



Midterm Report

Submitted by:
Cypress College
9200 Valley View Street
Cypress, CA 90630

Submitted to:
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Date Submitted:
October 2021

Midterm Report Certification Page

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From:

Dr. JoAnna Schilling, President
Cypress College
Cypress, CA 90630
9200 Valley View Street

I certify there was broad participation/review by the campus community and believe this report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

Signatures:

(Chief Executive Officer) (Date)

(Chairperson, Governing Board) (Date)

(Name, Title, Representing) (Date)

Table of Contents

Report Preparation

Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process

Institutional Reporting on Quality Improvements

- a. Response to Team Recommendations for Improvement
- b. Reflection on Improving Institutional Performance (SLOs and ISSs)
- c. Report on the Outcomes of the Quality Focus Projects
- d. Fiscal Reporting

Appendices

DRAFT

Report Preparation

The preparation of the Cypress College 2021 Midterm Report was a collaborative process overseen by the Accreditation Steering Committee and led by the Accreditation Co-Chairs, Liana Koeppel, the Accreditation Faculty Chair, and Eileen Haddad, the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO). After the completion of the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER) in Fall 2017, work on many of the self-identified Plans for Improvement (PFIs) began almost immediately. In January 2018, the College received the [action letter](#) resulting from the accreditation site visit which included a single Recommendation for Compliance with a required Follow-Up Report, as well as four College and three District Recommendations for Improvement (RFIs). The Recommendation for Compliance was successfully addressed in the [2019 Follow-Up Report](#), and accreditation efforts since then have focused on implementing the plans resulting from the Follow-Up Report, as well as addressing the remaining PFIs, RFIs, and Quality Focused Projects in preparation for the 2021 Midterm Report.

The Midterm Report will primarily provide an update on progress, improvements, and outcomes related to the PFIs, RFIs, and Quality Focused Projects since the ISER and accreditation site visit in 2017 but will also include reflections on improving institutional performance via Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Institution-Set Standards (ISSs), and a fiscal report. Much of the organization and coordination of the work leading up to the Midterm Report was facilitated by the former ALO, Philip Dykstra, who has since retired and was replaced by Eileen Haddad, and Liana Koeppel who continues to serve as the Accreditation Faculty Chair. This work included ensuring the PFIs, RFIs, and Quality Focused Projects were cataloged, assigned responsible parties, had established timelines, and regularly discussed at Accreditation Steering Committee and other meetings. Throughout 2019 and 2020, status updates were solicited each semester from the designated responsible parties and progress was tracked and documented.

In Spring 2020, as a result of COVID-19 and the emergency transition to remote work and online instruction, some accreditation efforts were put on hold as faculty and administration were focused on this transition. Especially impacted were the Distance Education leads, Treisa Cassens and Kathleen McAlister, who had the herculean task of shifting 100% of instruction to an online format a matter of days. Despite the delay, the campus resumed accreditation-focused work in a remote environment and the Accreditation Steering Committee continued meeting at least once every semester since the submission of the ISER to ensure continuous dialogue about accreditation beyond mandated reporting periods.

In Fall 2020, the Accreditation Co-Chairs began the initial writing of the Midterm Report. Progress reports from the responsible parties were solicited throughout Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 as writing was taking place and updates were made to the report accordingly. In March 2021, a first draft the Midterm Report was completed and the process to share it with College governance bodies and constituency groups for review and feedback began. The draft was also posted on the campus webpage and a survey link soliciting input was distributed to the campus to ensure everyone had an opportunity to contribute. The report was finalized in Summer 2021 and received final approvals in early Fall 2021 before it was submitted to the Commission.

The Accreditation Steering Committee membership as of Fall 2021 is summarized below, along with the Midterm Report Timeline.

Accreditation Steering Committee Members

Committee Role	Name (and title when applicable)
Accreditation Faculty Co-Chair	Liana Koeppel
Accreditation Liaison Officer Co-Chair	Eileen Haddad, Interim Director of Institutional Research and Planning
Standard I Chair	Adel Rajab, Faculty
Standard II Chair	Kathy Wada, Faculty
Standard III Chair	Parwinder Sidhu, Faculty
Standard IV Chair	Lynn Mitts, Faculty
College President	JoAnna Schilling
Academic Senate President	Damon de la Cruz
Academic Senate Past President	Craig Goralski
Vice President, Administrative Services	Alexander Porter
Vice President, Student Services	Paul de Dios
Vice President, Instruction	Lee Douglas
Classified Representative	Lynnette Young
Standard Sub-Committee Chairs	Lisa Clark, Faculty Richard Fee, Faculty Joyce Peacock, Faculty Deidre Porter, Faculty Eldon Young, Dean
Quality Focus Essay Leads	Treisa Cassens, Dean Jennifer Coopman, Faculty Kathleen McAlister, Faculty

Midterm Report Timeline

Term	Activity
Spring 2021	March 10 – Share draft with the Accreditation Steering Committee
	March 17 – Accreditation Steering Committee Meeting
	April 5-19 – Feedback from campus community and relevant District parties
	May 5 – Accreditation Steering Committee Meeting to approve report
	May 6 – Share with Academic Senate for approval
	May 13 – Share with PAC for final approval
	May 25 – Present to the Board of Trustees for first read
Summer 2021	June-September – Make final edits to Midterm Report
Fall 2021	September 9 – Share final version at Senate and PAC
	September 14 – Present to the Board of Trustees for approval
	October 15 – Midterm Report due

Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process

As a result of the comprehensive self-evaluation process, the College made 23 self-identified Plans for Improvement (PFIs). This section of the report provides an update on these plans that includes the responsible parties, the current status, completion timelines, and a narrative explaining how these plans have been integrated into planning and decision-making processes and improved institutional effectiveness.

PFI 1

Formalize and communicate the student complaint process. (Commission Policy)

The Vice President of Student Services and Dean of Counseling will formalize the student complaint process to include maintaining records for a minimum of six years. The student complaint process will be included in the Student Handbook and posted on the college website.

Responsible Parties: VP of Student Services, Dean of Counseling and Student Development

Status: Work in Progress

Completion Timeline: Fall 2021

Narrative: The College's existing student complaint process had some limitations in that it was specific to sexual harassment and racial discrimination complaints. The ability for students to seek remediation for more general concerns was not easily discernable. As a result, the newly hired Dean of Counseling and Student Development is coordinating efforts to expand the student complaint process for the College. [In collaboration with the Catalog writing team, the College decided to align the student complaint process with the process established at Fullerton College for consistency within the District. A draft of the student complaint process and related form was completed in Spring 2021 and is currently going through the College approval process \(PFI1.1 - Student Complaint Process Draft\). Once approved, the student complaint process will be included in the College Catalog, Student Handbook, and posted on the College website.](#)

Evidence:

- PFI1.1 - Student Complaint Process Draft

PFI 2

Create a distinct and separate program review for new baccalaureate program. (I.A.2, III.B.3.)

The Instructional Program Review Committee will create a distinct and separate instructional program review process for the baccalaureate degree in Funeral Service.

Responsible Parties: Instructional Program Review Chair

Status: Complete

Narrative: The Instructional Program Review Committee established a separate and distinct review process for the baccalaureate degree in Funeral Services that includes review of program outcomes, enrollment, student learning, and student achievement specific to the

baccalaureate degree (PFI2.1 - Baccalaureate Degree Program Review Form). The review of the baccalaureate program occurs on a separate four-year cycle from the Mortuary Science Department's regular program review (PFI2.2 - Program Review Cycle).

Evidence:

- PFI2.1 - Baccalaureate Degree Program Review Form
- PFI2.2 - Program Review Cycle

PFI 3

Evaluate all instructional budgets. (I.B.7)

The Vice President of Administrative Services will conduct an evaluation of all instructional supply budgets and resource management processes.

Responsible Parties: VP of Administrative Services

Status: Complete

Narrative: Prior to 2019, the College received from the District a base budget which was supplemented by varying annual one-time funds to support expenditures. Thus, the College's budgeting process relied heavily on repeated advanced and competitive one-time allocations based on available funds each year. Upon his arrival in 2019, the current VP of Administrative Services (VPAS) initiated a review of the budgeting and resource management processes. The evaluation resulted in a shift to include the previous advanced one-time funds as part of a modified base budget that was more aligned with budgeted needs for each department. These budgets are now on a two-year cycle and are reflective of the actual expenses in the prior year, and include consideration for ongoing structural equipment, supply, and material needs. At the conclusion of the two-year budget cycle, actual spending is assessed to inform the budget for the upcoming cycle. The implementation of these changes included meetings with each dean and area manager to improve budget literacy and understanding of expectations, setting up monthly, auto-produced budget reports to be distributed to each area manager, as well as three annual budget control center meetings (October, January, April) to review and monitor budget performance (PFI3.1 - Porter Email; PFI3.2 - Budget Meeting Schedule).

Evidence:

- PFI3.1 - Porter Email 112119
- PFI3.2 - Budget Meeting Schedule (need)
- Other - 2020-21 Budget pp. 43-60

PFI 4

Develop a BP and AP to ensure 120 units for the pilot baccalaureate degree. (I.B.7, II.A.5)

The District will prepare the necessary BP and AP to comply with the 120 minimum unit degree requirement prescribed by Title V for the pilot baccalaureate degree.

Responsible Parties: Vice Chancellor of Educational Services and Technology

Status: Complete

Narrative: In Fall 2017, Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 4100 entitled Graduation Requirements for Degrees & Certificates were revised to include the baccalaureate degree and the Title V 120 minimum unit degree requirement for the baccalaureate degree pilot program (PFI4.1 - BP 4100; PFI4.2 - AP 4100).

Evidence:

- PFI4.1 - BP 4100
- PFI4.2 - AP 4100

PFI 5

Provide more uniform dissemination of college information. (I.B.8)

To improve reliability and accuracy, the College will engage in a review to make better use of more systemic, public dissemination of college information.

Responsible Parties: Director of Campus Communications

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: In an effort to provide a more uniform dissemination of College information, the Office of Campus Communications has implemented several changes. First, they created and distributed the Campus Identity Guide that outlines stylistic and branding guidelines to better detail systemic, public dissemination of College information (PFI5.1 - Campus Identity Guide; PFI5.2 - Email Distribution). Second, a new webpage was launched linking the aforementioned Campus Identity Guide as well as various Cypress College campaigns including #CyProud and Cypress+ to facilitate more uniform distribution of such public information (PFI5.3 - Campaigns Webpage). Finally, working with the President, a community newsletter called @Cypress that highlights news and events from the College is regularly distributed in an effort to provide systemic and reliable information to the campus and key community leaders (PFI5.4 - @Cypress).

Evidence:

- PFI5.1 - [Campus Identity Guide](#)
- PFI5.2 - Email Distribution of Campus Identity Guide
- PFI5.3 - [Campaigns Webpage](#)
- PFI5.4 - @Cypress Newsletter

PFI 6

Improve local process of information provided to students and the public. (I.C.1)

The College will improve the process that ensures the integrity and accuracy of non-printed information and the increasing number of projects printed outside the District print shop process.

Responsible Parties: Director of Campus Communications, Catalog and Schedule Coordinator

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: For several years, the College has continuously moved away from printed materials in order to make better use of information-sharing through digital platforms. This transition drastically expanded during COVID-19 remote operations but was accelerated prior to the pandemic in several ways. In 2019 and 2020, the Office of Campus Communications and Office of Technology Services worked together to launch a new College website, which is the primary means of sharing information about the College to students and the public (PFI6.1 - College Website). Additionally, the Office of Technology Services implemented a Cypress College mobile app called CypressConnect (PFI6.2 - Mobile App). The website and mobile app both use a distributive method of information creation and publication, which created some issues related to approvals of information prior to publication. However, the offices are working to resolve these issues with new access controls and site-usage trainings which are in development and soon to be implemented—something that should significantly help in this regard (PFI6.3 - Training Materials). Ensuring the integrity and accuracy of the College website content continues to be the responsibility of the Office of Campus Communications, specifically the Web Content Specialist who was hired in 2016 to ensure more focused efforts in this area. These efforts have resulted in the previously discussed (PFI 5) Campus Identity Guide, as well as the forthcoming access controls and training. [Access to the various levels of the website is determined by the Office of Campus Communications who ensure the integrity and accuracy of material before final posting](#) (PFI6.4 - Jorgensen Email).

Another area of progress in improving the accuracy non-printed materials has been the shift to digital College Catalogs and Class Schedules (PFI6.5 - Digital College Catalog). In 2018, the production of the College Catalog and Class Schedule entered the final phase of a transition away from a static printed College Catalog to a digital version, while concurrently shifting from being a campus production to a District production. These transitions resulted in the expected challenges from making such significant changes and accuracy procedures are being developed to address those issues (PFI6.6 - Missing Evidence). However, the College community is now benefitting from this substantial update to the production and distribution of these critical documents.

Evidence:

- PFI6.1 - [College Website](#)
- PFI6.2 - [Mobile App](#)
- PFI6.3 - Training Materials
- PFI6.4 - Jorgensen Email **need**
- PFI6.5 - [Digital College Catalog](#)
- PFI6.6 - Missing Evidence
- Other - Posner Email 072319

PFI 7

Restructure the Distance Education (DE) program personnel, policies, procedures, and documentation. (II.A.2)

The College will restructure the DE program with more clearly established areas of responsibility for faculty and management along with a review of relevant policies, procedures and documentation.

Responsible Parties: Distance Education Coordinators, Academic Senate

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: The 2017-2023 Distance Education Plan (DE Plan) addresses the restructuring of distance education (DE) personnel (pp. 21-22) and outlines the current campus DE guidelines (pp. 33-43), as well as future plans (pp. 23-30; PFI7.1 - DE Plan). In addition, the DE Program completed their program review in Spring 2021 and identified several related goals such as ongoing evaluation of DE policies, procedures, and practices; establishing a permanent DE Project Manager; re-assessing the duties and compensation of the DE Coordinator; and hiring an instructional designer (PFI7.2 - DE Program Review). Additional details about the restructuring of the DE program are included as part of Quality Focused Project 3 on Distance Education later in this report.

Evidence:

- PFI7.1 – 2017-2023 Distance Education Plan
- PFI7.2 – Distance Education Program Review

PFI 8

Disaggregate data in the SSQR and CSQR process (II.A.7)

The College will disaggregate data based on demographics in the next review cycle for the Student Services Quality Review and Campus Services Quality Review.

Responsible Parties: Institutional Research and Planning Office

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: The Office of Institutional Research and Planning has expanded the data provided for Student Services Program Review (SSPR, formerly SSQR) and Campus Services Program Review (CSPR, formerly CSQR) to include disaggregated survey and other data when applicable. Additionally, the SSPR form has been updated to include equity-related questions to allow for additional reflection on providing equitable services and outcomes to students (PFI8.1 - Student Services Program Review Form; PFI8.2 - Campus Services Program Review Form).

Evidence:

- PFI8.1 – Student Services Program Review Form
- PFI8.2 – Campus Services Program Review Form (need)
- Other - Haddad Email (need)

PFI 9

Revise Mortuary Science PLOs (II.A.12)

The Mortuary Science Department will revise its PLO to include the baccalaureate degree in Funeral Service.

Responsible Parties: Mortuary Science Department Coordinator

Status: Work in Progress

Completion Timeline: TBD

Narrative: The Mortuary Science Department is governed by an external accrediting agency, the American Board of Funeral Service Education (ABFSE) Committee on Accreditation. Currently, ABFSE requires that schools under their accreditation use their prescribed Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) for all programs, regardless of the credential awarded (PFI9.1 - ABFSE Accreditation Standards). The Mortuary Science Department Coordinator is currently working with the ABFSE to develop the baccalaureate degree accreditation standards which are to include updated PSLOs for baccalaureate level programs, and they anticipate completion of these standards by [date] (PFI9.2 - Grande Email). The PSLOs utilized for the baccalaureate degree will continue to be those approved by ABFSE, as required, until the revision is completed.

Evidence:

- PFI9.1 - [ABFSE Accreditation Standards](#)
- PFI9.2 - Grande Email (need)
- Other – Note to List PLOs twice in the Catalog, once for each program

PFI 10

Evaluate Distance Education (DE) course success rates across campus (II.A.16)

The College will conduct a systematic evaluation of DE course success rates and implement any necessary changes.

Responsible Parties: Institutional Research and Planning Office, Distance Education Coordinator, Instructional Program Review Chair

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: Distance Education (DE) course success rates across the campus are evaluated in several ways. Within Instructional Program Review, each department evaluates course success rates by instructional method (PFI10.1 - Instructional Program Review Form). Additionally, the DE Program has an updated DE Plan for 2017-2023 that includes an evaluation of success rates by instruction method across the campus and makes comparisons to statewide trends (PFI10.2 - Distance Education Plan). Finally, the DE Program is on a program review cycle to ensure a systematic and comprehensive evaluation occurs regularly (PFI10.3 - Program Review Cycle; PFI10.4 - Distance Education Program Review).

Evidence:

- PFI10.1 - Instructional Program Review Form

- PFI10.2 - 2017-2023 Distance Education Plan (see pp. 15-17) (need)
- PFI10.4 - Distance Education Program Review (need)
- PFI10.3 - Program Review Cycle
- Other - IPR Form HIT
- Other - IPR Form ACCT

PFI 11

Enhance student services to Distance Education and off-site students (II.C.3)

The Financial Aid Office, Veterans Resource Center and Transfer Center will expand online services to meet the needs of DE and off-site students.

Responsible Parties: Dean of Counseling and Student Development

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: The College has enhanced the student services provided to Distance Education students in several ways. For example, the Financial Aid Office has expanded their online services to include Online Verification and an online FAFSA application process (PFI11.1 - [Financial Aid Webpage](#)). The Veterans Resource Center also now provides off-site students with access to information regarding its services and access to online counseling through the campus' Cranium Café (PFI11.2 - [Veteran Resource Center Webpage](#)). Additionally, the Transfer Center provides numerous online services via their webpage and self-enrolling Transfer Hub site in Canvas, including transfer documents, workshops, and classes (PFI11.3 - [Transfer Center Webpage](#); PFI11.4 - [Transfer Center Canvas Hub](#)). Other Student Services departments are also utilizing Canvas to provide easy access to resources for DE students (PFI11.5 – [Canvas Examples](#)) Finally, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, as of Spring 2020, all student services successfully transitioned to serving students in a remote environment (PFI11.6 - [Student Services Webpage](#); PFI11.7 - [Student Services Newsletter](#)).

Evidence:

- PFI11.1 - [Financial Aid Webpage](#)
- PFI11.2 - [Veteran Resource Center Webpage](#)
- PFI11.3 - [Transfer Center Webpage](#)
- PFI11.4 - Transfer Center Canvas Hub (need)
- PFI11.5 - Canvas Examples (need)
- PFI11.6 - [Student Services Webpage](#)
- PFI11.7 - Student Services Newsletter

PFI 12

Improve Distance Education faculty evaluation process. (III.A.5)

The District and United Faculty will work on revising the evaluation process to require DE faculty to be evaluated in DE courses taught.

Responsible Parties: Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, United Faculty

Status: Work in Progress

Completion Timeline: TBD

Narrative: All faculty are evaluated regularly as per the United Faculty (UF) and Adjunct Faculty United (AdFac) union contracts (PFI12.1 - UF Contract; PFI12.2 - AdFac Contract). At the time of the ISER, there were concerns related to whether faculty who taught both distance education (DE) and face-to-face courses were ever being evaluated in their DE courses, so the ability to ensure the evaluation of DE courses specifically was identified as an area for improvement. As the process of evaluating faculty is a contractual issue, potential revisions to the evaluation process necessitate negotiation between the faculty unions (i.e., UF and AdFac) and the District. The UF and AdFac leadership have been apprised of the issue (PFI12.3 - Koeppel Email or Senate Minutes) and the DE Plan outlines a process to facilitate the evaluation of DE courses once an agreement between the relevant parties has been reached (PFI12.4 – Distance Education Plan). Course evaluations were further complicated in the move to remote instruction when all classes became “distant.” Despite these challenges, the College remains committed to the ongoing evaluation of instructors. The District utilized Qualtrics to facilitate student course evaluations in 2020-21 and recently purchased Course Eval HQ which will be piloted by the College in Fall 2021 (PFI12.5 – Technology Coordinating Council Minutes).

Evidence:

- PFI12.1 - [United Faculty Contract](#) (check April 1 for new version)
- PFI12.2 - [AdFac Union Contract](#)
- PFI12.3 - Koeppel Email or Senate Minutes (need)
- PFI12.4 - 2017-2023 Distance Education Plan pp. 40-41
- PFI12.5 – Technology Coordinating Council Minutes (need) March 15th?
- Other - Qualtrics Survey Instructions

PFI 13

Review and revise the Management Appraisal Instrument. (III.A.5, III.A.6)

The District will work with the DMA to review and revise the Management Appraisal Instrument to assess the effectiveness in encouraging improvement through the use of Learning Outcomes.

Responsible Parties: Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, District Management Association

Status: Work in Progress (Complete; pending approval in April 2021)

Completion Timeline: TBD

Narrative: The District and District Management Association (DMA) have been engaged in ongoing discussions regarding evaluations and the Management Appraisal Instrument. The Chancellor identified a workgroup with District-wide representation to be charged with reviewing and revising the management evaluation process (PFI13.1 - Management Performance Process). The workgroup conducted a District-wide survey to identify top leadership competencies and assess the effectiveness of the current evaluation process, reviewed relevant examples and resources, and incorporated recommendations from a NOCCCD Leadership Academy’s group project analysis on this topic into their work.

The revised Management evaluation process includes establishing goals, conducting quarterly, informal, check-in meetings between managers and their direct reports, and performing formal evaluations of all managers on three-year cycles that utilize leadership and technical competencies selected for NOCCCD. In addition to a new Management Performance Evaluation form (PFI13.2 - Management Performance Evaluation Form), several other appraisal instruments were developed to facilitate the evaluation including self-evaluation tools (PFI13.3 - Self-Evaluation Guide), goal-setting guides (PFI13.4 - Goal-Setting Guide), and check-in guidelines (PFI13.5 - Check-In Guidelines).

The revised process and proposed changes to Administrative Guide 2002: Management Evaluation was shared at the DMA Coffee Break meeting and at several virtual open forums in March 2021 for feedback from managers (PFI13.6 - McPheron Email). After incorporating revisions based on the feedback received, the proposal was sent to District Consultation Council (DCC) for approval on March 22, 2021 (PFI13.7 - DCC Agenda).

Evidence:

- PFI13.1 - Management Performance Process
- PFI13.2 - Management Performance Evaluation Form (need all approved docs)
- PFI13.3 - Self-Evaluation Guide
- PFI13.4 - Goal-Setting Guide
- PFI13.5 - Check-in Guidelines
- PFI13.6 - McPheron Email 031121
- PFI13.7 - District Consultation Council (DCC) Agenda (March 22, 2021)
- Other - Volcy Email
- Other – BOT Minutes May 25
- Other – DCC Minutes April 26

PFI 14

Include SLO participation in the adjunct evaluation process. (III.A.6)

The District will initiate discussions with AdFac to include participation in the SLO assessment process in the evaluation of adjunct faculty.

Responsible Parties: Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, Adjunct Faculty United

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: The Adjunct Faculty United (AdFac) 2017-2020 contract now includes SLO data entry as a part of the adjunct instructor evaluation instrument (PFI14.1 - AdFac Union Contract Appendix B, p. 4). Despite the contractual change, many faculty, both adjunct and full-time, are not aware of the obligations which has slowed the increases in SLO participation rates. However, the College is working to communicate the SLO participation requirement more broadly in several ways (PFI14.2 - Instructional Program Review Annual Report). For example, the SLO Coordinator regularly disseminates SLO data collection instructions via email, including an FAQ sheet that addresses adjunct participation specifically (PFI14.3 - SLO FAQ Sheet). In

addition, regular discussions of adjunct participation occur in SLO Committee meetings (PFI14.4 - SLO Meeting Minutes). While adjunct faculty are obligated to enter SLO data, more robust participation and compensation still need to be discussed and included to ensure that the SLO assessment process is valuable and meaningful.

Evidence:

- PFI14.1 - [AdFac Union Contract](#), Appendix B, p. 4
- PFI14.2 - Instructional Program Review Annual Report
- PFI14.3 - SLO FAQs
- PFI14.4 - SLO Committee Meeting Minutes 083120

PFI 15

Conduct a longitudinal analysis pertaining to the six EEO categories. (III.A.12)

The District will maintain data on the six EEO categories year-to-year and conduct a longitudinal analysis with at least three years of data.

Responsible Parties: Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, District Management Association

Status: Complete

Narrative: The District collects and analyzes employment diversity data annually. The District Director of Equity and Compliance presented the EEO Commitment to Diversity report at the November 24, 2020 NOCCCD Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting (PFI15.1 - BOT Meeting Minutes). The report included a presentation highlighting District applicant and new hire demographics for 2019-20, five-year applicant and new hire demographics for 2015-20, District comparative data, District employee demographics, faculty hiring trends, departments and categories with underrepresentation, and district-wide diversity activities (PFI15.2 - EEO Commitment to Diversity Report 2015-2020).

Evidence:

- PFI15.1 - Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes 112420 p.9
- PFI15.2 - EEO Commitment to Diversity Report 2015-2020

PFI 16

Develop a full-time faculty professional code of ethics with articulated consequences. (III.A.13)

The District will work with Academic Senate to develop a professional code of ethics with articulated consequences for violations of professional ethics.

Responsible Parties: Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, United Faculty, Academic Senate

Status: Work in Progress

Completion Timeline: TBD – update if things progress

Narrative: Board Policy 3003 entitled Code of Ethics for Faculty was adopted in 1981 and has been “under review by the Academic Senates,” for an indeterminate amount of time (PFI16.1 -

BP 3003). The current iteration of the Code of Ethics for Faculty consists of philosophical and ideological statements regarding the role and responsibilities of faculty members, but does not specifically address consequences for violations of those statements. As a result, the review of the Code of Ethics for Faculty is, again, in ongoing discussions. Most recently, the Code of Ethics for Faculty was agendized by the Academic Senate President at the October 22, 2020 and February 11, 2021 Senate meetings (**PFI16.2 - Academic Senate Minutes; PFI16.3 – Academic Senate Minutes**). After extended discussion, the Senate identified several key issues that warranted further involvement of other campus and district groups. As the ACCJC Standard requirement of “consequences” has potential evaluative implications, the discussions necessitate faculty union and District Human Resources involvement. In addition, since a negotiated Code of Ethics for Faculty would apply Districtwide, Fullerton College and North Orange Continuing Education (NOCE) involvement was deemed necessary as well. The Senate directed the Accreditation Faculty Chair to contact the relevant faculty leadership to initiate such discussions (**PFI16.4 - Email Evidence**). At this point, it seems that a two-fold approach is warranted, 1) the review of the Code of Ethics for Faculty by the Academic Senates, and 2) the negotiation of the articulated consequences by the faculty unions and District.

Evidence:

- PFI16.1 - [BP 3003](#)
- PFI16.2 - Academic Senate Minutes 102220
- PFI16.3 - Academic Senate Minutes 021121 (need)
- PFI16.4 - Code of Ethics for Faculty Emails (ongoing)

PFI 17

Improve security through replacement of campus locks. (III.B.1)

The College will replace locks on campus with interior locking mechanisms to provide extra security in case of emergency lockdown.

Responsible Parties: VP of Administrative Services, Director of Physical Plant

Status: Complete

Narrative: All campus locks with interior locking mechanisms were retrofitted to be enabled from within the room to improve security. The project was completed in May 2019 (**PFI17.1 - Fleming Email; PFI17.2 - Jeffredo Email**).

Evidence:

- PFI17.1 - Fleming Email
- PFI17.2 - Jeffredo Email

PFI 18

Complete the assessment of the Network Refresh Project. (III.C.2)

District Information Services will complete an assessment of the wired, wireless video, and voice network to better serve students and staff.

Responsible Parties: District Director of Information Services

Status: Work in Progress

Completion Timeline: December 2021

Narrative: The NOCCCD Network Refresh Project began in 2015, and after initial approval by the Board of Trustees (BOT) to authorize expenditures, a steering committee was formed to oversee the project. By 2018, the Assessment and Network Design Phases were completed and the results were presented to the BOT ([PFI18.1 - BOT Meeting Minutes](#)) who subsequently approved the Procurement and Implementation Phase ([PFI18.2 - BOT Meeting Minutes](#)). However, to take advantage of the advancements in technology that had been made since the initial proposals had been approved, in May 2019 the BOT agreed to reject all bids that had been received ([PFI18.3 - BOT Meeting Minutes](#)). In July 2019, the Network Refresh Board letter was presented to the BOT detailing the Network Refresh Project procedures; the BOT approved funding and awarded the contract to Vector USA and implemented the project ([PFI18.4 - Network Refresh Board Letter](#); [PFI18.5 - BOT Meeting Minutes](#)). In June 2020, a change order was approved by the BOT which extended the project completion deadline to December 2021 ([PFI18.6 - Network Refresh Board Resolution](#)).

Evidence:

- PFI18.1 - BOT Meeting Minutes 050117, p. 48
- PFI18.2 - BOT Meeting Minutes 052218, p. 107
- PFI18.3 - BOT Meeting Minutes 051419, p.125
- PFI18.4 - Network Refresh Board Letter
- PFI18.5 - BOT Meeting Minutes 072319, p. 6
- PFI18.6 - Network Refresh Board Resolution 062320
- Other - Network Refresh Status Report January 2020

PFI 19

Increase collaboration and solicitation of input in financial decision-making. (III.D.1, III.D.2)

The College and District will work together to increase collaboration and solicitation of input from constituency groups as an intrinsic element of the financial decision-making process.

Responsible Parties: Vice Chancellor of Finance and Facilities, VP of Administrative Services

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: In the years since the ISER, the College and District have made significant efforts to increase collaboration and solicitation of input from constituency groups with regard to fiscal decision-making. At Cypress, the College has revamped its financial decision-making processes

by strengthening the alignment of resource allocation with the Program Review process (PFI19.1 - Need Evidence). In addition, there is a more robust budget evaluation by divisions and less reliance on the One-Time Funding process (PFI19.2 - Need Evidence). At the District, a new budgeting model was implemented in 2020-21 which allows for more autonomy in decision-making for the Colleges (PFI19.3 - Budget Model). For example, each College is now able to decentralize revenues, utilize performance-based funding, and benefit from savings for innovations such as sustainability initiatives. At District Consultation Council (DCC) and Council on Budget and Facilities (CBF) meetings which are composed of constituent representatives from across the District, there is more transparency and dialogue about state and local resource allocation processes (i.e., Student Centered Funding Formula, Resource Allocation Model), and discussion on how to allocate one-time funds (PFI19.4 - Meeting Agendas or Minutes).

While both the College and District have proactively engaged in efforts to increase opportunities for collaboration and input, those efforts have not yet been fully recognized by the campus community. The most recent Employee Campus Climate Survey conducted in Fall 2019 identified transparency in planning and decision-making, and meaningful involvement in shared governance as key areas for improvement (PFI19.5 - Employee Campus Climate Survey). It should be noted that the perceptions regarding decision-making processes have improved since 2017, but remain low with an average of just over 50% agreement overall, and as low as 43% among full-time faculty (PFI19.6 - Employee Campus Climate Survey). Faculty leadership posit that while many in the campus community have recognized the improvements made, they are overshadowed by significant lapses in collaboration in specific instances which may explain the Climate Survey results (PFI19.7 - Goralski Email). The College and District will continue to work to address these issues in both practice and perception.

Evidence:

- PFI19.1 - Need Evidence
- PFI19.2 - Need Evidence
- PFI19.3 - Budget Model
- PFI19.4 - Meeting Agenda or Minutes (need)
- PFI19.5 - Employee Campus Climate Survey Results p. 7
- PFI19.6 - Employee Campus Climate Survey
- Other - Schilling Email
- PFI19.7 - Goralski Email
- DCC and CBF Meeting Agendas (need)

PFI 20

Submit a substantive change for awards 50% or more online. (IV.A.4)

The College will submit a substantive change with more than 50 awards that can now be achieved more than 50% online.

Responsible Parties: Accreditation Liaison Officer

Status: Complete

Narrative: As the College was finalizing the Substantive Change Proposal in Spring 2017, ACCJC revised the Substantive Change Inquiry process to a simplified electronic form submission via their website. The College completed the electronic form and received receipt of confirmation and indication that a substantive change was not warranted at that time (PFI20.1 - ACCJC Letter). However, in Spring 2020, the College moved to remote instruction in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. As the emergency stay-at-home orders continued, the College made adjustments to ongoing terms for instruction as dictated by the state Chancellor's Office and ACCJC. The College identified the courses and programs to be offered 50% or more online and submitted Emergency Temporary Distance Education Addendum Blanket Approval requests to the state Chancellor's Office (PFI20.2 - ETDE Submission; PFI20.3 – ETDE Submission), and notified ACCJC as requested (PFI20.4 - ACCJC Response; PFI20.5 - ACCJC Response).

Evidence:

- PFI20.1 - ACCJC Letter March 2018
- PFI20.2 - ETDE Submission July 2020
- PFI20.3 - ETDE Submission December 2020
- PFI20.4 - ACCJC Response July 2020
- PFI20.5 - ACCJC Response December 2020

PFI 21

Evaluate dissemination of resource allocation and financial accountability processes. (IV.D.2)

The District will evaluate the dissemination of its resource allocation and financial accountability processes to make them easily accessible and centralized.

Responsible Parties: Vice Chancellor of Finance and Facilities

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: The District has made efforts to disseminate information regarding resource allocation and accountability processes in several ways. In Fall 2017, the District began the process of reviewing and revising the resource allocation procedures that had been employed for several years. The Resource Allocation Workgroup (RAW), a shared governance subcommittee, was established to begin the review of the current budgeting processes and make recommendations to Council on Budget and Facilities (CBF) and District Consultation Council (DCC). Over the next three years, RAW met regularly to develop the new Resource Allocation Model (RAM), and kept District shared governance groups apprised of their progress (PFI21.1 - CBF Minutes; PFI21.2 - DCC Summary; PFI21.3 - Accreditation F&F Write-Up). The proposed RAM was presented and discussed at NOCCCD Board meetings, and shared at the College by the VP of Administrative Services at the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC), Presidents Advisory Committee (PAC), and Management Team meetings (PFI21.4 - CBF Minutes; PFI21.5 - PBC Minutes; PFI21.6 - BOT Minutes). In addition, District representatives hosted a Districtwide Budget Allocation Model Forum to provide an opportunity to learn about the RAM as well as District and College budget processes (PFI21.7 - Budget Forum Email).

Currently, CBF has assigned the District Budget Officers the task of developing a new Resource Allocation Handbook which is to be revised by its February 2021 meeting ([PFI21.8 – Resource Allocation Handbook](#)).

Evidence:

- PFI21.1 - CBF Minutes 071320
- PFI21.2 - DCC Summary 102819
- PFI21.3 - Accreditation F&F Write-up
- PFI21.4 - CBF Minutes 060820
- PFI21.5 - PBC Minutes 091720
- PFI21.6 - BOT minutes 112619 p. 818
- PFI21.7 - Budget Forum Email 120920

PFI 22

Improve district communication efforts to ensure effective operations. (IV.D.6)

The District will look for ways to improve communication efforts through more District-wide forums for conversation and engagement.

Responsible Parties: Chancellor

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: There have been several efforts made on behalf of the District to improve communications to ensure effective operations. For example, the District has hosted several on-campus events to promote increased communication opportunities. Coffee with the Chancellor was held regularly (pre-COVID) as an opportunity for informal and open discussion with members of the Board of Trustees and Chancellor ([PFI22.1 - Coffee Flyer](#); [PFI22.2 - Coffee Email](#)). The District has also hosted Open Forums to provide information and solicit feedback on various specific district-wide projects including resource allocation processes and the recent Educational and Facilities Master Plan ([PFI22.3 - Budget Forum Email](#); [PFI22.4 - EFMP Open Forum Email](#)). Finally, in response to requests for more direct access to key District Services such as Human Resources and Finance, regular Campus Office Hours were held weekly for each campus ([PFI22.5 - District Office Hours Email](#)). Some of the campus-wide meetings were suspended during remote operations and resumption should continue once campuses reopen. Finally, the District plans to conduct its Districtwide Climate Survey in Spring 2021 which will include an assessment of the efficacy and improvement of District communication efforts ([PFI22.6 - Li-Bugg Email](#)).

Perceptions regarding the efficacy of these efforts vary. While many people recognize that there has been increased outreach by the District, the perception is that overall, these efforts have not resulted in improved communication between the College and the District. Several factors have been identified to be potential causes. First, the College recognizes the negative impact that recent contentious contract negotiations between the District and employee groups has had on trust and communication, and the need to repair the chasms that have developed. The significant distrust that has been exacerbated by the negotiations hinders the efficacy of the

District's communication efforts because the District's motives are in question. A common sentiment is that meetings and forums are held to "check a box," and disseminate information as opposed to an opportunity for genuine interaction and meaningful engagement. Others have noted that the scheduling of important meetings does not always take faculty schedules into account, often scheduled during peak teaching times or conflicting with other faculty meetings. For example, the Resource Allocation Model (RAM) Open Forum was held on Thursday December 10, 2020 from 3:00-5:00pm which was during the last Academic Senate Meeting of the semester. Finally, recent interactions at Board of Trustees meetings have led to the perception that voices have been "chilled." The College and District will continue to work towards repairing the damage and re-building the trust, respect, and communication necessary for ongoing improvement and effective operations.

Evidence:

- PFI22.1 - Coffee Flyer Fall 2017
- PFI22.2 - Coffee Email Spring 2020
- PFI22.3 - Budget Forum Email
- PFI22.4 - EFMP Email
- PFI22.5 - District Office Hours Email
- PFI22.6 - Li-Bugg Email

PFI 23

Conduct annual assessments of the budget allocation model and formula allocation. (IV.D.7)

The District will conduct an annual assessment of the budget allocation model and formula allocation and more effectively disseminate evaluation results to all stakeholders.

Responsible Parties: Vice Chancellor of Finance and Facilities

Status: Work in Progress

Completion Timeline: TBD

Narrative: The development of the new Resource Allocation Model (RAM) began in 2017 and was recently approved and implemented for 2020-21 (PFI23.1 - Proposed Budget 2020-21). The RAM essentially shifts resource allocation to the individual budget centers (colleges) which then allocate an agreed upon percentage of 9.25% back to the District for central services. The development of the RAM included comparisons between the old and proposed models using actual 2018-19 and 2019-20 budget figures to assess the efficacy of the model (PFI23.2 - Proposed Budget 2020-21). Since 2020-21 is the first year of implementation, the model has not yet been evaluated but the Council on Budget and Facilities (CBF) is developing an evaluation plan which will be discussed upon its completion (PFI23.3 - CBF Meeting Summary). Results of the evaluation will be shared and discussed at appropriate shared governance committee meetings.

Evidence:

- PFI23.1 - Proposed Budget 2020-21 pp. 43-60
- PFI23.2 - Proposed Budget 2020-21 pp. 43-60

- PFI23.3 – CBF Meeting Summary 121220 (need)

DRAFT

Response to Team Recommendations for Improvement

The ACCJC Action Letter following the accreditation site visit in October 2017 specified four College Recommendations and three District Recommendations for Improvement ([link ACCJC letter](#)). The College also received one Recommendation for Compliance (College Recommendation 2) which was successfully addressed in the Follow-Up Report submitted in February 2019 and will not be included in this report ([link Follow-Up Report](#)).

Below is a status update on each of the Recommendations for Improvement (RFIs) made by the visiting team that includes the responsible parties, current status, completion timeline, and narrative of what actions the College has taken as a result of the recommendations and how these actions have improved institutional effectiveness.

College Recommendations for Improvement

College Recommendation 1 (Improvement)

In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the college continues its efforts to operationalize a more robust, sustainable, and continuous dialog about the results of SLO assessments and the use of those results for improvement in support of student learning. (IB.1, IB.4, IB.8, IB.9)

Responsible Parties: Instructional SLO Faculty Coordinator, Non-Instructional SLO Coordinator

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: As a result of the Recommendation for Compliance issued after the 2017 accreditation site visit, the College developed the College Outcomes Assessment and Review Cycle (COA) Plan ([CR1.1 - COA Plan](#)). Addressed in detail in the 2019 Follow-Up Report, the COA Plan was designed to facilitate a campus-wide culture of assessment and the use of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) across all areas of the campus ([CR1.2 - Follow-Up Report](#)). The COA Plan also addresses this College Recommendation for Improvement as it seeks to further elevate the prominence of SLO assessments and promote subsequent, robust dialogue about the results of SLO assessments in support of student learning. Some of the essential elements of the COA Plan include required annual assessment of SLOs in all courses, departments, and programs, assessment of Institutional and Program Student Learning Outcomes (ISLO/PSLOs), and the inclusion of SLO assessments and reflections in all instructional and non-instructional Program Reviews.

In an effort to further operationalize the dialogue about SLO assessments and the use of the results, the inclusion of SLOs has been further integrated into the Program Review process in that departments are required to analyze, discuss changes, and identify plans for improvement based on the results of SLO assessment ([CR1.3 – Instructional Program Review Form](#); [CR1.4 – Student Services Program Review Form](#); [CR1.5 – Campus Services Program Review Form](#)). The Program Review processes also now include a compliance status that is impacted by SLO participation, and the compliance status is considered in resource allocation and funding

processes ([CR1.6 - One-Time Funding Request Form](#); [CR1.7 - Faculty Request Form](#)). Specifically, departments that are deemed “Not in Compliance” may be subject to limitations on budget requests. Departments are given the opportunity, however, to provide evidence to change their compliance status before the next review cycle ([CR1.8 - Program Review Summary](#)).

The dialogue about SLO assessments and their impact on student learning go beyond the four-year cycle of the Program Review process. [SLO assessments occur annually, and departments/programs discuss SLO results in regular department meetings, Professional Development Flex Day activities, and Student Services Council meetings \(CR1.9 - Biology Flex Proposal; CR1.10 - Chemistry Flex Proposal; CR1.11 - Anthropology Flex Proposal; CR1.12 - Student Services Council Minutes\)](#). In addition, the SLO Committee, [comprised of representatives from all instructional divisions meets regularly to discuss program review components, increasing SLO participation, as well as CSLO status reports \(CR1.13 – SLO Committee Minutes\)](#). Furthermore, the College examines ISLO/PSLO results and other assessment metrics at Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) and President’s Advisory Council (PAC) meetings as part of the campus-wide efforts [towards ongoing improvement \(CR1.14 - PBC Minutes; CR1.15 - PAC Minutes\)](#).

One challenge the College faced when operationalizing a more robust dialogue surrounding SLO assessment results was that adjunct faculty were not specifically required to engage in CSLOs per their Adjunct Faculty United (AdFac) union contracts. In fact, many departments refused to ask adjunct faculty to participate in any way as to not violate the contracts. Since a significant proportion of courses at the College are taught by adjunct faculty, this had significant impacts on CSLO completion rates and the College and District needed to address this barrier before additional progress could be made. The issue was further exacerbated by a protracted contract negotiation that was finally resolved in 2019. The new contract more specifically identifies SLO assessment data entry as an administrative clerical requirement of adjunct instructors as a part of their evaluation ([CR1.16 - AdFac Contract](#)).

A related challenge was that the College implemented a new learning outcomes management information system called eLumen in Fall 2017. Full-time faculty were trained on the use of the new system and expected to begin using the system to house CSLO data. Due to the aforementioned contract negotiations, adjunct faculty were not required by all departments to participate, so in an effort to increase CSLO participation rates prior to the contract resolution, the College provided a training stipend to adjunct faculty who entered CSLO data ([CR1.17 - Adjunct Stipend Email; CR1.18 - PBC Minutes](#)). As a result, Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 showed marked increases in CSLO participation rates, but in the absence of the stipend, those rates again dropped in Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 ([CR1.19 - CSLO Status Reports](#)). However, once the new AdFac Contract was ratified, CSLO rates are now beginning to show improvement as more adjunct faculty are being made aware of the new requirements and are engaged in CSLO assessments ([CR1.20 - CSLO Status Report Fall 2019](#)).

Finally, the transition to remote operations as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic impacted SLO assessments, in part due to the inability to translate assessment tools into a remote format, as well as the other complications of a sudden transition to remote teaching. The Instructional SLO Coordinator made substantial efforts to provide assistance, training, and support to instructors to transition this work to a remote environment (CR1.21 - eLumen Instructions; CR1.22 - SLO FAQs; CR1.23 - Coopman Email).

Taken together, the College has seen increased participation in SLO assessments and dialogue surrounding SLO assessment results and student learning, despite the various setbacks. For example, departments that completed their Instructional Program Reviews in 2019-20 assessed over 90% of the courses offered (CR1.24 - IPR Annual Report 2019-20). The COA Plan provided a framework for these efforts, and the integration of SLOs within Program Review and resource allocation processes operationalized these efforts within sustainable College planning processes. The Instructional SLO Coordinator is in the process of developing training materials to help facilitate more meaningful discussions regarding CSLOs and their impacts on student learning (CR1.25 – Need Evidence). Moving forward, the College will shift focus to further enhance the dialogue surrounding SLOs and the use of SLO results to improve both student learning and more broadly, institutional effectiveness.

Evidence:

- CR1.1 - COA Plan
- CR1.2 - Follow-Up Report
- CR1.3 - Instructional Program Review Form
- CR1.4 - Student Services Program Review Form
- CR1.5 - Campus Services Program Review Form
- CR1.6 - One-Time Funding Request Form
- CR1.7 - Faculty Hiring Request Form
- CR1.8 - Program Review Summary
- CR1.9 - Biology Flex Proposal
- CR1.10 - Chemistry Flex Proposal
- CR1.11 - Anthropology Flex Proposal
- CR1.12 - Student Services Council Minutes (need)
- CR1.13 - SLO Committee Minutes
- CR1.14 - PBC Minutes
- CR1.15 - PAC Minutes
- CR1.16 - AdFac Contract p. 54
- CR1.17 - Adjunct Stipend Email
- CR1.18 - PBC Minutes
- CR1.19 - CSLO Status Reports Fall 2017 through Spring 2020
- CR1.20 - CSLO Status Report Fall 2019
- CR1.21 - eLumen Instructions
- CR1.22 - SLO FAQs
- CR1.23 - Coopman Email 120920

- CR1.24 - IPR Annual Report 2019-20
- CR1.25 – Need Evidence

College Recommendation 2 (Compliance)

In order to meet the standards, the college must complete a full review of its processes related to the assessment and review cycle of Student Learning Outcomes for all instructional courses/programs to ensure that all courses, programs, and directly related services are improved (IIA.2, IIA.16)

Status: Complete

Narrative: The Recommendation for Compliance was addressed in the 2019 Follow-Up Report (CR2.1 - 2019 Follow-Up Report) which was accepted by ACCJC in June, 2019 (CR2.2 - ACCJC Letter).

Evidence:

- CR2.1 - 2019 Follow-Up Report
- CR2.2 - ACCJC Letter, June 2019

College Recommendation 3 (Improvement)

In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the college ensure that in every class section students receive a course syllabus that includes learning outcomes from the institutions officially approved course outlines. (II.A.3)

Responsible Parties: VP of Instruction, Deans

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: At the time of the accreditation site visit in 2017, academic divisions each had their own procedure to confirm the inclusion of CSLOs in course syllabi. These procedures were effective in ensuring that all syllabi included CSLOs, and during the site visit, nearly all of the syllabi randomly selected by the evaluation team for inspection included CSLOs. However, upon review, the team determined that the CSLOs in the reviewed syllabi were not consistently those from the official Course Outline of Record (COR).

A number of complicating factors led to this issue. First, the curriculum approval process has a long lag time between approval and activation, which leads to confusion regarding which and when CSLOs are “official.” Second, the various software systems utilized in curriculum (e.g., CurricUNET, eLumen, Banner) do not seamlessly interface with each other and require human intervention to update which resulted in confusion about where “official” CSLOs were located and when they were finalized. In addition, division offices had each developed their own CSLO confirmation process that varied in efficacy. Finally, the sheer volume of paperwork to individually inspect the syllabus for each course section to confirm the accuracy of the specific wording of each CSLO is a daunting task that naturally lends itself to occasional errors.

Since the discrepancy of official CSLO information on course syllabi was identified, there have been several, varied attempts to address the problem. When the College decided to search for

a new Curriculum approval software, there was hope that a system that seamlessly interfaced with eLumen would be selected to solve for that issue (CR3.1 - Grote Email). Unfortunately, there was a lack of agreement on a single program to be used by all colleges in the District which complicated the decision-making process. Those discussions were then paused while the State Chancellor's Office explores obtaining a system to be made available to all colleges state-wide. In the meantime, the College continues to explore ways to clarify the location and activation date of "official" CSLOs and the best way to confirm accuracy.

The SLO Committee has made repeated efforts to facilitate the inclusion of official CSLOs in course syllabi. The SLO Coordinator emails faculty before the start of each semester, with a reminder to include active CSLOs on syllabi with attached instructions detailing how to find active CSLOs for courses in CurricUNET (CR3.2 - Coopman Email; CR3.3 - CurricUNET Instructions). In addition, the active CSLOs on course syllabi requirements are articulated in the SLO FAQ sheet emailed to all instructors each semester (CR3.4 - SLO FAQs). The instructional materials are also posted on the Cypress College SLO webpage (CR3.5 - SLO Webpage). Finally, SLOs on syllabi are discussed regularly at SLO Committee meetings and representatives are asked to follow-up with faculty in their divisions (CR3.6 – SLO Committee Meeting Minutes).

In conjunction with these efforts, the College recognized that a uniform process to be utilized by faculty and deans needed to be developed. During this time, however, there was an instability in leadership in the area of Instruction at the College. A structural change from a single Executive Vice President to two Vice Presidents (VP of Instruction and VP of Student Services) and the sudden departure of a newly hired VP of Instruction (VPI) put the efforts to resolve the syllabus CSLO issue on hold. However, this effort has been renewed since the arrival of the new VPI in Fall 2020, and the VPI has worked with the deans to devise a multi-stage effort to rectify the issue.

In order to ensure the accuracy of the CSLOs, faculty will first receive a standard email from the deans requesting submission of course syllabi to the division offices one week prior to the start of the semester. The email reminds the instructor of the need to confirm the accuracy and currency of the CSLOs for the course as a necessary element for compliance, as well as provides a link to CurricUNET (CR3.7 - Douglas Email). Second, to further increase the accuracy of CSLOs in course syllabi, the deans are in the process of developing a more streamlined and consistent confirmation process to be used across campus (CR3.8 - Douglas Email). Discussions about this issue are being included in Department Coordinator meetings (CR3.9 – Department Coordinator Meeting Agenda), and deans are working with the instructional SLO Coordinator to explore various approaches to address the issue, including using eLumen participation reports and coordinating the timing of SLO Committee reports and follow-up efforts (CR3.10 - Email Evidence). Finally, an AdHoc committee consisting of deans and faculty has been formed to further explore workable practices to confirm official CSLO inclusion in syllabi moving forward (CR3.11 - AdHoc Committee).

Evidence:

- CR3.1 - Grote Email 101818 and 040819
- CR3.2 - Coopman Email
- CR3.3 - CurricUNET Instructions
- CR3.4 - SLO FAQs
- CR3.5 - SLO Webpage
- CR3.6 – SLO Committee Meeting Minutes
- CR3.7 - Douglas Email 020721
- CR3.8 - Douglas Email 020921
- CR3.9 - Language Arts Department Coordinator Meeting Agenda 022421
- CR3.10 - Young and Coopman Emails
- CR3.11 - AdHoc Committee (**need**)

College Recommendation 4 (Improvement)

In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the college assess and review the overall process for resource allocation to assure alignment with institutional goals, and to promote transparency and communication of resource allocations processes. (I.A.3, I.B.9, III.D.3)

Responsible Parties: VP of Administrative Services

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: At the time of the accreditation site visit and in subsequent years, the College experienced several upper-level management retirements and resignations which resulted in substantial change in leadership. As a result, work on some accreditation projects needed to be delayed until the new leadership had a chance to settle into their positions and assess the College's practices and procedures.

The current VP of Administrative Services began his tenure at Cypress College in 2019. Prior to his tenure, the College maintained a historical base budget that had not been adjusted for several years. As available funds were recognized, they were allocated via two separate one-time funding processes at the College. The first was an Advanced One-Time Funding process which was essentially a repeated, annual allocation made for regular expenses that were identified at the start of each year (i.e., baseballs for the Baseball Team). The second was a Competitive One-Time Funding process which addressed other funding needs that arose throughout the year (i.e., **example**). Both of these one-time funding decisions were made utilizing the shared governance process and were tied to College and District Strategic Directions as part of the decision-making process (**CR4.1 - Porter Email**).

After a review and assessment of the resource allocation processes was conducted, the VPAS began to institute changes to these processes for the campus beginning in the 2019-20 fiscal year. Specifically, departments were asked to propose a full budget that would be inclusive of previous "Advanced One-Time Funding" allocations to develop a modified base budget that was more in line with annual projected department needs. The modified base budgets reflected actual spending in the prior year as well as anticipated equipment and supply expenses of the coming year (**CR4.2 - Porter Email**). As this constituted a new process, the campus budget

office provided the necessary support to assist with the development process. Support included workshops and one-on-one meetings between managers and the Administrative Services staff throughout Spring 2019 to review expenses, provide budget templates to develop the new budget, and detail the elements to be included (CR4.3 - Ceppi Email). Additionally, the budgeting process moved to a two-year cycle to allow for more efficient use of carryforward budget balances and instituted ongoing (three times per year) budget performance review meetings between managers and Administrative Services staff (CR4.4 - Porter Email). Taken together, these changes greatly improved both transparency and communication regarding the budgeting and resource allocation processes utilized by the College.

While significant work had been accomplished with regard to budget development and planning, there was still a need to review the one-time funding process that was used to address unanticipated expenditures. In Fall 2019, the shared governance Planning and Budget Committee (PBC), under the leadership of the VPAS, began a review of the College's Competitive One-Time Funding practices and made several changes including a more robust alignment with institutional goals. First, the One-Time Funding process was linked more directly to Program Review by requiring requestors to connect their resource requests to the established needs and/or goals identified in their Program Review (CR4.5 - One-Time Funding Request Form). The College Mission Statement and District/College Strategic Plans continue to be important components of the process and are used, along with Program Review, to evaluate submitted requests (CR4.6 - One-Time Funding Scoring Rubric). Second, the pool of available funds is more clearly identified from the outset to provide greater context and transparency to the amount of funding available for allocation. Finally, the previous request limitations were removed to provide greater flexibility in determining a department's actual funding needs (CR4.7 - Porter Email).

In addition to the changes made to resource allocation processes thus far, the Faculty Hiring Prioritization and Classified Position Prioritization processes are also being reviewed and revised by the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) to ensure alignment with institutional goals, and better promote transparency and communication. The review discussions will include how best to utilize Program Review to promote increased alignment with the College's goals, planning, and strategic directions (CR4.8 - PBC Minutes; CR4.9 - Revised Forms)

The Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) discussions surrounding these budgeting and resource allocation processes are designed to communicate to the various members (faculty, management, and staff) the guiding principles and goals of the budgeting process (CR4.10 - Porter Email). The changes to department budgeting, the revised One-Time Funding process, as well as the pending revisions to Faculty Hiring Prioritization and Classified Position Prioritization are indicative of significant progress towards improving alignment with institutional goals, as well as the transparency and communication of resource allocations processes.

Evidence:

- CR4.1 - Porter Email 112119
- CR4.2 - Porter Email 112119

- CR4.3 - Ceppi Email
- CR4.4 - Porter Email 112119
- CR4.5 - One-Time Funding Request Form (need)
- CR4.6 - One-Time Funding Scoring Rubric (need)
- CR4.7 - Porter Email 202120
- CR4.8 - PBC Minutes 120320
- CR4.9 - Revised Forms
- CR4.10 - Porter Email 202120

College Recommendation 5 (Improvement)

To increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the college develop a structure to organize governance information in a manner that is accessible. Additionally, the team recommends continued effective communication through the consistent development and dissemination of robust committee meeting minutes that include constituent dialogue and feedback. (IV.D.1)

Responsible Parties: President

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: In order to improve the organization and dissemination of shared governance information, the College moved away from an internal shared drive (“the J: drive”) and created the Cypress College Governance webpage on the College website (CR5.1 - Governance Webpage). The page includes a list of shared governance committees and links to their individual webpages. Each committee webpage has descriptive information regarding the purpose and membership of the group as well as links to agendas, minutes, and other relevant resources. The webpages are easily and directly accessible via the Employees tab at the top of the College website (CR5.2 - College Website). While the implementation of the Governance webpage has created a much-improved structure to house and easily access shared governance information, continued work regarding ongoing maintenance is still necessary. The College is working to create maintenance and update procedures to ensure that the pages remain effective and accurate. In addition, plans to further clarify the relationships between the various governance committees and identify how the committees work together are underway.

The College has also made a more concerted effort to promote the development and dissemination of more robust committee meeting minutes in various leadership committees across the campus. For example, the Curriculum Committee began to distribute the meeting agenda and minutes broadly via email to the campus community in 2019, in addition to posting them on the Governance webpage (CR5.3 - Curriculum Minutes Email). Additional efforts included informing shared governance and other campus committees about the Recommendation for Improvement and directing them to review their minutes to ensure that they met the advised criteria of the standard (CR5.4 - Need Evidence). Reminders about the need for robust minutes are also made in various shared governance and leadership meetings when appropriate (CR5.5 - Academic Senate Minutes). The College is also working to create a template and training related to writing minutes to be offered to personnel responsible for recording committee work and dialogue (CR5.6 - Need Evidence). Ensuring regular posting of

minutes will be an element of the Governance webpage update and maintenance process that is in development (CR5.7 - Need Evidence).

Evidence:

- CR5.1 - [Governance Webpage](#)
- CR5.2 - [College Website](#)
- CR5.3 - Curriculum Minutes Email
- CR5.4 - Need Evidence
- CR5.5 - Academic Senate Minutes 022521 (need approved)
- CR5.6 - Need Evidence
- CR5.7 - Need Evidence

District Recommendations for Improvement

District Recommendation 1 (Improvement)

In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the district fully implement its new plan to review all chapters of the board policies and associated administrative procedures over a 6-year cycle. (IV.C.7).

Responsible Parties: Chancellor

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: The North Orange County Community College District (NOCCCD) has developed a 6-year review cycle for Board Policies (BP) and Administrative Procedures (AP) to ensure ongoing review and updates of all seven chapters (DR1.1 - BP/AP Review Cycle). In response to the Recommendation for Improvement issued by the visiting team, the NOCCCD Board of Trustees (BOT) held a Board Policy Study Session on September 25, 2018 to review and discuss development and review processes utilized for District policies and procedures. In this study session, the BOT determined that a subcommittee to review policies should be established to gain a mutual understanding of what needs to be updated and to determine priority and future action (DR1.2 - BOT Minutes).

The BP and AP review process begins in District Consultation Council (DCC). As a shared governance committee, DCC utilizes the Microsoft Teams platform to provide members ample opportunity to comment on policies and procedures to be reviewed prior to DCC meetings. All comments are shared during the meeting to facilitate the review. Once approved, the policies and procedures are forwarded to the Board of Trustees for their review and posted to the District website upon approval (DR1.3 - DCC Minutes; DR1.4 - BOT Minutes). The established BP and AP Review Cycle and related processes ensure that all board policies and procedures are reviewed over a 6-year cycle.

Evidence:

- DR1.1 - BP/AP Review Cycle
- DR1.2 - BOT Minutes 092518 p. 133
- DR1.3 - DCC Minutes 042219 pp. 3-4

- DR1.4 - BOT Minutes 042319 pp. 115-116

District Recommendation 2 (Improvement)

In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the governing board review both its BP 2740 and AP 2740 to create a clear direction for the ongoing training program for board development. Both policy and administrative procedures should reflect that all board members engage in ongoing training program for board development, including new member orientation. (IV.C.9).

Responsible Parties: Chancellor

Status: Work in Progress

Completion Timeline: TBD

Narrative: The Board Policy Subcommittee that was established as a result of the Board Policy Study Session discussed above in District Recommendation 1 began their review with policies in the 2000s, including BP 2740. The Board of Trustees (BOT) discussed the need to add more substance to the policy and create better balance between ongoing education and new trustee education in both the BP and the AP, and the matter was referred to the Board Policy Subcommittee for further discussion (DR2.1 - BOT Minutes). In May 2019, the Subcommittee provided an update on their progress noting that in their review of BP 2740 that changes to that policy might necessitate changes to AP 2740 as well (DR2.2 - BOT Minutes).

The Subcommittee completed their review of BP 2740 in May of 2020 and presented the revisions to the BOT for a first read. At the June 23, 2020 meeting, the BOT discussed the proposed changes and made additional recommendations for revision including a title change, inclusion of additional topic areas, as well as changes to language in order to avoid limiting topics to just those specifically listed in the BP (DR2.3 - BOT Minutes; DR2.4 - DCC Agenda). The revised BP was referred to legal counsel for review, but no revisions were recommended (DR2.5 - DCC Agenda).

The proposed BP 2740 was then discussed at District Consultation Council's (DCC) October 2020 meeting who added "equity, inclusion, and anti-racist practices" to the listing of relevant areas for professional development before approving the revised board policy and forwarding their recommendations to the BOT for their consideration (DR2.6 - DCC Summary; DR2.7 - BOT Agenda). In November 2020, after additional discussion and final revisions the Board approved BP 2740 and the revised policies were posted to the District website (DR2.8 - BOT Minutes; DR2.9 - Board Policy Webpage).

The revisions to BP 2740 represent a substantial increase in the ongoing training and professional development of Board of Trustees members. Specific changes to language provide clear direction for ongoing training and development. In addition, more specific delineation of elements of the new trustee orientation provide greater clarity of content and expectations (DR2.10 - BOT Agenda). Finally, professional development and education participation is tracked and documented to ensure ongoing engagement (DR2.11 - BOT Participation

Tracking). AP 2740 will be reviewed by DCC [when?] to determine whether modifications based on the revised BP 2740 are warranted (DR2.12 - AP 2740).

Evidence:

- DR2.1 - BOT Minutes 092518
- DR2.2 - BOT Minutes 052819 p. 169
- DR2.3 - BOT Minutes 062320 p. 121
- DR2.4 - DCC Agenda 102620 p. 29
- DR2.5 - DCC Agenda 102620 p. 25
- DR2.6 - DCC Summary 102620 p. 6
- DR2.7 - BOT Agenda 112420 p. 33
- DR2.8 - [BOT Minutes 112420](#)
- DR2.9 - Board Policy Webpage
- DR2.10 - BOT Agenda 112420 p. 33
- DR2.11 - BOT Participation Tracking 101220
- DR2.12 - [AP 2740](#)

District Recommendation 3 (Improvement)

To increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the Colleges and NOCCCD review the current budget model to ensure financial resources are sufficient to address productivity factors, FTES targets, and the impact in the model of adjunct, overload and re-assign time needed to support and sustain student learning programs and services. (III.D.1, III.D.4).

Responsible Parties: Chancellor

Status: Work in Progress

Narrative: As a result of the work leading up to the ISER, the District was aware of the concerns regarding the budget model that existed at that time, and discussions of a new budget model began soon after in Fall 2017. These discussions began in the Council of Budget and Facilities (CBF), and a subcommittee of CBF called the Resource Allocation Workgroup (RAW) was established to explore a new budget model (CBF Minutes 111317). The RAW, which included fiscal officers, faculty, classified staff, and confidential employees, began their work in January 2018 (CBF Minutes 021218).

Early work of the RAW included the development of their purpose, reviewing the parameters of SB 361, and outlining the principles and vision for the proposed model. The guiding principles for the proposed model were finalized and approved by CBF in May 2018 (CBF Minutes 051418) and the workgroup began to develop a new resource allocation model referred to at the time as the “Push-Out Allocation Model.” The basic premise of the model was to shift (or “push out”) the funding received from the State to the Colleges who would then be responsible for managing their allocations. The District would receive funds back from the Colleges (or “budget centers”) to cover the centralized services provided.

In December 2018, the work of the RAW was significantly impacted by the switch in the funding formula utilized by the State Chancellor’s office from SB 361 to the Student Centered Funding

Formula (SCFF). The SCFF was complicated and a major shift from previous funding mechanisms and the District contracted an outside consulting firm, Cambridge West, to provide guidance and support the District in implementing the new funding formula. At the same time, the membership of the RAW was reviewed and modified and scheduled to resume meetings in February 2019 (evidence: CBF Minutes 121018).

As the specifics of the SCFF continued to evolve through 2019, the RAW worked to implement the SCFF into the parameters of the Push-Out Allocation Model being developed. The RAW identified the need for data validation (evidence: F&F Write-Up) as they worked with Cambridge West to create an equitable formula for the District to implement (evidence: CBF Minutes 040819). The workgroup also identified budget centers and determined how the budget centers would fund District Services costs as well as determine the best assessments to be used for chargebacks (evidence: CBF Minutes 051319).

The District's new resource allocation model, renamed the Resource Allocation Model (RAM), was first presented to CBF in August 2019. The RAM was tested by utilizing the previous 2018-19 budget figures, as well as a side-by-side comparison of the upcoming 2019-20 budgeting process, with the goal of seeing the impacts of the new model and better understanding how and why each campus received their allocation (evidence: CBF Minutes 081219). The RAW continued to run projections comparing the old and new budgeting models, determining District percentages, and updating chargebacks, and reported their results at CBF meetings (evidence: CBF Minutes 101419; CBF Minutes 120919).

Through the spring and summer of 2020, the RAM was regularly discussed at CBF meetings and updates by RAW were provided (evidence: F&F Write-up) and it was decided to implement the RAM for the Tentative Budget Assumptions for 2020-2021 (evidence: F&F Write-up). A side-by-side comparison of the previous funding model and the RAM was presented, by request, at the July 2020 CBF meeting that provided a detailed breakdown of site revenues and expenditures as well as highlighted the differences between the two models. There was significant discussion that included explanations about how the RAM allowed for the campuses to look at their revenues as a source to fund additional Operating Allocations and Extended Day, which was a concern with the previous model, as the Extended Day budgets did not align with the expenditures and operating allocations were insufficient (evidence: CBF Minutes 071320).

In October 2020, the 2020-21 Proposed Resource Allocation Model Budget Summary was presented to CBF. The summary provided specific details on the funding components (e.g., SCFF, budget center revenues, expenditures, intrafund transfers, and chargebacks), comparisons of the 2019-20 budget, 2019-20 actuals, and the 2020-21 budget, as well as a detailed sheet to show calculation methodologies (evidence: CBF minutes 101220).

At the November 2020 CBF meeting, a full review of the RAM was presented that included explanation of the guiding principles, budget centers, SCFF impacts, resource allocation process and anticipated apportionment amounts for the 2020-21 Proposed Budget (evidence:

CBF Minutes 110220). The RAM was rolled out with the 2020-21 Proposed Budget (evidence: 2020-21 Budget), and initial impacts were evaluated at the December 2020 CBF meeting in order to make necessary adjustments. District staff solicited input, suggestions, and recommendations from CBF and several discussions took place to identify what needed to be identified and how. The Budget Office was requested to identify components that worked well, as well as make recommendations for changes to be discussed at a future meeting (evidence: CBF Minutes 121420).

The RAM was presented to the campuses via a virtual Open Forum in December 2020 which was then posted to the District website (evidence: Open Forum). The new Budget Allocation Handbook that will align with the RAM is in development (evidence: CBF Minutes101220). Throughout the development and implementation process of the RAM regular progress updates were made to both the District Consultation Council (DCC) and NOCCCD Board of Trustees (evidence: F&F Write-Up). As the RAM has been newly implemented for 2020-21 final evaluations will be completed at the end of the fiscal year and adjustments made accordingly.

Evidence:

- CBF Minutes 111317
- CBF Minutes 051418
- CBF Minutes 021218
- CBF Minutes 121018
- CBF Minutes 081219
- CBF Minutes 051319
- CBF Minutes 040819
- F&F Write-up
- CBF Minutes 121420
- CBF Minutes 110220
- CBF minutes 101220
- CBF Minutes 071320
- CBF Minutes 101419
- CBF Minutes 120919
- Open Forum 121020 link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-1rN6kysCo0>
Proposed Budget and Financial Report 2020-21

Reflection on Improving Institutional Performance: Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Institution Set Standards (ISSs)

Reflection on Student Learning Outcomes (Standard I.B.2)

ACCJC Standard I.B.2 states: "The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services." Reflect on the college's assessment processes since the last comprehensive review.

What are the strengths of the process that helps lead the college to improve teaching and learning?

The SLO assessment process has seen significant improvements since the implementation of the College Outcomes Assessment (COA) Review Cycle Plan that was developed as a result of the Recommendation for Compliance received by the College in 2018. The COA Plan in conjunction with the efforts of the Instructional and Non-Instructional SLO Coordinators has resulted in increasing participation in the SLO assessment process across all areas of the College. One of the goals of the COA plan was to create a culture of assessment wherein all departments participate in annual assessments of their programs and services. This campus-wide focus on ongoing assessment creates a shared experience and commitment to the College's pursuit of student learning and achievement, and highlights the need for all areas of the campus to work collectively to achieve this shared goal.

Establishing a culture of assessment has the added benefit of making the use of data a more normalized and expected element of other processes. Engaging in regular assessment has made the use of data more universal and underscores the role of data and its importance in making decisions. Data driven decision-making has become the standard expectation across campus.

Another strength of the SLO process has been the impact on courses and teaching methodologies. More and more departments regularly discuss SLO results at Department Meetings often as part of their required Flex Day Activities (Evidence: Combined Flex Agendas). When Flex activities were expanded to include Department sponsored events, the incentive to engage in SLO discussions was increased. Much of the resistance towards SLO participation was grounded in the lack of time available to engage in department discussions given the busy schedules of faculty. Providing the opportunity to fulfill Flex obligations while meeting to discuss SLOs eliminated the barrier and increased participation. Flex Day discussions include examining benchmarks, developing activities and teaching strategies to address difficulties in subject matter, reviewing grading policies, sharing best practices, and revising curriculum based on SLO results.

What growth opportunities in the assessment process has the college identified to further refine its authentic culture of assessment?

Significant progress in SLO assessment participation has been made, however, a key factor to ongoing success lies in the need for increased adjunct faculty participation. As of 2019, adjunct faculty are required to participate in the data collection and entry of SLO assessment tools as part of their administrative duties. However, their contract does not specifically require adjunct faculty to participate in other aspects of the SLO process such as SLO development or the critical discussion of SLO results. While some departments have robust participation from adjunct faculty in SLO discussions, that is not yet the culture across the entire campus. Even more critical is that adjunct faculty are not compensated for their time in these meetings. Adjunct faculty are responsible for XX% of the total number of courses taught on campus and are the sole instructor for XX%. As such, compensated adjunct participation in SLO conversations is the necessary next step in the effective use of SLOs to promote student achievement and success.

The SLO process would also benefit from continuing to improve the usefulness of the SLO data gathered. Because the College fell behind in SLO completion rates, the campus efforts have thus far been focused primarily on meeting the requirements established. In order for the process to be most effective, however, the focus needs to move beyond compliance. As the use of SLOs becomes common practice, efforts to make the process more meaningful can continue to grow. Improvement efforts such as revising CSLOs and PSLOs to make them more meaningful, developing effective assessment tools, and learning how to better use data are all areas to be explored and developed. These improvement efforts have already begun with instructional departments re-examining their SLOs to maximize their usefulness, as well as the SLO Coordinator working with Department Coordinators to help improve the processes used. Continued progress in this direction will help refine the process and create more meaningful results.

A third area of growth lies in the increased use of disaggregated data in SLO analysis discussions. Thus far the focus on the SLO process has been to increase SLO assessment participation and mapping the CSLOs to campus ISLO/PSLOs within the College's four-year Program Review Cycle. The next phase will include incorporating disaggregated SLO data into the Program Review process to identify and address potential equity gaps in disproportionately impacted groups. While not yet integrated into the Program Review process, some work in this area has begun between the Instructional SLO Coordinator and the Title V Grant data coaches who are examining how to use SLO data to address achievement issues and promote student success.

Another area of growth is in the potential expanded use of department PSLOs. Currently, the College has established four ISLO/PSLOs that are designed to be analyzed at the institutional and program levels, and some departments have developed additional PSLOs for department use or as required by external accrediting bodies. In addition, the College uses the Associate Degree and Certificate Assessment Plan (ADCAP) in order to assess ISLOs for degrees and certificates. Recent graduates are sent a survey that assess how well their program of study met the College's ISLOs (evidence: ADCAP Survey). However, degree and certificate PSLOs

at are not part an instructional department's SLO process and further discussion regarding the role of PSLOs for degrees and certificates is warranted.

Provide examples where course, program, or service improvements have occurred based on outcomes assessment data.

There are numerous examples of improvements made in courses, programs, and services as a result of the SLO process. Some examples include,

- The Aviation and Travel Careers Department moved to utilize improved standardized Computer Based Interactive Training (CBIT) course modules to improve online and hybrid courses, as well as worked with the English Department to create an English course for CTE students based on PSLO results (evidence: ATC PR).
- The Accounting Department worked to improve SLO results by identifying various successful methodologies including homework, case studies, and events and workshops, to teach foundational concepts and encouraged all instructors to integrate them into their courses. In addition, the department revised their curriculum to better utilize the textbook publisher homework program to better measure the results for each individual SLO and isolate a specific SLO more effectively, and provide easier and more effective collection of results by instructors for each individual SLO (evidence ACCT PR).
- The Dental Hygiene Department developed curriculum and revised prerequisites to better prepare students for success in the program as well as modified the mode of delivery for courses when the SLO results indicated less success in fully online courses (evidence: DH PR).
- The Health Information Technology Department revised the approach to present projects to students by breaking down the overall content of the assignment into smaller increments and providing feedback at completion of each stage of the project to help improve student success (evidence: HI PR).
- The Communication Studies Department worked in conjunction with adjunct faculty to create more similar experiences for the students by creating guidelines for courses that all instructors utilize when designing their individual classes. Guidelines included ranges for total required minutes of speaking and individual speech assignments, weighting of public speaking and communication theory emphasis in course construction, common writing requirements and weighting, etc. (Evidence: COMM PR).
- The Chemistry Department identified challenging concepts and created an original lab manual and lab activities that incorporated specific practices to increase CSLO success. Additionally, as a result of their PSLO results the Department intensified their focus on critical thinking and problem-solving skills in introductory chemistry courses as well as

increased the exposure to current events that relate to chemistry in the non-science major chemistry courses (Evidence: CHEM PR).

The College has also made improvements in non-instructional service areas as well.

- Disability Support Services (DSS) used their SSSLO results to identify areas of improvement in terms of tracking students who use the accommodations and services available. DSS recognized the disparity between the number of students to be eligible and the number of students who actually utilize the available accommodations/services. Plans to develop a process to accurately identify each group to compare the success rates of each in order to better target and promote the use of DSS services is underway (Evidence: DSS SSPR).

In those areas where assessment may be falling behind, what is the college doing to complete the assessments per the college's schedule?

The Instructional SLO Committee has made substantial efforts to support increasing participation rates for departments who are falling behind. The SLO Coordinator sends regular reminder emails to encourage timely SLO completion (evidence: Coopman Combined Emails). In addition, the Committee has developed and distributed training materials including an FAQ sheet that includes deadline dates, as well as instructions on finding CSLOs and entering eLumen data (evidence: FAQs; finding CSLOs). The SLO Committee regularly discusses how to improve SLO completion rates and representatives are asked to make announcements in Division meetings and follow up with Department Coordinators (evidence: SLO Minutes 110220; 030121).

In addition, the College has made efforts to better integrate SLO participation into other campus processes. As discussed earlier, the College made substantial changes to the Program Review process to make SLO participation more impactful (see College RFI 1 and QFE 1). A department's Program Review now includes a summary page that identifies commendations and recommendations, as well as assigns a compliance status (evidence: Program Review Summary). The compliance status is determined in large part by a department's CSLO completion rates. A department will receive a status of In Compliance, Compliance-Needs Improvement, or Not in Compliance. In addition, the Program Review Summary is now a required element of resource allocation requests and a department's status may impact their request (evidence: One-Time Funding Request, Process Memos). Specifically, departments that are deemed "Not in Compliance" may be subject to limitations on budget requests. Departments are given the opportunity, however, to provide evidence to change their compliance status before the next review cycle (evidence: Program Review Summary). The inclusion of the compliance status was designed to both incentivize departments to improve/maintain their SLO assessment participation as well as provide a level of accountability.

Finally, the work to complete SLOs in the Administrative Service areas continues. The College was in the process of revising the existing Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUOs; now called Administrative Service Outcomes) when the need to focus on the College's upcoming

Accreditation cycle delayed those efforts. After completing the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report, Accreditation team visit, and required Follow-up Report, work on the ASO revisions resumed. The COA Plan implementation included a re-examination of SLOs in both the Student and Administrative Service areas and both SSSLOs and ASOs were revised. In addition, the Program Review process and cycle for both Student Service and Administrative Service areas were revised. Plans to begin the new four-year Program Review cycle (to include the newly revised SSSLOs and ASOs) were in progress when the College was forced to close due to COVID-19. Since that time, all Administrative Services efforts have been focused on effectively sustaining the business of the College in the remote environment. The College plans to renew the efforts to assess ASOs when on-campus business resumes.

Reflection on Institution Set Standards (Standard I.B.3)

ACCJC Standard I. B. 3. reads: “The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information.” Using the most recent Annual Report, the college will reflect on its trend data on institution-set standards for course completion, certificate completion, degrees awarded, and transfer.

Has the college met its floor standards and its stretch (aspirational) goals?

The trend data reported in the College’s 2021 ACCJC Annual Report indicates that the College has consistently met the institution-set standards for course completion, certificate completion, degrees awarded, and transfer for at least the past two years (**evidence: Annual Report**). Specifically, course completion rates have been stable over the past three years at 73%, and have consistently exceeded the floor standard of 72%. Certificate completion, degrees awarded, and transfers have not only met their respective floor standards, but have realized significant increases over the past three years. With regard to certificates, the introduction of the IGETC and GE Breadth certificates in 2018-19, in addition to other new certificates, contributed to a dramatic increase from 690 certificates awarded in 2017-18 to 2,442 in 2019-20. The increases in degrees and transfers have also been impressive, with 1,387 degrees awarded in 2017-18 to 1,860 in 2019-20, and 848 transfers in 2017-18 to 1,242 in 2019-20. As a result of these notable increases, aspirational stretch goals for these metrics have also been attained. The exception is course completion which has an established stretch goal of 76%, which the College has not yet achieved.

The College also has a baccalaureate program that has awarded 15 degrees over the past three years. The College met the institution-set standard and stretch goal in 2018-19, but fell two degrees short of meeting the standard in 2019-20. Because the program is new, with the first cohort beginning in Fall 2017, the focus has been on program growth, which will ultimately lead to more degrees awarded in future years.

What initiative(s) is the college undertaking to improve its outcomes?

In order to improve student outcomes, the College has been engaged in a variety of large-scale initiatives designed to support student learning, equity, and success. For example, the College has adopted a Guided Pathways framework to support student success with an emphasis on equity. With the support of a Title V grant, Guided Pathways has established cross-functional Completion Teams within eight of the College's academic divisions, each of which includes a faculty data coach, faculty peer coach, and counselor, as well as members from student services and administration who work together to support the students within their division ([evidence: Title V Grant](#)). The Completion Teams provide unique support to students by holding major-specific events or orientations, working with departments to develop curricular pathways in Program Mapper, and providing resources and equity trainings to faculty, among other activities to help students in their divisions succeed.

Additionally, as a result of [AB 705](#) legislation, placement tests were phased out of the assessment process for English and math in 2018-19. Instead of placement tests, the College developed a [guided self-placement](#) (GSP) tool used to recommend the appropriate transfer-level English and math course to students ([evidence: GSP link](#)). This was a transformative change in the assessment process that, along with the resulting innovative curricular changes made by faculty, produced narrowing equity gaps and significant increases in student completion of transfer-level English and math across all ethnic groups ([evidence: 2019-20 AB 705 Report](#)).

Another large-scale initiative the District has undertaken to improve student outcomes is the [North Orange Promise](#). The North Orange Promise gives first-time, full-time students at Cypress College access to free tuition for their first two years of college in addition to a variety of academic and learning support services. Specifically, students who are a part of the North Orange Promise receive comprehensive counseling, tutoring services, as well as supplemental scholarships for qualifying students. The North Orange Promise provides a more streamlined onboarding process for incoming students while giving them access to the necessary tools and support for academic success ([evidence: North Orange Promise](#)).

Finally, an effort the College is hoping to expand upon to support student success is auto-awarding degrees and certificates for qualifying students. In Spring 2021, the Career Technical Education (CTE) Division initiated a small-scale pilot project to identify students who have successfully completed coursework for five specific low-unit certificates but had not applied for the award ([evidence: PBC or PAC Minutes](#)). Through this pilot project, 54 students were identified and subsequently notified that they had earned one or more certificates and that they would automatically be awarded the certificates unless they elected to opt out. None of the students elected to opt out and a total of 79 certificates were auto-awarded. The College is currently exploring ways to effectively streamline the auto-awarding process in order to accommodate all degrees and certificates.

How does the college inform its constituents of this information?

The College informs its constituents of student achievement trend data, institution-set standards, and goals in several ways. Institution-set standards and aspirational stretch goals are reviewed, discussed, and reestablished annually in the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC), which is the College's primary shared governance planning committee. The process includes examining recent data trends, evaluating whether goals were met, discussing goal-setting methodologies, and determining appropriate actions as needed (**evidence: PBC Minutes**). Subsequently, a summary of the discussion and the agreed-upon standards and goals are shared with President's Advisory Council (PAC) for approval (**evidence: PAC Minutes**). Both PBC and PAC include representation from all constituent groups and each representative is responsible for sharing the dialogue and information with their respective constituents. Additionally, institution-set standards and goals are posted on the Institutional Research and Planning webpage and are evaluated in an annual Institutional Effectiveness Report that is shared with the Board of Trustees, and also posted on the Institutional Research and Planning webpage (**evidence: BOT minutes; IRP webpage**).

DRAFT

Report on the Outcomes of the Quality Focus Projects

The Quality Focused Essay (QFE) projects that were proposed in 2017 were in response to the general directive of ACCJC to target areas where the College needed improvement. During the process of self-evaluation, the Accreditation Steering Committee identified three areas of importance to long-term improvement and student learning that included Student Learning Outcomes, Distance Education, and Funding Mechanisms. The Commission revised the directive at their 2019 conference to encouraged schools to propose QFE projects that more directly focused on improving student learning and achievement. As such, the updates to the QFEs below were guided by the original directive.

Quality Focused Essay 1: Student Learning Outcomes

QFE 1 - Desired Goal

Cypress College will re-double its efforts to focus on closing the identified gaps in the College's SLO completion process and further integrate SLOs into the College's ongoing efforts to improve student success.

Action Step 1: Revisit and Streamline SLOs, PLOs, AUOs, and ILOs

The College will improve the institutional effectiveness of outcomes by revisiting and streamlining all campus SLOs, PLOs, AUOs, and ILOs to provide meaningful connections.

Responsible Parties: SLO Coordinator, Department Chairs

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: After receiving the Recommendation for Compliance from the Accreditation visiting team, the College focused its efforts on reviewing its SLO assessment processes and developing a plan to ensure a review cycle for all courses, programs and directly related services to ensure ongoing improvement. The result was the College Outcomes Assessment and Review Cycle (COA) plan which was approved and implemented in 2018. The COA Plan elements included annual SLO assessments, revisions to Institutional and Programs Student Learning Outcomes (ISLO/PSLOs), and mapping SLOs to ISLO/PSLOs to be included in Program Review, among others (**evidence: Follow-up Report**). As such, the COA Plan also addressed many of the Action Plan items of QFE #1.

As one of the primary goals of the Recommendation for Compliance was to increase SLO assessment participation rates, particularly Course SLOs (CSLOs), campus efforts were initially focused on these efforts. The Instructional SLO Committee worked to get faculty to engage in more regular and consistent assessments of the existing CSLOs as required by the COA Plan. Given the historical resistance of faculty that resulted in the low participation rates in the first place, the Committee decided to delay the "revisiting and streamlining" CSLOs plans of QFE #1 until participation rates were improved and faculty were more comfortable with the assessment process. In addition, the College had just obtained a new learning outcome management information system, eLumen, and significant work was necessary to train faculty on the new system and map the existing CSLOs to department PSLOs for inclusion in Program Review. The Committee determined that the best course of action would be to have all instructional

programs learn how to use eLumen, determine how best to increase CSLO assessment rates, and complete their PSLO mapping in preparation for the Department's Program Review scheduled in a four-year cycle. Once all departments have completed their first cycle, the SLO Committee will refocus efforts on streamlining CSLOs and improving assessment methodologies to make them more meaningful and effective. The current four-year Instructional Program Review cycle will conclude in 2021-22 and the next phase will begin in Fall 2022 (evidence: Program Review Cycle).

The College's work on SLOs in the Student Services area (SSSLOs) was well-established at the time of the Accreditation visit. In fact, one of the College's Commendations specifically praised the work done in this area (evidence: External Evaluation Report). Nonetheless, with the implementation of the COA Plan, the SSSLO work was impacted and therefore changes were made. The Non-Instructional SLO Coordinator worked with departments to revise and streamline existing SSSLOs to better align with the goals of the COA Plan and provide greater clarity to help make assessments more meaningful.

At the same time, work on the Administrative Service Outcomes (ASOs, formerly AUOs) was also being conducted. There was significant discussion surrounding how best to organize ASOs, how many areas should exist, and what the format of ASOs should be. Ultimately, all Campus Service areas were grouped together under the category of Administrative Service Outcomes and ASOs were revised.

In addition to the changes to SSSLOs and ASOs, significant changes have been made to the program review process in the student and campus services areas. As a result of the COA Plan the College has added a Program Review Committee for the non-instructional areas of the campus. The newly established committee is comprised of representatives from these areas across the campus and is responsible for reviewing the reports and providing feedback. This addition to the campus practice ensures tracking and further elevates the prominence of SLO discussions in these areas (evidence: SSPR examples).

As part of the COA Plan development, the Accreditation SLO Subcommittee was formed to modify the College's existing ISLO/PSLOs to reflect the efforts towards a campus-wide culture of assessment. The modifications were in an attempt to incorporate all areas of the campus into SLO work and create a common process to be used by all. While mapping SLOs to ISLO/PSLOs for all areas was able to be completed at the theoretical level, implementing the maps into eLumen proved to be more complicated. eLumen, obtained in 2017(?) was originally designed for use with CSLOs and is configured to facilitate the type of data obtained in CSLO assessments. It was thought that SSSLOs and ASOs would also be able to be stored and mapped in eLumen. Unfortunately, due to its limitations, storing assessment data from SSSLOs and ASOs in eLumen proved to be problematic and its use needed to be reconsidered.

In addition to the challenges with eLumen, a separate, conceptual challenge with SSSLOs and ASOs and the mapping to ISLO/PSLOs was also discovered. Specifically, the relationship between student learning outcomes and service outcomes and ISLO/PSLOs needed further

discussion and clarification. To address this challenge, the Accreditation SLO Subcommittee will revisit this relationship and make adjustments as necessary. [revise as needed based on Subcommittee Meetings in April]

These challenges have put ASO data collection efforts on hold until ISLO/PSLOs are reviewed and appropriate storage and mapping systems can be identified. In addition, several other changes were happening at the College that impacted the planned implementation of the new ISLO/PSLO assessments.

The impacts of AB 705 and the resulting elimination of Basic Skills programs, the addition of new non-CTE certificates, and the move to a digital College Catalog also necessitated a re-examination of the existing ISLO/PSLO structure and assessment plan. The Accreditation SLO Subcommittee was reconvened in 2020 to address the many and varied issues surrounding ISLO/PSLO assessments and propose solutions. The Subcommittee first revised the ISLO/PSLO format for instructional areas and presented the modifications to the Accreditation Steering Committee before seeking appropriate campus approvals. The Subcommittee then plans to address the aforementioned SSSLO and ASO mapping and assessment issues.

Action Plan

The College plans to continue its work streamlining SLOs and mapping them to the College's ISLO/PSLOs in several ways,

1. Review and assess CSLOs as part of the Department's next Program Review Cycle 2022-2026
 - SLO Committee to provide training on SLOs and Assessment methodologies to facilitate more meaningful results
2. Subcommittee to reconceptualize SSSLOs and ASOs as related to institutional level assessments
3. Determine best SLO data storage system for SSSLOs and ASOs
4. Facilitate ongoing ASO assessment and data collection
5. Facilitate Campus Services Program Review
6. Facilitate CSLOs/SSSLOs for Specialized Instruction Programs

Action Step 2: Increase Participation in Learning Outcomes

The College will increase faculty and administration participation rates in learning outcomes reporting.

Responsible Parties: SLO Coordinator, Department Chairs

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: As discussed above, the COA Plan was developed in response to the Recommendation for Compliance received from the visiting team. One of the first elements of the COA plan to be developed was the annual assessment of SLOs across the campus. According to the plan, all areas of the campus (Instruction, Student Services, and Campus Services) are required to assess a minimum of one SLO annually (courses are to be assessed each semester). Departments determine which SLOs are to be assessed as well as set outcome standards. SLO assessment results are to be included in the department's program

review which occurs on a four-year cycle. The annual/semester assessment of SLOs was in an effort to increase participation rates by making assessments a regular practice, akin to submitting grades (for courses) and annual review of department effectiveness. While various factors have contributed to the ups and downs of participation rates (see College RFI #1) the College is making steady improvements.

SLO assessments have also been elevated in the Program Review process. All areas of the campus participate in Program Review on a four-year cycle. Instructional Program Review (IPR), Student Services Program Review (SSPR), Campus Services Program Review (CSPR), and Specialized Instructional Program Review (SIPR) have all reviewed and modified the forms used to expand SLO assessments and participation rates as part of the program review process. In addition, Program Review now includes a summary page that identifies commendations and recommendations, as well as assigns a compliance status (**evidence: Program Review Summary**). The Compliance Status Summary is now a required element of resource allocation requests and a department's status may impact their request. The inclusion of the compliance status was designed to both incentivize departments to improve/maintain their SLO assessment participation as well as provide a level of accountability.

SLO participation rates have also been impacted by the recent inclusion of reporting SLO data as a clerical duty required in the adjunct faculty contract. As discussed in College RFI #1, most adjunct faculty had previously not been participating in SLO data collection due to varied interpretations of the nature of those duties. The recent contract agreement clarified that duty and more adjunct faculty are participating in CSLO assessments as they are made aware of the change.

Action Step 3: Establish and Implement a Committee of Chairs

The College will establish a Committee of Chairs to improve collaboration to eliminate achievement gaps and increase student achievement.

Responsible Parties: SLO Coordinator, AUO Coordinator

Status: TBD

Narrative: The goal of establishing a "Committee of Chairs" was to increase collaborations across campus in order to work together to increase student achievement. When the Committee of Chairs proposal was presented in various leadership meetings a number of concerns were raised about committee proliferation as well as overlap of various existing committees since the same people tend to sit on multiple committees. A "new" committee with a different mix of the same voices was deemed repetitive and unnecessary. Given these concerns, the creation of the Committee of Chairs was postponed until other options had been explored.

Efforts to collaborate and decrease the work being conducted in "silos" has taken several forms. First, Program Review committees have expanded membership to integrate representatives from the other Program Review committees to integrate into each other's groups (**evidence: IRP Bylaws?**). This integration allows for better understanding of the needs identified by programs during their review process. For example, the Student Services Program Review (SSPR) liaison who sits on the Instructional Program Review (IPR) Committee is able to hear about student

service needs identified and is able to align processes more directly.

A second effort to collaborate across areas has been the increased collaboration between Instructional and Non-Instructional SLO Coordinators. Prior to the implementation of the COA plan, the SLO Coordinator was in Instruction. While SLO efforts in Student and Campus Services had been ongoing, they were limited by the lack of an official Non-Instructional SLO Coordinator and the work in each area had been independent of each other. The Instructional and Non-Instructional SLO Coordinators have been working together on the Accreditation SLO Subcommittee and are identifying appropriate ways to integrate their efforts to help increase student achievement.

Third, the work in Guided Pathways has increased cross collaboration across the campus in multiple ways. The Guided Pathways Steering committee is co-chaired by faculty and management, with membership representing all areas of the campus. In addition, the College received a Title V Grant that resulted in the creation of cross-functional Completion Teams to help facilitate student equity and achievement that are comprised of faculty, student services, and management personnel (evidence Completion Team Structure). [more? Based on JoAnna's input]

Finally, efforts to determine the best way to share and discuss institutional achievement data is under development. The College utilizes multiple metrics to assess student achievement including, Institution Set Standards, SLOs, Strong Workforce metrics among others. One of the roles of the proposed Committee of Chairs was to examine and discuss these metrics. The College has tested having these discussions in various existing forums that have campus-wide membership such as President's Advisory Cabinet (PAC) and Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) but have not yet found the best way to engage in the robust discussions necessary given the time constraints of these meetings. The College continues to search for the best way to engage in the focused collaborative discussions regarding these achievement metrics necessary for institutional effectiveness.

Action Step 4: System for SLO Tracking and Disaggregation

The College will secure an improved information system to house SLO tracking and disaggregation amongst cross platform integration.

Responsible Parties: SLO Coordinator, AUO Coordinator

Status: Complete

Narrative: The College obtained the eLumen learning outcome management information system in 2017(?). CSLOs and Instructional ISLO/PSLOs have been entered into the system and are being utilized by instructional departments in both CSLO assessment discussions and Instructional Program Review. As previously discussed, since eLumen was initially configured for courses, the College has found limitations when trying to utilize eLumen for SSSLOs and ASOs. The College is exploring other systems to house and track non-instructional SLOs.

As the focus of SLO efforts has been on increasing participation rates and integrating SLOs into Program Review, the College has not yet disaggregated SLO data. The integration of SLO data

into program review has come in stages. First, CLSO data was included for department review, then PSLO data was added. In order to avoid overwhelming faculty, many of whom were new to CSLO discussions, the decision was made to delay introduction of disaggregated CSLO data until all departments go through the current cycle and will begin in Fall 2022 (evidence: Kristina Email).

Evidence:

- COA Plan
- Program Review Cycle
- Evaluation Team Report
- SLO Minutes or Emails
- Program Review Summary (need)
- IPR Bylaws?
- GP Completion Team Structure [need]
- DeDios Committee Membership Email
- Kristina Email (need)

Quality Focused Essay 2: Distance Education

QFE 2 – Desired Goal

Cypress College will continue its efforts to improve and expand its DE program to meet current definitions and standards for distance education and to address the needs of 21st century learners. This includes a reorganization of the DE Program, evaluation of the current courses and technology utilized, and writing and finalizing a new DE plan.

Action Step 1: Reorganize Distance Education Personnel

The College will increase program and institutional effectiveness by reorganizing the Distance Education Program personnel.

Responsible Parties: President, Academic Senate

Status: Complete

Narrative: The Distance Education (DE) program was initially supported by a full-time faculty coordinator, a full-time instructional designer, and an administrative assistant. After Title V grant funding expired in 2013 and a series of personnel changes, the coordinator position remained vacant for 2.5 years. From 2014-2016 the DE program was supported by an administrative assistant and a temporary special projects director. During this time, the context for the DE program changed substantially and the Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC) was not empowered to make decisions related to the implementation of changes as necessary.

In 2016, the duties of the faculty DE Coordinator were revised and assigned 60% reassigned time beginning Spring 2017. In addition, the College assigned a Dean of Distance Education to provide administrative support. The DE team also includes a full-time, temporary Special Projects Manager and full-time DE Assistant, and is further supported by the DE Committee

comprised of faculty representatives from each of the divisions, a Disability Support Services (DSS) specialist, and the Academic Computing manager (QFE2.1.1 - DE Plan).

Plans to further reorganize the infrastructure of the DE Program have been outlined in the new DE Plan and DE Program Review. The plans include, reclassifying the DE Assistant, establishing a permanent DE Project Manager, reassessing the duties and compensation of the faculty DE Coordinator, and hiring an instructional designer (QFE2.1.2 - DE Plan; QFE2.1.3 - DE Program Review).

Action Step 2: Update Literature to advertise the Distance Education Program

The College will update campus literature to effectively advertise the DE program and clarify course criteria and expectations as defined by delivery mode.

Responsible Parties: Distance Education Coordinator, Department Coordinators, Deans

Status: Complete

Narrative: The College has made efforts to improve the clarity of information regarding Distance Education (DE) course offerings in campus publications in several ways. Previously, DE courses were identified in the Class Schedule by type of DE mode utilized, “online” and “hybrid,” and distinct icons were used to identify each. However, confusion regarding what constituted a “hybrid” course ensued as each instructor was able to set their own parameters and had varying conceptions of what “hybrid” meant.

The College adopted the definitions developed jointly by the Distance Education and Education Technology Advisory Committee and California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, Educational Services and Support (evidence: DE Guidelines pp. 13-15). The DE Guidelines recognize and define the three types of online courses, “Fully Online” (FO) and “Partially Online” (PO) and “Online with Flexible In-person Component” (OFI). Whenever an online, partially online or OFI section requires an activity that cannot be completed online or asynchronously, that requirement must be noted in the Schedule of Classes. In addition, the College defines Web-Enhanced courses as in-person classes that offer students access to class materials and resources online (evidence: DE Plan).

The College planned to utilize the updated terminology and new icons for 2020-21 before COVID-19 forced the campus to move to remote instruction. Instead, the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 Class Schedules required detailed explanations of the nature of the remote instruction utilized for each course. Distinctions between “Online,” “Remote,” and “Hybrid” modes were defined and identified so that students would know whether the courses were to be taught asynchronously or synchronously, or a combination of both (evidence: Fall 2021 Schedule; evidence: Spring 2021 Schedule). Plans to implement the new terminology and updated icons as well as the specific on-campus requirements for PO courses are planned for both the pdf and searchable Class Schedules when the College returns to more regular on-campus instruction (evidence: Cassens Schedule email).

Action Step 3: Evaluate Needs of Distance Education Students and Faculty

The College will administer a survey to identify and calculate the specific needs of DE students and faculty.

Responsible Parties: Distance Education Coordinator, Faculty Distance Education Coordinator, Institutional Research and Planning

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: Ascertaining the needs of Distance Education (DE) students and faculty has been an ongoing endeavor of the DE Program for several years. Results of the student and faculty surveys conducted in 2016-17 provided the basis for many of the goals and objectives of the newly revised DE Plan. The DE Faculty Satisfaction Survey identified various needs including technical support and access to training. As a result, plans to revise DE instructor training included increasing availability and frequency, providing more online training options, compressing content to reduce training length, increasing support for training, accessibility and course development, and creating certification processes for previous online teacher training. The DE team began implementing these goals and the number of faculty completing training to become DE certified increased substantially which resulted in significant growth in DE instruction ([evidence: DE Plan pp. 12-13?](#))

Students expressed in the Student Satisfaction Survey conducted in Fall 2016 that regular and substantive interaction (RSI) (between students and with the instructor) contributed to their satisfaction with online learning and was critical for learning and persistence. In addition, survey results indicated that students highly value timely feedback, instructor responsiveness, and student-student interactions in discussions. The DE Plan specifically details the standards online courses must meet with regard to RSI ([evidence: DE Plan p. 19](#)). [In Spring 2020, the DE Committee developed an RSI Policy which reflected the 2019 changes to Title 5, Section 55204. The RSI Policy was amended in Fall 2020 to reflect changes in federal guidelines issued by the Department of Education in August 2020, and it was approved by the Academic Senate in January 2021 \(evidence RSI Policy\).](#)

In Spring 2020, distance education at the College changed dramatically as a result of COVID-19 and the move to remote instruction for the entire campus. The DE Team facilitated this transition within days of the campus closure; the campus closed on a Friday and classes resumed 5 days later. With such an abrupt shift to online teaching, the College worked to ensure that students would be able to finish the semester by providing equipment, additional training for students and instructors, and increased support for the various tools necessary for a successful transition. The College conducted numerous surveys in Spring 2020 of both staff and students to determine what their needs were in the remote environment for both the remainder of Spring 2020 ([evidence: Employee Telecommuting Results](#); [evidence: Student Telecommuting Results](#)) and the upcoming Fall 2020 ([evidence: Student Needs Results](#); [evidence: Student Challenges Results](#)).

Plans for regular and ongoing surveys are in progress but have been delayed until the College returns to campus and resumes the previous more traditional forms of DE instruction used prior to COVID-19. The DE team hopes to provide time for students to better understand the difference between traditional “online” classes versus “remote” instruction before administering

surveys to ensure more accurate results. In addition, the College is discussing plans to participate in the Chancellor's Office survey used to complete its biennial DE Report that was originally scheduled for Spring 2020 but delayed due to COVID-19 (evidence: McAlister Email).

Action Step 4: Create a Distance Education Plan

The College will create a Distance Education Plan to update policies and practices related to distance education and improve program quality.

Responsible Parties: Distance Education Coordinator, Faculty Distance Education Coordinator
Status: Complete

Narrative: The Cypress College Distance Education Plan 2017-2023 has been in development since the expiration of the previous plan in 2017. As the Distance Education (DE) program went through a transitional period from 2017-2019, the plan's development was delayed which is explained in the Forward of the DE Plan. The DE Plan was completed in 2020 but campus approval was delayed due to the shift to remote instruction. The Plan was approved by the Academic Senate, and President's Advisory Council (PAC) in Spring 2021 (evidence: Senate Minutes; PAC Minutes). The DE Plan updates campus policies and practices related to DE instruction, outlines DE course guidelines, identifies student and faculty support structure, and sets program goals and objectives to promote learning and ongoing student success (evidence: DE Plan).

Evidence:

- QFE2.1.1 - DE Plan p 52
- QFE2.1.2 - DE Plan p 24-25
- QFE2.1.3 - DE Program Review
- Fall 2021 and Spring 2021 Schedules
- DE Plan
- DE Guidelines
- Cassens Schedule email
- DE Plan (waiting for final)
- Employee COVID-19 Telecommuting Survey Results Spring 2020
- Student COVID-19 Remote Instruction Survey Results Spring 2020
- Student Needs for Fall 2020 Remote Instruction Survey Results Spring 2020
- Student Challenges and Needs for Support Survey Results Fall 2020
- Kathleen McAlister email (030921)
- RSI Policy [need- see Kathleen's emails]
- Final DE Plan (need)
- Senate Minutes {need}
- PAC minutes [need]

Quality Focused Essay 3: Extended-Day Funding

QFE 3 - Desired Goal

Budget Centers within NOCCCD should receive from the District sufficient resources to be able to meet their FTES targets within their allocations.

Action Step 1: Modify the Extended Day Funding Model

The College will work with the District to modify the EDFM to provide adequate resources to meet and sustain college FTES targets.

Responsible Parties: District Consultation Council, Board of Trustees

Status: Complete

Narrative: During the preparation of the ISER in 2017, the College identified concerns related to the budgeting model being utilized at the time. Historically, the campuses received an ongoing allocation through the District's Extended Day Funding Model (EDFM) as part of the budget process. That allocation only covered a portion of the total amount spent on extended day expenses and the campuses were dependent on using carryover funds to supplement these costs ([QFE3.1.1 – 2020-21 Proposed Budget](#)). Over several years, the College was seeing increasingly significant drops in carryover balances as the funds provided by the District were deemed insufficient and the campus was required to use local revenue to fund instruction ([QFE3.1.2 - 2017 ISER](#)).

As a result of the ISER and the Recommendation for Improvement received from the accreditation visiting team, the District began a major review of the budgeting process and ultimately developed the recently implemented Resource Allocation Model (RAM) (see District RFI 3). While the RAM was in development, the District provided annual one-time funding allocations to the College to cover the EDFM deficits ([QFE3.1.3 - Porter Email](#)).

In addition to the development and implementation of the RAM, the introduction of the Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) by the State Chancellor's Office fundamentally changed how community colleges received their funding. Previous funding mechanisms relied primarily on FTES, however, the SCFF changed the funding formula to a combination of FTES and other performance and population-based metrics. The District incorporated the SCFF into the RAM under development ([QFE3.1.4 - CBF Minutes](#)).

The implementation of the RAM and SCFF have profound impacts on how instruction and other expenses are funded at the College. The RAM identified four "budget centers," the three colleges Cypress, Fullerton, and NOCE, and District Services. Resources are allocated to the three campuses, where each contribute 9.25% of revenues to District Services. The model incorporates the SCFF apportionment revenues, other state revenues, and other/local revenues. All personnel and operating costs are covered by the individual budget center and Districtwide expenses are paid for by all four budget centers ([QFE3.1.5 - CBF Minutes](#)). By "pushing out" the revenues to the budget centers, the responsibility, decision-making, and control of resources is shifted to the College.

The SCFF has also had significant impacts on revenue received by the College. While the majority of funding (70%) still comes from FTES, the College has the ability to generate the remaining 30% by serving specific student populations and increasing various student success metrics resulting in the institution having an additional means to impact the revenue earned than in the previous model.

The greater control over budgeting decisions at the College as a result of the RAM, in addition to the greater influence on revenues received as a result of the SCFF, empowers the College to determine how best to allocate resources. The College is able to fully fund all instruction (regular and extended day) first, and budget other expenses accordingly. As such, the College is no longer reliant on the funding allocated from the District, but rather on its own earnings and management of resources. However, it should be noted that the transition of responsibility has underscored the importance of developing effective enrollment management strategies given the impacts on revenue available for other resource allocation requests (QFE3.1.6 - Porter Email). In turn, the Colleges will need to rely on carryover funds to supplement their needs (QFE3.1.7 - 2020-21 Proposed Budget).

The RAM was implemented for the first time in 2020-21 and the impacts will be evaluated at the end of the fiscal year and adjustments made by the District accordingly. At the campus level, the impacts of the RAM and SCFF will be discussed as part of the annual evaluation of budgets.

Evidence:

- QFE3.1.1 - Proposed Budget and Finance Report 2020-21 pp. 43-60
- QFE3.1.2 - ISER pp. 434-436
- QFE3.1.3 - Porter Email (need)
- QFE3.1.4 - CBF Minutes 040819
- QFE3.1.5 - CBF Minutes 110220
- QFE3.1.6 - Porter Email (need)
- QFE3.1.7 - Proposed Budget and Finance Report 2020-21 pp. 43-60

Fiscal Reporting

Insert ACCJC Annual Fiscal Report

DRAFT

Appendices

Appendix A: ACCJC Annual Report

Appendix B: Acronym Page

DRAFT