

EVALUATION REPORT

Fullerton College
321 East Chapman Avenue
Fullerton, California 92832

A confidential report prepared for the
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team
that visited Fullerton College from March 14-17, 2011
James M. Meznek, Ph.D., Chair

Fullerton College
Comprehensive Evaluation Visit Team Roster
Monday, March 14 through Thursday, March 17, 2011

Dr. James Meznik (Chair)
Chancellor
Ventura County Community College District

Dr. Cathy Hasson
Director of Institutional Research & Planning
San Diego Community College District

Dr. Victoria Hindes
Vice President, Student Support Services
West Valley College

Dr. Haragewen Kinde
Dean-Math, Business, Computer Technology
San Bernardino Valley College

Dr. Jeffrey Lamb
Dean, Academic Success/Learning Resources
Solano Community College

Dr. Gaither Loewenstein
President
Modesto Junior College

Ms. Nancy Silva
Professor Theatre Arts
American River College

Dr. Robert Stinson
Instructor
Barstow Community College

Dr. Thea Trimble
Professor Science
College of the Sequoias

Ms. Deborah Wallace
Vice President Administrative Services
Antelope Valley Community College

Ms. Melissa Wong
Former Library Director, Consultant and University Adjunct Professor
Marymount College, Retired

Ms. Clare Geisen (Team Assistant)
Director, Administrative Relations
Ventura County Community College District

Ms. Patti Blair (Team Assistant)
Executive Assistant to the Chancellor
Ventura County Community College District

INSTITUTION: Fullerton College
DATE OF VISIT: March 14-17, 2011
TEAM CHAIR: James M. Meznek, Ph.D., Chancellor
Ventura County Community College District

Summary

An 11-member Accreditation Team with two Team assistants visited Fullerton College (College) from March 14-17, 2011, for the purpose of evaluating the institution's request to reaffirm Accreditation. In preparation for the visit, the Team chair attended a full-day chair training workshop on November 23, 2010, and the chair and Team members participated in a Team training workshop on February 3, 2011, conducted by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (WASC, ACCJC). Members of the Team reviewed the Commission's Handbook for Evaluators, the Accreditation Reference Handbook, the Team Evaluator Manual, and the Distance Learning Manual. Team members carefully read the College's self study and found it to be comprehensive. The College's 2008 mid-term audit, fiscal, and federal student aid eligibility reports were reviewed as part of the Team visit.

The Team chair and assistant conducted pre-visit meetings with the College president and District chancellor on January 21, 2011, to clarify expectations of the Team and to assure that all logistical arrangements for the visit were in good order. Preliminary logistics related to future District team meetings were also established with each chair and assistant.

Several weeks prior to the Team visit, each member prepared a written report of their assessment of the entire self study and the specific Accreditation Standard to which they had been assigned. Team members also identified those persons with whom they wished to confer while on campus, and this information was shared with the College. On March 14, 2011, the Team met to review the self study and share observations regarding the conclusiveness of its propositions and evidence.

During the site visit, Team members held over 40 individual or group meetings with District Board of Trustees members, College employees, students, and community representatives. Three well-attended open meetings were also provided for those wishing to speak to Team members. The Team reviewed documents supporting the self study report as well as Board policies and regulations, official records, Board and committee minutes, and online information. The Team also visited a wide variety of academic and student support facilities and observed classroom and online instruction. Classroom facilities were also reviewed at the Anaheim campus where occasional instruction takes place. One Fullerton College Team member and one Cypress College Team member visited the District's School of Continuing Education facility and attended committee meetings taking place on campus during the visit. The Team coordinated its observations and findings on District wide matters with the Team concurrently visiting Cypress College and prepared joint District recommendations.

The Team believed the College self study report to be complete, with 2005 evaluation recommendations, eligibility requirements, and current Commission Standards addressed in its narrative. With respect to the report's content, the Team assessed the depth of its documentation as wanting. Generally speaking, the self study lacked evidentiary support related to the institution's level of compliance with Commission Standards. This limitation resulted in the expenditure of atypical effort by the Team related to the identification and collection of data and documentation from which the self study could be validated and conclusions developed.

Of great interest to the Team was the status of the College in meeting the 2012 student learning outcomes (SLOs) deadline as described in its self study. This interest became a concern when Team members validated College aspirations for completion of its SLO activities in 2013-2014.

The Team also identified the need for strengthened planning assessment and budgeting at the institution. The College has not completed a full cycle of planning and its accompanying activities to ensure ongoing quality improvement of its practices, processes, programs, and services.

Five "Minority Reports" or "Constituent Complaints" were brought forward to the Team. The Team reviewed the circumstances and content of these matters and found them to be outside the scope of the comprehensive visit. Issues identified through reports and complaints were shared with the College president and District chancellor during the final day of the visit.

The Team found College faculty, staff, students, and administration enthusiastic about the College and its future prospects. Employees are proud of their institution and ability to engage in constructive dialogue where disagreements exist in order to best meet the needs of their students. Classroom and office visitations, as well as online class participation, identified quality instruction and student support services.

The Team greatly appreciates the support provided by College staff throughout the visit. Personnel responded quickly to Team requests. Staff members were open and candid in their responses to Team members' questions. The Team work room contained some evidentiary documents, as well as online computer access to search for supporting policies and regulations referenced in the self study.

Commendations for Fullerton College

The Team was impressed with Fullerton College's commitment to its students, fine employees, and adaptability in the face of change.

- The College is commended for its tradition of collegial discourse, which enables constructive dialogue to occur even when disagreements among participants exist.
- The College's senior student services management division is commended for providing stability, sound guidance, and forward-thinking leadership during a period of transition on the part of the College administrative team.
- The College, and in particular the Library, Academic Support Center, Veterans Services Office, EOPS Program, the Cadena Center, and Diversity Committee, are commended for

the wide variety of innovative programmatic initiatives in support of student development, engagement, and success.

2011 Accreditation Evaluation Team Recommendations

College Recommendations

During the course of the Fullerton College accreditation Team visit, College and District personnel were interviewed by Team members. Committees and classroom instruction were observed. In addition, Board policies and procedures, College governance body minutes, and other documents were reviewed. Conversations with students were conducted both individually and jointly. Upon examining the College's self study report, available evidence, and information gathered through interviews with staff and students, the Team offers the following recommendations to Fullerton College:

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.)

District Recommendations

During the course of the concurrent evaluation teams’ visits at Fullerton and Cyprus Colleges, the chancellor, Board members, and District office employees were interviewed by Team chairs and members, both individually and jointly, for the purpose of identifying any recommendations related to system functioning that might be necessary. The Teams reviewed Board policies, procedures, minutes, and other records as Team members evaluated evidence at Fullerton College and the District office pertaining to system support.

Following a careful review of the College self study report, examining evidence and conducting interviews with both District and campus personnel, as well as students, the evaluation Teams provide the following recommendations to the North Orange County Community College District and its colleges:

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.)

ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT FOR FULLERTON COLLEGE

Introduction

The North Orange County Community College District (NOCCCD) is a multi-college District with two colleges and a school of continuing education. The district office is located in the City of Anaheim, several miles from the College. Fullerton College was established as a “Junior College” within Fullerton Union High School District in 1913. The College relocated to its own campus on a 14-acre parcel of land adjacent to Fullerton High School beginning in 1935. It is one of the oldest two-year colleges in California.

Fullerton College formally separated from Fullerton Union School District to form Fullerton Junior College District in 1922, although it continued to share a common Board of Trustees with its parent high school district. In 1964, the citizens of Anaheim Union School District, Brea-Olinda Unified School District, and Placentia Unified District voted to join the existing Fullerton Junior College thereby creating NOCCCD. A new NOCCCD Board of Trustees, independent from the Fullerton Joint Union High School District, was seated and assumed responsibility for the system.

In 1966, NOCCCD opened its second institution, Cypress College. Further expansion occurred in 2002 with the dedication of a third site, the “Anaheim campus,” that houses District offices, the School of Continuing Education offices, classrooms for Cypress College, and continuing education instructional space.

The Fullerton College campus is located on an 83-acre site in the downtown area of the City of Fullerton. The campus has approximately 50 buildings consisting of approximately 525,000 assignable square feet of space. Buildings provide for classroom, laboratory, office, workshop, storage, and athletic areas.

NOCCCD educates approximately 40,000 full-time and part-time students in both credit programs and continuing education offerings each semester. Approximately 68 percent of the student body is minority. The College student body is 42 percent Hispanic and constitutes the largest segment of the student enrollment. A slight majority of the student population is female. The District encompasses the communities of Anaheim, Brea, Buena Park, Cypress, Fullerton, La Habra, La Palma, Los Alamitos, and Placentia. Approximately one million residents live within the 155 square miles of the District service area.

The College awarded 1,213 associate degrees and 185 certificates in the 2009-2010 academic year. The College offers a wide variety of courses and programs in keeping with its mission as a comprehensive California community college.

Fullerton College Self Study

The Team found the College self study report was undertaken during a time of considerable administrative changeover at the institution. Team members were impressed with the ability of the self study co-chairs and employees to complete the report during this period of leadership change and organizational redirection. Members of the campus community expressed ownership for the self study despite these challenges.

The Team felt the self study was comprehensive addressing current Commission Standards and prior Team recommendations. The document was clearly written and formatted. However, the Team also identified several issues associated with the report. The Team noted the College self study lacked evidence to support many of the statements presented in its narrative. Further, although data was contained in the report, this information was not applied in many instances within the documents self evaluation or planning sections in a reflective manner. The Team concluded that the College's sparing use of evidence weakened the document's self-evaluation and consequently produced limited planning agendas. The planning agendas that were produced in the self study appeared superficial and in most cases did not include timelines for proposed activities. Despite these limitations with respect to the self study, the Team found College staff members very helpful to Team members in their quest for evidence and interviews. The Team observed an institution committed to its mission and the success of its students. The Team greatly appreciated the candor and support from College staff throughout the site visit.

•

Team Evaluation of Institutional Response to the 2005 Team Recommendations

2005 Team Recommendation 1: District Budget Allocation Model

The Team recommends that the District Chancellor develop and implement an evaluation of the existing budget allocation model and make adjustments if appropriate to meet the needs of the entire District. (Standards III.D, IV.B.3.c.)

The Team found evidence that the District, in consultation with its colleges, reviewed the systems budget allocation model following the 2005 Team visit. No changes were instituted in the model following this review. The team noted, however, that no document explaining the model's elements of operation could be identified by the District or College. Further, it is evident that the District's budget allocation model is not understood by College staff, including the senior administrative management team. College personnel found no evidence that the District allocation model has been assessed for its effectiveness.

The recommendation has been met. However, shortcomings identified by the Team in the College's activity related to this Standard are outlined in the Team's report pertaining to Standards I.B.3; I.B.4; III.D.1.a; III.D.1.d; IV.B.3.a; Eligibility Requirement 17.

2005 Team Recommendation 2: District Institutional planning

The Team recommends that the Board of Trustees and Chancellor implement a process to systematically develop and document strategic institutional goals for the District. The goals should: provide a framework for the Colleges' institutional planning processes; include a review of the District mission statement to ensure that the District's strategic goals align with the mission; and are reflected in the allocation of District resources. (Standards I.A.1, I.B.4, III.D.1.)

The Team found that a District institutional plan was developed in 2005-2006, which provides the framework for College goals, and an Education Master Plan is currently being drafted that will provide overarching initiatives for the District and Colleges. The Team found no evidence that the District's planning/goal setting and resource allocation process has been evaluated for its effectiveness. Planning documents indicate the District's planning and goal setting processes are incorporated into the system's mission statement. The Team identified a great deal of confusion on the part of College employees regarding the District planning process, its link to resource allocations, and their respective roles in goal setting at the system level.

The recommendation has been met. However, shortcomings identified by the Team in the College's activity related to this Standard are outlined in the Team's report pertaining to District Recommendation 1, Standards I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, IV.A.3; IV.B.3.a, Eligibility Requirement 19 and District Recommendation 3, Standard IV.A.5, IV.B.3.g.

2005 Team Recommendation 3: College Planning Process

The Team recommends that the College formalize a College planning process to ensure that long-term strategic directions with related annual goals are established to guide College operations. These strategic directions should be developed in conjunction with an Educational Master Plan that incorporates recommendations from the program review process and serves as the foundation for the facilities and technology plans. The College should ensure that all plans are linked to the budget process and are reviewed, evaluated, and updated on a regular basis. (Standards I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.6, I.B. 7.)

The Team found that the College has responded to this recommendation by creating a number of different committees to focus on various aspects of its planning process such as an Instructional Technology, Distance Learning, Planning and Budgeting, and District wide Education Master Planning. The College also instituted a new institutional planning model in fall 2010 to provide better links to program review, division and department unit goal setting, and budget planning. The institutional planning process remains incomplete. The Team found it could not identify clear links to financial planning or budgeting. No evidence of assessment could be found regarding any of the institution's planning activities. The Team noted the institution has not completed a full cycle of institutional planning, resource allocation, assessment and improvement. Campus employees expressed confusion regarding the College's institutional planning processes and operational links to resource allocation and their roles in the process.

This recommendation has been partially met.

2005 Team Recommendation 4: College Equity and Diversity

The Team recommends that in order to further advance the College's ideals of equality and diversity, a College wide equity and diversity action plan should be developed and implemented in a timely manner, along with a schedule and budget (Standards III.A.4.a, III.A.4.b, III.A.4.c).

Although the Team found a diversity statement as one of the institution's core values and the existence of a student equity plan, no evidence could be identified that the 2005 Team's recommendation had been addressed. The College had engaged in a wide variety of activities designed to meet the needs of its diverse student population. This includes the development of a widely discussed student diversity plan.

This recommendation has not been met.

2005 Team Recommendation 5: College Student Learning Outcomes

The Team recommends that the College establish a timeline and complete the identification and implementation of student learning outcomes, incorporate the outcomes into courses, programs, degrees and certificates, educational and student services programs and inform students by publicizing the student learning outcomes to all of the College's constituents. (Standard II.A.)

While the College has established a timeline, the identification and implementation of student learning outcomes and their incorporation into courses, programs, and services has not been completed. The timeline established by the College would result in the recommendation of the 2005 visiting Team not being fully addressed until the end of the 2013-2014 academic year. Unless this timeline is accelerated, the College will not achieve proficiency under the ACCJC rubric for SLOs by the 2012 deadline established by the Commission. The Team, using the Commission's *Rubric for Evaluating Instructional Effectiveness — Student Learning Outcomes*, characterizes the College's SLO achievement in the development approaching proficiency range. Program and course SLOs remain to be completed. Student learning assessment is lacking. No ongoing evaluation of the institution's SLO process has taken place. Students and the campus community are not well-informed regarding SLOs.

This recommendation has been partially met.

2005 Team Recommendation 6: College Decision-Making Progress

The Team recommends that the College clarify decision-making processes and communicate them widely. The College should identify the informational basis on which to make decisions-institutional research, program review, institutional planning-and use decisions as a basis to improve institutional effectiveness. The role of participants in shared governance needs to be clear to all involved in the process. (Standards IV.A.2, IV.A.5.)

The Team found evidence that the District and College have delineated their functions in a mapping document. In addition, the Team observed efforts on the part of the campus's new leadership to strengthen communication through meetings with constituent groups, individual discussions with employees, and formal correspondence regarding campus-wide issues and activities. Nevertheless, considerable confusion remains throughout the College community with regard to institutional and District decision-making processes and significant communication gaps remain. The role of employees in participatory governance remains unclear to classified constituents.

This recommendation has partially been met.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges Eligibility Requirements for Accreditation (Revised January 2004) contain continuous compliance criteria. The assessment of the criteria for compliance is part of the institutional self study and comprehensive site visit process. The Team validated Fullerton College's compliance with Accrediting Commission eligibility requirements.

1. Authority

The authority for Fullerton College rests with the Board of Trustees. The Board derives its authority from the state of California. The Team confirmed that the District receives state approval and funding for its programs and services and is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

2. Mission

The Team confirmed that the College's mission statement is clearly defined. The current educational mission of Fullerton College was revised and adopted by the Board of Trustees in June 2005. The mission statement is included in the College catalog and class schedule, appears on College meeting agendas, and is posted on the District website. The mission is appropriate to a two-year degree granting public institution of higher learning; however it may be too general to provide institutional direction under prevailing economic circumstances.

3. Governing Board

The Team confirmed that the governing Board of Fullerton College consists of seven members who are responsible for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the District. The Board ensures the institution's mission is being effectively carried out. Its membership is sufficient in size and composition to fulfill its responsibilities. The Board of Trustees has adopted a Board Policy for ethical conduct, which contains language to address breaches of its code. The Board follows a conflict of interest policy, which requires that financial interests are disclosed and do not interfere with the fiscal integrity of the District.

4. Chief Executive Officer

Fullerton College has a full-time chief executive officer appointed by the Board of Trustees who is delegated the authority to administer Board policies and procedures. The College president reports to the chancellor, who has full authority to manage District operations.

5. Administrative Capacity

The Team confirmed the College has an administrative staff adequate to support the programs and services for an institution of its size, scope, and mission. The training and experience required for each administrative position, as well as duties and responsibilities, are clearly set forth in duty statements.

Since the last self study in 2005, the College has undergone staff turnover in upper administration, including the president, vice presidents, and deans. The presidency has been held

by three separate individuals in the last six years. A former president was reassigned to the vice chancellor of instruction position at the District office in October 2009. An interim president led the College from October 2009 to June 2010. A new permanent president was selected and began his tenure at the College in July 2010.

6. Operational Status

The Team confirmed that the College is operational with students actively pursuing its degree and certificate programs. The College enrolls approximately 27,000 full-time and part-time students by the end of each semester in credit courses and 13,000 full-time and part-time non-credit students. Classes are offered days, evenings, and weekends by the College in a wide variety of lengths from four weeks to a 16-week semesters.

7. Degrees

The Team confirmed that the majority of Fullerton College's educational offerings result in the attainment of a degree or certificate.

8. Educational Programs

The Team confirmed the College's degree programs are consistent with its mission and represent recognized fields of study in postsecondary education. Fullerton College offers two-year general education, transfer, and career technical education programs. College programs are of sufficient length, content, and quality consistent with accredited peer California community colleges.

9. Academic Credit

The Team confirmed the College awards academic credits based on generally accepted practices in degree-granting institutions of higher education. Institutional policies and transfer requirements, as well as the awarding of credit, are clearly and accurately described in the College catalog. The College awards academic credits based on the Carnegie formula: One semester unit of credit is defined as one hour of recitation or lecture, or three hours of laboratory work each week for a full semester.

10. Student Learning and Achievement

The Team has concern over the College's progress in the development of course and program student learning outcomes. Significant progress will need to occur in order for this eligibility requirement to be fully achieved by 2012. (See College Recommendations 1 and 2.)

11. General Education

The Team confirmed the College defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs an adequate component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and promote intellectual capacity. Fullerton College has SLOs for its general education requirements.

12. Academic Freedom

Academic Freedom is contained in District policy and observed in campus practice. The faculty senate assumes responsibility for professional and academic matters.

13. Faculty

The Team confirmed that Fullerton College employs approximately 315 full-time faculty and 480 adjunct faculty. The faculty members are qualified to conduct the institution's programs and meet both professional standards and state requirements.

14. Student Services

The Team confirmed the College provides all of its students with appropriate support services and develops programs consistent with their characteristics and the institution's mission. Services and programs address the needs of a highly diversified student population. The size and scope of the institution's student services programs are adequate to ensure student learning and success.

15. Admissions

The Team confirmed that Fullerton College's published admissions policies are aligned with its mission, appropriate for its programs, and follow practices that are consistent with College policies. College admissions meet State of California regulations.

16. Information and Learning Resources

The Team found that the Current library and learning resources are sufficient to support Fullerton College's mission and diverse instructional programs.

17. Financial Resources

The Team found that the District and College maintain an adequate funding base and financial reserves to support student learning programs and services.

18. Financial Accountability

The Team confirmed that the District demonstrates financial accountability through the findings of an independent financial audit secured by the Board of Trustees to perform review. It noted, however, that the District's budget allocation is not clearly understood by campus personnel nor is its link to District planning clear. (See District Recommendations 1, 2, 3.)

19. Institutional Planning and Development

The College has institutional planning processes, but the Team could not find significant evidence that a complete planning cycle has taken place nor that data-driven decisions are linked to budget, academic, facilities, technology, human resource, and equipment needs.

20. Public Information

The Team confirmed that the College catalog contains accurate, clear policies, procedures, and practices relative to admission requirements; academic and career technical education programs; requirements and degrees; grievance procedures; fees; and other items relevant to student attendance and withdrawal.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission

The Team confirmed that the College provides assurance that it complies fully with the eligibility requirements, Accreditation Standards, and policies of the Commission, demonstrating

honesty and integrity in representations to all constituencies and the public and in relationships with the Accreditation Association and other external agencies.

Standard I

Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

A. Mission

General Observations

The Team found that the College has a strong commitment to its mission statement: “We prepare students to be successful learners.” The mission has had broad employee input in its development and is Board adopted. The mission statement is reviewed informally by the campus on an annual basis. The statement appears on college planning and budgeting documents, as well as on some division and department unit program reviews. The College appears to make the institution’s mission statement core to its institutional planning and decision-making, with programs and services falling appropriately within its scope. The Team believed the College’s mission statement is very broad and may not provide guidance to the College under challenging economic circumstances. The Team found no evidence that the mission statement is formally assessed in order to ensure ongoing institutional improvement and quality.

In addition to the mission statement, the College established a set of core values developed through a collaborative process in 2005. These values define the guiding principles and character of the institution and assist in clarifying the mission statement. The mission does not clearly describe the College’s intended student body, but it does characterize the institution’s macro-level educational purpose and commitment to student learning. The mission statement has not been formally assessed for its effectiveness.

Findings and Evidence

The Team found that the College’s mission statement was originally approved by the Board of Trustees in 2002 and reaffirmed in 2005. The President’s Advisory Council (PAC), whose membership includes representatives from all constituent groups, has reviewed the mission statement since that time but has made no changes. The mission statement has a longstanding history with the College, and Team interviews with staff suggest the College believes there is no reason to change it as it still reflects the institution’s educational purposes. Interviews with campus members indicate they are proud of and support the College mission statement. No evidence was identified that the mission statement has been formally assessed for its effectiveness. (Standard I.A.2, I.A.3.)

The College has defined its student body as “students” within the context of its broad mission statement. Team review of the College’s catalog and other sources points to programs and services typical for a comprehensive urban community college student clientele, including basic and English language skills, associate degree/transfer, career technical certificates, and licensure for career enhancement. Team discussions with campus constituents identified a “diverse student body” as the population to be supported by the institution’s mission statement. College programs and services appear appropriate to the institution’s mission and student body. (Standard I.A, I.A.1.)

The Team reviewed evidence that the College mission statement has been aligned with that of the District. This took place in 2005 as part of the Chancellor's Office system wide planning efforts. The College mission statement is widely distributed on the campus and externally. The statement appears in the institution's catalog, class schedules, and websites. The Team also found references to the mission statement in College planning and budgeting documents. The College has department and division unit goals as part of its program review and budgeting processes. These goals align to both the College mission and District wide goals.

The self study provided evidence that the College attempts to achieve its mission statement by incorporating the statement as a component of its program review, institutional planning, and decision-making processes. The College's institutional planning process, however, was changed in 2010. (Multiple College planning processes have been established at the College since 2005.) A new planning calendar, formalized in 2009-2010, contains revised strategies to incorporate student learning outcomes and program review with planning and budgeting. The Team could not determine the effectiveness of the newest planning process. However, the Team did observe that for a variety of reasons, the College has not completed a full cycle of evaluation using any of its planning approaches since the last comprehensive evaluation Team visit. Consequently, the Team found that the institution is at a development performance level approaching proficiency using the Commission's *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness — Planning*.

Conclusions

The Team found that the College's mission statement aligns with its broadest institutional priorities without specific details regarding its target student populations. The mission statement has been subjected to annual reviews without revisions. Although the mission statement has not been formally evaluated for its effectiveness, evidence indicates it has received campus input and support. The mission statement is part of the College's program review process, and the mission statement is referenced in planning budgeting activities.

The College's alignment of department and division unit goals to its mission statement demonstrates the institution's effort to enact its mission. The broadly-stated mission provides a great deal of latitude for the College to create and revise goals and objectives. However, such a broadly stated mission may not provide adequate direction for the College to determine how or when to shift its focus in the challenging budget years ahead.

The Team found Fullerton College met Standards I.A.

Recommendations

None.

B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The Team identified a significant level of administrative changeover at Fullerton College since the last team visit in 2005. Interviews and Team review of institutional records indicate that a lack of continuity in the institution's management may have impacted the College's institutional effectiveness.

The Team found evidence of broad employee participation and dialoging about student learning. However, the institution has not completed the identification of program and course SLOs nor established assessment practices to measure SLO achievement. At the time of the Team visit, the College had not completed a full cycle of SLO assessments for improving any of its institutional processes.

The College revised its institutional planning process in fall 2010 to provide greater employee input to the process and better integration with its various planning activities. Because the process is not fully implemented, the Team could not assess its effectiveness. The institutional planning process is linked to District goal-setting. College planning produces division and department goals in alignment with District priorities and the campus mission statement.

College employees indicate a lack of clarity and confusion regarding planning, goal-setting, resource allocation, assessment, and quality improvement at both the College and District levels.

The College strives to maintain an ongoing collegial, self-reflective dialogue about continuous improvement of student learning and institutional process through various College committees and governance groups. Interviews with administrators, faculty, and classified staff indicate that the institution understands and embraces the concept of ongoing institutional planning, resource allocation, and assessment to improve institutional effectiveness.

In fall 2010, the College adopted a new institutional planning model and reinstated a program review process that had been previously modified. The College's new planning process includes revised goals. The Team found, however, that the College's progress report on goals and objectives lacks clear information from which to provide direction for making improvements or sustaining efforts or discussions regarding quality.

The Team noted that the previous 2005 evaluation Team had commended Fullerton College on aspects of its program review processes. Based on the evidence available to the 2011 Team, it appears as though the institution failed to continue its initiative related to this important component of institutional effectiveness. Evidence indicates that program review is not implemented broadly and thoroughly across the institution and that, where it occurs, the systematic use of evidence for purposes for ensuring quality are not clearly evident. The Team concluded that the College is performing at the development level contained in the Commission's *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness — Program Review*.

The Team found there is limited dialogue among constituent groups about planning activities regarding processes, procedures, goals, key action steps, and outcomes. Consequently, there is genuine confusion about the process on the part of the employees across the campus, including managers.

The College reports on basic data and information concerning the students it serves and the success of its programs and services. These data are used in College program planning; however, the connection between data accumulation and actual planning is not clearly evident.

Findings and Evidence

A great deal of turnover in the leadership of College planning has occurred since the last Team visit. The vice president of educational support and planning directed planning activities, including annual updates of the institutional plan, until the arrival of a new College president in January 2004. By fall 2004, the president transformed the Planning and Consultative Council, originally chaired by the vice president of educational support and planning, into the President's Advisory Council (PAC), which the president chairs. Planning was subsumed under this group. The majority of planning was carried out by the PAC, largely through deans and directors, with College goals developed in response to the District's institutional plan. The College president was reassigned as the vice chancellor for instruction at the District office in October 2009. An interim president chaired the PAC, and planning continued with new leadership. During this period, a group of faculty, deans, and the director of research began meeting to develop revisions to the College's program review and planning processes. In spring 2010, proposals for a new program review committee and revisions to the planning and budget steering committee, as well as a new planning cycle, were brought to the PAC and approved in 2010. Leadership for the institution's planning process passed into the hands of its current president in July 2010. The Team found, however, the institution had only recently reestablished discussions regarding the continuous improvement of student learning outcomes (SLOs) and other institutional processes for ongoing improvement. Evidence indicates the College will not meet the Commission's 2012 deadline for SLO completion unless the College further expedites its work. (Standard I.B, I.B.1.)

The self study report referenced active participation of constituent groups in reflective dialogue over matters related to the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes. Planning at the College is facilitated through the President's Advisory Council (PAC). Its membership consists of voting members in advisory roles to the president. The membership includes two managers, four faculty, two classified staff, and two students. Functionally, other College councils, committees, governance groups, and task forces provide input to the PAC through largely undefined processes. The PAC establishes institutional planning goals on a two-year cycle in keeping with District goals and the College mission statement. Each College department or division unit is expected to submit goals and budgets aligned with institutional planning goals. The Team identified and reviewed College goals for 2009-2011, which addressed student learning and program performance. Specifically, basic skills, vocations, and transfer programs were identified for assessment and improvement, which was ongoing. Interviews with staff, however, found widespread confusion regarding institutional planning, goal-setting, resource allocation, and assessment. Further, the link between

institutional planning and direct, clear efforts to produce, support, and assess student learning and ensure quality were not apparent to the Team.

The institutional planning process is currently being assisted by the director of institutional research with guidance from the PAC, which facilitates the review and recommendations for planning decisions. Current goals were developed by the director of institutional research, who examined a variety of source documents, such as District wide goals, previous self study recommendations and planning agendas, the College's accountability reports, and the community College system mission and goals. These are initial goals to jump start the new planning process that will allow time to revise goals based on a two-year cycle of planning and implementation. The goals provide the link needed to develop divisional and department unit level objectives that comprise the College's operational plans.

The Team found that the College's new institutional planning process is designed to provide greater integration of various complex plans, including the District's goals, and improve linkages to budget decisions by using a planning calendar to coordinate derived input from other planning activities needed to make decisions.

Discussion with campus administrators, faculty and staff, however, indicate they do not understand how the District reaches its planning decisions nor feel they have effective input in the processes, goal-setting or assessment. (Standard I.B.2, I.B.4.)

The Team noted that College outcome reports for stated goals do not provide adequate information to determine how or what additional action might be taken to strengthen, improve, or change outcomes. Consequently, the measurement of institutional effectiveness, as a measure of goal attainment, is limited and difficult to discern. Although the College has a relatively decent set and flow of data and information, the degree to which the data are being used to actually assess progress towards stated goals and objectives is not evident.

Despite the previous evaluation Team's commendation to Fullerton College for some of its earlier program review activities, the 2011 Team found that program review is not broadly and systematically implemented at the institution. Moreover, in many cases, evidence regarding discussions of program effectiveness based on evidence is lacking. The Team also observed that the linkage between program review and planning for improvement in many cases could not be verified. No evidence exists that program review processes have been assessed for their effectiveness. The Team concluded the College is operating at the development level for program review using the Commission's *Rubric for Evaluating Instructional Effectiveness — Program Review*.

The Team found evidence that the College's institutional planning process has a mechanism that links plans to budget through a schedule of coordinated and sequenced activities. For example, SLO assessment provides information for program review that provides material for department and division level plans that provide background for College unit allocations as determined by the President's Advisory Council priorities. (Standard I.B.3.)

Because the College's institutional planning process is new and a full cycle of planning has not been completed nor an assessment of the process conducted, the Team concluded the College is performing at the Development level contained in the Commission's *Rubric for Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness – Planning*. Considerable progress remains to be accomplished in the area of planning. The Team found no evidence that a complete cycle of planning has taken place for any of the institution's planning activities.

College employees also report that although College institutional planning is linked to District goals, they feel they have little direct input into the District process. Further, many report little knowledge about the District's planning, governance, and decision-making processes. (Standard I.B.4.)

The Team found the Department of Institutional Research was responsible for providing the documented assessment of institutional effectiveness to the College constituencies. This includes information on student success measures, such as retention, success, transfer, and awards, as well as productivity and efficiency measures, such as FTES and WSCH, and student demographic information. The institutional research website provides a posting of many of the data and information available to the College. The College also provides an enrollment management data portal system for the instructional deans and vice president of instruction. (Standard I.B.4.)

The College reports on basic data and information concerning the students it serves and the success of its programs and services. These data are used in College and program planning; however, the Team found that connection between data accumulation and actual planning is not clearly represented in College planning documents. (Standard I.B.5.)

Because the College's institutional planning had not been fully implemented, its effectiveness in resource allocation outcomes could not be assessed. Further, due to the recent implementation of the College's institutional planning process, no evidence regarding the processes effectiveness could be established by the Team. (Standard I.B.6, I.B.7.)

Conclusions

The Team noted considerable administrative turnover at Fullerton College, which appears to have reduced the institution's capacity to ensure institutional effectiveness. The Team found that despite previous Team commendations for its program review processes, the College could not provide evidence that it has a systematic culture of evidence resulting in an ongoing process of institutional improvement. The Team identified that the College sets goals in alignment with those established by the District. College goals and mission statements are referenced in program review documents for division and department units of the College. The use of goals within College division or department units appears narrowly focused and defined for budget building and augmentation purposes. Many of the division or department unit goals contained in program evaluations are not quantifiable, and no evidence could be found regarding their use for subsequent improvement for programs and services. The Team concluded that the College is operating at the development stage within the Commission's *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Program Review*. Based on interviews with campus administration and the

faculty senate, the Team identified evidence that student learning outcomes at both the course and program level remain to be completed. Further, assessment of student learning outcome measures has been marginally addressed. The Team concluded, based on the evidence available, that the College is performing between the development and proficiency level using the Commission's *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Student Learning Outcomes*. The College will need to further expedite its work pertaining to student learning outcomes in order to meet the Commission's 2012 requirement for compliance. The Team could not identify evidence that the institution employs systematic institutional planning and assessment to develop and improve its key processes in support of student learning.

The College adopted a new institutional planning process in fall 2010. The planning process was redesigned to strengthen employee participation and better integrate other institutional planning activities with College resource allocation decisions. The Team observed that none of the College's planning activities since the last Team visit had completed a full cycle of goal-setting assessment, resource allocation, and program improvement in support of student learning. The Team could not evaluate the efficacy of the new planning process due to its recent introduction. Interviews with campus employees found that many did not understand the planning, governance, and decision-making processes at the District and College levels. Despite activities on the part of the new College president to strengthen communication regarding these activities, additional improvements in communication are necessary regarding both institutional and system processes and practices.

The Team found that Fullerton College has partially met Standard I.B.

Recommendations

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.)

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.)

**STANDARD II
STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES
FINDINGS AND EVIDENCE**

A. Instructional Programs

General Observations

The Team found evidence that the College provides quality instruction and programs in disciplines appropriate for lower division California community colleges. The College offers distance education; however, the majority of instruction occurs on campus. The institution's programs lead to degrees and certificates or transfer to other institutions of higher learning or employment. The College assesses its instructional programs, although SLO implementation and assessment is lagging at the program and course levels. College programs and services were found to align to a mission statement that stresses student learning. Both the mission statement and the breadth and depth of college programs are appropriate to the diverse student body it serves. Fullerton College requires all academic and career vocational programs to incorporate a general education requirement tied to a clear educational philosophy, as determined by its faculty.

The Team found that the College operates and maintains high quality instructional programs, student services, and learning resources. Both students and College staff express pride in the institution and its activities. The College provides a learning environment that appreciates diversity, encourages responsibility, and enhances the intellectual development of all of its students.

Fullerton College's administrators, faculty, and staff are aware of the need for student learning outcome implementation. The institution has only recently reestablished discussions and activities regarding the continuous improvement of student learning outcomes (SLOs) and other institutional processes for ongoing improvement. The College has not completed the establishment and assessment of course and program SLOs. Therefore, the College will not meet the Commission's 2012 deadline for SLO completion unless the College further expedites its work.

Findings and Evidence

The Team found that through the College's curriculum and program review processes, all instructional programs are periodically reviewed to ensure that College courses and programs align with the College mission and uphold standards of academic rigor and excellence. The College offers quality programs for transfer, career technical education, basic skills courses, and lifelong learning. Certificates and degrees are offered in a diverse array of programs. Evidence indicates the College's career technical education programs have advisory committees to update those programs with evolving professional standards and practices. The College has a state-funded Basic Skills Initiative designed to improve student performance in English, math, English-as-a-second-language, and reading. (Standard II.A, II.A.1.)

Although there are various efforts underway to assess and respond to student needs, most notably under the auspices of the Diversity Committee, Student Equity Plan, and Basic Skills Initiatives, evidence indicates that the College does not systematically rely upon research and analysis to identify student learning needs and assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes. Records indicate that fewer than ten percent of the College's courses and none of its programs have undergone a complete cycle of student learning outcomes identification, measurement, assessment, and improvement based on assessments. A culture of assessment and evidence needs to be strengthened in the institution as a whole. (Standard II.A.1.a.)

The Team found that the College utilizes a variety of delivery systems and modes of instruction to address the needs of its students. All curricula must meet the approval of the Curriculum Committee (a faculty-led committee) and must meet standards of rigor and quality. The Curriculum Committee reviews curriculum to be certain that it meets the standards of Title 5 regulations and has begun to require that new and revised courses and programs include student learning outcomes. A Curriculum Committee Handbook provides faculty with procedures for initiating new course development or revision of existing courses. All credit program proposals must supply information on appropriateness to the College mission, need, curriculum standards, resources, and compliance with any licensing or Accreditation Standards. To ensure quality in its distance education delivery, the College created a Distance Education Advisory Committee in 2006. (Standard II.A.1.b.)

In 2006, the College approved a student learning outcomes process to assess student learning and used the results of this process to analyze its educational quality. The Faculty Senate appointed a student learning outcomes coordinator and an ad-hoc SLO Committee with faculty representation from each division. The Team confirmed that between 2006 and 2009, progress on student learning outcomes implementation was halted; activities intensified in 2009, and the College has struggled valiantly to make up for lost time. Nonetheless, under the College's current pace of development and stated timeline for completion, the institution will be unable to achieve the level of "Proficiency" on the ACCJC's rubric for student learning outcomes implementation by the Commission's stated deadline of 2012. Interviews with staff and document review confirm that the College has established a target for completing a full cycle of SLO identification, measurement, assessment, and improvements based on assessments for ten percent of its courses by the end of the 2010-2011 academic year and 100 percent of its courses and programs by the end of the 2013-2014 academic year. In its 2010 Annual Report to ACCJC, the College reported that 78 percent of its courses had defined student learning outcomes; members of the faculty assessment group report that this number has now reached more than 90 percent. A 2011 internal document posted on the College website indicates that assessment methodologies have been identified in 27 percent of all courses with assessments having been conducted in 13.5 percent of courses. Thus, despite the accelerated pace of activity that has characterized the institution over the past two years, further acceleration of its implementation timeline is necessary.

In 2009, the Faculty Senate endorsed a student learning outcomes assessment process (SLOA) for course SLOs; however, College courses are at various stages of completion in this process. At the time of the site visit, not all course syllabi include student learning outcomes and only

Math, Fine Arts, Humanities, and Natural Sciences have gone beyond the initial, definitional stages of the assessment process. The procedures that have been established are faculty driven. (Standard II.A.1.c.)

The Team reviewed evidence that faculty are professionally engaged in the College's pre-collegiate developmental and collegiate course program and support service development. Team review of records identified broad professional input and stewardship in the development, implementation, review, and modification of College programs and services. (Standard II.A.2.)

The Team found evidence supporting career technical education program faculty consultation within industry advisory committees concerning course content and offerings, degrees, and certificates. Career Technical Education (CTE) programs that require licensure exams have well-established mechanisms for assessing student achievement; others are at various states in the process of assessing student progress. (Standard II.A.2.b.)

The Team observed and noted that College credit is awarded according to student achievement of course objectives as evaluated by an instructor. Credits awarded are consistent with Carnegie unit definitions and Title 5 regulations. These are referenced in the College's Curriculum Committee Handbook and reviewed for accuracy during the curriculum approval process. Faculty members provide written course guidelines/syllabi that clearly state the requirements for completing a course. Students are evaluated on their progress towards meeting the goals, objectives, and outcomes for a course. Board Policy 4220 establishes standards of grading that are consistent with other California community colleges and four-year institutions. The College's grading system is published in the College catalog. All degrees have a required core group of courses in addition to the student's general education requirements. Students completing vocational and occupational certificates and degrees must meet current industry standards of proficiency. (Standard II.A.2.c.)

Fullerton College faculty members employ a wide variety of modes of instruction to meet the needs and learning styles of their students. The College has created a Basic Skills Student Success Steering Committee to further the success of students who may be underprepared for College work. Under the guidance of this committee, a variety of initiatives have been developed and implemented in an effort to enhance the success of students with diverse learning styles and varying levels of preparation. Through online courses, the College provides greater access and flexibility for the students they serve. The Team found, however, that although the College's self study notes that "online courses tend to have lower retention and success rates when compared to their face-to-face counterparts," the planning agenda includes no strategies designed to address these observable achievement gaps. Student learning is improved through programs such as Honors and Puente. The College continues to implement its Student Equity Plan in order to better serve all of its students. (Standard II.A.2.d.)

Although the Curriculum Committee periodically reviews all new, revised, or updated curricula, and the College has a Curriculum Handbook and curriculum website to assist faculty in curriculum development, the Team found insufficient evidence of ongoing, systematic review of all courses and programs. The absence of College or District program discontinuance policies and procedures and delay in implementing student learning outcomes assessment in accordance

with the timelines established by the Commission are symptomatic of the absence of a comprehensive approach to course assessment and program evaluation. The College's program review process was recently revised, however, the Team found no evidence that its effectiveness has been systematically evaluated.

The Team found that the College has established institutional student learning outcomes that are intended to reflect general education learning objectives associated with all of its programs. These institutional outcomes are referenced in planning and program review documents although exceptions to the practices were found. Nevertheless, evidence indicates that student learning outcomes and assessment methodologies for all courses and programs have not been developed. (Standard II.A.2.e.)

A central component in an integrated planning process that is lacking throughout the College is mechanisms for "closing the loop" in the planning process by evaluating the processes themselves. Evidence indicates that a lack of process evaluation characterizes the College's instructional and student services program review procedures, institutional planning and resource allocation processes, and methods for determining the adequacy of library materials, to name a few examples. While numerous assessment and evaluative procedures have been established, the effectiveness of the processes themselves has yet to be evaluated. Not a single example of planning process evaluation could be identified by the Team. (Standard II.A.2.f.)

The Team found that although most of the courses at the College include exams written by individual instructors, a few career technical programs with licensure processes use standardized examinations. These tests are screened for possible bias by the entities providing the test, such as the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training. The mathematics department has recently begun to employ the use of common exam questions as a means of SLO assessment, although the examinations themselves are independently prepared and administered. (Standard II.A.2.g.)

The Team noted that the majority of the courses offered by the College do not have student learning outcomes specified in the course syllabus. In addition, since methods of assessing student achievement of learning outcomes have not been fully implemented, the institution is not awarding credits based on student achievement of course level SLOs. (Standard II.A.2.h.)

Further, since the Team found that only 60 percent of the programs offered by the College have defined student learning outcomes as indicated on the 2010 Annual Report to ACCJC, and few of the programs have implemented ongoing assessment of learning outcomes, the College cannot be said to be awarding degrees and certificates based on the achievement of program-level student learning outcomes. (Standard II.A.2.i.)

The Team identified a general education statement of philosophy in the 2010-2011 College catalog. The College's institutional learning outcomes, which are stated to embody the institutions approach to general education, are not included in the College catalog. Finally, because the stated learning outcomes for each course have not all been adopted, incorporated into course outlines and added to course syllabi, the Team could not conclude that the

appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum is determined by examining course-level SLOs. (Standard II.A.3.)

The Team concluded that the College's general education requirements are appropriate and include student exposure to the humanities, arts, natural sciences, and social sciences. Based on review of the general education requirements specified in the College catalog, the statement of general education philosophy, the recently adopted general education student learning outcomes and the results of the spring 2009 annual student survey, there is evidence that the institution's requirements provide both breadth and depth for students. The Team identified evidence that basic skills such as writing and oral communication, computer literacy, and scientific reasoning are stressed as well as ethics and effective citizenship. (Standard II.A.3.a, II.A.3.b, II.A.3.c.)

The Team found that all degree programs at the College have a required core group of courses in addition to the general education requirements. The College offers 59 Associate of Arts degrees and 31 Associate of Science degrees. (Standard II.A.4.)

The College maintains employment and salary information for its vocational and occupational programs. The Team reviewed reported job rates for certification and licensure examinations for students in career technical programs as well as placement materials. Based on this and other sources of information, the Team concluded the College's career technical programs meet professional competencies. (Standard II.A.5.)

The College catalog contains descriptions of courses and brief descriptions of programs of study offered by the institution. The Team found that student learning outcomes are not specified in the course and program descriptions contained in the catalog and are absent from approximately 90 percent of course syllabi submitted for review by the visiting Team. The College's 2010 Annual Report to ACCJC indicates that 78 percent of College courses have defined student learning outcomes, with ten percent of the courses undergoing ongoing assessment; the report indicates that 60 percent of College programs have defined SLOs with zero percent of all programs conducting ongoing assessment of SLOs.

In light of the fact that SLOs have not been defined for all of the College's courses and programs, combined with the evident lag time between outcomes being identified and actually being listed in the course syllabi and catalog, the Team has concluded that the institution is not providing adequate information regarding learning outcomes. (Standard II.A.6.)

The Team noted that the College has clearly stated transfer policies and articulation agreements. The presence of a full-time faculty articulation officer, along with classified evaluators from the Admissions and Records Office, suggests that sufficient capacity meets student needs. Transfer and articulation information is available to students in printed materials. Since, however, not all courses at the College have defined student learning outcomes, nor have all of the outcomes that have been identified been incorporated into course outlines and syllabi and hence may be unavailable for review by faculty and classified staff charged with these functions, the institution cannot yet certify that "the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses." (Standard II.A.6.a.)

The Team found that neither the College nor the District has established formal processes for program discontinuance. According to interviews with administrative staff, discontinuance of programs occurs only when a full-time faculty member associated with a program leaves the organization or is deceased. Under these rare circumstances, students are phased through a gradual closure to ensure student goals are met. (Standard II.A.6.b.)

The Team reviewed both printed and electronic documents produced by the College. The College appears to represent itself accurately in print and electronically and reviews its institutional publications. (Standard II.A.6.c.)

The Team found that policies on academic freedom and student academic honesty appear in the College catalog and electronic publications. The mission of the institution is secular and embraces no specific institutional beliefs or worldviews. (Standard II.A.7.)

Conclusions

The Team found that although Fullerton College had developed student learning outcomes for its general education courses, the development of SLOs for program and courses remain incomplete. Consequently, the Team could not conclude that fields of study result in identified student learning outcomes leading to degrees or certificates. Further, the Team noted that a majority of student learning programs are not being assessed against achieved stated student learning outcomes. The Team found limited evidence that the achievement of student learning outcomes is being used to make improvements in programs and services.

The Team could not identify clear, strong linkages between the College's new institutional planning process and systematic program review for the purpose of ensuring program currency and assessing outcomes. The institution's planning process is not well understood by College constituents nor the process whereby planning is linked to resource allocation for the purposes of supporting student learning.

Recommendation

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.)

B. Student Support Services

General Observations

Although the self study states that “student support services at Fullerton College facilitate student success and achievement of the College’s mission,” the self-evaluation section provides no evidence of the relationship between delivery of student support services and enhanced success of student recipients of these services. The Team found based on interviews with key student services management personnel, that it appears as though most efforts at program improvement are initiated and implemented through dialogue among deans, directors, counseling faculty, and classified personnel. The Team could not identify formal, measurable benchmarks tied to the assessment mechanisms applied such as the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) survey and Accountability Reporting for the California Community Colleges (ARCC) indicators; instead, dialogue ensues with regard to these indicators and changes in service delivery methods are implemented in an effort to achieve unspecified improvements to the performance indicators. No goals or objectives have been established for success indicators such as successful course completion, retention, persistence, or completion of Student Educational Plans (SEPs). The precise number of students who complete SEPs, as well as the percentage of students with an expressed goal of transfer, degree, or certificate completion who have completed SEPs is unknown, although the dean of counseling estimates it at “around 60 percent.” Although numerous members of the College student services team express the viewpoint that SEP completion correlates positively with student success, this appears to be more of a statement of faith than based on assessment.

Findings and Evidence

The Team found counseling services are not formally evaluated, except in the context of performance evaluations for individual counselors that are conducted every three years. Evidence indicates that students receiving counseling services are not routinely surveyed to determine their levels of satisfaction, and the comparative rates of course and degree completion, retention, and persistence of counseling service recipients in comparison with non-recipients have not been calculated.

Team review of the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 Student Services program reviews contain goals as opposed to student learning outcomes or service area outcomes. Although the program goals appear to have been slightly modified between 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, they continue to be focused on inputs (i.e., expand services, maintain service levels, increase number of students served) than on student learning or service area effectiveness. The student learning outcomes and service area outcomes themselves do not appear in the program review documents but are instead published separately.

The Team noted that under the leadership of the vice president for student services, who joined the College in 2008, significant improvements were made to the College’s student services SLOs and SAOs between 2008-2009 and 2009-2010. They are linked to institutional learning outcomes, many of which are quantifiable, and while some continue to consist primarily of participant counts, a significant number of measures are now geared toward assessing improvements to student’s knowledge and enhanced ability to navigate through the College’s service delivery network. To expand the institution’s awareness and utilization of student services SLOs and SAOs, the College may wish to consider incorporating them into all student services program review documents.

The Team concluded that significant progress has been made toward strengthening the capacity of the College's student services units to enhance the quality of service delivery through assessment of measurable indicators. It is also apparent that a substantial amount of effort has gone into collaborative efforts to engage in dialogue aimed at improving the quality and efficacy of student service delivery. The College could benefit from a more formalized approach to program assessment, by adopting specific, measurable objectives for improvement in key performance indicators, accompanied by strategies for achieving them. Since many of these indicators, such as basic skills course completion rates, retention, persistence and the like, are affected by instructional as well as student services programs, their development, adoption and measurement is best achieved through the joint efforts of faculty and staff from both "sides of the house." These formal objectives and strategies could augment the already effective ongoing efforts to improve programs through less formal collaborative problem solving. (Standard II.B, II.B.1.)

Fullerton College publishes a College catalog with general information that is accurate and contains necessary student information. It provides the address and location of the College; the website; the College mission; College courses; degrees and programs; an academic calendar; information on financial aid; learning resources; etc. While the Catalog Committee participates fully in the development of the catalog, the dean of academic services is responsible for producing the catalog. Requirements for admissions, student fees, and other obligations are included in the catalog. All degree and certificate programs are listed in the College catalog.

Major policies affecting students such as academic policies; petitions and appeals; refund policy; probation and dismissal policy; academic honesty; academic freedom; student responsibilities; and nondiscrimination; etc., are also included in the catalog. Policy information is provided in Spanish for non-English speakers.

Information and policies can also be found in the schedule of classes and in the Student Handbook. The Student Handbook, however, does not contain the Student Conduct and Discipline Policy. The vice president of student services indicated that the division intended the handbook to focus on resources and positive aspects of the student experience. Nonetheless, since some students may have greater access to the Student Handbook than the College catalog, it may be advisable to consider including information pertaining to student conduct and discipline in both documents. (Standard II.B.2, II.B.2.a, II.B.2.b, II.B.2.c, II.B.2.d.)

The Team observed that a committed staff is expected to offer a full spectrum of student services that support students' needs. Ongoing campus dialogue occurs via regular forums and the process is dynamic. Instead of a Student Services Council, the Student Services division follows a task force approach in identifying and addressing student needs. The delivery of quality student services is well-documented within the program review process and Accreditation documentation provided to the Team.

Although the student services division is clearly heavily engaged in identifying and assessing the needs of the student population, assessment processes are, for the most part, dialogue-based and are somewhat ad-hoc. For example, results of the spring 2009 administration of the CCSSE

survey were discussed in various committees and work groups, and several improvements to student services programs were implemented as a result. The Team notes, however, that there has been no evident attempt to establish measureable benchmarks from evaluative instruments such as CCSSE, Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE), or ARCC data and to formulate specific objectives for performance improvement in these benchmarks. Although student services management personnel indicate that “we want to improve” on all effectiveness indicators, the College could benefit from the establishment of specific performance objectives and measuring its progress toward achievement. Further, the College could benefit from regular and periodic implementation of a survey instrument such as CCSSE (which was administered for the first time in 2009) in order to better assess the institution’s progress over time. (Standard II.B.3.)

Based on documents provided to the Team and interviews with students, faculty and staff, the visiting Team found that not all College service areas offer identical hours of operation. Some services maintain Saturday hours while others do not. Evening students seem to struggle most because the majority of services are not available during evening hours. In part, to address the needs of evening and nontraditional students, the College maintains an active student portal that allows students to access information and to communicate to student services personnel. During the first two weeks of each semester, service hours are extended to meet student demand. The Admissions and Records Office also maintains a chat room for students to ask questions related to all aspects of Student Services. The Financial Aid Office staff actively participates in both outreach and in-reach activities. The Financial Aid Office utilizes various modes to deliver information and services to students through consumer brochures, fact books, workshops, and labs. Students can also access information and communicate to staff through the active student portal, My Gateway. Students can communicate in real time through Fullerton College Twitter. Students can access some services such as financial aid, course registration, and counseling online. As more and more students take online classes, the services available to online students will need to be evaluated regularly to ensure efficiency and effectiveness. Additionally concerns about limited staffing and space were noted by student services staff and managers, particularly with regard to the Financial Aid Office, where students are asked to provide confidential information over the counter with little assurance of privacy. (Standard II.B.3.a.)

The Team noted there are numerous means by which the College provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development. Students can take classes such as music, art, philosophy, psychology, and participate in special events and programs that provide opportunities for reflection and foster an understanding of cultural diversity. Student art projects also promote an appreciation of aesthetic values and multicultural perspectives. Students also have the opportunity to become involved in leadership through the Student Affairs Office. The Associated Students (AS) and the Inter-Club Council (ICC) provide students with opportunities to participate as club members, representatives, senators, and elected officers, thereby imparting leadership skills and a sense of civic responsibility. To ensure this is the case, the student learning outcome for participation in student government could be strengthened by establishing clearer and more measurable indicators of leadership skills acquisition associated with program participation. Further, although the self study identifies bureaucratic “red tape” as an impediment to student

participation in campus activities, the Team found no strategies for addressing this challenge appear in the planning agenda pertaining to this matter.

The Team identified a variety of counseling services available to students. In addition to general and transfer counseling, more specialized counseling support is provided for students participating in programs such as EOPS, CalWORKs, Disabled Student Services, and Puente. The Health Center also provides personal counseling and psychological assistance to students. Aside from periodic counselor performance evaluations that take place once every three years, neither the general counseling program nor other counseling services are regularly or systematically evaluated for their contribution to student development and success. Student satisfaction surveys are limited to special programs such as EOPS. The Team found during interviews with students that the students felt availability of counseling services is often insufficient to meet their needs. Additionally, they indicated that the quality of counseling services is not consistent. Several students, however, expressed considerable satisfaction with counseling services provided by EOPS and other special programs. (Standard II.B.b.)

The Team notes that it will be necessary for the College to conduct more systematic evaluation of its counseling services. Student users of all counseling services should be periodically surveyed, and the College should conduct comparative analyses of indicators such as successful course completion, persistence and retention rates among student users and non-users of counseling services. (Standard II.B.3.c.)

The Team found that respecting and valuing diversity is among the core values of Fullerton College. The Cadena Cultural Center serves as the formal center for programs and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation for diversity. The Cadena Cultural Center hosts a number of activities that provide a broad range of activities and services. Additionally, under the leadership and guidance of the campus Diversity Committee, the College has implemented numerous initiatives that support and enhance student diversity. Interviews with students and staff point to a strong pride in the institution's commitment to diversity. (Standard II.B.d.)

The Team found evidence that the institution recently reviewed the admission process through a Banner student team to ensure that the admissions process meets state wide standards. The assessment center provides data to the director of institutional research that is used in departmental discussions about appropriateness and accuracy of their placement and assessment. This internal analysis combined with the use of third-party, externally validated, placement tools ensures an unbiased and fair assessment and placement process. The College follows Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) guidelines and backs up their records on the NOCCCD server. They have an appropriate process for providing access to student records. (Standard II.B.3.e, II.B.3.f.)

Student support services rely on program review and SLOs/SAOs in the Student Services division to determine support needs of its students. There is evidence of clear planning, implementation, and evaluation in these documents. In some respects, the College's student services work units appear to be further along in their processes for developing and assessing student learning outcomes than their counterparts in academic affairs. In order to make the

SLO/SAO discussions and assessment results more connected to campus planning and to increase transparency and accountability, the College should consider incorporating its student services SLOs and SAOs into its student services program review documents and processes. (Standard II.B.4.)

Conclusions

The Team found that the Student Services division has made significant progress in strengthening the unit's ability to enhance service delivery through the creation of student learning outcomes and the assessment of measurable indicators. The Team noted, however, that the student services assessment process could benefit from more formality through greater emphasis on measurable objectives. Despite some SLOs and assessment activities, interviews indicate program improvements result from informal dialogue among College managers and faculty.

The Team observed that the Student Services area appears to have progressed somewhat beyond the institution's Academic Affairs division. The Team found, however, that Student Services SLOs and SAOs receive limited incorporation into program review documents and processes. The College should consider greater usage of SLOs and SAOs to enhance the student services program review process.

Recommendation

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.)

C. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

The library's collection includes printed and electronic materials of a size and scope that are adequate for the needs of its student body. The Team also noted that the library provides training and educational programs and services for both students and faculty in library and other information retrieval skills. The library reviews its collection of holdings and student usage information in order to ensure student learning needs are being met. The Team noted, however, that institutional planning and budgeting activities do not have identifiable direct linkages to library functions. The library also lacks a budget line item specifically addressing its printed and electronic collections. Faculty and library professionals were found to play the primary role in maintaining educational programs, services, and materials in support of student learning. The library has not engaged in a full cycle of systematic planning, goal-setting, assessment, and improvement.

Findings and Evidence

The Team found the College's library and learning support services adequate to meet the learning needs of its student body. The Team did not identify a line item in the College budget dedicated to library materials acquisition and no mid-range or long-range plans exist to ensure the sufficiency of the collection. Library funding appears to be sporadic and ad-hoc; requests for resources are not enumerated in the library program review document nor are library personnel aware of the overall amount of funds needed for future collection development or of the past history of funding allocations to the library. Similarly, the Team noted that, although the Academic Support Center (ASC) has proven to be quite resourceful in identifying and securing funds in support of programmatic initiatives, there is no systematic means of requesting and obtaining resources for this administrative unit. Thus, despite the presence of a new library and academic support facility, evident strength of the library collection in selected disciplines, and demonstrable effectiveness of the ASC, the absence of systematic planning and resource allocation processes makes it difficult, if not impossible, to definitively assess the extent to which the College meets this Standard. (Standard II.C.1.)

The Team found evidence that an in-depth study of the collection was conducted in fall 2009, resulting in a number of recommendations for de-selection and new purchases. Interviews with librarians showed this evaluative document is being consulted as new purchases are made.

Faculty can request materials for purchase, and a collection development policy outlines the scope of the collection and selection criteria for print and electronic materials. A member of the library faculty serves on the Curriculum Committee and the library has access to CurricUNET, allowing the library to remain informed about changes in and needs for the curriculum. Faculty participation in materials selection and de-selection occurs to some extent, but varies from program to program and is not systematically enumerated or evaluated. (Standard II.C.1.a.)

The Team observed that the library provides instruction in the use of its resources through drop-in workshops, course-related instruction at the request of faculty, online library guides, and in-person and online reference services. The library also has a credit course under the auspices of the Study Abroad program. Librarians are well versed in national information literacy standards and can speak knowledgeably about how their instructional offerings have been revised and updated to focus on critical thinking instead of a tools-based approach to teaching research skills. Evidence indicated that student learning outcomes have been identified for drop-in workshops and credit course offerings; because course-related instruction is provided at the request of faculty and sessions are tailored to faculty assignments, it was noted by the Team that systematic learning outcomes have not been identified.

The library building includes a modern computer classroom that facilitates hands-on, active learning. The library's instruction program is robust with many course-related sessions offered each semester and all full-time librarians engaged in teaching. The Team reviewed student surveys that point to positive attitudes about instructional offerings. Librarians expressed interest in developing information competency instruction to support students in distance education programs, but have not yet done so. As the College's distance education program grows, this will be an important consideration. (Standard II.C.1.b.)

The Team verified the library is open six days a week; electronic resources are available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and can be accessed on-campus and off-campus. Services such as reference, instructional requests, and purchase requests are available in-person and online, making them available to faculty and students on-campus and in distance education programs.

Academic support services are available six days a week and services are available by appointment and on a drop-in basis. Information about the ASC is available on the website and appointments can be made over the telephone. In addition, the ASC is conducting a pilot program to offer math tutoring and writing support via Elluminate for students in selected distance education courses. Although services to students in distance education courses and programs are not yet equivalent to those offered to on-site students, ASC staff report an awareness of the need to develop equivalent services. (Standard II.C.1.c.)

The Team noted the library has safety and security systems in place to protect the physical collection. The library has emergency procedures. The procedures were initiated and developed by library staff, and all employees appear to be well versed in the procedures. The ASC also has safety and security procedures in place to protect its resources and users as well as emergency procedures. The library belongs to the Community College Library Consortium and Cal West Consortium through which it purchases electronic resources at a discount. The Team could not identify evidence that the performance of these services is formally assessed by the College. (Standard II.C.1.d, II.C.1.e.)

The Team noted the library's 2007-2009 program review identifies program goals and learning outcomes. In addition, the library has developed student learning outcomes for its three credit courses and identified methods for the assessment of those outcomes. In the case of one outcome, a robust rubric exists. Student learning outcomes have been identified for drop-in workshops; because course-related instruction is provided at the request of faculty and sessions

are tailored to faculty assignments, systematic learning outcomes for course-related instruction have not been identified.

At the time of the site visit, student learning outcomes at the program and credit course level have not been assessed. Although the library has only recently developed formal student learning outcomes for its drop-in workshops, it previously developed questions to assess student learning of some of the concepts taught in the workshops. In 2008, the library collected and analyzed data related to student learning in these workshops. The report concluded that student learning was adequate.

The Team found the library collects data related to collection size, electronic resource usage, the number of instructional sessions given, and participation levels for instructional sessions and queries answered. The library has conducted surveys of faculty and staff to determine satisfaction with its services. A general survey about library services was conducted in fall 2009, and surveys of students and faculty are sometimes distributed following instructional sessions. However, the Team found that the College does not provide evidence that data are systematically collected or that collected data are analyzed and used for decision-making purposes.

The College provides learning support services through the ASC. The ASC is housed in the new library building and includes the Skills Center (academic study skills, reading, and test proctoring), the Tutoring Center (individual and group tutoring in most subjects), and the Writing Center (individual assistance and workshops). In addition to the faculty and peer tutors, the ASC provides technology and reference materials to support student learning. The ASC is heavily used by students and staff commitment to student learning was evident to the Team.

The library conducted a program review covering years 2007-2009. This document included information about the library's activities and accomplishments; the document did not include an assessment of how well the library met its program goals or the achievement of student learning outcomes. Although the library produces an annual report, this report is primarily a compilation of input and output measures; the Team noted that the library engages in systematic, ongoing assessments of its resources and services. Overall, although much data are gathered and student learning outcomes have been defined and have, in some cases, begun to be measured, there is little evidence that the results of evaluations are being used as the basis for improvement of library programs and services.

The Team found the three departments within the ASC completed program reviews in 2009. These program reviews outline the departments' goals (which could be considered program outcomes and in some cases, student learning outcomes), provide a narrative description of services, present and analyze available data, and determine how well previous goals were accomplished. Program reviews follow a consistent pattern, utilize broad-based input from the department staff, and require the approval of the dean of library and learning resources. The Team noted the ASC has made more progress than the library in assessing its services to ensure quality and make improvements. (Standard II.C.2.)

Conclusions

The Team found the College's library and learning support services are adequate to meet the needs of its diverse student body. It provides appropriate access to its collection and learning support services. The library depends on the professional expertise of its staff and faculty in the maintenance of its print collection and operation of its learning support services.

Although both the library and academic support center have elements of program review, goals, and some SLOs, the Team could not find evidence they are engaged in an integrated cycle of assessment and improvement. Little evidence was found that the results of library and ASC program reviews result in improvements in support of student success.

Recommendation

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.)

Standard III Resources

A. Human Resources

General Observations

The Team found evidence that the District Human Resources provides appropriate control and oversight for the hiring of personnel. The College employs qualified staff regardless of their classification and function. Board policy and procedure as well as District and campus practices treat employees equitably. The District and colleges observe equal opportunity employment practices in the recruitment and hiring of employees. No evidence of systematic District or campus human resource planning assessment and improvement was identified by the Team. The Team 2005 recommendation regarding employee diversity has not been addressed by the College.

Findings and Evidence

The Team reviewed evidence that indicated that College employees meet or exceed qualifications for education, work experience, and training. Faculty receive degrees from accredited institutions and play a critical role in selecting other faculty for hire. Job descriptions appear current and are revised as necessary for administrative and classified staff. Faculty do not have specific job descriptions, although position announcements comply with state requirements. The Human Resources Department exercises oversight of employment advertising, the application process, and hiring committee training.

Board policy and administrative procedures exist, which govern the overall hiring of all personnel. Each hiring committee determines the questions to be asked of candidates. A short teaching demonstration is included in the process for faculty hires. (Standard III.A.1.a.)

The Team confirmed that Board policy and procedure exists for the employment of all District personnel classes. The College hiring practices were verified as compliant with District regulations including: position statement preparation, job announcement dissemination, applicant certification and screening, interview protocol, and hiring. Professional qualifications employed by the College for the purposes of faculty and administrative hiring met or exceeded standards established by the California Community College Chancellor's Office. Degrees held by College faculty and administrators are from institutions accredited by authorized U.S. accrediting bodies. The Team also determined that applicants for academic employment whose experience, training, skills, knowledge, educational attainment, or professional preparation are unclear receive review by an appropriately constituted faculty equivalency committees.

The Team found general staff approval for College employment practices with the notable exception of the District's reassignment of College employees to District functions. Academic hires were shown to be faculty driven processes, with selection committee participation appropriate to the discipline or function to be filled. Each hiring committee is autonomous but

follows practices consistent with Board procedure and determines its interview questions and practices consistent with Board procedure. An equity coordinator is assigned to each committee regardless of type hiring to ensure equitable and fair treatment of all candidates. (Standard III.A.1, III.A.1.a.)

The Team found that the College observes Board policy and applicable contract language in the evaluation of its employees. Evaluation is systematic, and all employee groups are provided with copies of their duty statements and evaluation forms prior to being assessed. Administrators are evaluated every year by their supervisors with a comprehensive evaluation every three years. Probationary academic employees are evaluated by a tenure review committee, as outlined in the faculty union agreement. Tenured faculty are evaluated within a three-year cycle. Probationary classified staff are assessed during four, six, eight months, and one-year intervals, and every two years thereafter.

The District Human Resources Department provides ongoing training to managers regarding the employee evaluation process. Team review of the evaluation processes indicates they are designed to enhance performance of staff at all levels. (Standard III.A.1.b.)

The Team found the completion of SLOs is not part of the College performance evaluation process. Interviews with the Faculty Senate and faculty, however, indicate they play a central role in the student learning objectives process. Records review indicates that faculty have participated in meetings workshops dedicated to SLO assessment activities. (Standard III.A.1.c.)

The Team found evidence that the College upholds a written code of professional conduct. The Board has adopted both policy and procedures outlining its ethics principals. The College has also published a statement of ethics in its catalog. (Standard III.A.1.d.)

The Team noted the number of College employees approximated the number of employees specified in its self study. During fall 2010, 305 full-time faculty members and 544 part-time were in the College's service. Approximately 270 classified staff and 37 administrators were also employed by the College. Interviews with employees indicated anxiety regarding the state budget and increasing workload. Generally speaking, however, campus personnel had a positive attitude regarding their capacity to serve students. (Standard III.A.2.)

The Team found the District Board of Trustees regularly updates or develops policy. Personnel policies are maintained as part of the District systematic review of its regulations. The Team identified the District's personnel policies on the District website and in some cases, personnel procedures written into its labor contracts. The District has a Board policy that outlines its commitment to equal employment opportunity (BP 3410). Additional policies address full-time and adjunct academic employment (BP 7120-1, BP 7120), classified hiring (BP 7120-3) and administrative hiring (BP 7120-4). (Standard III.A.3.)

The Team confirmed the District also provides training to college interview teams. Equal Employment Opportunity in-service training is mandatory for classified staff and full-time faculty serving as interview committee leads. (Standard III.3.a.)

The Team observed that employee records are maintained in a secured environment in the District's Human Resources Department. Records are found in the Human Resources Department in locked cabinets. Board policy (BP 3310) maintains personnel files as permanent records. Interviews with staff indicate employees can access personnel files upon request to the Human Resources Department. (Standard III.3.b.)

Although the Team identified a diversity statement as one of the institution's core values and the existence of a student equity plan, no evidence could be identified that indicated the 2005 evaluation Team's Equity and Diversity recommendation had been met. The previous Team had recommended "a college wide equity and diversity action to be developed and implemented in a timely manner along with a schedule and budget."

The Team did identify ample opportunities for College employees to participate in diversity activities designed to serve its diverse student population. A 2009 student survey indicated that over 80 percent of the respondents were satisfied with the diversity of College employees. (Standard III.A.4.a.)

The Team confirmed that the District Office of Equity and Diversity is responsible for monitoring system program and activities for inclusiveness. A District wide Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Advisory Committee (EEOAC) assists the office in the formulation of its diversity plan. Fullerton College participates in the EEOAC sending student, faculty, classified, and administrators to this advisory body. (Standard III.A.4.b.)

The District maintains a policy (BP 1002) that embraces both diversity and participatory decision-making. College employees report that personnel policies are fair and equitable. Interviews with staff and a review of policies, procedures, and other documents also indicate the College demonstrates integrity in the treatment of personnel. (Standard III.A.4.b.)

The Team confirmed that the College provides professional development activities for its employees. The President's Advisory Council has a staff development subcommittee that has offered several programs, workshops, and other activities to meet employee needs. The Faculty Senate also maintains a committee designed to meet faculty needs. The District offers sabbatical opportunities for academics. The Team found that College-based development workshops were typically evaluated at their conclusion for planning purposes. (Standard III.5.a, III.5.b.)

The Team could not identify evidence that human resource planning was taking place at the College. In addition, the Team noted the College's institutional planning did not incorporate mid to long-term human resource needs. The College has not completed a full cycle of planning for any of its institutional activities. Further, no formal assessment of institutional planning at the College has taken place in light of a new institutional planning process. (Standard III.a.6)

Conclusions

The 2005 evaluation Team recommended that Fullerton College in order to further advance its ideals of equity and diversity develop a College wide equity and diversity plan and implement it in a timely manner. Although the current Team found ample evidence the institution had engaged in a wide variety of student diversity planning and activities, the Team could find no evidence that the institution addressed a diversity and equity plan for employees.

Recommendations

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 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.)

B. Physical Resources

General Observations

The Team found that Fullerton College provides a safe, secure physical plant to support student learning. The campus is attractive and well-maintained. All instructional and student support activities take place on the College campus with the exception of online courses and limited classes at the District Administrative Center in Anaheim.

The Team could not identify a clear linkage between its facilities and equipment planning and resource allocation processes with overall institutional planning. The College's facilities planning process itself has not been assessed for its effectiveness in supporting student learning. No evidence was found linking facilities planning to the total costs necessary for the operation, maintenance, and equipment of its new facilities.

Findings and Evidence

The Team reviewed evidence showing that the College is struggling with continued maintenance of existing older structures and equipment in the support of student programs and services. Employees report there are not enough funds allocated to address all of the maintenance and equipment issues that have been identified. The College has been able to alleviate some of these problems with District funds. However, interviews with administrators and staff indicate there is a concern that some maintenance issues will soon become critical and impact the utilization and/or safety of older facilities. (Standard III.B, III.B.1.)

The College has undergone significant increases in physical assets as a result of the passage of a construction bond in 2002. These include the Campus Safety Building; Library/Learning Resource Center; Parking Structure; College Center; Classroom Office Building; Aquatic Center; Physical Education facilities renovation; and Science building. The addition of new facilities has clearly enhanced the quality and the quantity of the physical resources of the College. These additional facilities have allowed various programs to enhance their offerings and to provide students with additional educational opportunities. No evidence was found that indicates the institution has planned for the total ownership for its new facilities.

The Team noted the self study campus committee minutes and interviews with staff demonstrate a commitment by the College to provide a physical plant that will enhance student learning. The College utilizes the District's Facility Condition Assessment Report to assist in determining the necessary replacement and upgrade of facilities. The 2003 report is a comprehensive document that outlines the assessment of existing facilities at the District and the College. The document also outlines ten-year funding requirements. The greatest student concern with facilities was access to parking. A plan to add an additional parking structure exists. (Standard III.B.1.a.)

The Team found that the College utilizes a five-year Construction Plan as the planning vehicle for new facilities. The plan outlines major capital projects and is presented to the President's Advisory Council for review and approval.

The College has taken efforts to ensure that both older and newer facilities are compliant with state and federal safety regulations and meet the requirements of the American's with Disabilities Act (ADA). Campus security is evident at the College, and surveillance is provided in support of morning and evening student programming. The Team found College employees have received in-service training for emergency situations. Federally-mandated crime statistics are maintained and publicly disclosed. The evidence indicates the campus environment is maintained in a safe and secure manner. (Standard III.B.1.b.)

The self study states that physical resource planning is a regular part of planning at the institution. However, evidence does not support the axiom that facilities planning is a result of broader ongoing institutional planning. The College's program review processes are new, and the integration of facility planning with program review was not apparent during the Team visit. No evidence regarding the assessment of physical resources for their effectiveness could be identified. (Standard III.B.2, III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b.)

The Team also could not find evidence that the College has planned for the "total cost of ownership" for its facilities. Staff report continuing problems with equipment and with supply budgets related to new facilities. This lack of planning, along with the issues related to the continued maintenance of older buildings, has the potential to severely challenge the College. The Team concluded, however, that the College long-range capital construction plans are appropriate to the institution's mission.

Conclusions

Team observed the College facilities and equipment adequately support the institution's learning programs and services. The campus and its equipment provide access to students requiring reasonable accommodation for physical disability. The campus is safe and secure. The Team did not find evidence that clearly link facilities planning to institutional planning. No evidence was identified that the College has assessed its facilities planning process.

The College has increased its physical assets as a result of a 2002 construction bond. The additional new facilities has clearly enhanced the quality and quantity of College physical resources and allowed various programs to enhance offerings and provide students with additional education opportunities. However, no evidence was found that indicates the institution has planned for the total ownership for its new facilities.

Recommendations

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.)

C. Technology Resources

General Observations

The Team identified a 2011-2015 District Technology Plan that was developed with College input. A Team review of the College 2006-2011 Technology Plan and the technology improvements that have taken place since the last Team visit provides evidence that the plan has been partially implemented for decision making at the campus. The Team did not find evidence that the Technology Plan links to institutional planning nor that the technology planning process has been assessed for its effectiveness nor to make improvements. College Information Technology is adequate to support the student learning and support programs and services at the College. Students and staff are provided with adequate technology training and support.

Findings and Evidence

The Team noted the College has continued to mature in its effective application of technology since the last Team visit. There have been expansions to the computer systems infrastructure, improvements and expansions of computer labs, and changes to the software used for planning, curriculum review, and institutional research. The Team observed there are several committees that participate in planning of technology at the College: the Academic Computing Technologies (ACT), the principal department responsible for implementing technology and maintaining state of the art technology projects; the Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC), a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate; the Instructional Technology Committee (ITC); and the Technology Implementation Planning Committee (TIPC). (Standards III.C, III.C.1.a.)

The Team noted that the College provided computer assistance to students through a Help Desk and tutorials through the institution's website. Faculty and staff support is provided by technology employees through formal orientations or online support. Faculty indicated a high level of satisfaction with the training they received prior to offering course instruction in an online format. Flex day technology training was also found to be provided at the campus. (Standard III.C.1.b.)

The College has a Technology Plan for 2006-2011, however, it has not been fully implemented and a cycle of evaluation has not been completed. In addition, the institution's demand on technology is increasing, but the infrastructure and resources to support the technological advances seem to be deficient. Evidence, based on conversations with members from Instructional Technology Committee (ITC), and Technology Implementation Planning Committee (TIPC), suggests there needs to be a process for assessing and responding to the changing technology.

Management and staff readily admit there is not a clear and systematic process in place to support replacing or upgrading technology. Moreover, interviews indicate employees do not feel that appropriate planning has been conducted to address the equipment and operational costs of new campuses facilities. Evidence indicates technology needs are met on an ad-hoc basis or through requests occasionally made as part of program review. (Standard III.C.1.c.)

College technology supports the curriculum process, the online catalog, and student orientations. Meetings with representatives from the Instructional Technology Committee (ITC), and Technology Implementation Planning Committee (TIPC) showed that while technology services expanded, support staff has not kept up to meet this demand. Review of committee meeting minutes indicates there is dialogue to address the ongoing needs of the campus. (Standard III.D.1.d.)

The President's Advisory Council recently approved a revised Technology Plan prior to the Team visit. The College appears to be making progress with respect to integrating technology within its planning and budgeting processes by providing an assessment of its needs. There is ongoing dialogue in support of the new Technology Plan and recognition of the need for continued improvement. The Team could not, however, fully determine the linkage between institutional planning, budgeting, and technology. Since the recently-approved Technology Plan has been implemented, there is no systematic budgetary mechanism in place to replace or upgrade technology. The President's Advisory Council has approved some funding for infrastructure and equipment to support technology needs. (Standard III.C.2.)

Conclusions

The Team found a 2011-2015 District Technology Plan that provides general direction to the College. A review of Fullerton College's Technology Plan and subsequent information technology activities and developments indicates the College Technology Plan, in part, guided the institution in meeting its needs. Discussion with campus administrators, however, indicates the institution does not have a clear or systematic approach to replacing or upgrading its technology needs. Interviews with College staff found there is not clear communication regarding the rationale used for information technology budget allocations. The Team noted that no systematic review of the campus technology planning process has taken place. Further, no assessment of the effectiveness of expenditures on technologies has been completed.

Evidence obtained through interviews with College administrators and faculty have also indicated that the College's new facilities has not adequately planned for equipment and operational costs.

Recommendations

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.)

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.)

D. Financial Resources

General Observations

The Team noted evidence that the financial resources of NOCCCD and Fullerton College are adequate to meet the latter's student learning and support service needs. The District and College were found to operate their finances with integrity, resulting in fiscal stability. The District and College balance both short-term and long-term financial needs to maintain solvency. The Team could not identify evidence that either the District or College integrate financial and institutional planning processes. No evidence was found supporting a cycle of planning resource allocation assessment and ongoing improvement. Employees report a lack of understanding regarding both the District and College financial planning and budgeting processes.

Findings and Evidence

The Team confirmed the prudent financial management of the District through a document review process. Documents included three prior years of audit reports, District responses to audit findings, California Community College Annual Financial and Budget Reports CCFS 311Q and 320, actuarial studies, bargaining agreements, bond measure oversight committee meeting minutes, purchasing policies, and various facilities planning documents. The Team reviewed the College's budget expenditures and liabilities and concluded it has sufficient revenue to support its programs and services in addition to maintaining institutional effectiveness.

According to its CCFS-311 report, the District had an unrestricted fund balance of \$35,442,489 in fiscal year ending 2009 and \$40,862,098 in 2010. Of this fund, \$8,917,507 and \$10,319,292 were set aside respectively as the District's five percent contingency reserve. Fullerton College maintained ending fund balances of \$8,018,211 in 2009 and \$8,375,210 in 2010.

The Team observed that historically both the District and College have engaged in conservative fiscal practices. Records from the College PAC meetings and interviews with business office personnel found that the state's financial situation is being closely monitored and responded to by staff. The College leadership recognizes the institution must mitigate budget shortfalls by means other than reserve spending. PAC records indicate the institution's available reserves/ending balances could be -\$49,000,000 in fiscal year 2013-2014 should the institution "not make preparations to deal with intended shortfalls." (Standard III.D.)

The self study indicates the President's Advisory Council is the primary institutional planning group for the College. Recommendations from the PAC are stated to encompass the institution's mission, goals, and values. The Team found, however, that the actual operational or procedural activities that link the College's mission to resource allocations through budgeting are not clearly identified. Interviews with College staff and a review of institutional records point to a process of informal dialogue. The actual connection between mission and budgeting appears to be that they are reviewed concurrently on an annual basis.

Team review of the College's actual financial planning process indicates it has traditionally been of limited breadth focusing on budget adoption and implementation with subsequent adjustments

and transfers in keeping with divisional or department unit goals. Long-term to mid-term analysis and planning is not widely evident in College records or discussions with staff.

The Team found no evidence that the College has assessed its financial planning process nor evaluated the outcomes its resource allocation decisions have produced. The Team concurs with the College self study which indicates the institution should continue to refine the connection between institutional planning and resource allocation and develop effective ways to gauge the outcomes achieved from the allocation of its financial resources to maximize the effect on student success. (Standard III.D.1.a.)

NOCCCD has responsibility for establishing the parameters by which realistic budgets can be established and adopted. The Team confirmed the chancellor prepares an annual budget report (CCFS-311Q) that demonstrates the financial and budgetary status of the District including outstanding obligations consistent with state law. The District and College budgets are set through formal Board review and public action. The Board also approves all contracts, hiring, and purchase orders that draw on District funds. The District provides a general ledger Banner software system that allows District and College managers easy access to financial documents and budgets in order to effectively and realistically assess resources. (Standard III.D.1.b.)

The Team noted the District and the College have maintained a reputation of fiscal solvency. Although the statewide budget crisis is ongoing and very unstable, the College is positioned to financially support its needs. The College maintains adequate reserves and a five percent Board policy contingency helps ensure the College maintains an annual operating budget. The College provides for long-term debt payments and currently has a plan to support funding for the post employment retiree benefits liability.

Risk management is appropriately controlled and funded. The District is self-insured for general liability coverage through the Alliance of Schools for Cooperative Insurance Programs Joint Powers of Authority (ASCIPJPA). Worker's compensation is self-insured with excess claims coverage over \$500,000 provided by a private insurance carrier.

The Team found that both the District and College maintain reserves to account for emergencies and cover ongoing financial commitments. The institution has sufficient cash flow to maintain stability and meet emergencies. (Standard III.D.1.c.)

The Team found that both the District and College have clear budget policies and procedures in place. Discussions with personnel and records review found appropriate oversight and control in the Business Office. Communication regarding the budget is provided by the chancellor and president. Interviews with College staff, however, indicate employees report a lack of understanding regarding both District and College practices. Budget and business office forms are available online. (Standard III.D.1.d.)

The Team found evidence that District Business Office staff and College Business Office staff systematically monitor budgets and expenditures. The College's Banner software provides the platform for accurate monitoring of all budgets and transactions. The College also provides financial information in a manner that helps managers review real time budgets. Reports

showing detailed budgets and encumbrances are disseminated to managers on a monthly, quarterly, and annual basis. Procedures are in place that comply with the requirements of local, state, and federal regulations. The appropriate oversight of all College funds is evidenced in annual audit reports and correction of audit exceptions. (Standard III.D.2, III.D.2.a, III.D.2.b.)

The Team found evidence that the District monitors and plans for the payment of its liabilities and future obligations. The Team observed the District follows Governmental Accounting Standard Board (GASB) statements 34, 35 and 45 for business type activity as recommended by the California Community College's State Chancellor's Office. Consequently, annual fiscal year assets, liabilities, and net assets are made available to the Board, staff, and general public. The largest District liability is health and welfare costs for retirees. In accordance with GASB 45, the District maintains benefit costs plus amortized annual increases for the full 30 years unfunded obligation. According to the most recent actuarial study, the liability was forecast at \$158,000,000 for which \$50,000,000 has been set aside for Fiscal Year 2009. Other liabilities include Bond Measure X debt retirement. (Standard III.D.2.c.)

The Team identified sufficient College reserves to meet its cash flow needs and unforeseen emergencies. Fullerton College's unrestricted ending fund balance for 2009-2010 was \$8,375,210. In addition, the District exceeds the five percent reserve level required by the Commission. The total District unrestricted general fund balance ending June 30, 2010 was \$40,862,058. The Team also identified back-up planning by the Board should borrowing become necessary. Memorandum of Understandings exist with both the faculty and classified unions to borrow revenue against the Retiree Benefits Fund in the event of an unanticipated emergency. (Standard IV.2.c.)

The Team found evidence the institution practices effective oversight and control of its finances including non general fund activities. The College employs an internal auditor to assist the budget and finance director in the control of revenue expenditures and special projects. District investments are directed by Board policy and procedure. The District's Bond Measure X is overseen by a Citizens Oversight Committee and operated consistent with applicable state regulations. Special project grants require multiple levels of spending authorization at both the College and District levels. Purchase orders are prepared electronically and routed through approval queues with final authorization located with the District director of purchasing. The Board of Trustees approves all transactions over \$10,000. The District and College perform internal and external audits. External audits include categorically funded programs. The College Foundation is audited by its own independent auditor. (Standard III.D.2.d.)

The Team found that College grants have been approved by the Board of Trustees consistent with Board policy. Both categorical programs and grant activities are audited for transaction compliance with authorized activities. District audits since the last evaluation Team visit have received unqualified opinions on both its external financial and compliance audits. (Standard III.D.2.e.)

The Team noted the District vice chancellor of finance and facilities has the authority to supervise the general business procedures system and assure the correct administration of property and contracts. The District director of purchasing has authority to enter into contracts.

Both Board policy and procedure exist to guide agreements with external entities. All external use of College property is directed by District civic center policy. Independent contractors are hired in compliance with Internal Revenue Service regulations.

The College utilizes a thorough approach to approving external contracts that support institutional integrity. Contracts are reviewed by College personnel. Those equaling \$5,000 or greater are forwarded to the District Business Office for approval. The Chancellor, Vice Chancellor of Facilities and Finance, and the District Director of Purchasing are authorized to sign purchase agreements in accordance with established policies of the Board of Trustees for contracts under \$25,000. Agreements above this sum require Board action. The College provides evidence of policy compliance in its approval of external and contractual agreements. (Standard III.2.f.)

The Team observed the College's Business Office maintains accurate financial records. Cash disbursements are approved with multiple signature lines and narrative justifications. College purchase orders are completed within established District regulations. The Team found no evidence of structure of ongoing assessment and of College business affairs functions. (Standard III.D.2.g.)

The Team identified several District activities employed to assess the effective use of its financial resources. The District conducts semi-monthly meetings with College budget officers to discuss concerns or issues, in addition to the District Planning Council. The Team could not identify a structured systematic ongoing process of assessment to measure the effectiveness of resource allocations to strengthen student learning. (Standard III.D.3.)

Conclusions

The Team found that both the District and College have a thorough practice for financial conservatism. The Team noted that Fullerton College keeps appropriate financial reserve levels to cover unforeseen emergencies. Record reviews and interviews with campus and District financial staff found appropriate oversight for both budget and expenditures. Short-term expenditures are assessed against long-term needs. Interviews with campus employees identified confusion regarding College financial planning. Of concern to the Team was a reported lack of communication regarding unfunded requests for revenue. The Team could not clearly identify the practices that link the College's mission and institutional planning to resource allocation. No assessment of the institution's fiscal or financial planning process was found.

Recommendations

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.)

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.)

STANDARD IV LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

The Fullerton College self study provides an accurate depiction of the transition in leadership that has taken place at the institution since the last Team visit. The system relationships among the Board of Trustees, chancellor, District personnel and the College are collegial and productive. Governance roles and responsibilities and defined decision-making structures are in place to ensure employee participation in reflective well-reasoned operations of both the District and campus in support of student learning and service.

The Team found that policies and procedures guide employee participation in decision-making, yet considerable numbers of the staff point to a lack of clarity and understanding regarding basic activities such as planning, budgeting, decision-making, resource allocation, and assessment. Both the District and College have yet to complete a full cycle of planning, resource allocation, assessment and organizational improvement. Greater communications regarding system and institutional practices are necessary to strengthen organizational processes and outcomes and to build better understanding.

College leadership has experienced considerable turnover since the 2005 Team visit. A new District chancellor, president, and interim campus executive staff were in place during the Team visit. The leadership has instituted a new planning process and has reestablished program review and SLO practices. The Team noted that a focused effort needs to be made by the College in the areas of institutional planning, budgeting, assessment, and SLO implementation in order to establish an environment of continuous quality improvement in support of student learning. The College has in place many new or reintroduced processes. It is important they are continued through a full cycle of implementation.

Findings and Evidence

The Team verified that the College employs the skills and knowledge of its leadership, faculty, staff, and students throughout the organization in meeting its mission. The Team found an inclusive environment for decision-making and planning as evidenced through committee structures throughout the campus. The institution has reorganized its planning processes to assist in decision-making and provide information in support of varied programs and services. The College's published core values identify the involvement of all in the decision-making process and the expectation that everyone display behavior in accordance with personal integrity and high ethical standards. (Standard IV.A.)

Team discussions with administrative leadership, Faculty Senate and classified staff identified a consensus regarding the new president's emphasis on building an environment of inclusiveness, empowerment, improvement, and excellence at the College. Campus constituents generally

expressed optimism about consensus-based decision-making since the College's new president has taken office. Interviews with senate leaders, faculty, and counselors also pointed to a strong commitment to promoting the well-being of students and the entire campus community.

The Team identified several regulations that outlined participatory governance. In addition, the College PAC website also provides a link to an explanation of employee participatory governance processes and procedures. Interviews revealed College staff understand the importance of having all constituent groups at the table. Subcommittees of the PAC include a wide variety of activities: Budget and Planning; Staff Development; Technology; Diversity; Basic Skills; and Student Success and Student Learning Outcomes. (Standard IV.A.1.)

The College has a participatory governance document outlining campus practice. The roles and responsibility of the faculty via the Curriculum Committee are very clear regarding recommendations on learning programs and services. In conversations and as evidenced through the committee website, it is clear that the faculty embrace this important role in the College. The Faculty Senate participates actively in academic and professional matters.

A review of documents identified focused faculty involvement in formulation of course objectives, instructional content and methods, as well as SLOs. While the self study did not make specific reference to the role of academic administrators in this area, Team interviews revealed the Dean's Council and its membership are active in academic matters. In addition, the deans regularly engage in budget development, review faculty positions, and participate in the PAC, as well as advisory groups and other campus committees. There is evidence in various committee meeting agendas and minutes that faculty and academic deans are engaged in the making of recommendations on learning programs and services.

College minutes show that Associated Students (AS) representatives regularly attend PAC meetings. Interviews showed that faculty, staff, and administration have a good working relationship based on mutual respect. (Standard IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b.)

The Team found evidence that the Board of Trustees is informed through broad-based governance structures. These bodies are outlined in policy and include the Chancellor's Cabinet, as well as District Planning Council, Staff Development, and Insurance and Benefits Councils or Committees. Records from these bodies point to diverse opinion and information sharing with recommendations appearing on the Board's public meeting agenda. Interviews with Board members provided further evidence in support of the Board's participation in and support for cooperative, positive, and inclusive District wide decision-making.

Interviews clearly indicated there is a collaborative spirit at Fullerton College, with some minor exceptions. Employees report they do not feel a part of District planning, goal-setting, or decision-making activities. Many staff report their constituent representatives at the College do not keep them informed. There is a lack of clear delineation between the role of the California State Employees Association (CSEA) and the Classified Senate. The College Classified Senate does not have a clear role and function and occasionally finds itself in conflict with the interests of the CSEA distracting it from full collaboration in the governance process. College participatory governance processes are otherwise embraced by employees. (Standard IV.A.3.)

The Team found that the College's Career Technical Education (CTE) programs have established agreements with external agencies. They also have advisory boards that meet regularly. Relationships exist in the areas of law enforcement, cosmetology, automotive, and paralegal studies. CTE programs have conducted environmental scans; however, evidence regarding the College's relationship with other community agencies is limited.

The Team noted the College adheres to the Accreditation Standards and Commission requirements for public disclosure. The College self study report and mid-term report are available to the public via the College website. (Standard IV.A.4.)

Despite the existence of a delineation of functions document, the visiting Team further found there is no clear understanding among College leadership groups how their roles link to integrated planning and decision making at the campus or District levels. In addition, neither the College nor the District have evaluated their governance practices with an eye toward continuous quality improvement. (Standard IV.A.5.)

Conclusions

The Team found the NOCCCD system and its colleges recognize and support participatory governance within the District consistent with policy. The Team noted an abundance of District and College committees, councils, task forces, and advisory bodies that assist the Board in its policy and decision-making role. Administrators, faculty, classified staff, and students have appropriate and defined roles in governance processes. The working relationship among employee groups at the College and District is positive and professional. The chancellor and the president communicate on a regular basis with constituent groups and employees. The District maintains a delineation of functions document that outlines the primary and secondary authority and responsibility of the District's and College's various offices and participatory governance structures. The Team found, however, that the College's constituent groups expressed a lack of understanding regarding the District's Budget Allocation Model and its planning governance and decision-making activities. Moreover, it was noted by the Team that the District has not assessed any of its processes for effectiveness in supporting student learning.

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.)

B. Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations

Team interviews with Board members and staff, as well as review of policy and Board minutes, confirm the effectiveness of the District governing Board. The Board operates with ultimate responsibility related to matters of educational quality, legal issues, and financial integrity. Appropriate delegations of operational authority and accountability exist at the District and College levels. In addition, a clear delineation of responsibility exists for District and system colleges. The Board was found to adhere to its policy role within the District and hires and evaluates its chief executive officer, the chancellor. The Team noted the system's college presidents have delegated authority and responsibility to lead and operate their institutions within the parameters of Board policy. The Board's policies comply with the District's mission statement, and it acts as an independent body with ultimate authority to govern the District. Board policies and procedures are published online and are available to employees and the general public. The Team found the Board has a program of orientation for new members and a policy on ethics for its membership. Further, it engages in a self-assessment process to measure Board performance. Through interviews with Board members and corresponding records review, it was also noted that the Board was well informed and involved in the District's accreditation. The Board effectively communicates expectations of program service excellence and supports the colleges in the meeting their mission. The Board effectively constructs its system budget and controls expenditures.

The Team could not identify evidence that the District and Board systematically assess their decisions, governance planning, communications structures, and processes for effectiveness.

Findings and Evidence

The Team verified the Board is comprised of seven members elected to four-year terms by residents of North Orange County. Each College also has a student trustee who serves a one-year term. NOCCCD has a very stable Board of Trustees. As evidenced by Board minutes, interviews with Board members and the chancellor, the Board acts as a whole - very often making unanimous decisions. The Board also surveyed the various groups that comprise the "Board Resource Table" consisting of District wide constituent leaders, to determine the group's perception of the Board. The results indicate the vast majority of respondents have a positive perception of the Board, with 42 percent of respondents indicating overall that the Board is excellent, and 50 percent indicating that the Board is acceptable. (Standard IV.B.)

The Team reviewed numerous Board policies indicating the Board is ultimately responsible for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity. The Team also identified a comprehensive Board code of ethics, which details expected behaviors and the consequences if a member violates the code. Evidence indicates the Board has developed a regular review cycle for Board and District policies. (Standard IV.B.1.a.)

The Team confirmed NOCCCD has adopted its own mission statement and that College mission statements align with it. The Board engages in an ongoing process of policy/procedure review with actions being taken consistent with the District's mission. The District's philosophy statement states, "Trustees, faculty, staff, and administrators have the responsibility to provide and support educational offerings of the highest quality and value to the students and the community."

The Team found the Board approves all College curricula. In addition to curricula, the Board provides resources necessary to support programs. Board minutes indicate the Board monitors finances by approving the District annual budget, budget transfers, and major expenditures. Evidence supports Board final authority in all matters related to instructional quality, legal issues, and finances. (Standard IV.B.1.b, IV.B.1.c.)

The Team identified published policies specifying the Board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures. Board policies and administrative procedures governing Board operations are comprehensive and complete. (Standard IV.B.1.d.)

Board minutes and conversations with District and College personnel confirm the Board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and procedures. In addition, Board minutes and the website where policies and procedures are made public reveal evidence of routine updating of policies and procedures to streamline activities and align with state law. (Standard IV.B.1.e.)

The self study states that orientation materials are available to new Board members on request and further states orientations may include meetings with key personnel and a review of the budget. Administrative Procedure 2740 confirms that new Board members "may elect to receive an orientation packet." Interviews with Board members revealed that Board members have taken advantage of such materials and meetings to learn more about District operations. In addition, Board members are encouraged to attend new trustee training from the Community College League of California. However, the Team could not find evidence that there is a systematic orientation program or that measures are taken to ensure all members receive consistent information at the start of their term of service. (Standard IV.B.1.f.)

The Team noted that Board Policy 2745 requires a biannual self-evaluation of the Board, and Administrative Procedure 2745 outlines the process. Self-evaluations are scheduled to take place in odd-numbered years with a survey distributed in April and results discussed in May. In interviews, Board members and the chancellor expressed familiarity and satisfaction with the process.

The Team found evidence regarding the Board's April 2009 self-evaluation. These results were distributed to Board members at the first May meeting, however, the minutes do not provide evidence that self-assessment results were discussed, analyzed, or acted upon. (Standard IV.B.1.g.)

The Team noted the Board has adopted a comprehensive code of ethics that details expected behaviors and the consequences if a member violates the code. These policies and procedures are available on the District public website. (Standard IV.B.1.h.)

The Team reviewed meeting minutes and conducted interviews which reveal the Board was informed about and involved in the latest Accreditation process. Board members read draft self study documents, provided input to the College during the process, and approved the final self study prior to its submission to the Commission. Board members demonstrated familiarity with the content of the self study. (Standard IV.B.1.i.)

The Team identified Board Policy 2430, which delegates authority to the chancellor to manage the District. That same policy, together with Board Policy 3100, allow the chancellor to delegate authority to the College presidents. Interviews with Board members, the chancellor, District personnel, and College employees reveal widespread agreement that the chancellor and College president are able to act within their respective authority in leading the District and College. (Standard IV.1.j.)

The Team noted that the presidency at Fullerton College has been held by three separate individuals in the last six years. The new College president was selected and began his tenure at the College in July 2010. The College president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution that he leads. Examples of evidence to support that the president has primary responsibility include written policies regarding the College governance processes, Board policies, minutes of governance bodies such as the President's Advisory Council, the Faculty Senate, and a College function mapping document.

The Team found the College president works with institutional constituencies through the President's Advisory Council. While the president serves as chair of this council, he is a non-voting member. PAC members have the opportunity to present various agenda items from their areas and address these items at PAC. The College president also regularly meets with his leadership staff and constituency groups.

The Team found no evidence regarding how the information from governance group meetings is used by the College president or is communicated to the District Planning Council (DPC). Campus employees generally report they do not understand the larger system decision-making process and do not feel they have input to the process at the campus or District level. Although the College president has only been at Fullerton approximately eight months, the president has made significant efforts to have a high level of collegiality and ongoing institutional dialogue. The president's weekly publication is sent to all staff via email. The president has also reached out to the community by making a presentation to the Fullerton Chamber of Commerce. (Standard IV.B.2.a.)

The president and his administrators are beginning to use institutional data to make decisions and to start dialogue on campus improvement. The College gathers data related to the success of their students and programs. The Team found through interviews with different constituency groups that the president is engaged and active in institutional improvement. (Standard V.B.2.b.)

The self study states that the president supervises College operations, guides the campus in following College and District policies, and ensures decisions are in keeping with the mission. Interviews with faculty, staff, and administrators revealed general agreement with this statement.

The Team heard some concerns about decisions that had been made at the District or College level that were not well understood or did not align with past practices. These actions do not appear to be in violation of College policy, but rather are indicative of poorly understood decision-making processes and/or weak communication systems on campus. (Standard V.B.2.b.)

The self study states the president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution and that he exercises leadership in all areas, including planning, budgeting, personnel, and operations. PAC minutes and the president's weekly email reveal the president is engaged in discussions about the College's operations, including planning, operations, and financial affairs and that he uses a participatory process for decision-making about goals and values. PAC minutes show the group meets on a biweekly basis and discusses issues of substance. (Standard V.B.2.c.)

The Team reviewed evidence that the president provides oversight of the budget through the president's senior leadership and President's Advisory Council. Discussions with multiple constituents reveal the president appears to be functioning effectively in this area, although the College has not yet gone through a complete annual budget process. (Standard V.B.2.d.)

Team findings and evidence through interviews with various employee groups indicate the president works with the local community through routine communication with civic leaders and groups and by inviting community members to campus. The president also hosts a Community Advisory Group to solicit advice and support from the community. The group membership is available on the College's website. (Standard V.B.2.e.)

The Team found that the District oversees three separate educational entities: Fullerton College, Cypress College, and the School of Continuing Education. The District provides services to the institutions for human, technology, fiscal control, and legal services to its colleges and continuing education school.

In the District/College functional map, responsibilities are delineated utilizing "Primary" and "Secondary" designations along with the title of the responsible person. The functional map also provides descriptions of the various services and responsibilities for each function identified.

Interviews with College personnel indicate, however, that the document is not enough to clarify employee roles and activities as they relate to both College and District functions. Employees wish to have greater and clearer communication from the Board system leadership and College administration about their roles in planning governance and decision making. (Standards IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a.)

The Team confirmed the District provides adequate oversight and direction to its colleges. The Board participates within its appropriate policy role and adequate regulation exists to guide campus activities. The District also provides financial, technology, human resources, capital facilities, and legal support to its colleges. The District also allocates resources. Whether this allocation is equitable could not be ascertained. It is not clear if this model ensures that budget allocation will continue to meet the needs of the entire District. (Standard IV.B.3.b.)

The District reviewed its College Resource Allocation Model following the 2005 evaluation Team visit. No changes to the model were made as a result of this review. The Team found the staff, including administration, at the College did not understand the District's funding model. Recent assessment of the funding model for its effectiveness has not been conducted. (Standard IV.B.3.c.)

A review of Board policy and procedure in conjunction with interviews with District and College financial staff indicates that appropriate control is applied to expenditures. The internal and external audits of the District demonstrate that the oversight of the District in this area is sufficient. (Standard IV.B.3.d.)

The Team found that Board Policy 2430 delegates responsibility to the District chancellor. Section 1.1 stipulates the chancellor may delegate authority to any administrator, including the College president, to carry out that responsibility. The Board ultimately holds the chancellor responsible for all delegated authorities. The Team found the Board evaluates the chancellor. Appropriate evaluation practices are in place for the College presidents. (Standard IV.B.3.e.)

The Team observed the chancellor's office acts as a liaison between the Board and colleges. Members of Colleges serve on the District Planning Committee (DPC), which is a recommending body to the chancellor. Fullerton College representatives expressed confusion and frustration with roles and their authority in this planning body. Fullerton College DPC members believe there is no communication from the chancellor back to the group to explain the outcomes of recommendations or rationales for not accepting recommendations. The chancellor has indicated this information is available in minutes found on the campus servers. Examination of DPC agendas revealed documents that had few items, while the minutes for the meetings contained substantial information. It would be difficult for constituents from the colleges to know which minutes contained information pertinent to their inquiries. The Fullerton College president provides the College with information on what is occurring at the District level in several different venues on a regular basis. In addition, there are agenda items on the PAC and the Budget and Planning Steering Committee that specifically bring information about what has occurred at the District level to the campus constituents.

The Team did not find evidence of regular District evaluations or College planning governance and decision-making processes. Interviews found a great deal of confusion among College employees regarding their appropriate role in these activities. (Standards IV.B.3.f, IV.B.3.g.)

Conclusions

The Team found that the District's Board is appropriately constituted and maintains ultimate authority for the operation of NOCCCD. Both the District and colleges have mission statements that guide decision making. The Board has adequate policy to guide its actions. The chancellor and College presidents have delegated authority to operate their respective institutional entities. Although the District and colleges maintain a delineation of functions statement and communicate to employees about both District and College planning, governance, and decision-making processes, Fullerton College constituent groups indicate a lack of understanding

pertaining to these functions. In addition, both Fullerton College managers and constituent leaders report a lack of knowledge regarding the District's Budget Allocation Model and its link to campus planning. The Team noted the District does not engage in a systematic review of its planning evaluation or governance processes.

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.)