Cypress College

Focused Midterm Report

Submitted by

Cypress College
9200 Valley View St.
Cypress, California 90630

To

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Report Distribution:
Three hard copies and one electronic version of the report sent to
The ACCJC/WASC Commission Office
10 Commercial Boulevard, Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949

Submission Date: March 15, 2008

Table of Contents

Attachments:

1. North Orange County College District District-wide Strategic Plan Second Phase: Implementation
2. Educational Master Plan 2006-2016
3. Student Services Master Plan 2007-2014
4. Strategic Plan with Objectives and Action Plans for 2006-2008
5. Schedule of Major Planning Efforts
6. Diagram of the Planning Process at Cypress College

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Cypress College
Focused Midterm Report

Introduction

The Cypress College Self-Study was submitted in 2005 and the subsequent site visit occurred that same year. This midterm report has been prepared in response to recommendations that resulted from the Cypress College 2005 accrediting team visit and self-study. A Progress Report was submitted in September 2006 to the ACCJCC regarding certain recommendations made by the commission following the 2005 Self-Study and visit. The focus of the Progress Report in 2006 was to provide an update on the Commission's Recommendations #1 and #2, which had been addressed to the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor, as well as an update on Recommendation #4 which was regarding the College's development of an Educational Master Plan.

Updates have been included for each of the six original recommendations made by the Accrediting Commission including the recommendations which required a focused report at this time (#3, #5, and #6). These updates are followed by progress reports on each of the planning agenda items identified in the self-study report. Every effort was made to have the responses in this report be developed in an open and inclusive manner.

Some changes have occurred at the College that were not included in the responses to the accrediting team's recommendations. First, in 2007 a nationwide search was conducted for a new President following the retirement announcement of Dr. Marjorie Lewis. Dr. Michael Kasler was selected as the new President which created a vacancy for the College's position of Executive Vice President of Educational Programs and Student Services. In addition to the President's retirement, the former Vice President of Educational Support and Planning, who also served as the College's accreditation liaison officer, retired effective June 30, 2007. An in-district search for interim candidates for both the Executive Vice President and the Vice President was conducted. This search resulted in one additional vacancy developing for the Director of Budget and Finance position. This position has also been filled on an interim basis. In addition to these three interim positions which report directly to the President, there is also one dean position being filled via an interim assignment. These four interim assignments allow for a unique opportunity to review the current management structure of the College and the potential of reorganizing some duties. A taskforce was formed in October 2007, for the purpose of reviewing the management organization and making recommendations to the President by December 2007.

In the past three years, significant physical changes have also occurred on the College campus. In January 2006, a new 60,000 square foot Library and Learning Resource Center opened. In July 2006, a new Physical Plant and Facilities building was completed and now houses various campus services which had previously occupied forty-year-old "temporary" buildings. Several classroom buildings have also been renovated to make them more efficient (Business building, TE-I which houses Vocational Programs, TE-II which houses the PE locker rooms and School of Continuing Education classrooms, TE-III which houses Health Science, and the Theatre Arts building). Renovations to the classrooms in these buildings included replacement of classroom furniture and the upgrade of classroom technology.

By Spring 2008, the five-year renovation of the Piazza, the second level walkway, will have been completed, allowing the removal of construction fencing across the campus. By February 2008, a new facility for the School of Continuing Education will open on the south side of campus. Then, in April 2008, a new Student Center and a new Bookstore will open which will centralize student services previously located in several different buildings. Throughout the 2007/2008 year, the campus will be preparing swing space to accommodate the 45 classrooms, 78 faculty offices and 2 division offices currently housed in the Humanities building. All of these functions will be moving immediately following the completion of the Student Center and Bookstore buildings to make way for a complete renovation of the Humanities building commencing in August 2008.

Finally, 2007-2008 is the last year of our current four year Strategic Plan. The College has scheduled a colloquium in March 2008 for 50 administrators, faculty, staff members and students to begin the groundwork for developing our next strategic plan for the years 2009 – 2012. The District Strategic Plan, new Cypress College Educational Master Plan (Fall 2006) and the Cypress College Student Service Master Plan completed November 2007 will provide the framework for development of the new Strategic Plan.

This Focused Midterm report will focus on two areas. The first area will be a response to the specific accreditation team recommendations addressed to Cypress College following the 2005 site visit including those whose progress was reported in the 2006 Progress Report by providing an update on the achievement in those areas. The second focus of the report will be on providing an update on the 34 planning agenda items identified in the College's self study from Spring 2005.

STATEMENT OF REPORT PREPARATION

The process used by Cypress College to prepare the Focused Mid-term Report involved input from a wide representation of the College. Progress reports and projections of anticipated progress prior to the next Accreditation visit were prepared by the responsible people of the accreditation recommendations and for each of the Self-Study Planning Agenda items. The responsible persons were advised to collaborate with other campus individuals, report progress, and cite evidence to support the reported progress. The results of the research and written responses were compiled and distributed to all constituencies on the campus. The draft report was distributed to the Planning and Budget Committee, the President's Advisory Cabinet and the Leadership Team in November 2007. The draft report was also posted to the campus shared "J: drive" and an email went out to the entire campus advising them of the posting of the document and requesting additional review and input during November and December of 2007. A final draft was reviewed by the Planning and Budget Committee and forwarded to President's Advisory Cabinet in January 2008.

The Board of Trustees received a chronology of events and copies of the Focused Midterm Report as an information item at the February 12, 2008, board meeting. The report, along with documentation, was then submitted to the WASC Accrediting Commission.

As the chronology of events indicated, the process, which began with the identified responsible persons collaborating with others, allowed for many opportunities for review and edit for the entire campus community on both the responses to the accreditation team recommendations and the College's self-study planning agenda items.

_____
Karen L. Cant, Interim Vice President
Accreditation Liaison Officer

_____   _____
Michael J. Kasler, Ed.D.   Cherie Dickey
President   President, Academic Senate

RESPONSE TO TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS

The Accreditation Team identified six recommendations to assist Cypress College to become more efficient and effective and to better serve our educational mission. The Commission Action Letter identified three specific recommendations (#3, #5, #6) for focused review in the Midterm Report. We are also including an updates on #1, #2, and #4 which required the completion of an Educational Master Plan prior to October 2006.

District-Wide Recommendation #1: Budget Allocation Model
- **The team recommends that the District Chancellor develop and implement an evaluation of the existing budget allocation model and make adjustments if appropriate to meet the needs of the entire district (Standard III.D, IV.B.3.c).**

The District has met this recommendation after conducting an extensive and collaborative evaluation of its budget allocation model during 2004 and through 2006. The two-year-long evaluation, involving the District's shared governance committee, resulted in significant changes in two allocations and also led the way for making strategic connections between budget priorities and program priorities.

One of the areas impacted by the budget model evaluation was operation funding for growth, which originally was called "growth beyond extended day" in the District. Before, when campuses projected enrollment growth, they were provided with resources for faculty salaries (primarily adjunct faculty) to cover the costs of offering additional classes to meet growth targets. This was inadequate, however, because it did not also address the need for more resources to cover corresponding increases in supply and operation costs. Now, campuses are provided with these additional needed resources and more equitable per-student expenditures are being maintained.

A Budget Allocation Committee was formed from the District's shared governance committee to continue looking at new budget allocation methods. This committee, with representation from each campus, includes budget officers, researchers, and vice presidents.

As the District implements its first District-wide Strategic Plan, also overviewed in this Accreditation Mid-Term Report, there will be many more opportunities to review budget allocations. The Strategic Plan highlights important focus areas in the District that are intended to guide budget decisions in the future.

District-wide Recommendation #2: Strategic Plan
- **The team recommends that the Board of Trustees and Chancellor implement a process to systematically develop and document strategic institutional goals for the district. The goals should: provide a framework for the Colleges' strategic planning processes; include a review of the district mission statement to ensure that the district strategic goals align with the mission; and be reflected in the allocation of district resources (I.A.I, I.B.4, and III.D.1).**

During the 2005-06 academic year, work began on a District-wide Strategic Plan to address a variety of questions: What are the trends and needs in the District's service area? What is the District doing now to meet them? And what should the District do in the future to meet those needs that continue to change with both population and economic shifts?

The Strategic Plan was developed under the direction of the Board of Trustees and Chancellor. In the first phase, consultants specializing in strategic planning assisted a small Steering Committee and also worked directly with other planning groups. The Steering Committee, which included two representatives from the Board of Trustees, framed the planning discussions and work for the full Board of Trustees as well as the District Planning Council and Chancellor's Staff. Each of these groups deliberated separately at numerous meetings from January through June 2006. They also conducted interviews and surveys with students, employees, alumni, business representatives, community members, and others.

In the first-phase development of the Strategic Plan, eight goals and many potential strategies and indicators/measures were identified around three focus areas. These focus areas are: Innovation and Relevancy for All Learners, Intra-District and Community Collaboration, and Effective and Efficient Use of Resources. Within these areas, the goals address instructional programs, student services, campus relationship building, community partnerships, inclusive processes, revenue-generating opportunities, effective planning, and marketing/communications.

In the second phase of the Strategic Plan starting in 2006-07, implementation teams and individuals began to integrate existing campus plans into the newer District plan. This added a wide variety of detail to the District-wide Strategic Plan, which became a patchwork of the different formats and styles followed by the individual campus plans (See attachment - North Orange County Community College District District-wide Strategic Plan Second Phase: Implementation)

During 2007-08 as implementation continues, an effort is underway to continue to evolve a more cohesive District-wide Strategic Plan with the individual campus entries. During the first half of the academic year, the planning process was on the agenda of four District Planning Council meetings. Meanwhile, the Strategic Plan Steering Committee worked on a revised report framework that ties the District-wide Strategic Plan to the California Community Colleges System Office Strategic Plan.

Recommendation #3: Strengthen dialogue
- **The College must develop and implement a collaborative, inclusive process that focuses on the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional effectiveness (Standard 1B.1)**
- **Incorporates both quantitative and qualitative information in decision-making (Standard 1B.2)**
- **Mentors all faculty and staff in the College mission, practices, and decision-making processes (Standard 11A7; I11A.3)**
- **Provides a clear and effective communication path for faculty and staff so they know how to advance needs that maintain and/or enhance students' learning environment (Standards I11C;I11D; IVA)**

Student Learning and Institutional Effectiveness

The process for focusing on continuous improvement has both formal and informal elements and the College is committed to the development of Student Learning Outcomes/Classroom Assessment Techniques (SLO/CAT) by dedicating the time, funding and personnel necessary for the completion of Student Learning Outcomes for all courses by the end of the 2010-2011 academic year.

With the appointment of a faculty SLO/CAT Coordinator and a faculty Assessment Facilitator, and the commitment of the faculty College Staff Development Coordinator to the task, the College has developed an organizational framework with representatives from each instructional program to guide and support the inclusion of learning outcomes for every course offered. Workshops on SLO development and assessment are ongoing as the College supports faculty as they respond to this need.

Specific activities for the 2007-2008 year have included a series of college-wide dialogues held by the SLO Team in September to determine how to move the SLO-CATs process along faster by March 2011, the date of our next Accreditation Self-Study Visit. These dialogue sessions were attended by 38 faculty members and administrators. Each division was represented by at least one instructor with representatives of individual departments also attending.

Those faculty members participating in the SLO Dialogues made several recommendations to the Academic Senate. Among the recommendations were that the College establish a timeline for completing the SLO assessment process for all courses, each division appoint at least one SLO representative to an expanded SLO Team, and that each department create a plan for meeting the 2011 College goals and provide status reports to the dean and to the SLO Team representative at least twice a semester. The recommendations were discussed and approved at the September 27, 2007, meeting of the Academic Senate. Also in Fall 2007, the SLO Team was expanded to include faculty representatives from every division. Among other responsibilities, division representatives are charged with communicating important information and new developments pertaining to SLOs as they emerge.

The College created an important opportunity for further dialogue in January 2008 by allocating half of the Spring opening day for faculty to work as departments to develop SLOs, assessments, or plan future related activities.

In addition to supporting dialogue regarding student learning, the College has employed various strategies to strengthen dialogue about institutional effectiveness. First, the Institutional Research Office established a website to provide faculty, staff, students and members of the public with quick, easy access to relevant reports and information. The website was first launched in February 2005 and is updated regularly by office staff. Second, key research reports are distributed and discussed at College meetings (e.g., Deans and Directors, Planning and Budget, Management Team, and Leadership meetings) and events such as retreats and colloquia. Third, a new comprehensive *Institutional Effectiveness Report* was developed in 2005 and is now published and distributed widely each Fall. The *Institutional Effectiveness Report* provides demographic information (characteristics of students, staff, and service area) and some common measures of institutional effectiveness. Current measures of student achievement include success and retention in courses, term-to-term persistence, awards, and transfers. Measures of productivity, efficiency, and financial indicators are also included. However, the *Institutional Effectiveness Report* extends beyond a typical research factbook by including summaries of recent program reviews (within instruction, student services, and campus services), findings from comprehensive biannual surveys of students and staff, and an annual strategic planning status report. The *Institutional Effectiveness Report* is distributed to all members of the campus Leadership Team (approximately 117 members of the faculty, classified staff, managers, and Associated Students) and is also available online from the Institutional Research website.

Further evidence that the College is engaged in meaningful dialogue on these topics is reflected in the Cypress College Educational Master Plan 2006-2016 and the Student Services Master Plan 2007-2014. Both documents reflect collaborative, inclusive processes that identified institutional strengths and challenges and culminated in plans to further strengthen institutional effectiveness.

With the adoption of the Educational Master Plan (EMP) in September 2006, a task force was assembled to develop a framework for the completion of the Student Services Master Plan (SSMP). The EMP serves as the foundation to develop and shape other campus plans, such as the SSMP. The task force, comprised of appropriate Student Services staff, developed a format for the plan during the Fall 2006 semester. Each Student Services department was asked to complete a program plan during the Spring 2007 semester; using the protocol established by the task force. The findings were presented to the task force, the Student Services Council, the President's Staff, and then to the Planning and Budget Committee for review in Fall 2007. Lastly, the SSMP was presented to the President's Advisory Cabinet for approval.

The College also has well-established processes for program review in instruction, student services, and campus services, which contribute to ongoing discussions regarding institutional effectiveness. The campus community is learning the value of referencing the program review information when decisions need to be made.

On January 23, 2008, a discussion in the Dean's Meeting revolved around how program review is used in various division/department discussions and decision-making. Specific examples of how the program reviews are used included: 1) Social Science Division used success and retention data included in their program reviews to request additional Supplemental Instruction sessions for students. 2) P.E. Divisions reported that Program Reviews have lead to discussions on the statistics for program growth/decline, student retention and student success and possible causes. 3) Fine Arts uses program review for reviewing curriculum changes including both deactivating curricular or adding new curriculum, 4) the Counseling and Development area has used program review to measure and improve customer service with a goal being 100% satisfaction, 5) the Counseling and Student Development Dean felt that program review validated what was working well in the International Student Program helping to keep them focused in the services they provide, and 5) members of the Educational Program Review (IQA) committee reported that the process allows faculty peers to give input and feedback on programs when at a department level faculty may not be able to see changes that need to be made in order to improve.

Periodically, changes are made to existing review processes, and new processes are developed when needs arise. College leaders have been responsive to feedback regarding the relationship between program review procedures and timelines, and closely related initiatives, such as strategic and master planning. The Academic Senate approved a streamlined educational program review process for Fall 2007 that includes clear connections to the Educational Master Plan. The College also developed a new review process for "special programs" that are not purely instructional or student service programs and did not fit well within existing program review models. This new process is being piloted in Fall 2007 with nine programs (e.g., Black Studies, Honors, Service Learning, Study Abroad, Peer Assisted Learning, Teacher Preparation, and Tutoring). Like existing program review processes, the new model includes various types of information, an assessment of overall program effectiveness by program leaders, and future goals.

Qualitative and Quantitative Data in Decision-Making Processes

Cypress College uses data to inform a wide range of decision making processes. Decisions about allocations of one-time funds and decisions about on-going allocations of College resources are shaped by qualitative and quantitative data. Beginning with the Spring 2006 budget request cycle, data were provided to each member of the Planning and Budget Committee and to each member of the Direction Committees. Each Strategic Plan Direction has a committee that prepares an initial prioritization of one-time budget requests. Orientation sessions were provided to help committee members identify the information and how it could be used to validate arguments for funding being submitted by the campus budget units. Some of the information provided included: success and retention rates by discipline within each division, program review results for campus support and student services programs, and historical FTES trends for instructional programs. Beginning with the Spring 2007 cycle, in addition to considering data and possible safety concerns, new criteria were established to identify how strongly the funding being requested supported the newly adopted Educational Master Plan.

When making decisions about how best to allocate resources for on-going needs, decision-makers consider various types of qualitative and quantitative data. For example, staffing vacancies (in faculty or classified staff) are not automatically filled with replacement positions. Instead, the College relies on a March 2006 Classified Staff Needs Assessment to help gauge the importance of refilling a vacated classified position versus filling a position at the top of the classified staff needs list. Decisions regarding faculty positions also do not automatically revert to the original department. The deans and the Executive Vice President meet annually each Fall to review the list of faculty positions to be filled and carefully consider a broad range of qualitative and quantitative information before prioritizing the positions to be filled. In October 2007, the Academic Senate president, president-elect and past-president joined the deans and Executive Vice President in this important decision-making process. Decisions about allocations of other resources, such as facilities and course offerings, are also informed by data from the Institutional Research Office and various other sources of information. Annual room utilization reports show where the College may make improvements in efficient space usage. Annual analyses identify unmet student demand for courses and help departments clearly identify areas in which they may need to offer more course sections (for example, in certain Biology and English classes).

College Mission, Practices, and Decision-Making Processes

In response to the recommendation to strengthen dialogue with respect to the College mission, practices and decision-making processes, the College has included its Mission and Vision statements in the College catalog, the Educational Master Plan, and the newly developed Student Services Master Plan. The appearance of these statements in other College documents, such as the class schedule, College and division level meeting agendas, is under consideration. For the last two years the President has also reviewed the Vision, Mission, and Core Values with new management and classified staff members.

Communication paths have also been strengthened by utilizing effective dialogues to explore options to better inform faculty and staff of the processes and procedures available to advance needs and concerns. Email communications are frequently sent to the entire campus community via "allusers" mail for relevant topics such as the annual one-time budget request process and the classified staff needs assessment. By committing to a significant increase in the available amount

of reassigned time for faculty, the College has increased opportunities for faculty to effectively participate in and shape policy in the developmental phase.

The College responded to needs expressed by faculty through the Academic Senate with the development of a task force in the Fall of 2006 to review and consider allocations of faculty reassigned time. The result of this collegial collaboration was the recommendation of significant increases in the amount of reassigned time available to department coordinators to coordinate department activities and to participate in the governance activities of the College. In Fall 2007 the College President, with the support of the Planning and Budget Committee and President's Advisory Council, approved an approximate 50% increase in reassigned time (from 95.5 units to 150 units) at a cost of $116,521 in ongoing funding. By committing to this significant increase in the available amount of reassigned time for faculty, the College has increased opportunities for faculty to participate effectively in the development, shaping and approval of College policy.

A significant change in process has resulted in an effective collaboration between the Academic Senate and administration in the development of full-time faculty position allocations. College administrators collaborated with the three Academic Senate representatives to establish the Joint Committee on Full-Time Faculty Positions. Implemented in Fall 2007, representatives of the Academic Senate were included in this joint meeting with the instructional deans to consider and prioritize requests from the instructional programs for full-time faculty positions. At the conclusion of the hiring cycle, all Joint Committee participants will participate in an evaluation of effectiveness that will be used to inform and improve the process.

The President of the College continues the long-standing tradition of inclusiveness that characterizes our relationships. The following College shared governance committees include membership from administration, faculty, classified staff and students:

Diversity

Matriculation Advisory

Planning and Budget
> Direction Committees of the Strategic Planning Process
> (subcommittees of the Planning and Budget Committee)

President's Advisory Cabinet (PAC)

Staff Development

Student Equity Planning

Campus Technology

Clear and Effective Communication Path

Discussions have taken place in several different venues (Management Team, Deans and Directors Team, Leadership Team, PAC) regarding the responsibility of representatives participating in campus committees to take back information to their campus constituencies, departments, and divisions. There was some discussion in PAC about having committee members sign a form acknowledging their responsibility to share information heard. Ultimately the idea of a signed form was abandoned in favor of doing orientations at the beginning of the year which

include covering the responsibility of sharing information and of speaking up during committee discussions. These orientations have occurred in PAC and Planning and Budget - the two primary shared governance committees - each Fall for the last two years. Additional orientation meetings occur for the Chairs of Direction Committees and then for the Direction Committees themselves. Both a "commitment form" and a description of committee members' roles and responsibilities are reviewed at the first meeting of each Direction Committee for the year.

The information available about the significant efforts of the College to advance collaborative and inclusive decision making processes is of little value if that information is not available to those affected. The College presents its message by the effective utilization of public information from the President's office. A weekly newsletter publicizes and informs the College constituency of events, initiatives and activities. The newsletter is distributed electronically to all campus users and is available through the College website. In addition to the newsletter, all shared governance committee agendas and minutes are posted to the campus J:\ drive (campus server) along with other pertinent forms and information. These documents are then available to all faculty and staff.

Recommendation #4: Educational Master Plan (October 2006 Progress Report)
- **The team recommends that the College immediately address the need to develop and implement a comprehensive planning process. In doing so, the College must rely on the College mission and vision to develop a long-term educational master plan to guide short-term and long-term decision-making including resource allocations. This master plan must be developed collaboratively by College personnel and used as the foundational document for all other components of a comprehensive planning process, such as annual operational plans, technology plans, and facilities plans. All components of this comprehensive planning process must incorporate standardized data, contain measurable outcomes, and be widely disseminated. Once the comprehensive planning process is implemented, the process must be periodically evaluated to facilitate a cycle of continued improvement (Standards IA.4, IB., IIA.2f, IIB.4, IIC.2, IIIA.6, IIIB., IIIC.2, IIID.1a, IIID.3, IVB.2b, Eligibility Requirement 19).**

An update on the development of the Cypress College Educational Master Plan was previously submitted to the ACCJC on September 27, 2006, as part of the Cypress College Progress Report.

The Educational Master Plan (EMP), adopted by the College in September 2006 is now the foundational document for College planning. Utilizing cyclical planning processes, the College evaluates curriculum, instructional quality, and overall institutional effectiveness using the EMP as a guide.

As the College developed the new EMP, it envisioned an umbrella document that would set forth a long range vision for the College that would be implemented through various shorter plans (e.g. a strategic plan, technology plan, facilities plan, student services plan, etc.) Collectively, these elements would comprise a more comprehensive planning effort at the College that would ultimately improve institutional effectiveness. Some of these shorter-range plans, such as the strategic plan, already existed. Others, such as the student services and technology plans still needed to be developed at that time. Therefore, this represents an important time of transition for the College in how it plans for and implements improvements.

Until the 2006-2016 EMP was developed, the Strategic Plan served as the primary plan for the College. In fact, the current 2004-2008 Strategic Plan was developed and approved before the current EMP. To capitalize on the work and vision set forth in the EMP, the College engaged in various strategies to weave the EMP into strategic planning, decision making, and resource allocation processes.

Early in Fall 2006 the College established new action plans for 2006-2008 (the last two years of the current Strategic Plan). The broad directions, goals, and objectives of the Strategic Plan remained in place. By design, more specific action plans were established for the first and then the last two years of the plan, respectively. Fortunately, this gave the College the opportunity to reflect upon key findings from the EMP and identify new action plans for relevant initiatives within the existing structure of the Strategic Plan.

To further integrate the EMP into decision making, the College revised its processes for the allocation of faculty positions and one-time funding. Both processes specifically asked whether such needs had been identified previously by the department or program in quality review and the EMP.

Additional relevant developments include a new Student Services Master Plan, which was formed and shaped by the EMP, and an upcoming Technology Plan.

During 2006-2007, the College reflected upon recent changes in its planning processes and particularly the development of the EMP. These changes had far reaching implications and consequences, and discussions on these topics identified areas for further improvement. First, the College established a multiyear calendar of major planning activities that is anchored by the six-year accreditation cycle. The schedule identifies the timeframes and sequential development of important plans such as the EMP, Strategic Plan, SSMP, and Technology Plan. Second, the existing instructional quality assessment (IQA) process was revised to make it more focused on program effectiveness and to provide a mechanism for planning farther into the future and updating department portions of the EMP.

Recommendation #5: Evaluate, plan, and improve: Technology
The team recommends that the College rely on the educational master plan described in Recommendation #4 to collaboratively develop a comprehensive technology plan that addresses all components of technology resources identified in Standards IIIC.1 and IIIC.2:
- **Academic computing needs,**
- **Administrative computing needs,**
- **Training for faculty and staff,**
- **Equipment maintenance, and**
- **Equipment replacement.**

The Campus Technology Committee (CTC) has been assigned the task of developing and forwarding a recommended technology plan for the campus to approve. The CTC agreed that the first step of the process was to have the Academic Computing Staff draft an initial plan that would then be presented to the committee for input and review. In October 2007, the Academic Computing staff presented a draft Technology Plan to the CTC to begin a process of review, comment, and feedback. When CTC has agreed on a final draft, the document will be forwarded to the Planning and Budget Committee asking for further review and then forwarded to

President's Advisory Council for final approval. At this time the estimated completion and approval time for the plan is Spring 2008.

The premise of the plan is to synchronize the technology plan with the Educational Master Plan by looking five years into the future at the campus technology needs. This includes, but is not limited to, hardware, software, third party support, and maintenance. Equipment replacement is proposed to continue on a three and five year replacement schedule based on the instructional or administrative need of the program or functional area. The following more specific issues to be addressed are:

Academic and Administrative Computing Needs

The draft plan will identify a list of relevant current and future technology issues, concerns, and challenges based on industry trends and projected campus needs. Some concerns already identified include the need to consolidate servers, increase budget support for instructional software needs, respond to the demand for wi-fi deployment throughout the campus, and maintain network security against both internal and external threats.

Training for Faculty and Staff

The Academic Computing department will continue the current training on email and Web support as outlined in the current campus Strategic Plan. Also, the campus staff development office has added or increased offering in the technology area including these programs: Hybrid/Online Training, Instructional Web Training, Tech Café, and My Gateway Web-Enhanced Course Training. Additional training is planned for division, department, and faculty web page design for Spring 2008 to coincide with the new College web site that is expected to go live in Spring.

In addition to the on-campus training, District Information Services will continue to provide broader based training at the Anaheim campus location in areas such as Banner Navigation (offered weekly), Banner Finance and Requisition (every two months), and Argos (monthly or as needed). More recently District Information Services has added training for My Gateway, the District's new portal, and laptop security as a result of concern about the vulnerability of any student information if it is stored in mobile laptop computers. The Technology Plan will address the technology training needs of both faculty and staff by having one of the main goals be continuance of the training described here and the development of additional effective training opportunities as the need arises.

Equipment Maintenance and Replacement

Computer equipment will be replaced on either a three or five year cycle based on the needs of the particular program.

Recommendation #6: Identify and assess student learning outcomes across the campus.
  The College needs to implement and expand its strategic plan related to student learning outcomes. These outcomes must be developed and assessed for
- **Instructional programs at the course, program, degree and certificate levels (Standard IIA.2a, IIA.2e, IIA.2f, IIA.2i, Eligibility Requirements 10, 11),**
- **Student services provided throughout students' matriculation at the College, (Standard IIB), and**
- **Campus support services (Standard IIC.2, IIIB, and IIC.a).**

Once data on student learning outcomes measures are gathered for all campus programs, the information is then to be used to improve courses, programs, and services. All issues related to Student Learning Outcomes are to be regularly evaluated to establish a cycle of improvement (Standard B.7).

Cypress College has made significant progress in response to the accreditation team's recommendation, particularly in terms of establishing student learning outcomes (SLOs) in instructional and student services areas.

Instructional Programs

For instructional programs, the campus has used an inclusive faculty-led dialogue process to explore and consider various approaches and select the most appropriate course for the campus. Among the many topics discussed at dialogue sessions in 2003-2004 were examples of SLOs already in use by some campus departments and other institutions, the difference between assessing SLOs and assigning grades, the roles of campus academic governance bodies (e.g., Academic Senate, the Curriculum Committee, Instructional Quality Review Committee), and if it would be best to first establish SLOs at the course, program, degree, or institution level. The dialogue group decided to start by establishing learning outcomes at the institution level and drafted a set of institutional learning outcomes (ILOs). The Academic Senate and the Associated Students Executive Board approved the draft of ILOs in April 2004; on May 6, 2004, the President's Advisory Cabinet (PAC) reviewed and adopted the Academic Senate approved draft of the Institutional Learning Outcomes. By December 2004, faculty working as departments had completed an intensive ILO course mapping project to reflect the extent and level to which each course provides learning opportunities for students to achieve each ILO.

The campus-wide dialogue continued, but to better coordinate and lead efforts in this area, an SLO Team was created. The SLO Team initially consisted of three members: the Staff Development Coordinator (a faculty member on reassigned time), a Psychology department faculty member, and the Director of Institutional Research. The SLO Team met with the President and executive members of her staff in the summer of 2005 to share the vision for a phased, multi-faceted approach to building and sustaining faculty interest in establishing and assessing SLOs.

In 2005-2006, the SLO Team expanded to include a new SLO Trainer position, with responsibilities to design and implement staff development workshops for faculty and staff to help them learn about Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), including how to write measurable student learning outcomes at the course and/or program level and how to develop a plan for assessing SLOs. The position was allotted 20% reassigned time, funded by a federal Title V

grant. A faculty member assumed this new role and created a Blackboard training site to conduct faculty workshops on the SLO-CATs process. Throughout the Spring semester, faculty as departments wrote SLOs for at least one course. Departments were also preparing material for the College's next Educational Master Plan at the same time.

By Fall 2006, the SLO Faculty Assessment Facilitator position was added to design and implement workshops to help faculty, managers, and classified staff in the following areas: (1) selecting or developing appropriate measures to assess the extent to which students achieve stated SLOs and (2) compiling, analyzing, summarizing, and/or interpreting assessment data. The Psychology Department faculty member on the SLO Team assumed this role with 20% reassigned time, and presented workshops throughout the year to assist departments to develop and implement assessment plans for the SLOs they had written the previous Spring. In Spring 2007, some departments gathered data for at least one course and are analyzing this data in Fall 2007.

As the SLO-CATs momentum grows, so does the need for oversight. Tracking participants, SLOs, CATs, data collection and implementation of changes is an extremely important component of this process. A significant milestone for the College was the establishment of a Faculty SLO Coordinator position in Spring 2007. Responsibilities of the coordinator include leading the SLO Team meetings to develop a cohesive, integrated process for assessing, documenting, and reporting SLOs; tracking and following up on the various SLO-CATs stages (track participation in the various training events, record the progress in developing SLOs campus-wide, collect and archive assessment plans and reports); organizing faculty and staff dialogues to plan the direction of the SLO-CATs process; providing updates to appropriate audiences; ensuring campus-wide communication and discussion of SLOs and their assessment; and writing an annual executive summary of progress. A Computer Information Services faculty member assumed this role in Spring 2007 and receives 40% reassigned time from his teaching load as of Fall 2007.

As of February 1, 2008, all but two departments (Dental Hygiene and Physics) had developed SLOs for at least one course. Three vocational departments (Dental Assisting, Dental Hygiene, and Nursing) opted to develop SLOs at the program level before developing SLOs at the course level. Overall, this progress reflects the support of the Academic Senate and broad participation in faculty-led SLO training and assessment workshops. Now that faculty members in so many departments have developed skills in determining and assessing SLOs, there is the potential to apply them readily to other courses. However, much work remains. By February 1, 2008, the College had identified SLOs for 267 of its 1,097 active courses (24%) and developed assessment plans for 142 (13%). Data were collected in Fall 2007 to assess SLOs in 6 courses; data will be analyzed in Spring 2008. SLOs have been developed for the Freshman Experience Program, but have yet to be developed for other instructional support programs (i.e. Honors Program, Puente, Supplemental Instruction, and Service Learning).

Instructional Programs: Recent Progress and Plans for the Future

The SLO Team held a series of college-wide dialogues in September 2007 to determine how to move the SLO-CATs process along faster by March 2011, the date of our next Accreditation Self Study visit. These dialogue sessions were attended by 38 faculty members and administrators.

Each division was represented by at least one instructor with representatives of individual departments also attending.

Those faculty members participating in the SLO Dialogues made several recommendations to the Academic Senate. Among the recommendations were that the College establish a timeline for completing the SLO assessment process for all courses, that each division appoint at least one SLO representative to an expanded SLO Team, and that each department create a plan for meeting the 2011 College goals and provide status reports to the dean and to the SLO Team representative at least twice a semester. The recommendations were discussed and approved at the September 27, 2007, meeting of the Cypress College Academic Senate.

The specific timeline established through the dialogues and approved by the Academic Senate is as follows:

Year	Write SLOs	Complete the loop
2007-2008	25% of courses	10%
2008-2009	50% of courses	25%
2009-2010	75% of courses	37%
2010-2011	100% of courses	50%

Completing the loop for a course consists of writing SLOs, developing an assessment plan, collecting data, analyzing the data, reflecting upon the findings and writing a brief report, and implementing any necessary changes.

Another important development to grow out of the most recent dialogue is the establishment of an Expanded SLO Team with representatives from each division. The Expanded SLO Team will meet regularly each semester to monitor division and College progress and address emerging challenges. Specifically, each division representative will act as a liaison between the division and the SLO Team, communicate the SLO Teams' decision to their division, inform the SLO Team of any issues within their division, and share the status reports from their division with the SLO Team.

The Expanded SLO Team is already exploring ways to improve campus-wide communication about SLOs through newsletters, shared electronic folders, and/or a new web portal. It also plans to review and evaluate various commercial software packages and other tools that are designed to alleviate the cumbersome task of tracking progress on SLOs.

Although the College is currently focused primarily on establishing and assessing course SLOs, the process is flexible and dynamic. Some vocational programs have already begun to work on program and course SLOs at the same time. The College is also initiating a program review process for special instructional programs (e.g. Supplemental Instruction, Peer Assisted Learning, Honors, and Service Learning). These special programs may establish program SLOs as part of the program review process.

Student Services

On November 16, 2006, the Student Services Council adopted the Nichols and Nichols Model for the development of Student Services Student Learning Outcomes. The Nichols and Nichols Model is used widely in postsecondary education to assess conditions that enhance educational effectiveness. Know on campus as the "five column model", each student service office has specified: 1) its mission and goals, 2) intended outcomes, 3) means of assessment, 4) data summary, and 5) how results will be used in the future. By May 2007, all 18 student services programs had established SLOs and assessment plans under the facilitation of the Dean of Student Support Services. Early in Fall 2007, each program had completed all five columns for the 2006-2007 SLO cycle.

In October 2007, the Dean of Student Support Services, the Director of Institutional Research, and an instructional SLO Team member met to discuss the current status and future plans of SLOs in Student Services. Like their colleagues in instruction, student services staff are still developing the knowledge and skills needed to establish meaningful SLOs, assess them, and close the loop. Student Services Council meetings have been used as a time for questions and updates on division SLOs. Student Services made important progress in a very short period of time and plan to sustain interest and momentum in this area with various strategies. The November 2007 Student Services Council meeting was dedicated as a workshop for starting the second cycle of SLOs in student services. Each office sent a representative to gather materials and review assessment recommendations. Some staff, including some from EOPS, CARE, CalWORKS, and Financial Aid, have participated in SLO workshops at the statewide level through their association activities. In the future all student service programs may focus on a single theme, such as retention or persistence, for an SLO cycle. There are also plans to explore ways to integrate SLOs with the College's quality review process for student services. By integrating the SLO and quality review processes, the student services programs are likely to gain a more comprehensive assessment of each program, including how well it is helping students to achieve their educational goals.

Campus Support Services

Cypress College distinguishes campus services from instructional and student service programs based upon function and the areas served. The College recognizes nine campus services:

1. Academic Computing
2. Bookstore
3. Bursar's Office
4. Campus Safety
5. Institutional Research
6. Maintenance and Operations
7. Staff Development
8. Production Center
9. Public Information

The campus has set the establishment and assessment of SLOs in instruction and student services as primary goals and is focusing efforts in these areas first. Nonetheless, the College has an established process and cycle of program review for campus support services with clear links to planning and budgeting. The process includes surveying clients to assess satisfaction with core measures (e.g. staff helpfulness, staff knowledge, and overall quality of service) and with

program-specific measures developed in consultation with the Office of Institutional Research. The College set a standard of at least 75% satisfaction with each of the core measures, although some departments set a higher standard for themselves. After the surveys are analyzed by the Research Office, managers in each area review the results with their staff and complete a quality review report including a narrative that places the data in context, comments on any standards not met, and establishes program goals and objectives for the next several years. Summaries of these reports are included in the annual *Institutional Effectiveness Report*, so that others on campus may see and understand the current goals of campus service programs.

Campus services were reviewed in 2004, 2005, and 2007. They are now on a standard three-year cycle and will be reviewed again in 2010. The College is well-poised to integrate SLOs with the existing program review process for campus services; in anticipation, the Office of Institutional Research is collecting models of SLOs in non-instructional areas from other institutions.

RESPONSE TO COLLEGE-IDENTIFIED PLANNING AGENDA ITEMS

The College's Spring 2005 Self-Study identified 34 planning agenda items. Listed below are each of the planning agenda items and its status.

Planning Agenda – Mission
1. **The Mission Statement will be communicated more clearly to the entire campus community.**

   Reference the response to Recommendation #3, under **College Mission, Practices, and Decision-Making Processes** on page 10 of this report.

2. **The College's Mission Statement will be included in the Curriculum Committee Handbook and Course Development section to provide guidance for those offering curricular revisions.**

   As noted in the Status Report on the Strategic Plan Action Plans for 2004-2006, the Mission Statement has been added to the Curriculum Handbook to provide guidelines for those offering curricular revisions. But as the College has migrated to electronic processing of curriculum, the College Curriculum Handbook has been phased out. In its place, the College has adopted curriculum development software, Curricunet, which now serves as the repository for all curriculum guides. The College Mission Statement was included on the home page of the College's curriculum website beginning with the Fall 2006 term.

Planning Agenda – Institutional Effectiveness
1. **The College will increase efforts to engage a greater number and broader spectrum of participants in the dialogue process. Participants will be encouraged to more effectively serve as conduits of information to their constituency groups.**

   The agendas and minutes from the campus shared governance committees are posted on the campus J:\ drive (e.g., President's Advisory Cabinet, Planning and Budget, Campus Technology, Diversity, Matriculation Advisory, Student Equity Planning and Staff Development). Agendas and minutes from the District Planning Council and Board of Trustees meetings are also posted to the J:\drive. At the beginning of each year, the committee chairs review the responsibilities each member has to communicate with the constituency group they represent. Major campus initiatives (e.g., Student Learning Outcomes, Basic Skills Initiative) were broadly promoted throughout the campus to get more staff and faculty participation. Presentations regarding these topics were also made during the Fall Opening Day Programs. The College will continue to increase efforts to engage a greater number and broader spectrum of participants in the dialogue process. Participants will be encouraged to more effectively serve as conduits of information to their constituency groups and others.

2. **The College will strengthen the linkages of planning activities to all relevant committees, constituencies, Departments, Divisions and services. The College will develop a means of ensuring greater participant rotation on the Direction Committees under the Strategic Plan in order assure greater involvement of the entire campus community.**

   Planning is a regular agenda item for the Planning and Budget Committee and for President's Advisory Cabinet so that it remains a visible topic of discussion. Each year, the chair of the Planning and Budget Committee offers to come to division meetings to answer questions on the planning and budget process. In the Spring of 2007, two divisions did extend invitations for a discussion on the planning and one-time funding process at the campus.

   Increasing Direction Committee rotation has been difficult. There is a tendency for the same people to participate each year. When calls have gone out for new participants, there has not been a significant response. Nonetheless, there have been a few new members who have brought new perspectives to the process and who have themselves gained a better understanding of College processes. The representation includes a cross section of all the constituency groups. In addition to the constituency group representation on all committees, the Direction 1 Committee now allows for balanced representation from all instructional divisions.

3. **The College will communicate to all constituencies' student success data along with an explanation of how it is collected and how it might be used. During that process, faculty will be assured that any negative data on student success and/or retention relating to their courses does not pose a threat to them individually but will be used as an opportunity for growth and improvement.**

   At the time the Cypress College Self-Study was written, the campus was just beginning an important change in the way it assessed instructional quality. The College had a long history of an Instructional Quality Assessment (IQA) program review process that relied heavily upon surveys of students, faculty, counselors, and administrators. When the current Director of Institutional Research started in 2002, she suggested that the IQA process include additional measures of program efficacy such as trends in success and retention rates, enrollment, FTES, efficiency, and awards (at the course and department level). Most faculty members were unfamiliar with some of these new measures and, at the time of the self-study, some may have been concerned that these measures alone would be used to measure instructional quality of programs, or even the effectiveness of individual instructors.

   The Director of Institutional Research worked with the faculty chair of the IQA Committee and the Staff Development Coordinator to develop and deliver training workshops for faculty regarding the revised IQA process. These workshops were held in early Fall of 2005, open to all faculty. The training workshops provided an opportunity to discuss the purpose of IQA and the importance of including the new measures, provide examples, offer tips, and answer questions. Before, during and after the workshops, the Director of Institutional Research consistently emphasized that the purpose of cyclical program review is to help gauge overall program and institutional effectiveness, and that this review must include quantitative and qualitative measures considered within an appropriate context.

4. **The College will develop better mechanisms for the distribution of statistical data and reports from the Office of Institutional Research to reach a broader audience within the campus community. Such a process should include the improved sharing of research data and reports among committees and various constituencies.**

    In response to this planning agenda item, the Office of Institutional Research employed various strategies. First, it established an office website to provide faculty, staff, students and members of the public with quick, easy access to relevant reports and information. The website was first launched in February 2005 and is updated regularly by office staff. Second, the office prepares and distributes an *Institutional Research Bulletin* each semester, which is distributed via e-mail to all College employees. Third, key research reports are distributed and discussed at College meetings (e.g., Deans and Directors, Planning and Budget, Management, and Leadership Team meetings) and events such as retreats and colloquia. Fourth, a new comprehensive *Institutional Effectiveness Report* was developed in 2005 and is now published and distributed widely each Fall. The *Institutional Effectiveness Report* provides demographic information (characteristics of our students, staff and service area) and some common measures of institutional effectiveness. Current measures of student achievement include success and retention in courses, term to term persistence, awards and transfers. As the College develops its capacity to assess its success in meeting stated student and institutional learning outcomes, future editions will seek to incorporate such information. Measures of productivity, efficiency and financial indicators are also included. However, the *Institutional Effectiveness Report* extends beyond a typical research factbook by including summaries of recent program reviews (within instruction, student services and campus services), findings from comprehensive biannual surveys of students and staff, and an annual strategic planning status report. The *Institutional Effectiveness Report* is distributed to all members of the campus Leadership Team (approximately 60 members of the faculty, classified staff, and managers) and is also available online from the Institutional Research website.

5. **The College will improve the dissemination of research to the surrounding community. Such information will make greater usage of the College's "success" statistics and data.**

    Since the 2005 Accreditation Team visit, the College's Public Information Office has made an effort at broader dissemination of research data featuring the College's success statistics and data. The @*Cypress* newsletter, published weekly during the Fall and Spring semesters, has featured information on the awarding of degrees and certificates, enrollment increases and other areas of success. In addition to being an internal communication piece, the @*Cypress* newsletter is also a primary communications vehicle between the College and the media and is utilized to share campus information with members of various boards and committees, including the NOCCCD Board of Trustees, the Cypress College Foundation Board, various advisory committee members, retirees, and alumni. In addition to @*Cypress*, success data has been published in the *End of the Year Report* and shared on Cypress College pod casts. The President of Cypress College presents an annual report to the NOCCCD Board of Trustees. Two important documents are shared with the Board at that time: 1) the *End of the Year Report* and 2) the *Institutional Effectiveness Report*. The former is a concise yet comprehensive overview of the most important achievements of the institution and its staff. Intended as a public information document, it is also distributed to key stakeholders, such as the Foundation Board, the Community Advisory Group, and high school principals

and counselors. While the *Institutional Effectiveness Report* is intended more for an internal audience, it is distributed broadly and available to the public. The Board members have specifically expressed their appreciation for the breadth, detail, and candor of the *Institutional Effectiveness Report*.

Planning Agenda – Instructional Programs
1. **The College will continue its focus on the understanding and development of Institutional Learning Outcomes and Student Learning Outcomes and delineate the relationship between the two. The College will develop and assess Student Learning Outcomes for all courses and programs. The College will convey the importance of Student Learning Outcomes to all staff.**

   To place the first sentence of this local planning agenda in context, it is important to note that at the time of the self-study, Cypress College had established Institutional Learning Outcomes (May 2004) and faculty had completed an intensive ILO-course mapping project to reflect the extent and level to which each course provides learning opportunities for students to achieve each ILO. However, given that much of the literature and regional discussions centered on the concept of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) rather than ILOs, many questions remained among faculty regarding the distinction between the two terms, how to assess them, and how to use them for improvement.

   Since the accreditation site visit, the College has continued to use a faculty-led dialogue process to select and develop the best approaches for the campus. A small SLO Team was established to better coordinate and lead efforts in this area. The SLO Team initially consisted of three members: the Staff Development Coordinator, a Psychology faculty member, and the Director of Institutional Research.

   In 2005-2006, the SLO Team expanded to include a new SLO Trainer position, with responsibilities to design and implement staff development workshops for faculty and staff to help them learn about Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), including how to write measurable student learning outcomes at the course and/or program level and how to develop a plan for assessing SLOs. The SLO Trainer created a Blackboard training site to conduct faculty workshops on College Assessment Techniques (CATs). During the Opening Day general session in January 2006, she gave a brief presentation which clearly defined relevant terms, processes, and plans. Throughout that Spring semester, faculty as departments worked with the SLO Trainer to write SLOs.

   By Fall 2006, the SLO Faculty Assessment Facilitator position was added to design and implement workshops to help faculty, managers, and classified staff in the following areas: (1) selecting or developing appropriate measures to assess the extent to which students achieve stated SLOs and (2) compiling, analyzing, summarizing, and/or interpreting assessment data.

   These efforts and activities have already paid off in various ways, such as: broader participation among the faculty, the establishment of SLOs, the resolve of the Academic Senate to accelerate the pace by which new SLOs are established and assessed, and new communication tools related to SLOs.

It is anticipated that the campus will have further discussion and assessment of ILOs and make more progress in the development and assessment of course and program SLOs. Some vocational departments have already established and assessed program SLOs. This approach makes sense for career and technical disciplines, but is less feasible for the many departments on campus that offer a selection of courses to support students' general education and transfer goals. The established ILOs will likely serve as "program SLOs" for students who earn degrees in Liberal Studies, or who transfer with general education certification.

The importance of SLOs has been communicated to all staff repeatedly, such as through Opening Day sessions, Leadership Team and Management Team meetings, faculty dialogues, and by including goals related to SLOs in the College's *Strategic Plan 2004-2008*. It is anticipated that these efforts will continue. An Expanded SLO Team, with faculty representatives from every division, is also exploring ways to improve campus-wide communication about SLOs through newsletters, shared electronic folders, and/or a new web portal.

1. **The College will increase its offerings of Staff Development programs designed to enhance student learning.**

Since the self-study in Spring 2004, the Staff Development Office has increased the number of workshops, seminars, and semester-length programs designed to facilitate the use of delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students. All workshop series include a discussion of learning styles, as well as the importance of active learning, student engagement, and formative and summative assessment of student learning outcomes. Workshops designed to teach instructors how to use the latest technology to enhance student learning also include an emphasis on accessibility to meet the needs of disabled students.

As reported in the self-study completed in Spring 2004, the Staff Development Office had offered a Learning Centered Instruction Workshop Series for several years with a total of 59 faculty members attending. This workshop series - featuring workshops in teaching and learning styles, syllabus writing, motivating, engaging, and retaining the adult learner, dealing with disruptive students, classroom assessment techniques, teaching physically and learning disabled students, and culturally responsive learning, - continues as part of the New Faculty Seminar with 38 instructors attending through Fall 2007.

The previous self-study also reported the development of the Hybrid Training Program (44 hours of on-campus activities with online activities due each week culminating in the creation of an online or hybrid course), completed by 10 instructors in Spring 2004. The program was revised to include Hybrid/Online Training and has been offered one summer and every Fall since Spring 2004 with 20 additional instructors completing the course of study.

The previous self-study reported one Opening Day speaker. Since that time, we have had two Opening Day speakers who have presented multiple workshops on improving student learning. The highlight of the 2005 Fall Opening Day was the keynote address, "Generational Management and Community Colleges," presented by Pamela Cox-Otto. Although focus was on the management and working styles of the Cypress College staff, many instructors commented that the critical issues, defining moments, and social styles of each generation

defined in the presentation was reflected in the learning and social styles of their students, providing them with a greater understanding of how and why students of different generations communicate, act, and react as they do.

The previous self-study reported that Dr. Janet Zadina had presented a two-day, 10-hour Brain-Based Research workshop in March 2004. In November 2005 and January 2006, a 10-hour workshop series entitled "Using Brain Research to Energize and Enhance Instruction and Student Services" was offered by Dr. Zadina, who was brought back by popular demand. Attended by over 40 instructors, managers, and staff, this workshop was so well-received that Dr. Zadina was brought back for the 2006 Fall Opening Day to present three intensive workshops and the keynote address to the entire College community. Two of the workshops, "The Reading Brain" and the "ESL Learning & the Brain: Processing Information through a Second Language Filter," were attended by 40 faculty and deans from several disciplines. One workshop, "Learning Differences and the Brain: Research and Strategies to Enhance Student Learning," was designed specifically for 60 adjunct instructors. The keynote address was extremely well-received by the College community.

In February 2005, a two-day, 10-hour workshop seminar "Cross Cultural Awareness" presented by Lillian Roybal Rose explored how a student's culture can affect student learning. This seminar was attended by 25 faculty, staff members, and managers. In addition to this seminar, in Spring 2007 and adjunct orientation was attended by 46 instructors focused on Angelo and Cross's Classroom Assessment Techniques with 5 faculty members attending an intensive follow-up workshop on classroom assessment techniques.

Since Spring 2004, the Staff Development Office has added four additional semester-long faculty development programs to provide intensive training in creating learning communities and using technology to enhance instruction. Each of these programs emphasizes active learning, collaborative learning, student engagement, measurable learning outcomes, and accessibility:

- Learning Community Development Program – 27 hours of on-campus activities with work outside the seminar with partner(s) culminating in the creation of an integrated curriculum learning community. From Summer 2004 through Spring 2007, 16 instructors have completed the training program.
- Instructional Web Training Program – 30 hours of on-campus activities culminating in posting an instructional web site to support instruction. From Spring 2005 through Spring 2007, 22 instructors have completed this program.
- TechCafe – Individual flex workshops on instructional blogging, basic image editing for Blackboard and the web, podcasting, podcatching, creating faculty home pages and accessible audio for Blackboard. First implemented in Spring 2007, 14 instructors completed 6 workshops ranging in length from two to eight hours.
- In the Fall 2007 the Student Learning Outcomes team developed and offered a series of four workshops designed to help department faculty write course SLOs, and develop assessment reports with action plans. As of December 2007, 161 faculty participated in fifteen Student Learning Outcomes/College Assessment Techniques workshops

Since the self-study was completed in Spring 2004, the Staff Development Office added two opening day seminar series comprised of multiple workshops, one 2-day seminar, and four on-going semester-long programs designed to improve student learning.

2. **The College will continue its efforts to both track and improve its measurements of student success. Specifically, the College will examine methods to track the employment rates of graduated students and will work to improve its transfer rates, to increase the number of degrees and certificates awarded and to raise its success rates in Basic Skills courses.**

At the time of the self-study, the College reported a set of core measures (e.g., course success rates, the number of degrees and certificates, and the number of transfers to the University of California and the California State University systems). Since then, the Office of Institutional Research has helped to expand and improve the measurements of student success by identifying and monitoring additional measures of student success and institutional effectiveness. Reports of College performance on previous and new measures are prepared and distributed by Institutional Research on a regular basis. A cornerstone tool for reporting and monitoring how well Cypress College is fulfilling its mission is the *Institutional Effectiveness Report* which provides a comprehensive annual update on key measures such as enrollment trends, student success and persistence, degrees and certificates awarded, transfers, and other institutional strengths and challenges identified through surveys of students and staff.

Cypress College awards associate degrees in approximately 30 areas. Most degrees are earned in Liberal Arts and General Studies. Nursing showed strong growth in 2006-07 as it awarded 91 degrees, the highest number in four years. Smaller programs like Business, Mortuary Science and Hotel, Restaurant & Culinary Arts also showed increases for 2006-07. Cypress College awarded 779 associate degrees in 2006-07, up 23% from 2003-04.

Cypress College also awards certificates in 25 areas. In contrast to the trend for degrees, the number of certificates the College awarded decreased 7% from 596 in 2005-06 to 553 in 2006-07. One contributing factor may be that over time, the primary educational goals of our students have changed. Since 2003-2004, the proportion of students seeking to earn a degree and/or transfer increased from 64% to over 67%, and the proportion of students seeking to earn a vocational certificate dropped from 3.4% to 3.0%. Also, effective for 2006-07, the national accrediting body for the Mortuary Science program set the Associates Degree as the minimum education level for the field, and Cypress College ceased to award certificates in this program. Of the vocational programs, Auto Technology awarded the most certificates during 2006-07, followed by Hotel, Restaurant & Culinary Arts, Human Services, Marketing, and Radiological Technology. Smaller areas like Computer Information Systems and Art Computer Graphics saw the number of certificates awarded in 2006-07 increase over their 2005-06 level. Larger areas such as Hotel, Restaurant & Culinary Arts and Marketing also showed strong growth in 2006-07.

Most students who transfer from Cypress College to a CSU or UC campus choose to remain within the greater metropolitan Los Angeles area. The vast majority of our students who transfer matriculate to a CSU campus; and approximately 80% of our transfers to CSU end up at CSU Fullerton or Cal State Long Beach. Each of these neighboring campuses have impacted programs and have experienced dramatic swings in the number of transfer spots available to students as a result of fluctuations in statewide funding for the CSU system. Therefore, the number of Cypress College transfers to the CSU system has fluctuated

considerably. The most recent data show that in 2006-07, 617 students transferred to CSU from Cypress College, compared to 523 students in 2005-06, an 18% increase.

The numbers of students who transferred to the University of California have remained stable over time (96 in 2002-03 to 123 in 2005-06). Most of these students transfer to UC Irvine or UCLA. Through the National Student Loan Clearinghouse, the College tracks students who transfer to private and out of state colleges and universities. In California, former Cypress College students have transferred to prestigious public and private schools such as Biola, Claremont McKenna College, Loma Linda University, Loyola Marymount, Pepperdine, University of Redlands and Stanford.

Tracking employment rates for all graduate students has turned out to be an unrealistic and unfeasible goal. The data that are available are fraught with missing cases and important omissions (e.g., students who are self-employed and those who join military service). They also do not provide sufficient information to allow researchers to discern whether the student is employed in the same field that they studied at Cypress College. However, the College has developed the means to track and survey small samples of students about their employment after college. The Institutional Research Office has collaborated with faculty in the Mortuary Science program to develop a web survey of students who graduate from the program. Shortly after their graduation, students are invited to complete a short survey about how well their coursework prepared them for work in mortuary science. Conducting the survey over the internet gives researchers the chance to send multiple reminder e-mails as they seek to improve the notoriously poor response rates to alumni surveys. To date, three cohorts of students of 6 to 14 graduates (from Spring 2006, Fall 2006, and Spring 2007) have been surveyed; response rates have ranged from 24% to 43%. Results from the surveys show that most students are satisfied with the preparation they received in the program. The research provides important feedback to the mortuary science faculty and is expected to continue.

With respect to efforts to improve success rates in basic skills courses, the College has engaged in a number of efforts during the past three years. A number of resources and programs (e.g., counseling, tutoring, supplemental instruction, and learning communities) designed to improve success in basic skills were already in existence. These programs were reviewed to gauge student satisfaction with these programs and identify ways to expand or enhance these services. In addition, statistics regarding success rates in basic skills courses and student progress through basic skills course sequences were published and reviewed on a regular basis. This information provided feedback to those in instruction and student services who were engaged in various efforts to improve student success in basic skills. The College also recently established a Basic Skills Committee which is engaged in a detailed assessment of existing college programs and resources that support basic skills or developmental education. By May 2008, the committee will develop a comprehensive and integrated plan for further enhancement of developmental education at Cypress College.

3. **The College in concert with the other District entities will complete the development of the Program Discontinuance and Academic Freedom Policies.**

   Little progress has been made on the development of a District Program Discontinuance Policy. Discussion continues at the District level, specifically at the District Planning Council and the Chancellor's Cabinet. A draft document was developed by a joint subcommittee of the academic senates of the District but was not adopted. Representatives of the District Planning Council continue to review effective program discontinuance policies adopted by other districts in the hope of reaching agreement on a process.

   At the campus level, in 2006-2007, the Academic Senate President and Executive Vice President initiated discussions regarding Program Discontinuance. The goal was to begin discussing the issue and to share information regarding a College program that for the past several years had been under-subscribed. It was agreed that review and discussion regarding this was to take place after the task force on Reassigned Time completed its work in February-March, 2007. However, the task force did not complete its work until the end of the Spring 2007 semester.

   At the beginning of the 2007 Fall semester, the campus Academic Senate Presidents (both Cypress College and Fullerton College) met with the Chancellor to discuss the specific issues that they wanted to address in 2007-2008. Program Discontinuance was one of the issues discussed. The Chancellor requested that the Academic Senates focus on only one large item at a time; therefore, the Senates are currently focusing on the Academic Freedom Policy before pursuing Program Discontinuance.

   The Chancellor and the Academic Senate Presidents met in September 2007 to work on the policy for Academic Freedom. By October, 2007, agreement had been reached on the policy statement itself as well as rewording for three sections of the procedures. There remains some disagreement on whether language regarding unlawful discrimination should or should not be included in the proposed policy language. The proposed policy was presented to the Board of Trustees for a first reading at the January 22, 2008 Board Meeting.

Planning Agenda – Student Support Services
1. **The College will provide ongoing staff development opportunities regarding the campus based student service programs.**

   Student Support Services coordinates workshops and training throughout the year which are open to all faculty, staff, and students. In Spring 2007 and Fall 2007, Student Success Week highlighted programs and services across student support services. On an ongoing basis, Student Support Services staff regularly visit classrooms, staff information booths, and visit off campus sites to gather information and to collaborate with others in order to bring information back to better inform the campus constituents of the student service programs that are available.

2. **The College's commitment to serving its students will be enhanced through providing supplementary employee training programs and, when economically feasible, increasing the number of employees.**

    Through the Cypress College staff development program, student services staff members participate in activities offered throughout the year in conjunction with instructional faculty. In Spring 2007, a team of student support services staff attended the Noel-Levitz Regional Recruitment and Retention training seminar in Anaheim, CA. To supplement training on key issues concerning students and student support services, a series of advisory teams have been established to communicate services and coordinate efforts across the division. Quarterly student support services division staff meetings focus on recruitment and retention activities. Student support services staff members complete activities and set objectives in response to action plans identified in the campus strategic plan during the division meetings. In addition, staff members are encouraged to attend all staff development programs offered on campus and through various programs within student support services.

    Additionally, the Student Support Services Outreach Advisory Team, which meets monthly, works to integrate strategies on how to best communicate, outreach, and retain students through the use of our support programs. Additionally, the creation of a Student Ambassador program has enabled staff to train a select number of Cypress College students to assist with outreach endeavors. Staff in student support services also participate in the Guardian Scholars Advisory team which addresses and supports awareness of issues facing foster youth.

    Since Spring 2005, a total of four additional positions have been added to the student support services area. Three financial aid positions (categorically funded) and one EOPS position (categorically funded) have been added to support administration, outreach, and recruitment of students.

3. **The College will continue to monitor the matriculation process to insure equal access, opportunity, and success for all students.**

    Matriculation is a comprehensive student success program involving the entire campus community. The College has made significant progress during the current accreditation cycle to continue to insure equal access, opportunity, and success for all students by assisting them in the completion of their college courses, persistence to the next academic term and achievement of their educational objectives. This progress has been achieved through all components of the matriculation process: admissions, orientation, assessment, counseling/advisement, and student follow-up.

    To insure continued progress in monitoring the matriculation process for all students, the College developed and implemented the following matriculation related strategies and activities since the last accreditation site visit:

    1. Convened regular Matriculation Advisory Committee meetings to review matriculation components and projected budget expenditures for the current year.
    2. Developed and distribute New Student and Academic Progress Probation letters; coordinate follow-up component with new and probation students.
    3. Increased seat availability in new student orientations.

4. Implemented and coordinated an all day walk-in Counseling Center, which is staffed until 7 p.m., and continued division specific counseling reflecting a commitment to provide students with comprehensive academic counseling services. Counselors are assigned to a division or a department as an area of specialty. Areas of specialty include: Health Science, Business, Fine Arts, Humanities, Science Engineering and Math, Physical Education, Vocational, Outreach, DSPS, Puente, Transfer, Honors, Learning Communities, EOPS/CARE, and CalWORKS.
5. Expanded evening Transfer Center counseling services until 7 p.m. to serve the evening student population.
6. Upgraded SARS (Student Appointment Record System) software.
7. Provided funding for a research analyst to support matriculation-related research.
8. Reinstated faculty advising.
9. Added review of on-line student education plans and degree audits.
10. Administered College Success Factors Index (CSFI) in English 27, 57, 58, and approximately one-half of English 60 classes with a counseling follow-up.

Cypress College continues to make significant progress towards monitoring the matriculation process for all students. The College has reviewed all components of the Matriculation Process that resulted in structured implementation of strategies and activities to date. These strategies and activities will continue to be evaluated for their effectiveness and modified as needed to improve progress with this identified planning agenda.

Planning Agenda – Library and Learning Support Services
1. **Librarians will increase their periodic discussions with the faculty at-large, and the Curriculum Committee in particular, regarding information competency, the measurement of student learning outcomes, the status of Library holdings, and the method by which faculty can request the purchase of library materials.**

Librarians have increased discussions with faculty by: 1) attending department and division meetings specific to Librarians' areas of collection development, 2) organizing and inviting participation in the "weed-in-feed" program (the de-selection of outdated reference materials and the selection of replacement references), 3) placing Library advertisements for open orientations in the College newspaper, 4) communicating via email to faculty about various offerings, programs, and services, 5) creating and distributing flyers and handouts regarding Library displays and holdings, 6) creating flyers and handouts for specific classes based on instructor requests, 7) posting all the flyers and handouts created on the Library web site http://www.cypresscollege.edu/library, 8) creating "Research Guides" for specific courses and posting them on the Library's website, and 9) working in conjunction with faculty about Library holdings during the curriculum process.

The current chair of the Curriculum Committee is a tenured librarian. The new Curricunet system requires faculty to consult with a librarian during the curriculum development process to ensure that adequate library materials exist; therefore, a librarian's name is listed as the "contact" in Curricunet. A librarian serves on the SLO committee as well as the Learning Communities Advisory Team. The instruction librarian has partnered with English faculty to develop a learning community during Spring 2008. At the end of each fiscal year, the Library publishes an annual report that details the Library's holdings and other pertinent statistical

data. A copy of this report is provided to the President, a copy is kept in the Library, and a copy is provided to any faculty member who requests it.

2. **The Library will continue to increase the size of its print and data base collections as the budget permits.**

   The Library added approximately 3,000 public domain titles to its electronic book collection. Those 3,000 books (in additional to another 2,500 previously purchased) are available through the online catalog. The Library purchased 12 electronic reference titles and made those titles directly available through the online catalog. The following databases were also purchased: CQ Researcher, Noddlebib, Opposing Viewpoints, and Gale Virtual Reference.

3. **The Library will increase its outreach/marketing efforts regarding Library services, materials and databases. Particular attention should be paid to groups such as Disabled Students Programs and Services, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services and the Associated Students.**

   A new Instruction Outreach Librarian was hired in early Fall 2007. Librarians are now 're-visioning' the Library's instructional program. In order to offer online or hybrid courses, two librarians are current in Hybrid-Online Training. The Library's website is being redesigned to make it simpler for users. More information is being posted to the Library's new website, http://www.cypresscollege.edu/library.

   The Library offers tours and orientations to students in DSPS and EOPS. The Library anticipates hiring a new Access Services Reference Librarian who will increase the outreach and marketing efforts even more. During Spring 2007, a new display cabinet was purchased to promote diversity, library services, and collections. For example, during October, 2007, DSPS had a display for National Disability Awareness Month, and the Library has added related displays of books, videos, handouts, and links to web sites. In December, 2007, a massive "weed-and-feed" project was held. Faculty provided recommendations for new and/or replacements for the more than 1,100 obsolete titles removed from the general collection. Interest in the new L/LRC (Library/Learning Resource Center) remains high. Tours, presentations, and distribution of brochures to various groups are fairly common occurrences.

Planning Agenda – Human Resources

1. **The College will recommend that the District negotiate changes with the two faculty unions so that effectiveness in achieving Student Learning Outcomes becomes a component of faculty evaluation.**

   While the College has identified methods to evaluate programs based on their effectiveness in achieving Student Learning Outcomes, it has relatively little influence over pursuing the effectiveness in achieving Student Learning Outcomes as a component of faculty evaluation, as this is an item subject to negotiation. The campus did communicate with the district's Vice Chancellor of Human Resources regarding this planning agenda item.

2. **The College will develop a written code of ethics for non-instructional personnel.**

The CSEA representative from President's Advisory Cabinet agreed to carry this request forward to CSEA, but since this is potentially a negotiable item, the College can only request that a written code of ethics be developed.

The District Management Association (DMA) has an existing code of ethics for managers. The 2005-2006 President of DMA was contacted by the College President regarding the possible need to review and update the code of ethics, if necessary. The response was that the Management Comparability Study was taking all DMA's time that year, but they committed to forwarding the request to the 2006-2007 DMA President. The request from the campus was not addressed during the 2006-2007 year, and in Fall 2007, it was again requested that the code of ethics be reviewed and updated, if needed.

3. **The College will continue to assess staffing needs and increase its personnel when budgetary conditions permit.**

Prior to the Fall 2007 term, the determination of the need for and allocation of full-time faculty positions was made by the College President in consultation with the Executive Vice President and the instructional deans. Relevant information was developed by the instructional divisions in consultation with division faculty and then shared and discussed amongst the deans and the Executive Vice President prior to finalization by the College President, with the approval of the President's Advisory Council.

Beginning in the Fall 2007 term, the College initiated a full-time faculty position allocation process agreed upon by College administration and the Academic Senate that includes the instructional deans and the Academic Senate representatives. The Joint Committee on Faculty Positions reviews all full-time faculty position needs and requests and works by consensus to prioritize those requests. The recommendations of the Joint Committee are then shared with the College's shared governance bodies for review and discussion. Subsequent to discussions at the Planning and Budget Committee and the President's Advisory Council, the College President finalizes the position allocation.

In addition to prioritizing full-time faculty position requests as indicated above, the Joint Committee also considers new position requests as those requests come forward. Such requests can come forward at any time due to changing College needs or emergency situations such as an unexpected retirement or resignation. Those requests deemed critical by the Joint Committee are advanced to the Planning and Budget Committee for review and discussion along with the other significant funding needs of the College.

The College is fortunate in that funding was identified to add a total of 12 new classified positions since Spring 2005. The events involving the identification of new positions began in Fall 2005, when criteria were established and a process was approved for evaluating the classified position needs on campus. In March 2006, the campus finalized a Classified Staff Needs Assessment, which resulted in a prioritized list of position needs identified from across the campus. At that time, there were no ongoing funds available, and it was agreed that the list would be set aside pending the development of a new Educational Master Plan (EMP), which was soon to be completed. By Fall 2006, the EMP was complete, and a small amount

of ongoing funding had been identified. Based on the new EMP, which identified a need for staff and supply budget increases and additional data provided by the Institutional Research Office on the unmet student demand for certain courses, it was evident that the Biology and Chemistry Departments were impacted and that if classes could be added, they would easily fill with students. In order to offer the lab classes needed, the department needed the support of a classified lab technician and an increased supply budget. It was recommended by the Planning and Budget Committee to the President's Advisory Cabinet (PAC) that a full-time lab technician shared by the Biology and Chemistry Departments and a $24,000 supply budget increase be approved.

On February 12, 2007, the District Planning Council approved $1 million in ongoing general funds to be allocated for the purpose of hiring classified staff at both Cypress and Fullerton Colleges and at the School of Continuing Education. Of this, $374,734 was earmarked for Cypress College with the caveat that 50% of the funding be used for positions that would support the new infrastructure or facilities being built on campus. The already prepared Classified Staff Needs Assessment prioritized list was consulted and a recommendation was made by President's Staff to the Planning and Budget Committee and to President's Advisory Council (PAC) that the following positions be funded: Administrative Assistant I (SEM), HVAC Mechanic II, IT Services Coordinator I, Facilities Custodian I (2 positions), and Facilities Custodian II (2 positions). In March of 2007, with the support of both Budget and Planning Committee and PAC, the hiring processes were begun with the intention to have all positions filled by July 2007.

In addition to these positions, one other on the list (a research analyst) was funded by an increased allocation from the state to the Matriculation program. Two other categorical programs were able to increase staff due to increased funding: two positions were hired in Financial Aid and one in the EOPS program.

4. **The College will monitor the impact of the reduced Full Time Faculty Obligation on its staffing levels.**

When the District entered into negotiations with the state over the full-time faculty obligation, Cypress College was in the beginning stages of a period of declining enrollments. Though the District number relative to this obligation was decreased, the impact upon the College was minimized due to the realities of the enrollment situation.

During this same period, Cypress College entered into a significant and comprehensive construction phase that is believed to have had a considerable impact on enrollment. Access and construction barriers exacerbated the downward trend in student demand for classes.

During this period and including the 2007-2008 academic year, the College has monitored and reviewed staffing requests on a regular basis. Full-time faculty position requests are solicited and reviewed in a regular process, with the integrity of College programs as the primary consideration in making the allocation decisions. This ongoing process of review assures that this will remain as a College priority. It is difficult to identify a way to measure the impact of a reduced Full Time Faculty Obligation to the College. It is possible that more faculty would be willing to serve on shared governance committees and it is possible that

full-time faculty would be more accessible to students but both behaviors would be impossible to measure.

5. **The College will continue its efforts to hire personnel of diverse backgrounds.**

   The District's Office of Human Resources coordinates recruiting efforts for the College. They send all position flyers to a comprehensive distribution list that includes colleges and universities, city offices, employment offices, libraries, and other community centers throughout the greater Los Angeles and Orange County region. All vacancies are also posted to the District's website. Management and full-time faculty vacancies are advertised with the following diversity publications:

   - Hispanic Hotline
   - Black Careers Now
   - Asian Pacific Careers
   - Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education
   - www.diverseeducation.com
   - www.tribalcollegejournal.com
   - www.latinosinhigheredu.com
   - Journal of Blacks in Higher Education
   - www.HBCUCareerCenter.com

   In addition to these recruiting measures, managers distribute information through their professional organizations (e.g., listserves and websites), and the District uses other resources to advertise certain disciplines. For example, the District advertised a Student Services Specialist/DSPS position through ohsoez.com, which posts jobs working in the deaf community. It is anticipated that these various efforts to recruit and hire personnel of diverse backgrounds will continue.

   As reported in the 2003-2004 Self-Study report, most College employees were White (70%), although many were of other ethnicities: 13% Latino, 11% Asian or Pacific Islander, and 4% Black. By Fall 2007, the proportion of White employees had decreased to 67% while the proportions of most other ethnic groups increased. Now, 15% are Hispanic and 13% are Asian, Filipino or Pacific Islander. Staff demographics are monitored on an annual basis and published in the *Institutional Effectiveness Report.*

Planning Agenda – Physical Resources
1. **The College will investigate the adoption of a centralized scheduling plan for classroom utilization.**

   In Fall 2007, a large group of campus representatives reviewed a live demonstration of a software package that would allow for centralized scheduling for both instructional and non-instructional use of campus facilities as well as creation of a master calendar. A review of the same software occurred separately at both Fullerton College and the School of Continuing Education. Subsequent to the reviews, the District Information Services department agreed to purchase the software on behalf of the entire District and to provide the needed support centrally from their office. Fullerton College will be the first to have the software implemented with Cypress College to follow by the end of 2007-2008.

2. **The College will develop a plan to proactively and systematically replace and repair major equipment.**

    A draft list of the major equipment inventory has been created but is being cross-checked against existing plans, such as the Scheduled Maintenance Plan and the Facilities Condition Assessment report. By May 2008, the Director of the Physical Plant will have a replacement plan completed and ready to be presented to the Planning and Budget Committee for validation and approval.

Planning Agenda – Technology Resources

1. **The College and the Office of Academic Computing and Media Services will work with District Information Technology personnel to ensure the integration of the Banner and Blackboard systems.**

    The integration of the Banner and Blackboard systems was completed in August 2007.

2. **The Office of Academic Computing and Media Services will offer more training to faculty and staff. In order to accomplish this, consideration will be given to the hiring of additional personnel when the budget permits.**

    Training has been offered for a number of years in the areas of email (basic and advanced) and Web Development (basic and advanced). The Strategic Plan outlines twelve trainings per year with some being accomplished each semester. However, attendance at training sessions over the last two years has been poor. Attempts to conduct training at different times of the day and different days of the week resulted in little improvement. Training is consistently announced at the Deans and Directors Team meetings, and Management Team meetings, as well as via allusers email. Due to the apparent low demand, class offerings will be limited in the future. On the other hand individualized training is so popular that the webmaster devotes up to 50% of his time to one-on-one training of faculty and staff.

    It is anticipated that web training needs will increase in late 2008 due to the redesign of the campus website that is underway and the need for most campus personnel to have some level of training. Academic Computing is exploring different delivery modes for this training.

3. **The College will ensure that the campus network and systems receive continued funding to keep pace with technological changes.**

    One-time funding each year has been adequate to support the hardware needs of the campus as outlined by the Educational Master Plan, the Strategic Plan, and the Technology Plan. Ongoing funding for software and systems maintenance has also been adequate. One new staff position was added in 2006-2007, due to a funding allocation earmarked by the District Planning Council for new classified positions that support new facilities and infrastructure. The campus had already determined that the infrastructure of the new facilities required additional Academic Computing staff for critical network and after-hours support. Looking into the future, it is clear that increased technology needs also require increased hardware, software, and additional personnel resources. With the increasing pressure to have technology services available 24 hours a day, the future demand for resources to provide that service will only increase.

Planning Agenda – Financial Resources

1. **The College will request an increased cash allocation from the District when the budget permits.**

   The Cypress College Director of Budget and Finance works closely with the budget officers of both Fullerton College and the School of Continuing Education to formulate recommendations to the District Vice Chancellor of Facilities on how to make allocations of new ongoing or one-time funds for NOCCCD. The College has been successful in receiving some increases in funding through this avenue, although not all have directly impacted the cash allocation or discretionary budget.

   For a period of nearly two years, presentations were made to the District Planning Council on four different funding modifications to the District's allocation model: 1) Growth Beyond Extended Day - which would allow growth funding to be applied to costs other than full-time or part-time faculty salaries, 2) Operating Allocation - which would allow COLA to be applied to discretionary budgets prior to salary settlements with the unions, 3) New Facilities Budget Allocation – which would allow new funding to be allocated based on the increased square footage of new building construction, 4) Partnership for Excellence Allocation – which would allow PFE-funded positions to be treated as all other district general fund positions in that funding for COLA and health benefit increases would be covered "off the top" at the District level and the campuses would not be expected to use their fixed discretionary budgets to absorb the increases. On May 22, 2006, the District Planning Council reached consensus to support option #1 and #4 above. Both of these decisions became effective in the 2006-2007 budget year. Regarding option #2, consensus was reached but the District Planning Council reverted to the previously used "Simpson Model" which allowed for some level of COLA to be allocated to the campuses after salary settlements were reached for each of the unions. Option #3 was tabled due to lack of consensus, the primary issue being the concern that any allocation which requires funds off the top of COLA would have a potential impact on salary settlements.

   In Spring 2006, at the last meeting of the District Planning Council for the year, the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Facilities distributed an analysis of the current district funding model. Because this was at the end of the school year, there was little time for discussion about the model and by the Fall of 2007, the idea of further examination of the current allocation model was raised again. A work group was formed comprised of campus Budget Officers, campus Research Directors and the primary campus Instruction Offices to conduct further analysis and comparison to other multi-college district models.

   On March 12, 2007, a recommendation was approved by the District Planning Council to approve allocations to cover late retroactive salary settlements for positions that were funded through categorical programs. Since categorical programs cannot be charged retroactively across fiscal years, this action protected the campus general funds from having to absorb this cost. On April 9, 2007, the District Planning Council approved a recommendation to allocate one-time resources for Facilities, Equipment Technology, and Infrastructure from funds available in 2006-2007. Cypress College received $1 million of this allocation and determined in Planning and Budget Committee and President's Advisory Council to use these funds to complete the Gateway Plaza in front of the new Student Center/Bookstore

facilities as completion of this area was not in the scope of the bond construction project. Without these funds, the front entry to the campus would have been an unfinished dirt area.

2. **The District will provide a more thorough orientation and training for all personnel, especially with respect to financial matters.**

The District Information Services department provides Banner Navigation and Purchase Requisition training to all personnel who need to update their Banner technology and skills. In 2005, there were 45 navigation and 9 requisition trainings offered. In 2006, there were 37 navigation, 7 requisition trainings, and 20 Banner 7.0 version trainings offered to staff across the District. As of September 2007, there were 32 navigation and 3 requisition trainings offered to District personnel. The campus Business Office also provides supplemental training to campus personnel who need more thorough review. These training sessions occur in a group or individual setting based on the number of requests. In 2006/2007, the Business Office staff provided 6 training sessions: two were group (division) trainings on the topic of campus fundraising guidelines, two were group (department) trainings on cash handling, and one was an individual cash handling training. In the Fall of 2006, one overview training session for the Leadership Team was offered by invited guests from various District Offices (Purchasing, Instructional Resources, Accounts Payable, etc.). As of September 2007, there were two Banner financial training sessions provided by the Interim Director of Budget and Finance which included staff from district purchasing as resource members.

Planning Agenda – Decision Making Roles and Processes
1. **The College will promote orientations and training about the various shared governance processes.**

Each of the constituencies is represented on the various shared governance committees of the College. Each constituent group is charged with the responsibility of informing its representatives on these bodies of the duties and obligations assumed by virtue of their participation. In addition, each shared governance committee begins the academic year by reviewing purpose, mission, duties, and responsibilities of the members. Of particular emphasis is the need for participants in the shared governance processes of the College to inform their constituent group and to provide input and feedback from that group to the committee. Orientations for committee members and participation guidelines occur at the first meeting in the Fall in both the President's Advisory Cabinet and Planning and Budget Committee. Later each Fall, orientations are scheduled for the Direction Committee Chairs and they in turn conduct orientations for members of their committee regarding the roles and responsibilities of members. In addition to these sessions, both the Vice President of Educational Support & Planning and the Director of Budget and Finance (who chairs the campus Planning and Budget Committee) make themselves available to attend division meetings to discuss the annual One-Time Funding Budget Request processes. In Spring 2007, the Fine Arts division and the Science, Engineering and Math division invited the Director of Budget & Finance to spend an hour with them discussing the funding criteria, forms, and processes.

The definition of shared governance for Cypress College can be found in the President's Advisory Cabinet (PAC) Guidelines, page 1. This definition was used in 2007, when a PAC categorized all committees, councils, and other groups as shared governance or not shared

governance. The resulting list is published in the "Cypress College Shared Governance Process Committees and Task Forces." Both of these documents will be included in the Cypress College Resource Book, which is being revised. The Staff Development Office has developed and will maintain a database to track people serving on each shared governance committee including what constituency they represent. This information is available on the J:\ drive.

Future plans include having information about shared governance included in both the New Faculty Seminar and New Classified Orientations beginning in Spring 2008.

On Friday, February 10, 2006, Session 3 of the Cypress College Leadership Enhancement and Development Series focused on "Understanding Shared Participatory Governance: The ABC's of Campus Decision-Making." Participating in the forum were the College President, the Student Trustee, the CSEA President, the Academic Senate President-Elect, and the District Management Association President. Documents from AB1725 (Section 70902 (B)(7) Governing Boards: Delegation; the Education Code Section 53203; the Board and Administrative Policies on Participation in Local Decision–Making BP 2510 and AP 2510; and the role of the Academic Senate were shared with all participants.

2. **The College will make greater efforts to involve students in shared governance processes. Students will be made aware of both the existence of opportunities and the procedures of getting involved.**

The President's Office provides a list of campus shared governance committees that include opportunities for student representation. The list is reviewed with the Associated Students Council at a business meeting where student leaders are encouraged to participate on the various committees. This item is then agendized for future Associated Students meetings where it is discussed and students are appointed to serve on specific committees. All Associated Students Council members are required to serve on at least two campus committees. Representation of students is across a broad spectrum of Associated Students members. The President's Advisory Council (PAC) approves the composition of hiring committees for managers. This becomes another opportunity for student participation as the College President then requests the Associated Students President, who serves on PAC, to appoint a student to serve on these hiring committees. The appointment is confirmed with the Student Activities Advisor. Also, in March 2008 a three day campus-wide colloquium on strategic planning is planned and six current students have been invited to participate in this event.

Planning Agenda – Board and Administrative Organization

1. **The College will request that the Board of Trustees and the District continue the process of utilizing Strategic Conversations and consider variety in the format. The College will also request that the Board of Trustees and the District also continue to develop other strategies to receive and encourage input from constituent groups.**

    Since Spring 2005, the Board of Trustees has hosted two Strategic Conversations each year, and the format has varied from time to time. For example, the goals of Strategic Conversation #7, held on March 28, 2006, were to review and add to a variety of data already collected in the District's Strategic Plan process, to discuss significant trends in higher education, and to review data from the District's internal and external stakeholders (Strategic Conversation #7 Background Paper). The primary goal of the conversation was to discuss ways to overcome the barriers to the four themes identified in the planning process: enhanced instructional programs and student services; improved communication and collaboration; efficient and effective use of resources (people, operations, and money); and improved decision-making processes (Strategic Conversation #7 Facilitators' Agenda). This format was quite different from previous conversations, in that specific information was solicited from District employees to assist in the strategic plan process. The major concepts and actions identified by the 57 District employees in the conversation were collected by the District's consultants and integrated into the North Orange County Community College District District-wide Strategic Plan, adopted on June 27, 2006. It is important to note that in addition to the input solicited during the Strategic conversation, all District employees had the opportunity to contribute to the Strategic Plan through paper and electronic surveys and by participating in focus groups held on the campuses, with at least one Trustee in attendance, before the Strategic Conversation. This process is outlined on pp. 4-5 of the District-wide Strategic Plan. Strategic Conversation #8 was held after 5 p.m. on April 10, 2007, at a local area hotel. The focus was on what was important to the employees and students of the District, as identified in a district-wide survey (Opportunities to Discuss What's Important to You). Conversation participants had the opportunity to discuss the issues of technology, District strengths and areas needing new attention, strategic plan expectations, and other topics that a participant wanted to bring to the table. An open-microphone session was added to this conversation, giving participants the opportunity to address or ask questions of the Trustees or the Chancellor directly. This format worked well as evidenced by the Strategic Conversation #8 Summary Paper and Participant Evaluations. However, this conversation was attended mainly by faculty and managers. Strategic Conversation #9 is scheduled for February 29, 2008, on the Cypress College campus at an earlier time in hopes of attracting more classified staff and student participants.

    At this time, the Strategic Conversation remains the primary vehicle for all District employees and students to speak informally one-on-one or at least in a group discussion with Trustees. With the participation of Cypress College faculty and administrators in Strategic Conversations, issues of importance to this campus have been brought to the attention of Trustees.

2. **The College will regularly review and evaluate the administrative structure to determine its effectiveness and efficiency.**

   In 2004 and 2005, a reorganization task force was formed, chaired by the Executive Vice President, which made recommendations to the President's Advisory Cabinet. The recommendations were to hire a Dean of Library and Learning Resources and to adjust several of the responsibilities under the Dean of Counseling and Student Development and the Dean of Student Services.

   In light of four positions being filled by interim managers as of July 1, 2007, (Executive Vice President, Vice President, Director of Budget and Finance, and the Dean of Science, Engineering and Math), a new task force was convened in Fall 2007 to review the management structure and provide recommendations to the President before the end of the Fall semester.

   By early December, a recommendation had been formulated. The recommendation did not include any change in the Dean of Science, Engineering and Math position, so PAC approved moving forward with the hiring process. The consensus of the task force was that there was no change need for the Executive Vice President position. The campus has enjoyed a collegiality between the instructional and student service deans which is in part credited to having both groups report to the same position. The task force's recommendation evolved primarily around what were viewed as the unmanageable workload of the Vice President of Educational Support and Planning. Some of the primary duties of the position were also viewed as unrelated causing some concern that there would not be a sufficient pool of candidates ideally suited for the position should the duties remain the same. To correct this, the recommendation was to change the Vice President position to a Vice President of Administrative Services, change the Director of Research position to a Director of Research and Planning, and then reduce the ranking of the Director of Budget and Finance allowing for the new Vice President position to assume primary responsibility for budget and finance. The shifting of duties would also require the addition of one new classified position to provide clerical support to the Director of Research and Planning. This proposed reorganization was shared in several different ways including an open meeting of the task force allowing the campus to ask questions about the proposal, and discussions at the Deans and Directors Meeting, Planning and Budget, and President's Advisory Council. Time was allowed for the constituency groups to gather input and report back to the shared governance committees. The plan was approved by the campus shared governance committees on December 20, 2007.

   Any implementation of the plan is subject to approval by District Human Resources.

3. **The College will provide a more thorough orientation and training for all personnel, including specific attention to financial and collective bargaining matters.**

   Finance-related training has been provided by the Director of Budget & Finance and/or staff from the campus Business Office in small groups or one-on-one to new staff members or to areas identified as needing a refresher course on budget processes.

   In addition to this training, the campus has invited District Office of Human Resources staff members to both the Management Team and the Dean and Director's meetings to provide

training on contract revisions due to the collective bargaining process. Also, during 2006-2007, the Staff Development Office provided leadership in the development of a Classified Staff Resource Guide that is expected to also be a useful resource tool for managers and faculty. The Classified Staff Resource Guide is posted on the campus network drive (J:\drive). This resource handbook covers the basic information on a range of topics from the campus map, academic calendar, voicemail, valuable finance and budget information, email and a reference list for the Finance Procedures Book (in process). The expectation is that while this was designed with classified staff in mind, it can potentially be a resource to all staff including faculty and managers.

4. **The College will encourage the Board of Trustees to give careful consideration to academic concerns when renting out space at the Anaheim Campus and to be particularly alert that such actions not impact negatively the instructional programs of the campuses.**

Outside vendors have shown an interest in leasing space at the Anaheim Campus. Information regarding vendors and the programs they are interested in offering are discussed in Chancellor's Staff meetings. All of the information regarding the vendor is then shared and discussed with the appropriate dean and faculty at the campus level. If it is determined that leasing space to a vendor will negatively impact a College program, the College President will present this information to the Chancellor with the rationale and justification of why the College does not support such a lease agreement. Vendors have been turned away as a result of this process. When vacancies occur, the College is also given an opportunity to review the space and see if it can be used to expand a College program into the Anaheim facility.