

Follow-Up Report

Saddleback College
28000 Marguerite Parkway
Mission Viejo, CA 92692

A Confidential Report Prepared for the Accrediting Commission
For Community and Junior Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Saddleback College on
November 9, 2012

Dr. Joan E. Smith, Team Chair

Saddleback College

Follow-Up Report

Visiting Team Members

November 9, 2012

Dr. Joan E. Smith (chair)

Chancellor

Yosemite Community College District

Mr. Nick Stavrianoudakis (team member)

Director of External Affairs

Yosemite Community College District

ACCREDITATION FOLLOW-UP REPORT

FOR

SADDLEBACK COLLEGE

November 2012

The most recent comprehensive visit to Saddleback College was conducted in October, 2010. At its meeting of January 11-13, 2011, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) reviewed the institutional Self-Study Report and the report of the evaluation team that visited Saddleback College. The Commission acted to issue Warning and to ask that Saddleback College correct the deficiencies noted, submitting a Follow-Up Report in October 2011.

On October 15, 2011, Saddleback College submitted a Follow-Up Report pursuant to the direction of the ACCJC in an action letter dated January 31, 2011. A two-person site team visited Saddleback College for a follow-up visitation November 2-3, 2011. On those dates, another two-person team visited Irvine Valley College, the second college in the South Orange County Community College District. The teams collaborated with respect to the visit and team reports, as the six recommendations to be addressed were District Recommendations. The purpose of the team visit was to verify that the Follow-Up Report prepared by the college was accurate through the examination of evidence, and to determine if sustained, continuous, and positive improvements had been made at the institution. The team was also to document whether the institution has resolved the recommendations made by the comprehensive evaluation team and now meets the Accreditation Standards.

The ACCJC at its meeting January 10-12, 2012, reviewed the Follow-Up Report submitted by the college and the report of the evaluation team. The Commission took action to remove Warning and reaffirm accreditation with the requirement that the College complete a Follow-Up Report in October 2012.

The Follow-Up Report was submitted to the Commission on October 15, 2012, and was followed up with a visit by a two member team on November 9, 2012. There were three district recommendations the ACCJC asked the college to address in this second follow-up report in order to demonstrate that the deficiencies were completely resolved and the college was in full compliance with the accreditation standards.

The team found that the college had prepared very well for the visit by arranging for meetings with the individuals agreed upon earlier with the team chair. Further, the college and district office provided appropriate documents in the meetings and meeting room and provided easy access to college intranet sites to validate the follow-up report. Over the course of the day

visitation, team members met with the Chancellor, faculty members, the Vice Chancellor of Business Services, the Vice President for College Administrative Services, the Associate Vice Chancellor of Economic Development, the District Director of Research, Planning and Data Management, the Executive Director of Facilities Planning and Purchasing, the Director of Public Information and Marketing and the College President.

The team found that each of the three recommendations addressed by the College had been met. Below is a summary of the team's findings based upon the Follow-Up Report and observations and discussions on November 9, 2012.

District Recommendation 1

The teams recommend that the chancellor develop and implement both a strategic short-term and long-term plan that is inclusive of planning at the colleges and that this planning structure drive the allocation of district resources for the college, Advanced Technology Education Park (ATEP), and the district (I.B.4).

Findings and Evidence: The Follow-Up Report from 2011 indicated that the district had been engaged in long-term planning efforts prior to receipt of the Commission's letter and that the development of the *South Orange County Community College District Education and Facilities Master Plan (2011-2013 EFMP)* had been underway. This plan contains five volumes: an Education Master Plan and Facilities Master Plan for each of the colleges and a district summary. Further, the EMFP provides time horizons for five, 10 and 20 year periods. Everyone that was interviewed from the chancellor to the faculty member noted the plan is now built into the culture of the colleges and district. Also, those interviewed spoke of the evolution of the planning that has now become part of the district and the colleges and the chancellor was credited with moving this forward with a 'hard push' with great results.

Both the *SOCCCD Education and Facilities Master Plan* and the *SOCCCD District-Wide Strategic Plan* were scheduled for approval at the December 2011 meeting of the Board of Trustees. This was affirmed, as was the new District Wide Planning Council that was constituted from the District Wide Accreditation Committee and the District Wide Task Force for Recommendation 1—this group has been designated as the work group charged to carry out this broad based collaborative work.

Conclusion: Since the District first received this recommendation, much work has been done including the transformation of the district in the acceptance of planning from the district to the colleges. Planning as a highly collaborative process has been accepted at all levels throughout the district and the college(s). The *SOCCCD District Wide Strategic Plan*, was the first in the history of the district; it was built on the participants' mutual respect and shared desire to better integrate the planning and resource allocation processes of the district and the colleges. The

implementation of these plans over the recent years has been impressive—both in the quality and quantity of work completed and in the acceptance of the documents and planning processes throughout the district.

The district and the college have met the expectations of this recommendation and are encouraged to maintain the mutual respect that has emerged between the district and the colleges. Further, the district and the colleges are encouraged to sustain and maintain the continuous quality improvement of this planning by including the evaluation and effectiveness of the processes.

This recommendation has been met.

District Recommendation 2: The teams recommend that the district and the colleges develop and implement a resource allocation model driven by planning that includes all district funds and is open, transparent, inclusive, and that is widely disseminated and reviewed/evaluated periodically for effectiveness (I.a1., I.B., and III.D.1., III.D.1.b., III.D.1.c., III.D.1.d., III.D.1.d., III.D.2.b., III.D.3., IV.B.3.c).

Findings and Evidence: Both the Follow-Up Report and interviews with district and college staff in 2011 asserted that the district’s resource allocation model of unrestricted general funds through the District Resource Allocation Council (DRAC) worked well. However, the allocation of basic aid funding was deemed less clear, unpredictable and not demonstrably equitable across the colleges. There was a task force charged to address this recommendation and its charge was “to keep the planning model open, transparent, and simple, addressing all district funds including, but not exclusively, basic aid funds.”

Much work has been done on the resource allocation model since 2010. There was a new Basic Aid Allocation Policy, BP 3110, established in December 2010 after the comprehensive team visit. Those interviewed in 2012 cited BP 3110 and noted that it was working well for the colleges and the district. The task force had developed a flow chart in 2011 that identifies all resources received by the district. This document illustrated how the planning processes would be used to drive allocation decisions for the various resources such as facilities, technology and maintenance and renovation. Evidence of the utilization and understanding of this document and process was noted in interviews during the 2012 follow-up visit. Further, there has been the creation of a new committee—the Basic Aid Allocation Recommendation Committee (BAARC), designed to address specific district wide needs for the five areas listed in Board Policy 3110. BAARC was developed and agreed upon by the participatory governance groups. Those interviewed agreed that the process included “full involvement of all constituency groups.”

The implementation of the resource allocation model included the use of the software program TracDat, which was developed to provide alignment between college and district wide strategic

planning goals and to generate funding requests that are driven by instructional programs and administrative unit reviews of the colleges and the district.

Conclusion: The district and colleges have developed an open and collaborative process to determine resource allocation of all district funds that is driven by planning. The successful implementation of the model was in part due to the development of Board Policy 3110 and the procedure Administration Regulation 3110, which delineates the specific processes for resource allocations among the five types of project identified in BP 3110. TracDat is now utilized as a tool to further facilitate the district wide resource allocation process and is linked to district and college planning. The district will need to sustain and maintain the resource allocation process by regularly assessing the effectiveness of their processes.

This recommendation has been met.

The teams recommend that the district provide a clear delineation of its functional responsibilities, the district level process for decision making and the role of the district in college planning and decision making. The district should provide a regular review of district communities, conduct an assessment of the overall effectiveness of services to the college and communicate the results of those reviews (IV.B.3.a., IV. B.3.3., IV.B.3.f.).

The need for a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities within the district had been a long-standing issue. However, significant progress was made and noted both in the 2011 Follow-Up Report and during the evaluation team visit that year. A clear delineation of roles was achieved with the creation of a comprehensive district wide function map that accurately depicted the functioning of each entity with respect to the accreditation standards. It serves as the basis for future elaborations of the workflow in relation to the roles and responsibilities of the colleges and district services. This map was updated after the 2011 visit to incorporate the new policies and procedures that were developed; this demonstrates the continuous evolution and improvement of the processes.

All documents involved in planning and decision making, including any changes, are widely available through the district's SharePoint site. Each district wide committee has a uniform site where the purpose, membership, meeting times, agendas, minutes, and relevant documents can be located. Each committee conducts an annual self-evaluation and posts the results of that evaluation on its SharePoint site. The self-evaluation process includes review of committee charge, review of membership, review of communication process and assessment of goal attainment.

Those interviewed admitted that a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities within the district was a past problem; however, this is no longer the case. The creation of the jointly developed district wide planning processes and implementation procedures that are documented

in the *SOCCCD Planning and Decision Making Manual* have remediated the issues. Further, this document, along with current practices, are viewed by those at the college and the district as “unmistakable evidence” that the district now understands the importance of the standards for the effectiveness of its institutions. It was expressed repeatedly by everyone interviewed that the SOCCCD is a new district, and much is credited to the recommendations that had to be addressed in the 2010 Evaluation Report and to the chancellor who supported addressing them to satisfaction. It was noted in several interviews that the chancellor stated at an all district event that, “. . .it is because of those recommendations that we are a stronger institution and better positioned for the future.”

Conclusion: The roles and responsibilities of district personnel have now been clearly defined. The colleges and the district accept the district wide committee structure as effective. The work of each committee is now easily accessible by all members of the community and the transparency was appreciated by all interviewed. The functional responsibilities and work flow are evaluated on a regular basis as changes are made as needed.

This recommendation has been met.