

Santiago Canyon College

follow-up report

Submitted to Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

october 2010

FOLLOW-UP REPORT

To

ACCREDITING COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

Submitted: October 2010

SANTIAGO CANYON COLLEGE
8045 East Chapman Avenue
Orange, CA 92689

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	4
Statement on Report Preparation	5
Response to District Recommendation 3	6
Evaluation of the Planning Process	6
Integration of Planning and Budgeting – RSCCD	7
College-Wide Participation and Communication	9
Review Prior to Submission	10
Appendix: Evidence List	11

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Rancho Santiago Community College Board of Trustees

Lawrence R. “Larry” Labrado, President

Brian E. Conley, M.A., Vice President

Phillip E. Yarbrough, Clerk

R. David Chapel, Ed.D.

John R. Hanna

Mark McLoughlin, CPSM

Lisa Woolery, APR, M.A.

Nathan Selvidge, Student Trustee

Rancho Santiago Community College District

Raúl Rodríguez, Ph.D., Chancellor

John Didion, Executive Vice Chancellor, Human Resources/Educational Services

Peter Hardash, Vice Chancellor, Business Operations and Fiscal Services

Nga Pham, Director of Research

Libby Fuller, Assistant to the Chancellor

Santiago Canyon College

Juan A. Vázquez, President

Aracely Mora, Ed.D., Interim Vice President, Academic Affairs; Accreditation Liaison Officer

Steve Kawa, Vice President, Administrative Services

John Weispfenning, Ph.D., Dean of the Library and the Division of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences

Santa Ana College

Erlinda J. Martinez, Ed.D., President

Norman Fujimoto, Vice President, Academic Affairs

Paul Foster, Vice President, Fiscal/Administrative Services

Kennethia Vega, Assistant to the President

Bonita Nahoum Jaros, Ph.D., Chair, Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment
Coordinator/Accreditation Chair; Accreditation Liaison Officer

Cover Design: Eric Harsen

Printing: RSCCD Publications Department

Statement on Report Preparation

Following receipt of the commission's action in January 2010, the Rancho Santiago Community College District (RSCCD) formed an Oversight Committee to develop a plan of action and timeline to help coordinate the Santiago Canyon College (SCC) response to the commission's recommendation with the Santa Ana College (SAC) response to its recommendation (DR 3.1 – Timelines). The Oversight Committee was comprised of individuals who were directly involved in the development of the October 2009 Follow-Up Report: 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; SCC Academic Senate President Morrie Barembaum; SAC Academic Senate President John Zarske; SAC accreditation chairperson Bonita Jaros; and RSCCD Director of Research Nga Pham. The Oversight Committee reported its progress and activities to the district Budget Allocation and Planning Review (BAPR) Committee as well as the District Council, which is the Chancellor's forum for participatory governance discussion and action (DR 3.2-3.11 – Oversight Committee Minutes).

The Oversight Committee first met in February and developed its initial action plan and timeline to respond to the October 15, 2010, deadline (DR 3.1 – Timelines). It was apparent to the Oversight Committee that the continuing state budget crisis would delay the District's adoption of a 2010-11 district budget until late September or perhaps even October. This would probably not allow the District to complete 2010-11 budget plans prior to the submission deadline. Consequently, the Oversight Committee structured its action plan and timeline to focus on the development and approval of the District's tentative budget that was scheduled to be presented and approved by the Board of Trustees on June 21, 2010 (DR 3.12 – Board of Trustees Minutes 06-21-10). The Oversight Committee presented its work plan and timeline to the BAPR Committee (DR 3.13 – BAPR Minutes 02-24-10), college presidents, Chancellor, and to the Board of Trustees through the Chancellor's oral report (DR 3.14 – Board of Trustees Minutes 02-22-10).

In the weeks prior to the submission of the response, this document was shared in draft form with the SCC community at meetings with bodies of the collegial governance system and through a shared electronic file. These opportunities to review and discuss the response 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
Santiago Canyon College

Response to District Recommendation 3

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/budget process and use that data in subsequent budget development. (IA1, IA3, IB4, IB6, IIA1, IIA2f, IIB2d, IIID1, IIID2, IIID3, IVB3a, IVB3b)*

Evaluation of the Planning Process

In February, with the intent of linking planning with budgeting, the Board of Trustees held its annual planning retreat (DR 3.15 – Board of Trustees Minutes 02-01-10). This annual retreat was advanced from the summer to February in order for trustees to develop/reaffirm their annual vision and goals prior to the development of the District’s tentative budget for the 2010-11 fiscal year (DR 3.16 – Board of Trustees Vision and Goals 2010-2011). At that retreat, trustees reviewed the Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) data for both colleges; the internal district report, *The 12 Measures of Success*; current budgetary performance; the budget allocation model; and related processes for the development of the 2010-11 budget (DR 3.17 – ARCC Report Santa Ana College; DR 3.18 – ARCC Report Santiago Canyon College; DR 3.19 – 12 Measures of Success; DR 3.20 – RSCCD Budget Allocation Model; and DR 3.21 – RSCCD Budget Timelines).

Simultaneous to this effort, district planning and evaluation processes were reviewed by the Oversight Committee and the Budget Allocation and Planning Review Committee (BAPR) and, as a result, these processes were strengthened and clarified. This collaborative effort involved faculty and staff from both colleges as well as district operations with attention given to alignment with the colleges’ educational master plans.

In April 2010, a Strategic Technology Plan was presented to the BAPR Committee and then forwarded to District Council and the District Chancellor (DR 3.22 – RSCCD Strategic Technology Plan 2010-2011). The Board of Trustees approved the plan on April 26, 2010 (DR 3.23 – Board of Trustees Minutes 04-26-10). Annual updates to this plan will be developed and presented to the BAPR Committee prior to the development of the tentative budget for the upcoming fiscal year.

In the fall of 2010, the District Human Resources Committee met to review data associated with the composition of the staff, vacancies, proposed reorganizations and other staffing issues related to the financial crisis. Recommendations will be submitted to the BAPR Committee (DR 3.24 – RSCCD District Human Resources Committee 09-22-10 Meeting Agenda).

In the spring of 2010, HMC Architects, Inc., was contracted to assist the colleges in updating their Facilities Master Plans. These revised plans are expected to reflect current educational master plans as well as department portfolio reviews. The District Facility Planning Committee will meet in the fall of 2010 to review these plans and also to identify other district-wide facility

plans that require the attention of the BAPR Committee for inclusion in the 2011-2012 tentative budget (DR 3.25 – Oversight Committee Minutes 07-28-10).

At the college level, Santiago Canyon College practices integrated planning with a goal of continuous improvement. These practices were reviewed and refined through the mechanism of SCC's October 2009 Follow-Up Report. Planning efforts and budget development are integrated through the structure of the collegial governance system, which has the College Council as the central governance body in planning and information flow (DR 3.26 – SCC Annual Planning Processes). The College Council is tasked with annually reviewing the mission of the college and ensuring a link between college planning and resource allocation, as well as overseeing the planning and allocation processes for the Educational Master Plan (DR 3.27 – Collegial Governance Handbook, p. 6). All budget decisions not subject to emergency decision-making must demonstrate linkages to the Department Planning Portfolio (DPP) and program review documents. At each of its meetings, the College Council reviews the college's current budget performance and receives reports on completed program reviews from the Educational Master Planning Committee (DR 3.28 – SCC College Council Minutes 04-27-10). The six-year Educational Master Plan draws upon the annual three-year program review process and the annually updated Department Planning Portfolios (DR 3.29 – SCC Cycle of Planning and Accreditation).

Integration of Planning and Budgeting - RSCCD

In April 2010, the Oversight Committee made the following recommendations to link planning with budgeting:

1. The major district planning organizations will report regularly to the BAPR Committee. These organizations include the Technology Advisory Group, the Human Resources Committee, and the Facilities Committee (DR 3.30 – District and College Participatory Governance Planning and Budget Process Chart). Any process revisions were also reflected in the updated District and College Participatory Governance Guidelines (DR 3.31 – District and College Participatory Governance Guidelines).
2. Accreditation will be a regular agenda item for BAPR Committee meetings to ensure that planning and budgeting issues are regularly discussed (DR 3.13 – BAPR Minutes 02-24-10).
3. The BAPR Committee will annually review budget performance of the colleges and district operations for the recently concluded year and identify problems and issues that need to be addressed. In July 2010, BAPR conducted an initial review of the concept that a cost center would be allowed to carry over any discretionary funds saved the previous year. Similarly, if a cost center overran its discretionary budget, the deficit would be deducted from its budget the following year (DR 3.32 – BAPR Committee Meeting Minutes 07-28-10). This initial review resulted in two action steps. Cost center representatives were asked to share the concept of carryover of savings and deficits to the following year with constituent groups (DR 3.33 – SCC College Council Meeting Minutes 8-24-10). The second initiative was to have the BAPR Workgroup look at what problems might result from implementing the concept and identify how those problems could be avoided or resolved.

If the concept of savings carryover is implemented, this will allow cost center representatives to determine if they want to develop plans to reduce expenditures in a current year in order to have additional funds the following year. Long term financial planning could then be more synchronized with the long-term Educational Master Plan. For example, SCC could decide to reduce supply and contract expenses in 2010-2011, in order to have a savings carryover for 2011-2012 to purchase new computers in alignment with the SCC Technology Plan (DR 3.34 – SCC Technology Plan).

4. Problems and issues raised by the BAPR Committee will be assigned to the BAPR Workgroup, a standing committee of the BAPR Committee, which also has representatives from both colleges and district operations. The BAPR Workgroup evaluates the problems and issues and determines what changes, if any, need to be made to the budget allocation model or any district-wide budget processes. The BAPR Workgroup provides recommendations to the BAPR Committee that, if approved, are forwarded to the Chancellor (DR 3.35a-g – BAPR Workgroup March-July 2010).

In 2010, the BAPR Workgroup reviewed budget allocation models of other multi-college districts in the state. The intent was to identify concepts and/or processes used by other districts that might be used by RSCCD to improve the budget allocation model.

In summary, the BAPR Committee is where planning is integrated with budget resource allocation. All key planning components, the Board of Trustees Vision and Goals, the district Strategic Technology Plan, the Human Resources Plans and Facilities Master Plans, are reviewed and taken into consideration when funds are allocated utilizing the budget allocation model. In addition, BAPR Committee members are encouraged to identify where planning and budgeting do not appear to be in alignment. These situations would arise during program reviews, review of actual budget performance, and acknowledgement of success in meeting strategic goals whether at the district or the college.

The BAPR Committee is also responsible for providing feedback, negative or positive, that requires revisions to the budget process to planning groups, such as technology, human resources, facility planning as well as the colleges and district operations of those budget conditions.

It should be noted that while the RSCCD budget allocation model is relatively simple in its present form, there is a provision in the Budget Allocation Handbook that allows for adjustments in the form of budget assumptions (DR 3.20a-b – RSCCD Budget Allocation Model). For example, funds were set aside for the implementation of the Datatel student and financial information system (DR 3.36 – BAPR Committee Meeting Minutes 06-11-08). This was presented and approved by the BAPR Committee and recommended to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees with both approving the recommendation. There are several venues where budget issues such as the Datatel set-aside can be raised for consideration, such as college committees and/or district-wide committees. However, planning and budgeting information needs to be shared with all constituents so that any conflict between planning and budgeting can be raised by anyone including students, faculty, classified staff, and administration.

The alignment of the district 2010-2011 tentative budget with planning is also evident in the following ways:

- Implemented a 2% workload reduction for 2010-2011.
- Set aside a 5% reserve in the event of future budget reductions.
- Continued a hiring freeze and suspension of employee step and column increases.
- Significantly reduced the Older Adult programs offered by the Continuing Education Divisions at both colleges.

The 2010-2011 tentative budget is predicated on how we best preserve our efforts to fulfill the vision of the District as well as meet the strategic goals of the colleges.

There is evidence that internal college planning/budget processes function effectively at both colleges; nevertheless, the integration of the needs of all the entities of a multi-college district poses challenges. Evidence of college planning and budget processes functioning effectively includes SCC's responses to decreases in state funding during the current economic crisis. These responses included college-wide discussions of prioritizing classroom instruction and closing down an off-campus site (DR 3.37 – SCC College Council Meeting Minutes 05-27-09; DR 3.38 – President's Email 04-15-09).

The continuum of participatory governance structures has been reviewed and enhanced (DR 3.30 – District and College Participatory Governance Planning and Budget Process Chart). To insure that the needs of all entities are understood and duly considered within the context of the whole, analysis of the Budget Allocation Model is ongoing so that there is transparency and so that the needs of each entity do not compete with the Vision and Goals of the Board of Trustees for the whole district. Although this work is not complete, the colleges are satisfied with the progress that has been achieved in opening the decision-making processes to greater transparency and clarity. There is a commitment to continue this work which will provide needed flexibility to the colleges and ensure that the Vision and Goals of the Board are met.

College-Wide Participation and Communication

SCC involvement in the previously stated district committees and workgroups receives the support of the SCC College Council. College Council not only has representation from the Academic Senate, classified staff, student government and administration, but also has members who represent key governance committees such as technology, educational master plan and accreditation. College Council ultimately recommends to the college president how the college's budget resources are to be allocated taking into consideration the educational master plan and other college strategic plans.

It is the responsibility of the SCC members who serve on district-wide committees, workgroups and task forces to regularly report to College Council as well as to the constituents they represent, e.g., Academic Senate, the Management Council, and the classified staff organization. This keeps college organizations informed of the issues at which district-wide planning committees and the BAPR Committee are looking and provides opportunity for input. This is where the linkage of college planning and district-wide budget allocation takes place.

Representatives serving on College Council or on a district committee such as the BAPR Committee are expected to disseminate information so that any budget allocation decision that may have an adverse affect on an organizational plan can be identified early and appropriately addressed.

Review Prior to Submission

After the SCC College Council reviewed a draft of this response and suggestions were incorporated, the revised response was made available through a shared electronic file on the employee intranet for all faculty and staff to review and make comments. The Oversight Committee also reviewed and approved the response at its August 31, 2010, meeting (DR 3.11 - Oversight Committee Minutes 08-31-10). The response was then submitted to Board of Trustees for first reading at its September 13, 2010, meeting (DR 3.39 - Board of Trustees Summary 09-13-10) and received final approval by the Board of Trustees on September 27, 2010 (DR 3.40 – Board of Trustees Summary 09-27-10). A copy of the approved response is available at the college library and through the shared electronic file on the employee intranet.

APPENDIX - EVIDENCE LIST

DR 3.1	Timelines
DR 3.2	Oversight Committee Minutes 02-18-10
DR 3.3	Oversight Committee Minutes 03-15-10
DR 3.4	Oversight Committee Minutes 03-30-10
DR 3.5	Oversight Committee Minutes 04-23-10
DR 3.6	Oversight Committee Minutes 05-12-10
DR 3.7	Oversight Committee Minutes 05-26-10
DR 3.8	Oversight Committee Minutes 06-28-10
DR 3.9	Oversight Committee Minutes 07-28-10
DR 3.10	Oversight Committee Minutes 08-16-10
DR 3.11	Oversight Committee Minutes 08-31-10
DR 3.12	Board of Trustees Minutes 06-21-10
DR 3.13	BAPR Committee Meeting Minutes 02-24-10
DR 3.14	Board of Trustees Minutes 02-22-10
DR 3.15	Board of Trustees Minutes 02-01-10
DR 3.16	Board of Trustees Vision and Goals 2010-2011
DR 3.17	ARCC Report – Santa Ana College
DR 3.18	ARCC Report – Santiago Canyon College
DR 3.19	12 Measures of Success
DR 3.20a-b	RSCCD Budget Allocation Model
DR 3.21	RSCCD Budget Timelines
DR 3.22	RSCCD Strategic Technology Plan 2010-2011
DR 3.23	Board of Trustees Minutes 04-26-10
DR 3.24	RSCCD District Human Resources Committee – 09-22-10 Meeting Agenda
DR 3.25	RSCCD District Facility Planning Committee Information – Meeting Agenda
DR 3.26	SCC Annual Planning Process
DR 3.27	Collegial Governance Handbook
DR 3.28	SCC College Council Minutes 04-27-10
DR 3.29	SCC Cycle of Planning and Accreditation
DR 3.30	District and College Participatory Governance Planning and Budget Process Chart
DR 3.31	District and College Participatory Governance Guidelines
DR 3.32	BAPR Committee Meeting Minutes 07-28-10
DR 3.33	SCC College Council Meeting Minutes 08-24-10
DR 3.34	SCC Technology Plan
DR 3.35a-g	BAPR Workgroup Committee Meeting Minutes
DR 3.36	BAPR Committee Meeting Minutes 06-11-08
DR 3.37	SCC College Council Minutes 05-27-09
DR 3.38	President’s Email 04-15-09
DR 3.39	Board of Trustees Summary 9-13-10
DR 3.40	Board of Trustees Summary 9-27-10

RANCHO SANTIAGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Lawrence R. "Larry" Labrado, President

Brian E. Conley, M.A., Vice President

Phillip E. Yarbrough, Clerk

R. David Chapel, Ed.D

John R. Hanna

Mark McLoughlin

Lisa Woolery, APR, M.A.

Nathan Selvidge, Student Trustee

CHANCELLOR

Raúl Rodríguez, Ph.D.

SANTIAGO CANYON COLLEGE PRESIDENT

Juan A. Vázquez



Santiago Canyon College

8045 East Chapman Avenue

Orange, CA 92869

www.sccollege.edu

714-628-4900