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Statement on Report Preparation

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, took action to reaffirm the accreditation of Cabrillo College at its meeting on January 8-10, 2014. The action letter from the Commission set in motion the process of responding to four recommendations and six actionable improvement plans.

The College immediately began engaging our participatory governance process to work on the recommendations and action plans. An Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) was formed and was designated as the Accreditation Steering Committee.

The IEC reports to the College Planning Council (CPC). The charge of this committee is to improve program planning and resource allocation processes in support of student learning by:

- Ensuring program planning processes are documented
- Providing technical assistance to units developing program plans including establishing baseline data, designing measurable outcomes connected to College strategic plans and utilizing findings from evaluation efforts
- Reviewing and analyzing goals to identify institutional themes to aid the integration of planning and resource allocation efforts
- Recommending improvements to processes to ensure efficacy in fulfilling the college mission and meeting accreditation standards
- Communicating trends and findings with the campus community and visiting accreditation teams

IEC Membership:

- Director of Planning and Research, IEC Chair, ex-officio
- VP Instruction, Accreditation Liaison Officer, ex-officio
- VP Administrative Services, ex-officio
- VP Student Services, ex-officio
- Accreditation Co-Chair (2)
- Outcomes Assessment Review Committee Chair, ex-officio
- Administrator/Manager (2)
- Faculty (2)
- Confidential Staff (1)
- Classified Staff (2)
This midterm report summarizes the work Cabrillo has done on the site team's recommendations and the self-identified planning agendas. The Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) compiled a draft report that was reviewed and edited by the IEC. The report was then sent to the College Planning Council and the Faculty Senate for review and was approved by the Governing Board on June 6, 2016.

Laurel Jones, Superintendent/President

Date

9/30/14
Response to Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letter

Recommendation 1

In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the College build on its extensive, meaningful dialogue and develop a plan to document and assess institutional effectiveness more thoroughly through a culture of evidence embedded in codified roles, systems, and processes.

In response to Recommendation 1, Cabrillo formed the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) to address all institutional goals and objectives and to ensure integration of planning and resource allocation. In addition, Cabrillo developed a list of centralized committees, members, and reporting lines that was published in the Participatory Governance Manual in December 2014 and posted on the website of Cabrillo’s highest level participatory governance committee, the College Planning Council (CPC). Up-to-date memberships for the primary governance committees and links to their sites are available on the CPC website. An agenda template was also created in October 2013 for each participatory governance committee that included institutional effectiveness measures and goals. The agenda template was revised and updated based upon committee feedback and has now been replaced by BoardDocs, where every participatory governance committee posts agendas and minutes for public view. BoardDocs also serves as a searchable database to guide content searches of Cabrillo and all other institutions using BoardDocs to compare policies and approaches to common problems. With these institution-wide tools, our dialogue has been transformed from ephemeral conversations into systematic documentation readily accessible by the campus community.

To codify roles, systems, and processes, the aforementioned Participatory Governance Manual was developed and refined to both capture existing effective practices and clarify where needed. For example, Structures for Participation (page 8 of the manual) codifies the roles of participatory governance committees, operational committees, subcommittees, ad hoc committees, and task forces. These terms had previously been used somewhat interchangeably, in some instances, such as with subcommittees and task forces. The terms have now been clarified to indicate the former is permanent and the latter is issue- and time-limited. The distinction between participatory governance and operational committees has also been helpful in setting standards for representation and communication with governance committees having constituency representation. In addition, this work also developed consistency in the posting of agendas and minutes for Brown Act compliance. Operational committees have functional representation relevant to the committee’s charge. In addition to providing definitions of terms and roles, the Participatory Governance Manual also provides a diagram of the Cabrillo College Committee Structure, which shows committee reporting lines (page 9) and the Decision Making flowchart (page 12). Additional process flows for program planning are available on the Planning and Research Office (PRO) website. The processes
and associated diagrams were developed through an iterative and collaborative effort among the Outcomes Assessment Review Committee (ARC), Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC), Administrative Council, and the College Planning Council (CPC).

Two training sessions on decision making processes were provided to the members of the CPC:

1. CPC Retreat:
   - 10/04/13 CPC Agenda
2. Pizza workshop – training on new agenda templates and website and the decision-making process:
   - 08/19/15 CPC - Committee Workshop Agenda.pdf
   - How to Run an Effective Meeting (training handouts)
     - Decision Making.pdf
     - Decisions, Decisions!

Training was also provided to managers for team building and decision-making processes in the following meetings:

- Managers’ Agenda 11/05/14
- Managers’ Meeting/Handling Difficult Conversations 11/05/14
- Managers’ Agenda 03/04/15
- Managers’ Meeting/Creating a Climate of Trust 03/04/15
- Governing Board Online Evaluation Form - Fall 2013

Classified staff were provided with an opportunity for team building training through a variety of Professional Development Workshops for Classified Staff.

The Planning and Research Office (PRO) provided support on a year-long process to develop a data-driven five-year Strategic Plan. These data were presented in a series of forums and meetings to hundreds of participants. A visioning task force used participant feedback to create draft focus areas and goals that were finalized and adopted by CPC and the Governing Board. Each year the annual goals are prioritized through the participatory governance process and posted on the College Strategic Planning website for public access along with SmartSheets that track progress towards strategic plan goals.

These updated strategic goals provide a basis for integrating program planning into resource requests to achieve College goals. After the team site visit, the College expanded its program planning and resource allocation process to include all operational units in all stages of their planning cycle. Previously, departments and services would have requests associated only with a six-year comprehensive program plan. We have since moved to invite resource requests each year as part of the annual update process. All requests must be tied to a strategic goal or other institutional plan such as the Technology Plan, Facilities Plan, or Educational Master Plan. Resource requests are collected centrally via survey software and distributed to components (Instruction, Student Services,
Administrative Services, President’s Office) for prioritization and identification of possible funding sources within their operational committees. Cross-component dialog in the President’s Cabinet finalizes prioritizations and funding source recommendations. These are forwarded to the CPC for review, feedback, and approval followed by submission to the Governing Board for review and approval.

The IEC analyzes the final requests and allocations to determine trends, gaps, and process improvements. One planned improvement is the infrastructure that collects and manages requests. Currently, the process involves web surveys and spreadsheets with manual processing to incorporate the request and prioritization task with existing program planning processes. The college is now ready to develop a more robust infrastructure consisting of a database solution that will manage requests and prioritization scores and link allocations to budget data in the campus system. This will help ensure more precise, timely, and accurate allocations by providing budget codes and balances. It will also result in a data set that can be more readily and extensively analyzed. The college has requested technical assistance from the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) to aid the planning and design phase of such a system.

The IEC worked with PRO to create possible metrics of committee effectiveness and used them, along with information from other colleges, to design and implement an effectiveness survey (Participatory Governance Survey for Facilitators Reporting to the CPC). The results were presented to each primary governance committee with an omnibus analysis provided to the CPC. Each committee generated recommendations for improving their processes and effectiveness, which will be assessed.

Evidence (The items in the evidence list are hyperlinks to the documents.)
  - Participatory Governance Manual
  - BoardDocs
  - Cabrillo Structures for Participation
  - Cabrillo College Committee Structure
  - Cabrillo College Decision Making Flowchart
  - Strategic Plan Visioning
  - College Strategic Planning
  - Participatory Governance Survey for Facilitators Reporting to the CPC
  - Resource Request Process

CPC Training Sessions:
  - 10/4/13 Agenda - CPC Retreat
  - 8/19/15 CPC - Committee Workshop Agenda.pdf
  - 8/19/15 CPC Meeting - Decision Making.pdf (216 KB)
  - 8/19/15 CPC Meeting - Decisions, Decisions!
Managers Training Sessions:
Managers’ Agenda 11-05-2014
Managers’ Meeting/Handling Difficult Conversations 11-05-2014
Managers’ Agenda 03-04-2015
Managers’ Meeting/Creating a Climate of Trust 03-04-2015
Governing Board Online Evaluation Form - Fall 2013
Classified Training: Professional Development Workshops for Classified Staff
Recommendation 2

In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the College clarify and document its definition of a program and include the evaluation and improvement of all degree offerings in the program review and planning process.

The Outcomes Assessment Review Committee (ARC), a shared governance committee that analyzes each year’s SLO and Administrative Unit Outcome (AUO) assessment results and makes recommendations to improve assessment processes across the campus, began the process to meet recommendation #2 immediately after our site visit.

The first step was to analyze the recommendation itself. ARC meeting minutes of 10/22/13, held immediately after the site visit, captured the preliminary thoughts of the group, which were only deepened when the college received the team’s final report and recommendation. The committee noted the following:

- Those interviewed by the visiting team gave differing definitions of a program.
- A quick perusal of the college website found different usages of the word “program.” For instance, the English Department described its courses and major as a program, but listed its writing awards as departmental awards. The website for Mathematics says “Welcome to the Math Department” and then described its courses and degrees. There was no consistency.
- Though the college was clear that it was using data from the assessment of its college core competencies to measure three different levels of assessment - institutional level outcomes, the General Education (GE) program, and program outcomes for degrees in transfer - this was not clear to the visiting team. There were no maps of the assessment process to guide them, and the SLO assessment forms and program planning documents (Cabrillo’s name for program review) did not differentiate between the results for each specific area.

During spring semester 2014, ARC created an action plan (ARC’s Action Plan to Meet ACCJC Recommendation #2) to define and document what the College means by an “academic program” and to clarify and better publicize the assessment and program review processes for all degree offerings. The plan, along with its calendar for the accomplishment of its steps, was then taken to the following campus committees for feedback and approval:

- Instruction Council - 03/06/14 Minutes
- Faculty Senate - 10/07/14 Minutes
- College Planning Council - ARC 2014 Summary Annual Report - 05/20/15
- Governing Board Annual Report on Student Learning Outcomes at Cabrillo - 06/08/15
The plan has four major parts:

1. Defining a program.
2. Publicizing that definition.
3. Demonstrating the link between the College core competencies and transfer degrees.
4. Evaluating all programs through program planning.

I. Definition of a Program:

An academic program at Cabrillo College is now defined as:
“A collection or series of courses that lead to a degree, certificate, or transfer to another institution of higher education. For purposes of college organization, a program is composed of all the degrees and certificates offered by a specific academic department. Career Technical Education departments that offer separate programs accredited by different outside accrediting agencies are considered one department that offers multiple programs.”

An academic department is defined as:
“A group of faculty in a related field of study or a discipline that offers an academic program.”

Departments are people. Programs are courses of study, certificates and degrees.

As a result of this new definition, Cabrillo has gone from having twenty-one programs to fifty-six programs (see the difference in numbers in ACCJC Annual Reports 2014 and 2015).

Six of those programs are interdisciplinary and are not located within specific departments. They include:

- Bilingual/Bicultural Studies
- General Education
- General Science
- Latin American and Latino/a Studies (a certificate is in the process of being approved by the Chancellor’s Office and, once it is approved, a degree will then be created).
- Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Liberal Studies/Elementary Teaching

ARC has created a Proposal to Assess Interdisciplinary Programs Not Assigned to a Specific Department to assess those programs and will undertake a pilot of the plan in spring 2016 (12/07/15 ARC minutes).
II. Publicizing the Definition of a Program

The definition is now published in the following places:

- College Catalog (page 48)
- Program Planning Instructions
- SLO Website

In addition, it is in process of being added to the appropriate areas of the:

- Board Policies and Administrative Procedures
- Faculty contract
- Other documents that include programs
- College website (including each academic department’s website and listing under Majors/Programs)

A publicity campaign to highlight the new definition is also underway. It has repeatedly been discussed as part of the SLO Coordinator’s reports at Faculty Senate, at the Governing Board meetings, and in division meetings. The campaign will include presentations at the Department Chairs meeting during spring 2016 staff development week, division meetings, and other venues that arise from campus activities, as appropriate.

III. Demonstrating the Link between the Core 4 and Transfer Degrees

To clarify that the assessment of the institutional outcomes, known as the Core 4, is used to assess transfer degrees, the GE program and the College’s institutional outcomes, the following has been accomplished:

- New maps of Cabrillo’s Outcomes Assessment Process are posted on the SLO website (see Map of Cabrillo’s Assessment Process on the main page. This is a summary of all assessment areas. For more detailed maps of assessment in Transfer and Basic Skills, CTE, Student Services, Library, and Administration, click on the area listed on the main page under Assessment Areas. A link to the map will appear at the top of the next page, which describes the assessment process of that particular area of the College).

- Changes in the college Catalog make this more clear, including listing the Core 4 as program outcomes for all transfer degrees (example: English AA-T degree).
In addition, ARC plans to facilitate the creation of maps that show which courses in a transfer degree teach the specific skills contained in each of the Core 4. The mapping of the outcomes of a course to institutional outcomes is part of the curriculum course outline of record (COR), but the COR does not show a link to a specific transfer degree. Though the new mapping work was scheduled to start in spring 2016, beginning with the AA-T and AS-T degrees, it was recently postponed due to the College interest in the book *Redesigning America’s Community Colleges* by Bailey, Jaggars and Jenkins, and the creation of transfer pathways. ARC decided to postpone the mapping to avoid duplication of effort and “until there is more clarity on how to map and what the mapping should look like.” (ARC minutes of 11/09/15)

IV. Evaluation of all Degree Offerings in the Program Review and Planning Process

The College has taken the following steps to clarify that all degree offerings are being assessed through the program planning process.

- Since assessment of the College’s core competencies or institutional outcomes are used to measure three different assessment levels, the Core 4 Assessment forms have been revised to include separate discussions of what the results indicate about student mastery of the transfer degree, the GE program, and the institutional outcome. As the college is in the process of transitioning from a paper-based process to an electronic one, the SLO website now contains samples in both formats: a downloadable paper form and the CurricUNET form.

- The SLO section of transfer departments’ program plans now includes separate discussions of what the Core 4 assessment results indicate about student mastery of skills for a degree, the GE program, and institutional outcomes in general.

- A Proposal to Assess Interdisciplinary Programs Not Assigned to a Specific Department was developed to assess the six programs that are interdisciplinary and do not belong to a single department. (See 12/07/15 ARC Minutes for details.)

When the creation of the new SLO module in CurricUNET’s meta version is complete (spring 2016), new reports will be designed to gather Core 4 assessment results for all courses that are included as part of a degree so that a separate report is generated and evaluated by the department. The same process will be used to gather Core 4 assessment data for all courses required by the interdisciplinary degrees so that the faculty who teach in those programs, along with ARC, can evaluate student learning in the program overall.

The changes that have been made are new, so data are not yet available to assess effectiveness. ARC will be monitoring progress and analyzing its results, and reporting results in its annual report. Effectiveness measures will include:
• Surveying the campus for its familiarity with the definition of a program.

• Monitoring program plans submitted to the Council for Instructional Planning (CIP) to make sure that the three uses of Core 4 assessment data (to measure a transfer degree, the department’s contribution to the GE program, and the department's contribution to student mastery of the College’s institutional outcome) are discussed separately, rather than conflated, as has been done in the past. This will occur as part of the normal process of approving program plans by CIP.

• Monitoring Core 4 assessment forms to make sure that they include discussion of a transfer degree, the GE program and the college's institutional outcomes. This will occur as part of the normal process of approving SLO assessment forms by the SLO Coordinator.

In the latter two measures, it will be interesting to note the number of departments who will be asked to make changes over the coming years; hopefully, as the knowledge of these definitions becomes institutionalized across campus, the number will decrease.

Evidence (The items in the evidence list are hyperlinks to the documents.)

10/22/13 ARC Meeting Minutes
10/07/14 Faculty Senate Minutes
ARC’s Action Plan to Meet ACCJC Recommendation #2
College Planning Council - ARC 2014 Summary Annual Report - 05/20/15
Annual Report on Student Learning Outcomes at Cabrillo - Governing Board 06/08/15
ACCJC Annual Report 2014 - page 4
ACCJC Annual Report 2015 - page 4
Proposal to Assess Interdisciplinary Programs that don’t belong to a Specific Department
Definition of a Program - 2015-16 College Catalog (page 48)
Instructional Program Planning Instructions
Cabrillo College Mission, Vision, Core 4 Competencies, Accreditation
Cabrillo’s Outcome Assessment Process
English AA-T degree
11/09/15 ARC Minutes
12/07/15 ARC Minutes
Core 4 Assessment forms
Recommendation 3

In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the College expand and enhance its governance manual to clarify the roles and responsibilities of each of the college governance elements. In addition, the team recommends that the College develop a clear process and timeline for the evaluation and continuous improvement of the college planning and decision-making processes.

The process of clarifying committee definitions and roles in the Participatory Governance Manual (see page 8) allowed the college to systematically review its list of committees and determine a number of subcommittees, ad hoc committees, and task forces that had either completed their task and could be removed from the current list or been elevated to standing committees to align their designation with their actual function. For example, the Climate Initiative Task Force, previously a stand-alone effort disconnected from the governance structure, became the Sustainability and Climate Planning Committee reporting to the Facilities Planning Committee (FPC). Another example of merging was the Student Success Committee and Equity Committee merging into the Student Success and Equity Committee to ensure greater coordination of efforts and leveraging of categorical funds.

For all committees the College engaged in discussion to verify their purpose, membership, and reporting lines. The list is dynamic and is updated as new committees or task forces are created or disbanded. This greatly helped improve the clarity of the role of the committees, the charge of the members, and the process for moving recommendations through the governance process in a way that is clear and understandable to the campus community.

As noted previously, the primary governance committees all report directly to the CPC and bring forth recommendations for the CPC to consider. CPC members respond to proposals requesting clarification or consideration of alternatives, communicate with their constituents, and make a recommendation to the President. One key area the CPC reviews is the program planning resource allocation list of priorities and the process of prioritization. CPC also receives information about items not requiring approvals to disseminate critical information about items such as anticipated legislative, regulatory, or budgetary changes.

The Participatory Governance Manual requires regular updating to maintain accuracy and relevance. The College has aligned the update cycle with the three-year review of the Mission Statement (see IEC website). In addition, the visioning process has continued to develop a set of value statements that will inform the Mission and updates of governance processes. To ensure effective committees, the College has established two strategies to help guide committees and provide feedback. As noted previously, committees responded to a governance survey on their function, composition, and
effectiveness that will be repeated on at least a three-year cycle. In addition, primary governance committees are asked to develop goals each year in conjunction with the CPC, measure progress towards those goals, and report to the CPC on achievements, barriers to success, and changing conditions at the end of the academic year. These goals are aligned with the strategic plan, other institutional plans and initiatives, and the goals of related operational units. For example, the IEC goals are largely derived from accreditation recommendations that, in turn, are codified in several strategic plan goals, and PRO goals overlap significantly with the IEC goals as the primary operational unit that supports the committee. Similar goal alignments are seen among the Technology Committee, Technology Plan, and Information Technology program plan as well as the Facilities and Planning Committee, the Facilities Master Plan, and the Facilities Planning and Plant Operations program plan. Timelines for key evaluation activities are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Party(ies)</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review progress on strategic plan goals.</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness Committee, College Planning Council</td>
<td>Annually each spring. Full plan update every 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey primary governance committee members to assess committee and facilitator effectiveness for overall decision making</td>
<td>Planning and Research administers survey</td>
<td>Spring term every three years (2015, 2018, 2021, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate college mission and vision statements via surveys, forums, and task force activities</td>
<td>President’s Office, Planning and Research</td>
<td>Every three years (2014, 2017, 2020, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Governance Manual</td>
<td>President’s Office, College Planning Council</td>
<td>Every three years (2014, 2017, 2020, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate resource allocation process by analyzing input from participants via request form and committee dialogue</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness Committee</td>
<td>Late fall after each allocation cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate program review and assessment results and process by analyzing program plan content, input from participants, and</td>
<td>Assessment Review Committee, Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Administrative Services Council, Administrative Council, Council of Instruction</td>
<td>Ongoing and annually after each planning cycle; late spring for Instruction and late fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee dialogue</td>
<td>Instructional Planning, Instructional Council, Student Services Council</td>
<td>for all other areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Evidence (The items in the evidence list are hyperlinks to the documents.)_

- Structures for Participation
- Participatory Governance Survey
- Cabrillo’s Decision Making Process
- Institutional Effective Committee with Timeline for Key Evaluation Activities
Recommendation 4

In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends greater use of and evaluation of evidentiary data with a systematic process for capturing evidence of decisions and disseminating the results widely for use by all appropriate college constituents.

The systematic use of data in decision making requires two key components: (1) ready access to data and (2) the ability to interpret the data in the context of specific issues. To aid data access, great efforts have been made at the state and college level to allow college personnel to access self-service data on the web. While the state has greatly expanded the Chancellor’s Office Data Mart, Cabrillo has mirrored this effort by making a fully electronic Fact Book that provides data not available through state sources. In addition, the college created a robust database infrastructure that supports a set of automated reports using SQL reporting services to support operations, outreach, and program planning by operational units. This SQL database also supports the College’s award-winning web-based reporting tool called Student Outcomes for Faculty Inquiry and Analysis (SOFIA). Modeled after the Chancellor’s Office Data Mart, the SOFIA tool and associated back-end database provides access to detailed level student achievement data to assist program evaluation, achievement gap identification, curriculum design, and intervention design.

In addition, the College has invested in a team of campus researchers who conduct customized analyses not available through automated reports. The research team also aids the campus community in the interpretation of data. Members of the research team are formal members of many of the governance and operational committees and are frequent guests to many of the remaining committees. While college personnel are encouraged and supported to independently access and interpret data with colleagues, the ready availability of the research team supports inquiry, interpretation, and practical application.

To better capture evidence of decision-making processes and the use of evidence, great strides have been made to create a consistent collection of agendas and minutes. The college began with a set of word templates for agendas and minutes that all committees were asked to use and post on their websites. Committees were also asked to standardize the web presence so that their landing page matched the design of the CPC page. The standardization of formatting and expectation of posting agendas and minutes contributes to transparency (making it easier for the community to locate materials of interest) and incentivizes the documentation of evidence-based rationale for decisions. The college has recently upgraded to using BoardDocs Pro, which uses a web-based system for agendas and minutes and contains a centralized, searchable library for hosting documents. Now, rather than visiting a series of different sites to follow a decision-making process, users can access a single searchable portal.
Another venue for incentivizing use of evidence resides in the resource request prioritization process. The program planning resource request form asks requestors to provide evidence of need to ensure the request is relevant and assist the prioritization task. For the development of the Student Equity Plan last year, a Student Equity Plan Proposal Evaluation Rubric was created to evaluate proposals and weight proposals based upon efforts with demonstrated prior efficacy. The rubric itself was evaluated by the Student Equity and Success Committee. Recommendations for improvement were made that will be applied to other resource allocation processes beyond just equity projects.

A new community annual report was created to share Cabrillo news and highlights with our community. This report contains basic data about the district and qualitative information about initiatives and strategies to meet the needs of the community.

Evidence (*The items in the evidence list are hyperlinks to the documents.*)

- Cabrillo Fact Book 2015
- Student Equity Plan Proposal Evaluation Rubric
- Students Outcomes for Faculty Inquiry and Analysis (SOFIA)
- BoardDocs
- Cabrillo’s Outcome Assessment Process
- Cabrillo Annual Report to the Community 2013-14
- Cabrillo Annual Report to the Community 2014-15
Response to Self-Identified Issues

Planning Agenda 1

Fully implement the Integrated Program Planning cycle at all of its stages throughout the College at each department, division and component level.

The college has fully implemented an integrated program planning cycle. While there are planned infrastructure upgrades and process improvements, all departments, offices, and administrative units on campus participate in program planning integrated with resource request and allocation activities. Full implementation began in 2013-2014 when one-time money was allocated to fund prioritized program plan goals. Administrative units are the newest to the process and provide feedback to improve the program planning templates and help design the updated process for those units, with review and input primarily by Administrative Council, the Assessment Review Committee, and the Institutional Effective Committee with additional feedback from College Planning Council, Cabinet, and the component councils (Instruction, Students Services, Administrative Services, President). The creation of comprehensive master calendars ensued along with cross linking of component area websites to centralize program planning documentation on a single landing page on the PRO website.

The program planning resource request allocation process has been evaluated and improved each year to make the forms easier for college personnel to fill out, requests more readily prioritized, and the management of request data centralized for better analysis. One example of a major change for next year consists of budget requests being linked to budget codes rather than free text budget categories.

In year one, only a single source of one-time funds was allocated to program planning goals. In year two, a more comprehensive allocation process resulted in about twenty different funding sources including one-time carryover funds and special-purpose funding. This resulted in more coordinated and efficient allocations but created an additional budget reconciliation burden that we will mitigate this year by tying budget codes to allocations. This also puts us on track for the adoption of a database system for tracking program planning requests tied directly to budget tables in the campus system. This program planning database effort is the basis for a request of technical assistance from the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative as mentioned previously. To connect resource allocation to effectiveness, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee analyzed the distribution of allocations by request type, college component, and funding source. One finding was that requests for tutoring and similar academic supports were much more likely to be highly prioritized and funded. An evaluation of math tutoring conducted last year using multivariate regression and
propensity score-matching techniques indicated that math tutoring was likely an effective intervention with some caveats (Effects of Math Tutoring). This suggests that the highest priority allocations were to interventions with evidence of efficacy.

The committee also examined the allocations according to which strategic priority it supported. Most of the instructional component allocations related to the Sustainable Programs and Services area and only a few to other areas, which was expected given the primary function of that component. Overall, while subsequent analyses will be more detailed, the discussions this new integrated funding allocation has fostered appear to be achieving the goal of more thoughtful and effective distributions of resources.

Evidence (The items in the evidence list are hyperlinks to the documents.)
- Planning and Research Website
- Administrative Unit Plan Schedule 2012-2026
- Program Planning and Resource Allocation Diagram
- Institutional Effective Committee with Timeline for Key Evaluation Activities
- Effects of Math Tutoring
Planning Agenda 2

Develop a staggered, comprehensive six-year cycle with annual updates for all departments undergoing Administrative/non-Instructional Program Planning.

Since 2002, the College had been working to establish and improve a regular cycle of program review for administrative unit outcomes (AUO). Early pilot efforts led to a more comprehensive implementation in 2012. This effort was successful in establishing dialogue around the process, the utility of the program review findings, and improvement plans for the process. The Student Services Component had also created updated program review processes during this same time, borrowing heavily from the long standing Instructional Component process given that several student service units provide instruction such as Counseling.

In 2014, collaborative efforts by ARC, PRO, and the Administrative Council, the administrative unit process was updated, including new forms. The program review cycle timeline was reset to a six-year cycle with annual updates. Units such as the President’s Component evaluated and closed out the previous plan early and started a new plan with the new templates.

ARC and Administrative Council provided feedback on the forms and program review process in conjunction with the new integrated planning and resource allocation process. The new administrative unit program review process was approved by ARC, Administrative Council, and CPC and began in fall 2014. The newly instituted IEC joined the process evaluation effort, and improvements were made to the form in fall 2015 to: (1) provide more directive prompts to elicit relevant but concise contextual information about the recent history of the administrative unit, and (2) react to anticipated changes such as responding to new regulations or technology upgrades changing business practices. Each fall, the activities of the prior year will continue to be reviewed by ARC, IEC, and Administrative Council with PRO providing technical support and CPC providing broad oversight.

Evidence (The items in the evidence list are hyperlinks to the documents.)

Administrative Unit Plan Schedule 2012-2026
Administrative Unit Comprehensive Program Review Form
Administrative Unit Annual Update Form
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**Strengthen existing student learning outcome (SLO) processes for quality assurance.**

The focus of Cabrillo’s efforts to strengthen existing SLO processes for quality assurance has been to improve four issues that were identified in Standard II.A.1.c of Cabrillo’s 2013 *Institutional Self Evaluation of Educational Quality*. They are:

1. Adjunct participation in assessment
2. Timely completion of SLO assessment
3. Reporting of assessment results
4. Digitizing of SLO reporting

**I. Adjunct Participation in Assessment**

Since department chairs are now primarily responsible for training their adjunct faculty in SLO assessment, the College decided to intensify the chairs’ training in the hope that this would lead to increased adjunct participation. (Please note that since fall 2015, the term “department chair” has replaced “program chair” in keeping with Cabrillo’s new definition of a program. Historical documents reflect the older term). The following activities have occurred since the Self Evaluation was written:

A. Creation of a **Department Chair Resources** page on the SLO website that includes the **Department Chair SLO Handbook**, assessment scheduling tools, and PowerPoint presentations given at professional development activities to help chairs train the members of their departments.

B. Professional development workshops specifically for department chairs.
   - Make it Easy on Yourself: SLO Work for Program Chairs (spring 2012/page 4)
   - Social Networking for Program Chairs (spring 2013 - page 4)
   - Make SLOs Easy on Yourself II: Tools for Program Chairs (fall 2012 - page 3)
   - Analyzing SLO Assessment Data: Techniques, Tools and Tricks (special presentation as part of the Year of Instruction, March 2015)

C. Creation of “Current Best Practices” manuals for **Instruction, Student Services, and Administration** that are posted on the SLO website.
In addition, the SLO Coordinator now regularly presents the ABC’s of SLO assessment at the adjunct faculty orientations every semester, and it is posted on the SLO website.

Data reveal that these additional activities and materials have had a positive effect. The Outcomes Assessment Review Committee (ARC), a participatory governance committee that analyzes each year’s SLO assessment results and makes recommendations to improve assessment processes across the campus, reports increased adjunct participation in its annual reports. The 2013 ARC Annual Report noted that two departments (of the ten submitting their six-year program plans that year) had complete participation by both adjuncts and full time faculty. The 2014 ARC Annual Report found that of the six departments that submitted program plans that year, two had 90-100% of their adjuncts participating, three had at least half, and only one (which had misunderstood the process) had less than half. ARC concluded that “the percentages of adjunct participation are improving.” In its latest report for 2015, ARC found that “Most of the departments reported robust involvement from adjunct faculty in both the assessment process and the discussion of its results.” The trend is positive.

II. Timely Completion of SLO Assessment, Reporting of Assessment Results and Digitizing of SLO Reporting

The primary instrument used to improve all three of the above issues has been the adoption of CurricUNET’s SLO module, an electronic assessment results reporting tool. Before CurricUNET, all departments reported their SLO or AUO assessment results on paper, as an attachment to their annual report and as an appendix to their six-year in depth program plan (Cabrillo’s term for program review). Those reports were monitored by the SLO Coordinator, but since the program plans were on a six-year cycle, it was often years after the fact and too late to ensure that departments were staying on track with both doing the work and filling out the forms correctly.

The CurricUNET SLO module includes an approval process that prevents inaccurate or incomplete forms from being accepted. The SLO Coordinator approves the forms and can give feedback to the department chairs and individual faculty when they submit them, if they are incorrect. Additionally, this approval process enables the SLO Coordinator to see if departments are on track and completing their SLO work in a timely manner.

In addition, the CurricUNET forms capture both numerical data and a narrative that describes what happened and the department’s analysis of the assessment results. This is a campus-wide implementation of a pilot program that was described in the 2013 Institutional Self-Evaluation (page 84). Though some departments (notably Mathematics) initially feared that adding numerical data would somehow lessen the departmental dialog that occurs as part of the SLO assessment process, there is not one department annual report or program plan that shows this to be the case.
Seventy-five percent of Instructional departments have been trained in how to use the CurricUNET SLO module, with the final group slated for training in spring and fall 2016 (see the department training schedule, Using the CurricUNET SLO Module for Assessment Reporting, posted on the SLO website). The module is currently being updated to its “meta” version, and when it is complete, more training will ensue.

Now that Cabrillo has dealt with the four issues that it self-identified as needing improvement in the Self-Evaluation, it has moved on to improving quality assurance by attempting to improve the sophistication of how departments analyze their SLO results. ARC’s 2015 Annual Report notes that the committee

“…observed a continuing increase in sophistication of assessment efforts, with several departments choosing to reexamine the efficacy of their assessment instruments, further embracing the process to make it more useful. We hope that this will become a much more common pattern, as more departments gain sufficient experience with the assessment process to continue to evolve their efforts, and their successes.”

ARC recommended three measures to build on the gains that have been made, including:

- Using the CurricUNET SLO module training as venues for sharing more sophisticated methods of SLO analysis.
- Sending a copy of ARC’s annual report directly to department chairs, to give them a better idea of what is viewed as exemplary SLO analysis.
- Widely distributing the Current Best Practice for Instruction manual produced in fall 2015 for SLO assessment and highlighting some of the work done by exemplary departments in Instruction.

Finally, with the Outcomes Assessment Review Committee (ARC) as the primary monitor of the campus assessment processes and their quality assurance, the committee decided it should analyze its own institutional effectiveness. Since ARC’s role includes making recommendations to increase the efficacy of campus assessment efforts, the committee examined what had occurred as a result of those recommendations. Key findings: Sixty-three recommendations were scrutinized, derived from the annual reports from 2007-2013. The committee found that of those, 44 had been completed, 13 were in progress, five were ongoing, and one was abandoned after discovering it was not feasible with current technology. More importantly, ARC also noted the following trends:

1. Academic issues noted as a result of SLO assessment have remained constant. Students are underprepared academically, especially in reading and writing, and do not possess the habits of mind to enable them to be successful students.
2. Efforts to improve these academic issues have changed, moving from a focus purely on professional development to some solutions across disciplines. ARC noted that a college-wide approach to these issues is emerging through projects that will be developed through the Equity Plan and the focus on Habits of Mind by the Professional Engagement and Transformational Learning (PETL) Committee for the 2015-16 and 2016-17 academic years.

3. Recommendations demonstrate a constant effort to build an infrastructure to sustain campus-wide assessment efforts. That effort has been a success, but there is still an uneven quality in assessment across departments. In Instruction, department chair leadership is the key. In Student Services and Administrative Units, more experience with assessment will lead to improved metrics and measures.

4. The college has moved from the creation of the assessment process to quality assurance. How we talk about assessment efforts has changed, shifting from a focus on the instructors to a focus on what students do. This is a significant paradigm shift. Richer and more sophisticated analysis of assessment results is occurring, especially in some departments in Instruction. Interdisciplinary solutions are now more often sought to solve student learning issues.

The full report, Analyzing Emerging Issues from 2007-2013 ARC Annual Reports, is posted on the ARC website.

In addition, ARC members participated in the spring 2015 College Participatory Governance Survey, administered by the Planning and Research Office. Ten of the thirteen committee members completed the survey. While ARC was found to be working well, one area of concern emerged. The survey revealed that there was a confusion about whether the members should represent the expertise and point of view of their constituent groups in order to help ARC function or if they should act as representatives of those groups, like members of Faculty Senate or the College Planning Council. The committee’s discussion of the survey results helped clarify members’ roles and reporting duties. ARC will continue to monitor this, to make sure that this confusion is alleviated when committee membership changes. The full survey and a summary of the committee’s analysis of its results are included in the ARC meeting minutes of 09/14/15.

Evidence (The items in the evidence list are hyperlinks to the documents.)
- Standard II.A.1.c of the Institutional Self Evaluation of Educational Quality
- Department Chair Resources
- Department Chair SLO Handbook
- Make it Easy on Yourself: SLO Work for Program Chairs
- Social Networking for Program Chairs
Make SLOs Easy on Yourself II: Tools for Program Chairs
Analyzing SLO Assessment Data: Techniques, Tools and Tricks
Administrative Unit Assessment – Best Practices
SLO Assessment in Instruction Best Practices
SLO Assessment in Student Services Best Practices
ABC’s of SLOs at Cabrillo
2013 ARC Annual Report
2014 ARC Annual Report
2015 ARC Annual Report
Cabrillo College 2013 Self-Evaluation (page 84)
Implementation Schedule - Using the CurricUNET SLO Module for Assessment Reporting
Analyzing Emerging Issues from 2007-2013 ARC Annual Reports
09/14/15 ARC Minutes
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Identify responsibilities and timeline for implementation of requirements of the Student Success Act, Title 5 and the California Education Code: orientation, assessment, education planning and enrollment priorities.

The overall responsibility for the implementation of the Student Success Act belongs to the college. For the specific areas of orientation, assessment and education planning, the oversight and ongoing evaluation of these services lies primarily with the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) Coordinator/Dean of Counseling and Educational Support Services (CESS). The following actions have been accomplished on schedule per the Chancellor’s Office timeline:

**Orientation**

The content of the online orientation is updated annually so that all required topics are included. Additional topics that benefit students’ goal completion and success have been added as the need has been identified. All relevant publications indicate that this is now a requirement for all first-time students.

**Assessment**

The staff has complied with all aspects of implementing this service including working with PRO for timely validation studies. All relevant publications indicate that this is now a requirement for all first-time students unless they meet identified and approved exemptions.

**Education Planning**

Counselors have integrated the development of abbreviated and comprehensive electronic education plans into their services in an accelerated manner. Workshops have been developed and provided by student services assistants so that students better understand the basics of an education plan before seeing a counselor. Students are encouraged to return as many times as needed to update and revise their plans. All relevant publications indicate that this is now a requirement for all first-time students unless they meet identified and approved exemptions.

**Enrollment Priorities**

The implementation of enrollment priorities is under the Director of Admissions and Records. A collaborative team (A&R, Financial Aid, Counseling, Assessment, PRO, IT and others) identified implementation strategies and challenges that needed to be addressed. This group meets regularly. Enrollment priorities were implemented on time, spring 2015.
The Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) requires that all new students have an electronically-available education plan. Cabrillo College uses Colleague’s Student Planning software to meet this requirement. With this tool, available to all students and counselors through WebAdvisor, students can access their plans, modify them, and, once in a registration cycle, select specific sections and register. Students are able to begin the process of developing an abbreviated (one to two semester) education plan at any time on their own. To support this effort, counseling has developed a two-hour Education Plan Workshop, offered throughout the year, at which students learn the concepts and resources needed to develop an education plan. Further, they are given a tutorial on how to use the Student Planning tool including access to computers to begin development of their education plan. The first half of the workshop is presented by one of our Student Services Assistants (SSAs), and during the second half of the workshop, a counselor also helps with the specifics of plan development. It is a hands-on workshop that results in an abbreviated education plan.

In addition to the Education Plan Workshops, the following YouTube instructional videos have been created and posted to the Counseling webpage, informing students on how to use Student Planning for educational planning and registration:

- Adding, Deleting, and Moving Courses on your Plan
- Registering for Classes Using Student Planning

The videos explain the tool, how to access the tool, and how to use it.

While students leave the workshop with an abbreviated education plan, they are informed of the need to fully develop the plan with the assistance of a counselor, through scheduled counseling appointments. The goal is a comprehensive education plan that includes all courses needed to reach the educational goal, including notes on important deadlines, processes, and support resources needed for success. Students benefit by knowing the specific courses needed to reach their goal early in their academic process and knowing well in advance of a registration cycle the specific courses to be taken. Further, they can use the tool to develop a schedule detailing the days and times of their planned classes, allowing for easier registration.
Counselors utilize the Student Planning system, enabling access to each student’s education plan. This tool is applied during nearly all student interactions. Counselors can add, delete, and move courses on the plan while providing input to the student on course selection. There is a Notes feature allowing the counselor to communicate important details to the student and to other counselors who may work with the student. Counselor expertise is needed in developing a plan that ensures completion of requirements, often involving the evaluation of transcripts from colleges other than Cabrillo.

With the rollout of the SSSP, more efficient ways of providing the service have been developed—an Orientation to College course that results in an electronic education plan as part of the curriculum and a two-hour workshop that reviews the components of an education plan, with an abbreviated version, one or two semesters, created at the end of the session. This gets the student started and provides them with the third requirement for securing priority registration.

SSSP funds support education planning, so with these funds an “orientation” room was repurposed into a student computer lab with thirty-three computers, including three ADA stations. This is the location for the staff-facilitated Education Plan Workshops. One screen and two ceiling-mounted monitors, plus an ELMO (classroom cart), create the new environment. The room is for the Counseling department; the room is fully utilized most days and is considered a state-of-the-art computer room for student use.

Evidence (The items in the evidence list are hyperlinks to the documents.)
- Orientation
- Assessment
- Education Planning
- Enrollment Priorities
- September 2013 Board Student Success Initiative Update
- October 2013 Board Student Success Initiative Update
- February 2014 Board Student Success Initiative Update
- March 2015 Board Student Success Initiative Update
- August 2015 Board Student Success Initiative Update
- Adding, Deleting, and Moving Courses on your Plan YouTube Video
- Registering for Classes Using Student Planning YouTube Video
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Conduct analysis and develop a plan to improve counseling/transfer and student services space to better serve students and support the faculty and staff.

Facilities Planning and Plant Operations (FPPO) worked with employees in counseling/transfer and student services to improve the space used to serve students and to support the faculty and staff. There previously were two entrances to Counseling Services, which was confusing and inefficient. Working with Facilities and Planning, the staff redesigned the space for better flow and service to students. This was a first step in needed improvements. New carpeting, paint and furniture also were provided for the area.

The outcome of these discussions resulted in:

1. Painted and carpeted the redesigned space and provided new furniture
2. Abated all asbestos containing building materials throughout the 100 building
3. Removed all existing heating units in the basement of the building
4. Reconfigured existing duct work and modified air distribution systems throughout the building
5. Replaced 4 zone controls with 17 zone control systems throughout the building
6. Installed new furnaces and boiler systems in the basement of the building
7. Installed signage on the exterior and main hallways of the building
8. Renovated the Admissions front desk area in order to relocate services to the existing financial aid area of the building
9. Installed a split system air conditioner in the main admissions and records area of the building (Room 112 and adjoining offices)
10. Renovated offices 113, 132, 133, 107, 111 areas of the building
11. Upgraded the foster youth center
12. Upgraded the transfer center space

Further analysis determined that the original intent to place all Student Services processes together is a goal we are still developing.

Cabrillo College is implementing a plan for a Welcome Center. This center will be a location for 21 services to engage new and returning students. Important services include Admissions and Records, Financial Aid, and express/triage counseling. This new center will create a front door for the institution and a location for students to connect with the institution. This will free up staff in student services programs to deal with more complex student issues.
The Welcome Center will be located in Student Activity Center (SAC) East. After the Welcome Center is up and running, the plan is to move Admissions and Records and Financial Aid into the SAC buildings. This move will free up space in their former location, Building 100, for other needed services.

Counseling services will remain in their current location along with the Transfer and Career services. With A&R and Financial Aid relocating to the Welcome Center this will create more needed space for counseling and the ability to offer more programming and services for students in one location.

Evidence (The items in the evidence list are hyperlinks to the documents.)

- 2014 Measure D Annual Report
- 08-04-14 Board Agenda Item - FMP Project Status Update
- Welcome Center Proposal - 05/15/15 FPAC Handout
- Welcome Center Total Cost of Ownership - 09/18/15 FPAC Handout
- FPAC Minutes of 10/30/15
- FPAC Minutes of 12/11/15
The Board will incorporate Accreditation standards into its annual self-evaluation.

The Board incorporated accreditation standards into its annual self-evaluation in fall 2013. As a result of discussing Board involvement in the ACCJC accreditation process at the November 2014 Board Retreat, the Board unanimously agreed to adopt this goal:

> The purpose of annual Board evaluation is the improvement of performance of the Board as a whole. It is intended to stimulate discussion and clarification of the Board’s function within the Community College District, to evaluate the Board’s role in accreditation, to help assess Board effectiveness, to help reach agreement on operating procedures, to identify and help resolve differences of opinion among individual Trustees, to help the Board reach agreement on Board goals for the coming year, and to maintain the positive and proactive role of the Board at Cabrillo.

Evidence (The items in the evidence list are hyperlinks to the documents.)
- Governing Board Online Evaluation Form - Fall 2013
- Governing Board Goals 2015-2017
Update on Substantive Change in Progress, Pending, or Planned

The College intends to submit a Substantive Change Proposal for the May 3, 2016 meeting of the ACCJC Substantive Change Committee. The College has completed the first step of the process: notification to the ACCJC of the intent to submit a Substantive Change Proposal. On November 18, 2015, ACCJC staff notified the College that “the proposal described has been determined to be substantive and will require the submission of a Substantive Change Proposal.” The final proposal will be submitted to ACCJC by March 18, 2016.

The proposal would be a change in delivery modality for the following programs, which are expected to deliver 50% or more of their courses through a distance format: Art History, Art Photography, Anthropology, Computer Applications and Business Technology, Computer and Information Systems, Computer Science, Dental Hygiene, Geography, Health Science, History, Political Science, Sociology, and Theater Arts.

Accounting, Digital Media, and General Business were approved by the ACCJC in 2008 to offer 50% or more of their courses through a distance format but will be adding additional degrees/certificates to the approved list from 2008. ACCJC staff has determined that since “all of the programs identified already exist at the College...this proposal would be a change in delivery modality (for said programs), not a new program (Section 3.7.3, pg. 9, of the Substantive Change Manual)” and that “More information will be needed to determine whether the 3 programs noted as “programs expected to add degrees or certificates” (Accounting, Digital Media, and General Business) would be subject to Substantive Change (section 3.7.1).” (email communication from Norv Wellsfry, 11/18/15)
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Becky Sulay, Classified Staff
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Appendix B - Accreditation Recommendations and List of Responsible Leads for Recommendations

**Accreditation Recommendations** - ACCJC Letter of 02/07/14

List of Responsible Leads for Recommendations

Alancraig, Marcy  
SLO Coordinator

Bailey-Fougner, Dennis  
Vice President of Student Services

Jones, Laurel  
President/Superintendent

Mayo, Rachel  
Dean of Education Centers and Online & Innovative Learning

Regalado Rodriguez, Margery  
Dean of Counseling and Educational Support Services

Welch, Kathleen  
Vice President of Instruction

Willett, Terrence  
Director of Planning, Research, and Knowledge Systems  
Chair, Institutional Effectiveness Committee
Appendix C - Abbreviations / Acronyms

ALO – Accreditation Liaison Officer
ARC – Assessment Review Committee
AUO – Administrative Unit Outcome
COR - Course Outline of Record
CIP - Council for Instructional Planning
CPC – College Planning Committee
GE - General Education
FPPO - Facilities Planning and Plant Operations
IEC – Institutional Effectiveness Committee
PETL - Professional Engagement and Transformational Learning
PRO – Planning and Research Office
SAC – Student Activity Center
SLO – Student Learning Outcome
SSSP - Student Success and Support Program