

DEC 08 2009

Follow-up Visit Report

SANTIAGO CANYON COLLEGE
8045 East Chapman Avenue
Orange CA 92689

**A Confidential Report Prepared for the
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior College (ACCJC)**

**This report represents the findings of the evaluation visit to the
Santa Ana Community College District Office on November 17, 2009.**

**Team Chair:
Dr. Robin Calote, President
Ventura College**

Introduction

A comprehensive visit was conducted at Santiago Canyon College in October 2008. In February 2009, the Commission acted to issue a Warning. Santiago Canyon College was directed to correct the deficiencies noted in Team Recommendations 3, 4, and 6 and Commission Recommendation 1, and to document these corrections in a Follow-Up Report by October 15, 2009. The college was told that this Report would be followed by a visit by Commission representatives.

This follow-up visit was conducted by Dr. Robin Calote on November 17, 2009. Dr. Calote met with representatives of the district and the college at the district office. The purpose of the visit was to seek evidence for the accuracy and relevance of the Follow-up Report and to provide information on issues that are of concern to the Commission.

Dr. Calote found that the college and district had prepared well for the visit by arranging for meetings with the individuals and groups identified by Dr. Calote and Dr. James Meznek (the chair of chairs), and by assembling appropriate documents for review. Over the course of the day, she met with the following individuals:

Lawrence Labrado, Vice President, Board of Trustees,
John Hanna, Member, Board of Trustees,
Mark McLoughlin, Member, Board of Trustees,
Lisa Woolery, Member, Board of Trustees,
Edward Hernandez, Chancellor,
Juan Vazquez, President,
Mary Halvorson, Vice President, Academic Affairs
John Hernandez, Vice President, Student Services,
John Weispfenning, Dean, Library, Business, Mathematics and Sciences
Alex Taber, Professor of Economics, Educational Master Plan Committee Chair

In addition, Erlinda Martinez, President of Santa Ana College, was present during the discussions relating to Recommendation 3, Recommendation 4, and Recommendation 6.

College and District Responses to the Team Recommendations

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, IIIB2d, IIID1, IIID2, IIID3, IVB3a, IVB3b)

Response to the Recommendation:

A task force was formed to evaluate the district planning processes. Five recommendations emerged as recommendations from this task force. One key recommendation was to revise the timelines associated with evaluation, planning and budgeting so that the board's annual establishment of goals would fall within a more logical sequence relative to the release of the Governor's proposed state budget. Additional recommendations included mapping all planning activities within the district to ensure systemic coordination, reinstating the portfolio planning model at the district level in order to mirror processes used at the college level, and expanding the budget allocation model to include dollars from both categorical and general fund sources.

Team Conclusion:

The district has fully addressed the recommendation. The planning process has been mapped and analyzed, and modifications have been made to the timeline and to the procedures to address the shortfalls identified. The two colleges and the district now use a more uniform portfolio model for planning, and systems have been modified to integrate technology, staffing and facilities plans.

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. (IIID1b, IIID2a, IIID2g)

Response to the Recommendation:

The district converted from a legacy administrative computer system (GLINK) to the Datatel Colleague attendance recording system during the summer of 2009. The Datatel system now allows the Rancho Santiago Community College District to accurately track repeatability to ensure accurate attendance reporting.

Team Conclusion:

The district has fully addressed the recommendation. The computer-based student attendance recording system has been replaced with another widely-accepted system that accurately reports attendance.

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)

Response to the Recommendation:

Sample board evaluation models were collected and used as the basis for developing a draft board evaluation survey. A workshop was conducted for the board that included a segment on the evaluation of trustees. After several modifications, the board approved a survey instrument that would evaluate not just how effectively board members interacted with each other, but also how effectively the board interacted with and met the needs of constituent groups. From this feedback, the board learned that constituent groups needed more information on the role and responsibilities of the board, that constituent groups perceived the members of the board to be following correct communications protocol, and that it would be helpful to establish a series of presentations at board meetings about the programs and accomplishments of the college departments.

Team Conclusion:

The district has fully addressed this recommendation. The district has reviewed its board evaluation policy and procedures, and as a result has modified the survey instrument and opened the evaluation process to constituent groups. The board has used the results of the evaluation to modify the way it conducts business.

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 I.A.1, I.A.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, II.A.1, II.A.2.f, III.B.2.d, III.D.1, III.D.2, III.D.3, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b)

Response to the Recommendation:

The college mapped its planning and budgeting processes into a series of diagrams to display the relationship between systems over a multi-year cycle. Gaps identified through this mapping exercise were used to modify the processes as summarized below:

- The college examined and revised its program review templates, incorporating facilities, technology and personnel considerations. The modified format now includes a requirement to identify and document measurable goals, along with an executive summary so that program review findings can be more widely disseminated throughout the collegial governance system.
- The role of the Educational Master Planning Committee was clarified, and the committee began to conform to its previously-established charge to synthesize annual programmatic requests into a prioritized master list of current needs for personnel, equipment, facilities, and supplies. This list is submitted as a recommendation to the College Council.
- The Educational Master Planning Committee revised its timeline to better align with the six-year accreditation cycle. Under this timeline, Departmental Planning Portfolios are updated annually, Program Reviews are conducted every three years, and the Educational Master Plan is revised every six years.

Team Conclusion:

The college has fully addressed the Commission recommendation. The planning process has been analyzed and modified. The improved model has been implemented. Program review, the educational master plan, and human resource, technology, fiscal, and facilities plans are now contained as integrated elements in the institutions planning and resource allocation model.

Summary Conclusion

The team found that Santiago Canyon College and the Rancho Santiago Community College District have fully addressed Recommendation 3 (Evaluate Planning Processes), Recommendation 4 (Computer-Based Student Attendance Recording System), Recommendation 6 (Board Evaluation Policy), and Commission Recommendation 1 (Integration of Program Review Into Resource Allocation Model).