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Evidence Log for District Recommendation #1

References:
- North Orange County Community College District (NOCCCD) 2012 Integrated Planning Manual

D1-01 NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2009-11
D1-02 NOCCCD 2011 Comprehensive Master Plan
D1-03 Members of the Ad Hoc District Planning Committee
D1-04 Accreditation Workgroup Participants
D1-05 NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual
D1-07 September 16, 2011 Integrated Planning Workgroup agenda, sign-in sheet, and handouts
D1-08 E-mail distributing draft 1 of the Integrated Planning Manual
D1-09 E-mail distributing draft 2 of the Integrated Planning Manual
D1-10 October 21, 2012 Integrated Planning Workgroup agenda and sign-in sheet
D1-11 E-mail from CEOs distributing the Integrated Planning Manual for the first district-wide review
D1-12 Responses to feedback from the first district-wide review
D1-13 November 28, 2011 Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council agenda
D1-14 November 28, 2011 Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council minutes
D1-15 December 12, 2011 Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council minutes
D1-16 E-mail from CEOs distributing all three manuals for the second district-wide review
| D1-18 | Responses to feedback from the second district-wide review |
| D1-19 | January 23, 2012 Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council agenda |
| D1-20 | January 23, 2012 Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council minutes |
| D1-21 | January 24, 2012 Board Agenda and Minutes |
| D1-22 | February 13, 2012 Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council minutes |
| D1-23 | February 28, 2012 Board Minutes |
| D1-24 | NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2011-12 Final Report |
| D1-25 | August 28, 2012 Board Minutes |
| D1-27 | August 27, 2013 Board Minutes |
| D1-28 | NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2012-2014 |
| D1-29 | Planning Calendar of Activities 2012-2020 |
| D1-30 | 2012 Planning Calendar of Activities with links to evidence |
| D1-31 | 2013 Planning Calendar of Activities with links to evidence |
| D1-33 | 2015 Planning Calendar of Activities |
| D1-34 | Chancellor’s Cabinet and District Planning Council Purpose and Operational Guidelines |
| D1-35 | September 16, 2011 Decision Making Workgroup agenda, sign-in sheet, and handouts |
| D1-36 | October 21, 2011 Decision Making Workgroup agenda and sign-in sheet |
| D1-37 | E-mail distributing draft 1 of the Decision Making Manual |
| D1-38 | E-mail distributing draft 2 of the Decision Making Manual |
| D1-39 | Responses to feedback on draft 2 of the Decision Making Manual |
| D1-40 | E-mail distributing draft 3 of the Decision Making Manual |
| D1-41 | E-mail distributing draft 4 of the Decision Making Manual |
| D1-42 | E-mail from CEOs distributing the Decision Making Manual for the first district-wide review |
Responses to feedback from the first district-wide review

December 12, 2011 Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council agenda

Meeting agenda and presentation “How to Participate in Planning, Decision Making and budgeting in the NOCCCD” for Cypress College on April 20, 2012

Email invitation and presentation “How to Participate in Planning, Decision Making and budgeting in the NOCCCD” for the School of Continuing Education on May 2, 2012

“Board Role in Planning, Decision Making and Budgeting in the NOCCCD” presentation on July 21, 2012

Email invitation and presentation “How to Participate in Planning, Decision Making and budgeting in the NOCCCD” for Fullerton College on February 21, 2013

Email from Chancellor Doffoney to all district employees asking participation in the NOCCCD District Services/Districtwide Communications Satisfaction Survey 2013

NOCCCD District Services/Districtwide Communications Satisfaction Survey 2013


April 23, 2012 District Consultation Council minutes

May 8, 2012 Board Minutes

Responses to Feedback on NOCCCD 2013 Progress Report on the District-wide Strategic Plan from Board of Trustees 9/7/2013

District Services Administrative Review Procedure

2012 Budget Calendar of Activities with links to evidence

2013 Budget Calendar of Activities with links to evidence

Proposed Budget & Financial Report 2012-2013


February 27, 2012 District Consultation Council agenda and minutes

March 12, 2012 Council on Budget & Facilities agenda and minutes

November 15, 2011 Technology Advisory Committee agenda & minutes

April 16, 2012 Institutional Effectiveness minutes
Evidence Log for District Recommendation #2

References:
- NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012
- NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2013

D2-01  NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012
D2-02  NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2013
D2-03  September 16, 2011 Resource Allocation Workgroup agenda, sign-in sheet, and handouts
D2-04  E-mail distributing the first draft of the Budget Allocation Handbook
D2-05  E-mail distributing the second draft of the Budget Allocation Handbook
D2-06  E-mail distributing the third draft of the Budget Allocation Handbook
D2-07  E-mail distributing the proposed NOCCCD budget allocation model description for the Integrated Planning Manual
D2-08  E-mail distributing the fourth draft of the Budget Allocation Handbook
D2-09  October 21, 2011 Resource Allocation Workgroup agenda and sign-in sheet
D2-10  E-mail distributing draft 5 of the Budget Allocation Handbook
D2-11  Responses to feedback on the Budget Allocation Handbook
Other evidence for District Recommendation #2 is included in the evidence cited for District Recommendations #1.
Evidence Log for District Recommendation #3


Other evidence for District Recommendation #3 is included in the evidence cited for District Recommendations #1 and #2.

Evidence Log for Campus Recommendation #1

C1-01 President’s Advisory Cabinet Minutes December 01, 2011
C1-02 Planning & Budget Committee Minutes December 01, 2011
C1-03 Management Team Minutes December 02, 2011
C1-04 President’s Advisory Cabinet Minutes February 02, 2011
C1-05 Diversity Committee Minutes February 08, 2011
C1-06 Meeting schedule
C1-07 Planning and Evaluation Manual

Evidence Log for Campus Recommendation #2

C2-01 President’s Advisory Cabinet Minutes October 06, 2011
C2-02 Academic Senate Meeting Minute October 06, 2011
C2-03 Educational Program Discontinuance Policy

All evidence mentioned in the log above is available in electronic format with the USB Drive provided.
Report Preparation

The accreditation site visit team provided five recommendations to Cypress College to meet the accreditation standards: three of the recommendations were directed at District operations and two were directed at the College. Additionally, the College identified nine planning agenda items during its self-study. Response to the District recommendations were developed by multiple teams working under District and Campus leadership. An external consultant was also hired to help the District analyze the issues and develop solutions. The teams worked on each of the recommendations separately and produced three separate manuals to address the concerns raised by the site visit team. The manuals developed by the teams were reviewed by the constituent groups and were adopted for implementation. The process is elaborated under “Response to District Recommendations” sections of this report.

There were two recommendations directed at College operations. One of the recommendations was directed at academic affairs and asked the College to develop a program discontinuance policy. The Cypress College Instruction Office, in collaboration with the Academic Senate and District leadership, developed the policy that was duly approved and adopted by the Board of Trustees.

The second recommendation was directed toward improving the effectiveness of planning processes at the College. The College engaged in a strategic planning colloquium where the issues pertaining to planning effectiveness were discussed. After widespread consultation among all campus constituencies, processes were developed to improve the effectiveness of planning.

The College developed its three-year strategic plan subsequent to the accreditation site visit. The planning agendas identified by the College were discussed during the strategic planning process. Several of the planning agendas were integrated into the strategic plan.

Overall, there was pervasive dialogue across the campus that led to analysis of the problems, discussion of potential solutions, and adoption of solutions. Although the College recognized the planning agendas, all of the nine agenda items could not be addressed until the time of preparing this report. The College will continue to focus on these items going forward and integrate them into its upcoming strategic plan.
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 IB.3; IB.4; IB.6; IVA.3; IVB.3.a; Eligibility Requirement 19)

Response to District Recommendation #1

Descriptive Summary
The commission’s recommendation directs the North Orange County Community College District (NOCCCD) to articulate and align both district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes. The two sets of processes – planning and governance/decision-making – were addressed separately albeit with similar processes.

Assessment of District-level Planning and the Creation of the North Orange County Community College District 2012 Integrated Planning Manual
When this recommendation was received in June 2011, the NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2009-2011 (D1-01) was at the end of its term and NOCCCD was midway through the development of the NOCCCD 2011 Comprehensive Master Plan. (http://www.nocccd.edu/masterplan/index.html, D1-02) Although these two key documents provide evidence that district-level planning was taking place, the visiting team correctly identified that NOCCCD had neither clearly articulated district-level planning processes nor had we described how the components of district-level planning were connected to one another and to campus planning processes.

In late spring 2011, the Chancellor, two College Presidents, and the Provost of the School of Continuing Education appointed 40 representatives to serve on an Ad Hoc District Planning Committee. (D1-03) In July, this Committee met for the purposes of confirming the District Strategic Directions for the NOCCCD 2011 Comprehensive Master Plan and to review a proposed process for working toward resolution of the ACCJC District Recommendations. The Chancellor assigned the District Director of Information Services with facilitating responsibility for this process in collaboration with a consultant.

The challenge was to develop a process that would complete the task on an accelerated timeline while still providing multiple opportunities for feedback and dialogue. To meet this challenge, a process was utilized that combined core teams as workgroups for preparing initial drafts followed by broad distribution of multiple drafts district wide. (D1-04) This approach was used
to develop three documents that are central to NOCCCD’s response to the ACCJC District Recommendations:

- **NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual (D1-05)**
- **NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012 (D2-01)**

The timeline for the development of each of these three documents was approximately the same. Despite the similarities in processes and timelines, each document is described separately in this Midterm Report to enhance clarity.

The following describes the process for the development of the **NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual**.

**Integrated Planning Workgroup**: The Integrated Planning Workgroup was composed of faculty leaders and administrators from the Ad Hoc District Planning Committee chosen for their familiarity with or interest in planning concepts and processes. The Integrated Planning Workgroup functioned as a small, task-focused cadre of writers and first readers. In its first meeting (D1-07), the Integrated Planning Workgroup was charged with:

- Describing and evaluating current district-level planning processes;
- Comparing the current processes to integrated planning processes in other districts;
- Recommending solutions to identified gaps in the planning processes; and
- Creating a manual to guide district-level integrated planning.

At this initial meeting, the Integrated Planning Workgroup also compared the components typically found in integrated planning cycles with current district-level planning. They identified the need to develop:

- Charts showing the timeline and process for all current district-level planning processes;
- A process for District Services Administrative Review;
- A process to assess and document progress on District Strategic Directions; and
- A process to assess planning and governance/decision-making processes.
Recommendations for the new and revised district-level planning processes were developed through small group discussions. Recommendations from the small groups were then reviewed by the larger Integrated Planning Workgroup. The NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual was revised three times within the Integrated Planning Workgroup before it was distributed to a larger audience. (D1-08, D1-09, D1-10) In this way, when NOCCCD constituencies were reviewing and critiquing the descriptions of current district-level planning processes in the drafts of the NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual, they were also reviewing and critiquing recommended revisions and additions to district-level planning processes. The following iterative process was implemented to prepare the document:

- Distribution of a draft to all employees for review and comment; (D1-11, D1-12)
- Integration of feedback to prepare a revised draft;
- Distribution of the revised draft to Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council for circulation to constituencies for review and comment; (D1-13, D1-14, D1-15)
- Integration of feedback to prepare a revised draft;
- Second distribution of the draft to all employees via site CEOs and to the Board for review and comment; (D1-16, D1-17, D1-18)
- Integration of feedback to prepare a revised draft; and
- Second distribution to Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council for circulation to constituencies for review and comment. (D1-19, D1-20)

The input from this final round of feedback was incorporated into the document to prepare the penultimate draft of the NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual. This draft was presented to the Board for review and comment. (D1-21) Following the integration of their comments, the final document was prepared. The Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council approved the final draft on February 13, 2012. (D1-22) The completed NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual was presented to the Board for information on February 28, 2012. (D1-23)

The NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual begins with a description of the NOCCCD integrated planning model. Following that overview is a description of the process and timeline for each of these components in the model:

- District Mission Statement
- Comprehensive Master Plan
- District-wide Strategic Plan
- District Services Administrative Review
- Budget Allocation
- Plan Implementation
- Assessment of Progress on District Strategic Directions
- Assessment of the Planning and Decision-making Processes
Each of NOCCCD’s entities -- Cypress College, Fullerton College, and the School of Continuing Education -- also has an integrated planning process in which the components are linked to one another. The planning processes at each NOCCCD entity link to district-level planning in two ways:

- The District Strategic Directions establish the district-wide institutional goals. The campuses in turn develop site-specific goals, objectives, and action plans that collectively contribute to the achievement of the District Strategic Directions.
- The annual Progress Report details progress on District Strategic Directions and District Objectives as well as campus goals and objectives. Two iterations of this have been completed. The first was the NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2011-12 Final Report (D1-24) which was presented to the Board on August 28, 2012, (D1-25) to make the final report on the previous strategic plan. The second was the NOCCCD 2013 Progress Report on the District-wide Strategic Plan 2012-2014 (D1-26) presented to the Board on August 27, 2013, (D1-27) which was the first progress report on the current strategic plan. (D1-28)

The NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual was used to create a Planning Calendar of Activities for each year from 2012 through 2020. (D1-29) Annual updates to this document track progress on each activity described in the manual by month and by responsible group or individual. Each annual calendar links to evidence of the completion or modification of each activity. (D1-30, D1-31)

The NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual describes two processes designed to maintain the credibility of the document as a reliable resource:

- The NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual is reviewed annually to determine if minor changes are needed, such as changes in descriptions, timelines, or processes. The first review was completed in April 2013. As a result of this review, the NOCCCD 2013 Integrated Planning Manual was prepared. (D1-32) Future annual reviews are scheduled in the Planning Calendar of Activities. (D1-29)

- The NOCCCD Integrated Planning Manual will also be updated every three years to reflect changes that result from the formal assessment of the planning processes. Refer to the response to District Recommendation #3 for a description of this assessment process. As noted in the Planning Calendar of Activities, this formal assessment is scheduled for 2015. (D1-33)
Assessment of District-level Governance and Decision-Making and the Creation of the North Orange County Community College District 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment

When this ACCJC recommendation was received in June 2011, NOCCCD had in place documents to describe the purpose and membership of the two primary district-level governance groups: District Planning Council and the Chancellor’s Cabinet. (D1-34) However, the visiting team correctly noted that these documents did not describe the flow of recommendations and did not include explanations of the purpose and membership of organizational groups.

As a result of failing to explain governance/decision-making processes so that they are transparent across NOCCCD, lack of trust was often cited as a characteristic of the dynamics within NOCCCD. Without trust, a positive collegial culture is difficult to establish because constituents often perceive that decisions are reached without consultation as opposed to being reached through a partnership of Board members, faculty, staff, administration, and students.

As part of the effort to reduce tensions and increase trust across NOCCCD, in July 2011, the 40 members of the Ad Hoc District Planning Committee were interviewed to ascertain their current concerns and their visions for NOCCCD’s future. (Refer to http://www.nocccd.edu/masterplan/index.html Chapter 2, page 2-80, and the Appendix, pages A-2 through A-5, D1-02) The following nine themes describe the group’s collective vision of NOCCCD’s potential in the next decade:

1. NOCCCD will be student-centered.
2. Each NOCCCD campus will have a distinctive identity.
3. NOCCCD will be innovative.
4. NOCCCD will be courageous.
5. NOCCCD will communicate effectively.
6. NOCCCD will be characterized by mutual respect for all sites.
7. NOCCCD will be proactively compliant.
8. NOCCCD will have strong educational partnerships.
9. NOCCCD will reflect the community.

The fifth theme is of particular relevance to governance and decision-making. The specific suggestions offered in the interviews to strengthen trust in NOCCCD leadership were to:

- Clearly define roles for employees at all levels of NOCCCD;
- Clearly articulate decision-making processes;
- Develop goals and priorities through collaboration;
- Develop systems of accountability to ensure consistent adherence to those goals and priorities;
- Rely on data to make decisions and set priorities; and
- Create venues for representatives of the sites to collaborate with each other for the benefit of students district-wide.

To follow-up on some of these suggestions, the NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment was developed to clarify the roles and responsibilities of constituent groups as well as the processes that are used to make decisions in the NOCCCD.

The Chancellor assigned the District Director of Information Services to co-facilitate with a consultant the development of the NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment. Faced with the same challenge to develop a process that would complete the task on an accelerated timeline while still providing multiple opportunities for feedback, a process was used that was similar to the process previously described in this response to District Recommendation #1 regarding the development of the NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual.

The following is a summary of the process used to develop the NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment.

**Decision Making Workgroup:** The Decision Making Workgroup was composed of faculty leaders and administrators from the Ad Hoc District Planning Committee and other representatives chosen for their familiarity with or interest in governance/decision-making processes. This workgroup functioned as a small, task-focused cadre of writers and first readers. The Decision Making Workgroup was charged with:

- Clarifying and describing the purpose, membership, and reporting structure of current district-level governance/decision-making processes;
- Evaluating the effectiveness of current district-level governance/decision-making processes;
- Identifying gaps in the district-level governance/decision-making processes and recommending strategies to fill those gaps; and
- Creating a manual to describe the structure, function, and alignment of district-level governance/decision-making processes.

In their first meeting, the Decision Making Workgroup agreed that it was their task to develop a document that would describe the mechanisms by which NOCCCD ensures that
there are opportunities for meaningful collaboration and that the voices of the constituent groups are heard in making decisions. Other tasks completed by the Decision Making Workgroup in their first meeting were:

- Defined the role of each constituency from the Board to students to frame the governance/decision-making processes;
- Developed a list of current district-level governance and decision-making groups;
- Defined the purpose, membership, and reporting structure for each existing district-level governance and decision-making group;
- Reviewed the list of current groups and identified that instructional and student services were two areas where a district-level governance/decision-making group needed to be added; and
- Recommended changes to the current district-level governance/decision-making structure, such as:
  o Renaming groups to better describe their function;
  o Revising/articulating groups’ purposes to narrow and/or expand the group’s purview; and
  o Clarifying the group or position that received each group’s recommendations. (D1-35, D1-36)

As with the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*, these recommended changes to governance and decision-making groups were used to draft the *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment*. This manual was revised five times within the Decision Making Workgroup before this document was distributed to a larger audience. (D1-37, D1-38, D1-39, D1-40, D1-41) The task for the Decision Making Workgroup and larger audiences when they responded to drafts of the *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment* included the review and critique these recommended changes in governance and decision-making groups. The following iterative process was completed to prepare the document:

- Distribution of a draft to all employees for review and comment; (D1-42, D1-43)
- Integration of feedback to prepare a revised draft;
- Distribution of the revised draft to Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council for circulation to constituencies for review and comment; (D1-44, D1-15)
- Integration of feedback to prepare a revised draft;
- Second distribution of the draft to all employees via site CEOs and to the Board for review and comment; (D1-16, D1-17, D1-18)
- Integration of feedback to prepare a revised draft; and
Second distribution to Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council for circulation to
constituencies for review and comment. (D1-19, D1-20)

The input from this final round of feedback was incorporated into the document to prepare
the penultimate draft of the NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function,
and Alignment. This draft was presented to the Board for review and comment. (D1-21)
Following the integration of their comments, the final document was prepared. The Chancellor’s
Cabinet/District Planning Council approved the final draft on February 13, 2012. (D1-22) The
was presented to the Board for information on February 28, 2012. (D1-23)

by making the distinction between governance, organizational, and ad hoc groups. Following
this explanation, the manual describes the processes by which recommendations to the
Chancellor are developed by describing:

- The structure and function of each group that contributes to the development of those
recommendations and
- The alignment of the groups to one another for each of the groups listed below.

NOCCCD Governance Groups
District Consultation Council
Sub-committees:
 Council on Budget and Facilities
 District Curriculum Coordinating Committee
 Institutional Effectiveness Coordinating Council
 Technology Coordinating Council

NOCCCD Organizational Groups
Chancellor’s Staff
Banner Steering Committee
Sub-committees:
 Student Team
 myGateway Steering Committee

Budget Officers
District Agenda Committee
District Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee
District Facilities Committee
District Grants and Resource Development Committee
District Services Committee  
District Staff Development Committee  
District Technology Roundtable  
Learning Management System Steering Team  

The NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment was used to augment the Planning Calendar of Activities for each year from 2012 through 2020. (D1-29) Annual updates to this document track progress on each activity described in the manual by month and by responsible group or individual. Each annual calendar links to evidence of the completion or modification of each activity. (D1-30, D1-31)

NOCCCD communicated the components and organization of district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes articulated in the NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual and the NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment to the entire district community and assessed the effectiveness of that communication through the following activities:

- Conducted a presentation at Cypress College entitled “How to Participate in Planning, Decision Making and Budgeting in the North Orange County Community College District” on April 20, 2012. (D1-45)

- Conducted a presentation at School of Continuing Education entitled “How to Participate in Planning, Decision Making and Budgeting in the North Orange County Community College District” on May 2, 2012. (D1-46)

- Presented the “Board Role in Planning, Decision Making and Budgeting in the North Orange County Community College District” to the Board at their retreat on July 21, 2012. (D1-47)

- Conducted a presentation at Fullerton College entitled “How to Participate in Planning, Decision Making and Budgeting in the North Orange County Community College District” on February 21, 2013. (D1-48)

- Included questions in the annual NOCCCD District Services/District-wide Communications Satisfaction Survey 2013 regarding the understanding and effectiveness of district-level planning, governance, and decision-making processes to assess the effectiveness of the trainings. (D1-49, D1-50)
In order to maintain the NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment as a reliable resource, the document will be reviewed both annually and on a three-year-cycle:

- The NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment is reviewed annually to determine if minor changes are needed, such as changes in descriptions, timelines, or processes. The first review was completed in April 2013. As a result of this review, the NOCCCD 2013 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment was prepared. (D1-51)

- The NOCCCD Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment will also be updated every three years to reflect changes that result from the formal assessment of the governance/decision making processes. Refer to the NOCCCD 2013 Integrated Planning Manual and the response to District Recommendation #3 for a description of the assessment process. As noted in the Planning Calendar of Activities, this formal assessment is scheduled for 2015. (D1-33)

Evaluation

NOCCCD has successfully accomplished the following since receiving ACCJC District Recommendation #1 two years and four months ago:

- Conducted the district-wide dialogue needed to review and revise its district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes,
- Produced two documents that articulate the function, structure, and linkages of these processes,
- Developed a planning calendar of activities to track task completion,
- Collected evidence of the completion of all activities outlined in the two documents,
- Communicated the contents of the two documents district-wide,
- Reviewed and revised the two documents to reflect minor changes, such as in descriptions, timelines, or processes,
- Implemented all new and revised planning processes as scheduled including the development of the NOCCCD Strategic Plan 2012-2014, and
- Implemented the revised governance and decision-making structure.

A formal assessment of the planning and governance/decision making processes is scheduled for 2015. (D1-33)
NOC is committed to following the timeline and process charts in the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* as evidenced by the following:

- Creation of a Planning Calendar of Activities to track progress on all tasks identified in the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual* and the *NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment*. (D1-29) Links to the evidence that documents completion of the tasks are embedded in the annual calendars. (D1-30, D1-31)

- Completion of the *NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2011-12 Final Report*, which was presented to the Board on August 28, 2012, to close the loop on the previous strategic planning cycle. (D1-24, D1-25)

- Completion of the *NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2012-2014*, which is a key component in the NOCCCD integrated planning process. (D1-28) This document was presented and approved at District Consultation Council on April 23, 2012, (D1-52) and presented to the Board for information on May 8, 2012. (D1-53)

- Completion of the *NOCCCD 2013 Progress Report on the District-wide Strategic Plan 2012-14*, which assessed progress on the District-wide Strategic Plan and District Strategic Directions. (D1-26) This document was presented to the Board on August 27, 2013. (D1-27) The Board provided feedback that will be used to improve the progress report for Fall 2014. (D1-54)

- Completion of one cycle of the District Services Administrative Review as described in the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*. (D1-55) The results of these administrative reviews were accepted at the District Services Committee and reviewed at Chancellor’s Staff as noted in the 2012 Planning Calendar of Activities. (D1-30) Although funding requests did not emerge from the process this year, when such requests are forwarded through District Services Administrative Reviews, the District Services Committee will recommend funding priorities to the Council on Budget and Facilities.

- Completion of two cycles of Budget Development as described in the *NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual*. The annual Budget Calendar of Activities is used each year to track progress by month and responsible group or individual. (D1-56, D1-57)
• Revision of the Proposed Budget Document to indicate how planning is linked to resource allocation. (D1-58, D1-59)

NOCCCD is committed to implementing changes in title, purpose, and reporting structure of the governance/decision-making groups outlined in the NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment as evidenced by the following.

• Replaced Chancellor’s Cabinet meetings with District Consultation Council meetings beginning February 27, 2012. (D1-60)

• Replaced District Planning Council meetings with Council on Budget and Facilities meetings beginning March 12, 2012. (D1-61)

• Replaced Technology Coordinating Council meetings with Technology Advisory Committee meetings November 15, 2011. (D1-62)

• Formed the Institutional Effectiveness Coordinating Council that began meeting on April 16, 2012. (D1-63) One of the accomplishments of this group is the development of the District-wide Institutional Effectiveness Report and Inventory of Programs and Services to Address the Achievement Gap, a task assigned to this group in the NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2012 – 2014. (D1-64)

• Posted meeting materials and minutes for all governance groups on the NOCCCD intranet (myGateway). (D1-65)

The Board of Trustees is committed to the ongoing improvement of NOCCCD planning and governance/decision-making processes as evidenced by the Chancellor’s goals for the past three years.

• The Chancellor’s 2011 -2012 goals included:

  Meet Accreditation Standards  
  – Present a Program Discontinuance Board Policy to the Board for consideration.  
  – Create and implement a District planning process that:  
    o Is data-driven  
    o Is transparent  
    o Is inclusive
Identifies responsible individuals for continuous oversight improvement, and ongoing evaluation
- Is documented in a district-wide Governance Assessment Report
- Satisfies the accreditation recommendations
  - Ensure that District planning integrates research from Cypress College, Fullerton College, and the School of Continuing Education to demonstrate district-wide institutional effectiveness and resource allocation. (D1-66)

• The Chancellor’s 2012-2013 goals included:

  Continue with Accreditation Compliance
  - Ensure continuous oversight, improvement, and ongoing evaluation.
  - Document in a District-wide Governance Assessment Report.
  - Ensure that District planning integrates research from Cypress College, Fullerton College, and the School of Continuing Education to demonstrate District-wide institutional effectiveness and resource allocation. (D1-67)

• The Chancellor’s 2013-2014 goals include:

  Continue with Accreditation Compliance
  - Ensure continuous oversight, improvement, and ongoing evaluation.
  - Document in a District-wide Governance Assessment Report.
  - Ensure that District planning integrates research from Cypress College, Fullerton College, and the School of Continuing Education to demonstrate District-wide institutional effectiveness and resource allocation. (D1-68)

Next Steps

1. NOCCCD will evaluate the effectiveness of the district-wide presentations that described the components and organization of district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes and will use that feedback as the basis for improvement in such presentations.

District Recommendation #2
To fully meet the Standards, the Team recommends the district clearly delineate its budget allocation model, communicate the model to campus constituencies, and provide clarity as to its link to district planning. (Standards IB.3; IB.4; III.D.1.a; IVB.3.a; Eligibility Requirement 17)

Response to District Recommendation #2

Descriptive Summary
This recommendation directs NOCCCD to develop clear descriptions of the NOCCCD budget allocation model as well as the connection between district-level budget allocations and planning. Given the simultaneous efforts to review, assess, and articulate district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes, the decision was made to develop two descriptions of the NOCCCD budget allocation model. The first description, intended for a general audience, is included in the NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual and in the subsequent revision produced in April 2013 with minor updates. (D1-05, D1-32) The second and more technical description of the NOCCCD budget allocation model is intended for those who are more knowledgeable and involved in budgeting and presented in a separate document, the NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012 and in the April 2013 revision of this manual, which includes minor updates. (D2-01, D2-02)

In addition to the district-level budget allocation model described in these manuals, each NOCCCD campus also has a budget allocation model for the internal distribution of funds, including evidence of how budget allocations are linked to campus and district-level planning.

The development, review, and revision process used to produce the NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual and NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment is described in the response to District Recommendation #1 in this Midterm Report and will not be repeated here. A similar process was followed to develop the NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012. The process combined the use of a core team called the Budget Allocation Workgroup to prepare initial drafts followed by multiple cycles of broad distribution of drafts for review, comment, and revision. (D1-04)

The following describes the process used to develop the NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012.

Budget Allocation Workgroup: The Budget Allocation Workgroup was composed of faculty leaders and administrators from the Ad Hoc District Planning Committee chosen for their
familiarity with or interest in the budget allocation model and budgeting processes. The Budget Allocation Workgroup functioned as a small, task-focused cadre of writers and first readers. In its first meeting, (D2-03) the Budget Allocation Workgroup was charged with the task of preparing a description of the current NOCCCD budget allocation model that could be widely understood. Also in its first meeting, the Budget Allocation Workgroup completed these tasks:

- Reviewed the elements commonly found in a budget allocation handbook;
- Identified which common elements should be included in this budget allocation handbook;
- Provided feedback on sample table of contents from other district budget allocation handbooks;
- Discussed a flowchart or graphic to illustrate the NOCCCD budget allocation model; and
- Discussed a process and schedule for review and assessment of the NOCCCD budget allocation model to be included in the NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012.

Since the task was to explain rather than evaluate the current NOCCCD budget allocation model, this Budget Allocation Workgroup explained the evaluation component but did not evaluate the current model during this process.

Once the document was drafted and reviewed by this core group, input from larger audiences was sought. The NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012 and/or components of the handbook were revised a total of five times within the Budget Allocation Workgroup before the document was distributed to a larger audience. (D2-04, D2-04, D2-05, D2-06, D2-07, D2-08, D2-09, D2-10, D2-11) Following these revisions by the workgroup, an iterative process was used to prepare the final document:

- Distribution of a draft to all employees for review and comment; (D2-12)
- Integration of the feedback to prepare a revised draft;
- Distribution of the revised draft to Chancellor’s Cabinet/District Planning Council for circulation for review and comment;
- Integration of the feedback to prepare a revised draft;
- Second distribution of the draft to all employees for review and comment;
- Integration of the feedback to prepare a revised draft; and
The NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012 has three general sections:

- First is a general description of NOCCCD’s Council on Budget and Facilities, the timeline and process for budget development, and a list of the board policies and administrative procedures that guide budget development.

- Second is a graphical overview of the budget allocation process followed by an explanation of each component within the graphic.

- Third is the evaluation component that describes how NOCCCD works toward continuous quality improvement in budget allocation processes by assessing the effectiveness of resource allocations as they relate to the NOCCCD Mission and District Strategic Directions. As an overview of this process, the Council on Budget and Facilities continually evaluates the allocation model process and the allocations that are formula-driven. (D2-13, D2-14, D2-15, D2-16, D2-17, D2-18, D2-19, D2-20, D2-21) The resulting assessment report is presented to the District Consultation Council. (D2-22, D2-23, D2-24) Each site provides input into this process via their respective representative(s) on the District Consultation Council and on the Council on Budget and Facilities.

The NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012 was used to create a Budget Calendar of Activities for each year from 2012 through 2020. (D2-25) Annual updates to this document track progress on each activity described in the manual by month and by responsible group or individual. Each annual calendar links to evidence of the completion or modification of each activity. (D1-56, D1-57)

To communicate the NOCCCD budget allocation model to campus constituencies, the NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012 and subsequent revisions are posted on the NOCCCD website. (http://www.nocccd.edu/Accreditation.htm) In addition, the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Facilities and the District Director of Fiscal Affairs conduct annual campus-wide meetings at each
site to review the NOCCCD budget allocation model. These meetings were conducted in spring 2012 and spring 2013 as documented in the 2012 and 2013 annual Budget Calendar of Activities. (D1-56, D1-57) Future presentations are scheduled for each spring in the Budget Calendar of Activities. (D2-25) The information presented includes any changes to the model that occurred as a result of the model’s evaluation component.

Regarding the links between budget allocations and planning, in general, all of the District Strategic Directions are plans intended to increase student success; similarly, the purpose of the NOCCCD budget allocation model is to fund the programs and services that both directly and indirectly promote student success. Students’ needs are the foundation of decisions regarding the expansion and contraction of the budget allocations.

In addition to this general link between planning and budget allocations, NOCCCD ensures direct links between specific budget allocations and the District Strategic Directions in the following three ways.

1. A Strategic Plan Fund was created as a component of NOCCCD’s budget allocation model as one transparent mechanism to align planning with resource allocations. Proposals for resources from the Strategic Plan Fund require that the project contribute to achievement of a District Strategic Direction. This annual process is tracked on the Budget Calendar of Activities each year. (D1-56, D1-57)

2. NOCCCD’s annual Proposed Budget Document has been modified to indicate the alignment of resources with planning. (D1-58, D1-59) As appropriate, NOCCCD entities will identify and link budgets and expenditures directly related to achievement of specific District Strategic Directions by using a unique identifying budget code. Dollars spent in this way will be included in the Proposed Budget Presentation to the Board. This information was most recently reported to the Board on September 10, 2013. (D2-26)

3. The budget allocation processes at each campus include links to campus goals, each of which align with District Strategic Directions.

**Evaluation**

In the two years and four months since NOCCCD received ACCJC District Recommendation #2, NOCCCD has successfully completed the following activities:
• Prepared two different levels of descriptions of the NOCCCD budget allocation process;
• Developed a Budget Calendar of Activities to track task completion;
• Collected evidence of the completion of all the activities outlined in the manual;
• Communicated the contents of the manual district-wide;
• Created the NOCCCD Budget Central website as a repository for all budget related documents;
• Established a Strategic Plan Fund to clearly link resource allocations and planning;
• Revised the Proposed Budget Document to demonstrate clear links between budget and planning;
• Completed two cycles of budget allocation model review and revision; and
• Revised the manual to reflect minor changes, such as in descriptions, timelines, or processes.

A general description of the NOCCCD budget allocation model is included in the NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual and in the manual’s April 2013 update. (D1-05, D1-32) A more technical description is presented in the NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012 and the associated April 2013 update. (D2-01, D2-02)

To clearly communicate the NOCCCD budget allocation model to campus constituencies, the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Facilities and the District Director of Fiscal Affairs conduct annual campus-wide meetings at each site. The meetings held in the past two years were:

• Cypress College April 26, 2012 (D2-27)
• Fullerton College May 3, 2012 & May 8, 2012 (D2-27)
• School of Continuing Education May 17, 2012 (D2-27)
• Cypress College April 25, 2013 (D2-28)
• Fullerton College April 30, 2013 (D2-29)
• School of Continuing Education May 23, 2013 (D2-30)

To provide transparency to staff, students, and members of the public regarding the budget and budget process, the NOCCCD Budget Central website was created and is linked directly to the NOCCCD website. This repository contains information about the state and local budget as well as links to other resource information. (http://www.nocccd.edu/BudgetNews.htm) The NOCCCD Budget Central website was announced to staff in the back-to-school mailing in 2013. (D2-31)
Proposals were solicited for the process by which the Strategic Plan Fund process would evaluate and select projects for funding and the assessment of effectiveness following the project completion. The District Consultation Council completed the following steps in the development, implementation, and assessment of this process.

- Developed and approved of the Strategic Plan Fund Process in November 2012 (D2-32, D2-33, D2-34) and solicited proposals in December 2012. (D2-35)
- Reviewed, scored and approved funding for proposals in February 2013. (D2-36)
- Reviewed Strategic Plan Fund Progress Reports in September 2013. (D2-37)

In the September 2013 meeting, the District Consultation Council reviewed and revised the Strategic Plan Fund process. (D2-38) The process is scheduled to begin again on November 1, 2013, with the district-wide solicitation of proposals.

The Council on Budget and Facilities began meeting March 12, 2012. (D1-61) Over the last year and a half, the Council has evaluated the allocation model and component parts of the model including categorical program allocations such as DSPS, faculty additional load, and part-time faculty salary allocations (termed extended day allocation at NOCCCD), and allocation of FTES targets to the campuses. In some cases, it was decided that the allocation model was sufficient and would not be changed. (D2-13, D2-14, D2-15, D2-16, D2-17, D2-18, D2-19, D2-20, D2-21)

Two allocation model changes- Extended Day and DSP&S- were forwarded to the District Consultation Council for consideration. (D2-22, D2-24) District Consultation Council approved the change to the Extended Day allocation at the meeting of May 20, 2013, (D2-23) and to the DSP&S allocation at the meeting of June 24, 2013. (D2-24)

The process for assessing the descriptions of the budget process is described in the response to District Recommendation #3 in this Midterm Report. The process for assessing the effectiveness of the budget allocation model itself is described in the NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2012 and April 2013 update. (D2-01, D2-02) The processes that have been developed and completed thus far are documented in the Budget Calendar of Activities for the 2012 and 2013 budget years. (D1-56, D1-57)

Next Steps

1. Vice Chancellor of Finance and Facilities and the District Director of Fiscal Affairs will continue to conduct annual campus-wide meetings at each site to describe the NOCCCD budget allocation model.
2. NOCCCD will follow the timeline and process charts in the *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2013* by tracking the activities and documenting progress using the Budget Calendar of Activities.

3. NOCCCD will assess the budget allocation process following the timeline and processes outlined in the *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2013* and will implement recommended changes based on that assessment.

4. NOCCCD will assess the effectiveness of the budget allocation model in allocating resources to support the District Strategic Directions as described in the *NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2013* and will implement recommended changes based on that assessment.

5. NOCCCD entities will identify and link budgets and expenditures directly related to achievement of specific District Strategic Directions by using a unique identifying budget code. Dollars spent in this way will be reported along with the Proposed Budget Presentation to the Board.

**District Recommendation #3**

In order to meet the Standards, the Team recommends that the district conduct regular analysis and evaluation of its district planning, governance, and decision-making processes in order to assess the efficacy of these systems and ensure their effectiveness. Results of these analyses and findings should be broadly communicated across the institutions and used as a basis for improvement, as appropriate. *(Standards IVA.5; IVB.3.g)*

**Response to District Recommendation #3**

In response to District Recommendation #1, in fall 2011 both district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes were reviewed and revised as needed. The venues for providing input varied and included both small workgroup meetings as well as discussions in larger venues across NOCCCD. *(D1-07, D1-10, D1-11, D1-16)*

During this dialogue, numerous clarifications and revisions were made to district-level planning including:

- Articulation of the purpose process for each component in district-level planning;
- Development of a graphic to depict the links between/among district-level planning processes; and
• Addition of processes for
  o District Services Administrative Review;
  o Assessing and documenting progress on District Strategic Directions; and
  o Assessing planning and decision-making processes.

Also during this dialogue, numerous clarifications and revisions were made to district-level governance/decision-making processes including:

• Articulation of the purpose, membership, and reporting structure of each district-level governance and organizational group; and
• Revision of the names of some NOCCCD governance and operational groups to better describe their function.

Implementation of new and revised processes began immediately after approval of the revised and new processes on February 13, 2012. (D1-22)

One of the newly developed facets of district-level planning is a mechanism for assessing district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes. Refer to the last page of this Midterm Report for an excerpt from the NOCCCD 2013 Integrated Planning Manual that describes the assessment process. An overview of that process follows.

NOCCCD has scheduled a formal assessment of planning and governance/decision-making processes every three years with the first assessment commencing in September 2015. That process is documented in the 2015 Planning Calendar of Activities developed based on the NOCCCD 2012 Integrated Planning Manual and the NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment. (D1-33) The assessment will include a Planning and Decision-making Workgroup gathering district-wide input followed by preparing an assessment report to be submitted to the District Consultation Council. The District Consultation Council will review the assessment report and recommend revisions to planning, governance and/or decision-making processes as warranted. Changes to the planning, governance and decision-making processes, if any, will be documented with revisions to the NOCCCD Integrated Planning Manual and the NOCCCD Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment.

In addition to this formal assessment every three years, the current version of the NOCCCD Integrated Planning Manual and the NOCCCD Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment is reviewed annually and revised as needed. This annual review is conducted to incorporate minor changes, such as in descriptions, timelines, or processes, and is done to maintain the credibility of these documents as valuable, viable resources. The first of these annual reviews was conducted in April 2013; as a result, revised versions of the NOCCCD
Integrated Planning Manual and the NOCCCD Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment were produced. (D3-01, D1-32, D1-51) These changes were presented to the District Consultation Council at the meeting on April 22, 2013. (D2-22)

The NOCCCD 2013 Integrated Planning Manual and the NOCCCD 2013 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment are housed online to provide ready access to all NOCCCD constituents. (http://www.nocccd.edu/Accreditation.htm, D3-02)

Evaluation

In the two years and four months since NOCCCD received ACCJC District Recommendation #3, NOCCCD has successfully:

- Evaluated current district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes;
- Sought and evaluated district-wide input on recommended changes and additions to these processes;
- Designed a process for assessing district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes;
- Implemented the revised and new processes;
- Conducted the first NOCCCD District Services/District-wide Communications Satisfaction Survey 2013 assessment, which included questions regarding the understanding and effectiveness of district-level planning, governance, and decision-making processes; (D1-49, D1-50), and
- Developed a Planning Calendar of Activities and a Budget Calendar of Activities for tracking progress and documenting evidence of tasks being completed or modified.

These new and revised processes, including the mechanisms for assessing district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes, are being implemented. NOCCCD is committed to the assessing planning, governance, and decision-making processes as evidenced by the following.

- Identified and scheduled a process for the formal assessment of district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes; (D1-29, D1-30, D1-31, D1-32, D1-49, D1-50, D1-51)
- Assigned responsibility for this assessment to specific offices in the NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2012-2014 and in the Planning Calendar of Activities; (D1-28, D1-29, D1-30, D1-31)
• Included the production of an annual progress report as an Action Plan in the *NOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2012-2014*; (D1-28)

• Completed the *NOCCCD 2013 Progress Report on the District-wide Strategic Plan 2012-2014*; and (D1-26)

• Completed the first annual review of the manuals in April 2013. (D1-32, D1-51)

**Next Steps**

1. NOCCCD will assess the processes for planning and governance/decision-making in September 2015 following the timeline and process outlined in the current version of the *NOCCCD Integrated Planning Manual* and will use the results of that assessment to improve district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes.

2. NOCCCD will annually review and incorporate minor changes to the *NOCCCD Integrated Planning Manual* and the *NOCCCD Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function, and Alignment*.

3. NOCCCD will distribute the analysis of the assessment of district-level planning and governance/decision-making processes as well as any recommended revisions of these processes to all NOCCCD employees.

**COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION #1**

*To fully meet the standard, the team recommends that the college conduct regular analysis and evaluation of its college planning, governance, and decision-making processes in order to assess the efficacy of these systems and ensure their effectiveness. Results of these analysis and findings should be broadly communicated across the institutions and used as a basis for improvement, as appropriate. (Standards IB.6; IB.7; IVA.5; IVB.2.b)*

**Response to College Recommendation #1**

Cypress College has engaged in extensive planning activities for several years. There are several functional plans that focus on specific areas such as Basic Skills, Matriculation, and Student Equity. Apart from the functional plans, there are three important plans that delineate the long-term and strategic goals of the District and the College: the District Educational and Facilities
Master Plan, Cypress College Educational Master Plan, and Cypress College Strategic Plan. The time frame for these plans differs one from another. Aligning the plans, although necessary, is a challenging task. As relationships among plans became unclear, the decision-making and governance processes associated with planning also became difficult to understand. The visiting team correctly pointed out that the College needed to systematically evaluate the processes used to measure effectiveness of its plans, governance, and decision-making processes, ensure the processes are effective, and communicate the results across the institution.

The College engaged in a series of campus-wide dialogues in response to College Recommendation #1. Initial discussions took place at the President’s Staff. The first formal dialogue took place at the Strategic Planning Colloquium on September 29 and 30, 2011, and was continued in Management Team, Leadership Team, Planning and Budget Committee (PBC), and President’s Advisory Cabinet (PAC). Collectively, over 100 faculty, staff, administrators, students, and community members engaged in these dialogues (C1-01, C1-02, C1-03).

Three distinct areas of improvement that were identified during the dialogues are as follows:

1. A cohesive planning process that establishes the relationship among various College and District plans
2. A clearly defined collegial process that integrates planning with resource allocation
3. Regular evaluation and improvement of the instruments used for planning and resource allocation

The ensuing dialogues focused on identifying the relationship between the District Planning Process and Campus Planning Process. This was discussed at length at the Strategic Planning Colloquium on September 29 and 30, 2011, and again at the Leadership Team on November 4, 2011. The dialogues led to revision of the Planning Cycle Diagram that Cypress College had been using since 2006. The revised diagram clarifies the decision making processes and priorities by linking the plans and clearly defining the hierarchy. The Planning Cycle Diagram was made an integral part of the Cypress College Strategic Plan and was shared with the Strategic Planning Colloquium participants, Leadership Team, Management Team, PAC, PBC, and the Academic Senate.
The third draft of the Strategic Plan was shared with the entire campus community for their feedback. The Strategic Plan that includes a description of the relationship between plans and the planning process diagram was approved by PAC on February 2, 2012 (C1-04).

Although there are multiple functional plans at Cypress College, there was no well-defined process to periodically evaluate these plans. The Planning and Budget Committee charged the Institutional Research and Planning Department to develop an instrument to assess the effectiveness of plans. This instrument was developed and presented to the Leadership Team on November 4, 2011. The Leadership Team improved the instrument by linking the planning process with resource allocation. The instrument is a part of the Planning and Evaluation Manual (Appendix VI). This instrument ensures that Cypress College regularly evaluates the effectiveness of its plans and links planning with resource allocation.

Finally, the College developed an inventory of instruments used to evaluate its plans and processes. The inventory included instruments such as Program Review forms, a Campus Climate Survey, and a Student Satisfaction Survey. These instruments are used to measure effectiveness of campus processes and satisfaction with decision-making. Through the dialogues at Leadership Team, the College developed a process of periodically reviewing the instruments (Program Review Form, Climate Survey, etc.). The review process as well as an information dissemination process has been clearly articulated. The detailed process was shared with the campus community at a number of forums (C1-06).

The Planning and Evaluation Manual is provided in the evidence (C1-07). This manual ensures that Cypress College clearly defines the relationships between its plans, assesses the plans and decision-making process using a predetermined process, aligns the planning process with decision making, communicates the results to the campus community, and follows a process to improve effectiveness of planning through periodic assessment.

**Evaluation**

Cypress College received the recommendation during Summer 2011. During the six-month period since the recommendations were received, the College:

1. Developed an integrated planning process
2. Used the integrated planning process for development of Strategic Plan 2011-2014
3. Created a manual to define the process of evaluation of plans and processes, and linked planning with budgeting
4. Defined the process to communicate the assessment of plans and processes to the campus
5. Developed a comprehensive system of evaluating the instruments of assessment

The College has not only developed the instruments but also started using the instruments to evaluate the effectiveness of campus plans. The Instructional Program Review form and the Campus Climate Survey instrument were revised following the process described in the Planning and Evaluation Manual (C1-07). The College set up an electronic bulletin board to facilitate participation in the strategic planning process. The bulletin board was very well received, and there were 51 members who participated in over one hundred posts.

Effectiveness of campus plans continues to be evaluated using the process described above. Although the evaluation of plans automatically links them with the institutional mission, allocation of budget according to alignment of plans with college mission remains a difficult task. During the past several years, the budget situation across the state and at Cypress College did not allow funding of new initiatives. Most of the budget dollars were used to maintain the basic functions and operations of the College. Although the College evaluated the plans and linked its one-time funding process with demonstrated result of the plans, a complete linkage of funding with planning has not yet been accomplished. However, the College is working towards achieving this goal.

**Next Steps**
Although evaluation of plans is integrated into the planning cycle of the College, implementation of the plans at the division level can be strengthened going forward. Currently, the planning process is connected to the divisional activities through the program review process. However, the existing link is indirect and often it is difficult to attribute any causal analysis to explain the strength of such link. The College will address this issue in its forthcoming strategic plan.
COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION #2

To fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the college implement a program discontinuance process that provides pathways for program completion by currently enrolled students. (Standard IIA.6.b)

Response to College Recommendation #2

In response to College Recommendation #2, Cypress College informed the District Planning Council (DPC) of the need to develop a Program Discontinuation Policy. As any policy impacts all three institutions within NOCCCD, it was imperative to develop a policy in collaboration with all three entities. The DPC appointed a six member sub-committee to develop a program discontinuation policy. The members of the sub-committee were the three Chief Instruction Officers and three Academic Senate Presidents from Cypress College, Fullerton College, and the School of Continuing Education representatives. The six-member sub-committee developed the policy that was discussed at the Academic Senates of the three institutions. The policy was discussed at PAC (C2-01) and Academic Senate (C2-02) and approved by both the bodies.

The policy was subsequently presented to DPC upon approval from the individual campuses. DPC approved the policy. It was presented to the Board of Trustees for approval on January 24, 2012. Once the policy was approved by the Board of Trustees, it became effective immediately at the Campus.

The policy is attached in evidence log (C2-03). This policy ensures that Cypress College has a program discontinuance process that provides pathways for program completion by currently enrolled students.

The College evaluated one of its programs using the newly developed program discontinuance policy in Fall 2013. The Special Review Committee evaluated the program and developed specific plans to improve the program. Quantifiable goals were identified, and communicated to the department. According to the program discontinuance policy and recommendations developed by the Special Review Committee, the program will be evaluated again in Fall 2014.

Evaluation

Cypress College, in collaboration with the other entities in the District, developed a program discontinuance policy immediately after receiving the recommendation. The College used the policy to evaluate its programs and has conducted a full review of one of its programs. Following
the procedure laid out in the policy, the program has been provided an opportunity to improve. The College has set up a time line along with specific criteria to ensure the program serves its students well. This recommendation has been fully addressed and the deficiencies have been resolved completely.

Next Steps
The College will continue to focus on the programs that may need special review. The recommendations of the Special Review Committee will be used to revitalize or discontinue programs, as the case may be.

Planning Agendas

Planning Agenda 1

Evaluate the effectiveness of the College’s programs and services to determine their impact on the success of various student groups. The findings will be used to develop, modify, and/or continue services that best serve the College’s evolving diverse student population.

Cypress College continues to attract a diverse student body. Already a Hispanic serving institution, for over three years, Hispanics emerged as the single largest ethnic community among the students at Cypress College. These students come to the College with different levels of preparation. In order to fully integrate into campus life and help to achieve their academic goals, a number of programs and services are in place. Some of the programs are generic in nature, such as matriculation services and career counseling and are offered to a very large number of students. Some other programs are smaller in size and are offered to a small cohort, such as Puente, Legacy, and Honors. Irrespective of its size, every program undergoes periodic review. The review process begins with data collection, often via a survey of users. The collected data is analyzed by the Institutional Research department. The program management team conducts a self-review based on the data collected and any other evidence available. The impact of the program on student success is compared with previous reviews. The program management evaluates how well the program has accomplished its goals and develops a planning agenda.
The program review is presented to the Executive Vice President of Instruction and Student Services or to the Vice President of Administrative Services for review. Eventually, the summary of all programs reviewed in a particular year is presented to the Board of Trustees and is documented in the College’s annual Institutional Effectiveness Report.

During the past review cycle, Puente, Legacy, and Honors programs documented their positive impact on student participants and developed proposals to better serve their students. Reviews are available upon request from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. Although the review format is well established and functions well, the connection between the programs and their impact on different student groups can be strengthened going forward. In its upcoming strategic plan, the College will explore opportunities to strengthen such links. The objectives of this planning agenda have been met.

**Planning Agenda 2**

Develop ways to improve information dissemination among various employee groups on campus with the ultimate goal of improving participation, providing the rationale behind decisions, and expanding opportunities to engage in the decision-making process.

In order to improve participation in decision-making processes and increase transparency, the College President started scheduling town hall meetings and opportunities for individual conversations with him. The purpose of such forums was to provide an opportunity to all campus constituents to have a direct conversation with the President. Although the town halls were not attended by many, several members of the campus community took advantage of the individual conversation with the President.

The issue of participation and transparency is of paramount importance to the College leadership. Cypress College Strategic Plan 2011-14, Direction 4, addresses the issue of information dissemination among different groups to improve transparency. During the Strategic Planning Colloquium held in 2011, the issue of transparency and improving information dissemination was discussed at length. As a direct consequence, the College formally adopted two goals to improve the information dissemination in order to improve participation and transparency:
**Goal 1:** Evaluate effectiveness of College functional plans on a regular basis and establish a link between them and Planning and Budget.

**Goal 2:** Create an organizational structure and practice that maximizes shared-governance and a sense of ownership of the decision-making process within the Cypress College community.

The committee in charge of implementation of these two goals worked diligently to improve the shared governance process. In the bi-annual Climate Survey, a section on effectiveness of planning was added. The survey results indicated that the campus community is aware of the planning processes, although sometimes they are unable to participate because of work commitments.

Creating an open atmosphere and maintaining transparency is an ongoing process. The campus treats the issue of transparency very seriously and continues to invest in improving the processes. The objectives of this planning agenda have been met to a large extent. However, the work continues.

**Planning Agenda 3**

Develop and implement a process in TracDat that clearly establishes the link between Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) and Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUO) assessment results with program review, planning and budgeting, as well as aligning them with strategic directions in order to improve student success.

Cypress College has engaged in the development of course, program, and institution-level SLOs since 2004. The College initially developed institutional learning outcomes, then course-level SLOs, and finally program-level learning outcomes. Under the leadership of the SLO Coordinator and the Expanded SLO Committee, which is comprised of representatives from all divisions and the Research Office, the College engaged in several institution-wide dialogues that resulted in development of SLOs. In 2008, the College purchased TracDat (a comprehensive electronic assessment management system) to house and electronically map SLO assessments to program and institutional learning outcomes.
Course and program level SLO assessment are an integral part of the program review process. All instructional and student support services departments undergoing program review report the status of SLO assessment and provide a narrative as to how the SLOs enrich teaching and learning. The most recent modification of the program review form in 2009 includes SLO assessment. Cypress College received the RP Group “Excellence in Documenting SLO Assessment” award in 2009 for its SLO activities.

The link between resource requirements and SLO assessment is firmly established in the program review process. The Planning and Budget Committee uses the most recent program review to evaluate all requests for funding. If the resource requirements are not identified in program review, the department is asked to provide an explanation as to why the resource requirement was not identified during the program review process, ensuring that SLO assessment, resource identification, planning, and fiscal allocation are all tied together.

The College recently received feedback on the status of Student Learning Outcomes from the Accrediting Commission. Although Cypress College has developed SLOs for almost all of its courses, the program learning outcomes and institutional learning outcomes have not kept pace with development of course-level SLOs. The Campus is aware of the need not only to develop program learning outcomes but also link them with its strategic planning process. The SLO Committee, under the leadership of the Academic Senate, will continue to work on this area. The objectives of this planning agenda have been partially met.

**Planning Agenda 4**

Develop and evaluate a method based on mapping the course SLOs to GE & Basic Skills PLOs to assess the GE outcomes.

Assessment of learning outcomes at Cypress College is based on the principle that student learning occurs primarily at the course level; thus, the assessment of course learning outcomes provides the basis for the achievement of General Education (GE) and Career Technical Education (CTE) program learning outcomes. Mapping of General Education program outcomes was conducted by the GE Committee with representatives from all divisions. In Fall 2012, faculty participated in linking or mapping general education/degree outcomes in Institutional Learning
Outcomes Pathway I: Associate Degree and/or GE Transfer Curriculum with course learning outcomes in TracDat. Each department can now generate a report outlining how their course SLO assessment results contribute to each of the three ILO pathways. A comprehensive assessment report can also be generated across all departments for one or more degree/general education learning outcomes, allowing each department, the SLO Committee, the Curriculum Committee, and the Academic Senate to assess how well students are achieving individual degree/general education learning outcomes.

Students receiving a degree/certificate in GE and/or CTE programs will have successfully completed courses required for that degree or certificate. The program learning outcomes for career technical programs accredited by outside agencies reflect the competencies required by those accrediting agencies. The program learning outcomes for other career technical programs are based on each individual program’s industry standards. Program assessment reports based on the linking of course to program learning outcomes can be generated in TracDat. Several programs have used these assessment reports to make changes to their program’s curriculum and/or instructional strategies. The objectives of this planning agenda have been fully met.

**Planning Agenda 5**

Collaborate at Chancellor’s Cabinet to complete the development and adoption of an appropriate and effective educational program development and educational program discontinuance policy as directed in AP 2510.

As discussed in detail in College Recommendation #2, a program discontinuance policy has been developed and approved by the Board of Trustees. The policy has been used to conduct review of one program. The objectives of this planning agenda have been fully met.

**Planning Agenda 6**

Improve efficiency of the technological infrastructure and adoption process by working with instructional units to research and maintain a best-fit list of products as needed and as resources allow.
Keeping pace with technological infrastructure is a perpetual challenge. New developments in technology need continued investment in infrastructure, research, training, and maintenance. As the budget crisis continued in California since 2008, there were hardly any resources available to keep pace with advancing technology. At the same time, all technological innovations do not need to be adopted immediately to provide the students a high quality instructional experience. Cypress College continued to carefully balance the need for improvement and availability of resources to provide the students an academic infrastructure that is affordable. Some of the significant progress made in the area of technological infrastructure follows:

Following recommendations from Departmental Quality Review and District Technology Survey, Academic Computing enhanced and expanded the wireless network on Campus. Working from a plan that was developed during the first quarter of 2013, new access points were deployed in high density areas replacing lower density devices. The replaced lower density devices were then redistributed to buildings with little or no wireless coverage. By rebalancing the access points according to user needs, the College could improve its wireless access significantly within a limited budget.

The College is purchasing replacement “building data switches” to prepare the network for the next generation in access speed and replacement of Campus Core Network Switches due in 2016. Additionally, the replacements are spread across the campus buildings and floors to accommodate the addition of IP video cameras and replacement of analog security cameras. Adding IP video cameras will not only enhance the technology infrastructure, but also help improve the campus safety to monitor the strategic areas of the campus more efficiently.

Improving the quality of instruction by upgrading classrooms to “smart classroom” status was another initiative taken by the Academic Computing. The aging projectors were replaced with newer models in classrooms, and older working equipment was distributed to classrooms that did not have these systems.

Another significant improvement of technological infrastructure is the migration from Novell file and security services to Microsoft: this is 95% complete. With this migration, two major milestones are accomplished. The first is related to the creation of network folders for faculty to use for themselves and their students. Students can save their assignments into their secured
folder for faculty to grade, which eliminates the need for students to email assignments. Additionally, faculty and students have global access to their folders whether on or off campus.

Overall, keeping up with technological infrastructure within a limited budget is a challenging task. The campus is conscious of the challenges and continues to develop innovative solutions to meet the challenges. The objectives of this agenda item are met, although the work to improve the technological infrastructure is ongoing.

Planning Agenda 7

Identify and address training needs to improve use of technology by faculty, administrators, staff, and students.

As technology platforms continue to change and the College upgrades its hardware and software, the training needs of the campus keep evolving. Historically, Cypress College offered training in a variety of topics related to software in a calendarized manner. A training calendar was produced to satisfy the needs of the campus. Trainings were held in a classroom setting at pre-determined hours. Often, the training sessions were not used by the campus community, although training needs existed. Discussions in the Academic Computing department hypothesized two problems about the fixed training calendar: (1) the timing may not be convenient; (2) training offerings may not match with specific training needs.

Academic Computing introduced the concept of “training at the workstations”: instead of offering batch training, a pool of trainers is available to train users at their workstations according to their needs. Essentially, this was a change of approach from classroom model to tutoring model. Rather than offering a fixed training program, the training was tailored to the needs of the users at a time and place that was convenient to them. Although no formal survey has been conducted to measure the effectiveness of the changed approach, the word-of-mouth feedback from the users indicates that the modified training pattern is better suited for the needs of the users. In the next Climate Survey, a formal evaluation of the impact of modified training approach will be evaluated. The objective of this agenda item is met; formal review results are awaited until the next Climate Survey.
Planning Agenda 8

Promote activities that will engage employees and students from diverse groups, that will advance a supportive climate, and that will encourage the meaningful consideration of a variety of perspectives and opinions.

Inclusiveness is one of the core values of Cypress College. In order to assess how welcoming the campus is to its diverse constituents, a series of questions were included in the last Campus Climate Survey conducted in Spring 2012. Survey results indicate that the climate of diversity has improved since the last survey was conducted in Fall 2009. Three major highlights from the 2012 survey are as follows:

Gender-related diversity: Although men and women rated most of the items similarly, men were more likely to agree that the campus is supportive of all genders, that women have equal opportunities as men, and that the College is committed to curtailing sexual harassment. Women were more likely to agree that they are a spokesperson for their gender.

Ethnicity-related diversity: Whites and non-Whites rated items that measured both ethnicity and non-ethnicity diversity items differently. For ethnicity-related items, Whites were less likely to feel that they were a spokesperson for their race but more likely to agree that the follow-up of diversity-related conflicts is appropriate and that ethnic minorities have equal opportunities at the College. For non-ethnicity diversity items, Whites were less likely to agree that homophobia is a problem on campus, but were more likely to agree that the College is committed to curtailing sexual harassment. This latter finding might be explained by the fact that there were a high proportion of White women completing the survey (41% of the total responses).

Sexual orientation related diversity: Gay and straight respondents differed on responses to only two diversity questions; gay, lesbian, or bisexual employees were more likely to agree that they were a spokesperson for both their gender and their sexual orientation.

In its continued effort to include and engage constituents from all backgrounds, the College has taken several initiatives since the last Climate Survey. The College President started holding
town hall meetings as well as one-on-one conversations with employees in order to directly engage the campus community with the top leadership. In the most recent Opening Day function for Spring 2014, the Academic Senate President and Associated Student President were invited to share their perspectives with the audience. The Diversity Committee continues to meet and develop strategies to engage employees and students from diverse groups. Although the climate is improving and the objectives of this agenda item have been met, work in the area of diversity continues.

**Conclusion**

Since its last accreditation site visit, Cypress College has worked diligently to address all the recommendations provided by the site visit team. Several teams have worked individually and collaboratively to identify the issues that resulted in the recommendations and developed strategies to overcome the deficiencies. Additionally, the College reviewed its planning agenda items and integrated them in the College Strategic Plan. At the time of preparing this report, all the deficiencies indicated in the recommendations have been removed. Additionally, most of the planning agenda items have been addressed by the College. Although the work to improve the effectiveness of the College to meet the need of its students continues, the recent results of the statewide scorecard indicate the College is ahead of the state average in six out of the seven major parameters. This is a reflection of the dedication and commitment of the faculty, staff, and administrators to improve the College on a continuous basis.