

Santiago Canyon College

follow-up report

Submitted to Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

october 2009

FOLLOW-UP REPORT

To

ACCREDITING COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

Submitted: October 13, 2009

SANTIAGO CANYON COLLEGE
8045 East Chapman Avenue
Orange, CA 92689

This page left blank on purpose

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Statement on Report Preparation	5
Response to Team Recommendation 3	6
Response to Team Recommendation 4	9
Response to Team Recommendation 6	12
Response to Commission Recommendation 1	15
Statement of Review by the Board of Trustees Prior to Submission.....	20
Appendix A: Evidence List	21
Appendix B: Glossary of SCC Planning and Accreditation Terminology	24
Appendix C: Cycle of Planning and Accreditation	25
Appendix D: Annual Planning Processes	27
Appendix E: Year-at-a-Glance 2009-2010	29

This page left blank on purpose

Statement on Report Preparation

On Feb. 10, 2009, Chancellor Edward Hernandez, Jr. convened a meeting of the Rancho Santiago Community College District (RSCCD) Accreditation Steering Committee, comprised of key leaders from the district and Santa Ana and Santiago Canyon colleges, to plan the tasks of responding to the three common district recommendations for Santa Ana College (SAC) and Santiago Canyon College (SCC) (TR6.1—Steering Committee Minutes). Three task forces were created: The Planning and Budget Task Force, The Board Self-Evaluation Task Force, and the Attendance Recording System Task Force.

Santiago Canyon College President Juan Vázquez convened an additional group, the SCC Accreditation Task Force on Feb. 17, 2009, to respond to Commission Recommendation 1. The members of the SCC Task Force included faculty, classified staff, students, and administrators. The Task Force reviewed its charge, the evaluation report, and communications from ACCJC. The members mapped current planning and budgeting processes (RP1—SCC Accreditation Task Force Minutes). The resulting analysis was used to develop a set of recommendations that formed the basis for the response. Throughout the stages of analysis and development of recommendations, the Task Force communicated with the campus through a series of meetings with key councils, committees, bodies, and other groups (RP2—SCC Meeting Log). As part of the planned communication effort that will follow the submission of this document, the Task Force compiled a *Glossary of SCC Planning and Accreditation Terminology* (Appendix B) that also may be a helpful reference for the readers of this report.

Each task force reported to the District Accreditation Steering Committee and the Chancellor’s Cabinet through the respective chairs. Regular reports were made to the Board of Trustees by the Chancellor, the college presidents and the academic senate presidents of each college. The chair of the SAC Accreditation Committee kept in close contact with the chancellor and attended board meetings. The co-chair of the SCC Accreditation Task Force also attended board meetings and kept in contact with the chair of the SAC Accreditation Committee.

In the weeks prior to the submission of the response, this document was shared in draft form with the SCC community through a shared electronic file. Members of the Task Force met again with bodies of the collegial governance system and held open meetings with the larger campus community to discuss the recommendations contained herein. These meetings continued as the Board of Trustees considered and approved this Follow-Up Report, prior to the final submission to the Commission.

Juan A. Vázquez, President

Date

Response to Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letter

Recommendation 3: *The team recommends that the district evaluate its planning processes, including the integration of technology, staffing, and facilities master plans, to ensure the budget is used as a planning tool to achieve both district and college strategic goals. As part of this integration, the team recommends that the district resource allocation model be based on the plans, program reviews, and actual budgetary performance. This requires that the district evaluate the outcomes of its planning/budgetary process and use that data in subsequent budget development. (IA1, IA3, IB4, IB6, IIA1, IIA2f, IIIB2d, IIID1, IIID2, IIID3, IVB3a, IVB3b)*

Through a collaborative process involving faculty and staff from Santiago Canyon College, Santa Ana College, and the Rancho Santiago Community College District (RSCCD), the planning and evaluation processes have been reviewed, strengthened, and clarified. The mechanisms for broad communication of these activities have been improved. As such, the District and colleges have the processes in place to link budgeting and planning to meet Team Recommendation 3.

After the District officially transitioned from a single college to a multi-college organizational structure in 1997, a Budget Allocation and Planning Review (BAPR) Committee was developed as part of the District's participatory governance structure. This committee, comprised of faculty and staff from both colleges and the District office, was charged with eight specific tasks related to budgeting and planning (TR3.1—District and College Governance Participation Guidelines):

- Develops recommended district budget assumptions for board of trustee consideration (FTES, projected funding, etc.)
- Reviews District allocation model and makes annual adjustment recommendation(s)
- Reviews FTES goals allocation and generation and makes recommendation(s)
- Develops recommended annual District budget process calendar (colleges develop internal calendars which respond to the District calendar)
- Makes recommendations for funding
- Develops recommendations regarding annual/other master planning model (dates, etc.)
- Develops communication models for consideration to assist in developing linkages in planning to budget
- Develops data of outcomes of planning for Board of Trustee and Chancellor review developing annual vision and goal development

Since its inception, the BAPR Committee has primarily focused on the development and modification of the District's budget allocation model and minimal attention has been given to planning. In response to the team's recommendation, the Chancellor convened a meeting of college and District leadership to coordinate the response to the accreditation recommendations (TR3.2—Minutes, District Accreditation Steering Committee, Feb. 10, 2009). A Task Force was appointed to coordinate the response to the recommendation

on the district planning and budgeting process. The Task Force membership included: RSCCD Executive Vice Chancellor of Human Resources and Educational Services John Didion; RSCCD Vice Chancellor of Business Operations and Fiscal Services Peter Hardash; SCC Vice President of Administrative Services Steve Kawa; President of the SCC Academic Senate Morrie Barembaum; President of the SAC Academic Senate Ray Hicks; SAC accreditation chair Bonita Jaros; and RSCCD Director of Research Nga Pham.

The Task Force identified five activities to address this recommendation. It was the Task Force's recommendation that the BAPR Committee be the appropriate venue to review the results of these activities and make final recommendations to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees. The Task force reviewed the current District planning and budgeting process with the BAPR Committee and identified five areas for improvement.

- 1. Complete an inventory of all planning and evaluation materials currently in use throughout the District*

Although there were a number of planning and evaluation documents/processes being utilized at the District office and colleges, there was no complete inventory of these resources and various versions of the documents were in circulation. The RSCCD Research Department coordinated the identification and collection of these documents and produced a matrix, which was initially reviewed by the BAPR Committee on March 4, 2009. College and District office departments were asked to augment/revise the matrix and a final version of the matrix was approved by BAPR on March 25, 2009 (TR3.3—Inventory of Planning and Evaluation Documents).

- 2. Update the district's 2009-10 Planning Timeline and related activities*

The Task Force also reviewed the District's "Plan to Plan" schematic, which depicts the cycle of planning and evaluation activities district-wide. The schematic was revised to more clearly describe the activities at each step in the process and clarify the linkages between the planning activities and budget development/resource allocation (TR3.4).

The Task Force also reviewed the District's Planning Timeline and compared the key dates in the timeline to the various milestones that the colleges and District operations use each year in the budget development process. The committee noted that the current timeline called for the Board of Trustees to develop and/or review its vision and goals in the summer of each year. The committee determined that this activity was not sequenced properly with the annual budget development process, which typically begins in January with the release of the Governor's proposed state budget, and proceeds through the spring and summer concluding with the Board of Trustees' adoption of the District budget in September. In order for the colleges and District departments to integrate the Board Vision and Goals with the annual planning and budget process, the development and/or revision of the goals needed to move to the winter of each year. A revised Planning Timeline was approved by BAPR on May 13, 2009 and approved by the Board of Trustees on May 26, 2009 (TR3.5—Agenda, Board of Trustees, May 26, 2009).

The Board of Trustees' existing vision and goals were developed in 2007 and were not modified in 2008. The trustees recognized that given the serious financial crisis affecting the community college budget, some type of interim review of the vision and goals needed to occur prior to the completion of the 2009-10 district budget. The trustees held a special board meeting for July 13, 2009, to update their vision and goals. Based upon the new planning timeline, the Board will meet in February 2010 to develop its vision and goals for the 2010-12 period (TR3.6—Agenda, Board of Trustees, July 13, 2009). In addition to the work conducted by the Task Force and BAPR, the Board revised its self-evaluation process in response to another accreditation recommendation. During the course of reviewing and revising its policy on self-evaluation, the trustees also adopted a new board policy (TR6.16—Board Policy 9022.5) on May 11, 2009, which specifically addresses the process the Board will use to solicit input from the community and district constituent groups in its goal setting process (TR3.7—Agenda, Board of Trustees, May 11, 2009).

- 3. Supplement the Human Resources and Educational Services annual report to include material from the other areas of district operations*

During its review of the planning and evaluation documents, the Task Force and BAPR noted that both colleges and the District Human Resources and Educational Services division prepare annual reports to the Board of Trustees. In order to provide the Board with more comprehensive data on district-wide operations, the other two divisions in District operations (Public Affairs and Governmental Relations and Business Operations and Fiscal Services) will provide annual reports to the Board.

- 4. Renew the portfolio planning process for district operations*

The Task Force and BAPR noted that both colleges utilize a portfolio planning process. This process was also utilized briefly in the District office but the planning portfolios were not up to date. In order to improve the integration of planning and budgeting decisions in the District office, the portfolio planning process is being reinstated in these departments.

- 5. Expand the Budget Allocation Model to include restricted as well as unrestricted funds*

The District's budget allocation model determines how general fund dollars are allocated between the colleges and District operations. One of the weaknesses in the District's planning/budgeting process is the omission of restricted (categorical) funds from the allocation model. The use of these categorical funds generally requires more accountability, reporting, and evaluation than general fund dollars. In order to develop a more comprehensive resource allocation process and to effectively tie that process to planning and program outcomes, the District's resource allocation model must be expanded to include all funds received.

On July 13, 2009, the Board of Trustees conducted its annual planning retreat and reviewed the following data:

- 12 Measures of Success Report
- Service area population trends
- Feeder high school graduation rates
- Projected enrollment demand
- Changes in student demographics and participation rates
- Staffing demographics
- 2007-08 ARCC data for Santa Ana and Santiago Canyon Colleges
- Recommendations from both colleges and district operations regarding the 2007-09 vision and goals

Following the review of these materials, the Board reaffirmed its vision statement and developed nine goals for 2009-10 (TR3.8—Agenda and PowerPoint Presentation, July 13, 2009). Those goals were formally adopted at the July 27, 2009, meeting (TR3.9—Agenda and Minutes, July 27, 2009). The BAPR Committee met on July 29, 2009, and reviewed the Board’s vision and goals and developed budget assumptions for the 2009-10 adopted budget (TR3.10—Agenda and Materials, BAPR, July 29, 2009). These documents formed the basis for the development of the 2009-10 budget, adopted by the Board of Trustees on October 12, 2009. The BAPR Committee met on August 26, 2009, to continue its review of the budget allocation model and budget preparation process. In light of the severe funding reductions imposed by the state budget, a great deal of time has been dedicated to budget reduction district-wide. As a result, the Board of Trustees has dedicated a portion of each meeting to consider state and local budget information overall and review reduction alternatives proposed by the colleges and District operations (TR3.8—Agenda and Minutes, July 27, 2009, *Item 2.7*; TR3.11—Agenda and Minutes, Aug. 24, 2009, *Item 2.6*; TR3.12—Agenda and Minutes, Sept. 14, 2009; TR3.13—Agenda and Minutes, Sept. 28, 2009; and TR3.14—Agenda, Oct. 12, 2009). BAPR will also conduct a complete review of the Budget Allocation Model, Fall 2009.

Recommendation 4: *In order to maintain stable financial resources, the team recommends that the district review its computer-based student attendance recording system to ensure that repeated courses are being appropriately reported for state apportionment funding consistent with existing regulations. (IID1b, IID2a, IID2g)*

This response was prepared collegially under the aegis of the District Attendance Recording System Task Force with assistance from the SAC accreditation chair and the SCC accreditation chair. Task Force members included: RSCCD Vice Chancellor of Business Operations and Fiscal Services Peter Hardash; RSCCD Associate Vice Chancellor of Information Technology Services Sylvia LeTourneau; SAC Associate Dean of Admissions and Records Mark Liang; SCC Associate Dean of Admissions and Records Linda Miskovic; and SCC Project Manager for Datatel Sergio Rodriguez. The District Attendance Recording System Task Force met three times in the Spring 2009 semester to prepare this response (TR4.1—Minutes, March 3, 2009; TR4.2—Minutes,

April 1, 2009; TR4.3—Minutes, May 27, 2009). While limitations of the legacy administrative computer system previously required manual solutions to prevent submission of inappropriate attendance data for apportionment, the conversion to Datatel Colleague in Summer 2009 now allows RSCCD the ability to accurately track repeatability to ensure accurate attendance reporting consistent with existing regulations.

Rancho Santiago Community College District had been operating prior to July 2009 with a legacy administrative computer system (GLINK) that limited student records searches to a maximum of thirteen academic semesters and summer sessions due to limited memory capacity on the mainframe housing the system (TR4.4—Course Repeatability in GLINK). For example, students who registered in Spring 2009 were checked, during the registration process, for repeatability dating back to Fall 2004. Courses taken prior to Fall 2004 were not reviewed during the registration process. Following an audit finding in June 2005, RSCCD Information Technology Services created a course repetition report, the SR 2095, which compiled a list of students and repeated courses dating back to 1986 (TR4.5—Sample SR 2095). While archived student records prior to 1986 have been image scanned, they are not electronically searchable.

The SR 2095 manual special report searches were used regularly from 2005-2009 by the campus Admissions and Records offices to identify students who surpassed allowable repeats. Any identified FTES claimed in excess of repeatability standards were then removed from attendance accounting records for purposes of state apportionment. For a complete discussion of these procedures please see TR4.4—Course Repeatability in GLINK; while this document was developed at Santiago Canyon College, it details district-wide procedures.

The District's independent financial auditors have included in their annual financial audits from 2004-2008 a finding similar to the present ACCJC recommendation (TR4.6—Report on Audit of Financial Statements, June 30, 2008; TR4.7—Report on Audit of Financial Statements, June 30, 2007; TR4.8—Annual Financial Report and Single Audit Reports-Restated, June 30, 2006; TR4.9—Annual Financial Report and Single Audit Report, June 30, 2005 and 2004; TR4.10—Annual Financial Report and Single Audit Report, June 30, 2004 and 2003). The independent financial auditors annually test and review the manual procedures used to disallow claimed FTES for state apportionment. They have not found any material claiming of repeated course work. They were aware that the district was implementing a new administrative system that will provide additional credibility for claimed FTES for state apportionment.

The following is excerpted from the independent auditor's *Finding 08-2 Minimum Conditions – "Standards of Scholarship"* (TR4.6—Report on Audit of Financial Statements, June 30, 2008, p. 61):

- We noted the following when reviewing course repetition procedures:
- There should be a policy in effect on the limitations of remedial course work. No policy related to this was noted in the course catalog and schedule of classes.

- Per discussion with personnel, the District does not have a method to track students taking remedial courses.
- At Santa Ana College and Santiago Canyon College, it was noted that the system currently being used is limited to three years or nine semesters of data. The District has been doing a separate reconciliation of those students. Differences noted were insignificant to the total FTES.

Recommendation:

- The District should revise the catalog or schedule of classes to provide the policy on the limitations of remedial course work.
- The District should implement a procedure or method on the system to track students taking remedial courses to identify those that are close to exceeding or who have exceeded. A petition should be filed with admissions and records similar to those for substandard grade repetitions.
- The District is currently underway to implement a new system for their student information database.

The District response to the above finding included a statement that the course catalogs of both colleges have been revised to provide the guidelines for remedial course limitation (TR4.11—Course Catalog, 2009-2010, p. 22), as well as stating that the new Datatel system will provide an improved method of tracking students taking remedial courses.

RSCCD fully implemented the Datatel Colleague Student Module on July 1, 2009. Student records are electronically archived back to 1986 and are fully searchable. Records prior to 1986 have been image-scanned, but must be manually searched. The Datatel system has the ability to run a query to track students taking remedial courses to identify earlier those students who are close to exceeding the limitation on remedial course work (TR4.12—Datatel Student Course Repeatability Summary). While document TR4.12 was developed at Santiago Canyon College, it sets forth district-wide procedures. Datatel produces a repetition report to track students who are approaching repeatability limits (TR4.13—Course Section Repeat Report).

The state Chancellor's Office has made recent changes to Title 5 regulations *Course Repetition* and *Course Repetition to Alleviate Academic Work*. RSCCD and college practices remain well within the new, stricter maximum repetitions allowed by Title 5. For non-repeatable courses, both SAC and SCC require students to obtain (a) permission from a counselor prior to the second repetition of a course where two "Withdrawals" were received, or (b) permission from a dean prior to the second repetition to improve substandard grades (TR4.14—Course Repetition Request). Additionally, a draft updated Board Policy on Course Repetition is being prepared for submission for Board of Trustees' approval (TR4.15—BP Course Repetition). This board policy would also address extenuating or special circumstances, as well as setting forth repetition policies for activity and variable unit courses.

Given the implementation of the Datatel Colleague Student Module, RSCCD and the colleges are confident they will be able to accurately track repeatability to ensure attendance reporting consistent with current Title 5 regulations.

Recommendation 6: *The team recommends that the district review its board evaluation policy/regulation to ensure integrity and effectiveness, and that its assessment results are widely communicated and applied within a systematic culture of evidence and cycle of continuous improvement. (IVA5, IVB1g)*

This response was prepared collegially under the aegis of the District Board Self-Evaluation Task Force, a sub-group of the District Accreditation Steering Committee (TR6.1—Minutes, Feb. 10, 2009). The Board of Trustees reviewed and revised its policies on board evaluation and successfully completed an evaluation cycle in the period February-August 2009. As such, the District and colleges have the processes in place to satisfy the requirements of this recommendation, and the Board has demonstrated the capacity of the processes to lead to the desired outcomes.

On February 10, 2009, Chancellor Edward Hernandez, Jr. convened a meeting of the District Accreditation Steering Committee, comprised of key District and college leaders from SAC and SCC, to plan the tasks of responding to the three common District recommendations for Santa Ana College and Santiago Canyon College (TR6.1). The Board Self-Evaluation Task Force was one of three task forces created by the steering committee. The Board Self-Evaluation Task Force membership included: chair Edward Hernandez, Jr., RSCCD Chancellor; Juan Vázquez, SCC President; Erlinda J. Martinez, Ed.D., SAC President; Morrie Barembaum, President of the SCC Academic Senate; Ray Hicks, President of the SAC Academic Senate; and Bonita Jaros, Ph.D., Chair of the SAC Accreditation Committee and Coordinator of SAC Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment.

The first accreditation update to the Board of Trustees was at the February 23, 2009, meeting. In *Item 5.2 Accreditation*, the Board reviewed the material provided, including accreditation timelines, and the body discussed the process it would undertake to complete a board self-evaluation prior to the October 15, 2009, deadline established by the Commission (TR6.2—Minutes; TR6.3—Timelines). The Task Force on Board Self-Evaluation met on February 25, 2009, to review all Commission exigencies regarding Board Self-Evaluation, review the existing *Board Policy 9022: Evaluation of the Trustees*, analyze the standards of good practice regarding Board Self-Evaluation of other community colleges in the State of California, and make a recommendation to the Board that the President of ACCJC, Barbara Beno, be invited to conduct a workshop. On February 26, 2009, the District Accreditation Steering Committee was apprised of these issues and recommendations (TR6.4—Minutes).

The Task Force on Board Self-Evaluation met on March 4, 2009. Items for the Board meeting of March 9, 2009, included: a chart related to Board Self-Evaluation for each district in the state; a recommended revision to *BP9022: Evaluation of the Trustees*; a

recommendation to approve the workshop presentation of ACCJC President Barbara Beno for March 23, 2009; and a recommendation to create a survey. It was also determined that the Task Force would create a draft survey for the March 23, 2009, board meeting (TR6.6—Minutes). At the March 9, 2009, meeting of the Board of Trustees, *Item 4.1 Accreditation* provided the above information. *Item 4.2 Presentation by Dr. Barbara Beno* was approved. *Item 4.3 Evaluation of the Trustees* was an information item related to the Task Force recommendations of BP9022 (TR6.7—Minutes).

The District Accreditation Steering Committee met March 17, 2009, to review the status of all recommendations. The Chancellor reported that the Board approved the workshop of President Barbara Beno for March 23, 2009; BP9022 would be an action item at the following meeting; the task force would create a survey for board review; and a follow-up PowerPoint presentation would be created for the April 13, 2009, board meeting (TR6.8—Minutes).

At the March 23, 2009, board meeting, President of ACCJC, Barbara Beno, conducted a workshop *Accreditation and Trusteeship: What Every Board Should Know*. *Item 2.6 Informational Presentation on Accreditation* followed. *Item 6.3 BP9022—Evaluation of the Trustees* was postponed for further fact finding (TR6.9—Minutes).

The Board Policy Committee held a meeting on March 30, 2009, to review new or revised board policies. The amended *BP9022—Evaluation of the Trustees* was discussed for the first time at this committee. The amended policy was recommended to the Board for a first reading at the April 13, 2009 board meeting (TR6.10—Minutes).

At the April 13, 2009 board meeting, an informational presentation was conducted as a follow-up to President Barbara Beno's workshop on accreditation and trusteeship (*Item 2.6*) (TR6.11—PowerPoint, April 13, 2009). *BP9022—Evaluation of the Trustees* (*Item 6.2*) was also presented for a first reading (TR6.12—Minutes). At the April 27, 2009, board meeting, *BP9022—Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation* was approved (TR6.13—Minutes; TR6.14—BP9022). *BP9022.5—Board of Trustees Evaluation of District Goals* was presented for a first reading (TR6.13—Minutes). BP9022.5 was approved at the board meeting of May 11, 2009 (TR6.15—Minutes; DR6.16—BP9022.5).

At the May 26, 2009, board meeting, the Board approved the accreditation recommendation regarding revised planning/budget processes and timelines (*Item 3.4*). The Board also scheduled a special meeting for June 8, 2009, for the purpose of meeting accreditation timelines relating to the board's self-evaluation process (TR6.17—Minutes). The Task Force on Board Self-Evaluation met May 28, 2009, to create a recommendation regarding the board self-evaluation survey and timelines (TR6.18—Minutes). At the special board meeting of June 8, 2009, the Board Policy Committee was directed to recommend to the full board a self-evaluation instrument and process to be used for the board's self-evaluation at the regularly scheduled meeting of June 22, 2009 (TR6.19—Minutes).

At the June 22, 2009, board meeting, the Board Policy Committee recommended approval of the 2009 Board of Trustees Evaluation Survey and Process/Calendar to be used in Board Self-Evaluation (*Item 6.4 Board Self-Evaluation/Process*). It was approved with an amendment. The discussion of self-evaluation results was scheduled for the July 27, 2009, board meeting (TR6.20—Summary). After approval of the board self-evaluation survey on June 22, 2009, a letter was sent to designated persons in accordance with BP9022 (TR6.21—Letter; TR6.22—Board Self-Evaluation Survey; TR6.9—BP9022).

The July 13, 2009, special meeting of the Board was held as a Planning Retreat to review:

- Board vision and goals
- *12 Measures of Success*
- Student learning outcomes/core competencies
- Enrollment management
- Annual report to the board
- Other strategic initiatives

Board goals for 2009-10 were established. (TR6.23—Minutes; TR6.24—PowerPoint Presentation; TR6.25—RSCCD BOT Vision Statement 2009; TR6.26—Goals 2009-2010).

On July 16, 2009, the accreditation chairs of both Santa Ana College and Santiago Canyon College met to coordinate the district responses of the colleges' *Follow-Up Reports*. The Executive Vice Chancellor of RSCCD Human Resources and Educational Services and the Vice Chancellor of RSCCD Business Operations and Fiscal Services attended to discuss the responses to planning, budgeting, and attendance recording.

At the July 27, 2009, board meeting, the results of the 2009 Board Self-Evaluation was received and reviewed (*Item 6.7—Receive and Review the RSCCD Board of Trustees Evaluation Survey*, TR6.27—Minutes). Fifty-four surveys were sent out internally and externally; fourteen responses were received and tallied by the Research Office (TR6.28—RSCCD Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation Survey Results). After discussion of the quantitative findings as well as the written comments, the Board approved *Item 6.7*. The Board also determined that all the board members would fill out the survey and send it to the board secretary, who would then refer it to the District Research Office for compilation of results.

As the final step in the board self-evaluation process, at the August 24, 2009, board meeting, the results of the Board's response to the Board Self-Evaluation were received and discussed (TR6.29—BOT Summary/Minutes—*Item 6.4*; TR6.30—RSCCD Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation Survey Results—Board Members). In-depth, public discussion ensued, revealing clearly that the members of the Board feel they have benefited from the entire self-evaluation process and that the concept of continuous improvement is an explicit annual goal.

On September 8, 2009 the SCC and SAC accreditation chairs held a telephone consultation prior to board approval of the colleges' *Follow-Up Reports*. The Board of Trustees received the reports for review by September 24, 2009, for the first reading on September 28, 2009. At the meeting of September 28, 2009, as a result of months of collegial work, an additional item was included in the Board Self-Evaluation Processes: Item 6.9 "Continuous Improvement Process," which establishes a continuous improvement process that will focus on areas of improvement and establish the process leading up to setting the Board's goals and objectives for 2010 and beyond. The Board approved the *Follow-Up Report* of Santa Ana College and the *Follow-Up Report* of Santiago Canyon College on October 12, 2009 (TR6.31a—Minutes, Sept. 28, 2009—Items 2.6, 6.7, 6.8, 6.9 ; TR6.31b—Agenda, Oct. 12, 2009).

Commission Recommendation 1: *The Commission recommends that the college complete a meaningful analysis of its planning process to ensure that program reviews are of sufficient quality and currency to be used as the basis for decision making, and that results of program review, the educational master plan, and the human resource, technology, fiscal, and facilities plans are integrated into the institution's resource allocation model. (Standards IA1, IA3, IB4, IB6, IIA1, IIA2f, IIIB2b, IIID1, IIID2, IIID3, IVB3a, IVB3b)*

Santiago Canyon College President Juan Vázquez convened the SCC Accreditation Task Force on Feb. 17, 2009, to respond to Commission Recommendation 1. The SCC Task Force included faculty, classified staff, a student, and administrators, and met regularly from February 17-June 4, 2009 (CR1.1—SCC Meeting Log). Membership included: Vice President for Student Services John Hernandez (co-chair); Dean of Business, Mathematics and Sciences John Weispfenning (co-chair); Professor and chair of the Educational Master Planning Committee Alex Taber; Associate Professor and Academic Senator Randy Scott; Admissions and Records Graduation Specialist Leigh Ann Unger; Career Services Coordinator Dora Contreras-Bright; and Student Government Senator Asha Vaswani.

The SCC Accreditation Task Force analyzed college planning processes to ensure that program reviews form the basis for effective decision making and to understand how the program review and other plans can be integrated into the resource allocation model. This analysis began with documenting existing planning processes and then diagramming the individual processes and the linkages between the processes. From this mapping process, the Task Force developed a set of recommendations that have been presented and discussed widely in the collegial governance system (CR1.2—Minutes). Many of these recommendations have been implemented; others require final approval through the collegial governance system, and are expected to be operational before the end of the Fall 2009 semester. The recommendations fall into six areas, each of which will be discussed in the following sections:

1. Program Reviews
2. Educational Master Plan (EMP) and Educational Master Planning Committee

3. Department Planning Portfolios (DPPs)
4. College Council
5. College Planning and Budget Allocation Documents and Processes
6. Dissemination of Information to Campus Community

1. Program Reviews

As part of its review of planning processes, the Accreditation Task Force, in cooperation with the Educational Master Planning (EMP) Committee, examined the program review templates and processes to ensure they provided quality, current information that would support planning and allocation decisions. The program review templates were adopted in 2008 for Academic Program Reviews, and were revised in January 2009 for the Student Services Program Reviews (CR1.3—Academic and Student Services templates). The Educational Master Planning (EMP) Committee, which has responsibility for the program review process, carefully considered the best way to revise the template to include facilities, technology, and personnel. As revisions to the Academic Program Review template require two readings and approval by the Academic Senate, it was not possible to modify the template prior to the end of the Spring 2009 semester. However, for those departments that were undergoing program reviews in Spring 2009, the department chairs were provided with a detailed cover memorandum and checklist of resource materials (CR1.4—Guidelines for Program Reviews) from the EMP chair that provided thorough instructions on how to address the new elements or areas of emphasis expected by the EMP Committee. The memo also invited the department chairs to contact members of the EMP Committee, if they should have questions about the instructions or template itself.

In Spring 2009, the EMP Committee began meeting with department chairs to discuss their program reviews. These discussions, which will be ongoing, provide the Committee with an opportunity to seek clarification or amplification of items in the program review, and provide departments with feedback and an extended opportunity to discuss their missions and needs. The discussions also provide the Committee with the opportunity to ensure that the facilities, technology and personnel plans of the departments are included and adequately addressed. The Spring 2009 meetings took place on May 28 with the chairs of the Mathematics, Economics, and Library (CR1.5—Minutes, EMP Committee, May 28, 2009). Those instructional departments undergoing program reviews in Spring 2009 will be invited to meet with the EMP Committee during the Fall 2009 semester. Student Services program reviews are due December 2009, and those programs will be invited to meet subsequently with the EMP Committee.

Also in the Fall 2009 semester, the following revisions to the Academic Program Review template are being recommended for approval to the Academic Senate: (1) the addition of an Executive Summary that can be disseminated to the College Council so that program review findings are more widely known in the collegial governance system; and (2) the addition of a section that would require programs to set measureable goals for the next three year period based on the findings of the current program review; and (3) the clarification of Part III (Resources) to specify technology and staff support as areas to be

addressed, in the same way the current template has seven prompts concerning facilities and equipment. The addition of these elements will allow the EMP Committee to follow-up with departments in discussions of program reviews so that the EMP Committee and, ultimately, the College Council are better informed about the needs of each of the College's programs.

2. *Educational Master Plan*

In Spring 2009, the role of the Educational Master Planning (EMP) Committee was clarified through discussions with the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate directed the EMP Committee to align current practices to conform to the EMP Committee's charge, as described in the *Collegial Governance Handbook* (2007; CR1.6):

- Collect [DPP] Plans and manage their integration into the EMP of the college
- Synthesize annual requests into a prioritized master list of current needs for personnel, equipment, facilities, and supplies in order to make recommendations to the College Council
- Administer the Program review process
- Coordinate with the Accreditation and Curriculum Committees

To ensure that the responsibilities of the EMP Committee, and all committees, are met in the future, each governance committee is being directed to hold an orientation meeting early in the academic year for new members and to review annually the committee charge for all members.

The Educational Master Plan (EMP) is coordinated by the EMP Committee. The Board of Trustees of the Rancho Santiago Community College District approved the current Santiago Canyon College *Educational Master Plan 2007-2012* (CR1.7) in October 2007. Initial planning for the next Educational Master Plan is scheduled to begin in Spring 2011. The content of the EMP will be drawn from the annual Departmental Planning Portfolios (DPPs) and the completed Program Reviews following the discussions between the EMP Committee and the departments and programs. With the revised program review templates and the follow-up structured discussions with program leaders, the EMP Committee will ensure the next EMP includes facilities, technology, and personnel plans that are addressed consistently by the various programs of the college. The revised Academic Program Review template will include a section on measureable goals, and the EMP Committee has prepared a document that contains examples of measureable goals that programs can use as they develop goals for their annual DPPs (CR1.8—Examples of Measureable Goals). These two steps will ensure that programs consistently set goals that will improve EMP effectiveness. Additionally, the EMP Committee will provide programs with the current Board of Trustees' goals to promote alignment of district and college planning.

To synthesize a prioritized master list of current needs for personnel, equipment, facilities and supplies, the EMP Committee will compile information from the DPP database.

Departments will initiate the prioritization of needs into the following three categories (CR1.9—Educational Master Planning Committee DPP Modification Proposal):

- Critical (“the entire program will fail or cease to function if the need is not met”)
- Necessary (“important aspects of the program will fail or be compromised, but the program will still function”)
- Enhancement and Improvement (“funding of the need will enhance, grow, or improve the program but is not essential to its basic functioning”)

The EMP Committee has developed a revised timeline for planning that is centered on three- and six-year cycles that align with the six-year cycle of accreditation. The Accreditation Task Force has reviewed the revised timeline and recommends that the EMP Committee propose the following for approval by the College Council and Academic Senate in Fall 2009:

- The Departmental Planning Portfolios (DPPs): Review and update annually
- Program Reviews: Complete every three years
- The Educational Master Plan: Revise every six years

Because the current Educational Master Plan is in effect until 2012 and the next regular ACCJC site visit will be in Fall 2014, there will be a short period of adjustment to allow the alignment of the planning cycles with the accreditation cycle. The cycles will be fully aligned beginning in 2014. At that time, the linkages between planning, budgeting and accreditation will follow this pattern:

- The DPPs inform the Program Reviews (as do the most recent ACCJC Recommendations)
- Program Reviews inform the EMP
- The ACCJC Response to the Accreditation Progress Report, the DPPs and the EMP inform the subsequent Program Reviews
- The DPPs, EMP and Program Reviews inform the Accreditation Self-Study

Appendix C—Cycle of Planning and Accreditation presents a visual rendering of these connections.

3. *Department Planning Portfolios (DPP)*

The Departmental Planning Portfolio (DPP) is a planning and tracking database for use by the units of the college. Departments are encouraged to continue rigorous and open discussions as they develop and record their plans for the future. The Educational Master Planning (EMP) Committee revised the Departmental Planning Portfolio instructions during Summer 2009 to include specific prompts related to facilities, technology, and personnel (CR1.10—DPP Guidelines). Going forward, this will ensure the inclusion of these elements in the DPP and will align the DPP with the Academic Program Review template and the Educational Master Plan.

Next, the EMP Committee worked with the District Research Office to review and update the standardized data provided annually to departments and programs that is used as the basis for planning and decision making (CR1.11—Data List).

Finally, the EMP Committee developed a template for the annual evaluation of Departmental Planning Portfolio (DPP) goals (CR1.12—Evaluation of DPP Goals). The template was piloted in Spring 2009 and is a requirement for all programs beginning with the 2009-10 academic year. The EMP Committee will share the results of these annual evaluations with the College Council so that they may be used appropriately in discussions of budgeting and planning.

4. College Council

To carry out its responsibilities of making recommendations regarding planning and budget allocation, the College Council will receive, beginning in Fall 2009, from the Educational Master Planning (EMP) Committee, the following:

- Prioritized master list of current needs for personnel, equipment (including technology), facilities, and supplies
- Annual evaluations of Departmental Planning Portfolio (DPP) goals
- An Executive Summary of each program review

Having this information will allow the College Council a more comprehensive understanding of the challenges and successes faced by individual programs. In turn, this understanding will inform the budgeting process and most importantly will “close the loop” of planning, budgeting, action, and evaluation.

The Accreditation Task Force is recommending the addition of a member of the EMP Committee to the College Council to facilitate better communication between the two bodies. This recommendation will be presented to the College Council in Fall 2009, for acceptance and then forwarded for approval by the Academic Senate.

5. College Planning & Budget Allocation Documents & Processes

The Accreditation Task Force began its work on this response by gathering information on the planning and budgeting processes used at Santiago Canyon College. This information was then mapped into a series of diagrams to display the relationship between planning documents over a multi-year cycle (Appendix C—Cycle of Planning and Accreditation), the annual planning processes (Appendix D—Annual Planning Processes), and the annual planning calendar (Appendix E—Year at a Glance 2009-2010). Developing these diagrams allowed the Task Force to identify gaps in the planning and budgeting processes and served as the impetus for many of the recommendations in this document. In addition to the diagrams, the Task Force developed a glossary of terms and acronyms to assist those new to the SCC community or those from outside the community (such as accreditation team members) as they work

to quickly understand budgeting and planning at SCC (Appendix B—Glossary of SCC Planning and Accreditation Terminology). The development of these diagrams and documents will provide important guidance to all members of the SCC community, and will help to orient future new members of the community to the college’s planning processes and expectations.

One of the gaps that appeared in the existing planning processes concerned the annual planning timeline. While the planning for subsequent fiscal years begins in March, until now there has been no evaluation of the previous year’s budgeting in the preceding months. The Accreditation Task Force is recommending that Departments review and update their evaluation of DPP expenditures and activities prior to submitting their budget requests in March. Both the evaluations and budget requests will be reviewed by the College Council to ensure there is alignment between allocation, performance and future allocations. This will first occur in March 2010 in preparation for the 2010-2011 budget. This will also, importantly, align with the changes to the District’s budget preparation timeline described previously in Recommendation 3.

6. Dissemination of Information to Campus Community

The Accreditation Task Force met with the following committees and groups during the Spring and Fall 2009 semesters: Academic Senate, Associated Student Government Council, Associated Student Government Town Hall, College Council, Curriculum and Instruction Council, Instructional Deans, Educational Master Planning Committee, Joint Chairs, and the President’s Classified Advisory Group (the Classified Hawks) (CR1.1—SCC Meeting Log). In addition, an open meeting was held during FLEX week on Thursday, August 27, 2009, to update the campus community to the work being done on this accreditation response (CR1.13—SCC Faculty Development/Flex Week). Similarly, in the months prior to submission, a draft of this document was made available using shared electronic files on a college server. These meetings were held and documents were shared so that the campus community would (1) be informed of the processes and recommendations being developed; and (2) be able to contribute ideas and feedback that could be incorporated in the response.

The combination of modeling a collegial process to develop the present response, the addition of planned committee orientations, and the enhancement of information flow within the governance system will allow the Santiago Canyon College collegial governance system to operate more effectively.

Review by the Board of Trustees prior to Submission

Following the preparation of this document, it was submitted on September 14, 2009, to the Board of Trustees for consideration and approval. A first reading of the motion to approve the document occurred at the Board meeting on Sept. 28, 2009, with a second reading and approval on Oct. 12, 2009 (TR3.14 Agenda, Board of Trustees, Oct. 12, 2009).

APPENDIX A Evidence List

Statement on Report Preparation

- RP1 SCC Accreditation Task Force Minutes (Feb. 17, Feb. 26, March 5, March 12, March 19, March 26, April 16, April 23, April 30, May 7, May 14, May 28, June 4, all 2009)
- RP2 SCC Meeting Log

Team Recommendation 3

- TR3.1 District and College Governance Participation Guidelines
- TR3.2 Minutes, District Accreditation Steering Committee Minutes, February 10, 2009
- TR3.3 Inventory of Planning and Evaluation Documents
- TR3.4 Plan to Plan Schematic
- TR3.5 Agenda, Board of Trustees, May 26, 2009
- TR3.6 Agenda, Board of Trustees, July 13, 2009
- TR3.7 Agenda, Board of Trustees, May 11, 2009
- TR3.8 Agenda and PowerPoint Presentation, Board of Trustees, July 13, 2009
- TR3.9 Agenda, Board of Trustees, July 27, 2009
- TR3.10 Agenda and Materials, Budget Allocation and Planning Review Committee, July 29, 2009
- TR3.11 Agenda and Minutes, Board of Trustees, August 24, 2009
- TR3.12 Agenda and Minutes, Board of Trustees, September 14, 2009
- TR3.13 Agenda and Minutes, Board of Trustees, September 28, 2009 (Minutes forthcoming)
- TR3.14 Agenda, Board of Trustees, October 12, 2009

Team Recommendation 4

- TR4.1 Minutes, Repeatability Task Force, March 3, 2009
- TR4.2 Minutes, Repeatability Task Force, April 1, 2009
- TR4.3 Minutes, Repeatability Task Force, May 27, 2009
- TR4.4 Course Repeatability in GLINK (Legacy System)
- TR4.5 Sample SR 2095
- TR4.6 Report on Audit of Financial Statements, June 30, 2008
- TR4.7 Report on Audit of Financial Statements, June 30, 2007
- TR4.8 Annual Financial Report and Single Audit Reports-Restated, June 30, 2006
- TR4.9 Annual Financial Report and Single Audit Report, June 30, 2005 and 2004
- TR4.10 Annual Financial Report and Single Audit Report, June 30, 2004 and 2003
- TR4.11 Course Catalog, 2009-2010
- TR4.12 Datatel Student Course Repeatability Summary
- TR4.13 Course Section Repeat Report
- TR4.14 Course Repetition Request
- TR4.15 BP Course Repetition

Team Recommendation 6

- TR6.1 Minutes, District Accreditation Steering Committee Minutes, February 10, 2009
- TR6.2 BOT Summary, February 23, 2009
- TR6.3 Timeline for Accreditation Report/Visit
- TR6.4 District Taskforce on Board Self-Evaluation Minutes, February 25, 2009
- TR6.6 District Taskforce on Board Self-Evaluation Minutes, March 4, 2009
- TR6.7a BOT Agenda, March 9, 2009
- TR6.7b BOT Minutes, March 9, 2009
- TR6.8 District Accreditation Steering Committee Minutes, March 17, 2009
- TR6.9 BOT Minutes, March 23, 2009
- TR6.10 Board of Trustees Policy Committee Meeting Minutes, March 30, 2009
- TR6.11 BOT Accreditation PowerPoint Presentation, April 13, 2009
- TR6.12 BOT Minutes, April 13, 2009
- TR6.12a BOT Summary, April 13, 2009
- TR6.13 BOT Minutes, April 13, 2009
- TR6.13a BOT Summary, April 27, 2009
- TR6.14 BP9022
- TR6.15 BOT Minutes, May 11, 2009
- TR6.15a BOT Summary, May 11, 2009
- TR6.16 BP9022.5
- TR6.16a Email re BP9022.5
- TR6.16b Request for Approval BP9022.5
- TR6.17 BOT Minutes, May 26, 2009
- TR6.17a BOT Summary, May 26, 2009
- TR6.18 District Taskforce on Board Self-Evaluation Minutes, May 28, 2009
- TR6.19 BOT Special Meeting Minutes, June 8, 2009
- TR6.20 BOT Meeting Minutes, June 22, 2009
- TR6.20a BOT Meeting Summary, June 22, 2009
- TR6.21 Board of Trustees Evaluation Survey Letter
- TR6.22 Board Self-Evaluation Survey Form
- TR6.23 Special Board Meeting Planning Retreat Agenda, July 13, 2009
- TR6.23a BP Docket Cover Sheet, July 13, 2009
- TR6.23b BOT Summary, July 13, 2009
- TR6.23c BOT Meeting Minutes, July 13, 2009
- TR6.24 BOT Planning Retreat PowerPoint Presentation
- TR6.25 RSCCD BOT Vision Statement 2009
- TR6.26 BOT Goals 2009-2010
- TR6.27 BOT Minutes, July 27, 2009 (Item 6.7— Receive and Review RSCCD BOT Self Evaluation Survey)
- TR6.28 RSCCD Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation Survey Results (Internal & External Respondents)
- TR6.29 BOT Summary/ Minutes, August 24, 2009 (Item 6.4)
- TR6.30 RSCCD Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation Survey Results (Board Members)
- TR6.31a BOT Minutes, September 28, 2009 (forthcoming)

TR6.31b BOT Agenda, October 12, 2009

Commission Recommendation 1

- CR1.1 SCC Meeting Log
- CR1.2 Minutes, SCC Accreditation Task Force (Feb. 17, Feb. 26, March 5, March 12, March 19, March 26, April 16, April 23, April 30, May 7, May 14, May 28, June 4, all 2009)
- CR1.3 Academic and Student Services Program Review templates
- CR1.4 Guidelines for Program Reviews
- CR1.5 Minutes, EMP Committee, May 28, 2009
- CR1.6 Collegial Governance Handbook
- CR1.7 SCC Educational Master Plan, 2007-2012
- CR1.8 Examples of Measureable Goals
- CR1.9 Educational Master Planning Committee DPP Modification Proposal
- CR1.10 DPP Guidelines
- CR1.11 Data List
- CR1.12 Evaluation of DPP Goals
- CR1.13 SCC Faculty Development/Flex Week, Fall 2009

APPENDIX B
Glossary of SCC Planning and Accreditation Terminology

Acronyms

ACCJC	Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
ARCC	Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges: Report used to document the performance of the California Community Colleges.
BAPR	Budget Allocation and Planning Review: Committee charged with oversight of budget and planning for the district. Includes representatives of the District Office and both colleges.
DPP	Department Planning Portfolios: Database used to gather and update planning information, including vision, mission, goals, and needs.
EMP	Educational Master Plan: Document that includes departments' and programs' five-year plans, vision, mission, goal statements, and their current and future roles in the SCC instructional paradigm. The first Educational Master Plan covered the period 2001-2006, while the second covered the period 2007-2012. To align planning processes with the six-year accreditation cycle, the third EMP will cover the period 2012-2016, while the fourth EMP will cover the full six-year period 2016-2022.
EMPC	Educational Master Planning Committee: Group charged with oversight of the development of the SCC Educational Master Plan, Program Reviews, and the annual Department Planning Portfolios.
FTES	Full-Time Equivalent Student
RSCCD	Rancho Santiago Community College District
SAC	Santa Ana College
SCC	Santiago Canyon College
SLO	Student Learning Outcome: General student <i>achievement goals</i> that describe <i>what a student should learn to do</i> outside of the class as a result of learning experiences that take place within a class.

APPENDIX C

Cycle of Planning and Accreditation

See Appendix C – separate file

Acronyms used in Appendix C

- DPP** Department Planning Portfolios: Database used to gather and update planning information, including vision, mission, goals, and needs.
- EMP** Educational Master Plan: Document that includes departments' and programs' five-year plans, vision, mission, goal statements, and their current and future roles in the SCC instructional paradigm. The first Educational Master Plan covered the period 2001-2006, while the second covered the period 2007-2012. To align planning processes with the six-year accreditation cycle, the third EMP will cover the period 2012-2016, while the fourth EMP will cover the full six-year period 2016-2022.

This page left blank on purpose

APPENDIX D
Annual Planning Processes

See Appendix D – separate file

Acronym used in Appendix D

DPP Department Planning Portfolios: Database used to gather and update planning information, including vision, mission, goals, and needs.

This page left blank on purpose

APPENDIX E
Year-at-a-Glance 2009-2010

See Appendix E – separate file

Acronyms used in Appendix E

DPP	Department Planning Portfolios: Database used to gather and update planning information, including vision, mission, goals, and needs.
EMP	Educational Master Plan: Document that includes departments' and programs' five-year plans, vision, mission, goal statements, and their current and future roles in the SCC instructional paradigm. The first Educational Master Plan covered the period 2001-2006, while the second covered the period 2007-2012. To align planning processes with the six-year accreditation cycle, the third EMP will cover the period 2012-2016, while the fourth EMP will cover the full six-year period 2016-2022.
SLO	Student Learning Outcome: General student <i>achievement goals</i> that describe <i>what a student should learn to do</i> outside of the class as a result of learning experiences that take place within a class.

RSCCD BOARD OF TRUSTEES

R. David Chapel, Ed.D., President

Lawrence R. "Larry" Labrado, Vice President

Brian E. Conley, Clerk

John R. Hanna

Mark McLoughlin

Lisa Woolery, APR, M.A.

Phillip E. Yarbrough

Gloria Holguin, Student Trustee

CHANCELLOR

Edward Hernandez, Jr., Ed.D.

SANTIAGO CANYON COLLEGE PRESIDENT

Juan Vázquez



Santiago Canyon College
8045 East Chapman Avenue
Orange, CA 92869
www.sccollege.edu
714-628-4900