Foothill College Follow Up Report to ACCJC

Draft October 2, 2012
Section 5, Response to the Commission Letter
2011 Recommendations

The team offers four recommendations for ongoing institutional improvement in light of the ACCJC Standards.

Recommendation 1: Institutionalize Integrated Planning
To fully meet the Standards, the team recommends that the college institutionalize its new integrated planning model through a systematic cycle of evaluation, planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluations should be informed by quantitative and qualitative
data analysis in both instructional and non-instructional areas. Particular attention should be paid to communication and dialogue about both the process and its results throughout the college. (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, IV.A.3, IV.A.5)

Overview:
In the six months since receiving its recommendation from ACCJC, Foothill College made significant progress in institutionalizing its integrated planning and budgeting process that was begun three years ago. The model integrates the core missions (basic skills, transfer and workforce), resource allocation (stewardship of resources) and program review with shared governance, a process that involves the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Associated Students of Foothill College (ASFC), Administrative Council and President's Cabinet, all of whom have representatives on the Planning and Resource Council (PaRC). As the main shared governance body with representatives from all campus constituents, PaRC is integral to the systematic cycle of evaluation, planning, resource allocation, implementation and assessment. Its role in facilitating campus discussion, setting the campus agenda and making recommendations to the president ensures that campus decisions occur at PaRC and, in turn, are shared with the entire campus community. This cyclical process ensures that the college's planning process remains collaborative and responsive. In 2011-12, PaRC had 16 meetings and a wide range of planning issues were discussed, including program review templates, core mission workgroup objectives and reflections, budget reductions and resource prioritization (1.1 PaRC meeting/minutes archive). PaRC meets regularly, posting its agendas and meeting minutes in a timely manner, in order to remain relevant and flexible to the issues facing the college.

Planning Model: Core Missions
        Integration of the three core mission workgroups is a cornerstone of the integrated planning and budget model at Foothill College. In 2011-12, the core mission groups set their annual objectives and reflected on their progress over the course of the year. These objectives support the institutional goals and institutional-level student learning outcomes (IL-SLOs). For example, in the Basic Skills

Workgroup, an objective emerged to expand the basic skills bridge program, which was inspired from the institutional goal to improve student achievement outcomes for basic skills courses (1.2 Basic Skills workgroup minutes, January 19; 1.3 Basic Skills workgroup objective 1). This process identifying the core mission group objective(s) began within the workgroup, which was then presented at PaRC, allowing for feedback and discussion (1.4 PaRC minutes, October 26). Additionally, the conversation was enhanced by the use of data to help establish metrics and identify targets. In this case, after an examination of the enrollment, success and persistence rates from participants of the previous year's Adaptive Learning division (ALD) Summer Academy, the focus of the Summer Bridge Program shifted to focus on math basic skills and to increase the number of student participants (1.5 ALD Summer Academy memo, Research website, March 1; 1.6 Basic Skills workgroup minutes, March 22). During its reflections in the spring, the workgroup reported to PaRC regarding the anticipated participation figures along with a proposed plan to track and continue to offer academic support to these students (1.7 Basic Skills workgroup reflection 1; 1.8 PaRC minutes, March 21).

Planning Model: Resource Allocation Process
Another example of how Foothill College's planning model is integrated and institutionalized is the college resource allocation process. In 2011-12, Foothill College experienced its first full cycle of the planning process by linking resource requests to program review and tracking from the initial request until the final funding decisions are made by the president. There were 175 resource requests that emerged from the department program reviews, which were then discussed and prioritized at the divisional level, vice president level, the Operations Planning Committee (OPC) and ultimately presented to PaRC, which forwarded the recommendations to the president for final decision making (Resource allocation webpage). To guide the resource allocation process, OPC developed a rubric in Fall 2011 based on the ongoing budget augmentation and elimination guiding principles as stated in the governance handbook (Governance handbook; OPC minutes, November 18 and December 9). These guiding principles helped OPC members identify metrics used in the rubric, which was presented to PaRC for feeback and approval (OPC minutes, November 18, December 9, January 10 and Janury 24). Ultimately, changes were made to the guiding principles based on PaRC feedback (PaRC minutes, January 18). To ensure that resource requests are integrated in the planning process, the rubric required as a minimum standard that all requests had to have a completed program review and be linked to the core missions and IL-SLOs (OPC rubric, PaRC minutes, February 1).

One example of how the program review and the resource request process is more closely integrated is seen in a request for online critique software by the Art Department (Art program review). Based on their program review and analysis of the three-year data trends, the department concluded that a 20 percent increase in enrollment resulted from utilizing the software, creating an increased demand and interest in online art course offerings (Art program review, section 3.1). Their request for the online software was prioritized at the divisional and vice president level, leading to an OPC recommendation for funding (OPC prioritized list, B budget

requests, Resource allocation webpage) While it was determined that this request should be paid for with existing funds within the division as opposed to the general fund, this documentation demonstrates a systematic approach and integration of the resource allocation process in the college's planning model.

As the college integrated the resource allocation process into the planning model, there were some inconsistencies emerging from this implementation process, which required PaRC members to dialogue and reach consensus in order maintain consistency. This approach demonstrates the ongoing use of shared governance in discussing and providing recommendations about the planning model. In one instance, the role of core missions as part of the resource allocation process was clarified and the timeline for each step in the process was identified (PaRC minutes, January 18). Based on the recommendation of PaRC that the workgroups function as initiative funders, both the Basic Skills and Workforce workgroups actively sought out and funded initiatives that would support the institutional goals (PaRC minutes, January 18, March 21 and May 16). For example, the Workforce workgroup identified as one of its objectives to verify and improve the use of Perkins funding, which ultimately supports the institutional goal of improving outcomes of vocational students. This process was discussed and presented to PaRC for comment and feedback (Workforce minutes, February 14 and March 13; PaRC minutes, March 21 and May 16; Perkins funding request and recommendations, PaRC minutes, March 21).

Another example of how Foothill College improved its application of the planning model is seen in the discussions about new faculty and staff requests, B-budget requests and re-assigned time requests. In previous planning cycles, PaRC served as the primary entity that prioritized new faculty and staff requests for the college. In this first full resource allocation process, OPC sought guidance from PaRC to determine whether it would assume this responsibility (OPC minutes, January 10; PaRC minutes, January 18 and April 25; Faculty/Staff priority ranking survey, PaRC webpage, May 16). After much discussion, PaRC ultimately determined that the new faculty and staff prioritization would remain a PaRC responsibility (PaRC minutes, January 18, May 16 and June 6).

Re-assigned time is another form of resource request that led to college discussion about whether these requests supported the institutional goals and student learning outcomes. Initially, there was some debate regarding whether the prioritization of re-assigned time would remain PaRC's responsibility along with the new faculty and staff requests (PaRC minutes, January 18). Consensus was ultimately reached that re-assigned time, which is funded with the same funds as B budget, should be OPC's responsibility to formulate recommendations to PaRC (PaRC minutes, April 18). When OPC applied its rubric (which was based on guiding principles, institutional goals and core missions) to these requests, re-assigned time frequently was not ranked as a high priority (OPC minutes, May 7; OPC prioritized list, Resource allocation webpage). To ensure transparency regarding allocation of re-assigned time, OPC presented to PaRC a list of all existing re-assigned time, along with the dollar amount for each (Campus reassigned time 2011-2, PaRC minutes, May 2). Ultimately, the college decided not to use the general fund to fund most re-assigned time requests (PaRC minutes, June 20; B budget and one-time requests,

President's Decisions on Resource allocation webpage). When OPC reflected on its primary objective in Spring 2012, presenting their thoughts to PaRC, the workgroup assessed this funding evaluation process and presented possible changes for improvement in the next cycle, such as limiting the resource requests to submissions of only new requests that are unable to be funded at the department or division-levels (OPC Reflection template, PaRC minutes, June 6).

After completing this first cycle of the resource allocation process, Foothill College demonstrates its commitment to being open, transparent and explicit in how funding requests are prioritized. Requests need to support the mission and the IL-SLOs as well as enhance student outcomes. The values and metrics that drive this process is clear and accessible to the entire campus community, as each request originates at the program level; ranked at the department and division level; reviewed by the vice presidents; and prioritized by OPC. The spreadsheet containing all requests is presented and discussed at PaRC, whose final recommendations are sent to the President. Final resource funding decisions are made by the President, along the rationale and reported back at PaRC (OPC rubric; Resource allocation spreadsheet; Division meeting minutes). All stages of the resource allocation process are accessible because each step is posted online (resource allocation website) and discussed in multiple public formats (e.g. PaRC, core mission workgroups).

Planning Model: Program Review Process

This ongoing process of planning, implementation and evaluation is also seen in the program review process. Responding to the results of the Spring 2011 Governance Survey, the Integrated Planning and Budget taskforce (IP&B) created a new annual program review template (IP&B minutes, July 13, August 3, August 31 and September 13) that was presented to and approved by PaRC (PaRC minutes, Oct. 5). This new document, along with revised program review datasheets that include multi-year college-level, division-level, department-level and course-level data, encouraged administrators, faculty and staff to directly relate their program-level goals, action plans and SLOs to the core missions and IL-SLOs (Section 2.4, 3.1 and 3.3 of template).

The implementation of the new program review template led to an evaluation of this document and of the program review process (IP&B minutes, June 26). IP&B was tasked with this effort and collected feedback from various divisions. Additionally, the Office of Instruction & Institutional Research visited several divisions and reported back on their focused conversations with faculty and deans (Evidence?). It was determined that revisions should be made to shorten the annual program review template and to create a comprehensive program review template that would follow the three-year planning cycle, where each program/unit would complete a comprehensive review once every three year or twice in an accreditation cycle. These program review templates (annual and comprehensive) were created and revised in several IP&B meetings held in Spring and Summer 2012 (IP&B minutes, April 23, May 7, May 23, June 26, July 11, July 24, August 8 and September 11). PaRC approved changes to the annual program review template in spring 2012 and will review and approve the 2012-13 comprehensive templates at their first 2012-13 meeting (PaRC minutes, June 20; PaRC planning calendar, 2011-12).

These conversations about the annual and comprehensive program review templates also initiated a dialogue about defining who would complete a program review (IP&B minutes, Fall 2011). In this process, IP&B, with feedback from PaRC, recommended that all instructional, student services and administrative units would participate in this process (PaRC minutes, April 18?). The inclusion of divisional program reviews incorporates the deans more fully in the program review process by documenting divisional priorities, linking divisional goals to core missions and IL-SLOs and providing an avenue for divisional resource requests to be part of the resource allocation process. This approach of including all units in the program review process allows the college to document, assess, reflect, evaluate and improve on their progress toward the institutional goals, as seen in the creation of the Program Review Committee.

As stated in the 2011 self-study report, Foothill College noted that there was a need for systematic program review body that would also be part of the evaluative process. The IP&B taskforce was charged with creating a Program Review Committee (PRC) that would serve as an evaluative body in the program review process, which was approved by PaRC in May 2012 (PaRC minutes, May 16). The IP&B determined that the PRC would be responsible for reviewing all comprehensive program reviews and established guidelines regarding the evaluation process. This committee would be a cross-disciplinary body that would include administrators, faculty, staff and students (refer to PRC charge; governance handbook). These conversations ultimately influenced the expansion of data points as part of the program review datasheets. Along with additional demographic data, including age, ethnicity, highest education level and gender, labor market data will be included beginning in 2012-13. Program creation and discontinuance policies were also clarified and will be sent to PaRC for approval in Fall 2012 (IP&B minutes, September 11; PaRC planning calendar). These policies, upon approval, will be implemented in the PRC first cycle in 2012-13. With PaRC's leadership, a renewed focus on student equity as related to the institutional goal of improving student outcomes and closing the achievement gap, will serve as a prompt in the comprehensive program review template (PaRC minutes, June 6 and 20). Upon presentation of the PRC's charge to PaRC, a discussion occurred to determine how the current planning model might be modified to include this additional committee (IP&B taskforce update, PaRC minutes, April 18) Currently the PRC is expected to report to PaRC after its evaluation of the program reviews and before final resource allocation decisions are made (Resource allocation process chart).

EVALUATION OF PLANNING MODEL

An integral part of the planning model is the evaluation component. As part of the three-year planning cycle, PaRC is expected to review the college mission in 2012-13, including defining the student population, IL-SLOs and institutional goals (PaRC planning calendar). While this function of PaRC was not previously explicit in the governance handbook, this update has been made to reflect this key role (governance handbook). This opportunity allows the college to assess and reflect on its current processes and the value of this exercise has been shared with the campus community through various channels, including the PaRC planning calendar and the

President's presentations at Leadership and Opening Day (PaRC website; Judy's slides).

While revisiting the mission is scheduled for 2012-13, the college evaluated its progress toward its institutional goals in April 2012. A variety of ARCC measures and institutional metrics were presented and discussed at PaRC (PaRC minutes, April 25). The data regarding success by ethnicity prompted a renewed focus and emphasis on student equity, resulting in a scheduled update of the equity report in 2012-13 and presentations regarding this focus at campus-wide events, such as Opening Day (Judy slides?). IP&B was also charged with including an equity measure on the program review templates and exploring the incorporation of equity initiatives as part of the core mission objectives (annual and comprehensive program review templates; core mission revised objective template). As part of the update of the Educational and Strategic Master Plan (ESMP), institutional goals will serve as the section headers of the document, which reinforces the importance of these goals for the college. This focus will more actively demonstrate how the other aspects of the planning model relate to the institutional goals, which ultimately should drive the college's goals, outcomes and mission (ESMP). Initial revisions to the ESMP occurred in Summer 2012 and will be reviewed by PaRC in Fall 2012 for additional feedback (PaRC planning calendar).

Foothill College administered its annual governance survey in June 2012 and the results were reported back to PaRC (PaRC minutes, June 20). Ongoing efforts in program improvement are seen in the annual charge given to IP&B from the survey recommendations (IP&B agenda, September 11). Some of the planning components that may be modified include having President's Cabinet report out more regularly and having academic and classified senate agendize PaRC discussions (Governance survey results presentation, PaRC, June 20).

A main focus of the governance survey included evaluating the planning process and communicating the process to campus constituents (Governance survey raw data). A majority of respondents reported that they strongly agree or agree that the planning process is disseminated in a timely manner (87%), inclusive and transparent (86%), disseminated effectively (81%) and informed by data (76%) (Governance survey results). Communication regarding college planning discussions and decisions appears to occur through division/department meetings, emails and the college website as over half of survey respondents selected at least one of these three options (Governance survey raw data).

The governance survey also attempted to evaluate if PaRC was fulfilling its role in sharing its discussions with the rest of the campus community. PaRC members who responded to the Governance survey overwhelmingly strongly agree or agree that they receive information in a timely manner (92%) and enough information (91%) to make informed decisions (as part of the planning process) (Governance survey results presentation). The survey results also indicate that PaRC members are reporting back to their constituents by email and by reporting out at departmental/division meetings on primarily a monthly basis (53%) (Governance survey results presentation; Governance survey raw data).

Efforts to document and communicate the planning and resource allocation process extend beyond PaRC meetings and include those meetings occurring at the

department, divisional and dean level (Divisional meeting agendas—e.g. Language Arts). Deans have included program review and planning as agenda items in divisional meetings (Divisional meeting agendas). The Office of Instruction & Institutional Research also attended divisional meetings to discuss the program review process and the resource allocation process.

The Use of Data

The use of data continues to play an increasingly significant role as part of Foothill College's planning and evaluation process. In 2011-12, the college expanded the program review process to include success, enrollment, productivity at the course level. Additional data points that will be incorporated into the comprehensive program review include labor market data; student enrollment by age, ethnicity, gender and highest education level; and course success by ethnicity and gender at the division and department level.

An example of how data was used to influence curricular change can be seen in the initiative to combine trigonometry and pre-calculus content into one course sequence. Presented first in the 2010-11 Math program review, data collection occurred in the first year of implementation (2011-12) analysis of this curricular effort was conducted by exploring the enrollment and course success rates along this new sequence of courses as well as the relationship between placement and course success (Math 48 memo on research website—needs to be posted). As part of the cycle of continuous improvement, the Math department continues to explore the success rates between their current and previous pathways to Calculus; the 2012-2013 data will help make informed decisions about how to strengthen the pre-calculus curriculum and promote student success (can cite FHDA research request form).

Evaluations using data also occur in the non-instructional areas. In health services and financial aid, surveys help assess their SA-SLOs and determine what changes might be made in the next cycle (Health services program review, section 1; Financial aid program review, section 2.1 and 3.2). Financial aid also reflected on students comments about the FAFSA to help determine where the gaps were to better understand what issues may be preventing students from successfully completing this form. As a result of their analysis, financial aid focused on increasing awareness about the FAFSA timeline, disbursement process and the requirements to maintain financial eligibility (financial aid program review, section 2.1 and 3.2).

The use of data at Foothill College extends beyond program review. The NSF-grant funded STEMway program, which seeks to increase the number of STEM students, used longitudinal data to help establish benchmarks and determine how the program might effectively support participating students from all population groups. This data gathering and analysis process included an examination of the progression through the Calculus sequence was conducted between 2006 and 2009 and included demographic characteristics to determine the student profile (Math 1A tracking on research website; do we need to cite the S-STEM grant proposal?). Longitudinal research has also included an attempt to track transfers through the use of data provided by the University of California (UC), California State University (CSU) and State Chancellor's Office (US/CSU transfer memo and ISP and OoS

transfer memo on research website). Submissions to the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) has helped the college better understand where students' transfer destinations over time; such data is helpful for programs where transferring rather than earning an AA/AS or certificate, is the primary indicator for completion (Math 1A tracking; STEMway transfers memo on research website).

The gathering and use of data is imbedded in the college's decision-making process. The ESMP also includes data from state and local agencies, such as high school graduation rates, to help identify gaps in planning goals. Waitlist reports help determine which course sections need to be expanded or cancelled in order to better respond to student needs and interests (Waitlist memo on research website).

Qualitative data also enhance the college's ability to document and reflect on how the planning model is experienced by its campus constituents. Reflections from the governance survey were analyzed for specific themes and representative comments were shared at PaRC (Governance survey results, PaRC minutes, June 20). Other qualitative data assisted the college in assessing whether its administrative unit outcomes were being met (AU-SLOs) (AUO survey results, President's Cabinet, September 17). Such evaluation allows the college to ensure that its goals are stated clearly and are accessible to all campus constituents (AUO survey results, research website). Documented conversations as highlighted in meeting minutes document the process, highlighting areas for improvement that can supplement quantitative data (e.g. Program review template revisions, see PaRC and IP&B meeting minutes).

Other data sources continue to enhance existing data already being collected by the college. While Economic Modeling Specialists International (EMSI) provides vocational and demographic data that can be used to keep programs relevant, the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC), with its ability to identify students who transfer, help increase understanding about whether students are successful along this (one) completion metric. The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) serves as a similar resource in documenting students' experience both in and out of the classroom. These data serve as discussion points for the college in assessing and improving on attainment of IL-SLOs and their engagement with faculty, staff and other students. One application of CCSSE data was in an academic integrity presentation conducted by student services on Opening Day that examined issues of plagiarism and cheating with how students feel their college experienced has developed a personal moral code (or not) (Pat's slides). These multiple data sources provide an increased understanding of students and their experience, which can lead to informed decision-making that increase student achievement and success.

Recommendation 2: Student Learning Outcomes
In order to meet the Commission's 2012 expectation for meeting student learning outcomes Standards that require the identification and assessment of appropriate and sufficient student learning outcomes, and the use of assessment data to plan and implement improvements to educational quality, the team recommends that the college accelerate the assessment of program-level student learning outcomes, service area outcomes, and administrative unit outcomes, and use the results to make improvements. (II.A.1.c, II.A.2.e, II.B.4, II.C.2)

Overview:
In its 2011 Self Study the college documented the annual progress it has made for 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 in the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (SLOAC). (2.1: 2011 Self Study). According to the recommendation resulting from the evaluation team visit in October 2011, which stated that the college accelerate the assessment of its program-level student learning outcomes, service area student learning outcomes and administrative unit student learning outcomes, Foothill College continues its cycle of Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment (2.2: PaRC Planning Calendar) and is taking significant steps to move forward and fully meet the Standards. The cycle continues to revolve on a quarterly basis for course-level SLOs (CL-SLOs) and a yearly cycle for administrative unit (AU-SLOs), program-level (PL-SLOs) and service area SLOs (SA-SLOs). While the previous academic year's reflections are due by the third week of the new fall quarter, there is strong encouragement and support to complete these SLOs over the summer in advance of the next program review cycle. See Recommendation 1 for further descriptions of program review participants and the process.

In each of the three areas identified in the recommendation, the college has advanced its development and assessment of student learning outcomes through training, software implementation and education with faculty, administrators and classified staff related to writing, assessing and reflecting on PL-SLOs, SA-SLOs and AU-SLOs. Additionally, the college shares documented examples of where data analysis and authentic assessments are leading to improvements, resource allocations and program development. Finally, the college has plans to continue the acceleration of these initiatives to be at the level of Sustainable Quality Improvement in 2013.

Institutional Advancement:
The following progress has been made to address the Commission's recommendation related to advancing the assessment of student learning outcomes college-wide.

Building on its success in adopting TracDat as a new tracking tool for SLOs, the college worked to train faculty, staff and administrators in the new system, and to provide comprehensive training for those areas where deficiencies existed, so that quality SA-SLOs, AU-SLOs and PL-SLOs could be written; mapped to each other and to the IL-SLOs; and assessed and shared throughout the integrated planning and budget process.

As the integrated planning and budget process was evaluated over the 2011-2012 academic year and following summer (see Recommendation 1), key updates to

student learning outcomes and assessment occurred. For example, additional programs, services and administrative units have been identified to participate in the SLO and program review process as of Fall 2012, and one third of all participants will complete a comprehensive program review template that features additional data points to analyze and discuss (2.3: Program Review Schedule). All program reviews will continue to include a report of their SLO assessments, indicating the goals aligned with these assessments and identifying requests for resources to support those goals. As these completed program reviews move through the cycle, improved documentation of the prioritization phases exists to link resources to program reviews. (2.4: Resource Allocation Website) In keeping with the action plan listed in the 2011 Self Study, the Planning and Resource Council (PaRC) approved the membership and charge of a Program Review Committee (PRC) that will convene in Fall 2012 and will serve as the evaluative body for all comprehensive program reviews (2.5: Program Review Committee Website, 2.6: Governance Handbook)).

While the evaluation team's recommendations did not specifically refer to the assessment of Foothill College's IL-SLOs, the college renewed effort to develop, document and assess these outcomes, otherwise known as the 4Cs: Communication, Computation, Creative Thinking and Community/Global Consciousness & Citizenship. Currently all course, service area, administrative unit and program-level SLOs are being mapped to IL-SLOs through the new TracDat system. A reflection prompt asks faculty and staff to describe and reflect on the connection between their course, program or service area SLO and one of the four IL-SLOs (2.7: IL-SLO Reflection Examples). The Curriculum Committee adopted the four Cs as their general education SLOs (GE-SLOs) and data gathered through the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) (2.8: CCSSE Presentation), which was administered in Spring 2012, was analyzed and discussed among college constituents to consider improvements to the next cycle. Future planning at the institutional level includes another SLO Convocation and a focused assessment of one of the IL-SLOs in a rotating cycle each year.

Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes

In 2011-12, college reassigned two faculty members as SLO Coordinators. Along with the Office of Instruction, the coordinators offered workshops, trainings and general assistance to faculty in the area of PL-SLO assessment.

The college began the Fall 2011 term with an all-college mandatory SLO training session in TracDat (2.9: 2011 Opening Day Agenda) for full and part-time faculty as a part of its opening day activities. The SLO coordinators also presented small group workshops on September 30, October 5, October 7, November 1, November 2, December 2, 2011 and January 18, March 7, March 13 and March 16, 2012. SLO

coordinators visited the Academic Senate (2.10: Academic Senate Minutes from Feb. 27, 12)(2.11: Academic Senate Minutes from May 14, 2012) and PaRC (2.12: PaRC Minutes from April 18, 2012) to provide progress updates and invite program faculty to contact them to arrange individualized help sessions.

The Office of Instruction and SLO coordinators also attended department and division meetings on October 14, 2011 (English), December 6, 2011 (CHLD), January 20, 2012 (ESLL) and January 27, 2012 (2.13: BSS Division Meeting) to work directly with faculty on SLOs and Program Review. Communication also took place through the office's quarterly newsletters that are posted online (2.14: I&IR Newsletter website).

One particular area of focus was an initiative to ensure that course-level SLOs are aligned with program-level SLOs. Beginning in April 4, 2011, the SLO coordinators distributed (via deans) a document to faculty to help map PL-SLOs to CL-SLOs, and provided examples of possible assessments (2.15: PL-SLO Mapping Template). Program faculty were required to complete the mapping document, specify assessment measures, timelines and return the document to the Office of Instruction by May 27, 2011. Hence, the SLO coordinators offered several workshops to help faculty review, create and revise PL-SLOs and assessment plans, as well as entering these plans into the TracDat system. These completed documents were used in spring 2011 to transition the PL-SLO assessment plans to TracDat (2.16: Examples of Completed PL-SLO Mapping Template).

In March 2012, the SLO coordinators contacted program faculty for every program reviewing the PL-SLOs and updating faculty about the assessment cycle. The emails also included individualized suggestions for potential assessments (2.17: Example Emails to Departments). The SLO coordinators met with a number of program faculty during spring term on a one-on-one basis to help increase understanding about what is required and needed for aligning PL- and CL-SLOs. Faculty completion rates for PL-SLOs increased as a result of these meetings. As of October 14, 2012, XX number of programs, defined as degrees and certificates have entered a PL-SLO plan into the system, and XX number of programs have completed the 2011-2012 cycle of assessment. (Evidence: TracDat PL-SLO Report) Note that this completion rate is taking into account our established assessment cycle and deadlines which are aligned with our quarter system. The 2011-12 SLO assessment cycle does not close until three weeks into the Fall 2012 term.

One of the challenges arising from the PL-SLO mapping initiative was the difference in how programs are designed. For example, some programs, such as the allied health programs, have a prescribed sequence of courses that all students must take, effectively resulting in the formation of a cohort; this dynamic makes planned periodic evaluation of PL-SLOs an effective strategy. Many of the social science programs, however, allow students to complete their coursework by choosing courses in no specific order, which makes assessment more challenging because of the lack of defined student cohorts. Discipline faculty, SLO coordinators and

Institutional Research engaged in robust dialogue and discussed various assessment methods and possible solutions (2.19: PL-SLO Four Column Example).

As the college reaches proficiency in the SLO processes, the focus shifts to increasing ongoing assessment and evaluation of those results. The college has determined rather than two college-wide SLO coordinators, this effort will be better served by identifying an SLO coordinator for each academic division, helping direct resources to support those departments struggling to define a meaningful method of assessment so that results can be used to improve student learning. These appointments will be made in Fall 2012.

The Spring 2012 term ended with a successful completion of the new resource allocation cycle. SLO assessment findings were embedded in program reviews, and dialogue about these data occurred in many venues, including department and division meetings, the Operations Planning Committee (OPC) (2.20: OPC Minutes or Guiding Principles) and the Planning and Resource Council (PaRC) (2.21: PaRC Minutes from May). These conversations resulted in program improvement in the Psychology department, which initially noted a curricular need for a "Statistics in Behavior Science" course (2.22: PSYC Program Review, p.7-8) and a resource need for a statistical software package (2.22:PSYC Program Review, p. 8-10) to enhance teaching and learning. As part of the planning and resource allocation process, curriculum has been developed for this proposed course and the resource request has been prioritized as a high priority (2.23: Funded B Budget Requests). Another broader result of assessments used at the planning level is seen in the requests for faculty FTE, staff FTE and faculty re-assigned time (2.24: PaRC Minutes from 1/18/12). This dialogue, which culminated in PaRC, was the first time a college-wide decision-making body was responsible for making resource recommendations related to faculty reassigned time. This process was achieved by reviewing program reviews and OPC's resource prioritization list. OPC's decisions were made by reviewing each request through a defined rubric, providing recommendations back to PaRC and PaRC ultimately recommended a slate of approved allocations to the President. Given the constraints on college funding, the process resulted in a reduction in re-assigned time funding of $300,000, an annual savings to the college.(2.25: Re Assigned time decisions)

Current planning involves continued support of the Academic Senate, with PL-SLO presentations scheduled at fall meetings and recruitment of division SLO coordinators. Fall departmental and divisional meetings held on September 20 and 21, 2012 included broad-based dialogue on SLOs, as well as curriculum, program review and the resource allocation cycle as it pertains to requests identified through the assessment process. (2.26: Opening Day Agendas). The 2012-2013 year will include continued emphasis on sharing the assessment results, refining the cycle of program review and assessment and improving student learning.

Administrative Unit Outcomes

As with the PL-SLOs, much work has been accomplished within the administrative units regarding their SLOs and assessments. AU-SLOs were discussed and revised at an AUO workshop on September 12, 2011 and September 17, 2012 held during standing President's Cabinet meetings. There was dialogue and discovery at this meeting as administrative unit outcomes evolved and improved, and discussion regarding objectives versus outcomes helped guide the various units in refining their stated outcomes to benefit students. Discussions surrounding AU-SLOs revolved around how an administrative unit can be directly or indirectly supporting the achievement of SLOs. Several AU-SLOs for instance, are focused on direct faculty and staff support, which indirectly support student SLOs

For the past three years, AU-SLOs were assessed on an annual cycle during the spring term. Each assessment cycle allowed each administrative unit the opportunity to review the outcome statements, and to revise them to be more measurable and better aligned with the accreditation standards. Seven administrative units assessed their AU-SLOs using a survey as the primary assessment tool. This survey has been updated every year to better reflect the changing goals and outcomes (2.27: 2011 AU-SLO Survey; 2.28: 2012 AU-SLO Survey).

There were several key findings from this assessment and the work of the IP&B taskforce and the annual Governance Survey that was concurrently administered (2.29: 2012 Governance Survey). First, as assessment results were examined over the summer, it became apparent that this method of assessment needed revision and other assessment methods would need to be used to explore how an administrative unit was supporting the attainment of SLOs. The current assessment yielded satisfaction results with the operations of the AUs, which was relevant, but not a valid assessment of students and their outcomes.

AU-SLOs were discussed and revised on September 17, 2012 (2.30: AU-SLO Presentation), held during a standing President's Cabinet meeting. There was dialogue and discovery at this meeting as administrative unit outcomes evolved and improved, and discussion regarding objectives versus outcomes helped guide the various units in refining their stated outcomes to benefit students. As a result of this training, and after a robust and highly interactive dialogue, several AU-SLOs and assessment methods were revised for the next cycle (2.31: I&IR Four Column).

Just as with program-level SLOs, AU-SLO assessments were embedded in program review and in the resource allocation cycle. An example of a request that used SLO assessments and program review would be the funding of Web Content Developer support in the Marketing and Communications Department. This was originally requested in the program review document in Fall of 2011 (2.32: MARCOMM

Program Review). This request was discussed in PaRC (2.33: PaRC Minutes: May 2, 2012),(2.34: PaRC Minutes: May 16, 2012) and Cabinet as more data came in to support the high demand of web site revisions and development. For example, CCSSE data illustrated the importance of the website to students (2.8: CCSSE) and the spring AU-SLO surveys showed a great need for updates on the website (2.35: 2012 AU-SLO Survey Results) The Web Content coordinator position was ranked highly through the resource allocation process (2.36: PaRC FTEF/Staff Ranking Results), and although it could not be funded entirely due to budget restraints, funds were allocated for a part-time employee to be placed into the position.

At the time of writing this, XX NUMBER of Administrative Units have identified AU-SLOs, and XX NUMBER that were identified in 2011-2012 have fully completed the 2011-2012 year of AU-SLO assessment. (2.37: TracDat AU-SLO Report). Additional reflections continue to be entered into the system to meet the third week of the quarter deadline.

Most recently, the college has identified additional administrative units that had been overlooked during first year of the new program review process. These AUs include the offices of the division deans, the Krause Center for Innovation and the academic and classified senates These units are in a position to support faculty and staff at the college and receive resources from the institution, so it is necessary to include them in the Integrated Planning and Budget Process. The Planning and Resource Council expanded the list of Administrative Units that would need to complete a program review and establish and assess AU-SLOs (2.38: Program Review Types and Schedule). For the 2012-13 AY, all identified AUs will be trained and will participate in this process.

Service Area Student Learning Outcomes

Since the writing of the 2011 Self Study, immense strides have occurred in the SA-SLO arena at the college. This sphere of the SLO Assessment Cycle had struggled to move forward at the pace of course-level outcomes for several reasons, including changes to the tracking system and leadership changes in the area. These challenges were addressed with the formation of a Service Area SLO core team that formed in September 2011. Participation and direction of this core team involved vice presidents and staff from both the Instruction and Student Services offices. The goal of the core team was to communicate a unified and consistent message to Service Areas regarding SLOs, program review, and resource allocation. A plan and handbook were created in a joint effort (2.39: SA-SLO HANDBOOK) in late September 2011 and the topic of SA-SLOs was the focus of the September 22 Student Services Division Meeting (2.40: SS 2011 Division Meeting).

The SA-SLO core team also met September 28 and October 11, 2011, and created an SA-SLO cycle flow chart (2.41: Flowchart) and checklist (2.42: Checklist) as a reference tool for service areas. The next step was a meeting with all of the service

area directors on October 19, 2011, to set a timeline for 100 percent SA-SLO completion by the November deadline.

To accomplish this, the SA-SLO core team offered several workshops and trainings during Fall Quarter. On November 4 and 16, 2011, service area staff received collaborative, hands-on training with the writing of SA-SLOs, creating or revising of an assessment plan, and inputting reflections into the system. Many individual sessions were also offered to meet the schedules of the service areas.

There were many robust discussions similar to those of AU-SLOs. Several service areas first wrote their SLOs with a service in mind, but after assessment and reflection, revised their SA-SLOs to a more direct assessment of the attainment of a student skill or knowledge set. (2.43: SA-SLO Revisions). Additionally, many new assessment methods are being used as new software and data solutions are being implemented at the college

SA-SLOs were an integral part of the planning and resource allocation process at the college in the past year. Service areas completed program reviews and embedded their SLO and related assessments in the document. Requests, such as the need for more support in counseling and admissions and records, were included in the program reviews (2.44: 2011-2012 CNSL PROGRAM REVIEW), and prioritized by the division and governance groups (2.45: OPC Prioritizations). It culminated in a funded request for XX Dollars for support in registration of online and summer students. This SA-SLO continues to be relevant as the admissions and records department reflected on their SA-SLO this summer with institutional research validating the spike in registration need in these populations (2.46: Registration Study).

The core team attended the League for Innovation conference in March 2012 to share their efforts and collaborate with other colleges who were in their new SA-SLO cycles. (2.47: League SA-SLO Presentation). They were then invited to deliver the same presentation to the Classified Leadership Institute in June 2012 where there were many attendees new to the SA-SLO process. The 2012-2013 year of SA-SLOs began with the core team inviting two service areas to present their SA-SLO assessment results to the Student Services Division Meeting on September 20, 2012 (2.48: SS 9/20/12 Division Meeting Agenda), encouraging dialogue and inter-departmental inquiry. Several SA-SLO workshops continue to be scheduled by the core team (EVIDENCE: OPENING DAY SCHEDULE 9/21) with direct collaboration with Classified Senate.

At the time of writing this, XX NUMBER of Service Areas have identified SA-SLOs, and XX NUMBER have fully completed the 2011-2012 year of SA-SLO assessment and have planned their assessment for 2012-2013 (2.49: TracDat SA-SLO Report). Additional reflections continue to be entered into the system to meet the third week of the quarter deadline.

Recommendation 3: Comparable Support Services
To fully meet the Standard, the college must ensure equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable student and learning support services regardless of location or delivery method. (II.B.3, II.B.3.a, II.B.4, II.C.1.c)

As a comprehensive community college, Foothill College offers classes in multiple locations, and through face-to-face, online and hybrid online environments. In serving its diverse student population, the college offers a wide range of services. In serving our students, the college strives to provide services that are equitable across all populations and reaching across all modalities of instruction.
In its Evaluation Report, the ACCJC provided a recommendation that the college ensure equitable access to student services for students at the Middlefield Campus location. Since receiving this recommendation, the college reviewed the evaluation report and considered its findings seriously, leading to further self evaluation by the college in terms of the services provided at the Middlefield Campus. Through its evaluation of current student services at Middlefield the college has enhanced its communication to students regarding services offered at Middlefield and enhanced its delivery of key services outlined in the evaluation report, including disability support services, tutorial services and health services. The following section provides details on how Foothill delivers services at the Middlefield Campus.

Located six miles east of the main Foothill Campus, the Foothill College Middlefield Campus offers comprehensive student services on site and in combination with services and referrals to the main campus.(Middlefield website services page) In addressing the three areas identified in the evaluation report, Foothill College identified the following services:

Health Services: Middlefield campus offers basic health services to all students, including basic medication and first aid, flu shots, massage chairs and health information. For students who need to access a broader array of services, there are two options available nearby: The first option is to access the main campus which is a ten to fifteen minute drive from the Middlefield Campus. The second option is to access the Planned Parenthood office in Mountain View, which is just a three-mile drive from Middlefield. Foothill College contracts with Planned Parenthood to provide health services at the main campus and at its location in Mountain View. (Evidence List: Health Services website, Planned Parenthood Brochure, Middlefield website, Services Brochure)

Disability Services: The Disability Resource Center (DRC) on the main campus works with Middlefield Campus faculty and staff to accommodate students who need accommodations for their classes. Margo Dobbins, the DRC Supervisor, meets with students and faculty at the Middlefield Campus as needed or requested, to determine accommodations and deliver services. The Middlefield Campus also provides testing accommodations for disabled students in the main student services

16

area know as the "HUB". In addition, a DRC counselor is available at Middlefield one day per week to meet with students as scheduled and for drop-in appointments. (Evidence List: Disability Resource Center website, Middlefield HUB website, Student Services retreat minutes, DRC meeting minutes)

Tutorial Services: Foothill College offers a diverse array of tutorial services meeting the varying needs of students and academic programs, learning communities and teaching modalities. At the main campus, tutorial services are currently going through a transition to consolidate the majority of services in one location under the overall direction of the Learning Resource Center. At Middlefield Campus, the programs housed there offer specific services in some cases, such as the Child Development Program, which offers program-specific tutoring. As of Fall Quarter 2012, Middlefield Campus is not offering lower level mathematics classes, but in prior quarters when these classes were offered, the campus did have tutorial services available to them two days a week. The Middlefield Campus utilizes online tutoring services to serve students, available through OpenStudy, an online tutorial system. (Evidence List: Middlefield Services Website; Etudes Open Study website)

To ensure students are aware of all services, Middlefield Campus has a comprehensive information resource program with informational flyers for all college services and programs, such as health services, disabled student services, student activities and many more. Some are printed in Spanish.

In addition to the services outlined above, the Middlefield Campus also offers the following:

- On-site Outreach services through the College and Career Connections Office – to area high schools and community organizations.
- Admissions and Registration- daily
- Assessment and Testing – including testing done at local high schools and educational centers- daily
- Financial Aid- Two days per week: by appointment or drop-in
- Counseling – including career and transfer, disability, personal and academic counseling, two days per week: by appointment or drop-in. One Middlefield Counselor is certified in Disabled Programs and Services (DSPS) counseling. The Counselors at Middlefield collaborate with other departments both on the main campus and at Middlefield to help ensure student college success.
- Library services- provided online and on site. Students have access to the college's library databases, which can be accessed in the computer lab at the Middlefield campus. A librarian from the main campus is available to meet with any class at Middlefield to explain the process for accessing library books or resources. In addition, Middlefield has a "Reserve Book" program with textbooks for classes being offered that are available to students to use

on site. Students have access to all of the college's library databases, which they can access in the computer lab at Middlefield Campus.

- As on the main campus, Middlefield students have monthly access to legal services on site.
- Safety and Emergency Preparedness- Middlefield campus staff distribute an emergency resource sheet to all faculty at the start of each quarter providing emergency information and advice specific to the Middlefield Campus.

To serve the needs of Spanish speaking students, the Middlefield Campus offers one-on-one Spanish speaking recruitment, a Spanish hotline, enrollment and admissions assistance. This is accomplished largely in part with the outreach staff at Middlefield, and through the Foothill College and Career Connections (FCCC) http://www.foothill.edu/fccc/ which offers workshops and mentors for new students.

The Family Engagement Institute (FEI), housed at Middlefield Campus, engages in significant outreach, and offers parenting classes and family workshops mainly to under-served, Spanish-speaking families in Mountain View. In addition, each summer the FEI offers Stretch to Kindergarten, in partnership with Mountain View Wisman School District, for 80 families of children who will be entering kindergarten in the fall, but have had no preschool. This is offered bilingually (English-Spanish) for six weeks, and parents simultaneously take a 24-hour noncredit parenting class.

In addition, ASK Foothill, an online question and answer tool (receiving 13,000 asks per month) is available to assist students with information about Foothill College, and is now offered in Spanish. This helps with the recruitment and retention of Hispanic students at Middlefield Campus and the main campus

Recommendation 4: SLOs and Faculty Evaluation
In order to meet the Commission's 2012 expectation for meeting student learning outcomes Standards, the team recommends that the college and the faculty association work together to incorporate student learning outcomes into the faculty evaluation process. (III.A.1.c)

The district and the Faculty Association renegotiated the faculty evaluation process to include faculty participation in the evaluation process effective fall quarter, 2012 for Foothill and De Anza colleges. The new language is in the Professional Contributions section and applies to all faculty. The faculty are evaluated on their participation in the SLO/SAO processes. (see attached evaluation form, J1, attached)