institutional Research and Planning has also presented the United States Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Survey Data Feedback Report (CIII.43) to the President's Advisory Council. During each of these presentations, the Director takes the opportunity to discuss cohort tracking methods and the differences that arise from different cohort definitions.

Fullerton College is engaged in closing the planning loop by evaluating actions taken and documenting future actions based on the evaluation results. The major example of this activity has taken place in the evaluation of Basic Skills Initiatives program and actions (CIII.45). Every program and action funded by the Basic Skills Student Success Steering Committee has been evaluated and programs and actions have been modified on the basis of the evaluation results. Some interventions which did not prove to be successful have been eliminated and other programs which have demonstrated success in terms of improvement in student achievement have been expanded. The discussion about the evaluation results led to a college wide dialogue on the issue of dealing with underprepared students. As a result of the discussion, the college created the Student Success Committee (CII.11), an umbrella committee which incorporates all of the existing student success programs on campus in an attempt to consolidate activities and focus on interventions which have proven to be successful. This committee includes representation from the Basic Skills Student Success Steering Committee, the Transfer Achievement Program, Puente, Umoja, and the Student Equity Committee. The creation of this committee was largely the result of ongoing dialog about evaluation results of special programs.

Fullerton College has been expanding efforts to engage all relevant constituents in a collaborative inquiry process that is facilitated by a broad range of College members. For example, during Flex Day in spring 2011, the Faculty Senate President-Elect, the Director of Institutional Research, the Chair of the Student Equity Committee and the Chair of the Ethnic Studies department organized and presented a workshop on the Achievement Gap at Fullerton College. The workshop was attended by over 50 faculty, managers and staff. The workshop was followed up with a Flex Day workshop in fall 2011 on Addressing the Achievement Gap (CIII.37), with a focus on activities and programs that would help the college target the elimination of the Achievement Gap. That workshop was attended by over 75 faculty, managers and staff and led a set of suggested actions provided to campus programs addressing the Achievement Gap. Another Flex Day activity in fall 2011 was a workshop, organized by the Faculty Senate President, the Chair of the Program Review Committee and the Director of Institutional Research, on the revised program review process (CIII.28). This workshop was attended by approximately 80 deans and program coordinators and reviewed the program review process, the new program review handbook and the availability of data and information,

particularly on key program performance indicators and their analysis, including trend analysis and comparison to peer programs. Another example of the expanded efforts to engage all relevant constituents in a collaborative inquiry process in the inclusion, at each President's Advisory Council meeting, of agenda items on "Addressing the Needs of Underprepared Students" and "Strategic Planning." Other information, including the IPEDS Data Feedback Report and the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges are presented and discussed at the President's Advisory Council meetings and other meetings of constituent groups. Other discussions at the President's Advisory Council and other groups, e.g., Deans' Council and Faculty Senate, have focused on the Fullerton College Institutional Effectiveness Report. Another staff development activity, funded largely by the Basic Skills Initiative at Fullerton College, has been the attendance by ten faculty and staff at the Strengthening Student Success Conference annually.

Another set of meetings designed to share information and engage in dialogue about the information has been held with local high school partners and community groups. The Director of Institutional Research has made presentations, especially focused on the preparation of incoming students, at the High School Principals Luncheon (CIII.53) and the High School Counselors Breakfast (CIII.54). Similarly, the President and Director of Institutional Research made a presentation on the Achievement Gap at Fullerton College to Los Amigos of Orange County Education Committee, a local influential Latino organization. Those presentations have led to continuing dialog about solutions to common challenges.

During the spring 2011 semester, the President, President-elect of the Faculty Senate and the Director of Institutional Research began developing plans and mechanisms for regularly evaluating the effectiveness of planning processes. The College created the Institutional Research Committee (CIII.37) to serve this function. The purpose of the Institutional Research Committee is fourfold. It serves as the Institutional Review Board for the college; it helps to create the research agenda for the college; it reviews research and evaluation information for the college; and it develops and implements evaluation of the effectiveness of a number of college processes, including the planning process. In spring 2011, the committee was formed and includes the Director of Institutional Research and Planning, two deans, and five faculty, including the Faculty Senate President. During the fall 2011 semester, the committee has developed mechanisms for evaluating the colleges' processes. The discussion has focused on the development of surveys and the conduct of focus groups to provide systematic feedback on the effectiveness of the program review, planning and budgeting processes. Surveys have been distributed through the deans to program coordinators and to the Program Review Committee to evaluate the program review process (CII.29).

Fullerton College is also providing transparency in the institutional planning process by communicating clearly, broadly, and systematically, and by providing structured, well-defined, opportunities for broad employee participation. The major venue for transparency and communication is the President's Advisory Council. An ongoing agenda item on the college's

planning process has resulted in broad and systematic discussion and communication of the planning agenda and the strategic plan which has resulted from the analysis of data and information. The representatives of the various constituent groups on the President's Advisory Council are charged with reporting the discussions which take place at meetings and returning with constituents' perspectives and recommendations. These are taken into account in the further development of plans within the President's Advisory Council. Results of discussion and recommendations from the President's Advisory Council are routinely discussed at meetings of the Deans' Council, Faculty Senate, Classified Senate, Student Equity Committee, Program Review Committee, Planning and Budget Steering Committee and Basic Skills Student Success Steering Committee. Discussions at meetings of those groups are reported back to the President's Advisory Council and reflect broad employee participation. Minutes of the President's Advisory Council reflect these structured, well-defined opportunities in providing transparency in the institutional planning process (CIII.50).

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.

In response to the recommendation of the visiting team, and to fully meet the Standard, Fullerton College has implemented a plan to address the “total cost of ownership” (TCO) for new and renovated facilities and new technology infrastructure and equipment. The College’s former Safety Committee was reconstituted to include a broader mission and to report as an advisory committee to the Planning and Budget Steering Committee (PBSC) (CV.01, CV.02, CV.03, and CV.04). The new Facility and Safety Committee has been charged with the oversight of TCO. The TCO process has been developed through consultation with faculty, staff, students and management and has now been integrated into the College’s institutional planning and budget procedures (CV.05, CV.06, CV.07, CV.08, CV.09 and CV.10).

The objective of the College’s TCO process is to review the total financial impact of a proposed project by identifying and analyzing all “one time” and “on-going” costs associated with the project. Resource elements of the process include all costs for:

- Salaries, Benefits (Academic, Classified and Other Nonacademic) of new personnel needed to support new or renovated facilities
- Supplies and Materials (Instructional and Non-Instructional) that will be needed by programs housed in facilities above and beyond what was needed prior to the project or to support new equipment
- Operating Expenses and Services (Contracts, Repairs, Maintenance, Utilities, Professional Services, etc.) of new or renovated facilities or newly acquired equipment
- Capital Outlay Construction and Acquisition Costs (Site, Buildings, and Equipment)
- Other (Reserves for Contingency and Appropriations needed for the project)

The TCO process has now been incorporated into the College’s planning process requiring any new proposal to include a TCO coversheet outlining all organizational expenses and operational impacts for the life of the proposal, which can be from 5-30 years (CV.11). Before a new project is begun, funding for TCO will be identified and secured. After proposals and accompanying worksheets are submitted to the Facilities and Safety Committee for review of completeness and

accuracy, they will be forwarded to the PBSC. The PBSC is charged with evaluating the funding worksheet for TCO and identifying one-time or on-going monies to fund the project (CV.04).

In identifying and developing the elements that comprise the definition of “total cost of ownership” the College followed the Budget Accounting Manual categories established for community colleges (CV.06). Data are entered into the TCO Worksheet Estimator and are used in the decision process (CV.07). The combination of the proposal and worksheet are elements of the planning process used to demonstrate how the project aligns and supports the College goals (CV.08)

The TCO Proposal Coversheet contains a section titled “Project Evidence”. For this evidence to be useful, it must undergo analysis and reflection by the College community. Committee members serving on the Facilities and Safety Committee PBSC review the data with a specific rubric to ensure consistent evaluation (CV.09). Facilities and Technology proposals that are identified in the College planning process or through Program Review are also assessed by the Facilities and Safety Committee and PBSC, providing a review by a cross section of the College community.

The College Technology Plan is being amended to reflect the more extensive TCO process and will be considered part of the College planning process. TCO Guidelines included in the California Community College Chancellor’s Office Technology Guidelines will continue to be fully incorporated into the College Technology Plan to ensure reliable systems and services are implemented and operational. The identified elements are essential to determine the effective use of resources to meet the College’s needs, and provide the basis for self-evaluation, leading to continuous improvement.

Fullerton College faculty members, classified staff and managers have participated in the development of the *North Orange County Community College District 2011 Comprehensive Master Plan* (CMP) (DI.02) which includes elements of educational and facilities planning for Fullerton College. The CMP, which includes suggested modifications to existing programs, student demographic analysis, and facility’s needs, directs the Facility Master Plan for Fullerton College providing a guideline for development through 2020.

The Comprehensive Master Plan includes the following elements:

- Projected enrollment increase based on projected growth in population and jobs and the State Chancellors Office enrollment and WSCH forecasts.
- Descriptions of current instructional, student services, and campus and administrative services.
- Review of existing conditions and status of current facilities.
- Projects suggested during the concurrent educational planning effort.

Planning processes at the District level will be analyzed to assess their efficacy and effectiveness. College data analysis reviews of resource allocations will be communicated to the District Budget and Facilities Committee. Data analysis of new projects total cost of ownership proposals compared to actual results will be used to help guide any changes in the resource allocation model and to help direct the College Facility Master Plan implementation. By evaluating

previous allocation decisions and planning processes at both District and College levels, processes are better linked and provide a foundation for improvement.

Section III.C.1.c of the *Fullerton College 2011 Comprehensive Self-Study in Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation* discussed the lack of adequate staffing and funding resources to support College's technology needs (CIV.08). The State Chancellors Office "total cost of ownership" model (CV.16) had been used in prior years, however, the model was limited by the data it collected and presented. The College had not set aside the necessary complete long term funding because of the consideration for "lost opportunity" if the project did not move forward. Decisions will now be fully documented with further analysis occurring during the College and District planning model reviews.

There are several committees, plans and processes that guide the management, maintenance and operation of the College's technological infrastructure and equipment (CV.17). The College's Technology Plan (CV.18) provides the foundation to help support college goals and directions. Technology needs are included in the College's Program Review process. Committees include the Instructional Technology Committee, a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate, and the Technology Implementation Planning Committee, a subcommittee of the President's Advisory Council. Recently, the College has contracted with *PlanNet*, to address the long-range infrastructure needs to support the existing and future equipment and service demands. This review will be completed during the spring 2012 semester. Once complete, the ITC will be tasked with using the completed analysis to develop a long-term plan to fund the technology needs of the college. The Facilities and Safety Committee has been charged with addressing emergency data and communication needs on campus. The Planning and Budget Steering Committee will review the various funding needs for current and new technology services.

Appendices

Appendix A: Fullerton College Campus Diversity Plan

Introduction

Fullerton College has a proud tradition of embracing diversity. The college offers a multitude of programs and services in various media to promote and celebrate diversity. By including diversity as a core value of the institution, the college demonstrates the important role diversity plays in the campus community.

The current student population mirrors the diversity of the North Orange County community surrounding the College. The ethnic and racial mix of California, Orange County, and Fullerton College community has changed significantly in the last decade, and the inclusion of new racial/ethnic categories in the 2000 U. S. Census allowed individuals to report two or more races. California and Orange County no longer have a White majority population. Cities in the Fullerton College service area have no racial majority and the cities of Anaheim and La Habra have Hispanic pluralities.

At the end of the 2010-11 academic year the student population at Fullerton College was comprised of 43% Hispanic students, 31% White students, 13% Asian students, 4% African American students, 3% Filipino students, 2% multi-ethnic students, 1% Native American students, and 4% of students who declined to state their ethnicity.

According to the Student Climate Survey conducted in April 2011, students attending Fullerton College felt comfortable on campus regardless of their ethnic background. The respondents noted an overall satisfaction with the campus environment and the programs offered.

A recommendation from the 2005 Accreditation visiting team required a college wide equity and diversity action plan be developed and implemented in a timely manner, along with a schedule and budget. The Student Equity Committee of the Faculty Senate revised their Student Equity Plan drafting a new document in 2008. A number of initiatives were developed on campus with the shared goal of student success and reflective of a common purpose of equity for all individuals on campus.

A recommendation from the 2011 Accreditation visiting team requires the college to address the issue of employee diversity by developing, adopting, and implementing an action plan and timeline that emphasizes strategies geared toward attracting diverse applicants and facilitating career advancement for underrepresented groups within the college.

The goals of this 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.

Maintaining an environment where all individuals are treated with respect

Maintaining a respectful environment for all Fullerton College students requires support from faculty, staff, and managers throughout the college. This support comes in the form of instruction, activities, events, and communication. The Student Equity Committee and the Diversity Committee meet regularly to discuss issues related to equity and diversity on campus and to develop actions to address specific concerns. Each is a shared governance committee. The Student Equity Committee reports to the Faculty Senate while the Diversity Committee reports to the President's Advisory Council, the central, participatory governance council, functioning as the institution's primary recommending body for decision-making and planning.

The Cadena Cultural Center is another important partner in creating a respectful environment for all students. The Cadena Center was established in 1996 with funds from a federal Title V grant to institute a Hispanic Cultural Center on campus. The Center was institutionalized as the grant funding terminated and was combined with the Transfer Center. In the past two years, the Director has delineated the dual functions of transfer and cultural issues.

Student Clubs on campus also play a significant role in celebrating the diversity on campus. Through various activities the clubs allow students an opportunity to explore their own cultural backgrounds and to experience other cultural backgrounds. Numerous club activities highlight particular ethnic or cultural celebrations, exposing the entire campus to unique and diverse experiences.

A survey distributed by the Associated Students towards the end of each academic year is used to determine the current students' level of satisfaction with the campus environment and whether any group feels unwelcome or disrespected.

Providing opportunities for faculty, staff, and managers to learn about various cultures present on campus

In addition to participating in the various events and activities sponsored by the Cadena Cultural Center and the FC Student Clubs, faculty, staff, and managers have the opportunity to participate in workshops and seminars sponsored by the Staff Development Committee. Formed in 1983, the Staff Development Committee is a campus committee that reports to the President's Advisory Council. In addition to providing faculty members with updates on teaching methodologies, the Staff Development Committee provides workshops on cultural awareness and sensitivity.

As the Staff Development Committee works on its three-year plan with specific goals and objectives, they are specifically adding focused training on equity and diversity, joining efforts with the Student Equity Committee and the Diversity Committee. In the 2012-13 academic year, they plan to develop a certificate/equivalent credit unit program with a series of workshops that faculty/staff could attend for credit toward salary advancement.

Each year the classified staff members of the college have the opportunity to participate in a Classified Staff Development day-long workshop. The workshop covers topics such as working with difficult people, stress reduction, understanding the NOCCCD procedures, working as a team, and celebrating cultural differences.

To assess the effectiveness of the cultural presentations and experiences available to faculty and staff members on campus, evaluation forms are completed at the end of each professional development event, including the Classified Staff Development Day.

Inviting community outside of the college to embrace the culture of diversity present on campus

Fullerton College has been an integral part of the surrounding community for nearly 100 years. Many of the neighbors either attended Fullerton College themselves or have had a family member attend the college. Community members are invited to the college for events throughout the year. Several of the events expose the community to cultural activities different from what they have previously experienced.

The Fine Arts Division makes a concerted effort each year to create theatre and musical productions from various ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Attendance at these events allows the general community to see the diversity of students performing and to learn about cultures other than their own. In addition to the theatre and music productions, the art gallery regularly displays artwork from a variety of cultures and features artists from around the world.

Each October, the Ethnic Studies Department sponsors the Dia de los Muertos celebration on campus. The surrounding community joins students, faculty and staff for a traditional festival in

the Mexican tradition. Singers, drummers, dancers, and traditional *ofrendas* cover the main quad of the campus.

As members of the community become more familiar with the diversity of Fullerton College, they will see that the college is an institution of higher learning for all peoples regardless of their background or culture. By letting the community experience cross-cultural experiences they may act as ambassadors for the college, spreading the word to those who haven't been on campus or who haven't seen the campus diversity for themselves.

Attracting diverse applicants for positions at the college by presenting a welcoming environment

A multi-faceted approach is appropriate to fulfill the mission of ensuring equal employment opportunity and developing a diverse workforce. By creating a welcoming environment on campus for individuals from all backgrounds, potential employees will learn that Fullerton College is an institution that values the diversity of its faculty, staff and students. The comprehensive steps included in this diversity plan will increase the richness of our applicant pools.

Equal employment opportunity means that all qualified individuals have a full and fair opportunity to compete for hiring and promotion and to enjoy the benefits of employment with the District. Fullerton College collaborates with the District Office of Human Resources to actively and openly recruit from both within and outside the District workforce to attract a diverse pool of eligible candidates for positions. Ensuring equal employment opportunity also involves creating an environment that fosters cooperation, acceptance, democracy, and free expression of ideas and is welcoming to men and women, persons with disabilities and individuals from all ethnic and other groups protected from discrimination.

Examples

Examples of a number of campus actions to accomplish the goals of the Campus Diversity Plan can be found in the Appendix of this document, which follows.

Appendix—Campus Diversity Plan

Maintaining an environment where all are treated with respect

| Activity | Timeline | Responsible Party | Progress |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| Mission of the Diversity Committee was changed to more accurately reflect objectives of the committee | Effective for 2011-12 academic year | Diversity Committee | completed |
| Financial Aid hires hourly workers with diverse backgrounds from Orange County Youth Employment Services and Orange County Adult Employment Services. | Summer 2011 | Greg Ryan, Director of Financial Aid | Hired two employees who will continue to work through October 2011 |
| The Cultural Exchange Program (CXP) was created to immerse students in a cultural experience unique to a social group within the local community of FC. Participating students engage in a social group to explore the group's resources, activities, practices, and traditions. Students explore social issues through fieldtrips, and panel discussions. | Fall 2011 | Dolores Cornejo, Interim Director Cadena Center | 13 students are active in the CXP program, which was introduced Fall 2011 |
| Revise annual Festival of Diversity to: 1) make it more meaningful; 2) to include more activities; and 3) to increase participation. | Spring 2012 | Dolores Cornejo, Interim Director Cadena Center | |
| AB 540 and Dream Act Workshops | Fall 2011 | Maria Duque, President, Associated | 3 workshops held on August 8,9, and 11 in |

| | | | |
|---|---------|---|--|
| conducted | | Students | conjunction with Freshman Orientation |
| Support the UMOJA program which was previously funded by the Basic Skills Initiative and has shown good progress in increasing the success rates for African American students at FC. | Ongoing | Ernest Bridges, Adjunct Faculty, Retired Full-time Faculty, Ethnic Studies Department | Line item was added to the ongoing operating budget for the college to fund projects, hourly personnel, and special student events for the UMOJA program |
| Provide case management and academic advising for monolingual cultural/ethnic groups utilizing bilingual program staff and translators. | Ongoing | Yolanda Aguirre, CalWORKS Greg Ryan, Financial Aid Bob Miranda, EOPS | Each of these areas of student services schedules bilingual staff members to serve students and/or parents who speak only Spanish. |

Providing opportunities for faculty, staff, and managers to learn about various cultures present on campus

| Activity | Timeline | Responsible Party | Progress |
|---|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Facilitate forums for open discussion on particular issues of diversity | Ongoing | Dr. Lily Espinoza, Director of Cadena Center | First LGBT forum held on 10-10-11 with 90 participants 3 rd annual Hispanic Issues forum held on 9/29/11 Black student forum to be held in February |
| Teaching and Learning Certificate was designed to offer educational opportunities to FC faculty and staff to increase their understanding of 5 specific topics including <i>Student</i> | Year round beginning Fall 2010 | Dani McLean-Wilson, Director of Basic Skills | Currently in 3 rd semester |

| | | | |
|---|-------------|---|--|
| <p><i>Characteristics.</i></p> <p>Workshops focus on instructional issues of culturally sensitive teaching practices to assist participants in gaining a better awareness of the unique characteristics of FC students.</p> | | | |
| <p>Share the demographics of the college at meetings of the Fullerton College Community Advisory Group</p> | Ongoing | Dr. Rajen Vurdien, President | Meetings take place each semester with members of the Fullerton community. |
| <p>Include session on diversity at the Classified Staff Development Training.</p> | Spring 2012 | Dr. Toni M. DuBois, Vice President of Student Services | Scheduled for April 2, 2012 |
| <p><i>Our Students' Neighborhood</i> van tour was held on flex day to enlighten faculty about the areas that our students come.</p> | Fall 2011 | Gerald Padilla, Professor, Ethnic Studies Department | All day event was held on August 11, 2011 |
| <p>Fullerton College Faculty Senate hosted two workshops on the ethnic Achievement Gap informing faculty members about the gap at FC and in colleges across the State and the nation.</p> | Fall 2011 | Dr. Sean Chamberlin, Professor, Natural Science Division | August 10, 2011 |
| <p>Faculty and staff associations have been developed to help provide support and mentoring for faculty, staff and students from diverse backgrounds</p> | Ongoing | Latina Faculty and Staff Association Asian Pacific Islander Association Gay and Lesbian Association of District Employees | |

Inviting community outside of the college to embrace the culture of diversity present on campus

| Activity | Timeline | Responsible Party | Progress |
|--|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Financial Aid and EOPS will participate in outreach events requesting bilingual presentations throughout the year to promote FC and early application for financial aid. | Fall 2011 through Spring 2012 | Greg Ryan, Director of Financial Aid | Participated in <i>La Habra Goes to College</i> and <i>Fullerton Goes to College</i> |
| Managers assigned to meet with community groups | Year round beginning Spring 2011 | Andrea Hanstein, Public Information Officer | Managers have attended chambers of commerce meetings, Rotary Club meetings, and other service group meetings throughout the college service area. |
| Enhance annual Dia de los Muertos Celebration to attract more participants | October 2011 | Gerald Padilla, Professor, Ethnic Studies Department | The 2011 event attracted more student participants and community members. |
| Produce materials in Spanish. | ongoing | Jay Seidel, Professor, Journalism Department Christine Kiger, Director of the Health Center FC Class Schedule Taskforce | Premier production of <i>La Antorcha</i> , first Spanish language publication for FC students and the community on September 20, 2011 Sexual Violence Resource Guide is available in Spanish Nondiscrimination Statement and Victims of sexual Assault Statement are printed in Spanish in catalog |
| Installation of mural by Hispanic artist, Gronk, in Social | Fall 2011 | Robert Jensen, Dean, Fine Arts Division | Unveiled at ceremony on September 22, 2011 |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|---|
| Science Building | | | |
| <i>Transformacion: Dreams of Oaxaca</i> in Art Gallery | Fall 2011 | Robert Jensen, Dean, Fine Arts Division | October 5 through November 8, 2011 |
| <i>Tres Vidas</i> theatrical performance | Fall 2011 | Robert Jensen, Dean, Fine Arts Division | October 25, 2011 |
| <i>Kwanzaa</i> Celebration | Fall 2011 | Dr. Chris Lamm, Professor, Ethnic Studies Department | December 1, 2011 |
| Diverse members of the FC Administrative Team are participating in the first cohort of <i>Leadership Fullerton</i> interacting with other leaders in Business, Services, and Community Groups | Fall 2011-Spring 2012 | Dr. Terry Giugni, Vice President of Instruction Michael R. Perez, Vice President of Administrative Services Albert Abutin, Dean of Admissions and Records | September 2011 to May 2012 |
| Review and revise college publications and other marketing tools to reflect diversity in pictures, graphic, and text to project an inclusive image. | Ongoing | Andrea Hanstein, Public Relations Officer | |
| Sponsor and host the French Film Festival | Spring 2012 | Violette Vornicel-Guthman, Professor, Foreign Language Department | Spring 2012 is the 3 rd annual event |

Attracting diverse applicants for positions at the college by presenting a welcoming environment

| Activity | Timeline | Responsible Party | Progress |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| In accordance with Adjunct Faculty Contract, which speaks to the need to promote diversity, particular expertise, and recency of skills sets within the department or area , ability to hire adjunct faculty from | Fall 2011 through Spring 2012 | Instructional Deans | Adjunct faculty at Fullerton College are more representative of student body |

| | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--|--|
| underrepresented groups exists | | | |
| Basic Skills Graduate Internship Program makes a conscious effort to select a diverse group of interns every semester. Training provided by FC makes the interns more competitive for adjunct positions at the college. | Fall 2011 through Spring 2012 | Dani McLean-Wilson, Director of Basic Skills | |
| Hiring brochures will indicate that Fullerton College is a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) as well as an Asian/Pacific Islander serving institution, and will include a statement that Fullerton college recognizes the importance of diversity in the academic environment. | Fall 2011 | Jeff Horsley, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources | Statements will be included on all Faculty and Management positions for Fullerton College effective immediately. |
| Continue to meet with Los Amigos of Orange County, Anaheim Chamber of Commerce, La Habra Chamber of Commerce, California State University, Fullerton administrators, and other community groups who can serve as resources for referring potential candidates. | Ongoing | Dr. Rajen Vurdien, President | Managers of Fullerton College regularly meet with community groups throughout the academic year. |

Appendix B: Timeframes and Activities

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.

| Activity | Timeline | Responsible Party | Progress |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| Meet with the College Diversity Committee to discuss actions and timelines for projects to address ACCJC Recommendation #1 | Beginning of Fall 2011 Semester | Dr. Toni DuBois, VPSS, ALO | Meeting held September 7, 2011 (CI.02) |
| Meet with Student Equity Committee to discuss actions and timelines for projects to address ACCJC Recommendation #1 | Beginning of Fall 2011 Semester | Dr. Toni DuBois, VPSS, ALO | Meetings held September 8, 2011 (CI.03) and October 6, 2011 (CI.04) |
| Meet with Kenneth Robinson, District Director of Equity and Diversity to discuss NOCCCD EEO procedures and offerings | October 2011 | Dr. Toni DuBois, VPSS, ALO | Meeting held October 7, 2011 |
| Discuss NOCCCD hiring practices and proposed enhancements with Jeff Horsley, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources | October 2011 | Dr. Toni DuBois, VPSS, ALO | Telephone conversations and emails exchanged November 9 through November 22, 2011 |
| Distribute draft of Campus Diversity Plan and Appendix to all FC staff, faculty members, | October 2011 | Dr. Toni DuBois, VPSS, ALO | Emailed to all staff on October 28, 2011 and comments received by |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
| and managers for comments | | | November 9, 2011. |
| Incorporate suggested modifications into the Campus Diversity Plan and Appendix | November 2011 | Dr. Toni DuBois, VPSS, ALO | Completed |

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.

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

| | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | Instruction, Director of Institutional Research, President's Advisory Council | resources were reviewed and submitted to President's Advisory Council (PAC). PAC sent themes and requests to Planning and Budget Steering Committee. |
| SLOA Committee developing SLO/SLOA handbook | November, 2010 – March, 2011 | SLOA Committee | Complete. Faculty Senate approved March 2, 2011 |
| Division Deans provided current list of SLOs & SLOAs on website and asked to update | November, 2010 – February, 2011 | Danielle Fouquette, SLO Coordinator and Division Deans | SLO webpage updated by March 2011. Update of CurricUNET not completed |
| Recommendation by Planning and Budget Steering Committee of \$100K to resource requests from 2011-2012 program reviews. | Fall 2011 | Planning and Budget Steering Committee | Completed |
| Allocation by President of \$100K to resource requests from 2011-2012 program reviews. | Fall 2011 | President | Completed |
| Course-level SLOs to be entered into the CORs. | Spring 2012 | Curriculum Committee | Approved by Curriculum Committee February 15, 2012 (CII.08). |
| Course-level SLOs to be entered into the CORs. | Spring 2012 | VPI and Curriculum Specialist | Currently updating SLOs and SLOAs in CurricUNET and working with Governet to turn process on. |
| Change SLO Assessment Committee from ad hoc committee to a standing committee under the Curriculum Committee. | Spring 2012 | Faculty Senate | Approved by Faculty Senate February 16, 2012 (CII.34). |
| Reinstate campus-wide SLO Coordinator. | Spring 2012 | VPI and Faculty Senate | Approved by Faculty Senate February 16, 2012 (CII.34). |

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | | Currently recruiting to fill the position. |
| Program-level SLOs to be entered into the catalog. | Spring 2012 | Curriculum Committee | Approved by Curriculum Committee February 15, 2012 (CII.08). |
| Program-level SLOs to be entered into the catalog. | Spring 2012 | VPI and Curriculum Specialist | Working with Governet to modify program page in CurricUNET for program-level SLOs. Once this is completed CurricUNET will be updated with current program-level SLOs. |
| Complete development of program-level SLOs. | Spring 2012 | SLO Assessment Committee, Curriculum Committee, and VPI | A timeline for the development of program-level SLOs has been developed and presented to the Curriculum and SLOA Committees, Faculty Senate, and PAC (CII.08, CII.20). Faculty are currently working on the development of SLOs. |
| Assessment of program-level SLOs. | Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 | Faculty, Deans, VPI, and SLOA Committee | Faculty are currently assessing program-level SLOs that are in place and will assess those being developed Spring 2012 and Fall 2012. |
| Closing the loop on program-level SLOs. | Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 | Faculty, Deans, VPI, and SLOA Committee | Upon completion of assessment of program-level SLOs faculty will have critical dialogue in regard to the assessment results and propose changes to curriculum and pedagogy to improve student learning. |

COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 3: In order to meet the Standard, to achieve the Proficiency level in accordance with 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.

| Activity | Timeline | Responsible Party | Progress |
|---|-------------------------|--|---|
| Re-institution of Fullerton College program review process | Fall 2009 | Ad hoc committee of Interim Vice President of Instruction, several deans, Faculty Senate president, Director of Institutional Research | All instructional programs and student services programs completed program reviews. |
| Review of program reviews | Spring 2010 | Ad hoc committee of Interim VPI, several deans, Faculty Senate president, Director of Institutional Research Deans Council | All program reviews were reviewed. Common themes were abstracted – these included dealing with underprepared students and upgrading technology and computer support. |
| Incorporating program review into planning | Fall 2010 – Spring 2011 | Interim Vice President of Instruction, Director of Institutional Research, President’s Advisory Council | Program review themes and request for resources were reviewed and submitted to President’s Advisory Council. President’s Advisory Council sent themes and requests to Planning and Budget Steering Committee. |
| Creation of Program Review Committee | Spring 2011 | President, President’s Advisory Council, Faculty Senate | Completed |
| Updating of Fullerton College Planning Cycle | Spring 2011 | President, President’s Advisory Council, Faculty Senate | Completed |
| Updating of Fullerton College Planning and Budgeting Calendar | Spring 2011 | Director of Institutional Research, Planning and Budget Steering Committee | Completed |
| Recommendation by Planning and Budget Steering Committee of | Spring 2011 | Planning and Budget Steering Committee | Completed |

| | | | |
|---|--------------------|--|-----------|
| \$1M to upgrading technology and computer support. | | | |
| Report on Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges to Presidents Advisory Council, Deans Council, Faculty Senate | Spring 2011 | Director of Institutional Research and Planning | Completed |
| Development of Strategic Plan Goals | Spring 2011 | President's Advisory Council | Completed |
| Development of Draft Strategic Plan Objectives | Spring 2011 | President's Advisory Council | Completed |
| Development of Program Review Website and Handbook | Summer – Fall 2011 | Program Review Committee | Completed |
| Allocation by President of \$1M to upgrading technology and computer support. | Summer 2011 | President | Completed |
| Program Review data compiled and distributed to deans by Director of Institutional Research. | Summer 2011 | Director of Institutional Research and Planning | Completed |
| Flex Day Presentation on Program Review | Fall 2011 | Director of Institutional Research, Faculty Senate President, Program Review Committee Chair | Completed |
| Recommendation by Planning and Budget Steering Committee of \$100K to action plans for 2011-2013 strategic plan. | Fall 2011 | Planning and Budget Steering Committee | Completed |
| Allocation by President of \$100K to action plans for 2011-2013 strategic plan. | Fall 2011 | President | Completed |
| Recommendation by | Fall 2011 | Planning and Budget | Completed |

| | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|-----------|
| Planning and Budget Steering Committee of \$100K to resource requests from 2011-2012 program reviews. | | Steering Committee | |
| Allocation by President of \$100K to resource requests from 2011-2012 program reviews. | Fall 2011 | President | Completed |
| Presentations on Institutional Effectiveness | Fall 2011 | Director of Institutional Research and Planning | Completed |
| Consultations on Program Review | Fall 2011 | Program Review Committee | Ongoing |
| Report on Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges to Board of Trustees | Fall 2011 | Director of Institutional Research and Planning | Completed |
| Development of Draft Strategic Plan Action Plans | Fall 2011 | Deans and Directors | Completed |
| Review of Strategic Plan Action Plans | Fall 2011 | Director of Institutional Research and Planning, Planning and Budget Steering Committee | Completed |
| Funding of Selected Strategic Plan Action Plans | Fall 2011 – Spring 2012 | Planning and Budget Steering Committee, President’s Advisory Council, President | Completed |
| Instructional Program Reviews Completed and Turned in to Deans | Fall 2011 | Department Coordinators, Deans | Completed |
| Program Review Evaluation Distributed to Deans and then to Department Coordinators | Spring 2012 | Institutional Research Committee, Deans, Department Coordinators | Completed |
| Planning Cycle Calendar Reviewed and Updated | Spring 2012 | Planning and Budget Steering Committee | Ongoing |

| | | | |
|--|---------|--|---------|
| Regular meetings of Program Review Committee | Ongoing | Program Review Committee | Ongoing |
| Regular meetings of Planning and Budget Steering Committee | Ongoing | Planning and Budget Steering Committee | Ongoing |

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 facilitated 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.

| Activity | Timeline | Responsible Party | Progress |
|--|-------------------------|--|---|
| Re-institution of Fullerton College program review process | Fall 2009 | Ad hoc committee of Interim Vice President of Instruction, several deans, Faculty Senate president, Director of Institutional Research | All instructional programs and student services programs completed program reviews. |
| Review of program reviews | Spring 2010 | Ad hoc committee of Interim VPI, several deans, Faculty Senate president, Director of Institutional Research Deans Council | All program reviews were reviewed. Common themes were abstracted – these included dealing with underprepared students and upgrading technology and computer support. |
| President’s Advisory Council Recurring Agenda Item on Planning | Ongoing | President, Director of Institutional Research and Planning | Ongoing |
| Incorporating program review into planning | Fall 2010 – Spring 2011 | Interim Vice President of Instruction, Director of Institutional Research, President’s Advisory Council | Program review themes and request for resources were reviewed and submitted to President’s Advisory Council. President’s Advisory Council sent themes and requests to Planning and Budget Steering Committee. |

| | | | |
|---|--------------------|--|-----------|
| Creation of Institutional Research Committee | Spring 2011 | Faculty Senate | Completed |
| Creation of Program Review Committee | Spring 2011 | President, President's Advisory Council, Faculty Senate | Completed |
| Development of Draft Strategic Plan Objectives | Spring 2011 | President's Advisory Council | Completed |
| Development of Strategic Plan Goals | Spring 2011 | President's Advisory Council | Completed |
| Flex activity – The Achievement Gap | Spring 2011 | Director of Institutional Research, Faculty Senate President Elect, Chair of Latino Studies Department, Chair of Student Equity Committee | Completed |
| Managers' Planning Retreat | Spring 2011 | President, Director of Institutional Research | Completed |
| President's Advisory Council Planning Retreat | Spring 2011 | President, Director of Institutional Research | Completed |
| Recommendation by Planning and Budget Steering Committee of \$1M to upgrading technology and computer support. | Spring 2011 | Planning and Budget Steering Committee | Completed |
| Report on Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges to Presidents Advisory Council, Deans Council, Faculty Senate | Spring 2011 | Director of Institutional Research and Planning | Completed |
| Updating of Fullerton College Planning and Budgeting Calendar | Spring 2011 | Director of Institutional Research, Planning and Budget Steering Committee | Completed |
| Updating of Fullerton College Planning Cycle | Spring 2011 | President, President's Advisory Council, Faculty Senate | Completed |
| Development of | Summer – Fall 2011 | Program Review | Completed |

| | | | |
|--|-------------|--|-----------|
| Program Review Website | | Committee | |
| Allocation by President of \$1M to upgrading technology and computer support. | Summer 2011 | President | Completed |
| Creation of Director of Institutional Research and Planning | Summer 2011 | President, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources | Completed |
| Distribution of Program Review data sheets to Deans | Summer 2011 | Director of Institutional Research | Completed |
| Program Review data compiled and distributed to deans by Director of Institutional Research. | Summer 2011 | Director of Institutional Research and Planning | Completed |
| Allocation by President of \$100K to action plans for 2011-2013 strategic plan. | Fall 2011 | President | Completed |
| Allocation by President of \$100K to resource requests from 2011-2012 program reviews. | Fall 2011 | President | Completed |
| Consultations on Program Review | Fall 2011 | Program Review Committee | Ongoing |
| Creation of Planning Handbook | Fall 2011 | Director of Institutional Research and Planning | Ongoing |
| Creation of Program Review Handbook | Fall 2011 | Program Review Committee | Completed |
| Development of Draft Strategic Plan Action Plans | Fall 2011 | Deans and Directors | Completed |
| Development of Rubric for Evaluating Planning | Fall 2011 | Institutional Research Committee | Ongoing |
| Development of Rubric for Evaluating Program Review | Fall 2011 | Institutional Research Committee | Ongoing |
| Flex activity – Closing the Achievement Gap | Fall 2011 | Director of Institutional Research, Faculty Senate President, Chair of | Completed |

| | | | |
|---|-----------|--|---|
| | | Latino Studies Department, Chair of Student Equity Committee | |
| Flex Activity – Program Review | Fall 2011 | Director of Institutional Research, Faculty Senate President, Chair of Program Review Committee | Completed |
| Hiring of Director of Institutional Research and Planning | Fall 2011 | President, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, Director of Institutional Research and Planning Hiring Committee | Director of Institutional Research and Planning position filled on October 12, 2011 |
| Presentations on Institutional Effectiveness | Fall 2011 | Director of Institutional Research and Planning | Completed |
| Publication of Institutional Effectiveness Report – 2010-2011 | Fall 2011 | Director of Institutional Research | Completed |
| Recommendation by Planning and Budget Steering Committee of \$100K to action plans for 2011-2013 strategic plan. | Fall 2011 | Planning and Budget Steering Committee | Completed |
| Recommendation by Planning and Budget Steering Committee of \$100K to resource requests from 2011-2012 program reviews. | Fall 2011 | Planning and Budget Steering Committee | Completed |
| Report on Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges to Board of Trustees | Fall 2011 | Director of Institutional Research and Planning | Completed |
| Review of Strategic Plan Action Plans | Fall 2011 | Director of Institutional Research and Planning, Planning and Budget Steering Committee | Ongoing |

| | | | |
|--|-----------|---|---------|
| Revision of Institutional Research Website to include Planning | Fall 2011 | Director of Institutional Research and Planning | Ongoing |
| Staff Development Activity – Program Review | Fall 2011 | Director of Institutional Research, Faculty Senate President, Chair of Program Review Committee | Ongoing |
| Regular meetings of Planning and Budget Steering Committee | Ongoing | Planning and Budget Steering Committee | Ongoing |
| Regular meetings of Program Review Committee | Ongoing | Program Review Committee | Ongoing |

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)

| Activity Fall 2011 | Timeline | Responsible Party | Progress |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Meet with the President’s Advisory Council (PAC) to discuss actions and timelines for activities to address ACCJC Recommendation #5. | Beginning of Fall 2011 Semester | Michael Perez, VPAS | Meeting held September 14, 2011. Total cost of ownership scope shared with PAC. (CV.02) |
| <p>Meet with PAC to present and discuss recommended actions that address ACCJC Recommendation #5:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Presentation of charge, structure and scope of Facilities and Safety Committee – including total cost of ownership. 2. Presentation of framework, scope and elements of total cost of ownership. 3. Request College Master Calendar include Facilities & Safety Committee – allowing representation from across the College constituency. | Beginning of Fall 2011 Semester | Michael Perez, VPAS | Meeting held September 28, 2011. Draft documents were provided to committee for review and feedback. (CV.03) |
| Meet and discuss with Planning and Budget Steering Committee (PBSC) the best practice of total cost of ownership, and how to integrate it into the College’s decisions for long range | Beginning of Fall 2011 Semester | Michael Perez, VPAS | Meeting held October 5, 2011 Consensus was given to move forward with integrating total cost of ownership. (CV.06) |

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| planning allocations, supporting the College's mission and strategic plan. | | | |
| Meet with PAC regarding amending and finalizing integration of Facilities and Safety Committee and total cost of ownership in the College's planning process. | Beginning of Fall 2011 Semester | Michael Perez, VPAS | Meeting held October 12, 2011 with comments being received and incorporated. (CV.04)) |
| Meet with PBSC regarding final recommendations from PAC. | Beginning of Fall 2011 Semester | Michael Perez, VPAS | Meeting held November 2, 2011 with PBSC. Facilities and Safety Committee will be charged in developing and operating the total cost of ownership process, recommending to PBSC, and PBSC recommending to PAC. (CV.07) |
| Conduct first meeting with Facilities and Safety Committee (F&S) to review mission, scope, integration, total cost of ownership, and integration with other planning committees. | Beginning of Fall 2011 Semester | Michael Perez, VPAS | Meeting held November 18, 2011. Total cost of ownership (TCO) documents were shared and discussed. Recommend TCO be integrated with other planning committees. Received recommendation to form a total cost of ownership sub-committee to allow a more detailed and focused analysis of |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| | | | proposed projects. (CV.05) |
| Meet with Program Review to begin incorporation of total cost of ownership into the program review planning cycle. | Beginning of Fall 2011 Semester | Michael Perez, VPAS | Meeting held December 6, 2011. (CV.15) |
| Meet with PBSC to review forms and worksheets and identify new projects for total cost of ownership analysis. | Beginning of Fall 2011 Semester | Michael Perez, VPAS Ken Meehan, Director of Institutional Research and Planning | Meeting held December 7, 2011. (CV.08) |
| Meet with Facilities and Safety Committee to draft final total cost of ownership forms and worksheets and begin processing new projects. | Beginning of Fall 2011 Semester | Michael Perez, VPAS | Meeting held for December 9, 2011. (CV.06) |
| Meet with Planning and Research Director to develop new Fullerton College Planning Process map, reflecting new committee and total cost of ownership process. | Beginning of Fall 2011 Semester | Michael Perez, VPAS Ken Meehan, Director of Institutional Research and Planning | Meeting held December 14, 2011. |
| Meet with PBSC to review total cost of TCO forms and worksheets. | Beginning of Fall 2011 Semester | Michael Perez, VPAS Ken Meehan, Director of Institutional Research and Planning | Meeting scheduled for December 14, 2011. Recommend incorporating procedures that had been institutionalized in years prior, but were never |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | utilized. (CV.04) |
| Meet with Facilities and Safety Committee to review Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) Subcommittee structure and review the proposed Fullerton College Planning Process amendment. | Beginning of Spring 2012 Semester | Michael Perez, VP-AS Ken Meehan, Director of Institutional Research and Planning | Meeting held January 27, 2012. Facilities and Safety Committee approved structure of Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) Subcommittee and proposed Fullerton College Planning Process amendment. (CV.03) |
| Meet with Academic Computing Technology (ACT) to modify Technology Plan, to include interface with Facilities and Safety Committee and include the more comprehensive total cost of ownership (TCO). | Beginning of Spring 2012 Semester | Michael Perez, VP-AS Bob Morrison, ACT Co Ho, ACT | Start in February 2012. |
| Update College Committee Home Pages on Web: 1. Facilities and Safety Committee 2. Total cost of ownership (process and forms) 3. Planning and Budget Steering Committee 4. Fullerton College Planning Process Map 5. Technology Committee | Beginning of Spring 2012 Semester | Michael Perez, VP-AS Ken Meehan, Director of Institutional Research and Planning | Start in February 2012. |
| Review total cost of ownership documentation in the Program Review process. | Beginning of Spring 2012 Semester | Michael Perez, VP-AS Program Review Committee (PRC) | Start in February 2012. |

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Facilities and Safety Committee with analysis of total cost of ownership recommendations from Program Review. | Middle of Spring 2012 Semester | Michael Perez, VP-AS Facilities and Safety Committee (F&S) | Start in March 2012. |
| Planning and Budget Steering Committee review recommendations from Facilities and Safety Committee – regarding total cost of ownership. | End of Spring 2012 Semester | Michael Perez, VP-AS Ken Meehan, Director of Institutional Research and Planning Planning and Budget Steering Committee (PBSC) | Start in April 2012. |
| Evaluate data from Fall total cost of ownership initial projects. | End of Spring 2012 Semester | Michael Perez, VP-AS Ken Meehan, Director of Institutional Research and Planning Facilities and Safety Committee – Total Cost of Ownership subcommittee. | Start in May 2012. |

Appendix C: Listing of Evidence

Evidence for Response to District Recommendation 1

References:

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

DI.01 *North Orange County Community College District District-wide Strategic Plan 2009-11*

DI.02 *North Orange County Community College District 2011 Comprehensive Master Plan*

DI.03 Members of the Ad Hoc District Planning Committee

DI.04 Accreditation Workgroup Participants and Workgroup Timelines (original and revised)

DI.05 September 16, 2011 Integrated Planning Workgroup agenda, sign-in sheet, and handouts

DI.06 E-mail distributing draft 1 of the Integrated Planning Manual

DI.07 E-mail distributing draft 2 of the Integrated Planning Manual

DI.08 October 21, 2012 Integrated Planning Workgroup agenda and sign-in sheet

DI.09 E-mail from CEOs distributing the Integrated Planning Manual for the first district-wide review

DI.10 Responses to feedback from the first district-wide review

DI.11 November 28, 2011 Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council agenda

DI.12 November 28, 2011 Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council minutes

DI.13 September 1, 2011 Fullerton College Faculty Senate President's Report

DI.14 October 20, 2011 Fullerton College Faculty Senate President's Report

DI.15 November 3, 2011 Fullerton College Faculty Senate President's Report

DI.16 November 17, 2011 Fullerton College Faculty Senate President's Report

DI.17 December 1, 2011 Fullerton College Faculty Senate President's Report

- DI.18 October 6, 2011 Fullerton College Faculty Senate meeting minutes
- DI.19 October 20, 2011 Fullerton College Faculty Senate meeting minutes
- DI.20 November 17, 2011 Fullerton College Faculty Senate meeting minutes
- DI.21 February 2, 2012 Fullerton College Faculty Senate meeting minutes
- DI.22 February 16, 2012 Fullerton College Faculty Senate meeting minutes
- DI.23 January 20, 2012 Fullerton College Campus-wide Accreditation forum PowerPoint, meeting notes, and sign-in sheets
- DI.24 December 12, 2011 Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council minutes
- DI.25 E-mail from CEOs distributing all three manuals for the second district-wide review
- DI.26 January 6, 2012 Board Letter distributing the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and the *North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision-Making Resource Manual: Structure, Functions and Alignment*
- DI.27 Responses to feedback from the second district-wide review
- DI.28 January 23, 2012 Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council agenda
- DI.29 January 23, 2012 Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council minutes
- DI.30 January 24, 2012 Board agenda and minutes
- DI.31 February 13, 2012 Chancellor's Cabinet/District Planning Council minutes
- DI.32 February 28, 2012 Board Agenda item
- DI.33 Chancellor's Cabinet and District Planning Council Purpose and Operational Guidelines
- DI.34 September 16, 2011 Decision Making Workgroup agenda, sign-in sheet, and handouts
- DI.35 October 21, 2011 Decision Making Workgroup agenda and sign-in sheet
- DI.36 E-mail distributing draft 1 of the Decision Making Manual
- DI.37 E-mail distributing draft 2 of the Decision Making Manual
- DI.38 Responses to feedback on draft 2 of the Decision Making Manual

- DI.39 E-mail distributing draft 3 of the Decision Making Manual
- DI.40 E-mail distributing draft 4 of the Decision Making Manual
- DI.41 E-mail from CEOs distributing the Decision Making Manual for the first district-wide review
- DI.42 Responses to feedback from the first district-wide review
- DI.43 December 12, 2011 Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council agenda
- DI.44 August 23, 2011 Board minutes
- DI.45 January 27, 2012, and February 10, 2012 District-wide Strategic Plan agenda, sign-in sheet, and handouts
- DI.46 November 15, 2011 Technology Advisory Committee agenda and minutes
- DI.47 February 14, 2011 District Staff Development Committee minutes
- DI.48 February 27, 2012 District Consultation Council agenda and minutes
- DI.49 March 12, 2012 Council on Budget and Facilities agenda and minutes
- DI.50 District Services Administrative Review Procedure
- DI.51 February 14, 2012 Presentation to Board on priorities for the 2012-2013 Budget

Evidence for Response to District Recommendation 2

Reference:

North Orange County Community College District Budget Allocation Handbook 2012

- DII.01 September 16, 2011 Resource Allocation Workgroup agenda, sign-in sheet, and handouts
- DII.02 E-mail distributing the first draft of the Budget Allocation Handbook
- DII.03 E-mail distributing the second draft of the Budget Allocation Handbook
- DII.04 E-mail distributing the third draft of the Budget Allocation Handbook
- DII.05 E-mail distributing the fourth draft of the Budget Allocation Handbook
- DII.06 Responses to feedback on the Budget Allocation Handbook

- DII.07 E-mail from CEOs distributing the Budget Allocation Handbook for the first district-wide review
- DII.08 E-mail distributing the proposed NOCCCD budget allocation model description for the Integrated Planning Manual
- DII.09 October 21, 2011 Resource Allocation Workgroup agenda and sign-in sheet
- DII.10 E-mail distributing draft five of the Budget Allocation Handbook

Evidence for Response to District Recommendation 3

- DIII.01 *North Orange County Community College District District-wide Strategic Plan 2012- 2014* (draft)

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

Evidence in Support of Responses to College Recommendations 1:

- CI.01 Campus Diversity Plan (See Appendix A)
- CI.02 September 7, 2011 Diversity Committee meetings minutes
- CI.03 September 8, 2011 Student Equity Committee meeting minutes
- CI.04 October 6, 2011 Student Equity Committee meeting minutes
- CI.05 Hiring procedure for Faculty, Classified, and Managers

Evidence in Support of Responses to College Recommendations 2:

- CII.01 SLO PowerPoint presentation presented to Business/CIS Division, spring 2008 semester
- CII.02 April 19, 2007 Faculty Senate meeting minutes
- CII.03 Example CurricUNET website SLO/SLOA page
- CII.04 October 15, 2009 Faculty Senate meeting minutes
- CII.05 March 2011 SLO/SLOA status
- CII.06 October 20, 2011 Faculty Senate meeting minutes
- CII.07 CurricUNET SLO/SLOA report for English

- CII.08 February 15, 2012 Curriculum Committee minutes
- CII.09 October 1, 2009 and October 15, 2009 Faculty Senate minutes and SLO plan
- CII.10 February 2, 2012 Faculty Senate meeting minutes
- CII.11 Descriptions of Student Success Committee and Staff Development Committee
- CII.12 Evidence: Humanities division meeting notes and other division meeting notes
- CII.13 Email from Dean, Humanities and Dean, Technology and Engineering
- CII.14 February 21, 2012 email from Dean, Social Sciences
- CII.15 Student Services SLOs and SAOs
- CII.16 Institutional Learning Outcomes and General Ed SLOs
- CII.17 Spring 2010 PAC meeting minutes
- CII.19 March 6, 2012 Dean's Council meeting minutes
- CII.20 March 14, 2012 PAC meeting minutes
- CII.21 Example of a completed SLO/SLOA form
- CII.22 Screen prints of SLO webpage
- CII.24 Social Science Division SLO website
- CII.25 PAC meeting minutes where eight goals developed and stated.
- CII.26 Program Review form and rubric
- CII.27 August 11, 2011 Program Review workshop PowerPoint presentation
- CII.28 SLO/SLOA worksheet
- CII.29 IRC program review surveys for writers and readers
- CII.30 IRC meeting minutes describing Program Review survey
- CII.31 Planning and budget calendar
- CII.32 IRC meeting minutes discussing evaluation of SLOs
- CII.33 SLOA Committee minutes discussing evaluation of SLO/SLOA process
- CII.34 February 16, 2012 Faculty Senate meeting minutes

Evidence in Support of Responses to College Recommendations 3:

- CIII.01 Fullerton College Institutional Effectiveness Report
- CIII.02 Description of TAP
- CIII.03 Description of Puente
- CIII.04 Description of STEM grant
- CIII.05 Instructional Program Review Key Performance Indicators
- CIII.06 Fullerton College Environmental Scan
- CIII.07 Fullerton College Student Equity Report
- CIII.08 Examples of ad hoc Research reports and evaluations of special programs
- CIII.09 PAC meeting minutes where eight goals were developed
- CIII.10 March 9, 2011 PAC meeting minutes
- CIII.11 March 23, 2011 PAC meeting minutes
- CIII.12 DC meeting minutes where three college goals were discussed
- CIII.13 Management retreat minutes where three college goals were discussed
- CIII.14 April, 2011 PAC retreat notes
- CIII.15 FS meeting minutes where three college goals were discussed
- CIII.16 FC Strategic Plan Objectives
- CIII.17 PAC meeting minutes where student concerns about 3 college goals were voiced
- CIII.18 President's Advisory Council Minutes where task of action plans discussed
- CIII.19 Strategic Plan Action Plans
- CIII.20 Minutes of Planning and Budget Steering Committee where \$100K recommended
- CIII.21 Minutes of PAC where \$100K for strategic plans was decided
- CIII.22 Minutes of Planning and Budget Steering Committee where funding of specific action plans discussed
- CIII.23 Minutes of PAC where funding of specific action plans reported out

- CIII.24 PAC minutes – program review committee
- CIII.25 Minutes of the Program Review Committee (All)
- CIII.26 Program Review Reporting Form
- CIII.27 Program Review Handbook
- CIII.28 Program Review Flex Day PowerPoint
- CIII.29 Calendar of Program Review training workshops scheduled fall 2011
- CIII.30 Director, Institutional Research and Planning job description
- CIII.31 Program Review timeline of review process
- CIII.32 Fullerton College Technology Plan
- CIII.33 Fullerton College Institutional Effectiveness Report
- CIII.34 Fullerton College Annual Report
- CIII.35 Achievement Gap Flex Day PowerPoint
- CIII.36 Student Equity Plan
- CIII.37 Fullerton College ARCC Report with Self-Assessment
- CIII.38 Achievement Gap Flex Day Activity notes and sign-in sheets
- CIII.39 PAC meeting minutes where ARCC report presented
- CIII.40 Deans Council meeting minutes where ARCC report presented
- CIII.41 Faculty Senate meeting minutes where ARCC report presented
- CIII.42 NCES IPEDS Data Survey Data Feedback Report
- CIII.43 PAC meeting minutes where NCES IPEDS data presented
- CIII.44 Basic Skills Intervention Evaluations
- CIII.45 PAC meeting minutes where Student Success Committee was discussed
- CIII.46 PowerPoint from spring 2011 Flex Day PowerPoint on Achievement Gap
- CIII.47 Notes and sign-in sheets from spring 2011 Flex on Achievement Gap
- CIII.48 Notes and sign-in sheets from fall 2011 Program Review Flex workshop

- CIII.49 Example PAC agendas
- CIII.50 PAC meeting minutes where Institutional Effectiveness Report discussed
- CIII.51 Deans' Council meeting where Institutional Effectiveness Report discussed
- CIII.52 Director, Basic Skills pre and post meetings – agendas, notes for SSS conference
- CIII.53 High School Principals Luncheon Agenda and PowerPoint
- CIII.54 Counselor's breakfast Agenda and PowerPoint
- CIII.55 Agenda, PowerPoint presentation, sign-in sheet from Director, Institutional Research and Planning's presentation on Achievement Gap to Los Amigos
- CIII.56 IRC description
- CIII.57 Minutes of the Institutional Research Committee meetings
- CIII.58 Description of PAC
- CIII.59 Diagram of committee organization

Evidence in Support of Responses to College Recommendations 4:

- CIV.01 Examples of Fall 2009 Program Reviews
- CIV.02 Program Review Long and Short Term Goals
- CIV.03 Basic Skills Outcomes Report
- CIV.04 College Fact Book
- CIV.05 Minutes of Planning and Budget Steering Committee where \$1M toward upgrading technology was recommended.
- CIV.06 PAC meeting minutes where \$1M approved.
- CIV.07 Fullerton College Planning Documents with Unit Goals
- CIV.08 *Fullerton College 2011 Comprehensive Self-Study in support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation*
- CIV.09 President's Advisory Council Minutes
- CIV.10 President's Advisory Council Minutes where three goals were accepted
- CIV.11 Examples of Fall 2011 Instructional Program Reviews

Evidence in Support of Responses to College Recommendations 5:

- CV.01 Facility and Safety Committee description
- CV.02 PAC meeting minutes where Facility and Safety Committee was discussed
- CV.03 Minutes of all Facility and Safety Committee meetings where Total Cost of Ownership was discussed
- CV.04 Minutes of all PBSC meetings where Total Cost of Ownership was discussed
- CV.05 Total Cost of Ownership coversheet, worksheet and ballot worksheet
- CV.06 Budget Accounting Manual
- CV.07 Total Cost of Ownership Estimator
- CV.08 Fullerton College goals
- CV.09 Rubric for evaluation of Total Cost of Ownership project evidence

- CV.10 California Community College Chancellor's office Total Cost of Ownership Model
- CV.11 Descriptions of Instructional Technology Committee and Technology Implementation Planning Committee