Saddleback College 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.

Saddleback College Vision Statement

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

On January 31, 2011, the College received the action letter from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges placing Saddleback College on warning status and outlining six deficiencies that needed to be rectified. The College and District immediately began working together in unprecedented fashion to address the recommendations and make the necessary changes to bring us into compliance with all accreditation standards.

Through the leadership of President Tod Burnett, the College reconvened its Accreditation Steering Committee consisting of the following members:

Juan Avalos – Vice President for Student Services
Donald Busché – Vice President for Instruction/Accreditation Liaison Chair
Claire Cesareo-Silva – Faculty/Past President, Academic Senate
Bob Cosgrove – Faculty/Past President, Academic Senate
Carmen Dominguez – Faculty/Past President, Academic Senate
Russell Hamilton – Classified Staff/Past President, Classified Senate
Carol Hilton – Director of Fiscal Services
Joseph Tinervia – Faculty
Jim Wright – Dean
Tere Fluegeman – District Director of Public Affairs, SOCCCD
Beth Mueller – District Director of Fiscal Services, SOCCCD

Donald Busché and Bob Cosgrove were made Co-Chairs of the Steering Committee. Carmen Dominguez and Claire Cesareo-Silva were designated as primary writers for the Follow-Up Report, and Joe Tinervia was made editor. The Steering Committee has met every other week during this process.

Since all of the recommendations were District Recommendations, the newly appointed Chancellor, Gary Poertner, scheduled a discussion of the Commission’s findings and recommendations at the monthly meeting of the Chancellor’s Cabinet on February 10, 2011 [I.01]. Out of this discussion, a District-wide Accreditation Committee was assembled that brought together representatives from both of the Colleges and the District offices to jointly address the recommendations. This committee met monthly beginning on March 10, 2011 [I.02], and consisted of the following members:

Chair: Gary Poertner – Chancellor, SOCCCD
Robert Bramucci – Vice Chan. of Technology and Learning Services, SOCCCD
In addition, district-wide task forces, chaired by one of the Vice Chancellors, were established around each of the six joint recommendations. These task forces were charged with developing and implementing specific actions to be taken by the District and Colleges in order to rectify the identified deficiencies. The task forces reported on a regular basis to the larger District-wide Accreditation Committee on their activities, and attained consensus on their recommended actions. All agendas, minutes, and documents produced by these task forces have been available for review by all employees of the District through SharePoint, our intranet system [I.03].

The membership of these task forces is as follows:
District Recommendation 1
Task Force – Planning
Chair: Gary Poertner, Chancellor, SOCCCD
Robert Bramucci, Vice Chan. of Technology and Learning Services, SOCCCD
David Bugay, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, SOCCCD
Brandye D'Lena, District Dir. of Facilities Planning and Purchasing, SOCCCD
Debra Fitzsimmons, Vice Chancellor of Business Services, SOCCCD
Tere Fluegeman, District Director of Public Affairs, SOCCCD
Denice Inciong, District Director of Research and Planning, SOCCCD
Delores Irwin, Accounting Specialist, SOCCCD/CSEA Representative
Teddi Lorch, District Director of Human Resources, SOCCCD
Beth Mueller, District Director of Fiscal Services, SOCCCD
Randy Peebles, Associate Vice Chan. of Economic Development, SOCCCD
Juan Avalos, Vice President for Student Services, Saddleback College
Gretchen Bender, Dir. of Planning, Research and Grants, Saddleback College
Tod Burnett, President, Saddleback College
Donald Busché, Vice President for Instruction, Saddleback College
Claire Cesareo-Silva, Faculty, Saddleback College
Carmen Domínguez, Faculty, Saddleback College
Russ Hamilton, Classified, Saddleback College
Carol Hilton, Director of Fiscal Services, Saddleback College
Don Mineo, Classified, Saddleback College
John Ozurovich, Director of Facilities, Saddleback College
Dan Walsh, Faculty, Saddleback College
James Wright, Dean, Saddleback College
Lisa Davis Allen, Faculty, Irvine Valley College
John Edwards, Director of Admissions, Irvine Valley College
Dennis Gordon, Classified, Irvine Valley College
Jeff Kaufmann, Faculty, Irvine Valley College
Davit Khachatryan, Director of Fiscal Services, Irvine Valley College
Craig Justice, Vice President of Instruction, Irvine Valley College
Gwen Plano, Vice President of Student Services, Irvine Valley College
Glenn Roquemore, President, Irvine Valley College
Keith Shackleford, Dean, Irvine Valley College
Chris Tarman, Classified, Irvine Valley College
Kathy Werle, Dean, Irvine Valley College

District Recommendation 2
Task Force – Resource Allocations
Chair: Debra Fitzsimmons, Vice Chancellor of Business Services, SOCCCD
Brandye D'Lena, District Dir. of Facilities Planning and Purchasing, SOCCCD
Delores Irwin, Accounting Specialist, SOCCCD/CSEA Representative
Beth Mueller, District Director of Fiscal Services, SOCCCD
Gretchen Bender, Dir. of Planning, Research and Grants, Saddleback College
Claire Cesareo-Silva, Faculty, Saddleback College
Carmen Dominguez, Faculty, Saddleback College
Carol Hilton, Director of Fiscal Services, Saddleback College
Jeff Kaufmann, Faculty, Irvine Valley College
Davit Khachatryan, Director of Fiscal Services, Irvine Valley College
Craig Justice, Vice President for Instruction, Irvine Valley College
Kathy Schmeidler, Faculty, Irvine Valley College

District Recommendation 3 Task Force – Communication
Chair:  David Bugay, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, SOCCCD
Tere Fluegeman, District Director of Public Affairs, SOCCCD
Randy Peebles, Associate Vice Chan. of Economic Development, SOCCCD
Donald Busché, Vice President for Instruction, Saddleback College
Claire Cesareo-Silva, Faculty, Saddleback College
Bob Cosgrove, Faculty, Saddleback College
Russell Hamilton, Classified, Saddleback College
Jennie McCue, Director of Public Information and Marketing, Saddleback College
Diane Oaks, Director of Public Information and Marketing, Irvine Valley College
Gwen Plano, Vice President of Student Services, Irvine Valley College
Stephen Rochford, Faculty, Irvine Valley College
Susan Sweet, Classified, Irvine Valley College

District Recommendation 4 Task Force – Board Self Evaluation
Chair:  Gary Poertner, Chancellor, SOCCCD
Bob Cosgrove, Faculty, Saddleback College
Carmen Dominguez, Faculty, Saddleback College
Jim Wright, Dean, Saddleback College
Lisa Davis Allen, Faculty, Irvine Valley College
Dan Rivas, Faculty, Irvine Valley College
Jerry Rudmann, Faculty, Irvine Valley College

District Recommendation 5 Task Force – Board Code of Ethics
Chair:  David Bugay, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, SOCCCD
Bob Bramucci, Vice Chan. of Technology and Learning Services, SOCCCD
Cheryl Clavel, Executive Assistant to the Vice Chancellor of Business Services
Debra Fitzsimmons, Vice Chancellor of Business Services, SOCCCD
Donald Busché, Vice President for Instruction, Saddleback College
Carmen Dominguez, Faculty, Saddleback College
Based on the work of all of these district-wide committees, the Saddleback College Steering Committee produced this Follow-Up Report. A draft was presented to the entire College community during the fall 2011 in-service week and to the district-wide task forces. Input from these presentations was incorporated into a final draft. This final draft was accepted by the Saddleback College Consultation Council on September xx, 2011 [I.04], and then forwarded for review by the Board of Trustees at their September 26, 2011 meeting [I.05].
Evidence for the Statement of Report Preparation

I.01 Minutes from Chancellor’s Cabinet, February 10, 2011 (hard copy only)

I.02 Minutes from the District-wide Accreditation Committee, March 10, 2011

I.03 District-wide Accreditation Committee site
   https://accreditation.socccd.edu/default.aspx

I.04 Minutes from Consultation Council, September xx, 2011
   Link

I.05 Agenda for the Board of Trustees Meeting, September 26, 2011
   Link
Response to District Recommendation 1

**District Recommendation 1:** The teams recommend that the chancellor develop and implement both a strategic short-term and long-term plan that is inclusive of the planning at the colleges and that this planning structure drive the allocation of district resources for the colleges, Advanced Technology Education Park (ATEP), and the district (I.B.4.).

The 2010 Self Study Report extensively documented the planning processes occurring at Saddleback College, and the College received commendations for its efforts in both strategic planning and in integrating planning with the College resource allocation process. The 2010 Evaluation Report, however, noted that while the College was in compliance with all subsections of Standard I, the District had made less progress in developing their processes, and in integrating district-wide planning with the planning efforts at the Colleges. Although district-wide goals were developed in 2009-2010 [1.01], they were not connected to the Colleges’ strategic planning efforts nor directly linked to resource allocations. Moreover, there was not a set process for the evaluation of progress in meeting the goals or for evaluating the process itself.

The Commission’s recommendation addresses the need for both strategic short-term and long-term planning. The District’s long-term planning efforts were already well-underway prior to the receipt of the Commission’s letter. For the first time in the District’s recent history, the development of the 2011 Education and Facilities Master Plan (EFMP) was a fully-collaborative process which took place over ten months beginning in June of 2010 and included [1.02; 1.03]:

- A consideration of all Program Reviews and Administrative Unit Reviews produced by the Colleges
- Student, employee, and community surveys
- Eighty-nine College meetings, including presentations to each of the participatory governance groups
- Six campus-wide/community presentations
- Thirty-nine College and District Services focus group interviews
- An interactive web site

The entire process, overseen by Brandye D’Lena, District Director of Facilities Planning and Purchasing, and directed by gkkworks consulting firm, was designed to maximize participation so that both College and District plans that reflect the shared vision of students, faculty, staff, administrators, Trustees, and the community.
The Master Plan documents are comprised of one Education Master Plan and one Facilities Master Plan for each College and a fifth document reflecting a District-wide summary and plan. The Education Master Plan for each College includes the following chapters:

- Executive Summary
- Background: Overview, Guiding Principles for Master Plan
- College Vision, Mission, Goals and Organizational Structure
- Community and Regional Context
- Inside the College: Fall 2010 Snapshot, Historical Student Data, Employees, Surveys, and Key Indicators
- Education Program Services: Overall College Description, Long-Range WSCH Forecast, Academic Divisions – Description, Trends and Future Development, Student Services
- Long Range Considerations
- Appendices

The Facilities Master Plan for each college includes the following chapters:

- Executive Summary
- Introduction: Purpose, Methodology and Process, College Background, Existing Conditions
- Goals and Influences
- Development Strategies: Project Prioritization Criteria, Academic Organization, Project Sequence, Campus Space Inventory
- Facilities Master Plan: Five Year Horizon, Ten Year Horizon, Twenty Year Horizon, Topography, Landscape Considerations, Sustainable Principles
- Appendices

And the District Summary includes the following chapters:

- Executive Summary
- Introduction: District-wide Missions and Goals
- District Overview: History, Profile, Key Indicators
- District Facilities: Overview of Master Planning Process, Facilities, Vision
- District-wide Strategic Planning Goals and Objectives

A completed version of the EFMP is available on the master planning website [1.04]. The plans will be approved by the Board of Trustees upon completion of the
Environmental Impact Report (EIR), anticipated in December 2011. Once approved, the District will forward the EFMP to the California Community Colleges (CCC) Chancellor’s Office.

The five volumes of the EFMP provide a blueprint for the Colleges and the District through 2031, and serve the following principal purposes [1.05]:

- To establish clear direction for the Colleges and District by envisioning the future under the changing conditions of internal and external trends and influences.
- To provide a foundation and serve as a primary resource for the development of other College and District planning activities.
- To support accreditation reviews and demonstrate compliance with accreditation standards.
- To forge a closer relationship with the community through the dissemination of information about the District and Colleges’ present situations, needs, and future plans.
- To forecast dynamics that may impact the Colleges and District, and to provide appropriate responses.
- To serve as the basis for facility expansion and modification decisions and the implementation of expenditures provided to improve facilities.
- To identify the limitations, strengths, and capabilities of the Colleges and District, and to offer options for the future.
- To stimulate continuing discussion about the Colleges’ programs and their effectiveness.

The plan includes five, ten, and twenty year time horizons. Annually, a Five Year Plan is updated and submitted to the CCC Chancellor’s Office. This prioritized list of projects for the entire District is developed with input from both Colleges.

Short-term planning was more problematic because the District had never engaged in an integrated strategic planning process before. In order to assist the District in coming together with the Colleges to devise a relevant and integrated plan, it was decided at the first District-wide Accreditation Committee on March 10, 2011 [1.06] that a consultant would be hired to advise the Chancellor and to facilitate discussions. Two proposals were solicited, and the District Recommendation 1 Task Force, chaired by Chancellor Gary Poertner, reviewed the proposals and decided to retain the services of College Brain Trust, with the appointed facilitators being Dr. Eva Conrad, former President of Moorpark College, and Julie Hatoff, former Vice President, Instructional Services, at Mira Costa College.
To prepare, the facilitators read the strategic plans of both Colleges, the self study reports, and the evaluation reports, and individually interviewed each member of the District Recommendation 1 Task Force. Based upon this, they made recommendations to the Chancellor on how to proceed.

The first of two Strategic Planning Retreats was held on June 13, 2011, at the Mission Viejo Country Club. The all-day retreat was attended by the District-wide Accreditation Committee, as well as several other invited individuals from both Colleges and the District. At this meeting, committee members worked collaboratively to determine the following [1.07]:

- The components of the SOCCCD Strategic Plan 2011-2014
- The list of data sources to be used in the development of goals and objectives
- A proposed list of district-wide 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 necessity of District Services units to undergo Administrative Program Review

The Chancellor took this information and, with the assistance of the facilitators, developed a draft strategic plan that was reviewed and revised at a second strategic planning retreat which took place at Saddleback College on August 3, 2011 [1.08]. Once again, individuals from the two Colleges and the District offices worked collaboratively and respectfully with one another throughout the retreat. This resulted in the framework for an initial district-wide strategic plan that was grounded in research, meaningful input from all constituent groups, cooperation, and transparency.

The draft goals that emerged from this retreat and which will serve as the basis for planning and decision-making during the next three years are the following [1.09]:

- SOCCCD will create a district-wide culture which is characterized by mutual respect and collaboration and which 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 which enhance student access and success.

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

• SOCCCD will develop, document and implement data-driven district-wide 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.

These goals are designed to encourage a productive working relationship among the different entities within the District, direct resource allocations, and promote student success at the Colleges. Moreover, while this plan utilized the Colleges’ strategic plans as its starting point, future College strategic planning will now use the District Strategic Plan as the foundation for its efforts. 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 now be linked across the District.

Objectives and action plans related to each of these goals were also developed. A draft of the District-wide Strategic Plan was then distributed to all employees for feedback on August 16, 2011. In addition, during that same week in-service presentations were made at both the Chancellor’s opening session and at a special session dedicated to discussing progress on the Commission’s recommendations [1.10]. The draft plan was submitted to the Board of Trustees for review at their August 28, 2011 meeting [1.11]. 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 [1.12]. The plan was then posted on the District’s planning web page [1.13].

A process of Administrative Unit Reviews (AURs) for District Services offices has also been developed by the Chancellor’s Executive Team, using the Saddleback College AUR Handbook as a model [1.14]. All District Service units began their evaluation process by looking at the results of the spring 2011 Employee Survey [1.15], and developing action plans to address all of the identified concerns. A schedule was devised for the completion of the AURs, with all due by May 2012. These AURs will be used as the basis for continuous improvement and future strategic planning, and will be linked to resource allocations within District Services.
Based upon the work of several of the recommendation task forces, an SOCCCD Planning and Decision-Making Manual has been developed by Chancellor Poertner and Vice Chancellor of Human Resources David Bugay which clearly outlines the current strategic planning, decision-making, and resource allocation processes of the District. The model for this handbook was the Irvine Valley College Planning and Decision-Making Manual. These processes will be regularly evaluated and revised if necessary.

Evaluation

Additional Planning Agendas

1. Institutionalize the District-wide Accreditation Committee as a new District-wide Strategic Planning Committee in order to ensure that there will continue to be broad participation in the ongoing oversight of strategic planning on the district-level.

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

3. All District Services Units to complete an Administrative Unit Review by May 2012.

4. Update the SOCCCD Planning and Decision-Making Manual as needed.
Evidence for District Recommendation 1

1.01 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, June 22, 2009
   Link

1.02 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, May 23, 2011

1.03 Presentation to the Board of Trustees on the 2011 Education and Facilities Master Plan, May 23, 2011
   http://www.socccd.edu/about/documents/DiscussionItem4.2.pdf

1.04 Website of the 2011 Education and Facilities Master Plan
   http://socccddefmp.com/

1.05 Saddleback College 2011 Education and Facilities Master Plan
   Link when completed

1.06 Minutes of the District-wide Accreditation Committee, March 10, 2011

1.07 Agenda of the SOCCCD Strategic Planning Retreat, June 13, 2011
   https://accreditation.socccd.edu/rtf1/Agendas%20and%20Minutes/June%202013,%202011/SOCCCD%20Retreat%20Agenda%20for%20June%202013,%202011.pdf

1.08 Agenda of the SOCCCD Strategic Planning Retreat, August 3, 2011
   https://accreditation.socccd.edu/rtf1/Agendas%20and%20Minutes/August%203,%202011/SOCCCD%20Agenda%20August%203.pdf

1.09 District Web Site
   http://www.socccd.edu/about/about_mission.html

1.10 Saddleback College Fall 2011 In-Service Professional Development Program
   http://www.saddleback.edu/asenate/documents/FlexFall11.pdf

1.11 Agenda of the Board of Trustees Meeting, August 29, 2011
   Link

1.12 Agenda of the Board of Trustees Meeting, September 26, 2011
   Link

1.13 District-wide Strategic Plan
   Link
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.14 District Services Administrative Review Handbook</td>
<td><a href="#">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.15 2011 Employee Survey</td>
<td><a href="#">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to District Recommendation 2

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

The 2010 Self Study Report documents the significant advances that the College has made in linking resource allocation to comprehensive planning. The 2010 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 our self study, this was particularly the case for Basic Aid funds, which led to widespread dissatisfaction at the College with Board of Trustee decision making.

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 [2.01]. The task force was initially chaired by David Bugay, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources and then Acting Vice Chancellor of Business Services, and later chaired by Debra Fitzsimons, the new Vice Chancellor of Business Services, when she came on board in June 2011.

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 which come primarily from local property taxes and enrollment fees, flow through the District Resources Allocation Council (DRAC), which has been in place since 1996. DRAC is a district-wide participatory governance council that is charged with making recommendations for and overseeing the resource allocation model upon which the District’s budget decisions are based. 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 principle, the District Resource Allocation Model [2.02] is produced each year which shows the exact allocations made to Saddleback College, Irvine Valley College, District Services, district-wide 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 unrestricted funds have been allocated to the five areas listed above according to the DRAC model, the remaining property taxes are designated as Basic Aid funds. At the time of the 2010 Self Study Report, the Board of Trustees allocated these funds according to a process adopted at the August 29, 2005 Board meeting [2.03]. The self study report provided evidence that Basic Aid allocations were often out of compliance with the approved process, as well as with Budget Development Guidelines which states that Basic Aid funds can only be allocated to one-time expenses.

The Recommendation 2 Task Force confirmed the findings of our self study that the main concern of the Colleges is directed towards the allocation of Basic Aid funds. While the Colleges understand the DRAC process and feel that it works well, there seems to be a widespread sentiment that the determination of how projects get on the Basic Aid funding list seemed “mysterious” [2.04].

In order to rectify these discrepancies and clarify how Basic Aid expenditures would be linked to District priorities determined through planning, it was determined by the District-wide Accreditation Committee that a policy on Basic Aid should be developed [2.05]. Fortunately, this process was already underway. The Board Policies and Administrative Regulations Council (BPARC), which is a shared governance committee charged with developing and updating board policies and administrative regulations and making recommendations to the Chancellor and Chancellor’s Cabinet, has worked diligently for the last two years on the development of a new Basic Aid Allocation Policy, BP 3110 [2.06]. This new policy asserts that “allocation of basic aid will be made based on district and college planning documents and supporting data.” Moreover, the policy goes on to clearly specify the types of projects for which Basic Aid funds can be used. They are:

1. Capital construction, major renovation, large infrastructure projects, and site development. These projects will follow district and college strategic plans, Education and Facilities Master Plan, 20-year Facility, Renovation and Scheduled Maintenance Plan and 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 fifty 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 was placed on July 25, 2011, Board of Trustees meeting agenda for the Board’s study and review. At the meeting, the Board made some changes to the policy [2.07]. It then went to the August 29, 2011, Board Meeting for further discussion and approval. The Board Policy was passed unanimously at this meeting [2.08].

AR 3110, which is the Administrative Regulation associated with BP 3110, is currently being developed by a small workgroup of the BPARC. This workgroup has met several times, and their goal is to produce a draft of the Administrative Regulation, which will then go to BPARC for further discussion and consultation with the participatory governance groups. When in final form, the Administrative Regulation will be brought to a Board of Trustees meeting as an information item for the Board to review and provide additional input. The purpose of AR 3110 will be to show the exact process by which the District will utilize the long-term master plan and short-term strategic plan, as well as other planning documents, in determining the allocation of Basic Aid funds.

In order to help clarify the District’s current resource allocation processes and make this information clear and transparent, the District Recommendation 2 Task Force developed a flow chart that illustrates in a simple, user-friendly manner, the resources that are received by the District and how the planning processes are used to drive allocation decisions with respect to the various resources [2.09]. This chart is accompanied by a glossary which defines all the terms used in relation to budget allocations [2.10]. The Task Force also devised a table listing all of the District funds that shows the fund number, gives a description or title for the fund, and provides a brief definition [2.11]. All of these documents are posted on the SharePoint site of the Task Force and will become part of each year’s final budget. They are also posted on District’s budget web page [2.12].

Evaluation
Additional Planning Agendas

1. Complete AR 3110 in a way which clearly links resource allocations to planning.
Evidence for District Recommendation 2

2.01 Final report of the Accreditation Sub-Committee for Recommendation 2
Resource Allocation, July 29, 2011
https://accreditation.socccd.edu/rtf2/Handouts/Final%20Report%20july%2029%202011%20with%20revisions%208%204%2011%20and%208%205%2011%20pdf.pdf

2.02 District Budget Allocation Model, 2010-2011

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

https://accreditation.socccd.edu/rtf2/Handouts/Final%20Report%20july%2029%202011%20with%20revisions%208%204%2011%20and%208%205%2011%20pdf.pdf

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

2.06 Board Policy 3110, Basic Aid Funds Allocation Process
Link

2.07 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, July 25, 2011

2.08 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, August 29, 2011
Link

2.09 District Resource Allocation Process Flowchart
2.10 SOCCCD Resource Allocation Definition of Terms

https://accreditation.socccd.edu/rtf2/Handouts/RESOURCE%20ALLOCATION%20DEFINITION%20OF%20TERMS%20draft%207-26-11%20revised%208%204%2011%20pdf.pdf

2.11 SOCCCD Funds Table

https://accreditation.socccd.edu/rtf2/Handouts/Funds%20Table%20revised%207%2029%2011,%20revised%208%204%2011%20pdf.pdf

2.12 SOCCCD Budget Web Page

http://www.socccd.edu/businessservices/bs_fiscal_budget.html
Response to District Recommendation 3

**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.).

As noted in our Evaluation 2010 Evaluation Report, the College and District had made significant strides in the area of communication and effective participation over the past six years, citing the College’s “proactive approach and use of multidimensional strategies to reach diverse college groups and external communities.” However, due to the lack of consistent, clear, and open communication channels and protocols, areas of conflict arose within the District. This was especially the case around points of potential disagreement among the different District entities, such as the five areas noted in the recommendation: academic calendar, planning, Advanced Technology and Education Park (ATEP), technology, and building priorities.

It was evident from early discussions at the District-wide Accreditation Committee meetings that this was the most perplexing of the recommendations because many individuals, including the Chancellor, were still unclear as to what, exactly, the District was doing wrong in this regard [3.01]. District Recommendation 3 Task Force, chaired by Vice Chancellor Bugay, was, therefore, charged with first determining what the real problem was and then developing strategies to address it. Indeed, the first meeting of the task force was spent trying to identify the problem by outlining current communication practices [3.02]. Eventually it became clear that solutions would have to be multipronged since different groups accessed and desired information in different forms (e.g., via email, on a web site, through College forums, etc.). It was also determined that part of the problem stems from a lack of clear decision-making processes, and that the work of the other task forces, especially for District recommendations 1, 2, and 6, would go a long way in alleviating some of the tensions within the District.

Through extensive dialogue during task force meetings, a number of strategies were developed and enacted. These include [3.03]:

- Creating an intranet (SharePoint) site for each of the accreditation task forces so that all documents, including agendas and minutes, would be available to all employees of the District.
• Creating standardized intranet sites for all district-wide committees, following the model established for the accreditation task forces, which outline each committee's charge, membership, and member responsibilities.
• Including a list of all district-wide committees and their specific charge in the newly created SOCCCD Planning and Decision-Making Manual.
• Developing a template for standardized meeting agendas and minutes, with all action items listed.
• Developing uniform definitions of consensus and standards of interaction so that resolutions can be achieved when there is disagreement among committee members.
• Establishing guidelines for 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) keyword searchable online.
• Continuing to email updates to employees, such as the Board of Trustee Meeting Highlights and District Updates, but also posting information around key issues on dedicated web or intranet sites.
• Creating RSS feeds for all District Committee sites so that employees can receive notification of recent developments.
• Developing a wiki for District Services, using the Human Resource Wiki as a model, which provides pertinent information such as personnel, processes, forms, etc.

Additionally, planning objective 1.2 from the SOCCCD’s 2011-2014 Strategic Plan [3.04] directs the Chancellor to periodically communicate directly with employees district-wide. This will include regular newsletters from the Office of the Chancellor and open forums at the Colleges.

In respect to the five issues specifically mentioned in this recommendation, awareness of communication needs and the suggested solutions will have or have had the following effects:

**Academic Calendar**

Since both IVC and Saddleback have historically been on the same academic calendar, there is a district-wide committee that looks at proposed calendars from both Colleges and establishes the final joint calendar. While in the past this has not caused any problems, this past year it became contentious because the proposals from the two Colleges were substantially different and there were rumors about the possibility of going on two different calendars. While the
measures listed above cannot alleviate disagreements between the two Colleges, they will help to ensure that discussions are based on facts and not rumors, and they will make the actual decisions and action items transparent and available to everyone.

In the end, a revised academic calendar for 2012-2013 was established through collegial efforts on the part of both Colleges and the District-wide Calendar Committee, chaired by the Vice Chancellor of Technology and Learning Services, in spring 2012. It was approved by all participatory groups and adopted by the Board of Trustees at the March 29, 2011, meeting [3.05]. The new calendar addresses the unique needs of both Colleges while decreasing long-standing length disparities between the fall and spring semesters. It also increases the length of winter break, which will increase options for programs that utilize field trips, institutional visits, and discipline-specific internships, and addresses summer scheduling options.

Planning

The first goal of SOCCCD’s 2011-2014 Strategic Plan is to “create a district-wide culture which is characterized by mutual respect and collaboration and which celebrates the uniqueness of each institution” [3.04]. Open communication is essential to create and sustain a climate based on 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 Recommendation 1 Task Force [3.06]. This was also true of the EFMP process, in which an interactive web site was established that allowed individuals to leave comments and get a response to questions posed.

The new SOCCCD Planning and Decision-Making Manual, which clearly documents how decisions are being made within the District, will also help to make the entire planning and resource allocation processes more understandable and transparent.

ATEP

Over the years, decision making in regards to ATEP was not fully transparent and significant Basic Aid funds were being funneled to the site without clear guidelines and goals nor a shared understanding of how the site would be used. Part of the negativity towards ATEP at Saddleback College stemmed from the fact that there were conflicting messages being delivered by the District. It was felt that decisions were not being made in a forthright manner and when made, they were often not communicated clearly. One way this was addressed was through the creation of Board Policy 3110, which lays out the priorities for Basic
Aid funding. Another way that communication was increased in relation to ATEP was through the ability to do keyword searches for the Board of Trustees Meeting agendas and minutes. This will make information about Board actions easily attainable.

Technology

The goals and priorities of District IT have long been questioned by many at the College who feel that they focus more on the high visibility cutting-edge projects (such as MAP and SHERPA) than on the more mundane projects that are necessary for the day-to-day functioning of the College (such as scheduling and the Student Information System). In order to address this perception, it was determined that a District-wide technology plan would be established with input from all constituent groups at both Colleges. This plan will be worked on as one of the objectives for the SOCCCD 2011-2014 Strategic Plan (District-wide Objective 3.1).

Building Priorities

The District has made significant process in clarifying the district-wide building priorities and how they are established. The Colleges and District offices effectively and collegially collaborated on the development of the EFMP which includes five, ten, and twenty year projections. Feedback was solicited from constituent groups and individuals at the Colleges through numerous meetings and focus groups, as well as a collaborative web site.

Recently, a new district-wide Capital Improvements Committee (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 twenty years.

The Colleges and the District also came together in the creation of BP 3110 which establishes a list of funding priorities for the Basic Aid funds.

In addition to these processual modifications, recent changes in personnel in District leadership and among the Board of Trustees has had a significant impact upon the level of open dialogue and shared decision-making in the District. Gary Poertner, the new Chancellor, is respected by all constituent groups on campus. He is committed to working collaboratively with all constituent groups at both Colleges and to accurately conveying College needs to the Board of Trustees.

Evaluation
Although a number of steps can be taken to make communication more open, efficient, and effective within the District, it is also the responsibility of all employees to ensure that they are.

**Additional Planning Agendas**

1. Institutionalize the practices for improving communication identified by the Recommendation 3 Task Force.

2. Employees at the Colleges and in District Services will continue to be collaborative on issues of key concern within the District.
Evidence for District Recommendation 3

3.01 Minutes from the District-wide Accreditation Committee, April 8, 2011
https://accreditation.socccd.edu/dac/Agenda%20and%20Minutes/accred%20minutes%204-8-11.pdf

3.02 Minutes from the District Recommendation 3 Task Force Meeting, April 21, 2011
https://accreditation.socccd.edu/rtf3/Shared%20Documents/Mtg%20Agenda%20and%20Minutes/Minutes%20Accred%20Subcommittee%20Rec%203%204-21%20Final.pdf

3.03 Communication Issues and Solutions

3.04 SOCCCD 2011-2014 Strategic Plan
Link

3.05 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, March 28, 2011

3.06 Recommendation 1 Task Force SharePoint Site
https://accreditation.socccd.edu/rtf1/default.aspx
Response to District Recommendation 4

District Recommendation 4: The team recommends 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 [4.01], which was adopted on August 27, 2007, the SOCCCD Board of Trustees is to conduct an annual self-evaluation in order to identify both its strengths and areas for improvement. At the time of our 2010 Self Study Report, the most recent evaluation had been conducted on May 20, 2009, during a Special Board Meeting which was open to the public but held at an offsite location. As noted in our report, the results were not published or reported to the public. This was also the case for the 2010 Board self-evaluation. Through the creation of this recommendation, the visiting team concurred with our stated Planning Agenda that the Board review its self-evaluation process and disseminate the outcomes of the evaluation in a timely manner.

After receiving the commission’s recommendations, the current process was carefully reviewed by the Chancellor in consultation with the Board of Trustees, as well as by the District-wide 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.

It was decided by the Chancellor and Board President Nancy Padberg that a facilitator would be hired to lead the Board through their 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 with their 2009 self-evaluation, was selected [4.02].

The evaluation process took place in three stages. Stage one involved the administering of three similar surveys in April/May 2011 – one for the Board of Trustee members [4.03], one for Chancellor’s Cabinet (a district-wide cabinet composed of members from all shared governance groups), administrators, and managers (CAM), all of whom regularly observe the Board in action [4.04], and one for all employees of the district [4.05] – and a comparison of the responses [4.06]. The surveys were administered online and were completely anonymous.

Stage two involved a Board of Trustees Self Evaluation Workshop held on May 14, 2011, at the Mission Viejo Country Club. This meeting was open to the public and announced throughout the District [4.07]. The District-wide 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 videotaped. It was decided that, in
the interest of candor, the workshop would be held off-campus and not videotaped.
However, everyone was invited to attend and the results of the discussion would be
widely distributed. Only three people apart from the Board and the Chancellor attended
the workshop (the two College Presidents and a Saddleback College faculty member
who was observing it for the purposes of this report), allowing the Board members to
engage in a frank dialogue.

The facilitator set the agenda of the workshop based upon an analysis of the data from
the surveys [4.08]. This included a review of the Board’s self-identified strengths and
areas of improvements [4.09], 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 for which 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 these 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 improve these
perceptions. Moreover, the Board 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 [4.10].

At the end of the discussion, concrete actions and tasks were developed, and are
summarized below [4.11]. Progress on these items will be 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 and 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 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 regularly occurs. The Chancellor will present a proposed 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 an opportunity to comment. The Board will consider the feasibility of doing a survey in six or so months to gather perceptions on 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 rationale 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 of its communications and leadership on creating an environment for safe, open, and professional communication, and will strive to do so.

10. The Board will ensure there are opportunities for it to engage fully in discussions on policy issues. The staff will be asked to present reports in such a way that engage trustees in discussions; trustees will ensure that meetings allow time to
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, Chancellor Poertner reported on the Board self evaluation, and mentioned that a webpage was created on the District web site which outlines the entire self-evaluation process and where individuals can access all of the pertinent documents [4.12; 4.13].

On May 31, 2011, District employees were sent an email by Tere Fluegeman, District Director of Public Affairs, alerting them to the existence of this webpage.

**Evaluation**

One point that was raised on several occasions during the Board self evaluation on May 14, 2010, is that there is a new Chancellor who has the respect of both the Board members and College employees as well as several new Trustees. There was a sense of optimism about positive changes in the future, and they were looking forward to conducting a new survey in the near future to monitor changes in perception about the Board and its functioning among District employees. This optimism is also reflected in anecdotal statements made by members of the College community.

During the fall 2010 Chancellor’s opening session, the Chancellor discussed some positive changes that have already occurred in relation to the Board goal of strengthening "its role in being knowledgeable about, setting standards for, and monitoring and discussing student success and educational quality " (see Goal 7 above). The Board is committed to providing more opportunities for the Colleges, including faculty, to present information in order to facilitate this greater understanding, and at the July meeting IVC President Glenn Roquemore gave a presentation on the Trustees’ role in accreditation [4.14]. Also slated for this year are presentations on:

- Educational Quality and Academic Programs (September 2011)
- Educational Program Review and Student Learning Outcomes (October 2011)
- Student Success Improvements and Vision 2020 Planning (November 2011)

**Additional Planning Agendas**

1. The Chancellor, the SOCCCD Director of Public Affairs and College President will ensure that employees and the general public are kept apprised of progress on the action items from the 2011 Board of Trustees Self Evaluation.

2. The Chancellor will evaluate the success of this process, and make any necessary adjustments for future years.
Evidence for District Recommendation 4

4.01 Board Policy 172, Board Self Evaluation

4.02 Minutes of the District-wide Accreditation Committee, April 8, 2011

4.03 Board of Trustees Self Evaluation Survey Results
   http://www.socccd.edu/about/documents/BOTSelfEvaluationResults.pdf

4.04 CAM Board Evaluation Survey Results
   http://www.socccd.edu/about/documents/BOTEvaluationResults_CAM.pdf

4.05 All District Employees Board Evaluation Survey Results
   http://www.socccd.edu/about/documents/BOTEvaluationResults_All.pdf

4.06 Comparison of Responses on Surveys
   http://www.socccd.edu/about/documents/ComparisonofSurveyResponses.SelfEvaluation.PDF

4.07 Notice of Special Board Meeting

4.08 Board of Trustees Self Evaluation Workshop Discussion Outline, May 14, 2011
   http://www.socccd.edu/about/documents/DiscussionOutline.pdf

4.09 Board of Trustees Self Evaluation Workshop Highlights of Strengths/Areas of Improvement, May 14, 2011
   http://www.socccd.edu/about/documents/StrengthsandImprovements.PDF

4.10 Board of Trustees Self Evaluation Workshop Discussion Notes, May 14, 2011

4.11 Board of Trustees Self Evaluation Workshop Outcomes, May 14, 2011

4.12 Board Meeting Highlights, May 23, 2011
   http://www.socccd.edu/board/highlights/5-23-2011.htm

4.13 Board Self Evaluation Web Page
   http://www.socccd.edu/about/BoardSelfEvaluation.html
4.14 Agenda of the Board of Trustees Meeting, July 25, 2011

Response to District Recommendation 5

**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 our 2010 Self Study Report, however, the policy did not include a stated process for dealing with Board behavior that violates the policy, and we recommended that such a clause be added. The visiting team 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, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources David Bugay 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. [5.01]. Based upon this information, Dr. Bugay drafted a new policy, which was renumbered as Board Policy 110 in order to more closely follow CCLC Board Policy number conventions.

At the February 11, 2011 meeting of the Board Policy and Administrative Regulations Council (BPARC), a district-wide participatory governance committee, the first draft of the revised Board Policy was presented to its members [5.02]. The revised policy included the following new section on enforcement [5.03]:

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 the 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 of 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 their 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 would immediately be sent to the Trustees for their input; following Trustee comment, the policy would return to BPARC 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 [5.04]. The Trustees were given two months to provide comment to the proposed policy changes.

After incorporating the Trustee input, a revised draft policy was returned to the Vice Chancellor to present to BPARC at their next regularly scheduled meeting in June 2011. The revised draft policy was placed on the BPARC agenda for review, comment, and revision, and then forwarded to all governance constituency groups within the District [5.05]. Each Saddleback College constituency group representative presented the revised policy to their membership for review [5.05, 5.06]. Following approval from College constituency groups, the policy was once again brought back to BPARC for final discussion, approval and recommendation to the Chancellor. The Chancellor reviewed the final draft policy and placed it on the August 29, 2011, Board agenda [5.07] for adoption and implementation. It was unanimously approved by the Board of Trustees.

Evaluation
Additional Planning Agendas

None
Evidence for District Recommendation 5

5.01 E-mail from Vice Chancellor Bugay to Mary Dowell
   Link

5.02 Minutes of BPARC, February, 11, 2011
   Link

5.03 Board Policy 110, Code of Ethics – Standards of Practice
   Link

5.04 Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, April 25, 2011

5.05 Minutes of BPARC, June 24, 2011
   Link

5.06 Minutes of the Saddleback College Classified Senate, xx, xx, 2011
   Link

5.07 Minutes of the Saddleback College Academic Senate, August 3, 2011
   Link

5.08 Minutes of the Board of Trustee Meeting, August 29, 2011
   Link
Response to District Recommendation 6

**District Recommendation 6:** The teams recommend that the district provide a clear delineation of its functional responsibilities, the district level process for decision making and the role of the district in college planning and decision making. The district should provide a regular review of district communities, conduct an assessment of the overall effectiveness of services to the college and communicate the results of those reviews (IV.B.3.a., IV.B.3.b., IV.B.3.e., and IV.B.3.f).

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 district-wide functional responsibilities.

To address previous visiting team recommendations, in May 2007 the then-Vice Chancellor of Technology and Learning Resources, Andrea Serban, coordinated the efforts of representatives from Irvine Valley College, Saddleback College, and the District offices in developing a district-wide function map that delineated institutional roles based on primary, secondary, or shared responsibilities. The function map did not include any detail about the exact responsibilities of each entity and it was not subsequently reviewed or modified at the District level. During the 2010 accreditation self study, Saddleback College, working with the then-District Director of Public Affairs, Tracy Daly, revised the function map and added narrative for each of the standards and sub-standards in an effort to better understand how decisions are implemented across the District. In their 2010 accreditation report, Irvine Valley College used a function map identical to that developed in 2007.

District Recommendation 6 Task Force, chaired by Vice Chancellor of Human Resources David Bugay, began by looking at the different function maps submitted by the Colleges, as well as models from other community colleges in the State. The first decision reached was that the function map should be district-wide and not developed independently at each College. The second decision was that the model used at Saddleback College in 2010 would be adopted, with an additional column added for Irvine Valley College [6.01]. The District column was revised as changes were being implemented due to the work of the accreditation task forces. The task force also looked at discrepancies between the two function maps and resolved them in a collegial
manner. The resulting document is a comprehensive function map [6.02] that more accurately reflects the functioning of each entity with respect to the accreditation standards, and it will serve as the basis for future elaborations of the work flow in relation to the roles and responsibilities of the Colleges and the District offices.

Another main area of concern for the task force was the organization, communication methods, and responsibilities of district-wide committees. The following recommendations were made by the task force and have been implemented:

- Creation of uniform SharePoint sites for all district-wide committees so that there would be a record of the committee’s charge or purpose, committee membership, meeting times, agendas, minutes, and decisions made [6.03].

- Review of all district-wide councils, committees, and task forces with the end result being a clear understanding of the committee structure at the district level, as well as the purpose and membership of each committee [6.04; 6.07]. The committees were divided into the following categories:
  
  o **Council:** Composed of administrators and/or executive representatives of faculty, staff, or student organizations. A council often directs the work of numerous committees or task forces. A council meets regularly and its charge is broad in scope.

  o **Committee:** Composed of a variety of individuals whose scope of work is narrower than a council. A committee reports its recommendations to senior administrators or a council. A committee can be long-term in nature and may meet on a regular basis.

  o **Task Forces:** Deal with one or more specific issues on a one-time or ongoing basis. The membership might not include representatives from all governance groups.

  o **Work Groups:** Sub-groups of a larger committee that work on a particular, singular issue and then report back.

- Creation of a **SOCCCD Planning and Decision-Making Manual** in order to consolidate all documentation of the district-wide processes [6.05].

- Inclusion of all committees in the **SOCCCD Planning and Decision-Making Manual**. The committee pages were modeled after the Irvine Valley College committee pages in their planning manual [6.05].

- Implementation of an annual self-evaluation for each committee, the results of which would be placed upon the committee’s SharePoint site [6.06]. The process for this self evaluation would be determined by the each committee and
review periodically for effectiveness. The self evaluation process must include the following components:

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

- Development of standardized templates for committee agenda and minutes so that information regarding all recommendations and actions taken would be clear and easily accessed [6.06].

- Development for direction of how committees should function in relation to decision-making. It was recommended that all district-wide committees function on the basis of consensus, and the following model from the IVC Planning and Decision-Making Manual was recommended [6.07]:

  Committees and task forces that operate on the principle of consensus generally follow these guidelines:

  1. **Clarification of the Issue:** At the outset of the discussion, the issue(s) are clearly presented.
  2. **Discussion/Dialogue:** A range of alternatives may be presented to the committee or developed by the committee for discussion. When possible, the committee modifies alternatives to accommodate the interests of committee representatives.
  3. **Participation:** Committee representatives accept responsibility for attending meetings and contributing to the discussion. Silence is not consensus. Absence is not participation.
  4. **Consensus Does not Mean Unanimity:** The committee reaches consensus once all representatives have had an opportunity to contribute to the discussion. Consensus requires majority rather than unanimous approval.
  5. **Committee Recommendations/Decisions:** Once consensus is achieved, all committee representatives support the decision of the committee. Committees work according to the assumption that silence during the discussion or speaking against the committee decision undermines the process.

**Evaluation**
Additional Planning Agendas

1. Develop work flow documents for the Colleges and District offices in relation to their different function in key areas (e.g., human resources, purchasing).

2. Regularly update the SOCCCD Planning and Decision-Making Manual so that it always reflects current processes.

3. Regularly review the district-wide Committee structure to determine if all existing committees are still relevant and make changes as needed.
Evidence for District Recommendation 6

6.01 Minutes of the Recommendation 6 Task Force, May 11, 2011
https://accreditation.socccd.edu/rtf6/Shared%20Documents/Meeting%20Agenda%20and%20Minutes/Minutes%20Accred%20Rec%20Functional%20Responsibilities%202011%202005%202011.pdf

6.02 SOCCCD Function Map
Link when final

6.03 Minutes of the Recommendation 6 Task Force, June 6, 2011
https://accreditation.socccd.edu/rtf6/Shared%20Documents/Meeting%20Agenda%20and%20Minutes/Minutes%20Accred%20Rec%20Functional%20Responsibilities%202011%202006%202006.pdf

6.04 SOCCCD District-wide Councils, Committees and Task Forces
https://accreditation.socccd.edu/rtf6/Handouts/District-wide%20Committees%20revised%202011%202007%202029.pdf

6.05 SOCCCD Planning and Decision-Making Manual
Link

6.06 Minutes of the Recommendation 6 Task Force, June 20, 2011
https://accreditation.socccd.edu/rtf6/Shared%20Documents/Meeting%20Agenda%20and%20Minutes/Minutes%20Accred%20Rec%20Functional%20Responsibilities%202011%202006%202020%20Final.pdf

6.07 Minutes of the Recommendation 6 Task Force, July 20, 2011
https://accreditation.socccd.edu/rtf6/Shared%20Documents/Meeting%20Agenda%20and%20Minutes/Minutes%20Accred%20Rec%20Functional%20Responsibilities%202011%202007%202020%20Final.pdf