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**Mission Statement**

Saddleback College enriches its students and the south Orange County community by providing a comprehensive array of high-quality courses and programs that foster student learning and success in the attainment of academic degrees and career technical certificates, transfer to four-year institutions, improvement of basic skills, and lifelong learning.

**Vision Statement**

Saddleback College will be the first choice of students who seek a dynamic, innovative, and student-centered postsecondary education.

**Values**

Saddleback College embraces:

- **Commitment**
  We commit to fulfilling our mission to serve the south Orange County community.

- **Excellence**
  We dedicate ourselves to excellence in academics, student support, and community service.

- **Collegiality**
  We foster a climate of integrity, honesty, and respect.

- **Success**
  We place our highest priority on student learning and delivering comprehensive support for student success.

- **Partnership**
  We strive to develop strong and lasting partnerships among students, faculty, staff, and the community.

- **Innovation**
  We anticipate and welcome change by encouraging innovation and creativity.

- **Academic Freedom**
  We endorse academic freedom and the open exchange of ideas.

- **Sustainability**
  We promote environmental sustainability and use our resources responsibly to reduce our ecological impact.

- **Inclusiveness**
  We cultivate equity and diversity by embracing all cultures, ideas, and perspectives.

- **Global Awareness**
  We recognize the importance of global awareness and prepare our students to live and work in an increasingly interconnected world.
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Statement of Report Preparation

On February 1, 2012, Saddleback College received the action letter from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) removing the college from warning status and reaffirming its accreditation [I.01]. It was acknowledged that the college and district had made significant advancements in addressing the deficiencies identified by the ACCJC in its January 31, 2011, letter, as documented in the 2011 Accreditation Follow-Up Report [I.02] and confirmed by the visiting team’s Follow-Up Report from the November 2-3, 2011, site visit [I.03]. However, there were three district recommendations that the ACCJC asked the college to address in a 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 completion of the 2012 Accreditation Follow-Up Report was overseen by the college’s Accreditation Steering Committee, consisting of the following members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juan Avalos</td>
<td>Vice President for Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tod A. Burnett</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Busché</td>
<td>Acting Vice President for Instruction/Accreditation Liaison Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Cesarea-Silva</td>
<td>Faculty/Former President, Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Cosgrove</td>
<td>Faculty/President, Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Durdella</td>
<td>Director of Planning, Research and Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Fitzsimons</td>
<td>District Vice Chancellor, Business Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tere Fluegeman</td>
<td>District Director, Public Affairs and Government Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Hilton</td>
<td>Vice President for College Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denice Inciong</td>
<td>District Director of Research, Planning, and Data Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Langrell</td>
<td>Faculty/Standard III Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margot Lovett</td>
<td>Faculty/Standard IV Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher McDonald</td>
<td>Dean, Division of Mathematics, Science, and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Mineo</td>
<td>Career Guidance Officer/President, Classified Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake Stephens</td>
<td>Faculty/Standard I Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Teng</td>
<td>Faculty/Standard II Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table I.1: Saddleback College Accreditation Steering Committee*

The steering committee was co-chaired by Dr. Donald Busché, acting vice president for instruction, and Dr. Bob Cosgrove, president of the Academic Senate. Claire Cesarea-Silva, the primary writer of the 2011 follow-up report, was appointed as the primary writer for the 2012 report, and Carol Ziehm, professor of English, was identified as the editor. Members of the steering committee met periodically throughout the spring and summer of 2012 to guide the preparation and writing of the report.
A presentation on the first draft of the report was given to the college community at an open forum on August 15, 2012, during the fall 2012 in-service week [I.04]. Feedback from that presentation was incorporated into a second draft, which was distributed by Dr. Burnett via email to all college employees and posted on the college’s accreditation web page on August 24, 2012. College-wide feedback was solicited through September 6, 2012, and suggestions from individuals and the various constituent groups were incorporated into a subsequent draft. In addition, writers of the Irvine Valley College and Saddleback College reports exchanged drafts throughout the process to ensure that the information was accurately and consistently presented.

Members of the steering committee met with Dr. Burnett on September 10, 2012, to complete the final draft. This draft was presented to the Consultation Council on September 11, 2011, where it was recommended for acceptance to the college president [I.05]. Dr. Burnett accepted the recommendation, and the finalized report was then forwarded for review by the board of trustees at its September 24, 2011, meeting [I.06].
Evidence for the Statement of Report Preparation

I.01 Letter from ACCJC, February 1, 2012  

I.02 Saddleback College 2011 Accreditation Follow-Up Report  

I.03 ACCJC Visiting Team's Follow-Up Report, November 2-3, 2011  

I.04 PowerPoint of the In-Service Presentation on the Saddleback College 2012 Accreditation Follow-Up Report, August 15, 2012  

I.05 Minutes from Consultation Council, September 11, 2012  
http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/intro/i-05_Minutes_from_Consultation_Council_9-11-12.pdf

I.06 Agenda for the Board of Trustees Meeting, September 24, 2012  
http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/intro/i-06_Board_of_Trustees_Agenda_9-24-12.pdf
Response to District Recommendation 1

**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 the planning at the colleges and that this planning structure drive the allocation of district resources for the colleges, Advanced Technology Education Park (ATEP), and the district (I.B.4.).

As identified in the 2011 Accreditation Follow-Up Report, the district came together in unprecedented fashion to develop and implement a district-wide strategic planning process and the South Orange County Community College District (SOCCCD) 2011-2014 District-wide Strategic Plan, with both the colleges and district services demonstrating a shared commitment to engage in integrated, ongoing, systematic, and data-driven planning that would serve as the basis for all resource allocations within the district, including funding for ATEP. At the time of the site visit, however, it was openly acknowledged that the district-wide strategic planning process was new and only just entering the implementation phase.

Based upon this understanding, the college outlined the following planning agendas in the 2011 follow-up report:

1. Institutionalize the District-wide Accreditation Committee and the District-wide Recommendation 1 Task Force into a new District-wide Planning Council to ensure continued to broad participation and oversight of all district-wide planning.

2. Continue to assess, evaluate, and further develop the strategic planning process utilized during this first iteration of a district-wide plan.

3. Complete an Administrative Unit Review of all district service units by March 2012, and regularly assess their progress in meeting their goals and action plans.

4. Update the SOCCCD Planning and Decision-Making Manual as changes occur and through a systematic review every two years.

5. Implement the action steps outlined in the SOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2011-2014, including the development of a concrete 3- to 5-year site development plan for ATEP [1.01].
The November 2011 ACCJC visiting team concurred with our identified planning agendas, and stated that, “[T]he District has partially met the expectations of this recommendation and is encouraged to maintain the mutual respect that has emerged between the district and the colleges and to follow through with implementation of its District-wide plans and with evaluation of the effectiveness of the new planning process” [1.02].

The district-wide planning process includes both long-term and short-term planning. Long-term planning is represented primarily by the 2011-2031 Education and Facilities Master Plan (EFMP). This plan was in final draft form in fall 2011, but at the time of the ACCJC site visit, the district was still awaiting the completion of the required environmental impact report. The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) was completed in April 2012, and, after incorporating public comments, the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was completed in June 2012 [1.03]. A public hearing on the EIR was held at the June 25, 2012, board of trustees meeting, followed by a vote to certify the EIR and a vote to approve the EFMP in its entirety [1.04].

The Five-Year Construction Plan for 2014-2018, an annualized report that prioritizes projects identified in the EFMP for completion in the upcoming five years, was also approved at the June 25, 2012, board of trustees meeting, and submitted to the California Community Colleges (CCC) Chancellor’s Office as required [1.05]. This plan is collaboratively devised each year. A draft plan is initially developed by the district executive director of facilities planning, purchasing, and materials management, reviewed by the college presidents, and revised if necessary until a consensus is reached. If there are significant changes from the previous year, such as following a five-year update of the EFMP, then the presidents will take the report back to the constituent groups at each college for additional review and revisions.

Another important long-term plan is the district-wide 20-year facilities, renovation, and scheduled maintenance management plan. It was noted in the 2011 report that although each of the colleges already had a 20-Year Facilities and Scheduled Maintenance Plan in place, it was important to have an integrated plan that assessed the facilities needs of the entire district for the purposes of prioritization. The Capital Improvement Committee (CIC), which is composed of representatives from both colleges and district services, was designated as the responsible entity for the development of this plan. After considerable discussion, CIC decided that it was essential to have an independent and objective assessment of the state of the facilities at both colleges before such a plan could be created [1.06]. Toward this end, CIC proposed contracts for maintenance management and facility planning.
software and implementation from SchoolDude, Alpha Facilities, Inc., Facilities Planning and Program Service Inc., and the Foundation for California Community Colleges, which were approved by the board of trustees at its meeting on June 25, 2012 [1.07]. The four contracted services will address condition assessment, the provision of software, and the management and coordination of the college reporting and software with the state reporting database. The software will include a work order module, a preventative maintenance module, and a scheduled maintenance module.

Following this approval, work began on laying the foundations for the development of the district-wide plan, which will include a work order module, a preventative maintenance module, and a scheduled maintenance module. A kick-off meeting was held on July 25, 2012, with the consultants and representatives from the colleges and district services [1.08]. The managing consultant began assembling all available electronic information on the buildings in order to provide a foundation for compiling the existing conditions. Parallel with this effort, district staff and consultants are working with the Foundation for California Community Colleges to ensure compatibility with FUSION, the state’s project planning and management software. A pilot project will be performed on the student services buildings at both colleges in order to ensure that data collection and reporting are functioning as expected before moving on to the assessment of remaining facilities. The pilot will begin after the initial electronic data effort is complete in October 2012. If all goes well with the pilot, the entire facilities assessment will be completed by the end of the 2012-1013 fiscal year. In the interim, the existing college plans have been used by CIC to create short-term prioritized lists for capital improvement and scheduled maintenance.

Short-term planning is represented primarily by the SOCCCD 2011-2014 District-wide Strategic Plan, which was approved by the board of trustees on September 26, 2011 [1.9]. This plan identified the following six goals, along with measurable objectives and action steps:

- **District Goal 1**: SOCCCD will create a district-wide culture that is characterized by mutual respect and collaboration and celebrates the uniqueness of each institution.

- **District Goal 2**: SOCCCD will support innovations that result in quantifiable improvement in student preparedness and success and will facilitate the institutionalization of those innovations across the district.
• District Goal 3: SOCCCD will maintain its technological leadership and will make future advancements to enhance student access and success.

• District Goal 4: SOCCCD will increase the effective use of all resources by developing and implementing a cycle of integrated district-wide planning.

• District Goal 5: SOCCCD will develop, document and implement data-driven, district-wide decision-making processes that are collaborative, transparent, efficient and effective.

• District Goal 6: SOCCCD will assess the educational needs of the communities within the district boundaries and will pursue joint venture partnerships with educational institutions and business/industry [1.10].

Each of the action steps within the plan identifies responsible parties and target dates for completion of the corresponding actions. Progress on each of the action steps has been input into TracDat. An annual progress report was created, presented to the board of trustees on September 24, 2011 [1.11], and posted to the district planning SharePoint site [1.12].

The district-wide strategic plan is monitored by the District-wide Planning Council (DWPC), co-chaired by Chancellor Gary Poertner and District Director of Research and Planning Denice Inciong. The mission of the council is to coordinate and oversee all district-wide planning, to review progress of the strategic plan, and to update the plan and planning documents as appropriate [1.13]. Regular meetings are scheduled for each semester, along with an annual planning retreat in late May.

On November 4, 2011, the Chancellor held the inaugural meeting of the newly formed DWPC at Irvine Valley College. The DWPC was created out of the membership of the District-wide Accreditation Committee and the District-wide Recommendation 1 Task Force, both of which had initially come into being during the writing of the 2011 Accreditation Follow-Up Report. The DWPC currently consists of the following members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCCCD District Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gary Poertner</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denice Inciong</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robert Bramucci</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>David Bugay</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brandye D’Lena</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At this meeting, the following took place:

- Review of the council’s purpose, mission, and membership;
- Demonstration of TracDat for tracking progress on the strategic plan;
- Establishment of the council’s meeting schedule; and
- Discussion of the mission statements for the district and ATEP [1.14].

The next meeting of the DWPC was held on February 10, 2012, at Saddleback College. At this meeting, the following took place:

- Accreditation updates from each college;
• Demonstration of the progress on TracDat implementation for strategic planning and for inputting of the district services administrative unit reviews;
• Announcement of the dates for the annual board of trustees self-evaluation and district services satisfaction survey;
• Presentation of the final proposal of the mission statements for the district and ATEP;
• Discussion of progress on Action Step 1.1.2 for District-wide Objective 1.1 from the strategic plan, which included reports from both colleges on the top five barriers to mutual respect, collaboration, and cooperation;
• Creation of a task force for the revision of the District-wide Planning and Decision-Making Manual and the function map, to be headed by Vice Chancellor David Bugay; and
• Selection of the date for the May planning retreat and creation of a task force to facilitate the meeting [1.15].

On May 30, 2012, the DWPC met for a full-day retreat at the Mission Viejo Country Club. During the retreat, the following took place:

• Review and evaluation of the 2011-2012 progress on the district-wide strategic plan [1.16];
• Setting the agenda for 2012-2013, which will include an evaluation of the strategic planning process;
• Final revision to and approval of the mission statements for the district and ATEP; and
• Establishment of dates for the 2012-2013 council meetings [1.17].

The most recent meeting of the DWPC took place on September 7, 2012, at Saddleback College. The following was accomplished at this meeting:

• Review of the draft SOCCCD Strategic Plan Annual Report [1.18];
• Discussion of district-wide committee self-assessments and the survey instrument to be used by DWPC [1.19];
• Review of the survey results from the pilot district-wide climate survey [1.20];
• Review of the draft district-wide climate survey to be administered in fall 2012 [1.21]
• Report on the status of the environment scan for the 2014-2017 district-wide strategic plan;
• Preliminary approval of the District-wide Integrated Budget and Planning Handbook (see Recommendation 2 for more information);
• Discussion of updates to the strategic planning documents [1.22].
Proposed revisions to the function map and District-wide Planning and Decision-Making Manual are being collected by Assistant Vice Chancellor Randy Peebles, and will be distributed to DWPC members prior to the November 2012 meeting where the revisions will be discussed.

Two objectives in the District-wide Strategic Plan 2011-2014 address ATEP specifically (planning objectives 6.1 and 6.2), and require the chancellor and college presidents to collaborate in determining the responsibility for the use and maintenance of the ATEP site, including the development of a 3- to 5-year site development plan. Significant progress has been made on these objectives.

The development of the ATEP site, and each college’s relationship to that site, has been addressed in various plans and policies established over the past year. The chancellor requested that both colleges present their vision and future plans for the educational use of ATEP for the board of trustees meeting on December 5, 2011 [1.23]. Saddleback College’s presentation focused on the creation of a Center for Innovation in Healthcare Education at ATEP, a comprehensive regional simulation center for all healthcare services including an emergency department, patient care units, clinical laboratories, and medical records [1.24].

At the January 23, 2012, board of trustees meeting, the following actions were taken in relation to ATEP [1.25]:

- Approval of Resolution #12-04 – College Service Areas
  This resolution reaffirms the two college campus service areas within the SOCCCD and establishes a separate ATEP service area for both colleges to initially share in approximately equal proportions with complementary, non-competitive Career Technology Education (CTE) programs and related services for the district at large.

- Approval of Resolution #12-05 – ATEP Site Assignments for Saddleback College and Irvine Valley College
  This resolution includes the approval to assign approximately equal land sites for each college’s buildings, infrastructure and parking; affirmation that future ATEP site development would be allocated in approximately equal proportions to each college for educational use and for potential ground leases or space leases with educational, business, and commercial partners; and approval to continue moving forward with the planning and design for the one building for each college at the ATEP site, contingent upon available funding [1.26].
At the February 27, 2012, board of trustees meeting, the following additional actions were taken in relation to ATEP [1.27]:

- Approval of the initial instructional program areas to be offered by each of the colleges on the permanent ATEP campus.
- Approval of the ATEP Five-Year Site Development Plan and Timeline. This plan was identified as a goal in the district-wide strategic plan. It includes a summary of the incremental steps needed to complete the planning and construction of future buildings at ATEP. It will be routinely updated as needed, and published on the district website for college and district staff to utilize for information and planning [1.28].

To further clarify the development of ATEP, the College Service Area Boundaries and ATEP Campus Board Policy, BP 176 [1.29], was drafted by district services and is currently being reviewed by the Board Policy and Administrative Regulation Advisory Council (BPARC) and the colleges. It is expected that the policy will be finalized and sent to the board of trustees for approval in fall 2012. An administrative regulation to support this policy is also being developed by BPARC that will codify the process of identifying the complementary and non-competitive CTE programs to be scheduled at ATEP. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Irvine Valley College and Saddleback College has also been drafted and is currently going through the college review process [1.30]. The purpose of this MOU is to provide a framework for cooperation between the two colleges at the site and to clarify the criteria that will be used in determining the specific program offerings and student support services that each college will be able to offer.

ATEP site development is well documented in the ATEP Site Development Administrative Unit Review (AUR) section of the District Services Administrative Unit Reviews 2011-2012 Report (see below for more information on district services AURs) [1.31]. ATEP is also addressed in the Chancellor's Office and Trustee Services AUR section under the objective of increasing the board of trustees' knowledge of district and educational responsibility.

Planning and evaluation of district services is being directed by the District Services Planning Committee (DSPC), established in October 2011 and chaired by Chancellor Poertner. This committee meets monthly, and its charge is to “support planning, including budget allocation recommendations and accreditation progress reporting at the district services level; ensure that integrated planning and budgeting occur for district services; provide guidance and direction to district services...”
administrative unit review teams; [and] address other planning related tasks as needed” [1.32].

Completion of all district services AURs occurred in March 2012 as planned, and a TracDat report on the 2011-2012 AURs was distributed via email to all employees of the district in May 2012 and posted to the district’s SharePoint site [1.33]. This was the first year of what will be an annual review cycle for district services. As stated by the chancellor in the introduction to the District Services Administrative Unit Reviews 2011-2012 report, “District Services units now have a process to report activities, successes and improvements that will be utilized in strategic planning and prioritization of the annual budgeting process. The AURs will provide valuable information toward comprehensive planning that is inclusive of all district services support staff, managers and administrators.”

Part of the data for these AURs and the objectives that were developed came from an annual district services satisfaction survey. The third annual survey was conducted with all district employees in March and April 2012. The report was published and distributed in July 2012 [1.34].

Evaluation

The district has made a clear and sustained commitment to both long-term and short-term planning as the basis for the allocation of district resources for Saddleback College, Irvine Valley College, ATEP, and district services. Planning processes have been established, documented in policy and systematically evaluated for effectiveness, plans have been developed and implemented, and decisions have been made in accordance with collegially agreed upon goals and objectives.

Planning Agenda

Complete the objective evaluation of the facilities at both colleges, and develop an integrated 20-year facilities, renovation, and scheduled maintenance management plan, and ensure adequate funding for this plan based upon demonstrated need.
Evidence for District Recommendation 1

1.01 Saddleback College 2011 Accreditation Follow-Up Report

1.02 ACCJC Visiting Team's Follow-Up Report, November 2-3, 2011

1.03 Final Program Environmental Report, June 2012

1.04 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, June 25, 2012

1.05 Five-Year Construction Plan
http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation1/1-05_2012_Board_Agenda_for_Five_Year_Construction_Plan.pdf

1.06 Minutes of the Capital Improvement Committee, January 13, 2012
http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation1/1-06_Capital_Improvement_Committee_01-13-12_Minutes.pdf

1.07 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, June 25, 2012

1.08 Agenda of the Maintenance Management, Facility Planning Software and Implementation Meeting, July 25, 2012

1.09 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, September 26, 2011

1.10 SOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2011-2014
1.11 Agenda of the Board of Trustees Meeting, September 24, 2012


1.13 District-wide Planning Council Sheet from the District-wide Planning and Decision Making Manual 2010-2011

1.14 Minutes of the District-wide Planning Council, November 4, 2011

1.15 Minutes of the District-wide Planning Council, February 10, 2012

http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation1/1-16_DWPC_Retreat-05-30-12-Agenda.pdf

http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation1/1-17_DWPC_Retreat_Minutes%20_05-30-12.pdf

1.18 2012 SOCCCD Strategic Plan 2011-2014 Annual Report (Draft)

1.19 District-wide Planning Council Self-Evaluation Survey (Draft)

1.20 Results from the District-wide Climate Survey (Draft)
http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation1/1-20_District-wide_Climate_Pilot_Survey_Results%20_09-05-12.pdf
1.21 District-wide Climate Survey, 2012 (Draft)

1.22 Agenda of the District-wide Planning Council Meeting, September 7, 2012
http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation1/1-22_DWPC_Agenda_09-07-12.pdf

1.23 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, December 5, 2012

1.24 Saddleback College Presentation on ATEP to Board of Trustees: “Center for Innovation in Healthcare Education,” December 5, 2012
http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation1/1-24_Center_for_Innovation_Presentation.pdf

1.25 ATEP Site Assignments for Colleges, January 23, 2012
http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation1/1-25_ATEP_Site_Assignments.pdf

1.26 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, January 23, 2012

1.27 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, February 27, 2012

1.28 ATEP Five-Year Site Development Plan and Timeline

1.29 Board Policy 176, College Service Area Boundaries and ATEP Campus Use (Draft)
http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation1/1-29_BP-176-Service_Areas.pdf

1.30 Memorandum of Understanding on ATEP (Draft)
1.31 District Services Administrative Unit Reviews 2011-2012

1.32 Minutes of the District Services Planning Committee, April 20, 2012

1.33 District Services Administrative Unit Reviews 2011-2012

1.34 SOCCCD District Services Satisfaction Survey 2012 Results
http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation1/1-34_SOCCCD_District_Services_Survey_2012_Results_FINAL_0-07-12.pdf
Response to District Recommendation 2

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, and that is widely disseminated and reviewed/evaluated periodically for effectiveness (I.A.1., I.B., III.D.1., III.D.1.b., III.D.1.c., III.D.1.d., III.D.2.b., III.D.3., IV.B.3 c.).

In its 2011 Follow-Up Report, the ACCJC visiting team recognized that the district had developed, in an open and collaborative manner, a resource allocation model of all district funds that is driven by planning. At the time of the visit, however, implementation was not yet complete and was contingent upon the completion of AR 3110 and the utilization of TracDat as a tool to facilitate the district-wide planning and resource allocation processes. The visiting team also noted that the Basic Aid Allocation Policy, BP 3110, and the new AR 3110 must be regularly assessed for effectiveness and revised if necessary. For these reasons, the visiting team found that the district had partially met the expectations of this recommendation [2.01].

The observations of the visiting team, in fact, echoed those of the college, as evidenced in the following planning agendas outlined in the college’s 2011 Accreditation Follow-Up Report:

1. Complete AR 3110 in a way that clearly links resource allocations to planning.

2. Regularly review BP 3110 and AR 3100 for effectiveness, and revise if necessary.

3. Complete the District-wide 20-Year Facilities, Renovation, and Scheduled Maintenance Plan, the Five-Year Construction Plan, and the District-wide Technology Plan by March 15, 2012, and ensure adequate funding for these plans based upon demonstrated need.

4. Devise and adhere to district-wide plans related to capital improvement, scheduled maintenance, and technology.

5. Complete the implementation of TracDat and the installation of SharePoint 2010, and investigate the purchase of the TracDat-SharePoint 2010 integration option [2.02].

Most of the district’s resources, the unrestricted general funds which derive primarily from local property taxes and enrollment fees, flow through the District Resources
Allocation Council (DRAC), which has been in place since 1996. DRAC is a district-wide participatory governance council that is charged with making recommendations for and overseeing the model upon which the district’s general fund resource allocations are determined. Once funds have been allocated to the colleges and district services in accordance with the DRAC model, the remaining property tax revenues are designated as basic aid funds. The Basic Aid Allocation Policy, BP 3110 [2.03], which requires that all basic aid funds be allocated in accordance with district and college plans, was approved by the board of trustees on August 29, 2011 [2.04].

AR 3110 [2.05], the administrative regulation associated with BP 3110, was approved by BPARC on February 3, 2012 [2.06] and presented to the board of trustees on February 27, 2012 [2.07]. The purpose of AR 3110 is to show the exact process by which the district will utilize the long-term master plan, short-term strategic plans, and other planning documents (such as the District-wide 20-Year Facilities, Renovation, and Scheduled Maintenance Management Plan and District-wide Technology Master Plan) to determine the allocation of basic aid funds. AR 3110 also created a new district-wide committee, the Basic Aid Allocation Recommendation Committee (BAARC), which is chaired by the vice chancellor of business services. This committee oversees the entire basic aid allocation process, assesses its effectiveness, and makes recommendations for further refinement of the process. Its inaugural meeting was held on March 9, 2012 [2.08], and the first prioritized list of recommended basic aid expenditures was finalized on May 11, 2012 [2.09]. This list was sent to the board of trustees for review and study on May 21, 2012 [2.10], and was approved by the board, along with the complete 2012-2013 tentative budget on June 25, 2012 [2.11].

Included in AR 3110 is the BAARC flow chart (shown on page 25 below). This flow chart clearly demonstrates how basic aid allocations are tied to college and district-wide planning efforts, and identifies the entities responsible for approving the allocations at each step in the process. The flow chart is another effort to ensure that decision-making occurs in an open, transparent, and participatory manner.

In order to help ensure transparency and inclusiveness, a draft SOCCCD District-wide Integrated Budget and Planning Handbook was developed by Dr. Debra Fitzsimons, vice chancellor of business services, in June 2012 [2.12]. This handbook fully describes the district’s resource allocation processes and demonstrates the link between the budget and planning. The handbook also includes links to relevant documents such as the District-wide Planning and Decision-Making Manual.
Figure 2.1: Basic Aid Allocation Recommendation Committee (BAARC) Flow Chart

*For more details, refer to AR 3110.
The information provided in this handbook is invaluable, and it was preliminarily approved by the DWPC at its September 7, 2012 meeting [2.13].

Additionally, on January 19-20, 2012, DRAC sponsored a presentation and open forum at each college entitled “A Workshop on Understanding the Budget” [2.14], and over 50 employees were in attendance at Saddleback College. The purpose of this forum was to clarify the budget processes and increase dialogue between college employees and district services. Topics covered included basic aid, the state budget situation, the governor’s budget proposal, SB 361, the DRAC model, and the processes by which resource allocations are now being driven by planning.

Continued work has also been done on the completion of various additional plans that are incorporated into the BAARC flow chart, including the District-wide 20-Year Facilities, Renovation, and Scheduled Maintenance Management Plan, Five-Year Construction Plan, and District-wide Technology Master Plan. The 20-year facilities and scheduled maintenance plan and the five-year construction plan are addressed in Recommendation 1 above. The District-wide Technology Master Plan 2012-2017 [2.15] was developed by the District-wide Technology Committee (DTC) and approved at its April 5, 2012, meeting [2.16]. The plan will be reviewed and revised annually in order to respond to rapid changes in technology. Items contained in the plan are derived from two main sources – the district-wide work order portal (KACE) and the Program Reviews (PRs) and AURs that are completed by academic programs and administrative units at both colleges and in district services. At a special meeting of the DTC held on May 3, 2013, a list of basic aid projects from this plan was prioritized for 2012-2013 and forwarded to BAARC [2.17]. BAARC recommended some slight revisions to this list, and these were accepted by the DTC at its meeting on June 7, 2012 [2.18].

There was some concern at the colleges about what they perceived as a lack of adequate input into the creation of the District-wide Technology Master Plan and the prioritized list of projects, and a letter was sent to Dr. Robert Bramucci, vice chancellor of technology and learning services, by both college presidents expressing these concerns [2.19]. This letter gave provisional approval to the district technology plan and the prioritized list of projects for 2012-2013, but recommended to BAARC that additional conditions be met before actually allocating any funds. These conditions included the need for more detail about the funding required for the projects included in the plan and more fiscal review for all expenditures made. BAARC discussed the recommendations at its March 11, 2012, meeting, forwarded its concerns to DTC for further action, and will include them as part of the evaluation of the current process [2.20].
The issue was discussed in detail at the June 7, 2012, DTC meeting. Dr. Bramucci acknowledged the issue and accepted the conditions outlined by the college presidents. He also explained that the scope of the technology plan was limited due to the expedited timeline, and that a governance plan, which will look more closely at the processes for technology requests and decision-making, needs to be created. A Governance Plan Task Force was created and members of the DTC were appointed to serve on the task force [2.21].

Finally, TracDat, the software program selected by both district services and the colleges for the tracking of strategic planning processes and resource allocation requests, is in the process of being fully implemented. It is being used at the colleges for the inputting of student learning outcomes (SLOs), administrative unit outcomes (AUOs), PRs, AURs, and some strategic planning information. District services have used it for the inputting of their AURs, as well as for tracking progress on the district-wide strategic plan. The TracDat-SharePoint 2010 integration option has been approved for purchase, and is 13th on the list of prioritized items for basic aid funding from the DTC. Once acquired, this option will provide the ability to generate funding requests directly from data-based PRs, AURs, and strategic planning initiatives.

**Evaluation**

The district has worked diligently over the past two years to develop and implement a resource allocation model driven by planning, and to regularly review and evaluate the effectiveness of this model and the district’s planning committees. For the first time in the history of the district, a planning process that is participatory and transparent is now the basis of basic aid recommendations to the chancellor and the board of trustees, and the foundation for all decision-making at the district.

Because the new planning and resource allocation model emphasizes regular review and evaluation, a mechanism for addressing issues that arise and thereby strengthening the processes and procedures now exists. For example, in creating the *District-wide Technology Master Plan*, several issues emerged that will be addressed as part of the annual evaluation of the DTC and its related planning bodies prior to the creation of the next master plan. These issues include improving the initial input and feedback gathering stages; ensuring a better alignment of the district plan with the college plans; including more detailed information relating to requests; ensuring greater accountability and oversight for expenditures; and clarifying the roles and responsibilities of the participating committees.
Planning Agenda

Develop an integrated 20-year facilities, renovation, and scheduled maintenance management plan, and ensure adequate funding for this plan based upon demonstrated need.
Evidence for District Recommendation 2

2.01 ACCJC Visiting Team's Follow-Up Report, November 2-3, 2011

2.02 Saddleback College 2011 Accreditation Follow-Up Report

2.03 Board Policy 3110, Basic Aid Funds Allocation Process
   http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation2/2-03_BP-3110_Basic_Aid_Funds_Allocation_Process.pdf

2.04 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, August 29, 2011

2.05 Administrative Regulation 3110, Basic Aid Allocation Process
   http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation2/2-05_AR-3110_Basic_Aid_Allocation_Process.pdf

2.06 Minutes of the Board Policy and Administrative Regulation Advisory Council Meeting, February 3, 2012
   http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation2/2-06_BPARC_Meeting_Minutes_2-3-12.pdf

2.07 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, February 27, 2012

2.08 Minutes of the Basic Aid Allocation Recommendation Committee Meeting, March 9, 2012
   http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation2/2-08_03-09-12_BAARC_Minutes.pdf

2.09 Minutes of the Basic Aid Allocation Recommendation Committee Meeting, May 11, 2012
   http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation2/2-09_05-11-12_BAARC_Minutes.pdf
2.10 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, May 21, 2012

2.11 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, June 25, 2012

2.12 SOCCCD District-wide Integrated Budget and Planning Handbook 2012 (Draft)

2.13 Agenda of the District-wide Planning Council, September 7, 2012


2.15 District-wide Technology Master Plan 2012-2017

2.16 Minutes of the District-wide Technology Committee Meeting, April 5, 2012
http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation2/2-16_DTC_Minutes_4-5-12.pdf

2.17 Minutes of the District-wide Technology Committee Special Meeting, May 3, 2012
http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation2/2-17_DTC_Minutes_Special_Mtg_4-3-12.pdf

2.18 Minutes of the District-wide Technology Committee Meeting, June 7, 2012
http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation2/2-18_DTC_Minutes_6-7-12.pdf
2.19  Letter from the College Presidents to the Vice Chancellor of Technology and Learning Services

2.20  Minutes of the Basic Aid Allocation Recommendation Committee Meeting, May 11, 2012

2.21  Minutes of the District Technology Council, June 7, 2012
http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation2/2-21_DTC_Minutes_6-7-12.pdf
Response to District Recommendation 6

**District Recommendation 6:** 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.b., IV.B.3.e., and IV.B.3.f.).

While the need for a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities within the district had been a long-standing issue, significant strides were taken prior to the submission of the 2011 follow-up report. The report outlined these strides, and identified the following planning agendas:

1. Develop work flow documents for the colleges and district services in relation to their different functions in key areas (e.g., human resources, purchasing).
2. Regularly update the SOCCCD Planning and Decision-Making Manual so that it always reflects current processes.
3. Regularly review the district-wide committee structure to determine if all existing committees are still relevant, and make changes as needed [6.01].

The 2011 ACCJC visiting team, recognizing the district’s efforts, wrote that:

The SOCCCD Planning and Decision-Making Manual that was developed jointly with the district office and colleges produces evidence that the district is working with the colleges to bring a better understanding of how decisions are made and implemented across the district. This should continue to lead to the improvement of district wide communications and understanding of the decision making processes, workflow, and delineation of responsibilities. The team recognizes that an exemplary attempt is being made regarding this recommendation; however, the changes have only begun to take place. The team concludes that this recommendation has been substantially met [6.02].

Of primary importance for the clear delineation of roles was the creation of a comprehensive district-wide function map [6.03] that accurately reflects the functioning of each entity with respect to the accreditation standards, and serves as the basis for future elaborations of the workflow in relation to the roles and responsibilities of the colleges and district services. Between the 2011 and 2012...
follow-up reports, new policies and procedures were developed that necessitated the revision of the function map. A small working group of the District-wide Planning Council (DWPC) developed a draft of the new function map. The draft was then distributed to all members of the DWPC on August 17, 2012 [6.04], and feedback was solicited. The draft will now go through the review and approval processes at both colleges and district services before final recommendations by the DWPC at the November 2012 meeting.

In addition to the function map, there was a necessity for a clear understanding of the work flow involved in the functioning of key areas such as human resources and purchasing. In order to obtain a clear understanding of district processes, to streamline when possible, and to provide necessary information for the purchase of efficiency software, Dr. Debra Fitzsimons, vice chancellor of business services, initiated Business Process Analysis (BPA) sessions of the following services: travel, payroll processing, hiring, onboarding, budget development, account receivables, and purchasing/account payables. These were conducted between the months of May and August in 2012, and included participants from all segments of the district community.

Based upon the outcomes of the BPAs, changes in functioning have occurred or have been recommended for future implementation, and these will be outlined in written procedures and work flow documents created during fall 2012. One option being investigated is the use of InfoPath, a Microsoft program related to SharePoint, which is designed to create transparent and easily followed workflow procedures. Another way of communicating this information is through district services communiques. In July 2012, the inaugural issue of the District Fiscal Services Newsletter was distributed to all employees within the district via email and through posting on the SharePoint site [6.05] This newsletter includes a discussion of travel processes updates that were a result of the BPA.

A second working group was tasked to develop proposed updates to the SOCCCD Planning and Decision-Making Manual. A draft of these changes was sent to all members of the DWPC on August 17, 2012 [6.06], and discussed at the DWPC meeting on September 7, 2012. The proposed changes will now go through the review and approval processes at both colleges and district services, and be brought back for final recommendations by the DWPC at the November 2012 meeting [6.07].

All of the documents involved in planning and decision-making, along with proposed 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.
It was also determined that each committee would conduct an annual self-evaluation, and post the results of that evaluation on its SharePoint site. As outlined in the 2011 report, the self-evaluation process must include the following components:

- Review of committee charge;
- Review of committee membership;
- Review of communication process; and
- Assessment of goal attainment.

On April 3, 2012, the chancellor sent an email to each of the district-wide committee chairs reminding them to conduct their annual self-evaluation on the effectiveness of their committee as outlined in the District-wide Planning and Decision Making Manual 2011-2014 [6.08]. Each committee developed its own review process and questions, and the self-assessments were initiated in spring 2012. For example, Chancellor’s Council decided to administer a self-assessment survey to all members of the committee [6.09]. The results of the self-assessments will be documented in committee minutes, will be used to improve the effectiveness of each committee’s functioning, and will provide the basis for a discussion of the effectiveness of the district-wide committee structure at the November 2012 meeting of the DWPC.

The college has also begun an evaluation of its committee structure, and formed the Task Force on Committees to oversee the evaluation process. This body, which reports to the Consultation Council, is chaired by Jennie McCue, director of marketing and communications, and includes representation from each of the constituency groups.

**Evaluation**

The roles and responsibilities of different individuals and groups within the district have now been clearly defined. The district-wide committee structure is effective, and information regarding each committee’s work is now easily accessible by all members of the college community. Evaluation of functional responsibilities and work flow are being regularly conducted, and changes are made when necessary.

**Planning Agenda**

Complete the annual evaluation of all district-wide committees, assess the committee structure for continued effectiveness, and make changes as needed.
Evidence for District Recommendation 6

6.01 Saddleback College 2011 Accreditation Follow-Up Report

6.02 ACCJC Visiting Team's Follow-Up Report, November 2-3, 2011

6.03 SOCCCD Function Map, October 14, 2011
   http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation6/6-03_District_Function_Map.pdf

6.04 SOCCCD Function Map, August 15, 2012 (Draft)

6.05 District Fiscal Services Newsletter, July 2012
   http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation6/6-05_Fiscal_Services_Newsletter_7-12.pdf


   http://www.saddleback.edu/accreditation/2012/DistrictRecommendation6/6-07_DWPC_Agenda_09-07-12.pdf


6.09 Minutes of Chancellor's Council, August 16, 2012
Conclusion

The ACCJC recommendations have created numerous positive changes in the way that the district operates. Planning now plays a central role in resource allocations, roles and responsibilities within the district are more clearly defined and delineated, and inclusiveness and transparency are the hallmarks of the planning and decision-making processes. Without the hard work and commitment of everyone involved, improvements would not have occurred. It is important, therefore, to recognize the efforts of the board of trustees, the chancellor, district services personnel, and many members of the college community in bringing about these necessary changes. Recognition must also go to the ACCJC and the visiting team for their careful assessment and perceptive recommendations.

This Follow-Up Report is dedicated to Joe Tinervia our Accreditation Style Editor.

He was excellent at what he did. He was our colleague, friend, and he was a wonderful teacher.

Born: September 6, 1943
Died: November 18, 2011