# SADDLEBACK COLLEGE

# ACCREDITATION PROGRESS REPORT

# October 2005

## *Presented to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges*

**Saddleback College
South Orange County Community College District
28000 Marguerite Pkwy.
Mission Viejo, CA 92692
Richard D. McCullough, Ph.D., President**

1

CERTIFICATION OF THE PROGRESS REPORT

To:       Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
          Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From:     Saddleback College

This progress report provides a summary of institutional responses to
recommendations cited in both the October 2004 visiting team report and the
January 31, 2005 action letter from the accrediting commission.

We certify that preparation of this report included opportunities for
participation by the campus community and that the progress report
accurately reflects action taken by Saddleback College in response to the
ACCJC recommendations.

_____
David B. Lang            President, Board of Trustees        Date


_____
Dr. Raghu Mathur         Chancellor                          Date


_____
Dr. Richard D. McCullough, President Saddleback College      Date


_____
Dr. Rajen Vurdien,       Vice-President of Instruction       Date
                         Accreditation Liaison Officer
_____
Ana Maria Cobos          Progress Report Coordinator         Date


_____
Claire Cesareo-Silva     Academic Senate President           Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

This Progress Report is submitted in response to a requirement from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The report addresses each of the six recommendations made by the accrediting commission team that visited Saddleback College in October 2004. The report covers the period from July 2004-mid-September 2005 and it describes actions that have been or are in the process of being completed. The responses not only describe initiatives taken in response to the recommendations but also contain, whenever appropriate, evaluative comments about what has worked, what has not, obstacles that prevent or limit progress, suggested adjustments, and a responsible party with timeline for completion.

The team report makes reference to three themes that emerged from their analysis of our self study and their visit to Saddleback College. These themes are 1) Evaluation, planning, and improvement; 2) Student learning outcomes; and 3) Dialogue, communication, and climate. As these were woven into the team report, we attempt to weave these themes into our progress report.

Saddleback College values highly the visiting team's recommendations and we recognize that the sole purpose of the commission's guidance is to improve our institutional effectiveness so that we can better serve our community. The responsibility for responding to and implementing recommendations 1, 2 and 3 fall to the college while recommendations 4, 5, and 6 concern district or board actions almost exclusively.

On Friday, August 5, 2005, Saddleback College and Irvine Valley College representatives met with the chancellor and the president of the Board of Trustees to discuss district and board efforts to address recommendations 4, 5, and 6. During this meeting it was agreed that the colleges would provide responses for the board/district recommendations from the college perspective.[1]

---

[1]Minutes from August 5, 2005 Irvine Valley College meeting.

Institutional Context

During the last 13 months, since the installation of the new president, Saddleback College has taken affirmative steps to enhance institutional effectiveness. Dramatic changes to the institutional culture have resulted in overhauling of the planning and decision-making processes, development and adoption of the SLO Implementation Plan (that includes program review and curriculum revision), and improved communication.

With respect to college-district-board relations, there have been subtle though much welcomed changes, since David B. Lang assumed the presidency of the Board of Trustees, in December 2004. Mr. Lang has been a trustee since 1996. This is the first time he has served as board president. In addition to the August 5th meeting (mentioned above), the Academic Senate president, the president of the college, and chair of this report, met with the chancellor on September 1st to receive his input. The meeting was productive, and collegial and agreements were made regarding important issues such as 1) maintaining communication venues open as the Academic Senates and district seek technical assistance and 2) that the board would receive a draft progress once again in September (in order to present the most accurate progress report possible, the college plans to revise the document through the end of September). Furthermore, on September 6, four board members held an Open Forum. This special Board of Trustees meeting was well attended and the dialog, once again, was productive and collegial. The accrediting commission recommendations were discussed in all these meetings.

On August 24, 2005, The Academic Senates of Irvine Valley College and Saddleback College received notice that the California Supreme Court had refused to hear the appeal from the SOCCCD Board of Trustees in the matter of the faculty hiring policy. Since the Supreme Court refused to hear the case, the unanimous decision of the Court of Appeals stands and any revisions to the faculty hiring policy must be jointly developed and mutually agreed upon pursuant to Education Code, Section 87360. Though the official response by the board and district to the California Supreme Court's ruling in favor of the Academic Senates' lawsuit may have temporarily depressed the perception that college-district-board tensions are easing, the entire college community anxiously awaits concrete progress in this faculty policy matter and in the three accrediting commission recommendations concerning the board and district. The college community is profoundly aware of the considerable challenge before Board of Trustees President, David Lang as he tries to change board culture.[2]

The following list highlights some of the activities and accomplishments of 2004-2005[3]:

- President McCullough and Vice-President of Instruction Rajen Vurdien completed their first year in their respective offices and Vice-President Lise Telson completed her second year in office;
- The new Health Sciences & Human Services building (also houses the district offices) opened in January 2005*.

---

[2] Claire Cesareo-Silva's September 7, 2005 email to the faculty; Irvine World News article, September 1, 2005.
[3] Saddleback College, 2004-2005 Accomplishments.

- A new faculty contract was ratified and approved by the Board of Trustees in April 2005 after a lengthy negotiations process;
- A campaign to attract the 18-22 year old student was launched in summer 2005 that is proving successful;
- Freshman "Welcome Day" served 700 new students and 354 parents;
- New student handbooks, day planners, and calendars were disseminated to all new students;
- A new, state-of-the-art telephone system was installed in spring 2005*;
- The college hired 24 new faculty for the 2005-2006 academic year;
- The college hired 31 replacement and 14 new classified staff positions;
- The Academic Senate revised the faculty handbook that will be used in fall 2005 with a mentoring and tenure review process for the new faculty;
- The Academic Senate approved a Program Discontinuance policy;
- The classified hiring process was revised; the Planning and Budget Council approved the process in April 2005. An allocation of $225,000 was approved in August 2005 to hire classified staff;
- A comprehensive student equity plan was submitted to the state chancellor's office in May 2005. The plan, based on research results, was developed by a shared-governance committee;
- Student Services was reorganized with no additional cost to the college to include a new assistant dean and director of financial assistance position;
- McKinney Theatre completed a $1.3 M technical upgrade*;
- 190 new Dell computers were installed in faculty offices in June 2005*;
- The college web site was refreshed in June, 2005;
- The Business and General Studies building is undergoing major mold abatement and reconstruction at a cost of almost $4 M*. Up to 50% of college instructional space is affected (including all faculty and division offices in BGS) during repairs/reconstruction taking place during spring 2005- spring 2006. This major infrastructure project will require the development of a temporary "classroom village" of 20,000 sq. ft. in south campus that will cost more than $7 M*;
- The district offices vacated college space when they relocated their operations to the new Health Sciences & Human Services building.

*Basic aid funds have made these projects possible. The chancellor and board have endorsed and approved the college president's recommendations.

The changes to the planning infrastructure, the adoption of the SLO Implementation Plan and a new Program Review process, coupled with almost 40 new faculty (hired since fall 2004) and 45 classified staff members, and the revitalization of the physical plant, leave the college well positioned to make continuous and responsible changes that affect both the quality of our programs and services in a climate of cooperation and shared purpose among the faculty, staff, and administration.

Report Preparation

Saddleback College's accreditation was reaffirmed as stated in the January 31, 2005 action letter from the accrediting commission. This news and the ACCJC action letter were disseminated via email by the President's Office on February 2, 2005 and both the report and the action letter were posted soon thereafter on the accreditation web site (http://www.saddleback.edu/fs/accreditation/). The President's email broadcast indicated that the accrediting commission requires that the college submit a progress report focusing on the six visiting team recommendations.

Throughout 2004, discussions held in different forums focused on taking advantage of the momentum generated by the self study to begin immediately to plan for the implementation of the planning agendas and the visiting team's recommendations. Indeed, beginning in summer 2004, prior to the October 2004 team visit, the new college president assigned a task force to prioritize the self study planning agendas. During the August 9-10, 2004 President's Council Planning Workshop, the participants reviewed the prioritized list and three planning agendas were selected to become the three college goals for 2004-2005*. Another outcome of the planning workshop is that three task forces were created, one for each of the goals, with a charge to "develop an action or operational plan for its respective planning agenda item, including primary objectives, design activities, expected minimum outcomes, and deadlines." The three task forces completed their assignments in November 2004. The shared governance groups reviewed the recommendations and most were implemented in spring 2005. These three college goals have guided the institution through the first year of President's McCullough's tenure.

*Goal #1: The college will develop a shared governance process to ensure a unified approach to resource allocation as it relates to hiring, program, review, planning, retention and enrollment management;
*Goal #2: The College Planning Council will develop a comprehensive model that will integrate planning with resource allocation. The new model will also incorporate dissemination of the new plan to the entire college community;
*Goal #3: The college will focus on improving communication regarding the college's decision-making process and how these relate to the college and district missions.[4]

Beginning in summer 2005, Ana Maria Cobos assumed the responsibility for coordinating the work represented in this report. College administration and constituency groups regularly reviewed and provided input through the summer and fall. The draft was distributed to the entire college community via email on September 16, 2005.

Details follow about progress to date for the six accrediting commission recommendations.

---

[4] Kevin O'Connor August 16, 2004 e-mail; February 9, 2005 minutes of Goals Task Force Oversight Committee Meeting; January 3, 2005 memo to Barbara Beno from R. McCullough.

**Recommendation 1**

The team recommends that the college create a formal process for the regular review of the mission statement. This process should:
A. Use college governance and decision-making structures (Standards IA.3, I.A.4);

Response: The college mission statement was reviewed and updated within the revision of the college planning infrastructure. The comprehensive review, revision, and approval process involved all college governance groups. In April 2005, the new Planning and Budget Council (PBC), a shared governance decision-making body, discussed in detail below, approved the revised college mission and goals after dedicating two meetings to consideration of all suggestions received from the college constituent groups[5].

The new mission reads, "To provide access to learning opportunities that promote student success; to foster intellectual growth, individual expression, and character development; and to support a dynamic and diverse environment of innovation and collegiality." Furthermore, Goal #8 was added. It reads, "Provide opportunities for the promotion of economic development within the scope of the District and College."

In a January 21, 2005 memo from the college president to the chancellor, he recommended that the college mission statement be agendized in the Board of Trustees planning agenda calendar for April or May of each year. In 2005, after the college community revised its mission and goals, the trustees approved the revisions in May 2005[6]. Furthermore, in August 2005, the deans met with the chancellor and they agreed to formulate annual division goals by late September so the divisions will have sufficient time to formulate their plans. The end result of this successful mission and goals revision process is that, beginning in fall 2006, as part of in-service activities, the college community will begin the process of reviewing the college mission statement and goals. Feedback will be solicited from all constituent groups and all suggestions will be considered by the PBC. If the PBC determines that a change is necessary, a draft of the proposed mission or goals will be distributed to all constituent groups on campus for further comments. The finalized version will be approved by the PBC in April and submitted to the board in May for their approval.

Evaluation: All members of the college community did not immediately recognize the importance of revising the college's mission statement and its accompanying goals on a regular basis in order to correctly reflect the current needs of the community we serve. However, after much discussion of the issue through the revision process, it became clear to all the college constituencies that this process is essential. Although administration was deeply involved in revising the mission statement in 2005, other groups (faculty and staff) were less involved. It is hoped that once this process of review and revision becomes a regular, annual activity, more members of the college community will realize the importance of becoming active participants in the mission revision process. Also, since the new SLO Implementation Plan links the college's mission and goals to

---

[5] April 12, 2005 PBC minutes.
[6] January 21, 2005 memo from President R. McCullough to Chancellor R. Mathur.

program/unit assessment and program review, the college community at large will be working actively with the college mission and goals and will come to understand that they have a direct stake in the annual review process.

Response: There are several examples of how the college has begun to institutionalize its mission statement.

As was our practice in the past, the mission and goals appear prominently in the college catalog and on the refreshed college web site.  These are also reproduced in the Faculty Handbook (2005-2006), the Guide to Developing and Assessing Student Learning Outcomes at Saddleback College (2005-2006), the Saddleback College Program Review Handbook for Instructional Programs (2005-2006), and the Saddleback College Program Review Handbook for Student Support and Administrative Services (2005-2006).  In addition, since the PBC is the main planning body of the college, the mission statement appears on all PBC agendas to serve as reminder that the college mission must be considered in the planning and decision-making process.

The new SLO Implementation Plan institutionalizes the college mission.  Beginning in fall 2005, all college programs and administrative units (using the five-column template) will use the college mission and goals to develop their own mission and goals to demonstrate how each program or unit is and integral part of the college's overall mission and goals.  This link with the college mission is, in fact, the first step in the implementation process.  Additionally, the first phase of the program review process also requires a discussion and evaluation of how the program or administrative unit serves to carry out the college's mission.  Thus, by the end of the fall 2005 through the SLO Implementation Plan and program review processes, all programs and administrative units on campus will have their own mission and goals statements, which relate directly to the college's mission.

The Enrollment Management Committee has adopted the five-column model to define its own mission and goals, derived from the college's mission. Furthermore, all college committees will create mission statements that relate to the college mission.  The Academic Senate maintains a web page with the mission statements, as well as contact, meeting, and membership information for all college committees, and this web page (http://www.saddleback.edu/gov/senate/committees.html) can be accessed by the college community.

Evaluation: The IE Office will have primary responsibility for ensuring the institutionalization of the college mission through the SLO Implementation Plan.  Furthermore, when the Program Review Committee, the vice-presidents and president sign off on all program reviews, they will, in fact, be overseeing the institutionalization of the college mission.

The institutionalization of the college's mission has begun in earnest.  In a relatively short period, most staff is aware of the college's mission and they are beginning to see the need for each program and unit on campus to be aligned with the institution's

mission. The fact that this linkage is embedded in both the SLO implementation process and program review will enable the college to make great strides towards the institutionalization of the college's mission over the next two years.

It is imperative that college leadership continues to actively use and refer to the mission statement on a regular basis in its own practices so that the importance of the mission is continually reinforced.

## C. Ensure that the mission guide college planning and decision making (Standard IA.4); and

Response: In theory, every employee should understand the need to ensure that the college's mission guides planning and decision-making. In practice, however, the ultimate responsibility will fall to the PBC, as the primary integrated planning body.

The college mission is the core of the new SLO Implementation Plan and Program Review process. Beginning in fall 2005, all programs and administrative units will be using the new SLO five-column template to generate their own mission and goals. As college departments and units adopt the new SLO template and adapt to the new process, college administrators will be responsible for ensuring that the institutional mission is the basis for all college planning and decision-making. The SLO Implementation Plan envisions that within three years all college faculty, staff, and administration will be active participants in ensuring that the college mission guides institutional planning and decision-making. Indeed, all programs and departments in Student Services already utilize the college and department mission statements to prepare their goals; a mid-year progress report and final report are also completed.

Evaluation: All college units are beginning to integrate the college's mission and goals into planning and decision-making processes. All administrators and department chairs are working with the SLO Implementation Plan and program review process. Not all faculty and staff, however, are yet aware of or understand the new process but as each program and unit works to define its mission statement and evaluates its programs/services (e.g., funding and staffing decisions will need to examine the discussions and needs assessments contained in the SLO assessment and program reviews) on the basis of this mission, staff throughout the college will gain a deeper understanding of how the college's mission and goals guides college planning and decision-making. For the first time in the college's history, departments and administrative units across the campus are writing their mission statements and aligning them with the college's mission and goals. This is a noteworthy first step in creating an institutional culture in which all decisions are based on the mission and goals of the college.

## D. Allow for the implementation of revisions as appropriate to assure continuous improvement of college efforts to accomplish the mission (Standards IA.6, IA.7).

Response: The planning process was overhauled in 2004-2005 and one of the outcomes of this process is that the revision of the college mission and goals has become an annual college and board activity. At the August 9, 2005 meeting of the PBC, it was decided that

this review and revision process will become a regular fall in-service activity when the time for gathering suggestions and modifications will begin. The PBC will solicit, receive, and consider this input, make necessary modifications, and publicize these revisions in timely manner so the annual planning cycle that begins in spring can make appropriate adjustments.[7]

Evaluation: Although implementation of revisions to the planning infrastructure to assure institutional effectiveness are envisioned in the new planning infrastructure, it is too soon to know if this will work well. All departments and administrative units will have responsibility for making necessary adjustments to their plans with the Office of IE and the PBC overseeing the Office of IE.

---

[7] PBC minutes, August 23, 2005.

**Recommendation 2**

The team recommends, consistent with recommendation one of the 1998 visiting team, that the college fully develop, implement, and coordinate an integrated college planning and evaluation structure by:

Response: Since Dr. Richard McCullough became president of the college in July 2004, the college has experienced dramatic changes in its institutional planning culture. The first noteworthy change is the creation of the Planning and Budget Council, the main body responsible for coordinating integrated college planning and evaluation. The PBC was established in March 2005. The purpose of the PBC is to involve college governance groups in college budget and decision-making.

The charge of the PBC is, "to provide leadership in college wide planning so that Saddleback College will have a defined mission that will drive the budget augmentation to college committees and service areas." (Reference: PBC Minutes, 3/29/05). The PBC has representation from all shared governance groups and meets weekly. The creation of the PBC and concurrent dissolution of President's Council and Senior Staff governance groups were the direct results of recommendations made by the task force assigned to prioritize the self study planning agendas. The PBC maintains and disseminates minutes of its weekly meetings. These minutes and other information about PBC and college decision-making will be posted to a web site (Reference PBC description). When the new Director of Information and Marketing is hired in October 2005, he/she will be assigned this task.

In fall 2004, before the accrediting team's visit, the new college president launched the Self Study Planning Agenda Prioritization Task Force to work with the 139 self study recommendations. The charge of this task force was to prioritize the 139 planning agendas and identify 3-4 major college initiatives that would serve as the basis for planning in 2004-2005. Several of the 139 planning agendas addressed the coordination of college and district research. The Task Force completed its work, which resulted in these three college goals for 2004-2005:

1. The college will develop a shared governance process to ensure a unified approach to resource allocation as it relates to hiring, program review, planning, and retention and enrollment management.
2. The College Planning Council (dissolved and restructured as the Planning and Budget Council) will develop a detailed and comprehensive model that will integrate planning with resource allocation. The new model will also incorporate dissemination of the new plan to the entire college community.
3. The college will focus on improving communication regarding the college's decision-making process and how these relate to the college and district missions[8].

The second noteworthy change in institutional planning is the development, adoption, and implementation of SLOs at Saddleback College and the revision of the program review process.

---

[8] Minutes from Goals Task Force Oversight Committee Meeting, February 9, 2005.

The Academic Senate created the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Office (www.saddleback.edu/fs/ie) as part of the SLO Implementation Plan, which establishes direct links between assessment, program review, and curriculum revision.  IE Office is comprised of the SLO Coordinator and the chairs of Curriculum and Program Review. A full-time researcher, to be hired in fall 2005, will be supporting the new office . For more detailed information about SLOs and program review, see response to recommendation 3 that describes the comprehensive SLO Implementation Plan.

The third noteworthy change in institutional planning, is the reactivation of the Enrollment Management Committee, whose task is, "to implement, document, monitor and periodically revise the structure of student enrollment and retention using processes that are flexible, educationally sound, evidence based, and provide guidance to the PBC for a collaborative approach to establishing priorities and determining strategies.[9]"

Evaluation: The modification of long-standing practices, although proving successful, has not come easily. The PBC is slowly shifting college decision-making towards a model that links planning, research, and resource allocation.  Significant progress has been made to date. We know, however, that much more work still needs to be done.

A. Updating the educational master plan annually at the college and department levels and using the master plan for decision making and resource allocation (Standards IA.4, IA.6, IB.4, IIA.2.e, and IIA.2.f);

Response: The college has not yet developed an annual master plan that fully addresses college decision-making and resource allocation.  However, the PBC, created in March 2005, recognizes that this is the next essential planning step that must be taken.  Since the college is embarking on the state-mandated Educational and Facilities Master Plan, to be completed in March 2006, the PBC decided that the college would use data from the EFMP as the basis for its three-year strategic plan. The strategic plan will serve as the basis for the college's educational master plan. In the meantime, until the college develops its new strategic plan, the college is using the three goals, mentioned above, identified by the Self Study Planning Agenda Task Force as the interim goals that have guided the college in 2004-2005. Furthermore, the SLO Implementation Plan and program review process will provide college programs and administrative units with relevant data that will make it possible to make annual updates to the college's educational master plan once it is in place.

In April 2005, the district selected GKK Architects and the MAAS Companies to assist the college and district in updating the EFMP. College shared governance committees and the college research analyst have worked closely with the EFMP consultants in summer 2005.  The deans met with GKK and MAAS Companies representatives and the consultants agreed to conduct student, faculty, staff, and community surveys instead of relying on unit reports. This revised EFMP will include an implementation component that will enhance its effectiveness on decision-making and resource allocation. The EFMP will also include a comprehensive assessment of all college facilities.

---

[9] Enrollment Management Steering Committee, Administrative Unit Outcomes, September 13, 2005.

The Enrollment Management Committee, a shared-governance group, was reactivated in June, 2005. The EMC will make recommendations to the PBC about, "providing access to learning opportunities that promote student success." (Reference, EMC Goal, August, 2005). The plan includes hiring a consultant to conduct an environmental scan, provide training, and acquire scheduling software that will enhance the college's ability to improve class scheduling and outreach and marketing. The EMC recommended that the consultant work closely with the EFMP consultants. The Enrollment Management Plan was presented and approved by the PBC in summer 2005. The college plans to seek basic aid funding for the comprehensive enrollment management plan.

Evaluation: Much progress has been made but much work remains to be done. Once we have more fully implemented SLO and have the new EFMP, we'll have the tools we need to revise our strategic plan and develop the college's educational master plan so that college decision-making and resource allocation can be linked.

B. Refining the focus of institutional research so that research and information are used and integrated systematically in planning, decision making, and program review structures for ongoing institutional improvement (Standards IA.4, IA.5, IA.6, IA.7, IB.3, IB.4, IB.6, IIA.1., and II.A.2);

Response: The 2004 self study discussed the spring 2004 reorganization of the college and district research and planning functions. The reorganization of the Office of Research, Planning, and Grants, eliminated the director of research position. The research analyst position was maintained and a new staff member was hired as the permanent research analyst in January 2005. In order to enhance the college's ability to receive and support external funding, a college Grants Specialist was hired in May 2004. A district director of research and planning was hired in summer 2004. The college and district researchers provided research assistance to program reviews and supported the work of the Student Equity Plan Task Force, which completed the Student Equity Plan in May 2005.

The comprehensive SLO Implementation Plan and new program review processes are examples of how the college is enhancing its institutional research capability in an ongoing effort towards institutional improvement. The SLO Implementation Plan includes hiring a research assistant whose job will be to support SLOs and program review. The comprehensive SLO Implementation Plan, including the SLO researcher, was unanimously approved by the PBC. Funding has been set aside for this new research position, and the process of hiring began in the fall of 2005.

Another important characteristic of the SLO Implementation Plan is that it fully integrates SLO assessment, program review, and curriculum revision. Data from SLO assessment, enrollment, success indicators, and other data, will be used in program review to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of programs and develop plans that will support decision-making. Within three years, when SLOs are fully institutionalized, each program will devise a needs assessment to be used by college committees (such as hiring prioritization committees, curriculum, equipment, technology and facilities, as well as the PBC) in their decision-making.

Enrollment management is focusing its attention on research to revamp the enrollment and matriculation processes. There is a plan to hire a consultant to assist with enrollment management and monitoring the process for two years.

Evaluation: While it is premature to assess the success of the various comprehensive planning efforts, there is an expectation that the college will institutionalize funding support of the SLO Implementation Plan beyond its initial two years, to ensure that our planning and institutional effectiveness culture is well developed and can support improvement on an ongoing basis. The IE Office will have primary responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of "research in support of planning and decision-making" with ultimate responsibility falling to PBC.

C. Identifying intended institutional and student learning outcomes, coordinated with the college mission statement, and measuring progress towards accomplishment (Standards IA.1, IB.1, IB.2, IB.3, IIA.1);

Response: The SLO Implementation plan not only requires that all instructional programs identify and assess student learning outcomes, but also that every student support and administrative service unit must also complete administrative unit outcomes (AUOs). Administrative units will have measurable administrative outcomes. Enrollment Management, for example, defines one of its outcomes as the ability to monitor enrollment patterns and make decisions based on the patterns. The program review process uses these outcomes assessment as the basis of institutional evaluation and future planning.

See response to recommendation 3 that describes in detail the SLO Implementation Plan. The SLO Implementation Plan, which includes program review, begins with the college mission statement, assesses the strengths and weakness of each program or administrative unit in fulfilling that mission, and concludes with a discussion of steps have been taken to improve programs and services including any additional future efforts. The purpose of the SLO Implementation Plan is to link the mission statement, intended outcomes, assessment, with ongoing improvement.

D. Coordinating program review more thoroughly with the educational master plan, department plans, and decision-making processes (Standards IB.1, IB.4,);

Response: To date, program review has had limited success because the links to integrated planning and budget did not exist. In August 2005, the college implemented a new, simplified and integrated program review process for instructional programs. A similar plan is being developed in fall 2005 for services and administrative units[10].

Program review is an evaluation of each program on campus, a discussion of its strengths and weaknesses, and an assessment of what is needed for program improvement. Under the new process, program review will be conducted every two years for vocational programs and every five years for all other programs and units. The data for program review will include, 1) an

---

[10] Saddleback College Program Review Handbook for Instructional Programs, 2005-2006.

organizational chart; 2) a five-year staffing profile; 3) SLO assessment forms for the previous two or five years; and 4) data sets on enrollment and success indicators created by the college research analyst for the previous two or five years.  The needs assessment created through this process will serve as the basis of planning within departments and within the college as a whole. Needs assessment plans will be included in the justification of all requests such as hiring and funding.

Program review is now linked with curriculum revision.  Each program is required by the state to review and revise its course offerings every two years for vocational programs and every five years for all other programs through a process known as technical review.   In each cycle, programs will undergo program review the year before they are due for curriculum technical review so that the data and assessment used in program review will be the basis for curriculum revisions. All completed program reviews will be available to the entire college community via the IE web site (http://www.saddleback.edu/gov/senate/ie/) and in the IE office.

Evaluation: Though program review has been recently revitalized, it is expected that the new coordinated plan will be more successful in improving institutional effectiveness.   A schedule of the SLO assessment (yearly), program review (every two or five years), and curriculum technical review (every two or five years) cycles will be regularly revised and is housed on the IE web site.  The SLO Implementation team includes the SLO Coordinator, the Program Review chair, and the Curriculum chair and they will have primary responsibility of ensuring that the programs and units complete each phase of the cycle in a timely manner. In addition, college committees have a key role to play in implementing the needs assessments generated by program review. The use of the needs assessments produced by program review, while envisioned, has not yet been written into the procedures of college committees.  This will be done during 2005-2006 academic year as each college committee defines its mission and procedures.

E. Requiring and implementing program review for all departments, including instructional, student services, and administrative departments (Standards IIA.1, IIA.2, IIB.3, IIB.4);

Response: The IE Office created a schedule for all programs and administrative units for the completion of SLO assessment on a yearly basis. The program review cycle is every two or five years as required and curriculum review occurs every two or five years as required.  This schedule is available on the IE web site (http://www.saddleback.edu/gov/senate/ie/) and will be revised regularly by the SLO Coordinator.

The SLO Implementation Team secured funding for two years, with the hope of one additional year, to allow for the institutionalization of this new process.  The funding secured provides some reassigned time for the Implementation Team members. Once the plan becomes fully institutionalized, the Program Review Chair and the Curriculum Chair, in conjunction with the College Research Analyst and IE Research assistant, will be responsible for ensuring that all programs and units continue adhering to the schedule.

The division deans and program directors, as well as senior administrators, are supportive of the SLO Implementation Plan and have expressed to their faculty and staff the necessity of full participation.

Evaluation: While it is too early to assess the success of the streamlined program review process, there is an expectation that the new process will be effective because it is a fundamental component of the comprehensive SLO Implementation Plan. All programs and administrative units will conduct program review and the IE Office will have primary responsibility for monitoring and evaluating its effectiveness.

F. Linking facilities, technology, and human resources plans into the overall comprehensive planning and evaluation structure of the college (Standards IB, IIIA.6, III.B.2.b, IIIC.2, and IIID.1.d); and

Response: As mentioned above, the college has taken several important steps to enhance its institutional effectiveness by revising its planning structure. The PBC, the SLO Implementation Plan, and Enrollment Management Plan are examples of the relatively new and linked decision-making process. It is expected that as these plans are implemented in 2005-2006, relevant data for facilities, technology, and human resources needs, will be produced. In March 2006, the Facilities and Educational Master Plan will be complete. The college plans to use data from the EFMP and the assessment plans for program reviews as the basis for the college's 3-year strategic plan.

The PBC has the ultimate responsibility for ensuring that college-wide planning is comprehensive and linked. The PBC envisions that most of the pieces necessary for comprehensive and linked planning will be in place by summer 2006 to make this ambitious change in institutional culture a reality. Partial implementation of the new comprehensive planning model is envisioned for 2006-2007.

Evaluation: The new comprehensive planning process is still too new to evaluate its effectiveness though the college community has received the plans with great enthusiasm. The IE Office and PBC will be responsible for evaluating the effectiveness of the new planning structure.

G. Publishing and widely disseminating the completed planning and evaluation process (Standards IA.4, IB).

Response: The Goals Task Force prioritized the 139 self study planning agendas and selected three goals to guide college planning in 2004-2005. Goal #3 reads, "The college will focus on improving communication regarding the college's decision-making process and how these relate to the college and district missions."

The college president has made improving communication a top priority. The PBC, Deans' Cabinet, and Student Services Council meet weekly. The Academic Senate meets twice per month, and the Classified Senate meets monthly. In addition, the college president has instituted the monthly President's chats and the once-a-month Leadership Forum. The vice-president for instruction meets with the instructional deans weekly to disseminate PBC and EMC decisions and to review/update division goals. The vice-president of student services meets regularly with leaders of each unit. In turn, divisions and departments meet regularly to disseminate information and create unit plans. During these meetings, the mission and goals are reviewed; progress reports are due mid-year and annually. In addition to these regular meetings where college

information and decisions are made/announced/discussed, the president's office disseminates broadcast email updates on a regular basis. The President's Office plans to launch a web site to disseminate information about the PBC, including its meeting agendas and minutes. The new Director of Information and Marketing will assume this responsibility in October 2005.

The IE Office is responsible for disseminating the results of SLO assessment and program review. This will be achieved by posting the completed SLO assessment forms and program review reports on the IE web site, as well as having hard copies available in the IE Office. All programs reviews are submitted in conjunction with an open, formal presentation to the Program Review Committee and all interested parties.

The needs assessment portion of the program review report will be attached to any request for hiring, funding, or college resources so that those who will be making these decisions will have the necessary information. In-service week always includes presentations and training opportunities about the planning and evaluation process.

Evaluation: Communication clearly has improved although it is evident that more improvement is needed. Every member of the institution needs to take personal responsibility for communicating important decisions, but as an institution we have not yet defined how to accomplish this important goal.

**Recommendation 3**

The team recommends that the college develop and implement student learning outcomes across the college by:

Response: The 2004 self study described early efforts to institutionalize SLOs at Saddleback College. The 2004 visiting team found that these efforts did not substantially meet the requirements of the standard. Since fall 2004, these early efforts have evolved into a solid and comprehensive plan through the initial work of the SLO Task Force (fall 2004-spring 2005) and the SLO Implementation Team (beginning summer 2005).

In early December 2004, several college faculty and administrators attended an intensive two-day training program at Mt. San Antonio College with Dr. James Nichols and Karen Nichols of the Institutional Effectiveness Associates (IEA). The SLO Task Force was created as a direct result of this training and an initial draft was completed in December 2004 of the SLO Implementation Plan, based on the Nichols' five-column model.

This plan, which links SLOs with program review and curriculum revision, also defines training and educational research components. The SLO plan was endorsed by the Academic Senate in April of 2005 and by the PBC in May of 2005. The PBC approved summer funding for the SLO implementation team to begin the implementation process. The implementation team is comprised of the SLO Coordinator, the Program Review Chair, the Curriculum Chair, two faculty facilitators, and the research assistant. All team members were identified in summer 2005 with the exception of the research assistant who will be hired in fall 2005.

The SLO Implementation Plan includes reassigned time for a SLO Coordinator, the Program Review Chair, the Curriculum Chair, and two faculty facilitators. Currently, there is a commitment by the college president and chancellor for two of the three years requested by the SLO task force, although it is hoped that the funding will continue for the vitally important third year. Additionally, the college has committed to providing funding support for assessment purposes.

In July 2005, the IEA were hired as consultants and they held two days of training for the SLO implementation team and other college community members. Dr. Nichols used the 2004 Accreditation Team Report and the ACCJC's action letter to focus their training specifically on the needs of Saddleback College. Dr. Nichols also provided an outline of the steps he felt were necessary to ensure that the success of the college's SLO implementation plan[11].

During summer 2005, using the recommendations made by the Nichols, the SLO implementation team created the procedures and forms for SLO implementation and devised an implementation calendar to be used for SLO assessment, program review, and

---

[11] IEA letter, July 18, 2005.

curriculum revision across the campus. A guidebook for SLO assessment was created (www.saddleback.edu/fs/ie) and presented to the college during in-service in August 2005. The team presented the entire SLO implementation process during the President's Breakfast (attended by most faculty) and at several division meetings. The program review process was revised so that SLOs are at its core and a Program Review handbook has been prepared (www.saddleback.edu/fs/ie). The new program review process was presented during in-service in August 2005 at the Chairs Meeting and the Program Review Committee Meeting.

Evaluation: Although the college took time to create and fund an SLO Implementation Plan, significant progress was made in the summer and fall of 2005. Prior to this, there were discussions about SLOs in various departments and divisions. The SLO Implementation Plan has created a common language and process to be used campuswide that links SLO assessment with program review and curriculum revision. The Institutional Effectiveness Office coordinates this process.

The SLO Implementation Plan applies to instructional programs, services, and administrative units, and the implementation process has begun in all areas. Currently, there is a new program review process in place for instructional programs. The SLO implementation team is developing a similar program review process for services and administrative units. It is anticipated that this process will be ready for implementation by the end of fall 2005.

A. Developing measurable learning outcomes for all courses, degrees, certificates, programs, and services (Standards IB.1, IB.2, IIA.1.c, IIA.2.a, and IIA.2.b);

Response: The SLO Implementation Plan proposes to determine SLOs and the methods of assessment at the program level for at least 70% of the programs and administrative units by the time the ACCJC team visits the college in fall, 2005. During spring, 2006, it is expected that at least 50% of those programs will begin actual assessment and program revisions based on the results of their initial assessments. The assessment of three to five SLOs, as determined by the faculty and staff of that program or unit, will take place annually[12].

The SLO implementation team includes two faculty facilitators who are responsible for meeting with individual departments, programs, and administrative units to help determine their SLOs or Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUOs) and methods of assessment. A guidebook and worksheet are available to "demystify" the process.

Currently, the college is focusing on SLO implementation at the program level (including degrees, certificates, and services). Once SLO assessment is established in all programs and units, the SLO team will begin training on course level SLO assessment. Student Services has defined a minimum of three SLOs per department/unit. These SLOs are

---

[12] A Guide to Developing and Assessing Student Learning Outcomes and . . . at Saddleback College.

derived from the program's mission statement and the college's mission and goals. Student Services trained a core group of leaders who worked with their units to develop Student Services SLOs.

Evaluation: The guidebook and procedures for SLO implementation have been well received by the college community and adoption of the process is underway. All college administrators are very supportive of the process and are working with their faculty and staff to ensure that they have adequate time and resources to complete the SLO assessment forms in a timely and effective manner. The IE Office is responsible for ensuring that the implementation process is moving forward successfully.

B. Defining and instituting research procedures for measuring, assessing, and tracking learning outcomes (Standards IB.2, IB.3, IIA.1.c, IIA.2.a, and IIA.2.b); and

Response: The SLO Implementation Plan addresses the need for research support by requesting that a new Research Assistant position be created. The main task of the Research Assistant will be to support SLOs and program review. This position was unanimously supported by the deans, EMC, and PBC, and plans are to hire the RA in fall 2005. The college president has agreed to provide college funding for this new position and an account has been established for this purpose. Approval from the Board of Trustees for this new position will be requested in October 2005.

The college president also committed to providing funds for assessment purposes for those programs or units that require them. SLO assessment will be determined by the needs of each program or unit and the Research Assistant will help provide data and create instruments for assessment purposes. College funding has been set aside to support assessment projects.

The new Program Review process includes a basic data set for all instructional programs. The college Research Analyst and SLO Research Assistant will prepare this data set for each program once per semester. These data sets will enable programs to track trends and create action plans based on those trends.

Evaluation: Currently, the college research analyst does not have the time to devote to SLO assessment and program review. The Research Assistant, who will be hired in fall, 2005, will be dedicated to SLOs and program review. This support will enable programs and units to obtain the data and assistance required as they begin the SLO assessment process. Funding for assessment purposes has been set aside by the college. Both these components are crucial to the success of the SLO implementation plan.

C. Creating a staff development program to educate and train all pertinent faculty and staff members in the identification, assessment, and evaluation of student learning outcomes (Standards IB.4, IIA.2.d, IIIA.5).

Response: Training is a significant component of the SLO Implementation Plan. During

2004-2005, the SLO Task Force attended several SLO and assessment training sessions on SLOs both on- and off-campus. On July 7-8, 2005, the Nichols of Institutional Effectiveness Associates provided initial training to the SLO Implementation Team and other college community members.

In August 2005, the SLO Implementation Team members began their staff and faculty development efforts by holding a number of sessions during the college's fall in-service program.  A presentation was made to the faculty during the Presidents' breakfast where the ACCJC recommendations and the Saddleback SLO Implementation Plan were outlined.  This was followed by presentations in several college divisions.  At this meeting, the Nichols' five-column model was discussed in detail, and time was given for departments to begin working on their mission statements and/or SLOs.  The SLO implementation team will meet with the remaining divisions early in the fall semester and will also be meeting individually with each program and administrative unit.

Evaluation:  In-service presentations are planned for each semester.  The initial trainings focused on instructional programs.  In fall 2005, the sessions focused on the plan and creation of SLOs.  Fall, 2005 in-service training sessions were very well attended and there has been good receptivity throughout the college.  Most divisions and departments have requested follow-up meetings with members of the SLO implementation team.  During the fall 2005, the SLO implementation team will be meeting with all college student support and administrative units. In spring 2006, more emphasis will be placed on assessment techniques, such as indirect versus direct methods, testing, and rubrics.  Future training sessions will also include course level assessment and classroom assessment techniques.

**Recommendation 4**

The team recommends, consistent with recommendation two of the 1998 team, that the board of trustees review and revise the "Employment Procedures for Executive Positions" so that it conforms to accepted best practices. Specifically, this process should be fair, equitable, and provide for meaningful constituency input. Once revised, the implementation of these procedures should be delegated to the chancellor an presidents, and the direct involvement of the board should be limited to the appointment of the chancellor (Standards IIIA1, IIIA.3).

Response: The accrediting commission recommendations appear as Board of Trustees meeting agenda item in February 2005. With respect to this particular recommendation, the SOCCCD Strategies to Accomplish Goals, indicates that the board will, "review and revise Employment Procedures for Executive Positions.[13]" This same item appeared again on the agendas for the March and April 2005 Board of Trustees meetings. The item was tabled in February and March. The Board of Trustees discussed the SOCCCD Strategies to Accomplish Goals during the April 25th meeting but no concrete steps were taken regarding this recommendation.

In order to clarify district and board actions to address recommendations 4, 5, and 6, a meeting was held on Friday, August 5, 2005, at Irvine Valley College, during which President of the Board of Trustees, David Lang, Chancellor Dr. Raghu Mathur, and representatives from both colleges, discussed the accrediting commission recommendations that addressed board and district issues. During this meeting Board President David Lang and Chancellor Mathur decided that Recommendation 4, regarding Employment Procedures for Executive Positions, would be added to the agenda of a workshop to be held during the September special board meeting[14]. Although a September 13, 2005 special board meeting was held, the accrediting commission recommendations were not on the agenda. According to Board of Trustees President, David Lang, the accrediting commission recommendations were not discussed in a focused manner due to insufficient time.

Evaluation: See comments under Recommendations 5 and 6.

---

[13] February 28, 2005 agenda item exhibit A.
[14] Minutes of the Accreditation Progress Report Meeting at IVC, August 5, 2005.

**Recommendation 5**

The team recommends, consistent with recommendation four of the 1998 visiting team, that the board of trustees cease its involvement in college and district operations and delegate all non-policy issues, including policy implementation, at the district level to the chancellor and at the college level to the president.

Response: Trustee David Lang was elected for the first time to the presidency of the Board of Trustees in December 2004. Board President David Lang recognizes the difficulty of changing board culture but is nevertheless committed to ceasing board involvement in college and district affairs and delegating all non-policy decisions to the chancellor and college presidents.

In January and February 2005, the Chancellor's Executive Committee (CEC) developed a document that outlined strategies to accomplish the WASC recommendations. The document developed was essentially a summary of the WASC recommendations that indicated which entity was responsible for addressing the recommendations (C for colleges, D for district and B for Board of Trustees). The document also suggested some possible strategies. This document was sent to the Chancellor's Cabinet, a shared governance group, on January 20, 2005 and February 16, 2005 for revisions. Some minor changes were suggested and approved. The document was agendized for the Board of Trustees meetings for February, March, and April 2005. Regarding this particular recommendation, the SOCCCD Strategies to Accomplish Goals, indicate the following:

- 8. **Board of Trustees Not to Micromanage**
    a. The Board of Trustees will address this goal.
- 9. **Clarification of Roles and Decision-Making Process**
    a. Employ qualified consultants from the Community College League of California (CCLC) and the State Academic Senate to facilitate the clarification of roles of different shared governance groups in the decision-making process in a workshop setting.
    b. Develop and disseminate a handbook that clarifies the decision-making process.
    c. Demonstrate decision-making to be consistent with the Education and Facilities Master Plan, Strategic Plan, and the Annual Plan.

The above board agenda item was tabled in February and March 2005 and it was discussed by the Board of Trustees in April. Subsequent to the board's discussion, the Academic Senate considered and rejected the SOCCCD Strategies to Accomplish the WASC Goals during its April 20th meeting because some senators perceived that the document had been developed without faculty input even though the Academic Senate president had been able to make some revisions to the document in Chancellor's Cabinet.

In order to clarify district and board actions to address accrediting commission

recommendations, a meeting was held on Friday, August 5, 2005, at Irvine Valley College, in which David Lang, the President of the Board of Trustees, Dr. Raghu Mathur, the Chancellor, and representatives from both colleges, discussed the accrediting commission recommendations that addressed board and district issues. This collegial and productive meeting produced several agreements including that the district and Senates would request technical assistance from CCLC and the State Academic Senate. During this meeting, David Lang stated that the board has held meetings with outside facilitators to address micromanagement (although details of these meetings have not been made available to the colleges) and that on several recent occasions the board has delegated decisions to the chancellor or president. David Lang also stated that he meets weekly with the chancellor to discuss this and other board and district issues[15].

On August 23, 2005, the presidents of the Academic Senates of Saddleback College and Irvine Valley College sent a letter to the chancellor, requesting technical assistance. The chancellor placed this item on the August 29, 2005 board agenda and it was approved by the Board of Trustees[16]. The CCLC and State Academic Senate have received notification of the request for technical assistance and a meeting is being scheduled for November 2005[17].

On September 13, 2005, the Board of Trustees held a board special board meeting (12-8 p.m.) that focused on the evaluation of the chancellor. In this context "micromanagement" was discussed, though the accrediting commission recommendations were not discussed in a focused manner. According to Board President Lang, though at times challenging, the meeting was productive. Board President Lang continues to expresses his commitment towards developing a work environment that is cooperative and collegial. Furthermore, according to Board President Lang, the October 24, 2005 board meeting will include an agenda item that will be a direct outcome of the September 13th special meeting that discussed the evaluation of the chancellor. The agenda item will address goals for the district (not the chancellor) because, according to Chancellor Mathur, his personal goals can only be discussed in closed session because this is a personnel matter.[18]

In addition, Board President Lang reports that efforts to change board culture involve mostly private discussions between him and the chancellor. There is one noteworthy exception to these off-the-record discussions and it is the chancellor's May 16, 2005 memo to the board in which he presents strong advice regarding board responsibilities for conducting productive and professional board meetings. The article, "How to Keep Trustees from Being Micromanagers," from the May 6, 2005 issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education, is attached to the chancellor's memo[19].

---

[15] August 16, 2005 memo and attachments from Chancellor Mathur.
[16] Board Agenda Item, August 29, 2005.
[17] September 14, 2005, e-mail from Chancellor Mathur to Academic Senate presidents.
[18] Telephone conversation between Ana Maria Cobos and David Lang, September 14, 2005 and October 7, 2005.
[19] May 16, 2005 memo and attachments from Chancellor Mathur.

Evaluation: Little solid evidence is available to document these important changes in board culture, though it is important to note that there is a growing perception among college faculty and staff that positive changes may be underway recent actions or events are indicative of the ongoing challenges that relate to changing board culture.

One particularly troubling example is that Chancellor Mathur's contract was renewed for an unprecedented 3-year term despite widespread faculty dissatisfaction. In response to considerable faculty opposition, Board President Dave Lang stated that he meets weekly with the chancellor to discuss board and district issues. The Academic Senate presidents report that in some instances Chancellor Mathur has referred faculty leaders to Board President Lang for input[20].

Though changing board culture is understandably difficult to undertake and some members of the college community recognize that it is necessary to hold such discussions in a non-public setting, it is troubling that these discussions about board involvement in district and college matters and district involvement in college matters have taken place almost exclusively in closed forums. At the August 5, 2005 meeting, Board President Lang mentioned board workshops that have taken place in which board micromanagement was discussed, although details have not been made available to the colleges. Also, despite several discussions about items that would be on the September 13, 2005 special board meeting agenda (including the accrediting commission recommendations), the announcement for this special meeting was not distributed until September 12, 2005 with only one item listed, the "Evaluation of the Chancellor[21]." Furthermore, the special meeting announcement was delivered in hard copy form to college and district leadership 24 hours before the meeting was to be held. The Brown Act requirements for announcing special meetings was met, though not its spirit. As a result, some members of the college community feel that if the Board of Trustees had truly wanted to encourage constituency participation at this special board meeting, the announcement would have been sent sooner. With respect to the expectation that the accrediting commission recommendations would be discussed during this special board meeting, these issues were not listed in the special board meeting announcement due to a lack of time nor were they discussed in a focused manner.

To achieve this end, the board of trustees, district leadership, and college leadership are encouraged to:
A. Define their respective roles in decision making and clearly delineate the areas and scope of responsibility for each constituent group (Standards IB.1, IVA.1, and IVA.2);

Response: Some efforts have been made in this regard. Because the current AR 102 precludes constituent group participation in the initial development and revision of board policies, the constituent groups (Academic Senate, Classified Senate, CSEA, and the

---

[20] September 21, 2005 e-mail from Chancellor Mathur.
[21] Special board meeting announcement, September 12, 2005.

SOCCCD Faculty Association, and the Police Officers Union) with Vice-Chancellor of Academic Services Tom Anderson, proposed a new board policy that would clearly delineate the roles of shared governance groups in the creation and revision of board policies. This proposal was presented to the chancellor on February 22, 2005. No response has been received by the shared governance groups to date.

In 2003, the Academic Senates filed a lawsuit against the SOCCCD for having failed to consult effectively with the Academic Senates in the revision of the faculty hiring policy. In a broader context, this lawsuit concerns the respective role of the Academic Senates in decision-making as specified by the Education Code. On June 8, 2005, the California Court of Appeals ruled that any revisions to the faculty hiring policy must be jointly developed and mutually agreed upon pursuant to Education Code, Section 87360. In its ruling, the State Court of Appeals stated, "[T]he bottom line is that the Legislature granted the Senates a role equal to the District's in developing and adopting faculty hiring policies." Further, the appellate court states "[A]greed upon jointly means what it says – joint agreement - not merely the opportunity to recommend or to participate in the process." The SOCCCD Board challenged this ruling by petitioning the California Supreme Court. On August 24, 2005, the California Supreme Court refused to hear the SOCCCD appeal and the unanimous ruling of the Court of Appeals stands[22].

On September 1, 2005, the Board of Trustees and the chancellor presented an official response to this recent ruling that reads,

> *Our board is concerned about the dangerous precedent of taking authority away from elected governing boards and placing that authority in the hands of unelected academic senates. We believe this is not what the Legislature intended. At the same time, we recognize that mutual cooperation and collegiality are essential, particularly in the academic environment[23].*

Since the Court of Appeals ruling, faculty and district representatives have been meeting to produce a faculty hiring policy that is "jointly developed and mutually agreed upon."

During the August 5, 2005 meeting at Irvine Valley College, it was decided that the district and Senates would request technical assistance from CCLC and the State Academic Senate. The Academic Senate presidents of both colleges submitted a formal request to the chancellor, which he placed on the August 29th board agenda. The Board of Trustees approved the item and a letter was sent by the chancellor to the CCLC to set this process in motion[24]. Currently, the district and the two college academic senates are working to define the objectives of the process and agree on the parties to be involved in technical assistance.

---

[22] June 8, 2005 California Court of Appeals ruling.

[23] September 1, 2005, Irvine World News article.

[24] Chancellor Mathur e-mail, September 14, 2005.

Evaluation: Important steps are being taken to clarify the respective roles of each constituent group. The shared governance groups (Academic Senate, Classified Senate, CSEA, and the SOCCCD Faculty Association, and the Police Officers Union) have worked to clarify their role in decision-making though these efforts have not yet been successful. Though the college community recognizes the considerable challenge before Board President David Lang to change board culture, the college community remains anxious to make concrete progress in defining the respective roles of the constituency groups in college and district decision-making[25].

Despite the recent California Appeals Court ruling, the board and district maintain their position that they have been unable to clarify the roles of the constituent groups because those roles are not clearly defined in Education Code and Title V regulations. The ruling of the appellate court makes clear the role of the academic senates with respect to the development of faculty hiring policies. Yet the board and district continue to question that authority. Unfortunately, the official board and district position regarding the outcome of the faculty hiring policy lawsuit affects negatively the slowly developing perception that college-district-board tensions are easing. As a result, some faculty are wary about participating in technical assistance at this time because previous requests for technical assistance were not successful. The most recent example was in summer 2004, when the Academic Senates of both colleges formally requested technical assistance for Board Policy 2100.1 (Delegation of Authority to the Academic Senate). This request, however, was not supported by the chancellor and was not forwarded to the Board of Trustees. Despite the lack of success of these past efforts, the leadership of the academic senates and other staff representatives are anxious to make concrete progress in the very near future.

The chancellor feels that all constituencies will be in a good position to proceed with the revision of board policies and administrative regulations that define the role of the constituencies in decision-making once technical assistance is complete and the board has spent more focused time addressing the accrediting commission recommendations. As the district leader, the chancellor, supported by the board, has the responsibility for moving forward with the need to define the respective roles and responsibilities of the constituency groups in college and district decision-making.

B. Identify the roles and scope of authority of district and college committees in the decision-making process (Standards IB.1, IVA.1, and IVA.2);

Response: The college president and the PBC created a flow chart and narrative that define the relations between the various college committees and the PBC (Reference, Saddleback College 2005 Governance/Decision Making Process). The Academic Senate has established a web page with all the college committees. During fall 2005, a web page

---

[25] Claire Cesareo-Silva's September 7, 2005 e-mail to the faculty.

will be created for each committee that will include its charge, meeting times, chair and membership.

During the Sept 1st meeting with the chancellor, it was agreed that the Director of Marketing, Government, and Community Relations would take advantage of the college's efforts to establish a document that defines the role of college committees and set up a similar web site for district committees[26].

Evaluation: This PBC decision-making chart is new and college administration should use it as a vehicle for explaining the revised college decision-making process among all constituencies. A narrative description that describes PBC's decision-making process is available but it should be revised and made available to the entire college community via a web site. The President's Office plans to create a web site for this purpose and will move forward with these plans when the new Director of Public Information & Marketing is hired in October 2005.

C. Involve all constituent groups in a meaningful and collaborative manner in the decision-making process (Standards IB.1, IVA.1, and IVA.2 ); and

Response: Please see response to 5. A and B above. In addition, it is necessary to note that as of fall, 2005, when board members request reports from college or district staff, they also inquire about the amount of time required to respond to the request. These efforts demonstrates that board members are becoming more attuned to the time and effort their requests place on the staff responsible for providing reports to them in a timely fashion. College and district staff appreciates this gesture.

D. Publicize the roles and responsibilities of each group through college publications and procedures (Standards IB.1, IVA.1, and IVA.2).

Response: The PBC has drafted The Saddleback College 2005 Governance/Decision Making Process chart. This chart defines how college committees provide input to the PBC. This chart has been distributed to the constituency groups. The Academic Senate has revised its web site and the college committee structure is a prominent feature of the site. The Saddleback College 2005 Governance/Decision Making Process chart appears in the Faculty Handbook, 2005-2006 that was distributed to all full- and part-time faculty members and is also available online.

Evaluation: Progress has been made to document and publicize the roles and responsibilities of the constituent groups, but it is too soon to assess the long-term effectiveness of these efforts. See evaluation under B above.

---

[26] District list of committees.

**Recommendation 6**
The team recommends, consistent with recommendation seven of the 1998 visiting team, that representatives of all formally recognized constituent groups (trustees, chancellor, presidents, other administrators and managers, faculty senates and unions, classified senates and unions, and students) come together and take measures to reduce the hostility, cynicism, despair, and fear that continue to plague the college by:

Response: Since fall 2004, several factors have contributed to a slowly developing sense that tensions between the college, district, and board are easing. Among the most important events that have contributed to this feeling is 1) that the faculty contract was ratified and approved in April 2005; 2) David Lang assumed the presidency of the Board of Trustees; and 3) all college constituency groups are now active participants in the Docket Meeting that discusses and establishes the Board of Trustees meeting agenda.

In conjunction with these positive factors, the district has been pursuing numerous communication efforts to try to ease board/district-college tensions. These attempts include formal and informal meetings (e.g., the chancellor's Q&A with college faculty and staff and his visits to division meetings; Board Forums were held in September, 2005, at both colleges for faculty and staff to ask questions of the board of trustees); the Director of Marketing, Government, and Community Relations regularly disseminates highlights of board meetings and other important announcements; as well as faculty and staff social events[27].

Most of the "climate" issues in this recommendation are a direct result of board/district-college tensions. The college has been successful in taking key steps to improve college climate. Noteworthy are the President's Chats, the college electronic newsletters, and the president's regular communications with college staff. The creation of the PBC has streamlined and linked decision-making more closely with budget planning. When the PBC was created and President's Council was dissolved, some felt that a valuable communication and input venue had been withdrawn. As a result, the Leadership Forum was created in June 2005 to fill this need for disseminating information. The Leadership Forum is a collegewide monthly meeting for information sharing and discussion.

Evaluation:  Despite the perception that notable progress regarding "climate" issues is being made at the college level, some tensions remain at the board/district-college level. Recent efforts to improve communication are seen by some as mere window-dressing because meaningful communication opportunities are bypassed (e.g., the September 13, 2005 Special Board Meeting and its agenda).  In addition, while the faculty was successful and secured a contract after 2.5 years of negotiations, classified staff contract negotiations are still pending. The result is that some classified staff members do not feel that the board or district values them or their work. And yet, the college community remains optimistic and will continue to welcome initiatives to create a more collegial climate.

---

[27] Tracy Daly's "Communication Strategies."

See also Recommendation 5 above.

A. Developing a positive and in-depth dialogue on essential issues (e.g., evaluation, planning and research, student learning outcomes, decision making roles and responsibilities, etc.) that will ultimately lead to strengthening student learning and success at the college (Standards IA.3, IB.1);

Response: In an effort to improve communication within the college and between the college and the district, the college president has instituted informal, monthly, "President's Chats" (first one held in November, 2004) that are widely publicized and open to all faculty, staff, and students. Thirty-forty faculty and staff have participated in these chats. Topics of discussion include the decision to create the PBC, facilities updates, SLOs and program review, among other important issues. In December, the president held a Holiday Open House that was well attended by college and district administrators, college faculty, staff and students. According to the president, the purpose of these gatherings is to promote collegewide unity among all personnel and increase and improve communication and enhance trust.

With respect to district and Board of Trustees efforts to improve communication with the college community, the chancellor has held several Q&A sessions with college faculty and staff and he has attended several division meetings. Board Forums were held in September 2005, at both colleges for faculty and staff to dialog with the board of trustees. The Director of Marketing, Government, and Community Relations regularly disseminates highlights of board meetings and other important announcements. The district has also sponsored faculty and staff social events[28].

Evaluation: The SLO Implementation Plan, the Enrollment Management Plan, coupled with the well-received fall 2005 flex program, and the many accomplishments of 2004-2005, indicate that the institutional dialog about improving student learning and success is being well received.

While most members of the college community are pleased with the steps taken by the district leadership and the Board of Trustees to improve communication, some faculty and staff remain skeptical of the sincerity of these efforts and await concrete outcomes before they make up their minds. See also the evaluation under Recommendation 6 above.

B. Creating an environment which ensures greater administrative stability and empowerment at the college (Standards IVA.1, IVA.2, IVB.1, IVB.2, and IVB.3); and

Response: College leadership has been considering different ways to provide administrative support for the deans so they could have time to develop their programs. One successful example of these efforts is that the Fine Arts, Physical Education, and

---

[28] Tracy Daly's "Communication Strategies."

Athletics "megadivision" was reorganized as two separate divisions, each with its own dean. The president and chancellor recommended this reorganization and the Board of Trustees approved it in April 2005. Another example is that Student Services reorganized its administrative structure, at no additional cost to the college, and hired an assistant dean to oversee several programs who joined the college on October 1st. These administrative changes should enhance administrative stability.

Evaluation:  While these changes are welcomed by the college community, it remains to be seen if these steps will result in greater administrative stability and empowerment, primarily due to budgetary concerns.

C. Enhancing the college and district communication structure so that it is clear to everyone who the responsible party is for making decisions and how those decisions are or will be made (Standards IVA.1, IVA.2, IVB.1, IVB.2, and IVB.3).

Response: At the college level much has been accomplished to improve and clarify decision-making and affirmative communication steps have been taken. See also recommendations 1, 2, and 3, and 5.

During spring 2005, the chancellor has held three question and answer sessions at the college. The chancellor has attended several division meetings and the Board of Trustees held Board Forums in September 2005 at both colleges. All these sessions were open to faculty and staff who were invited to ask questions, express concerns, or simply provide opinions.

Evaluation: During 2004-2005, the college has been working diligently to improve communication. In response to fall 2005 flex activities, anecdotal evidence indicates that these efforts yielded palpable results and there is a feeling that we are re-building our institutional esprit de corps, though admittedly more work remains to be done by every member of the college community.

With respect to college-district communication, a level of improvement is apparent though more time is needed to overcome the years of cynicism, despair, and fear that have characterized college-district relations since 1997.  While some faculty and staff are anxious to move forward, these strongly-held feelings sometimes affect the interpretation of board and/or district actions. Careful attention to sincere and open communication should help to minimize such instances.

In summary, the numerous improvements at the college level coupled with the cautious optimism of better board/district-college relations, leave the college well positioned to make continuous and responsible changes that affect both the quality of our programs and services in a climate of cooperation and shared purpose among the faculty, staff, and administration.