

Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report

Fullerton College
321 E. Chapman Avenue, Fullerton, CA92832

A Confidential Report Prepared
for the
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Fullerton College/North Orange County Community College District

on

April 23, 2012

Dr. James M. Meznek, Chancellor
Team Chair

Ventura CCCD

Dr. Cathy Hasson, Director, Research and Planning
Team Member

San Diego CCD

Follow-Up Visit Report

DATE: April 23, 2012

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

FROM: James M. Meznek, Ph.D., Team Chair

SUBJECT: Report of Follow-Up Visit Team to Fullerton College/North Orange CCC District
April 23, 2012

Introduction

A comprehensive 11-member site visit was conducted at Fullerton College on March 14-17, 2011. At its meeting of June 8-10, 2011, the Commission acted to require Fullerton College to submit a Follow-Up Report followed by a return team visit. In addition, the Commission acted to issue Warning and a Reminder to Fullerton College to correct deficiencies identified in the 2011 Evaluation Report. The Follow-Up Report Visiting Team, Dr. James Meznek and Dr. Cathy Hasson, conducted the follow-up site visit to Fullerton College on April 23, 2012. The purpose of the team visit was to verify that the Follow-Up Report prepared by the College was accurate through examination of evidence, to determine if sustained, continuous, and corrective improvements had been implemented at the institution, and that the college had met the recommendations made by the comprehensive evaluation team and complying with Commission Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies.

Because the Fullerton College follow-up visit focused on three (3) District Recommendations, five (5) College Recommendations, and one (1) Commission Reminder, the Team divided its time between the North Orange County Community College District Office and Fullerton College. The Team reviewed evidence and interviewed individuals/groups at each site. In general, the Team found the North Orange CCC District and Fullerton College representatives prepared for the visit. A well-organized evidence room at Fullerton College, workroom at the District, and representative interview schedules at each location facilitated the timely and organized assessment of evidence, however, several errors or omissions in the Fullerton College Accreditation Follow-Up Report created the need for supplementary evidence the day of the visit.

Over the course of the one day visit, the Team met with approximately 50 individuals. District interviews were conducted with members of the Board of Trustees, Chancellor's District Consultation Council, District Council on Budget and Facilities, as well as the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, Vice Chancellor of Finance and Facilities, and District Director of Information Services. Fullerton College interviews were conducted with the President, Vice President of Student Services, Vice President of Instruction, Faculty Senate President, and Student Learning Outcomes Coordinators. The team also met with members of the President's Advisory Council, Planning and Budget Steering Committee, Campus Diversity Committee,

Student Equity Committee, Facilities and Safety Advisory Group, Associated Student Government, Technology Implementation Planning Committee, and the Program Review Committee.

The Follow-Up Report and visit were expected to document resolution of the following three (3) District recommendations, one (1) Commission Reminder, and five (5) College recommendations:

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 I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, IV.A.3; IV.B.3.a, Eligibility Requirement 19.)

District Recommendation 2

To fully meet the Standards, the Team recommends the District more clearly delineate its budget allocation model, communicate the model to campus constituencies, and provide clarity as to its link to District planning. (Standards I.B.3; I.B.4; III.D.1.a; III.D.1.d; IV.B.3.a; Eligibility Requirement 17.)

District Recommendation 3

In order to meet the Standard, 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. (Standard IV.A.5, IV.B.3.g.)

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.)

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.)

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, III.D.1, III.D.1.a, III.D.1.d.)

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 ACCJC *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. (Standard I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4.)

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.c, III.C.2.)

Commission Reminder

The Commission expects that institutions meet Standards that require the identification and assessment of student learning outcomes and the use of assessment data to plan and implement improvements to educational quality, by fall 2012. The Commission reminds Fullerton College that it must be prepared to demonstrate that it meets these Standards by fall 2012 (I.B.1, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B.4, II.C.2, and III.A.1.c).

Responses to Team Recommendations

General Observations and Comments:

The 2012 Follow-Up Report Team (Team) noted that the North Orange County Community College District and Fullerton College had implemented a variety of activities to address the eight recommendations and Commission concern produced as an outcome of the Site Visit Team's March 14-17, 2011 Comprehensive Evaluation Report. Evidence assessed by the Follow-Up Team, through document review and employee interviews, confirmed focused work and achievement in successfully aligning District level planning, budgeting, governance, and decision-making processes with Commission Eligibility Requirements and Standards. Consequently, based on its review of the evidence, the Team concluded the District fully met District Recommendations 1, 2, and 3.

The Team identified partial success in fully meeting College Recommendations. Based upon document analysis and focused dialogues with campus employees, the Team concluded that College Recommendation 1 Employee Diversity, College Recommendation 3 Program Review, and College Recommendation 5 Total Cost of Ownership had been met. However, only partial progress was verified regarding the resolution of College Recommendation 2 Student Learning Outcomes and College Recommendation 4 Institutional Planning and Budgeting.

Although Fullerton College has completed the writing of the majority of its course and program SLOs, considerable work related to their assessment and use in ensuring sustainable, continuous quality improvement remains to be accomplished. The Team concluded that Fullerton College continues to perform at the development stage of the ACCJC *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness* for student learning outcomes and has not, as yet, achieved proficiency with the rubric for student learning outcomes.

The Follow-Up Team advises Fullerton College of the urgency to fully meet the Comprehensive Team's SLO recommendations in accordance with ACCJC *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness* for student learning outcomes and ACCJC 2011 Reminder:

“The Commission expects that institutions meet Standards that require the identification and assessment of student learning outcomes and the use of assessment data to plan and implement improvements to educational quality, by fall 2012. The Commission reminds Fullerton College that it must be prepared to demonstrate that it meets these Standards by fall 2012 (I.B.1, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B.4, II.C.2, and III.A.1.c).”

In addition, the Team advises Fullerton College to continue to address the 2011 Comprehensive Team's planning recommendations, consistent with ACCJC *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness* in planning. Although its planning activities are linked to District strategic directions, technology, facilities, and program review components, the college has not, as yet, achieved proficiency within the rubric for planning. College planning lacks clarity, assessment, and broad constituent understanding.

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 I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, IV.A.3; IV.B.3.a, Eligibility Requirement 19.)

Findings and Evidence:

The 2012 Follow-Up Report Team found that the North Orange County Community College District has substantively and fully addressed the previous team's recommendation. Since the 2011 visit, the Team noted that the District developed and implemented a collaborative process to evaluate and revise its planning systems and created a planning manual. The 2012 Team reviewed the District's newly developed *2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and concluded that it is both clear and comprehensive. The document includes schematic depiction, outlines, timelines, and activities for all District-level planning processes, illustrates the operations for District services administrative review, identifies planning linkages to budget allocation, describes evidence gathering and assessment practices employed to meet strategic directions, and articulates how the District will evaluate its planning and decision-making system.

The 2012 Team's interviews with the chancellor, trustees, college presidents, administrators, students, and campus constituents confirmed broad-based participation in the Manual's construction, and support for its precepts, activities, responsibilities, and timelines. A document review verified that planning and decision-making bodies contained in the District handbooks are meeting and observing established Manual protocols. Further review by the Team also found congruence among District and college planning and decision-making processes and activities.

At the time of the Team visit, members also observed planning and decision-making manuals were being assessed and further strengthened by the District. Evidence verified formal assessment practices for integrated District-level planning and decision-making within a three-year cycle. In addition, the Team noted evidence in support of the wide dissemination of the information contained in *2012 Integrated Planning* and *2012 Decision-Making Resource* manuals. The Team verified that the *2012 Integrated Planning Manual* was distributed. An implementation strategy to ensure full District employee awareness of the information contained in the Manual had been developed and was being implemented.

District Recommendation 2

To fully meet the Standards, the Team recommends the District more clearly delineate its budget allocation model, communicate the model to campus constituencies, and provide clarity as to its link to District planning. (Standards I.B.3; I.B.4; III.D.1.a; III.D.1.d; IV.B.3.a; Eligibility Requirement 17.)

Findings and Evidence:

Through a review of documents and interviews, the Team noted that a broad-based and iterative process for clarifying the District's *Budget Allocation Model* occurred since the last Comprehensive Team Visit. Recommendations from constituents were incorporated into the creation of a *2012 Budget Allocation Handbook*. The Team validated that the *Budget Allocation Handbook* is explicitly linked to the practices and processes contained in the District's *2012 Integrated Planning Manual*. The Team further confirmed activities outlined in both the District's planning manual and budget allocation handbook clearly and effectively close the District-level planning and budgeting loop. A Team analysis of the activities contained in the *2012 Budget Allocation Handbook* and interviews with employees by the Team concluded that it also contained an assessment system to evaluate and strengthen the District's budget processes. The Team verified clear constituent understanding and support of the *Budget Allocation Handbook*'s content with both District and campus personnel. It was further noted that the District had begun a process to ensure strengthened communication and understanding of the Manual's content, including both school and campus presentations, as well as Board facilitated budget allocation dialogue. The Team confirmed that the *2012 Budget Allocation Handbook* is readily accessible to employees on the District's website.

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. (Standard IV.A.5, IV.B.3.g.)

Findings and Evidence:

Through a review of documents and interviews, the Team noted the creation and implementation of a newly developed *2012 Decision-Making Resource Manual*. This manual was prepared in conjunction with the District's *2012 Integrated Planning Manual*. The Team confirmed inclusive and open feedback in the preparation of the manual. The Team reviewed evidence that documented the reflective and systematic revision of District decision-making practices. A calendar outlining the tasks and timelines for committees, groups, and individuals accountable for processes or actions within the District's decision-making structure is embodied in the *2012 Decision-Making Resource Manual*. Constituents and documents indicated strengthened clarity in the structures and functions of governance bodies in District planning, decision-making, and budgeting activities. The Team found that the Manual aligns District, college, and school governance and decision-making processes. Further evidence from written records and discussions with employees verified formal assessment practices for integrated District-level decision-making and planning within a three-year cycle. The Team verified that the *2012 Decision-Making Resource Manual* was distributed. An implementation strategy to ensure full District employee awareness of the information contained in the Manual had been developed and was being implemented.

District Recommendation 1, 2, and 3 Conclusion:

Based on the evidence, the Team concludes that the North Orange County Community College District has fully addressed the 2011 Comprehensive Team District Recommendations 1, 2, and 3. The Team validated evidence that the District devised and implemented collaborative and inclusive approaches to assess, clarify, and strengthen its District planning, decision-making, and budget allocation processes. The Team further found that the District had clearly articulated its planning, governance, and budgeting activities, processes, and structures through the creation of the *2012 Decision-Making Resource Manual*, *2012 Integrated Planning Manual*, and the *2012 Budget Allocation Handbook*. The Team noted the clear linkages between District planning and resource allocation. In addition, the Team found that the District incorporated assessment practices for its planning, decision-making, and budget allocation systems and documents. The Team confirmed clear constituent understanding of the District's planning, governance, and budgetary systems and practices. An implementation plan for strengthened communication of these structures exists and is being implemented.

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.)

Findings and Evidence:

The 2012 visiting team verified the Fullerton College Follow-Up Report assertion that the institution has developed and implemented an action plan in support of employee diversity. Interviews with members of the Fullerton Faculty Senate Student Equity Committee, Cadena Cultural Center Gay and Lesbian Association, Asian Pacific Islands Faculty and Staff Association, College Diversity Committee, and District Vice Chancellor for Human Resources found that the College *Campus Diversity Plan* was developed with broad constituent input and wide institutional acceptance.

A Team review of the Plan noted that it was both thorough and clear. The goals of the Plan include maintaining an environment where all individuals are treated with respect; providing opportunities for faculty, staff, and administrators to become knowledgeable regarding campus diversity; increasing community awareness of campus diversity; and attracting diverse applicants for positions at the institution. The Team verified that in addition to activities in support of the plan's goals, timelines, responsible parties, and implementation progress was evident.

Team analysis of the parties responsible for the plan's implementation also documented strong cross-campus commitment to its goals. The president, vice presidents, deans, directors, full-time and adjunct faculty, students, and classified staff all participate in the Plan's implementation. A

records review by the Team verified a high degree of Plan activity completion, with ongoing thought for future activities.

A Team interview with the Direct Vice Chancellor of Human Resources found support for system-level awareness of the Fullerton Campus Diversity Plan. As a result of the Plan, District employment materials inform applicants that the institution is a “Hispanic Serving” campus. A District Diversity Plan is anticipated to be completed in the 2012-2013 academic year in further support of the college plan.

Conclusion:

Based on its review of the evidence, the Team concludes that Fullerton College has fully met Recommendation 1. The institution has developed and implemented a campus diversity plan which is clear and ongoing. Campus constituents report satisfaction with the plan and its activities. District activities support the plan’s implementation and goals.

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.)

Findings and Evidence:

The Team held conversations with approximately 18 college employees pertaining to institutional progress in meeting Recommendation 2. Among those engaged in this discussion were the College President, Vice President of Instruction, Acting Vice President Student Services, Curriculum Chairperson, Deans, and Faculty SLO Coordinators. The Team also performed a records and document review of SLO and SLOA materials and committee minutes to validate Fullerton College’s progress in completing SLO and SLOAs.

Evidence indicates that the College has made substantial progress in the construction of course and program SLOs. The Team noted that approximately 90 percent of the College’s courses and approximately 50 percent of its programs had completed, written SLOs.

The Team further found, however, that although a majority of courses have SLOs written, only about 65 percent of sections offered have SLOs included in course syllabi, about 90 percent have assessments identified and 45 percent have actually been assessed with results reviewed and linked to curricular program or pedagogical modifications.

The Team confirmed evidence that college employees understand SLO assessment must occur at an increased pace. The College President and Vice President of Instruction uniformly reported that SLO and their assessments will be entirely completed by the close of fall 2012.

The Team found that Fullerton College is at the development stage of the ACCJC *Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness* for Student Learning Outcomes and is making progress toward proficiency.

Conclusion:

Based on its review of the evidence, the Team concludes that Fullerton has partially met Recommendation 2.

The Team found that Fullerton College has made substantial progress in creating its written course and programmatic SLOs and also noted that SLO assessment is ongoing and used for purposes of sustainable quality improvement. Full cycles of closed loop activity pertaining to SLOs and assessment needs to continue at an accelerated pace to ensure the proficiency level within the ACCJC *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness* for Student Learning Outcomes. The College would benefit from leveraging its existing momentum in the SLO writing in order to achieve proficiency status by fall 2012, and ensure that its SLO and assessment processes are firmly embedded in the College's academic culture and course and program practices.

The Team advises the College to observe all due haste and diligence in observing the ACCJC 2011 Reminder:

"The Commission expects that institutions meet Standards that require the identification and assessment of student learning outcomes and the use of assessment data to plan and implement improvements to educational quality, by fall 2012. The Commission reminds Fullerton College that it must be prepared to demonstrate that it meets these Standards by fall 2012 (I.B.1, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B.4, II.C.2, and III.A.1.c.)."

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, III.D.1, III.D.1.a, III.D.1.d.)

Findings and Evidence:

The Team conducted conversations with approximately 14 Fullerton College employees regarding institutional progress in meeting College Recommendation 3. Interviews included the

President, Vice President for Student Services, Vice President of Administrative Services, Vice President of Instruction, Program Review Committee chairperson, Faculty Senate President, Administrators, faculty, and classified staff serving on the institution's President Advisory Council, Planning and Budget Steering Committee, Program Review Committee, and Institutional Research Committee.

In addition, the Team also reviewed committee minutes, as well as review documents, in order to assess college progress in meeting the ACCJC *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness* for program review with a cycle of planning and resource allocation.

The Team confirmed evidence that the College had revised its program review system through reflective input and discussion with campus constituents. The Team also found that employees both understood and supported the revised process.

The Team assessment of Fullerton College revised program review process was found to be comprehensive and well executed by clear documentation, including a handbook, rubric, and feedback forms, as well as data sheets, to provide statistical background for decision-making.

The Team noted that the institution's revised program review process contains a very clear and systematic approach to identifying departmental resource needs to better inform budget decision-making and to evaluate needs within the common themes of college planning and renewal processes.

At the time of the Team visit, the Team observed that Fullerton College had completed a full cycle of its revised program review process. Additional cycles will need to be completed and their effectiveness formally assessed.

Conclusion:

Based on its review of the evidence, the Team concludes that Fullerton College has met Recommendation 3. The College revised its program review process and implemented a full cycle of the new process using a very comprehensive model. Employees report a clear understanding of the revised program review process. The process includes linkages to budgeting and has been used for the purpose of resource allocation. The College acknowledges that this program review process will require ongoing assessment as cycles continue to be implemented.

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 ACCJC *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. (Standard I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4.)

Findings and Evidence:

Individuals interviewed regarding the 2011 Team Recommendation 3 were also conferred with to validate College progress pertaining to overall institutional planning, budgeting, and assessment. In addition, the Team spoke with other campus employees and reviewed documents, including the Fullerton College strategic and technology plans, the *Institutional Effectiveness Report*, and Council and Committee minutes. The team also reviewed a document titled “*Fullerton College Planning Process*” provided to members the day of the site visit.

The Team found that the Fullerton College strategic plan was linked to District strategic directions. In addition, institutional planning links at the campus-level were identified in the areas of technology and facilities. The Team verified, however, that the Fullerton College program review was the primary revision made to the institution’s planning process since its 2011 comprehensive visit. Over the course of the 2010-2011 academic year, several committees (e.g., the Ad Hoc Program Review Committee, the Deans’ Council, the Faculty Senate, and Presidents Advisory Council [PAC]) discussed program review documents and proposed goals for the college’s 2011-2014 strategic plan. Ten goals were submitted to PAC and subsequently disseminated to constituent groups for review and consideration. The recommendations resulted in the adoption of three college goals by PAC. These are: 1) improve student learning and achievement; 2) reduce the Achievement Gap; and 3) strengthen connections with the community. Subsequent constituent discussions resulted in objectives for each goal. The team noted that at the start of the fall 2011 semester, PAC requested that constituent groups and program areas develop action plans to address the college’s strategic planning objectives.

Action plans were assessed by the institution’s Planning and Budget Steering Committee for monetary support through a \$100,000 fund to underwrite activities. At the time of the team visit, assessment of funded action plans had not been fully implemented. The Team did find, however, that activities funded in the area of student success had been evaluated, resulting in modifications in campus practice. The effectiveness of college action plans in meeting planning goals had not been uniformly implemented at the time of the Team visit. Documents indicate that the action plans will be assessed using indicators prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning.

While the program review process is a solid model which appears to be functioning effectively, it has become the key component for all college-wide planning. Although this aspect of integrated planning is necessary to inform budget decisions, other components of the planning system remain to be developed and implemented on a level consistent with the ACCJC *Rubric for Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness* for planning and program review. The institution’s component plans must be integrated into a comprehensive plan to achieve broad educational

purposes and improve institutional effectiveness. Community constituent input does not appear to be informing the planning process.

The Team noted that college-critical indicators and measures for assessing planning outcomes in documents, such as Fullerton College's *Institutional Effectiveness Report*, lack clarity, meaningful benchmarks, and connection to the institution's strategic goals. Discussions with staff further verified the lack of clear, consistent indicators and measures supporting the institutional planning process outside of program reviews.

Planning at the college unit level was reviewed by the Team. Evidence indicated that the action plans developed across institutional sub-units lack cohesiveness, coordination, and reflective analysis. Employee interviews identified continued vagueness or confusion pertaining to action plans.

Evidence indicates that a clear, concise, closed loop of planning activities, although scheduled, has not taken place. In spring 2011, Fullerton College established the Institutional Research Committee to evaluate college processes. Subsequently, a mechanism for the evaluation of planning, program review, and budgeting processes were developed. The Team found no evidence that the institution's planning process had been assessed at the time of the site visit.

The Team could not identify a public college planning outcomes document, with the exception of its *Institutional Effectiveness Report*. A widely disseminated and clearly written summary document describing the planning process and the institutional progress in addressing strategic goals is lacking. The President's Advisory Council attempts to integrate all aspects of communication and decision-making pertaining to planning through the college's various standing committees. Uniform, clear, broad planning communication to all constituents on the part of campus leadership could not be validated. Employee conversations confirmed a lack of comprehensive understanding related to the planning process and its effectiveness in meeting planning goals.

Despite the President's Advisory Council's inclusion of constituent leaders in the Fullerton College planning process and select workshops addressing college goals, the Team could not identify widespread collaborative inquiry in support of collegewide development of planning goal indicators, measures, and action plans. The Team further found that only marginal discussion had taken place pertaining to institutionwide outcomes, such as student success or community constituent needs.

The Team found evidence of institutional effort to evaluate its planning process. Documents indicate that the Institutional Research Committee has been charged with this task. The Team could not identify evidence that substantive progress in meeting this charge has occurred.

The Team identified improvement in the planning process since the 2011 Team visit; however, the institution has not yet achieved proficiency status within the ACCJC *Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness* for planning.

Conclusion:

Based on its review of the evidence, the Team concludes that Fullerton College has partially met Recommendation 4.

The Team acknowledges the work of Fullerton College in integrating program review into its institutional planning processes. However, gaps still exist in the college planning and resource allocation process which will not allow it to ensure sustainable continuous quality improvement, as contained in the ACCJC *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness* for planning and program review. The institution's planning system continues to be confusing, poorly understood, and not clearly linked to budget decisions.

The Team found that the measures and indicators employed for planning purposes remain unclear, poorly defined, and not clearly linked to institutional goals. The inquiry process used for planning is not systematic and an evaluation component for the college's planning process is largely undefined and at the preliminary stages of development.

Recommendation:

The Team recommends that Fullerton College address each of the five components of the 2011 Comprehensive Team's recommendations, through accelerated activity and judiciousness.

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.c, III.C.2.)

Findings and Evidence:

The Team conducted interviews with the College President, Vice President of Administrative Services, Director of Physical Plant/Facilities, Manager of Network Services and Software Development, Faculty Senate President, and Associated Students Vice President, and others, in order to assess the validity of Fullerton College's response to the previous Team's recommendation. Through staff discussions and document review, the Team validated that the total cost of ownership (TCO) had been incorporated into the campus multi-year planning and budgeting systems.

The Team observed that the Colleges former Safety Committee was modified to become a Facility and Safety Advisory Group (FSAG) with broader charge to advise the Campus Planning and Budget Steering committee regarding the total cost of ownership for facilities, technology infrastructure and equipment. Evidence verified that the mission and activities of the FSAG were developed through reflective collegial dialogue with employees and students.

The Team found supporting documentation for TCO review and analysis in the human resources, supplies and materials operational expenses and capital outlay projects at the campus. The Team

noted that a TCO rubric is now required summarizing immediate expenses and operational impacts for all facilities project proposals.

Conclusion:

Based on its review of the evidence, the Team concludes that Fullerton College has fully met Recommendation 5. The Team documented that Fullerton College has introduced the Total Cost of Ownership into its facilities, technology, and equipment planning processes.

Team interviews and records review confirm that the College's Planning and Budget Steering Committee assesses Facilities and Safety Advisory Group materials forwarded for consideration. This assessment includes template information on both project need and costs. Facilities proposals and their supporting evidence are assessed for alignment to college goals and consistency with the *North Orange County Community College District 2011 Comprehensive Master Plan*. The process has been successfully employed to plan and allocate college resources.