Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

Standard IVA: Decision-Making Roles and Processes

IVA1. Institutional leaders create and encourage innovation leading to institutional excellence. They support administrators, faculty, staff, and students, no matter what their official titles, in taking initiative for improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective planning and implementation.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Cypress College leadership is committed to the shared governance process as the primary means to ensure institutional excellence. Under the leadership of the President, the College provides multiple ways for staff members from all areas of the campus to contribute to the improvement of campus practices, programs, and services.   The College encourages innovation through actively keeping the campus informed, structuring regular venues for collaborative decision-making, and providing opportunities to obtain resources to fund projects and programs.

In order to improve campus practices, programs, and services, the College routinely keeps the staff informed about the State of the College as well as other benchmarks of student achievement.   The annual *Institutional Effectiveness Report* (IER) serves as the primary document illustrating the College's performance related to student achievement. The IER utilizes the State Chancellor's Office Student Success Scorecard information which includes degree/transfer completion, persistence, 30-unit completion, success in remedial courses, and Career Technical Education (CTE) award completion. The *IER* also includes campus level reporting on course success and retention rates, degrees and certificates earned, and transfers to UC and CSU (IVA1.1 – IER). The IER is presented to the Board of Trustees every November (IVA1.2 – BOT Minutes) and is available on the College's website. (IVA1.3- IER on web screen shot). Elements of the *IER*, such as the Achievement Gap or Accreditation Institutional Set Standards (ISS), are also discussed at shared governance meetings such as the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) as well as Opening Day and Leadership Team activities (IVA1.4a – PBC minutes Mar. 2016; IVA1.4b – Opening Day Presentation; IVA1.4c – LT Agenda). This gives an opportunity to the various campus constituencies to become aware of the status of the College's efforts and allows them to focus more clearly on potential areas of needed improvement.

The *ACCJC Annual Report* is also a document that is developed in PBC (IVA1.4a – PBC Minutes) and shared with the campus at events such as Opening Day to discuss Institutional Set Standards (ISS) and include successful course completion, degrees and certificates earned, and transfers (IVA1.4b – Opening Day Presentation). Presentations of the *IER* and ISS serve to call attention to areas in need in order to foster innovative problem-solving and ideas.

In addition to keeping the campus informed about student achievement, the College leadership provides multiple venues for active participation in planning and innovation. Utilizing a

collaborative model, the College includes faculty, classified staff, managers, and students in collective planning and decision-making at gatherings such as Leadership Team Meetings and the Strategic Plan Colloquium, as well as the Educational Master Plan Taskforce. For example, as part of its decision-making processes, the College periodically reviews its Mission statement to ensure that it accurately reflects campus practices, programs, and services. Due to the recent addition of the B.S. program in Mortuary Science and the increased use of Distance Education formats, the College's Leadership Team met in April 2016 to draft different options for a new Mission statement (IVA1.5 – LT Agenda). Three were sent to all employees, and one was chosen. It was presented to the President's Advisory Council (PAC) on November 17, 2016 (IVA1.6 – PAC Minutes) and, after time for the various constituencies to respond, was approved on December 7, 2016 (IVA1.7 – PAC Minutes). The Board of Trustees approved the change on December 13, 2016 (IVA1.8 – BOT Minutes).

Planning processes and reviews of institutional performance are also discussed in a variety of venues, most particularly during the Leadership Team meetings which include representatives from all campus areas; those leaders are then expected to relay information to their various constituencies (IVA1.6 – LT Agenda). Planning and institutional performance are also discussed at shared governance meetings on campus including PBC and PAC and at meetings of the Academic Senate (IVA1.4a – PBC Minutes; IVA1.7 – PAC Minutes; IVA1.9 – AS Minutes).

The *Strategic Plan* is developed every three years and is the short-term roadmap to carry out the Mission of the College (IVA1.10 – Strategic Plan). The development of this plan takes place at the College's Colloquium where faculty, classified staff, administrators, and students are all invited to come together to help develop the plan. The 2017-20 Strategic Plan Colloquium took place in April 2017 (IVA1.11 – Colloquium email).

The Educational Master Plan is developed every ten years and is the long-term guiding document to help the College carry out its mission (IVA1.12 - EMP). The plan is initiated by a task force made up of faculty, classified staff, and administrators representing the College at a campus-wide colloquium. (IVA1.13 – Colloquium Group assignments). Each department on campus prepares a section and then the task force reviews these sections along with general information related to where the students come from and labor market information essential to planning.

In addition, all constituency groups meet regularly and have opportunities to discuss areas of improvement: such as in Faculty Academic Senate, Student Services Council, Deans, Associated Students, and Management Team meetings. Individuals can bring forward ideas for institutional improvement in a variety of different ways through the shared governance process. One example was an idea that came about in a focus group on developing the College's new mission statement. In order to improve the core value of inclusiveness, the group came up with the idea to shut down campus for a few hours so that all employees could attend Opening Day. While the College did not completely shut down, managers did work with their classified staff so that more classified staff could participate in the Opening Day activities while core college functions remained open for business (IVA1.14 - Mission Report).

Finally, the College encourages innovation through providing various opportunities to obtain resources to fund ideas aimed at improving student success. The One-Time Funding process allows staff members to request funding for projects designed to improve practices, programs, or

services. For example, funding was allocated for the Math Learning Center (MLC) and English Success Center (ESC) to improve course success rates in math, English, and discipline specific courses utilizing math and English concepts (IVA1.15 – One-Time Funding list). The ISS/Strategic Plan Fund provides resources for projects specific to the goals outlined in those plans. In 2015/16, the ISS/Strategic Plan funded new nursing simulation activities for students to improve basic nursing skills (IVA1.16– SP year 2 Report). In addition, the Cypress College Foundation provides opportunities for faculty mini-grants for those projects that are smaller in scope (under $500). Last year, the Foundation provided over $5,000 for projects such as Auto Technology Diagnostic and Repair Tools, Automated Defibrillator Trainers, and Wood Ballet Barres (IVA1.17a – Mini-grant List 2015; IVA1.17b – Mini-Grant Minutes).   The NOCCCD has also created the district-wide Innovation Fund to provide resources for faculty and staff to develop and implement new ideas, methods, or practices that will improve education programs and services. For 2016-17, Cypress College received funding for two projects: the Chemistry Department received funding to implement Process Oriented Guided Inquiry Learning (POGIL) techniques to assist students in completing the General Chemistry course, and the Mortuary Science Baccalaureate degree program received support to create companion Blackboard sites supplemented with interactive media and educational technologies (IVA1.18- Innovation Fund webpage).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. Cypress College leaders create and encourage innovation leading to institutional excellence. Through the shared governance process, the President encourages all members of the campus community to take initiative to improve student success. Through structured venues including Opening Day and Leadership Team meetings, the College is committed to keeping the campus community informed about the success and achievement of students. Whether through their own constituency group meetings or participation in planning and decision making colloquiums or requesting funding for individual, innovative ideas and programs, all constituent groups take the initiative to improve the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. Systematic participative processes including PBC, PAC, and Academic Senate are used to ensure effective planning and implementation of proposed ideas.

<div align="center">

Evidence Sources

</div>

IVA1.1 – Cypress College Institutional Effectiveness Report 2015-16
IVA1.2 – Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, November 8, 2016
IVA1.3 – Institutional Effectiveness Report on website screen shot
IVA1.4a – Planning and Budget Committee Minutes, March 17, 2016
IVA1.4b – Opening Day Presentation
IVA1.4c – Leadership Team Agenda, March 23, 2014
IVA1.5 – Leadership Team Agenda, April 15, 2016
IVA1.6 – President's Advisory Cabinet Minutes, November 17, 2016
IVA1.7 – President's Advisory Cabinet Minutes, December 7, 2016
IVA1.8 – Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, December 13, 2016

IVA2. The institution establishes and implements policy and procedures authorizing administrator, faculty, and staff participation in decision-making processes. The policy makes provisions for student participation and consideration of student views in those matters in which students have a direct and reasonable interest. Policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose committees.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Cypress College has a long-standing history of well-defined and effective participation in governance processes. Administration, faculty, classified staff, and students are intrinsically involved in governance, planning, and budget development. The two primary shared governance bodies involved in campus decision-making are the President's Advisory Cabinet (PAC) and the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC).

At the beginning of each academic year, members of PAC are provided with the PAC Guidelines (IVA2.1 – PAC Guidelines). The document defines "shared governance" and includes PAC's purpose of serving as the primary recommending body to the College President. The structure of shared governance includes representatives from the college's main constituent groups and the President's staff. PAC was also responsible for developing the document regarding the Shared Governance Process. This document defines the roles of members on shared governance committees as representatives of a constituent group. They provide regular written or oral reports to their groups and should share the views and concerns of their group with the other members of the shared governance committee on which they serve (IVA2.2 – Shared Governance Process). PAC has also developed a list of all campus shared governance special-purpose committees that includes the responsibilities and roles of each member (IVA2.1 – PAC Guidelines). PAC guidelines also specifically identify the process members use to bring forward ideas and have agenda items considered and discussed by the committee.

Similarly, at the beginning of each academic year, members of PBC are presented with PBC Purpose and Guidelines document, which provides the definition of shared governance, the purpose of PBC, the composition of PBC membership, and the operating guidelines used to present ideas and work together. Its composition includes three administrators, three faculty, two classified staff, two student representatives, and several non-voting resource advisors. This

documented policy discusses the roles and responsibilities of shared governance committee members regarding PBC decision-making. All decisions are based on consensus (IVA2.3 – PBC Guidelines, p. 2).

The composition of all shared governance committees includes student participation. The students represent their constituent group by providing reports to their group and by sharing the views and concerns of their group to the members of the shared governance committees. Committees or bodies that are not technically "shared governance" committees, such as the Academic Senate and the Curriculum Committee, still provide for student representation at the meetings. While they do not have a vote, they still have a voice in such bodies (IVA2.4a – Academic Senate minutes, p. 3; IVA2.4b-Senate By-Laws). At the District level, the NOCCCD Board of Trustees includes a Student Trustee from Cypress College who makes regular reports and participates in all Board meetings (IVA2.5 - BOT Minutes).

All campus personnel have access to information related to policies, procedures, and decision-making. The campus J Drive (IVA2.6 – J Drive) contains information from all of the major bodies on campus and can be accessed by any employee. The documents mentioned above are included on the J Drive. It also includes items such as PBC Budget Request Assessment Forms and PBC One-Time Funding Process. Agendas and meeting minutes for PAC and PBC are also included there. Other information is accessible through the campus website. The Academic Senate provides information regarding its constitution, agendas, and minutes on its website, linked to the College's website (IVA2.7 – Academic Senate Webpage). In addition, the Cypress College website contains information regarding the Cypress College Associated Students meeting agendas and minutes (IVA2.8 – AS Webpage).

At the District level, several Board Policies explicitly recognize the roles of various groups in decision-making processes. *NOCCCD Board Policy and Administrative Procedures 2510-Local Decision-making* guarantee that the Academic Senate, staff, and student groups must have a role in decision-making and specify the process used (IVA2.9a – BP 2510; IVA2.9b – AP 2510). *AP 2510* further specifies that the various constituencies of NOCCCD "including faculty, students, classified staff, confidential employees, and administration shall be represented on college, North Orange Continuing Education, and District committees concerned with broad policy and planning matters" (IVA2.9b – AP 2510).

Additionally, *NOCCCD Board Policy and Administrative Procedures 2410-Board Policies and Administrative Procedures* guarantee that all persons may initiate a review of all Board Policies (IVA2.10a- BP 2410; IVA2.10b – AP 2410). Finally, *NOCCCD Board Policy and Administrative Procedures 4020-Program and Curriculum Development* define the roles of various groups in program and curriculum development and places the primary responsibility on the faculty regarding curriculum (IVA2.11a – BP 4020; IVA2.11b – AP 4020).

Prior to 2011, NOCCCD had in place documents that described the purpose and membership of the two primary district-level governance groups that were distributed each year and were available online. However, these documents did not describe the flow of recommendations and did not include explanations of the purpose and membership of organizational groups. As a result of failing to explain governance and decision-making processes so that they were

transparent across NOCCCD, lack of trust was often cited as a characteristic of the dynamics within NOCCCD. In an effort to reduce tensions and increase trust across NOCCCD, the 40-member Ad Hoc District Planning Committee was convened in 2011 to ascertain concerns and visions for the future of the campuses and District. *The NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure, Function and Alignment* (*DRM*) was created in response to suggestions regarding decision-making to clarify the roles and responsibilities of constituent groups as well as the processes that are used to make decisions (IVA2.12 - DRM).

The *DRM* seeks to further the collegial culture in NOCCCD by detailing the process of a partnership in which Board members, faculty, staff, administration, and students participate in making decisions. The purpose of the *DRM* is to describe how decisions are made in the District, and the goal is to improve communication and trust across the District. Specifically, the *DRM* describes the role of each constituency group in the decision making process. The NOCCCD groups that provide recommendations in the decision-making process are organized into three categories based on the group's responsibilities and its source of authority, Governance Groups, Organizational Groups, and Ad Hoc Workgroups (IVA2.12 - DRM).

The widely recognized culture of collegiality and inclusiveness at Cypress College serve as the primary indicators that our processes and procedures are working well. This is further evidenced by ratings of College employees in climate surveys which are conducted every two years (IVA2.13- Climate Survey).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. Cypress College and NOCCCD have established, modified, and implemented policies, procedures, and documents authorizing administrator, faculty, and staff participation in decision-making processes. Campus shared governance committees, PBC and PAC, ensure participation in decision-making of all campus constituent groups including faculty, managers, staff, and students. In addition, *NOCCCD Board Policies and Procedures 2510, 2410* and *4020*, as well as the *Decision-Making Resource Manual* explicitly govern participation of all relevant groups in District decision-making processes. College and District policies and procedures specifically make provisions for student participation and consideration of student views in those matters in which students have a direct and reasonable interest. Student representatives have voting rights on PAC and PBC; the Associated Students have a strong presence on campus; and the Student Trustee actively participates in NOCCCD Board meetings. PAC and PBC Guidelines, as well as District BPs, APs, and the *DRM,* specify the inclusion of relevant constituent groups as well as the manner in which individuals should bring forward ideas and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose committees.

Evidence Sources

IVA2.1 – President's Advisory Cabinet Guidelines
IVA2.2 – President's Advisory Cabinet Shared Governance Process
IVA2.3 – Planning and Budget Committee Purpose and Guidelines
IVA2.4a – Cypress College Academic Senate minutes Oct 27, 2016 p. 3

IVA2.4b – Cypress College Academic Senate By-Laws, 2017
IVA2.5 – NOCCCD Board of Trustees Minutes, November 22, 2016
IVA2.6 – Cypress College J Drive
IVA2.7 – Academic Senate Webpage
IVA2.8 – Associated Students Webpage
IVA2.9a – NOCCCD Board Policy 2510 – Local Decision-making
IVA2.9b – NOCCCD Administrative Procedure 2510 – Local Decision-making
IVA2.10a – NOCCCD Board Policy 2510- Board Policies and Administrative Procedures
IVA2.10b – NOCCCD Administrative Procedure 2410- Board Policies and Administrative
        Procedures
IVA2.11a – NOCCCD Board Policy 4020- Program and Curriculum Development
IVA2.11b – NOCCCD Administrative Procedure 4020- Program and Curriculum Development
IVA2.12 – NOCCCD 2012 Decision-Making Resources Manual: Structure, Function and
        Alignment
IVA2.13 – Cypress College Climate Survey 2015

IVA3. Administrators and faculty, through policy and procedures, have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Cypress College policies have clearly prescribed roles for both faculty and administrators in matters of institutional governance. The composition of major committees indicates that both faculty and administration play a significant role in campus decision-making.

The Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) has three administrators, three faculty, two classified staff, and two students as voting members. There are also several non-voting members, such as the Chair of the Curriculum Committee and the Dean of Counseling among others, who serve as resource advisors selected for their particular expertise in areas of importance (IVA3.1 – PBC Guidelines). PBC has primary responsibility for making decisions regarding resource allocation.

The President's Advisory Cabinet (PAC) is comprised of the President, both Vice Presidents, the Director of Research and Planning, a dean, two faculty members representing the Academic Senate, a faculty member representing United Faculty, an adjunct faculty representative, and two representatives from the Associated Students. The PAC is the primary recommending body to the College President in policy, procedures, and general college issues (IVA3.2 – PAC Guidelines).

In addition to participating in the major decision-making committees on campus, faculty and managers are also significantly involved in faculty and administrator hiring decisions as well. Several years ago, the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee was expanded to include three representatives from the Academic Senate in addition to the Deans of each Division and the Director of Institutional Research and Planning who were already on the Committee (IVA3.3-

Faculty Hiring Evidence). Further, all faculty and administrator hiring committees include members from both groups who are then consulted when the President makes the final decision (IVA4.a – NOCCCD AP 7120-4; IVA4.b – NOCCCD BP 3004).

Other ad hoc groups that play a substantial role in developing institutional planning and policies, such as those that establish both the Educational Master Plan (EMP) and the *Strategic Plan*, are open to, and always include, both administrators and faculty. Implementation of policies developed in those plans is then carried out through further involvement of faculty and administrators; the role of each is dependent on the nature of the particular policy and plan under consideration (IVA3.5 – EMP Taskforce Evidence).

At the District level, as discussed in the previous Standard, Board Policies and Administrative Procedures clearly define faculty and administrator roles and areas of responsibility in governance. Faculty and managers have played a substantial part in the District's governance model not only through seats on various councils and committees but also as a result of more substantively and clearly defined roles that are contained in *The NOCCCD 2012 Decision-making Resource Manual: Structure, Function and Alignment (DRM)* (IVA3.6).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. Cypress College administrators and faculty, through established NOCCCD Board Policies and Procedures as well as campus decision-making committee (PAC and PBC) guidelines, have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance. The College and District seek to have balanced representation in decision-making groups so that faculty and administrators can exercise a substantial voice in the development of Cypress College and NOCCCD policies, planning, and budget allocation.

Evidence Sources

IVA3.1 – Planning and Budget Committee Purpose and Guidelines
IVA3.2 – President's Advisory Cabinet Guidelines
IVA3.3 – Faculty Hiring evidence
IVA3.4a – NOCCCD Administrative Procedures 7120-4- Management Employee Hiring
IVA3.4b – NOCCCD Board Policy 3004 – Tenure-Track Faculty Hiring Policy
IVA3.5 – Educational Master Plan Taskforce Timeline
IVA3.6 – NOCCCD 2012 Decision-making Resource Manual: Structure, Function and
        Alignment

IVA4. Faculty and academic administrators, through policy and procedures, and through well-defined structures, have responsibility for recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The District recognizes the role of both faculty members and academic administrators in the development of curriculum. Curriculum development includes the establishment, modification, or discontinuance of all programs and courses at the College. *NOCCCD Board Policy 4020 Program and Curriculum Development* describes the general process for curriculum development. It indicates that although curriculum proposals may originate at any point within the District, it is recognized that curriculum changes and new course proposals generally flow from the departmental level through the division to other points within the approval process. Each college and North Orange Continuing Education (NOCE) shall be responsible for adherence to its own intra-curricular process. On completion of the campus process, curricular items will be presented to the District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC) by the appropriate curriculum committee chair or designee. Ultimately, all curriculum is sent to the Board of Trustees for approval. After Board approval, all new courses that are not part of an existing approved program and all new programs shall be submitted to the Office of the Chancellor for the California Community Colleges for approval as required (IVA4.1- BP 4020).

BP 4020 also indicates that the programs and curricula of the District shall be of high quality, relevant to community and student needs, and evaluated regularly to ensure quality and currency. To that end, the Vice Chancellor, Educational Services & Technology, shall, in consultation with the faculty, establish procedures for the development and review of all curricular offerings, including their establishment, modification, or discontinuance. There is to be appropriate involvement of the faculty and Academic Senate in all processes (IVA4.1- BP 4020).

Since the last college accreditation, the Board of Trustees adopted *NOCCCD Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 4021-Educational Program Discontinuance* that recognize the role of faculty and administrators in eliminating programs and provides for the specific methods which lead to such discontinuance (IVA4.2a- BP 4021; IVA4.2b – AP 4021).

At the campus level, the College has a well-defined Curriculum Process that has a number of documents to explain its functioning. Those documents can be found on the Curriculum Committee link on the Cypress College website (IVA4.3 - Cypress Website). Of primary value to faculty members or relevant academic administrators is the Cypress College Curriculum Committee Training Guide, last updated in 2014. The document explains all of the relevant information that is necessary for an individual wishing to propose either new curriculum or modifications of existing curriculum (IVA4.4 – Training Guide). The website also provides information adapted from the State-Wide Academic Senate regarding the role, structure, duties and standards of good practice for campus Curriculum Committees. The agendas and minutes of the Curriculum Committee meetings are also found on that link (IVA4.5 – Curriculum Webpage). In addition, since the Curriculum Committee is a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, it reports at every meeting of the Senate (IVA4.6 – Academic Senate Minutes) and is subject to oversight by and recommendations from the Academic Senate (IVA4.7 - Academic Senate Constitution, p. 1).

Recommendations for student learning programs and services are typically guided by either System-wide initiatives or local requests for funding on campus via the One-time Funding process. Funding and directives from the System Office typically guide the development and implementation of new student services programs. For example, the implementation of Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), Basic Skills Initiative (BSI), Student Equity Program (SEP) frameworks were legislated and subsequently appropriated for implementation. At

Cypress College, administrators, faculty, and staff convene to develop action plans and objectives related to how new programs and services should be funded and implemented (IVA4.8 a- SSSP Funding Request Forms; IVA4.8b - SEP Funding Request Forms). Plans are required to be submitted and outcomes are expected to be measured and reported back.

The One-time Funding process at Cypress College enables faculty, administrators, and staff to recommend new programs and services as well (IVA4.9a- One Time Funding Form; IVA4.9b- One-time Funding Process). For example, the Student Support Services Division requested and received approximately $2,500 annually to offer a course through the NOCE taught by a Cypress adjunct counselor to help students transition to college (IVA4.10 – One-Time Approval List). The Research Office and Planning (IRP) is a resource for any faculty, administrator, or staff member who wishes to ascertain a specific need or understanding of a gap or opportunity that the campus wishes to address for recommending a new program or service on campus.

DE - The Cypress College Curriculum Committee is currently reviewing all programs, degrees and certificates to determine if any of these are available 50% or more via distance education (DE). The academic deans in each area recently finished their review, and the Institutional Research and Planning Office is currently preparing the final inventory. Since the last substantive change, the College has identified over 50 awards that can be achieved more than 50% online (IVA4.11 – Substantive Change 2010). The College will submit a substantive change report to ACCJC regarding the items that qualify prior to the visit in 2017.

Baccalaureate Degree Consistent with the established Cypress College Curriculum development processes, the Mortuary Science Department faculty and Health Science Division Dean are tasked with making recommendations about the curriculum, Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), and student support services for the baccalaureate degree program. The Department and Dean have responsibility for conducting Advisory Committee meetings with industry professionals who forward industry recommendations (IVA4.12- Evidence). Using the campus shared governance and decision-making processes already established, faculty and administrators develop appropriate curriculum and learning support services.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. Cypress College faculty and academic administrators have responsibility for recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services. *NOCCCD BP 4020* and *4021* have clearly established curriculum policies and procedures for both curriculum development and discontinuance. Further, the Cypress College Curriculum Training guide outlines the necessary procedures for development of new and modification of existing courses. For student learning programs and services, the One-Time Funding process in conjunction with system-wide initiatives provide well-defined structures through which faculty and academic administrators make recommendations.

Evidence Sources

IVA4.1 – NOCCCD Board Policy 4020- Program and Curriculum Development

IVA4.2a – NOCCCD Board Policy 4021 - Educational Program Discontinuance
IVA4.2a – NOCCCD Administrative Procedures 4021 - Educational Program Discontinuance
IVA4.3 – Cypress College Website
IVA4.4 – Cypress College Curriculum Training Guide
IVA4.5 – Cypress College Curriculum Webpage
IVA4.6 – Cypress College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, October 27, 2016
IVA4.7 – Cypress College Academic Senate Constitution
IVA4.8a – Student Success and Support Funding Request Form
IVA4.8b – Student Equity Program Funding Request Form
IVA4.9a – One-time Funding Request Form
IVA4.9b – One-time Funding Process
IVA4.10 – One-Time Funding Approval List 2016-17
IVA4.11 – ACCJC Substantive Change 2010
IVA4.12 – awaiting Advisory Committee meeting evidence

IVA5. Through its system of board and institutional governance, the institution ensures the appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives; decision-making aligned with expertise and responsibility; and timely action on institutional plans, policies, curricular change, and other key considerations.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

NOCCCD and Cypress College are committed to the widespread participation of relevant constituency groups in decision-making and planning at both the District and colleges. The NOCCCD has a number of Board Policies, Administrative Procedures, and other planning documents that reinforce the culture of partnership between Board members, faculty, staff, students, and administration in collegial governance, a process that ensures all in the District have the opportunity to contribute to policy development, decision-making, integrated planning, and resource allocation.

In order to ensure the appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives, *NOCCCD Board Policy* and *Administrative Procedure 2510-Participation in Local Decision-making* outline the Board's commitment to the full participation of all groups in decision-making District-wide (IVA5.1a – BP 2510; IVA5.1b – AP 2510). *AP 2510* specifically clarifies the Board's encouragement of faculty, students, classified staff, confidential employees, and administration to participate in committees concerned with broad policy and planning matters, and it delineates the roles and responsibilities of the District and Senates when collaborating with the faculty on academic and professional matters. The policy identifies the matters in which the Board relies primarily on the recommendations of the Senate and those matters on which the Board will seek mutual agreement ((IVA5.1b – AP 2510).

Similarly, the shared governance culture of decision-making perpetuated through the President's Advisory Council (PAC) and Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) at the College seeks to ensure the consideration of relevant perspectives (IVA5.2 - PAC Guidelines, IVA5.3 - PBC Guidelines). In addition, the Academic Senate Constitution indicates the faculty's role in the 10 +1 items related to educational programs and services that are covered by AB 1725 (IVA5.4 - Academic Senate Constitution). The overarching goal of collegial governance is for the

realization of District and College Strategic Directions in improving student learning and overall institutional effectiveness.

The District and College have also established procedures that ensure decision-making is aligned with expertise and responsibility. *The NOCCCD 2012 Decision-making Resource Manual: Structure, Function and Alignment (DRM)* describes the structure and function of each group that contributes to the development of recommendations to the Board and the alignment of the groups to one another (IVA5.5 - DRM). In addition, *NOCCCD Board Policy 3250 - Institutional Planning* states,

> the Chancellor shall ensure that the District has and implements a broad-based, comprehensive, systematic and integrated system of planning that involves appropriate segments of the college community… (IVA5.6- BP 3250).

Further, *The NOCCCD 2013 Integrated Planning Manual (IPM)* is a guide to integrated planning at the District level. It describes planning processes that identify the ways that constituent groups participate in and contribute to District-level long-term and short-term planning (IVA5.7 - IPM). *The NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2013 (BAH)* not only details the budget allocation process District-wide but also provides for the formation of the Council on Budget and Facilities (CBF), one of the five District-level governance groups. CBF has representation from faculty, students, staff, and administration, and its purpose is to ensure that NOCCCD resources are tied to the *District Strategic Plan* and the Comprehensive Master Plan (IVA5.8 - BAH). Finally *NOCCCD Administrative Procedures 3100-Organization Structure* states, "Revisions to the organizational structure of the colleges, North Orange Continuing Education and District shall be developed through established collegial consultation process" (IVA5.9 – AP 3100).

Both the District and the College attempt to provide clear and current information regarding District and campus governance issues to all staff. Regular communication is provided through News from the Board (IVA5.10) and the District wide e-newsletter called inside/NOCCCD (IVA5.11), which contain news and updates District-wide as well as information about upcoming governance group meetings and links to the groups' webpage for agenda and minutes/summaries. At the College level, decision-making is communicated through the online @Cypress (IVA5.12), distribution of the Academic Senate minutes to all faculty and retention of the minutes on the Academic Senate website (IVA5.13), and the provision of minutes from shared governance committees on the campus J Drive (IVA5.14). In addition, information is provided at Opening Day activities each semester and through the meetings of the Leadership Team (IVA5.15a – Opening Day Agenda; IVA5.15b – LT agenda).

The College makes an effort to implement decisions in a timely fashion. For example, as part of the aforementioned Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), the Student Athlete Success Center (SASC) Project was initially developed and proposed in Fall 2016, and a funding request through SSSP was submitted on September 28, 2016 (IVA5.16 - SSSP Funding request). The decision to fund the program was made on December 14, 2016 (IVA5. 17- Bandyopadhyay email) and the project was launched in Spring 2017 (IVA5. 18 - Rams email).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and District meet the Standard. Through *NOCCCD BP 2510 – Participation in Local Decision Making, BP 3250 – Institutional Planning* and *AP 3100 – Organizational Structure*, the District ensures the appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives and aligns decision-making with expertise and responsibility. The planning and decision-making documents *DRM, IPM* and *BAH* provide additional structure to the District's processes.

At Cypress College, the PAC and PBC Guidelines as well as the Academic Senate Constitution provide the appropriate shared governance framework to ensure consideration of relevant perspectives of all constituent groups and include those with appropriate expertise and responsibility in all decision-making. Finally, both the College and District make efforts to take timely action on institutional plans, policies, curricular change, and other key considerations.

Evidence Sources

IVA5.1a – NOCCCD Board Policy 2510 Participation in Local Decision-making
IVA5.1b – NOCCCD Administrative Procedure 2510 Participation in Local Decision-making
IVA5.2 – Cypress College President's Advisory Cabinet Guidelines
IVA5.3 – Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee Purpose and Guidelines
IVA5.4 – Academic Senate Constitution
IVA5.5 – NOCCCD 2012 Decision Making Resource Manual: Structure Function and
 Alignment
IVA5.6 – NOCCCD Board Policy 3250 Institutional Planning
IVA5.7 – NOCCCD 2013 Integrated Planning Manual
IVA5.8 – NOCCCD Budget Allocation Handbook 2013
IVA5.9 – NOCCCD Administrative Procedure 3100 Organizational Structure
IVA5.10 – News from the Board, December 13, 2016
IVA5.11 – inside/NOCCCD e-newsletter, June 9, 2016
IVA5.12 – @ Cypress, November 9, 2016
IVA5.13 – Academic Senate Link on the Cypress College Website
IVA5.14 – J Drive
IVA5.15a – Opening Day Agenda, Fall, 2015
IVA5.15b – Leadership Team Agenda, November 2015
IVA5.16 – Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) Funding Request
IVA5.17 – Santanu Bandyopadhyay, EVP, Student Athlete Success Center Program email
IVA5.18 – Richard Rams email- Student Athlete Success Center Program

IVA6. The processes for decision-making and the resulting decisions are documented and widely communicated across the institution.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Cypress College has clearly established decision-making processes that are readily available to all staff. The College documents and communicates the decisions made to all staff members through a variety of channels.

The processes for decision-making are laid out in the establishing documents for each of the shared governance committees and for many of the other committees as well. President's Advisory Cabinet (PAC) and the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) are the two primary campus decision-making bodies and have clearly established procedures as documented in the PAC and PBC guidelines (IVA6.1 PAC Guidelines; IVA6.2 - PBC Guidelines). These guidelines are accessible by all staff members on the campus J-Drive (IVA6.3a – PAC J drive screenshot; IVA6. 3b- PBC J-Drive Screenshot). Other campus decision-making groups such as the Faculty Academic Senate (IVA6.4 – Constitution), Curriculum Committee (IVA6.5 – Training Guide), Program Review Committee (IVA6.6 - PR Handbook) also post their decision-making guidelines to the campus J-Drive as well. In this way, all staff can find the processes through which the various bodies make decisions.

In addition to communicating the decision-making processes, ample opportunities exist on campus for the staff to be aware of decisions that have been made by various bodies. The agenda and minutes of PAC and PBC as well as all shared governance committees can be accessed through the campus J-Drive (IVA6.7a- PAC Minutes Screenshot; IVA6.7b - PBC Minutes Screenshot). The agendas for Academic Senate meetings and approved minutes are sent to all faculty members (IVA6.8a –Agenda email; IVA6.8b – Minutes email) and can also be found on both the J-Drive and the Senate website (IVA6.9a - Academic Senate J-drive Screenshot; IVA6. 9b- Academic Senate Webpage). In addition, the College's @Cypress electronic newsletter is distributed weekly to all staff during the academic year (IVA6.10).

The District also widely communicates decisions made. After each Board meeting, the District Public Information Office sends out the "News from the Board," a synopsis of each Board meeting (IVA6.11- News). The full agendas and minutes can also be found on the District website (IVA6.12).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The Cypress College processes for decision-making and the resulting decisions are documented and widely communicated across the institution. Decision-making bodies post their processes and guidelines on the campus J-Drive. In addition, the decisions made by those bodies are made available through distributed minutes and/or those posted on the J-Drive. As in all large institutions, there is no guarantee that all personnel will avail themselves of the information but access to that information is provided.

<div align="center">Evidence Sources</div>

IVA6.1– Cypress College President's Advisory Cabinet Guidelines
IVA6.2 – Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee Purpose and Guidelines
IVA6.3a – Cypress College President's Advisory Cabinet J-Drive screenshot
IVA6.3b – Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee J-Drive screenshot
IVA6.4 – Academic Senate Constitution
IVA6.5 – Curriculum Committee Training Guide
IVA6.6 – Cypress College Department Planning and Program Review Handbook 2017

IVA6.7a – President's Advisory Cabinet Minutes Screenshot
IVA6.7b – Planning and Budget Committee Minutes Screenshot
IVA6.8a – Senate Agenda email
IVA6.8b – Senate Minutes email
IVA6.9a – Academic Senate J-Drive Screenshot
IVA6.9b – Academic Senate Webpage
IVA6.10 – Cypress College @Cypress electronic Newsletter
IVA6.11 – NOCCCD "News from the Board"
IVA6.12 – NOCCCD Board Agendas and Meeting Minutes Website screenshot

IVA7. Leadership roles and the institution's governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The policies and procedures set by NOCCCD are the guiding principles under which Cypress College sets its own processes related to governance and decision-making.   Evaluation of Board policies and procedures occurs regularly and the results are widely communicated. At the campus level, the evaluation process differs for each decision-making body.

NOCCCD Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 2410- Board Policies and Procedures indicates that the District Consultation Council (DCC) shall regularly review Board Policies and Procedures and make recommendations to the Board regarding the need for changes to ensure currency and compliance with state and federal regulations (IVA7.1a – BP 2410; IVA7.1b - AP 2410). In addition, the District regularly consults with the Community College League of California (CCLC) regarding recommended updates and changes in Board Policies and Administrative Procedures. Once changes are made, the District informs all personnel in the District of the changes via email and updates the District website where they are housed (IVA7.2 – Revised AP email). *Board Policies 3225-Institutional Effectiveness* (IVA7.3) and *3250- Institutional Planning* (IVA7.4) indicate the criteria to be utilized in evaluating how the institution is doing. The policy covers areas such as assessing long-range planning, facilities, Equal Employment Opportunity, Student Equity, Student Success and Support, the Transfer Center, Cooperative Work Experience, and Extended Opportunity Programs and Services. The results of these evaluations are used to make changes as deemed necessary.

The District also engages in systematic evaluation of those in leadership roles. *NOCCCD Board Policy 2745-Board Self Evaluation* (IVA7.5) describes the process by which the Board evaluates itself. In April of odd-numbered years, the Board distributes an assessment form to its members and to the District staff who regularly participate in Board meetings. The results are compiled and discussed in public session at the first meeting in May. *Board Policy* and *Administrative Procedure 2435- Evaluation of the Chancellor* (IVA7.6a; IVA7.6b) describes the process for evaluating the Chancellor of the District. Due to confidentiality concerns, results of the evaluation process are held in the Human Resources Office and are not widely distributed to the District. While the District Policies and Procedures regarding the evaluation of Management are still being developed, the College does engage in an assessment of those in leadership positions

through the Management Appraisal Instrument. Goals and objectives are established for all personnel, and feedback is requested from those serving under personnel in such leadership positions (IVA7.7 – Mgt. Appraisal Template).

The College utilizes the Campus Climate Survey to evaluate the decision-making processes utilized by campus leaders. The Survey is conducted every two years, and the results are posted to the College website (IVA7.8 – CCS). In addition, the results are presented to President's Staff and the Management Team to determine what changes are necessary for ongoing improvement. PAC and PBC have instituted a regular assessment schedule for the Guidelines utilized (IVA7.9 - PAC Guidelines; IVA7.10 - PBC Guidelines). Most campus governance bodies and committees engage in an informal evaluation at the end of each academic year. However, in very few cases is the process of self-evaluation formalized nor is input solicited from those outside of the membership of the particular body. Unless members of the body recognize weaknesses themselves, the lack of outside input may hide areas where improvement could take place. In addition, the informality of such assessments may lead to a lack of a perceived need to focus on making changes for the future.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. Leadership roles and the Cypress College's governance and decision-making processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The District also engages in systematic evaluation of Board policies and procedures which govern the District and colleges. Both the District and the College widely communicate the results of these evaluations through their respective websites and other campus meetings. The College's bi-annual Campus Climate Survey is the primary decision-making evaluation tool that is used as the basis for improvement.

At the broad level, sufficient policies are in place to ensure that there is a clear evaluation of the actual decision-making policies, procedures, and processes of various bodies.   With that evaluation comes a delineation of what needs to be done in the future. However, at a specific level, the assessment of particular campus bodies and committees is too informal and self-contained to provide the information that could lead to even more improvements in how those bodies operate. While generally meeting the Standard, the College would be better served by a more institutionalized system of documented, on-going evaluation of procedures and processes that includes more direct feedback from those affected by decisions.

Sources of Evidence

IVA7.1a – NOCCCD Board Policy 2410-Board Policies and Procedures
IVA7.1b – NOCCCD Administrative Procedure 2410-Board Policies and Procedures
IVA7.2 – Revised AP email
IVA7.3 – NOCCCD Board Policy 3225-Institutional Effectiveness
IVA7.4 – NOCCCD Board Policy 3250-Institutional Planning
IVA7.5 – NOCCCD Board Policy 2745-Board Self-Evaluation
IVA7.6a – NOCCCD Board Policy 2435-Evaluation of the Chancellor

IVA7.6b – NOCCCD Administrative Procedure 2435-Evaluation of the Chancellor
IVA7.7 – Management Appraisal Template
IVA7.8 – Cypress College Campus Climate Survey 2015
IVA7.9 – Cypress College President's Advisory Cabinet Guidelines
IVA7.10 – Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee Purpose and Guidelines

Changes Arising out of the Self Evaluation Process

Change, Improvement and Innovation	Standard	College Lead	Timeline	Outcome
Conducted an evaluation of the shared governance process	IVA7	IRP	Spring 2017	The College conducted an evaluation of the shared governance process along with specific processes with PBC and PAC.

Plans Arising out of the Self Evaluation Process

Planned Change, Improvement and Innovation	Standard	College Lead	Timeline	Anticipated Outcome
Submit a substantive change for awards 50% or more online	IVA4	ALO	Spring 2017	The College will submit a substantive change with more than 50 awards that can now be achieved more than 50% online.