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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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The completion of the Saddleback College 2013 Accreditation Midterm Report was overseen by the college’s Accreditation Steering Committee, consisting of the following members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</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>Don Busché</td>
<td>Former Acting Vice President for Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Cesareo-Silva</td>
<td>Faculty/Former President, Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Cosgrove</td>
<td>Faculty/Past-President, Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Durdella</td>
<td>Director of Planning, Research and Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tere Fluegeman</td>
<td>District Director, Public Affairs and Government Relations</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 Math, 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>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Werle</td>
<td>Vice President for Instruction/Accreditation Liaison Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Saddleback College Accreditation Steering Committee

The steering committee was initially co-chaired by Dr. Donald Busché, acting vice president for instruction, and Dr. Bob Cosgrove, president of the Academic Senate. In June 2013, Dr. Busché was replaced by Dr. Kathy Werle, the new vice president for instruction. Claire Cesareo-Silva and Tony Teng wrote the responses to the commission district recommendations, and each of the standard chairs wrote the responses to the relevant visiting team recommendations for increased institutional effectiveness and the college’s self-identified planning agendas. Carol Ziehm, professor of journalism/English, served as the editor of the report. Members of the steering committee met periodically from August 2012 through October 2013 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 12, 2013, during the fall 2013 in-service week [01]. Feedback from that presentation was incorporated into a second draft, which was distributed by Dr. Burnett via email to all college and district services employees, as well as student leaders, and posted on the college’s accreditation web page on August 19, 2013. Collegewide feedback was solicited through August 30, 2013, 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 6, 2013, to complete the final draft. This draft was presented to the Consultation Council on September 10, 2013, where it was recommended for acceptance to the college president [02]. Dr. Burnett accepted the recommendation, and the finalized report was then forwarded for review by the board of trustees at its September 23, 2013, meeting [03].
Evidence for the Statement of Report Preparation

01  Fall 2013 In-Service Week Schedule

02  Minutes of Consultation Council Meeting, September 10, 2013

03  Agenda of Board of Trustees Meeting, September 23, 2013
Responses to Commission Action Letter Recommendations

Following Saddleback College’s 2010 Self Study Report and team visit, the college was asked by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) to report on progress made in relation to six district recommendations. These recommendations were:

**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.).

**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.).

**District Recommendation 3:** The teams recommend that the college, district administrators, faculty and staff develop a communications process among the entities on key issues of district-wide concern including academic calendar, planning, (ATEP) Advanced Technology Education Park, technology and building priorities (Standards IV.A.2., IV.B.3.).

**District Recommendation 4:** The teams recommend that the Board of Trustees widely communicate the results of its self evaluation process annually and use this as the basis for improvement (IV.A.5., IV.B.1.g.).

**District Recommendation 5:** The teams recommend that the Board of Trustees develop a clearly defined policy for a code of ethics which must include dealing with violations of the Board’s code of ethics (III.A.1.d., IV.B.1.h.).

**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.).

All six of the recommendations were addressed in the college’s 2011 Accreditation Follow-Up Report and three of them were further addressed in the college’s 2012 Accreditation Follow-Up
Report. The following is a summary of the college’s responses to these recommendations, with additional information on continued progress in some areas.
**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.).

This recommendation was addressed in both the 2011 and 2012 follow-up reports. Over the past three years, the district has come together in unprecedented fashion to develop and implement both short-term and long-term planning. Completed during this period has been a districtwide strategic planning process, the South Orange County Community College District (SOCasco) 2011-2014 District-wide Strategic Plan, [DR 1.01] the 2011-2031 Education and Facilities Master Plan (EFMP), [DR 1.02] and the Five-Year Construction Plan for 2014-2018 [DR 1.03] and 2015-2019 [DR 1.04]. Throughout, both the colleges and district services have demonstrated 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.

The college’s 2010 Accreditation Self-Study Report extensively documented the planning processes in place at Saddleback College. In recognition for its efforts, the college received the following commendations in the 2010 visiting team’s Evaluation Report:

- The team commends the college for its development of a 20-year facilities needs assessment that includes scheduled maintenance, renovation, and new buildings.
- The team commends the college for its efforts in strategic planning and integrating that with the college resource allocation efforts.

The visiting team’s report also noted, however, that while the college was in compliance with all subsections of Standard I, the district had made less progress in developing its processes, and in integrating districtwide planning with the planning efforts at the colleges. Although districtwide goals were developed in 2009-2010, [DR 1.05] they were not connected to the colleges’ strategic planning efforts nor directly linked to resource allocations. Moreover, there was not a procedure for evaluating the progress in attaining these goals or for evaluating the planning and implementation process itself.

**Long-Term Planning Efforts**

The commission’s recommendation addresses the need for both districtwide strategic short-term and long-term planning. The district’s long-term planning efforts were well under way prior to the receipt of the commission’s letter. For the first time in the district’s recent history, development of the 2011-2031 EFMP was a fully collaborative process that took place over 10 months beginning in June 2010 and included:

- A consideration of all Program Reviews (PR) and Administrative Unit Reviews (AUR) produced by the colleges
- Student, employee, and community surveys
• Eighty-nine college meetings, including presentations to participatory governance groups at both colleges
• Six campus-wide/community presentations
• Thirty-nine college and district services focus group interviews
• An interactive website [DR 1.06]

The entire process, overseen by the district director of facilities planning and purchasing, and facilitated by gkkworks consulting firm, was designed to maximize participation so that both college and district education and facilities plans would reflect the shared vision of students, faculty, staff, management, trustees, and the community.

The EFMP documents are composed of one Education Master Plan and one Facilities Master Plan for each college and a fifth document reflecting a district summary and plan. This plan was in final draft form in fall 2011 and the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), a necessary component of the final EFMP, was completed in April 2012. After incorporating public comments, the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was completed in June 2012 [DR 1.07]. A public hearing on the EIR was held at the June 25, 2012, board meeting, followed by a vote to certify the EIR and a vote to approve the EFMP in its entirety [DR 1.08].

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, [DR 1.09] and submitted to the California Community Colleges (CCC) Chancellor’s Office as required, and The Five-Year Construction Plan for 2015-2019 was approved at the March 18, 2013 meeting [DR 1.10]. The five-year construction 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.

The district is also working on the development of an integrated 20-year facilities, renovation, and scheduled maintenance management plan. Rather than create a plan without the necessary comparative data to have a sufficient understanding of the facilities needs at both college, the Capital Improvement Committee (CIC), which is composed of representatives from both colleges and district services, decided to contract services from various outside vendors (including SchoolDude, Alpha Facilities, Inc., Facilities Planning and Program Service Inc., and the Foundation for California Community Colleges) to assess the conditions of all facilities at both colleges and to create a database for the tracking and monitoring of the future maintenance of those facilities. When completed, the tracking system will include a work order module, a preventative maintenance module, and a scheduled maintenance module. The cost for these vendors was approved by the board of trustees at its meeting on June 25, 2012 [DR 1.11]. In the interim, the existing college 20-year facilities and maintenance plans have been
used by CIC to create short-term prioritized lists for capital improvement and scheduled maintenance.

A kick-off meeting for the assessment project was held on July 25, 2012, with the consultants and representatives from the colleges and district services [DR 1.12]. 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 was 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 project, completed in October 2013, was successful. Assessment then began on the remaining campus facilities and was completed in June 2013. Data from all buildings on both campuses has been collected by the vendors and a preliminary report is available [DR 1.13]. It was discovered, however, that an assessment of below ground facilities, such as storm drains and chillers, were not included in the project. CIC is working with the vendors to complete the underground facilities in fall 2013. Currently, CIC and the colleges are reviewing the data in preparation for completing an integrated 20-year plan in spring 2014.

Advanced Technology and Education Park
A key area of concern on the part of the visiting teams was the situation at the Advanced Technology and Education Park (ATEP), and the relationship between ATEP and the two colleges within the district. ATEP was conceived when the district was conveyed 68.37 acres of land from the Department of the Navy on the former Marine Helicopter Base in Tustin in 2004. A 1-1/2 acre portion of this site was used to begin serving students and the community in fall 2007 as required by the conveyance while plans were being devised for the remaining acreage. Currently, Irvine Valley College oversees the day-to-day operations of the 14,088 square feet of temporary buildings at the ATEP site while the district services ATEP development team oversees site planning and the establishment of partnerships for the full site. 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 future responsibility for the use and maintenance of the ATEP site, including the development of a 3- to 5-year site development plan [DR 1.14]. 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 several years. At the January 23, 2012, board of trustees meeting, [DR 1.15] the following actions were taken in relation to ATEP:

- 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.

At the February 27, 2012, board of trustees meeting, [DR 1.16] the following additional actions were taken in relation to ATEP:

- Approval of the initial instructional program areas to be offered by each of the colleges on the permanent ATEP campus, which includes a Center for Innovation in Health Care Education for Saddleback College
- Approval of the ATEP Five-Year Site Development Plan and Timeline
  This plan was identified as a goal in the districtwide 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 is published on the district website for college and district staff to utilize for information and planning.

Recent activity has concerned negotiations with the City of Tustin to change the current ATEP land configuration in order to improve the value and development potential of the property. These issues needed to be resolved before any further site development could take place. Resolutions on these agreements were passed at the May 20, 2013, board meeting [DR 1.17]. The resulting land swap was announced to the public on August 14, 2013, [DR 1.18]. The ATEP site now consists of 66 acres of development-ready land in the heart of Orange County, and an updated agreement with the City of Tustin allows for both educational and commercial uses. The district and the colleges are currently seeking potential partnerships with academic institutions and businesses to assist in the development of the campus.

Short-Term Planning Efforts
Short-term planning was initially more problematic because the district had never engaged in an integrated strategic planning process. In order to assist district services in coming together with the colleges to develop a relevant and integrated plan, it was decided at the first Districtwide Accreditation Committee on March 10, 2011, [DR 1.19] that a consultant would be hired to advise the chancellor and to facilitate districtwide discussions. Two proposals were solicited, and the District Recommendation 1 Task Force, co-chaired by the chancellor and the associate vice chancellor of workforce development, reviewed the proposals and decided to retain the services of College Brain Trust. The appointed facilitators were Dr. Eva Conrad,
former president of Moorpark College, and Julie Hatoff, former vice president of instructional services at MiraCosta College.

In preparation, the facilitators read the strategic plans and accreditation reports of Saddleback and Irvine Valley colleges, and conducted interviews with each member of the District Recommendation 1 Task Force. Based upon this data gathering, the facilitators made recommendations to the chancellor on how to proceed.

The first of two strategic planning retreats was held on June 13, 2011, at the Norman P. Murray Community Center in Mission Viejo [DR 1.20]. The all-day retreat was attended by the Districtwide Accreditation Committee, along with several other individuals invited from both colleges and district services. At this meeting, committee members worked collaboratively to determine the following:

- The components of the SOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2011-2014.
- The list of data sources to be used in the development of goals and objectives.
- A proposed list of districtwide goals (originally called “strategic directions”).
- A proposed list of objectives (originally called “goals”) for each of these goals.
- A proposed list of action steps for each of the objectives.
- The need for district services units to undergo Administrative Unit Review.

A general discussion also ensued regarding how the districtwide strategic plan would ultimately guide the strategic plans of both colleges. The following (Figure 1) is an illustration of how this relationship came to be understood by the task force:

![Figure 1: Districtwide Strategic Planning Model](image_url)
The chancellor took this information and with the assistance of the facilitators, developed a draft districtwide strategic plan that was reviewed and revised at a second strategic planning retreat that took place at Saddleback College on August 3, 2011 [DR 1.21]. This retreat was recorded on video and is available for viewing by district employees [DR 1.22]. Once again, individuals from the two colleges and district services worked collaboratively and respectfully throughout the retreat. This resulted in the framework for an initial districtwide strategic plan that was grounded in research, meaningful input from all constituent groups, collaboration, and transparency.

The draft goals that emerged from this retreat and will serve as the basis for planning and decision-making during the next three years are the following:

- SOCCCD will create a districtwide culture that is characterized by mutual respect and collaboration and celebrates the uniqueness of each institution.
- 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.
- SOCCCD will maintain its technological leadership and will make future advancements to enhance student access and success.
- SOCCCD will increase the effective use of all resources by developing and implementing a cycle of integrated districtwide planning.
- SOCCCD will develop, document and implement data-driven districtwide decision-making processes that are collaborative, transparent, efficient and effective.
- 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 [DR 1.23].

These goals were designed to encourage productive working relationships within the district, to guide resource allocations, and to promote student success.

Measurable objectives and action plans related to each of these goals were also developed, with responsible parties and target dates for completion identified. A draft of the districtwide strategic plan was then distributed to all employees for feedback on August 16, 2011, and posted on the district’s accreditation SharePoint site [DR 1.24]. In addition, during the college’s fall 2011 in-service, presentations were made at both the Chancellor’s Opening Session and at a special college session dedicated to discussing progress on the commission’s recommendations [DR 1.26]. The vice chancellor of human resources also attended the August 31, 2011, Academic Senate meeting to present the plan and respond to questions [DR 1.25]. The draft
plan was submitted to the board of trustees for review at the August 28, 2011, meeting [DR 1.26]. Based on feedback received, a final draft was completed and submitted to the board of trustees for approval at the September 26, 2011, board meeting [DR 1.27]. The plan was subsequently posted on the district’s planning web page [DR 1.28].

The districtwide strategic plan is monitored by the Districtwide Planning Council (DWPC), co-chaired by the chancellor and the district director of research and planning. The membership of the committee consists of representatives from all constituent groups at both colleges and from district services. The mission of the council is to coordinate and oversee all districtwide planning, to review progress of the strategic plan, and to update the plan and planning documents as appropriate [DR 1.29]. Regular meetings are scheduled for each semester, along with an annual planning retreat in late May.

Progress on each of the action steps identified in the plan is input into TracDat. An annual progress report is presented to the board of trustees and posted to the district planning SharePoint site [DR 1.30]. The first progress report was presented to the board on September 24, 2012, [DR 1.31] and a second one was presented on September 23, 2013 [DR 1.32].

The strategic planning, decision-making, and resource allocation processes of the district are documented in the SOCCCD Planning and Decision-Making Manual [DR 1.33]. This manual was developed by the chancellor and his staff in 2011, and is updated annually by the DWPC. The first update occurred on November 2, 2012, at the DWPC fall meeting [DR 1.34].

While the first districtwide strategic plan utilized the existing colleges’ strategic plans as its starting point, future planning efforts will be based upon an integrated process whereby the districtwide and college goals will be simultaneously developed. This will serve to better integrate the work of the district and colleges and also lead to increased success at the college level since planning and resource allocation processes will be linked across the district.

Planning for the 2014-2020 strategic plan began in fall 2012 with the hiring of a consultant to create an external scan and the administering of the districtwide climate survey. After meeting with the research directors at the district and both colleges, the external scan was completed by the College Brain Trust [DR 1.35] and presented to DWPC on May 29, 2013 [DR 1.36]. The scan looks at enrollment projections and labor market analysis through 2020. The districtwide climate survey was conducted in October and November 2012 and a draft of the results [DR 1.37] was distributed to members of DWPC at its annual retreat in June 2013.

On June 26, 2013, DWPC held its annual retreat at the Mission Viejo Country Club in order to evaluate progress on the current strategic plan, discuss districtwide planning definitions and planning assumptions, review the timeline for the 2014-2010 strategic planning process, and begin the development of goals and objectives for the 2014-2020 plan [DR 1.38]. The retreat was attended by constituent groups from both colleges and from district services. Based on the data from the external scan and the district wide climate survey and on brainstorming activities conducted during the retreat, a list of potential goals was formulated. A task force was also
created to work on the refinement of these goals prior to the next DWPC meeting on September 6, 2013. District services, Irvine Valley College, and Saddleback College also held separate planning forums on the draft goals and the feedback provided was utilized by the task force in refinement of the goals. The Saddleback forum was held during its inservice week on August 14, 2013 [DR 1.39]. The event was attended by approximately 60 people and included administrators, managers, faculty, staff, and students. During the forum, the college’s current strategic plan was reviewed, the proposed districtwide goals were discussed, and input on additional goals or objectives for the 2014-2020 college strategic plan were solicited [DR 1.40].

At the September 6, 2013, DWPC meeting, the draft districtwide goals were reviewed, refined, and approved [DR 1.42]. The colleges will now begin developing additional goals specific to each institution, and the colleges and district services will draft objectives for each identified goal. At the November DWPC meeting, these objectives will be reviewed and common objectives will be incorporated into the districtwide plan for 2014-2020.

A process of Administrative Unit Reviews (AURs) for district services has also been developed by the chancellor and his staff, using the Saddleback College AUR Handbook as a model [DR 1.42]. A schedule was devised for the completion of initial district services AURs, with all due by March 2012. These AURs serve as the basis for continuous improvement and future strategic planning, and are linked to resource allocations for district services. The AURs are revised on an annual basis. The 2013 review process began in May and was completed in August, with a report distributed to all district employees in September [DR 1.42].

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.
**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.).

The 2010 Accreditation Self-Study Report documents the significant advances that the college has made in linking resource allocations to comprehensive planning. The 2010 visiting team’s Evaluation Report noted that the college has “through its strategic planning process and program and administrative review, provided mechanisms for allocating resources to effectively support student learning and service and program improvements.” It was also noted, however, that the district lacked a resource allocation model that is based on planning, is open and transparent, and is periodically reviewed for effectiveness. As discussed in the college self-study, this was particularly the case for basic aid funds, which, in the past, led to widespread dissatisfaction at the college with chancellor and board of trustee decision-making.

The District Recommendation 2 Task Force was charged with researching and analyzing the district’s current resource allocation model, identifying gaps in the model, and recommending changes so that it is open, transparent, inclusive, and widely disseminated [DR 2.01]. The task force was initially chaired by the vice chancellor of human resources who was also serving as acting vice chancellor of business services, and subsequently chaired by the vice chancellor of business services.

The first task was to study the district’s current resource allocation processes and models. Most of the district’s resources, the unrestricted general funds derived 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 districtwide participatory governance council that is charged with making recommendations for and overseeing the model upon which the district’s resource allocations are determined. One of the guiding principles of DRAC is that the colleges are allocated revenue using the state’s SB 361 funding formula for all ongoing operating expenditures. Based upon this formula, the District Budget Allocation Model [2.02] is produced each year and shows the exact allocations made to Saddleback College, Irvine Valley College, district services, districtwide general expenses, and a contingency reserve. The intention of the model is to guarantee the colleges a predictable, fair, and equitable distribution of revenues.

Once funds have been allocated in accordance with the DRAC model, the remaining property tax revenues are designated as basic aid funds. At the time of the 2010 Accreditation Self-Study Report, the board of trustees allocated these funds according to a process adopted at the August 29, 2005, board meeting [DR 2.03]. The self-study report provided evidence that basic aid allocations were often out of compliance with this approved process, as well as with the district’s Budget Development Guidelines that state that “excess revenue above apportionment shall be allocated at the college or district level for one-time purposes” and “shall not be used for regular ongoing expenditures, such as salaries” [DR 2.04].
The Recommendation 2 Task Force confirmed the findings of the college’s self-study that the main concern of the colleges was the process and decision-making for the allocation of basic aid funds. While the colleges understood the DRAC process and felt that it worked well, there was a widespread sentiment that the determination of how projects are added to the basic aid funding list seemed “mysterious” [DR 2.05].

In order to rectify these inconsistencies and clarify how basic aid expenditures are to be linked to district priorities based on planning, it was determined by the Districtwide Accreditation Committee that a board policy on basic aid should be developed [DR 2.06]. Fortunately, this process was already under way. BPARAC began working on the development of a new Basic Aid Allocation Policy, BP 3110 [DR 2.07], in December 2010. This new board policy asserts that “allocation of basic aid will be made based on district and college planning documents and supporting data.” Moreover, the policy clearly specifies the types of projects appropriate for basic aid funding. These are:

1. Capital construction, major renovation, large infrastructure projects, and site development. These projects will follow district and college strategic plans, the *Education and Facilities Master Plan*, the *20-Year Facility, Renovation, and Scheduled Maintenance Plan*, and the *Five-Year Construction Plan*.

2. Retiree benefit trust fund and other long-term obligations.

3. Trustee elections, legislative advocacy, major legal fees and judgments.

4. Major technology initiatives as identified in the district and college technology plans.

5. Fifty percent matching funds for scheduled maintenance and smaller renovation projects, including maintenance equipment, as identified in the *20-Year Facility, Renovation and Scheduled Maintenance Plan*. The other 50 percent will be funded by the site requesting the funds, whether district office or college, in receipt of the allocation. Allocations must be used within five years on the specific project for which funding was allocated. The allocation will be based on the distribution ratios used in the model established in the District Resource Allocation Council process.

BP 3110, Basic Aid Funds Allocation Process, [DR 2.08] 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 [DR 2.09].

AR 3110, the administrative regulation associated with BP 3110, [DR 2.10] was approved by BPARAC on February 3, 2012, [DR 2.11] and presented as an information item to the board of trustees on February 27, 2012 [DR 2.12]. 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 districtwide 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, [DR 2.13] and the first prioritized list of recommended basic aid expenditures was finalized on May 11, 2012 [DR 2.14]. This list was sent to the board for review and study on May 21, 2012, [DR 2.15] and was approved by the board, along with the complete 2012-2013 tentative budget on June 25, 2012 [DR 2.16]. The same process was utilized in 2013 with the prioritized list of basic aid expenditures presented to the board on June 17, 2013, [DR 2.17] and approved along with the 2013-2014 adopted budget [] at the August 26, 2013, meeting [DR 2.18].

Included in AR 3110 is the BAARC flow chart (shown on Page 25). This flow chart clearly demonstrates how basic aid allocations are tied to college and districtwide 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 the vice chancellor of business services in June 2012 [DR 2.19]. This handbook fully describes the district’s resource allocation processes and demonstrates the integration of budget and planning, with links to relevant documents. The information provided in this handbook is invaluable, and it was preliminarily approved by the DWPC at its September 7, 2012, meeting [DR 2.20]. At the November 2, 2012, DWPC meeting, this handbook was renamed the District-wide Integrated Budget Planning Resource Guide, [DR 2.21] and is now a one-page document with links to all of the important resources on the planning and budget processes in the district, such as the District-wide Planning and Decision Making Manual, 2011-2014, all committees dealing with budget and planning, relevant board policies and administrative regulations, the budget development guidelines, and the chart of accounts.

Work has continued on the completion of various additional plans that are incorporated into the BAARC flowchart, 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 [DR 2.22] was developed by the Districtwide Technology Committee (DTC), a participatory governance committee, and approved at its April 5, 2012, meeting [DR 2.23]. The plan will be reviewed and revised periodically in order to respond to rapid changes in technology. Based upon the technology master plan, a prioritized list of projects is developed by the Technology Plan Task Force each year, approved by the DTC as a whole, and
then forwarded to BAARC to be integrated into the basic aid allocation process [DR 2.24]. Following approval by BAARC, the list of 2013-2014 proposed technology projects was approved by the board at the June 17, 2013, meeting [DR 2.25]. The Technology Plan Task Force is currently in the process of developing the list for the 2014-2015 projects.
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 strategic planning information. District services have used it for the inputting of their AURs, as well as for tracking progress on the districtwide strategic plan. Through this program, resource requests are generated 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.
**District Recommendation 3:** The teams recommend that the college, district administrators, faculty and staff develop a communications process among the entities on key issues of district-wide concern including academic calendar, planning, (ATEP) Advanced Technology Education Park, technology and building priorities (Standards IV.A.2., IV.B.3.).

Over the past three years, the college and district have come together to develop consistent, clear, and open communication channels and protocols. It was decided that solutions had to be multipronged since different groups accessed and desired information in different forms (such as via email, on a website, or through college forums). Through extensive dialogue, a districtwide task force proposed a number of strategies to address the identified communication issues. These are outlined in the table below [DR 3.01]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Issue</th>
<th>Possible Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Issue #1: Decisions are made and it is not clear they have been made. | • Post meeting agendas, minutes, handouts, and related documents on SharePoint so that a clear chronology of decisions is available.  
• Clearly delineate decisions and action items in meeting minutes. Include any steps needed to move the process forward. All committees to use the same template for minutes.  
• Look into improvements to electronic search capacities.  
• Provide RSS feeds.  
• Ensure changes in processes are clearly communicated through regular open forums held at the colleges by district services. |
| Issue #2: Lack of process creates indecision, so decisions are not being made. | • Function Map will clarify who “owns” decisions.  
• See solutions for Communication Issue #3. |
| Issue #3: Some committees are not clear on their charge and member responsibilities are not clear. | • Update and maintain a list of districtwide committees that includes the committee charge and scope.  
• Define the responsibilities of the:  
  o Committee  
  o Chair  
  o Members  
• For each committee, define:  
  o Decision-making process  
  o Reporting structure  
  o Process to resolve disagreements  
• The committee chair is responsible for the posting of all information described above on the committee’s SharePoint site. |
Table 2: Communication Issues and Solutions

The specific strategies enacted have included:

- A monthly newsletter on highlights from the meetings of the board of trustees.
- Dissemination of newsletters and district updates from the Office of the Chancellor and the district director of public affairs.
- Periodic chancellor-led districtwide forums at both colleges.
- Creating an intranet (SharePoint) site for districtwide committees that outlines each committee’s charge, membership, and member responsibilities, and to which all documents are stored related to that committee. These sites are available to all district employees.
- Listing all districtwide committees and their specific charge in the SOCCCD Planning and Decision-Making Manual.
- Development of a standardized template for committee meeting agendas and minutes that requires reporting of all decisions and action items within five days.
- Development of uniform definitions of consensus and standards of interaction so that resolutions can be achieved when there is disagreement among committee members.
- Establishment of an annual self-assessment of all committees to ensure that they are fulfilling their stated purpose and communicating all actions taken.
- Making board of trustee meeting minutes and agendas (which can exceed 300 pages) searchable online by keyword.
- Email updates to employees, such as the Board of Trustee Meeting Highlights, District Updates, and the Chancellor’s Perspective.
- Creation of RSS feeds on SharePoint for all district committee sites so that employees can receive notification of recent developments.
- Develop of a SharePoint site for district services with access to pertinent information such as personnel, processes, and forms.
• Creation of RSS feeds from the college websites on the home page of the district services SharePoint site so that all district employees are aware of college-specific events and activities.

With respect to the five issues specifically mentioned in this recommendation, awareness of communication needs and the suggested solutions have had the following impacts:

**Academic Calendar**

Academic calendars for 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, and 2014-2015 were established through collegial efforts from both colleges and the Districtwide Calendar Committee, chaired by the vice chancellor of technology and learning services. These calendars were approved by all participatory governance groups and adopted by the board [DR 3.02]. The approved calendars address the unique needs of both colleges while decreasing long-standing length disparities between the fall and spring semesters. They also increased the length of winter break, which will provide options for programs that utilize field trips, institutional visits, and discipline-specific internships, and provide “down time” for the completion of technology upgrades and maintenance projects.

**Planning**

The first goal of **SOC CCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2011-2014** is to “create a districtwide culture which is characterized by mutual respect and collaboration and that celebrates the uniqueness of each institution” [DR 3.03]. Open communication is essential to creating and sustaining a climate based on trust, mutual respect, and aligned purposes. Each step of the strategic planning process was inclusive of all constituent groups and was posted on the SharePoint site for the Districtwide Planning Council (DWPC) [DR 3.04]. This was also true of the EFMP process, during which an interactive website was established that allowed individuals to view documents and participate in the process by leaving comments or obtaining answers to questions.

The **SOC CCD Planning and Decision-Making Manual**, [3.05] which clearly documents how decisions are made within the district, has helped to make the entire planning and resource allocation processes more transparent and understandable.

**ATEP**

Over the years, planning and decision-making with regard to ATEP was not fully collaborative or transparent, and significant basic aid funds were being funneled to the project without clear guidelines and goals or a shared understanding of how the site would be developed. Part of the negativity toward ATEP stemmed from conflicting messages being delivered by district services and the board of trustees. It was felt that decisions were not being made in a forthright manner and when made were often not communicated clearly. One way this problem was addressed was through the creation of Board Policy 3110, which lays out the priorities for basic aid funding, and the subsequent development of the corresponding administrative regulation [DR 3.06].
Another way that communication was increased in relation to ATEP was through the ability to conduct keyword searches in the board of trustees meeting agendas and minutes. This makes information about board actions easily attainable. The SOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2011-2014 calls for a collaborative 3- to 5-year site development plan that will clearly delineate the future steps to be taken regarding ATEP (planning objective 6.2) [DR 3.07]. In the last year, significant progress was made by the district on site development at ATEP. The colleges are now working collaboratively on the development of educational programs to be offered on the site.

**Technology**

The activities and priorities of District Information Technology (IT) have long been questioned by many at the college who feel that there is more focus on high-visibility, cutting-edge projects (such as My Academic Plan – MAP – and Sherpa, a student recommendation engine) than on the more mundane projects necessary for the day-to-day functioning of the college (such as scheduling and the Student Information System). Although District IT can document that, in actuality, considerably more time and resources were dedicated to necessary projects (such as the inFORM Data Warehouse, CurrSIS curriculum system, human resources integration, maintenance of the ESCAPE and CHRMS financial systems, maintenance of the Blackboard course management system and coordination of upgrades, and the MySite web portal) than to special projects, the perception persists, indicating that communication may be the central problem.

In order to address this perception, it was determined that a districtwide technology plan would be created with input from all constituent groups at both colleges. The plan is also one of the objectives for the SOCCCD District-wide Strategic Plan 2011-2014 (planning objective 3.1) [DR 3.08]. The District-wide Technology Master Plan 2012-2017 [DR 3.09] was developed by the DTC and approved at their April 5, 2012, meeting [DR 3.10]. Based upon this plan, a prioritized list of projects is developed by the Technology Plan Task Force each year, approved by the DTC as a whole, and then forwarded to BAARC to be integrated into the basic aid allocation process [DR 3.11]. This process enables the colleges to have input into the prioritization and funding of all districtwide IT projects. Moreover, District IT identified additional strategies for improving communication in the SOCCCD District Services Survey Results 2011 Evaluation and 2011-2012 Action Plans, [DR 3.12] including the designing and building of the intranet (SharePoint) infrastructure currently being used by all district services, the biannual publication of a District IT newsletter starting in fall 2011 that documents the status of all projects, [DR 3.13] the institution of monthly meetings with representatives from the various constituent groups at the colleges, and open forums held at the colleges to discuss technology-related issues. [DR 3.14].

**Building Priorities**

The district has made significant progress in clarifying districtwide building priorities and how they are established. The colleges and district services effectively and collegially collaborated on the development of the EFMP, which includes five-, 10-, and 20-year projections. Feedback
was solicited from constituent groups and individuals at the colleges through numerous meetings and focus groups, as well as a collaborative website.

Moreover, the CIC was established to collaboratively address long-term facilities and capital improvement needs and make recommendations using uniform, data-driven criteria to plan and budget for the next 20 years [DR 3.15].

The colleges and the district also came together in the creation of BP 3110, which includes a list of funding priorities for basic aid funds [DR 3.16].

In addition to these procedural modifications, recent changes in personnel in district leadership and among the board of trustees have had a significant positive impact upon the level of open dialogue and shared decision-making in the district. The current chancellor is respected by all constituent groups on campus and is committed to working collaboratively with both colleges and to accurately conveying college needs to the board of trustees.

**Evaluation**

Numerous steps have been taken to improve communication within the district, and the college is optimistic that communication will continue to improve. Although these steps will go a long way in making communication more open, efficient, and effective within the district, the committee also determined that communication is a “shared responsibility.” Employees of the district must want to be informed and engaged. It is hoped that a demonstrated willingness to communicate on the part of the chancellor, district services, and the board of trustees will be reciprocated with increased participation in committees and districtwide events, such as open forums.
District Recommendation 4: The teams recommend that the Board of Trustees widely communicate the results of its self evaluation process annually and use this as the basis for improvement (IV.A.5., IV.B.1.g.).

In accordance with Board Policy 172, Board Self-Evaluation, [DR 4.01] which was adopted on August 27, 2007, [DR 4.02] the SOCCCD Board of Trustees is to conduct an annual self-evaluation in order to identify its strengths and areas for improvement. Three years ago, the current process was carefully reviewed by the chancellor in consultation with the board of trustees and by the Districtwide Accreditation Committee. It was determined that the process was essentially sound, but that steps would be taken to a) communicate the results of the self-evaluation to all employees and the public, and b) ensure that the results were used to create action items for improvement.

In 2011, the chancellor and board president decided to hire a facilitator to lead the board through its 2011 self-evaluation. Dr. Cindra Smith, who wrote the Community College League of California (CCLC) document entitled Assessing Board Effectiveness: Resources for Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation and who assisted the SOCCCD Board of Trustees with its 2009 self-evaluation, was selected [DR 4.03].

Three stages comprised the evaluation process. Stage one took place in April and May 2011 and involved the administering of a comprehensive evaluation questionnaire for board of trustee members [DR 4.04], a survey for Chancellor’s Cabinet (a districtwide cabinet composed of members from all participatory governance groups – now called Chancellor’s Council), administrators, and managers, all of whom regularly observe the board in action, [DR 4.05] and a survey for all employees of the district [4.06]. The questionnaire and surveys were administered online and were anonymous. The responses of the three groups were then compared [DR 4.07].

Stage two involved a Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation Workshop held on May 14, 2011, at the Mission Viejo Country Club [DR 4.08]. This meeting was open to the public and was widely publicized through districtwide emails and postings on the district website and on the required board meeting public posting areas. The workshop was also announced at board meetings, [DR 4.09] Chancellor’s Council, [DR 4.10] and at other participatory governance committee meetings. The Districtwide Accreditation Committee discussed the pros and cons of holding the workshop in the regular boardroom or at an off-campus location, and whether or not it should be recorded. It was decided that, in the interest of candor, the workshop would be held off-campus and would not be recorded. However, all district employees were invited to attend, and the results of the discussion would be widely distributed.

The facilitator set the agenda of the workshop based upon analysis of the data from the surveys [DR 4.11]. This included a review of the board’s self-identified strengths and areas of improvements, [DR 4.12] as well as an in-depth discussion of the survey results that focused, in particular, on areas in which there was a significant discrepancy between board member perceptions and those of other employees within the district. These included the following
statements from the surveys where the trustees rated themselves high, but district employees rated them low:

- The board understands its policy role and differentiates its role from those of the CEO and college staff.
- The board respects faculty, staff, and student participation in decision-making.
- Trustees set a positive tone for the institution.
- Board meetings are conducted in an orderly manner with sufficient time provided to explore and resolve issues.

Although some board members felt that these low survey ratings were unwarranted, it was mentioned that, regardless of the reasons, the perceptions of individuals and groups must be taken seriously, and the board agreed to consider actions that would change these perceptions. Moreover, board members acknowledged that their behavior set the tone for the district as a whole, and they discussed the importance of working together in a civil and respectful manner [DR 4.13].

At the end of the discussion, concrete actions and tasks were developed and are summarized below [DR 4.14]. Progress on these items was assessed as part of the 2012 self-evaluation process.

1. The board will review and approve an updated code of ethics policy that includes addressing violations of the code. A draft policy was accepted for review at the April board meeting; the board will discuss the proposed policy in detail at a board or special meeting. The board noted the urgency of doing so before fall.

2. In addition to reviewing and adopting an updated code of ethics policy, the board will discuss and renew its commitment to communication protocols and expectations for trustee roles during board meetings and with college staff and community.

3. The board will re-institute a process for CEO evaluation, including setting expectations, annual priorities and/or goals. It will include CEO evaluation on the board's master calendar to ensure it occurs regularly. The chancellor will propose a process to the board.

4. The board will re-institute a regular self-evaluation process and will include the process of seeking input from administrators, faculty, and staff. The next survey process may include items that gather how much knowledge respondents have about board roles, including attending and/or viewing videos of board meetings. It was recommended the surveys include opportunities to comment. The board will consider the feasibility of doing a survey within six months to gather perceptions of the “new” board.
5. The board is committed to listening to and considering faculty, staff, and student perspectives and recommendations in local decision-making. It is committed to clarifying its rationale for decisions that may be counter to those recommendations.

6. The board will seek opportunities to inform administrators, faculty, and staff about board roles, limits, responsibilities, accountability to the community, and rationales for decision-making.

7. The board will strengthen its role in being knowledgeable about, setting standards for, and monitoring and discussing student success and educational quality. Efforts will include understanding and monitoring the processes used to ensure quality. The chancellor will present proposals for board consideration.

8. The board will be involved early in the collective bargaining process in discussing and setting parameters. Members recognize that individual trustees must avoid negotiating directly, or appearing to negotiate, with employees or their representatives.

9. The board recognizes the effect its communications and leadership have on creating an environment for safe, open, and professional communication within the district, and will strive to do so.

10. The board will ensure that there are opportunities for it to engage fully in discussions on policy issues. Staff will be asked to present reports in ways that engage trustees in discussions, and trustees will ensure that meetings allow time to truly engage in discussion.

The third and final stage of the process involved the dissemination of the results to the college community and the public. At the May 23, 2011, board of trustees meeting, the chancellor reported on the board self-evaluation, and mentioned that a web page was created on the district website that outlines the entire self-evaluation process and where individuals can access all of the pertinent documents [DR 4.15]. On May 31, 2011, district employees received an email from the district director of public affairs, with a link to the Board Self-Evaluation web page [DR 4.16].

In 2012 and 2013, the board conducted self-evaluations following a similar process. The most recent self-evaluation workshop took place on May 18, 2013, at the Mission Viejo Country Club [DR 4.17]. The results of the surveys and discussions from all self-evaluations are made available to the public on the web page.

**Evaluation**

Due to recent changes in the board composition and the appointment of a new chancellor who has the respect of board members and college employees alike, there is a pervasive sense of optimism about the future of the SOCCCD. However, employee surveys still reflect some
skepticism about the board’s performance, and many indicators have remained flat or even slightly decreased in their approval rating over the past three years. The board will need to address this issue in future self-evaluations.
**District Recommendation 5:** The teams recommend that the Board of Trustees develop a clearly defined policy for a code of ethics which must include dealing with violations of the Board’s code of ethics (III.A.1.d., IV.B.1.h.).

The SOCCCD first adopted Board Policy 1400, Code of Ethics – Standards of Practice, in 1977, and has revised it on various occasions over the years. As noted in the college’s 2010 Accreditation Self-Study Report, however, the policy did not include a stated process for dealing with board behavior that violates the policy, and it was recommended that such a clause be added to the board policy. The visiting team members concurred, and in their Evaluation Report, stated that in order to be in compliance with Standard III.A.1.d, the policy must be revised to address how unethical behavior on the part of board members would be addressed.

At the direction of the chancellor, the vice chancellor of human resources contacted Mary Dowell, legal consultant to the CCLC, in order to gather information and appropriate documentation to be used in developing an additional section of the existing policy on board ethics. Based upon this information, the vice chancellor drafted a new policy, renumbered as Board Policy 110, in order to more closely follow CCLC board policy number conventions. Eventually, the vice chancellor of business services took over the responsibility of shepherding the policy through the revision and approval process.

At the February 11, 2011, meeting of BPARAC, the first draft of the revised board policy was presented to its members[]. The revised policy includes the following new section on enforcement[]:

All board members are expected to maintain the highest standards of conduct and ethical behavior and to adhere to the board’s Code of Ethics. The board reserves the right to censure any board member who does not adhere to this policy or engages in other unethical conduct.

A. Censure is an official expression of disapproval passed by the board of trustees. A board member may be subject to a resolution of censure by the board of trustees should it be determined that trustee misconduct has occurred.

B. A complaint of trustee misconduct will be referred to the board president.

With the assistance of legal counsel, the board president will appoint an ad hoc committee of three trustees not associated with the complaint to conduct an investigation and review the matter. In the event the complaint involves the board president, another officer of the board shall form the ad hoc committee. A thorough fact finding process, formulated in a manner deemed appropriate by the committee, shall be initiated. The committee shall be guided in its inquiry by the standards set forth in this policy and shall complete inquiries within a reasonable period of time.

C. The trustee subject to the charge of misconduct shall not be precluded from presenting information to the committee.
D. The committee shall, within a reasonable period of time, make a report of its findings to the board of trustees for action.

E. Board members who are found by a majority of the board to have acted unethically or to have violated this policy may be subject to reprimand, possible exclusion from closed sessions, public censure, referral to the district attorney for criminal prosecution, or other action as determined by the board.

The chancellor decided that since this policy dealt directly with sensitive trustee issues, it should be sent to the trustees for their input. Following trustee comment, the policy would return to BPARAC in order to proceed through the normal review and revision process. The first presentation of this policy to the board of trustees was made at the April 2011 meeting[]. The trustees were given two months to provide comment to the proposed policy changes.

After incorporating trustee input, a revised draft policy was returned to the vice chancellor to present to BPARAC at its next regularly scheduled meeting in June 2011. The revised draft policy was placed on the BPARAC agenda for review, comment, and revision, and then forwarded to all participatory governance groups within the district[]. Each Saddleback College governance group representative presented the revised policy to its membership for review[]. Following approval from college governance groups, the policy was once again taken back to BPARAC for final discussion, approval, and recommendation to the chancellor. The chancellor reviewed the final draft policy and placed it on the September 26, 2011, board agenda[] for adoption and implementation. It was unanimously approved by the board of trustees.

Evaluation

It is recognized that the behavior of the governing board of the district sets the tone for the entire district. Through less-than-cordial public displays at board meetings over the years, the trustees did not always succeed in establishing a tone of civility and ethical behavior for the district. Therefore, it was vital that this policy be revised to include ramifications for violations of the board’s Code of Ethics. Fortunately, recent changes in board membership have also ushered in a new era of cooperation and collegiality among board members and between the board and district leadership. Addressing this recommendation offered the opportunity for the entire district to reaffirm its commitment to ethics, respect, and civility.
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.).

The need for a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities within the district has been an issue since at least 1998, when it was addressed by the accreditation visiting team, and it continued to be identified as problematic in 2010. The 2010 Accreditation Self-Study Report states that the “roles and scopes of authority has occurred at the college and since 2008, with the board of trustees. However, the role, authority, and responsibilities of the district office personnel and leadership are not clearly defined.” Although the 2008 Focused Midterm Visit Report concluded that Standard IV.B.3 had been met, the 2010 visiting team reinstated a recommendation on the delineation of districtwide functional responsibilities.

Function Maps
Of primary importance for the clear delineation of roles was the creation of a comprehensive districtwide function map [] 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 Districtwide Planning Council (DWPC) developed a draft of the new districtwide function map, as well as a separate function map for ATEP. The drafts were then distributed to all members of the DWPC on August 17, 2012, [] and feedback was solicited. The drafts then went through the review and approval processes at both colleges and district services, and final recommendations were forwarded to the DWPC. At the November 2, 2012, meeting, the DWPC approved the final versions of the districtwide and ATEP function maps. Both documents are included in the districtwide planning and decision-making manual.

Business Process Analyses
In addition to the function map, there is a necessity for a clear understanding of the workflow involved in the functioning of key district services areas, such as human resources and purchasing. In order to obtain a clear understanding of the processes, to streamline when possible, and to provide necessary information for the purchase of efficiency software, the vice chancellor of business services initiated Business Process Analysis (BPA) sessions for the following services: accounts receivable, budget development, hiring and employee orientation, payroll processing and timekeeping, purchasing/accounts payable, and travel. These were conducted between the months of May and August in 2012, and included participants from all segments of the district community. Additional BPAs were conducted between the months of May and August 2013 for the following services: benefits processing, board agenda development, contracts, curriculum development, facilities planning and construction, financial aid processing, and grants.
The goal of the BPAs is to eliminate redundancies and establish clear instructions for college and district processes. As a result, a BPA report was created that delineated the recommended changes and any progress to date. Once all of the information has been analyzed, the ultimate goal is to create an operations manual. Each unit within business services and human resources will review the recommendations and incorporate them into their AUR annual updates for 2013.

Based upon the outcomes of the BPAs thus far, changes have occurred or have been recommended for future implementation. One option being investigated is the use of InfoPath, a Microsoft program related to SharePoint, which is designed to create transparent and straightforward workflow procedures.

Planning and Decision-Making Manual
A 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 [], and discussed at the DWPC meeting on September 7, 2012. The proposed changes went through the review and approval processes at both colleges and district services, and were brought back for final approval by the DWPC at the November 2, 2012, meeting []. All of the documents involved in planning and decision-making, along with proposed changes, are widely available through the district’s SharePoint site.

Districtwide Committee Structure
The districtwide committee structure was also addressed in relation to clarity of purpose and communication methods. Each districtwide committee now has a uniform site where the purpose, membership, meeting times, agendas, minutes, and relevant documents can be accessed by all district personnel. Standardized templates for committee agendas and minutes have also been implemented. This ensures that information regarding the recommendations and actions taken by each committee are clear and easily accessed.

It was also determined that each committee would conduct an annual self-evaluation, and post the results of that evaluation on its SharePoint site. 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 districtwide committee chairs reminding them to conduct annual self-evaluations on the effectiveness of their committees, as outlined in the District-wide Planning and Decision Making Manual 2011-2014 []. 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[]. The results of the self-assessments were documented in committee minutes, were used to improve the effectiveness of each committee’s functioning, and provided the basis for a discussion of the effectiveness of the districtwide committee structure at the November 2012 meeting of the DWPC. Committee self-assessments were conducted again in spring 2013[].

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 the 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 districtwide committee structure is effective, and information regarding each committee’s work is now easily accessible by all members of the college community. Evaluations of functional responsibilities and work flow are being regularly conducted, and changes are made when necessary.
Evidence for the Responses to Commission Action Letter Recommendations

DR 1.01 SOCCCD 2011-2014 District-wide Strategic Plan

DR 1.02 2011-2031 Education and Facilities Master Plan

DR 1.03 Five-Year Construction Plan for 2014-2018

DR 1.04 Five-Year Construction Plan for 2015-2019

DR 1.05 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, June 22, 2009

DR 1.06 Presentation to the Board of Trustees on the 2011 Education and Facilities Master Plan, May 23, 2011

DR 1.07

DR 1.08

DR 1.09

DR 1.10

DR 1.18 SOCCCD and The City of Tustin Joint Press Release, August, 14, 2013

DR 2.01 Final report of the Accreditation Sub-Committee for Recommendation 2 Resource Allocation, July 29, 2011

DR 2.02 District Budget Allocation Model, 2010-2011

DR 2.03 Process for the Allocation of District Basic Aid Funds for Priority Projects

DR 2.04 District Budget Allocation Model, 2010-2011
DR 2.05 Final Report of the Recommendation 2 Task Force, July 29, 2011  
https://accreditation.socccd.edu/rtf2/Handouts/Final%20Report%20july%2029%202011%20with%20revisions%208%204%202011%20and%208%205%202011%20pdf.pdf

DR 2.06 Minutes of the District-wide Accreditation Committee, June 17, 2011  
https://accreditation.socccd.edu/dac/Agenda%20and%20Minutes/Accred%20Minutes%206-17-11.pdf

DR 2.07 Board Policy 3110, Basic Aid Funds Allocation Process  

DR 2.08 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, July 25, 2011  

DR 2.09 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, August 29, 2011  
http://socccd.granicus.com/DocumentViewer.php?file=socccd_e9e0b6fcbaaf4c3c6a877572dabf8e03.pdf

DR 2.10 Administrative Regulation 3110, Basic Aid Allocation Process  

DR 2.11 Board Policy & Administrative Regulation Advisory Council  

DR 2.12 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, February 27, 2012  
http://socccd.granicus.com/DocumentViewer.php?file=socccd_7bd0cbc8068f5793f2dc2e4101babc74.pdf&view=1

DR 2.13 Basic Aid Allocation Recommendation Committee Meeting, March 9, 2012  

DR 2.14 Basic Aid Allocation Recommendation Committee Meeting, May 11, 2012  
https://sharepoint.socccd.edu/chancellor/dwc/baarc/Minutes/2012%20%20Minutes%20-%20Basic%20Aid%20Allocation%20Recommendation%
DR 2.15 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, May 21, 2012
http://socccd.granicus.com/DocumentViewer.php?file=socccd_2648f08acbb7a1af8e00bce76a29dcf.pdf&view=1

DR 2.16 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, June 25, 2012

DR 2.17 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, June 17, 2013

DR 2.18 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, August 26, 2013

DR 2.19 SOCCCD District-wide Integrated Budget and Planning Handbook

DR 2.20 District-wide Planning Council Meeting, September 7, 2012

DR 2.21 District-wide Planning Council Meeting, November 2, 2012

DR 2.22 District-wide Technology Master Plan 2012-2017

DR 2.23 District-wide Technology Committee Meeting, April 5, 2012
https://sharepoint.socccd.edu/chancellor/dwc/dwtc/Minutes/2012%20DTC%20Minutes/2012-04-05%20DTC%20Minutes.pdf

DR 2.24 Basic Aid Allocation Recommendation Committee Meeting, June 14, 2013

DR 2.25 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, August 26, 2013

DR 3.1 xx
DR 4.1 xx
DR 5.1 xx
Responses to Visiting Team Recommendations for Increased Institutional Effectiveness

The visiting team also identified five college recommendations that were outlined in the 2010 Visiting Team Evaluation Report. These recommendations were:

**College Recommendation 1:** Although the college and its constituent groups have achieved a collegial working relationship with the current president to address issues with a new optimism, the college does not have the same type of relationship with the district leadership and the Board of Trustees.

The team recommends elements from both Recommendation 7 of the 1998 Accreditation Team and Recommendation 6, B and C of the 2004 visiting team that the district and Board of Trustees support the work of the college by:

B. “Creating an environment which ensures greater administrative stability and empowerment at the college” (IV.A.1., IV.A.2., IV.B.2., and IV.B.3.); and

C. “Enhancing the college and district communication structure so that it is clearer to everyone who the responsible party is for making decisions and how those decisions are or will be made.” (IV.A.1., IV.A.2., IV.B.1., IV.B.2., and IV.B.3.).

**College Recommendation 2:** The team recommends that the college address the need for both maintenance and new facilities funds and use these funds to address the current safety, accessibility and educational needs of the students (III.B.1.a., III.B.1.b).

**College Recommendation 3:** The team recommends that the commitment to equity and diversity be demonstrated through multiple means including an updated Student Equity Plan and greater faculty involvement on the Equity and Diversity Committee (I.A., I.A.2.d., II.B.3.d., III.A.4., III.A.4.a.).

**College Recommendation 4:** The team recommends that the faculty have as a component of their evaluation effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes (III.A.1.c.).

**College Recommendation 5:** The team recommends that a Student Services strategic plan be developed and implemented to address issues including campus accessibility; DSPS separate locations; International Students Office accessibility and visibility; the long wait list for EOPS students; and Information Technology infrastructure, support and training (II.B.3.a., II.B.4.).
These recommendations were not included in the ACCJC action letter, but all have been addressed by the college, and significant progress has been made in each of the areas as addressed in the following pages.
**College Recommendation 1:** Although the college and its constituent groups have achieved a collegial working relationship with the current president to address issues with a new optimism, the college does not have the same type of relationship with the district leadership and the Board of Trustees.

The team recommends elements from both Recommendation 7 of the 1998 Accreditation Team and Recommendation 6, B and C of the 2004 visiting team that the district and Board of Trustees support the work of the college by:

- **D.** “Creating an environment which ensures greater administrative stability and empowerment at the college” (IV.A.1., IV.A.2., IV.B.2., and IV.B.3.); and
- **E.** “Enhancing the college and district communication structure so that it is clearer to everyone who the responsible party is for making decisions and how those decisions are or will be made.” (IV.A.1., IV.A.2., IV.B.1., IV.B.2., and IV.B.3.).

This recommendation, together with all recommendations, was initially discussed at Consultation Council on February 15, 2011, upon receipt of the Commission’s warning letter. The evaluation team had validated a collaborative working relationship among the administration, faculty, and classified staff at the college level. Although the ACCJC evaluation report commended the college for the positive change in campus climate since the last accreditation visit, the site visit had occurred when district leadership was in transition, and the report did not acknowledge the more positive working relationship between the college and district services personnel established under the interim chancellor that began in July 2010.

**The Chancellor and the Board of Trustees**

During November and December 2010, changes in board membership and the hiring of a new permanent chancellor further improved relationships between the college, the district leadership, and the board. This positive working relationship has been central to addressing the district recommendations, which has in turn continued to improve the college’s relationship with district services and the board. Upon the death of a longtime trustee in 2012, a recently retired Saddleback College dean was appointed to fill the vacancy, resulting in increased positivity in board/college dynamics.

The climate at board meetings has noticeably improved since these changes have occurred. Board meetings have been briefer and more collegial than in past years. The trustees have recognized these recent improvements, and at the board self-evaluation workshop on May 14, 2011, they identified a good working relationship with the chancellor and appropriate delegation of authority to college administration as two of their strengths.

**Strategic Planning and Collaboration**

During the districtwide strategic planning process which began in March 2011, the relationship between the colleges and district services emerged as a key issue that needed to be addressed. Therefore, the first goal of the *District-wide Strategic Plan 2011-2014* was that that SOCCCD
“create a districtwide culture that is characterized by mutual respect and collaboration and celebrates the uniqueness of each institution.”

The specific objectives of this goal include:

**Objective 1.1.** SOCCCD Chancellor will take the actions necessary to assure that employees districtwide collaborate on the achievement of common educational benchmarks.

**Objective 1.2.** SOCCCD Chancellor will periodically communicate directly to employees districtwide.

**Objective 1.3.** SOCCCD will relocate District Services to provide equitable accessibility for both campuses and facilitate a more effective district-services-college collaboration.

Work on Objective 1.1 included reviewing the results of the most recent district services satisfaction survey and developing a districtwide climate survey in order to pinpoint areas of dissatisfaction and develop plans of action. A district services satisfaction survey was conducted in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 in order to identify the concerns and commendations college personnel have with each individual district services unit. Using the 2011 data from the survey as benchmarks for AURs, each district services unit created an improvement plan to address the concerns identified. The *District Services Administrative Unit Reviews 2011–2012* was published on the district services planning SharePoint site in May 2011, and the *District Services Survey Results 2011 Evaluation & 2011-2012 Action Plans* were published in August 2011. The action plans were also distributed via email to all district employees on August 31, 2011, as one of a number of efforts to improve districtwide communication by the chancellor.

A districtwide climate survey was also developed by DWPC and administered to all district employees from October 24, 2012, through November 16, 2012. Results from the survey were distributed to DWPC members at the annual retreat on June 26, 2013. These results, which still indicate the need for continued work in this area, were utilized in the development of goals for the 2014-2020 districtwide strategic plan.

The second main focus of Objective 1.1 concerned the perceived barriers to collaboration and cooperation throughout the district. The college presidents were charged with the development of a plan to address the top five barriers to collaboration and cooperation across the district. In order to start this process, a workshop to identify the barriers was held on June 12, 2012, with members of Chancellor’s Council. The workshop was facilitated by Dr. Eva Conrad, the same consultant who assisted in the development of the initial districtwide strategic plan. The five barriers were:

**Barrier 1:** Unhealthy competition among Irvine Valley College, Saddleback College, and district services
Barrier 2: Lack of utilizing data and metrics for decision-making

Barrier 3: Circumvention and lack of established policies, procedures, and protocols

Barrier 4: Lack of districtwide perspective and mutual understanding and acceptance of the roles of each college and district services

Barrier 5: Lack of district policy encouraging civility, respect, and collegial behavior

Task forces were then established for each of the barriers. The charge of these task forces was to identify and analyze the causes of the barriers and to recommend solutions. The work is still in progress and it is anticipated that recommendations from all five task forces will be presented to Chancellor’s Council by the end of fall 2013.

District Services and the colleges also worked independently to identify perceived barriers and create independent statements of mutual respect and civility. Saddleback College, through the work of all constituent groups, created a Statement of Mutual Respect and Collegial Behavior that was approved by Consultation Council in June 2012 [ ]. This statement is the college’s guiding principle for all members of the college community, including administrators, managers, faculty, staff, and students, and demonstrates the college’s commitment to upholding the highest professional and ethical standards. As addressed in the Statement of Mutual Respect and Collegial Behavior, each constituent group has its own statement on ethics or code of conduct by which individuals are expected to abide.

Delineation of Responsibilities
The directive to create “an environment which ensures greater administrative stability and empowerment at the college” was largely accomplished through the clarification of roles and responsibilities. The delineation of functional responsibilities between district services and the colleges was articulated in a comprehensive function map created by the District Recommendation 1 Task Force consisting of representatives from both colleges and district services. This document identifies each responsibility as primary, secondary or shared. Saddleback College representatives on the task force presented the drafted function map to the campus governance groups for review and input. Working independently, each college edited its respective narrative sections, and then reconvened the task force to achieve consensus and develop a final draft. The final draft was forwarded to the Districtwide Accreditation Committee, approved on July 8, 2011, and posted on the district SharePoint site [ ].

Enhanced Communication
In an effort to enhance “the college and district communication structure so that it is clearer to everyone who the responsible party is for making decisions and how those decisions are or will be made” (Recommendation 6 C of the 2004 visiting team) the chancellor has worked to improve the transparency of decision-making through processes established in response to district recommendations 1, 2, 3 and 5 and developing multiple methods for the communication of decision. For the past two years, regular open forums at each campus are
held by the chancellor, the college president and members of the board of trustees. Additionally, information is regularly sent to all district employees in the form of Board Meeting Highlights and the Chancellor’s Newsletter.

**Evaluation**

Saddleback College strives to foster a climate of civility and optimism. The college has achieved a collegial working relationship with the district leadership and the board and has demonstrated a commitment to defining, evaluating, and improving the college’s relationship with Irvine Valley College and district services. Actions taken to date have set up an infrastructure that will continue to improve transparency, communication, and trust among the chancellor, the board, district services personnel, and the two colleges.
College Recommendation 2: The team recommends that the college address the need for both maintenance and new facilities funds and use these funds to address the current safety, accessibility and educational needs of the students (III.B.1.a., III.B.1.b).

The college, in conjunction with district services, has continued to address the ongoing need for maintenance and new facilities. The 2011-2031 EFMP was approved by the board at the June 25, 2012, meeting [CR 2.1], and is the primary planning document for new facilities necessary to meet the educational needs of students. 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, [CR 2.2] and submitted to the California Community Colleges (CCC) Chancellor’s Office as required, and The Five-Year Construction Plan for 2015-2019 was approved at the March 18, 2013 meeting [CR 2.3]. The five-year construction 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.

The district is also working on the development of an integrated 20-year facilities, renovation, and scheduled maintenance management plan. Rather than create a plan without the necessary comparative data to have a sufficient understanding of the facilities needs at both college, the Capital Improvement Committee (CIC), which is composed of representatives from both colleges and district services, decided to contract services from various outside vendors (including SchoolDude, Alpha Facilities, Inc., Facilities Planning and Program Service Inc., and the Foundation for California Community Colleges) to assess the conditions of all facilities at both colleges and to create a database for the tracking and monitoring of the future maintenance of those facilities. When completed, the tracking system will include a work order module, a preventative maintenance module, and a scheduled maintenance module. The cost for these vendors was approved by the board of trustees at its meeting on June 25, 2012 [CR 2.4]. In the interim, the existing college 20-year facilities and maintenance plans have been used by CIC to create short-term prioritized lists for capital improvement and scheduled maintenance.

Accessibility and safety issues are assessed and reviewed on an ongoing basis. Accessibility issues are integrated into any new building or renovation plan as mandated by state and federal guidelines such as Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations on building standards.

The college also addresses the safety issues through the Injury, Illness, and Prevention Plan (IIPP) [CR 2.5]. Based on this plan, the maintenance department conducts periodic inspections and identifies issues to be resolved. In addition, the college uses a safety consultant, Keenan and Associates to inspect the college annually and provide a detailed report. If a specific issue arises, the dean or director responsible for the area can also submit a work order via the Facilities, Maintenance & Operations online work order system. If the college is unclear on how
to resolve an issue, it confers with the risk management in district services for a recommendation.

**Evaluation**

Saddleback College has collaborated with both district services and Irvine Valley College to address the longstanding and ongoing needs for maintenance, renovations, and new facilities within the district concerning the safety, accessibility and educational needs of students and employees. Long-term plans have been developed, and new committee structures have been put in place in order to ensure that the specific needs of the colleges are met and that the processes are open, transparent and fair. Although the college has its own 20-year facilities, renovation and scheduled plan, work continues on an integrated districtwide plan and management system. The process for creating this new plan has been comprehensive and collaborative, and will lead to a greater understanding of the facilities needs at each institution and the most equitable means of distributing funds.
College Recommendation 3: The team recommends that the commitment to equity and diversity be demonstrated through multiple means including an updated Student Equity Plan and greater faculty involvement on the Equity and Diversity Committee (I.A., I.A.2.d., II.B.3.d., III.A.4., III.A.4.a.).

Saddleback College is committed to equity and diversity, as evidenced in two of the college’s core values:

**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.

Moreover, there are several board policies dealing with issues of equity and diversity. BP 4010, Commitment to Diversity, addresses the district’s commitment to diversity in hiring. It reads:

The District is committed to employing qualified administrators, faculty, and staff members who are dedicated to student success. The Board recognizes that diversity in the academic environment fosters cultural awareness, promotes mutual understanding and respect, and provides suitable role models for all students. The Board is committed to hiring and professional development processes that support the goals of equal opportunity and diversity, and provide equal consideration for all qualified candidates.

BP 5410, Student Equity, discusses the need for a Student Equity Plan that addresses:

- institutional barriers to equity;
- goals for access, retention, degree and certificate completion, English as a Second Language (ESL) and basic skills completion, and transfer for each historically underrepresented group;
- activities most likely to be effective to attain the goals, including coordination of existing student equity related programs;
- sources of funds for the activities in the plan;
- a schedule and process for evaluation of progress toward the goals; and
- an executive summary that describes the groups for whom goals have been set, the goals, the initiatives that the District will undertake to achieve the goals, the resources budgeted for that purpose, and the District officer or employee who can be contacted for further information.
In 2005-2006, a task force of administrators, managers, faculty, staff and students, came together to write the state-mandated Student Equity Plan. Although updates to this plan were no longer required after 2006, the college continued to work on the goals and strategies that were outlined, and made significant progress in some areas. For example, staff diversity has increased, especially among managers and administrators, and services such as EOPS have been improved.

In 2006-2007, the task force was reconfigured as the Equity and Diversity Committee, and is a standing committee of the Academic Senate. The committee was active from 2006-2008, but then, due to a lack of leadership, became defunct. In 2011, the committee was revived, and approximately fifteen faculty members have been appointed to serve on the committee. Two faculty members are co-chairs of the committee, and they are working closely with the vice president for student services to review and update the Student Equity Plan for 2013-2014.

The Equity and Diversity Committee, in conjunction with the Ethnic Studies Advisory Committee, a standing committee of the Academic Senate responsible for overseeing the Ethnic Studies program and curriculum, are active in sponsoring diversity events for students and staff. Last year, the committee sponsored an event on campus entitled “Living in the Bubble: Social Issues in Orange County.” The event was held over a three day-period in November 2012, and brought members of the community to campus to raise awareness about issues such as homelessness, poverty, addictions, and mental illness. More than a thousand students attended the event, which will take place annually. The committee is currently working with governance groups on campus to create a policy regarding transgender bathroom use. A draft of this policy was approved by the Academic Senate on May 15, 2013 [1].

Equity issues are also being addressed through the Student Success Taskforce student scorecard recommendations. The scorecard provides ways to measure success in all areas, such as Basic Skills and CTE, in relation to ethnicity, age, and gender. Saddleback is starting to look at metrics made available through the scorecard, and anticipates incorporating some of these measures into its benchmarking activities. The college will analyze and monitor these equity-based metrics as part of its revival of the Equity and Diversity committee and strategic planning processes.

Recognizing the need to continue to support underrepresented students despite state budget cuts and a reduction in categorical allocations beginning in 2009, the college made a decision to fund categorical programs such as EOPS and CalWORKS at the same levels through general fund monies with no reduction in services to these students.

**Evaluation**

Saddleback College demonstrates its commitment to equity and diversity in a variety of ways, including services, curriculum, and extra-curricular activities. The Equity and Diversity Committee has been reinvigorated and includes representatives from faculty, staff, and administration. This committee is working with the Planning and Budget Steering Committee to
evaluate and revise the current Student Equity Plan, and to integrate the goals and objectives with other planning initiatives across campus.
**College Recommendation 4**: The team recommends that the faculty have as a component of their evaluation effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes (III.A.1.c.).

Saddleback College continues its commitment to student learning and student success. As part of that commitment, Saddleback has addressed the need for Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) development and assessment as an integral part of faculty evaluations. Article XVII of the *Academic Employment Master Agreement, 2010-2014*, addresses probationary, tenured and part-time faculty evaluations. Section II.A.2.iii, on page 42 of the contract, reads:

*Each evaluation may include information relevant to the instructional duties assigned to the faculty member, including participation in curriculum development and review, and in development and assessment of student learning outcomes. Any information included in the probationary faculty member’s evaluation regarding participation in curriculum or student learning outcomes process must be verified and documented.*

In addition, the current *Faculty Performance Evaluation Review* form requires the rating of faculty on the publishing of SLOs in the course syllabus and is used to evaluate participation in curriculum and student learning outcomes. The current process complies with all Board Policies, Administrative Regulations and College Policies and Procedures.

The Educational Planning and Assessment Committee (EPA), a standing committee of the Academic Senate, tracks each program’s compliance with SLO assessment and program review procedures. Department chairs are responsible for gathering assessment data from the faculty within their department, inputting results into TracDat, and coordinating program review. Department chairs, therefore, are aware of each individual’s participation in the assessment and review processes and can use this information in the evaluation of faculty, as long as it is adequately documented.

**Evaluation**

Saddleback College has demonstrated its commitment to the SLO assessment and program review processes through the institutionalization of the faculty-led Educational Planning and Assessment (EPA) Committee. This committee oversees outcomes assessment on campus and facilitates the dialogue on the use of assessment results for continuous improvement of the college’s courses and programs. Faculty at the college are evaluated on a regular basis in accordance with the *Academic Employment Master Agreement, 2010-2014*. As part of the evaluation process, faculty must demonstrate their participation in SLO assessment and program review within their departments.
**College Recommendation 5:** The team recommends that a Student Services strategic plan be developed and implemented to address issues including campus accessibility; DSPS separate locations; International Students Office accessibility and visibility; the long wait list for EOPS students; and Information Technology infrastructure, support and training (II.B.3.a., II.B.4.).

The college views student services as a major component to the college strategic plan and has included the tenets of the student services mission and vision in the student affairs portion of the college’s plan. Accordingly, a specific document focusing only on student services has not been established but significant progress has been made to address the concerns of the 2010 accreditation visiting team.

Members of the student services team, led by the vice president of student services, have been working on the development of a unified sense of mission and vision that aligns with the mission and vision of the college. Collaborative efforts at all levels have occurred and the team has met on multiple full and half day retreats in order to focus on the development of a set of shared core values [CR 5.01]. The results of these meetings included the identification of the following student services-wide core values:

- **Whole-Student Approach**
  Student Services will provide resources and make appropriate referrals to meet the comprehensive needs of Saddleback students.

- **Collaboration**
  Student Services will work collaboratively across campus to provide the best possible educational experience for our students.

- **Innovation**
  Student Services will strive to produce the highest quality outcomes and to develop more effective ways of delivering services.

- **Excellence**
  Student Services will dedicate itself to excellence in academics, student support, and community service.

- **Mutual Responsibility**
  Student Services will act with integrity and will accept our mutual role in student success.

- **Learning-Focused**
  Student Services will help students acquire knowledge and skills essential for their success.
To better address the needs of DSPS students, the college increased facilities space available to the DSPS program. Due to the renovation of the student services center and the LRC, additional space was added on the lower campus section of the college, known as the village. DSPS has three locations in the student services center, the village, and the kinesiology/athletics complex. The space added in the village is located close to disabled parking locations, on flat terrain, and readily accessible to students. As the college reduces its use of the village, the DSPS office will be consolidated and services will be provided from a single location. The current plan is to consolidate the three locations when the college completes the construction of the gateway building, which will centralize a majority of student services into a single location. In the meantime, the college purchased a wheelchair accessible cart and funded a driver to transport disabled students between the locations as needed. Accessibility of DSPS services remains a challenge because of the campus topology, but the college is committed to providing access and support for disabled students and community members.

To ensure that DSPS students are provided with information that will assist them in succeeding at the college, the Special Services office has created a Student Information Handbook [CR 5.02] that provides detailed information on available services, procedures to obtain assistance, location of services, and advice on how to succeed.

International Students Office Accessibility and Visibility
During the ACCJC visit related to the college’s 2010 Self Study, the International Students Office was located in a temporary office adjacent to Admissions and Records. Student access to the office was difficult and not visible. During the spring of 2011, the International Students Office was relocated to office space within the Student Service Center, which has direct access from the college quad area for student access. The office includes an open reception and meeting area; as well as a private office for the International Students Program Specialist. The new office space is adjacent to other student service offices with the intention of integrating international students into the social fabric of our institution.

Long Wait Lists for EOPS Students
The Extended Opportunity Program and Services (EOPS) department provides an important service to the student community of the college. Because of the demand for services, students needed to plan early and follow the established rules and requirements of the program. Prior to August 2010, the EOPS program maintained an “application pool” in order to screen student eligibility. This process was cumbersome since each application had to be reviewed prior to the student receiving services. In 2010-11, the process was streamlined. Students are now pre-screened prior to the application process, which has led to a reduction in processing time. In most cases, students are screened and notified within one week of the application date. Since the department changed the screening process, student wait lists are no longer necessary.

Students who meet the eligibility requirements and become part of EOPS can meet with counselors, receive priority registration, and receive assistance for various financial aid programs. In order to better serve students, the EOPS office has increased the dissemination of
information through its website [CR5.03] as well as through the establishment of a presence on Facebook and Twitter.

Information Technology Infrastructure, Support and Training
The college has been continuously working on increasing its use of information technology in order to improve student success, leading to a greater need for student support and training in this area. A joint effort with district and college IT, the online education and learning resources division, and student services, has increased student access to current computer technologies and the internet. Further, students have access to technical support through a new website designed to answer the majority of student questions [CR 5.04]. Students also have access to 24/7 online and voice support for Blackboard through an outside technology support service [CR 5.05].

The college has made significant progress in the implementation and utilization of MAP. Counselors and district IT personnel meet bi-weekly to address problems and to perform upgrades and general software troubleshooting, and system performance has improved significantly. With this improved performance, counselors are able to use the system during counseling sessions more effectively. The MAP database continues to be improved and additional data will be included once an articulation specialist can be brought on board to focus on evaluating course equivalencies between institutions. Once the database is expanded, counselors and Admissions & Records will be able to evaluate transcripts more efficiently.

In fall 2011, the division of Online Education & Learning Resources and the Distance Education Committee launched a series of student focused workshops offered each semester focused on student success using technology entitled “How to Succeed in an Online or Hybrid class.” These free workshops are taught by faculty members and provide students with the information to succeed primarily in online and hybrid modalities [CR 5.06]. Further, the division maintains a Student Help Resources web site to provide students with a single point of reference for technical and general support [CR 5.07].

Evaluation

The college has made significant progress in addressing the recommendations of the visiting team. Student services has been an integral part of the college strategic planning process and has addressed accessibility and visibility for its support services. The process continues to be refined as student needs are identified and fiscal resources become available.
Evidence for the Responses to Visiting Team Recommendations for Increased Institutional Effectiveness

CR 1.1 xx
CR 2.1 xx
CR 3.1 xx
CR 4.1 xx
CR 5.01 All Student Services Meeting 2012 NEED DATE
CR 5.02 Special Services Student Handbook
CR 5.03 Extended Opportunity Program and Services Website
http://www.saddleback.edu/eops
CR 5.04 Student Technical Support Website
http://saddleback.edu/de/student-technical-support/
CR 5.05 Blackboard Support Center Website
CR 5.06 “How to Succeed in an Online or Hybrid Class” Workshop Flyer
CR 5.07 Student Resources Website
https://www.saddleback.edu/student-resources
## Responses to Self-Identified Planning Agendas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Standard II.A.1**  
The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity. | This planning agenda has been completed. As the college initiated the hiring process for the director of online education and instructional technology training, the college realized that it needed to place online education and instructional technology as a higher priority and needed to create a position that would be a leader in the area. Accordingly, the dean of online education and learning resources was appointed to a new college division that included oversight of the college library, LRC tutoring, basic skills, and online education, including the Center of Instructional Design and Distance Education (CIDDE) [PA II.01]. This new division coordinates online education and learning resources for the entire college and coordinates the college’s efforts toward student success for both faculty and students. |
| The college has identified the need for leadership in developing its distance education programs and has created the director of online education and instructional technology training position responsible for developing, monitoring, and assessing distance education programs and courses and training in instructional technologies. The hiring process to fill this position is under way. | |
| **Standard II.A.6.b**  
When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption. | This planning agenda has been completed. Administrative Regulation 5220 addresses program discontinuance, and assigns the responsibility for the development of both a review process and a program discontinuance policy to each college [PA II.02]. |
<p>| The district board of trustees will develop a board policy that addresses program discontinuance and substantive program change. | At Saddleback College, the review process is conducted in two ways. The first method is through the regular evaluation of program curriculum in |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accordance with Title 5 section 55130(d) and Education Code section 78016 [PA II.03] as overseen by the Curriculum Committee. During this review, known locally as technical review, the curriculum of CTE programs is evaluated and updated every two years, and the curriculum of all other programs is evaluated and updated every five years. The second method is through a more comprehensive self-evaluation each program undergoes during the bi-annual program review process as overseen by the Educational Planning and Assessment Committee. This process entails a review of each instructional program based upon such areas as staffing, curriculum and instruction, student success, facilities and infrastructure, and community outreach [PA II.04; PA II.05]. The Academic Senate developed the process for program discontinuance inquiry and established the criteria by which a program would be considered for discontinuance. This policy has been in effect since 2005, is regularly updated, and is available on the senate website [PA II.06].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard II.B.3.c**
The institution designs, maintains, and evaluates counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.

The counseling division will work with the district and college IT services to improve online resources (II.B.3.c). This planning agenda has been completed and is ongoing. The counseling services division, in concert with college technology services, launched online counseling appointment scheduling using SARS software in order to reduce the number of students waiting in line or on the phone to schedule their appointment.

Counseling faculty meet biweekly with district IT staff and consultants to troubleshoot technical issues with MAP and with the Project ASSIST website. A major accomplishment of this collaboration has been the |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reduction in the speed of loading data in MAP from several minutes to several seconds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation faculty and staff have been working with district IT staff to serve as a test group for the launching of Sherpa, a software platform developed by the district to ensure greater student success by guiding students through the registration process and allowing for targeted contact with them [PA II.07]. Sherpa sorts students by specific characteristics so that tailored online notifications can be delivered to them. Matriculation has successfully used Sherpa to notify first semester probation students of required workshop attendance. Having this information sent individually to each probationary student has resulted in a significant increase in the number of students participating in the probation workshops.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard III.A.1**
The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services.

The ethics statements will be reviewed annually by the appropriate groups, disseminated to each group’s membership, and included in new-employee orientation.

This planning agenda has been completed. Saddleback College, through the work of all constituent groups, created a Statement of Mutual Respect and Collegial Behavior that was approved by Consultation Council in June 2012 [PA III.01]. This statement is the college’s guiding principle for all members of the college community including administrators, managers, faculty, staff, and students, and demonstrates the college’s commitment to upholding the highest professional and ethical standards. As addressed in the Statement of Mutual Respect and Collegial Behavior, each constituent group also has its own statement on ethics or code of conduct by which individuals are expected to abide.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copies of all the college ethics statements (Saddleback College Statement of Mutual Respect and Collegial Behavior; Saddleback College Faculty Code of Ethics and Professional Standards; Saddleback College Classified Senate Code of Ethics; and the SOCCCD Administrator and Manager Statement of Ethics) have been provided to Human Resources and they are distributed to all new employees and included in the new employee orientation.</td>
<td>The college also works to make current employees aware of the statements and the principles that are included in them. A copy of the Saddleback College Statement of Mutual Respect and Collegial Behavior is posted in offices and meeting rooms across the campus. On June 4, 2013, the college held its first annual college governance retreat, attended by representatives from each constituent group [PA III.02]. During the retreat, participants reviewed the statement and discussed the steps they take as individuals to uphold it in their day-to-day encounters with others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard III.A.1.b**
The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

The college will develop clear tenure review guidelines for conducting faculty evaluations and will improve the process for tracking all faculty evaluations.

Work is continuing on this planning agenda. Tenure review guidelines are set forth in Article XVII of the Academic Employee Master Agreement 2011-2014. The article describes the intended purpose of evaluations as well as the specific procedures and timelines by which they are conducted.

Human resources is currently working on a project for improving the maintenance and tracking of faculty evaluations. This will result in a fully
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>automated process through the expanded use of its current human resources management system, PeopleAdmin 7. This will allow for the tracking of the evaluation process while still maintaining confidentiality. The district implemented a soft rollout of this new functionality of PeopleAdmin 7 in June 2013, with the goal of full implementation within two years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard III.A.3.a**
The institution establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures.

The college, through its relevant governance groups, will work with district human resources to institute an ongoing, systematic review of all personnel-related policies and procedures.

Work is continuing on this planning agenda. In order to update and review all board policies and administrative regulations, the district has hired a consultant to coordinate the process. When the consultant was hired in fall 2010, there were 52 board policies that had not been reviewed in 10 years or more. The consultant, under the supervision of the vice chancellor of business services, is currently working with BPARAC to review all policies and administrative regulations, develop a plan to revise all policies and regulations needing updates, and to create an ongoing three-year review schedule. With this new process, the formatting of board policies was changed so that the revision dates are now clearly indicated in the footer of each policy.

BPARAC is the districtwide committee charged with writing, reviewing, and revising board policies and administrative regulations. This committee ensures that all proposed changes go through a vetting process with all shared governance groups on both campuses. Once a board policy has been agreed to by both colleges and finalized by BPARAC, it is then forwarded to Chancellor’s Council for review, where it will either be returned to BPARAC for further revisions or sent to the trustees for review and study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel-related policies and procedures follow the same process. BPARAC is currently reviewing the hiring and evaluation procedures of administrators and managers, including the chancellor. Moreover, the vice chancellor of human resources has convened a task force with members of the faculty association and academic senate to make recommendations on the policies related to faculty roles and responsibilities and department chair roles and responsibilities. The task force began meeting on August 2, 2013[].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard III.A.5.b**

With the assistance of the participants, the institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

The college will work with the faculty and classified staff development committees to ensure that evaluations are completed and the findings are reviewed with the goal of improving staff development activities.

This planning agenda has been completed and is ongoing. The college has a strong faculty and staff development program. This includes nine full days of in-service each year, required professional development/flex hours for faculty, and competitive funding for individuals to attend conferences and off-campus training.

The college strives to streamline the reporting process for faculty and expand the offerings available. The faculty development (FLEX) coordinator has made huge strides in streamlining the process of reporting and increasing availability of faculty development opportunities. During the last two years, all recorded sessions, handouts, and PowerPoint presentations have been made available on the faculty development website. A FAQ web page and handbook were created to assist faculty with questions regarding faculty development, including the activities available. In addition, faculty are regularly surveyed to ensure that the training and development needs are being met. The last evaluation survey was
# Planning Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>administered during the spring 2013 semester, and the results indicated that faculty were overwhelmingly pleased with the opportunities available to them.</td>
<td>During the last three years, specific activities were created for associate faculty. For example, an associate faculty dinner was held each semester during in-service week and new associate faculty orientations were offered in the summer of 2011 and 2012. The activities provided associate faculty with the opportunity to become more familiar with the college and to meet and interact with administrators, full-time faculty, and other part-time faculty with whom they might otherwise have limited contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many in-service activities are also organized specifically for classified employees, and classified staff are encouraged to participate in other activities offered during that week. In addition, other classified development days are organized during the year, such as the SOCCCD Classified Staff Development Day. Classified staff have also been supported in their involvement to help create a portal for staff development statewide. The portal, known as California Career Café, allows users to explore what is happening at other community colleges in the state. [<a href="http://cacareercafe.ning.com/">http://cacareercafe.ning.com/</a>].</td>
<td>The college continues to support faculty and classified staff by providing funds for off-campus activities and conferences through the academic and classified senates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college has also created the Institute for Teaching and Learning (ITL) to centralize ongoing faculty development activities and the Center for Instructional Design and Distance Education (CIDDE) to offer training and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>support to faculty in the area of instructional technology. The ITL and CIDDE are co-located in a space designed to facilitate faculty interaction.</td>
<td>This planning agenda has been completed and ongoing. One of the stated goals in the college’s 2010-2013 strategic plan was to find funding for the 20-year Facilities and Scheduled Maintenance Plan. The college worked with the Capital Improvement Committee (CIC) to find funding for identified projects and to establish a mechanism to create an integrated 20-year facilities, renovation, and scheduled maintenance plan that would establish districtwide priorities. In order to create this plan, CIC determined that the district needed to have comprehensive comparative data by which to evaluate the current facilities needs at both colleges. Therefore, the committee selected and contracted several vendors (School Dude, Alpha Facilities, Inc., Facilities Planning and Program Service Inc., and the Foundation for California Community Colleges) to assess all facilities at both colleges and to create a monitoring system. When completed, this system will include a work order module, a preventative maintenance module, and a scheduled maintenance module. The assessment is still in progress, with the expectation that it will be finalized in fall 2013. Using the data generated by this process, the integrated 20-year plan will then be developed by CIC in consultation with the colleges in spring 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college will explore and secure funding sources for the 20-year Facilities and Scheduled Maintenance Plan.</td>
<td>In the meantime, the existing 20-year facilities and scheduled maintenance plans at both colleges and the 5-Year Construction Plan, which is reviewed annually, are being used to establish priorities for basic aid funding by CIC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard III.B.1**
The institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery.
### Planning Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and BAARC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 2013-2014, the college was able to secure funding for the following maintenance and renovation projects [Board meeting 6/17/13]:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Library Renovations - $4,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ATAS Renovation and Swing Space - $3,714,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Storm Drain, Parking Phase IA, and Practice Fields - $7,638,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fine Arts Complex Renovations - $5,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Electrical Distribution Repairs - $200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PE 100 HVAC Maintenance - $800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PE 200 Bleacher Replacement - $725,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard III.D.1.c

When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies and plans for payment of liabilities and future obligations.

As outlined in the 2010-2013 Strategic Plan, the college will ensure that its *20-year Facilities and Scheduled Maintenance Plan* is a high priority for allocation of District funds.

This planning agenda has been completed and is ongoing. See progress outlined in the above planning agenda.

### Standard IV.A.2.a

Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.

Board Policy 4056 will be reviewed and revised to provide separate procedures for the recognition and

It was determined that this planning agenda was not necessary. Board Policy 4056, Classified Employees Participation in Decision Making, [PA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>appointment of classified bargaining unit members and classified managers to represent their constituent groups on districtwide and college committees for matters related to governance.</td>
<td>IV.01] was reviewed by BPARAC on August 27, 2012, [PA IV.02] and slightly revised to ensure its continued alignment with California Education Code Section 70901.2. It was decided that this policy only applies to classified employees. Classified managers are represented as a separate entity on all districtwide and college committees. The college has taken steps to ensure that classified managers and academic administrators have equal representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Policy 4056, 4011, et seq., will be revised to harmonize with each other as they delineate classified managers being appointed to serve on college and district committees.</td>
<td>It was determined that this planning agenda was not necessary. As stated above, Board Policy 4056 was reviewed and revised by BPARAC. Board Policies 4011, Employment Procedures for Administrators and Managers, [PA IV.03] and 4011.6, Employment Procedures for Chancellor, [PA IV.04] address the appointment of administrators and classified managers on search committees for the hiring of administrators, classified managers, and the chancellor. Administrators and managers comprise the majority of appointees on these committees. This is in alignment with current district and college practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ASG will be asked to appoint students to serve on districtwide committees. The college and district leadership will facilitate student participation on district committees.</td>
<td>This planning agenda has been completed and is ongoing. The college and district have taken numerous steps to include students on districtwide and college committees, and to facilitate their active participation on these committees. On the district level, students serve on BPARAC [PA IV.05] and the Chancellor’s Council, [PA IV.06] and the Associated Student Government (ASG) presidents at both colleges attend all board meetings and give a report on their activities to the trustees [PA IV.07]. On the college level, students serve on the Consultation Council, [PA IV.08] Marketing and Communications Committee, [PA IV.09] Outreach Committee, [PA IV.10] the Food and Beverage Committee, [PA IV.11] the Parking Committee, [PA IV.12] the Commencement Committee, [PA IV.13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Agenda</td>
<td>Progress to Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success Task Force, [PA IV.14] all standards committees for accreditation, each of the strategic planning groups, and the Saddleback Foundation Board [PA IV.15]. ASG members also attend Academic Senate meetings and make regular reports to that body [PA IV.16]. While both the district and the college have long recognized the importance of including students in the governance process, over the last three years concrete steps have been taken to ensure their active participation. As an example of this, during the college’s governance retreat held on June 3, 2013, six student representatives were invited and were an integral part of the activities [PA IV.17].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In recognition that students who participate will often have to choose between work or study activities, often to the detriment of their academic advancement or financial situation, part of the facilitation process may include incentives in the forms of student scholarships, priority registration, or stipends. This planning agenda has been completed. As an incentive to participate in ASG leadership, such students receive priority registration as per BP 5210, Enrollment Priorities, [PA IV.18] and AR 5210, Enrollment Limitations and Priorities [PA IV.19]. Beginning in fall 2013, the Student Life Office began instituting a new co-curricular transcript so that student participation can be recognized and documented. This transcript lists all activities in which a student participated while at Saddleback College and can be used in college and job applications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard IV.B.1.b**
The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them. Consideration will be given for a policy to be amended or created in the 100 Series (Board of Trustees) that would clearly state the board expectations for quality, integrity, and ongoing improvement of student learning programs and services. It was determined that this planning agenda was not necessary. BP 112, Duties and Responsibilities of the Board of Trustees, last revised on May 20, 2013, clearly states the board’s commitment to establish the mission of the college, to assure the development and implementation of short-term and long-term plans, to assure financial health and stability, to monitor the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>services as they relate to the mission statement.</td>
<td>institutional effectiveness and educational quality of the district’s colleges, to work respectfully with one another, and to establish policies that implement the district’s mission and goals and set prudent, ethical and legal standards for college operations [PA IV.20].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The third philosophy statement, found in the 2009 final budget, will be revised to explicitly reference the district mission statement.</td>
<td>This planning agenda has been completed. On August 23, 2013, DRAC revised the board’s budget philosophy, as contained within the budget development guidelines, to read:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Board of Trustees shall support and follow fiscal policies that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Ensure wise and prudent use of public resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Promote financial strength and stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Maximize educational opportunities for students, in accordance with the district’s mission statement [PA IV.21].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard IV.B.1.e</td>
<td>This was approved by the board, along with the adopted budget for fiscal year 2013-2014, at its August 26, 2013 meeting [PA IV.22].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The board will consider creating additional avenues for the free exchange of information with those who are closest to working with our students.</td>
<td>This planning agenda has been completed and is ongoing. Within recent years, the chancellor has actively worked to provide more educational opportunities for trustees in order to deepen their understanding of college needs. For example, at eight different board meetings, presentations were made by faculty and administrators from both colleges on each of the Student Success Task Force recommendations [PA IV.23]. The board also regularly requests additional reports on various topics. Recent requests have included a report on local partnerships for CTE and a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Agenda</td>
<td>Progress to Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report on services available for student veterans [PA IV.24]. Additionally, the chancellor and members of the board hold districtwide forums each semester at the colleges [PA IV.25]. These provide opportunities for district employees to directly address members of the board on issues of wide-ranging concern in an informal setting.</td>
<td>This planning agenda has been completed. Guiding Principle #7, which states that basic aid funds can only be spent on one-time expenditures, was reaffirmed by the board through the passing of BP 3110, Basic Aid Funds Allocation Process [PA IV.26] and AR 3110, Basic Aid Allocation Process, [PA IV.27] thus bringing the practices of basic aid allocation into line with the principle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The board will examine if it is time to revise and align Guiding Principle #7 pertaining to basic aid so that this budget-related guiding principle will reflect current Board practices.</td>
<td>This planning agenda has been completed. The basic aid allocation process, BP 3110 [PA IV.28], 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 [PA IV.29]. AR 3110 [PA IV.30], the administrative regulation associated with BP 3110, was approved by BPARAC on February 3, 2012 [PA IV.31], and presented to the board of trustees as an information item on February 27, 2012 [PA IV.32]. 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 to determine the allocation of basic aid funds. AR 3110 also established the formation of BAARC, the committee chaired by the vice chancellor of business services that oversees the entire basic aid allocation process, assesses its effectiveness, and makes recommendations for further refinement of the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The board will adopt the policy, currently in development, that delineates the process for allocating basic aid resources.</td>
<td>This planning agenda has been completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard IV.B.1.f
### Planning Agenda

| The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office. |

| The trustees will consider amending Board Policy 109, Board Education, to address a need for training in accreditation standards and expectations. |

| This planning agenda has been completed. BP 109, Board Education, [PA IV.33] was revised to include accreditation standards and expectations as part of the list of professional development items for trustees, and approved by the board at the September 23, 2013, meeting [PA IV.34]. |

### Standard IV.B.1.g

| The board will review its self-evaluation process and focus upon improving it and ensuring that it remains current and addresses issues facing boards of trustees throughout the state. The board will widely disseminate the outcomes of the evaluation in a timely manner. |

| This planning agenda has been completed and is ongoing. In accordance with Board Policy 172, Board Self-Evaluation, [PA IV.35] which was adopted on August 27, 2007, [PA IV.36] the board is to conduct an annual self-evaluation in order to identify its strengths and areas for improvement. The 2010 accreditation visiting team concurred with this stated planning agenda. After receiving the commission’s recommendations, the current process was carefully reviewed by the chancellor in consultation with the board of trustees and by the Districtwide Accreditation Committee. It was determined that the process was essentially sound, but that steps would be taken to a) communicate the results of the self-evaluation to all employees and to the public, and b) ensure that the results were used to create action items for improvement. |

In 2011, the chancellor and board president hired Dr. Cindra Smith as a facilitator to lead the board through its self-evaluation. The evaluation process took place in three stages. Stage one took place in April and May 2011 and involved the administering of a comprehensive evaluation questionnaire for board members, [PA IV.37] a survey for members of Chancellor’s Council, administrators and managers, [PA IV.38] all of whom regularly observe the board in action, and a survey for all other employees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of the district [PA IV.39]. The responses of the three groups were then compared [PA IV.40].</td>
<td>Stage two involved a self-evaluation workshop for trustees held on May 14, 2011, at the Mission Viejo Country Club. This meeting was open to the public and was widely publicized through districtwide emails, the district website, at districtwide committee meetings, and at board meetings [PA IV.41].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The facilitator set the agenda of the workshop based upon analysis of the data from the surveys [PA IV.42]. At the end of the discussion, concrete actions and tasks were developed [PA IV.43].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The third and final stage of the process involved the dissemination of the results to the college community and the public. At the May 23, 2011, board of meeting, the chancellor reported on the board self-evaluation, and mentioned that a web page was created on the district website that outlines the entire self-evaluation process and allows individuals to access all of the pertinent documents [PA IV.44]. On May 31, 2011, district employees received an email from the district director of public affairs with a link to the web page [PA IV.45].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In 2012 and 2013, the board conducted self-evaluations following a similar process. The most recent self-evaluation workshop took place on May 18, 2013. The results of the surveys and board self-evaluation discussion are posted on the district website [PA IV.46].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard IV.B.1.i**
The governing board is informed and involved in the accreditation process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The college recommends that processes and dialogues initiated with the 2008 [Progress Report] Task Force be sustained.</td>
<td>This planning agenda has been completed and is ongoing. Board members served on the standard committees that completed the 2010 self-evaluation and will be involved in the production of the 2016 self-evaluation. All board members review the self-evaluation reports, progress reports, and midterm reports, as required by ACCJC, and certify their review of these documents. In addition, the chancellor keeps the board notified of any changes to accreditation standards and processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard IV.B.1.j**
The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college.

The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.

In multi-college districts/systems, the governing board establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges.

Trustees should consider expanding the current policy to require the chancellor to establish formal input from the college constituency groups into the president’s performance evaluation.

Work is continuing on this planning agenda. BPARAC has placed AR 4090, Evaluation of the Administrators and Classified Management Personnel, on its list of policies and procedures to be reviewed and revised in 2013-2014 [PA IV.47], with the expectation that input from relevant constituency groups will be incorporated into the evaluation process of all administrators and managers.

**Standard IV.B.2.a**
The president plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution’s purposes, size, and complexity. He/she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.
**Planning Agenda**

A comprehensive study should be undertaken to evaluate the administrative workload and determine whether additional administrative positions are required to better support implementation of the college strategic plan and for the effective operation of the college.

**Progress to Date**

This planning agenda has been completed. During 2011-2012 academic year, the college developed a new management organizational structure, which was designed to address administrative workload and support the effective operation of the college. A new additional administrative position, dean of online education and learning resources, was created and filled. Several other positions were reclassified, including the creation of two new dean positions (the dean of transfer, career and special programs, and the dean of enrollment services) and a vice president for administrative services [PA IV.48].

Also, during that year, a districtwide management reclassification study took place and became effective July 1, 2012. All position descriptions were revised and updated to reflect actual duties. During that process certain duties were realigned to more effectively support operations and workload [PA IV.49].

**Standard IV.B.2.e**

The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.

The president will ensure information about the college’s strategic planning process is provided to the foundation board of governors and facilitates discussion relating to the importance of aligning the foundation’s bylaws and planning with the college mission and vision.

This planning agenda has been completed and is ongoing. The 2005 Master Agreement between the college and foundation aligns the foundation bylaws with the college mission. The bylaws of the foundation state that the purpose of the foundation is “to raise charitable funds in support of the academic and institutional excellence of Saddleback College” [PA IV.50]. The college president is a member of the executive and finance committees of the foundation.

In addition, the mission statement of the Foundation is in alignment with the college’s mission and vision. It reads, “The mission of the Saddleback College Foundation is to enhance the quality of higher education by
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gaining financial support for academic, athletic and cultural programs of Saddleback College. The Foundation initiates and coordinates college and community fund raising in support of Saddleback College and its students. By raising funds for scholarships and other programs, which directly benefit students, the Foundation is committed to increasing student success and the enhancing the excellent education offered by Saddleback College. Guided by a group of dedicated community leaders, the Foundation strives to make higher education attainable for all in South Orange County” [PA IV.51]. Information about the college’s strategic planning process is provided to the foundation board of governors through presentations at the foundation’s annual retreats. The most recent presentation was given by the director of planning, research, and grants on June 4, 2010 [PA IV.52]. These presentations coincide with college planning efforts to ensure that the foundation is included in the strategic planning process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard IV.B.3.a**  
The district/system clearly delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice.  
Create a manual delineating the role and scope of authority of the district office in relation to the college, including the delineation of the responsibilities and functions of the district.  
This planning agenda has been completed. The **SOCCCD District-wide Planning and Decision-making Manual, 2011-2014**, contains a link to the districtwide function map, which delineates the role and scope of authority of district services in relation to the college [PA IV.53]. In the function map, key decision areas are carefully aligned with the WASC/ ACCJC standards. Decisions are delineated as being: 1) primary, 2) secondary, or 3) shared, and the decision-making roles and responsibilities are carefully outlined. Continued review, improvement, and revisions are the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a manual clearly delineating the role and scope of authority of the Advanced Education Technology Park (ATEP) staff in relation to the college administration and faculty.</td>
<td>This planning agenda has been completed. Members of DWPC decided that a separate manual for ATEP was not needed, and that information about ATEP would be included in the districtwide planning and decision-making manual. At the November 2, 2012, DWPC meeting, a function map for ATEP was approved, which differentiated between the responsibilities of district services and of the respective colleges in relation to ATEP [PA IV.54]. It was determined that all academic planning would be done at the colleges, and that the district would be responsible for site development. This function map is included in the SOCCCD District-wide Planning and Decision-making Manual, 2011-2014 [PA IV.55].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard IV.B.3.b**  
The district/system provides effective services that support the colleges in their missions and functions.

<p>| The district offices should collaborate with the college leadership and all constituency groups in addressing the feedback and suggestions from employees and in developing more in-depth surveys and data-driven methods of assessing the effectiveness of its services. | This planning agenda has been completed. In 2010, 2011, and 2012, a district services satisfaction survey was conducted to assess the effectiveness of district services and units. The third annual survey was conducted with all district employees in March and April 2012. The report was published and distributed in July 2012 [PA IV.56]. The results of these surveys were used to develop administrative unit outcomes (AUOs) and objectives, which then became a part of the district services AURs. A broader districtwide climate survey of all faculty, administrators, managers, and staff was conducted from October 24 - November 16, 2012. Preliminary results were presented at the February 1, 2013, DWPC meeting [PA IV.57]. The final report was issued in <strong>August 2013</strong>, and was used in the development of districtwide goals for the 2014-2020 strategic plan [PA |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The district offices should collaborate with the college leadership and all constituency groups to develop and disseminate an operations manual with standardized procedures and updated contacts in order to facilitate effective use of district services and district processes.</td>
<td>Work is continuing on this planning agenda. Of primary importance for the clear delineation of roles was the creation of a comprehensive districtwide function map [PA IV.59] and an ATEP function map [PA IV.60] 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. DWPC approved the function maps at its November 2, 2012, meeting, [PA IV.61] and they are included in the SOCCCD District-wide Planning and Decision-making Manual, 2011-2014 [PA IV.62]. In addition to the function map, there is a necessity for a clear understanding of the work flow involved in the functioning of key district services areas, such as human resources and purchasing. In order to obtain a clear understanding of the processes, to streamline when possible, and to provide necessary information for the purchase of efficiency software, the vice chancellor of business services initiated BPA sessions for the following services: accounts receivable, budget development, hiring and employee orientation, payroll processing and timekeeping, purchasing/accounts payable, and travel. These were conducted between the months of May and August 2012, and included participants from all segments of the district community. Additional BPAs were conducted between the months of May and August 2013 for the following services: benefits processing, board agenda development, contracts, curriculum development, facilities planning and construction, financial aid processing, and grants. The goal of the BPAs is to eliminate redundancies and establish clear...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- instructions for college and district processes. As a result, a **BPA report** was created that delineated the recommended changes and any progress to date [PA IV.63]. Once all of the information has been analyzed, the ultimate goal is to create an operations manual. Each unit within business services and human resources will review the recommendations and incorporate them into their AUR annual updates for 2013.

- Based upon the outcomes of the BPAs thus far, changes have occurred or have been recommended for future implementation.

- In addition, human resources convened a Continuous Quality Improvement Task Force in August 2011. The committee was chaired by the associate director of applications delivery, and was composed of seventeen members from all constituent groups (faculty, staff, and administration) from both colleges. The task force finalized their work in November 2011 [PA IV.64]. The objective of the task force was to significantly reduce the time and effort it takes to fill a vacant position. The task force analyzed the number of steps required to fill a vacant position and tracked how many days were spent on each step of the process at both the college and district level. Recommendations were then made and are currently being enacted.

- Human resources also developed a task force to develop an operations manual. The task force recommended that a Wiki be developed instead of a manual because it would be more dynamic and could be updated on a regular basis. It is anticipated, however, that human resources processes will also be included in the operations manual that results from the BPA processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>instructions for college and district processes. As a result, a <strong>BPA report</strong> was created that delineated the recommended changes and any progress to date [PA IV.63]. Once all of the information has been analyzed, the ultimate goal is to create an operations manual. Each unit within business services and human resources will review the recommendations and incorporate them into their AUR annual updates for 2013.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Agenda</td>
<td>Progress to Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The district offices should establish a timeline to regularly evaluate their</td>
<td>This planning agenda has been completed. AURs for all district services units were completed for the first time in March 2012 [PA IV.65] and will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services; a component of the evaluation should focus on support for the</td>
<td>be updated on an annual basis. Within the AURs are objectives which are linked to the districtwide strategic planning goals that are in turn linked to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutional missions and functions.</td>
<td>district mission. These objectives also are updated on an annual basis. The 2013 review process began in May and was completed in September [PA IV.66].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources should undertake a more-detailed examination of the survey</td>
<td>This planning agenda was completed and is ongoing. Human resources convened a Continuous Quality Improvement Task Force in August 2011. The task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comments. A task force, perhaps even a standing committee, should be</td>
<td>force was chaired by the associate director of applications delivery and was composed of seventeen members from all constituent groups (faculty,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formed with representatives from both colleges and all constituency groups to</td>
<td>staff, and administration) from both colleges. The task force finalized their work in November 2011 [PA IV.67]. The objective of the task force was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assist in evaluating the feedback and supporting the development of plans for</td>
<td>to significantly reduce the time and effort it takes to fill a vacant position. The task force analyzed the number of steps required to fill a vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved services. Consideration of other evaluation models, such as the one</td>
<td>position and tracked how many days were spent on each step of the process at both the college and district levels. The following recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employed by district IT, would assist them in developing a culture of</td>
<td>emerged from this process:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous improvement that reaches out to their “user groups” to evaluate HR</td>
<td>1. Upgrade to PeopleAdmin 7, an online applicant tracking system, to better define the workflow in the hiring process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services and their support for the college mission and function.</td>
<td>2. Provide stop-gap training on the current system until PeopleAdmin 7 is in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Identify five classified positions as a test case for the screening of applicants in an attempt to eliminate unqualified candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The first two recommendations are complete, and PeopleAdmin 7 was implemented in January 2013 for the hiring of faculty and in July 2013 for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Agenda</td>
<td>Progress to Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the hiring of classified staff, managers, and administrators. The third recommendation is still under review by human resources.</td>
<td>The full-time faculty hiring procedure was also made available online and tracked at each step so that the process is completely transparent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The district offices should disseminate and widely communicate the results of the assessment and evaluation of their services with the college.</td>
<td>This planning agenda was completed and is ongoing. District services satisfaction surveys were done in 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012. The district public affairs office communicated the results to the faculty, staff, and administrators via email. Results are also posted on the District Services Planning Committee SharePoint site [PA IV.68]. 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 [PA IV.69]. That was the first year of what is now an annual review cycle for district services. The 2013 review process began in May and was completed in August. The AUR TracDat report was distributed via email and posted in September 2013 [PA IV.70].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard IV.B.3.c**
The district/system provides fair distribution of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations of the colleges.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The district and college leadership and management teams should come together to develop a long-term facilities plan and funding mechanism.</td>
<td>This planning agenda has been completed and is ongoing. One of the stated goals in the college’s 2010-2013 strategic plan was to find funding for the <em>20-year Facilities and Scheduled Maintenance Plan</em>. The college worked with the Capital Improvement Committee (CIC) to find funding for identified projects, and to establish a mechanism to create an integrated 20-year facilities, renovation, and scheduled maintenance plan that would establish districtwide priorities. In order to create this plan, CIC determined that the district needed to have a comprehensive comparative data by which to evaluate the current facilities needs at both colleges. Therefore, the committee selected and contracted several vendors (School Dude, Alpha Facilities, Inc., Facilities Planning and Program Service Inc., and the Foundation for California Community Colleges) to assess all facilities at both colleges and to create a monitoring system [PA IV.71]. When completed, this system will include a work order module, a preventative maintenance module, and a scheduled maintenance module. The assessment is still in progress, with the expectation that it will be finalized in fall 2013. Using the data generated by this process, the integrated 20-year plan will then be developed by CIC in consultation with the colleges in spring 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the state budget crisis and the deterioration of college facilities, it is also recommended that extensive dialogue occur among the board, district office administration, and the college leadership and</td>
<td>This planning agenda has been completed and is ongoing. BP 3110, Basic Aid Funds Allocation Process, [PA IV.74] 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 [PA IV.75]. AR 3110,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2013 Accreditation Midterm Report**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>management teams on the subject of basic aid prioritization and funding the vision of ATEP.</td>
<td>the administrative regulation associated with BP 3110, was approved by BAARC on February 3, 2012, [PA IV.76] and presented to the board of trustees as an information item on February 27, 2012 [PA IV.77]. 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 to determine the allocation of basic aid funds. AR 3110 also established the formation of BAARC, the committee chaired by the vice chancellor of business services that oversees the entire basic aid allocation process, assesses its effectiveness, and makes recommendations for further refinement of the process. Basic aid funds can be utilized for ATEP as long as they adhere to the guidelines established by BP 3110. This would include, for example, site development at ATEP, which would be one-time expenditures, but not ongoing operational costs. The <em>ATEP Five-Year Site Development Plan and Timeline</em> was developed and presented to the board at the February 27, 2012, meeting [PA IV.78].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is recommended that a comprehensive report be prepared of all basic aid allocations that have been spent on or encumbered by ATEP and all other projects and purposes that fall outside the basic aid guidelines, policies, and processes established by the board of trustees.</td>
<td>This planning agenda has been completed. Although a comprehensive and detailed report on spending or allocations for ATEP has not been completed, monthly basic aid reports are presented at board meetings in which all allocations for ATEP are clearly documented [PA IV.79]. In addition, at the May xx, 2013, board meeting, the vice chancellor of business services gave a presentation on the status of ATEP in which she provided an overview of all SOCCCD funding for ATEP [PA IV.80]. From 2004 until 2012, funding was spent or allocated in the following amounts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Site development, ATEP initial campus and building, demolitions to date, and negotiations - $18.2 million</td>
<td>- Site development, ATEP initial campus and building, demolitions to date, and negotiations - $18.2 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Temporary Campus Operations - $10.9 million  
- Future demolitions - $4.7 million  
- Building Phase 3A - $12.5 million |

The allocation process for distributing basic aid funds for compliance with the board-approved process should be reviewed. Strong consideration should be given to revise the basic aid allocation process to include specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely goals. Criteria for funding could include FTES; number of educational programs supported; instructional space; age of buildings; time since the last renovation; timely compliance with local, state, and federal safety laws and regulations; and staff-to-student ratio.

### Standard IV.B.3.g

The district/system regularly evaluates district/system role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disseminate a summary of the survey [District Self Evaluation] results throughout the district.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This planning agenda was completed. A district services satisfaction Survey was given in 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012. The district public affairs office communicated the results to the faculty, staff, and administrators via email. Results are also posted on the District Services Planning Committee SharePoint site [PA IV.85].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Openly seek additional feedback in the areas where improvement, additional training, and increased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This planning agenda was completed. The District Services Satisfaction Survey provided for open-ended feedback in the form of unlimited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication are indicated on the survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish procedures to regularly evaluate its services, both districtwide and by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those who use those services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate improvements and changes that are made in services and processes as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a result of evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence for the Responses to Self-Identified Planning Agendas

PA II.01 Division of Online Education & Learning Resources Website
https://www.saddleback.edu/oe

PA II.02 Administrative Regulation 5220, Program Discontinuance

PA II.03 Curriculum Procedures and Resources

PA II.04 Board Policy 6100, Curriculum

PA II.05 Administrative Regulation 6100(b), Instructional Program Review

PA II.06 Program Discontinuance Inquiry Policy

PA II.07 Saddleback College Matriculation Department Website
http://www.saddleback.edu/matriculation/

PA III.1 xx

PA IV.01 Board Policy 4056, Classified Employees Participation in Decision Making

PA IV.02 Minutes of Board Policy and Administrative Regulation Advisory Committee Meeting, August 27, 2012

PA IV.03 Board Policy 4011, Employment Procedures for Administrators and Managers

PA IV.04 Board Policy 4011.6, Employment Procedures for Chancellor

PA IV.05 Board Policy and Administrative Regulation Advisory Council Committee Composition and Purpose

PA IV.06 Chancellor’s Council Committee Composition and Charge

PA IV.07 Minutes of Board of Trustees Meeting, July 22, 2013

PA IV.08 Minutes of Consultation Council Meeting, June 18, 2013

PA IV.09 Agenda of Marketing and Communications Committee Meeting, November 14, 2012

PA IV.10 Outreach Committee Meeting

PA IV.11 Food and Beverage Committee Meeting
| PA IV.12 | Parking Committee Meeting |
| PA IV.13 | Commencement Committee Meeting |
| PA IV.14 | Student Success Task Force Meeting |
| PA IV.15 | Saddleback College Foundation Board Meeting |
| PA IV.16 | Minutes of Academic Senate Meeting, February 27, 2013 |
| PA IV.17 | Saddleback College Governance Retreat, June 3, 2013 |
| PA IV.18 | Board Policy 5210, Enrollment Priorities |
| PA IV.19 | Administrative Regulation 5210, Enrollment Limitations and Priorities |
| PA IV.20 | Board Policy 112, Duties and Responsibilities of the Board of Trustees |
| PA IV.21 | Minutes of District Resource Allocation Committee Meeting, August 23, 2013 |
| PA IV.22 | Minutes of Board of Trustees Meeting, August 26, 2013 |
| PA IV.23 | Minutes of Board of Trustees Meeting, April 29, 2013 |
| PA IV.24 | Minutes of Board of Trustees Meeting, February 26, 2013 |
| PA IV.25 | Districtwide Forum |
| PA IV.26 | Board Policy 3110, Basic Aid Funds Allocation Process |
| PA IV.27 | Administrative Regulation 3110, Basic Aid Allocation Process |
| PA IV.28 | Board Policy 3110, Basic Aid Funds Allocation Process |
| PA IV.29 | Minutes of Board of Trustees Meeting, August 29, 2011 |
| PA IV.30 | Administrative Regulation 3110, Basic Aid Allocation Process |
| PA IV.31 | Minutes of Board Policy and Administrative Regulation Advisory Committee, February 3, 2012 |
| PA IV.32 | Minutes of Board of Trustees Meeting, February 27, 2012 |
| PA IV.33 | Board Policy 109, Board Education |
PA IV.34  Agenda of Board of Trustees Meeting, September 23, 2013
PA IV.35  Board Policy 172, Board Self-Evaluation
PA IV.36  Minutes of Board of Trustee Meeting, August 27, 2007
PA IV.37  Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation Survey Result, 2011
PA IV.38  Chancellor’s Cabinet, Administrators and Managers Board Evaluation Survey Results, 2011
PA IV.39  All District Employees Board Evaluation Survey Results, 2011
PA IV.40  Comparison of Responses on Surveys, 2011
PA IV.41  Notice of Special Board Meeting, May 14, 2011
PA IV.42  Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation Workshop Discussion Outline, May 14, 2011
PA IV.43  Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation Workshop Outcomes, May 14, 2011
PA IV.44  Minutes of Board of Trustees Meeting, May 23, 2011
PA IV.45  Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation Website
   http://www.socccd.edu/about/BoardSelfEvaluation.html
PA IV.46  Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation Website
   http://www.socccd.edu/about/BoardSelfEvaluation.html
PA IV.47  BPARAC List of Policies and Procedures for Review and Revision
PA IV.48  Saddleback College Management Organization Chart, June 2013
PA IV.49  Districtwide Management Reclassification Study
PA IV.50  Saddleback College Foundation By-Laws
PA IV.51  Saddleback College Foundation Website
   http://www.saddleback.edu/foundation/
PA IV.52  Minutes of Saddleback College Foundation Retreat, August xx, 2013
PA IV.53  Districtwide Function Map
PA IV.54  Minutes of Districtwide Planning Council Meeting, November 2, 2012
PA IV.56  SOCCCD District Services Satisfaction Survey 2012 Results
PA IV.57  Minutes of Districtwide Planning Council Meeting, February 1, 2013
PA IV.58  SOCCCD Districtwide Climate Survey 2012 Results
PA IV.59  Districtwide Function Map
PA IV.60  ATEP Function Map
PA IV.61  Minutes of Districtwide Planning Council Meeting, November 2, 2012
PA IV.63  Business Process Analyses Report
PA IV.64  Humans Resources CQI Task Force PowerPoint, November 30, 2011
PA IV.65  District Services Administrative Unit Reviews, 2011-2012
PA IV.66  District Services Administrative Unit Reviews, 2012-2013
PA IV.67  Humans Resources CQI Task Force PowerPoint, November 30, 2011
PA IV.68  SOCCCD District Services Satisfaction Survey 2012 Results
PA IV.69  District Services Administrative Unit Reviews, 2011-2012
PA IV.70  District Services Administrative Unit Reviews, 2012-2013
PA IV.71  Minutes of Capital Improvement Committee, January 13, 2012
PA IV.72  Saddleback College 20-Year Facilities and Scheduled Maintenance Plan
PA IV.73  5-Year Construction Plan
PA IV.74  Board Policy 3110, Basic Aid Funds Allocation Process
PA IV.75  Minutes of Board of Trustees Meeting, August 29, 2011
| PA IV.76 | Minutes of Board Policy and Administrative Regulation Advisory Council Meeting, February 3, 2012 |
| PA IV.77 | Minutes of Board of Trustees Meeting, February 27, 2012 |
| PA IV.78 | ATEP Five-Year Site Development Plan and Timeline |
| PA IV.79 | Minutes of Board of Trustees Meeting, August 26, 2013 |
| PA IV.80 | Minutes of Board of Trustees Meeting, May xx |
| PA IV.81 | Board Policy 3110, Basic Aid Funds Allocation Process |
| PA IV.82 | Minutes of Board of Trustees Meeting, August 29, 2011 |
| PA IV.83 | Minutes of Board Policy and Administrative Regulation Advisory Council Meeting, February 3, 2012 |
| PA IV.84 | Minutes of Board of Trustees Meeting, February 27, 2012 |
| PA IV.85 | SOCCCD District Services Satisfaction Survey 2012 Results |
| PA IV.86 | SOCCCD District Services Satisfaction Survey 2012 Instrument |
| PA IV.87 | District Services Administrative Unit Reviews, 2012-2013 |
| PA IV.88 | SOCCCD District Services Satisfaction Survey 2012 Results |
| PA IV.89 | District Services Administrative Unit Reviews, 2011-2012 |
| PA IV.90 | District Services Administrative Unit Reviews, 2012-2013 |