

Foothill College Follow-Up Report to ACCJC

Draft November 1, 2012 October 9, 2012 October 8, 2012 October 8, 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 began three years ago and is updated annually (1.1: PaRC Calendar, 2012-13). 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 (1.2: IP&B Structure). 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 (1.3: 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 (1.4: Basic Skills workgroup minutes, January 19, 2012; 1.5: 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 (1.6: PaRC minutes, October 26, 2011). 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 (1.7: ALD Summer Academy memo, March 1, 2011; 1.8: Basic Skills workgroup minutes, March 22, 2011). 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 (1.9: Basic Skills workgroup reflection 1; 1.10: PaRC minutes, March 21, 2012).

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 these requests through the process 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 (1.11: Resource Allocation Prioritizations: 2011-2012, PaRC minutes, October 3, 2012). 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 (1.12: Integrated Planning and Budget Handbook; 1.13: OPC minutes, November 18, 2011; 1.14: OPC minutes, December 9, 2011). These guiding principles identified metrics used in the rubric, which was presented to PaRC for feedback and approval (1.13: OPC minutes, November 18, 2011; 1.14: OPC minutes, December 9, 2011; 1.15: OPC minutes, January 10, 2012; 1.16: OPC minutes, January 24, 2012). Ultimately, changes were made to the guiding principles based on PaRC feedback (1.17: OPC recommendations to be shared PaRC attachments to minutes, January 18, 2012). 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 (1.18: OPC rubric, PaRC attachments to minutes, February 1, 2012).

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 (1.19: Art program review 2011-2012). 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 the trial software use, creating an increased demand and interest in online art course offerings (1.19: Art program review 2011-2012, 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 (1.20: Resource Allocation Prioritizations: 2011-2012, OPC prioritized list, updated May 29, 2012) While it was determined that this request should be paid for with existing divisional funds 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 completed a full cycle of the planning and budget process, there were some inconsistencies that emerged from integrating the resource allocation process into the planning model, requiring PaRC members to dialogue and reach consensus in order to maintain consistency. This approach demonstrates the ongoing use of shared governance in discussing and providing recommendations, which led to a more detailed resource allocation model (1.21: Resource Allocation Process, proposed models, PaRC attachments to minutes, January 18, 2012; 1.22: Resource Allocation Process, final draft, PaRC attachments to minutes, February 1, 2012). 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 (1.23: 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 (1.23: PaRC minutes, January 18, 2012; 1.10: PaRC minutes, March 21, 2012; 1.24: Basic Skills workgroup reflection 1, March 21, 2012). For example, the Workforce workgroup identified as one of its objectives, to improve the Perkins funding process, which ultimately supports the institutional goal of improving outcomes of vocational students. This process was discussed and presented to PaRC for comment and feedback (1.10: PaRC minutes, March 21; 1.25: Perkins funding requests, PaRC attachments to minutes, March 21, 2012; 1.26: Perkins funding recommendations, PaRC attachments to minutes, March 21, 2012).

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 (1.10: PaRC minutes, March 21, 2012; 1.27: PaRC minutes, April 18, 2012; 1.28: OPC planning process, PaRC attachments to minutes, May 2, 2012). After much discussion, PaRC ultimately determined that new faculty and staff prioritization would remain a PaRC responsibility (1.27: PaRC minutes, April 18, 2012).

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. Consensus was ultimately reached that prioritization of re-assigned time should be part of OPC's responsibilities (1.27: PaRC minutes, April 18, 2012). 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 (1.29: OPC Prioritization Recommendations, PaRC attachments to minutes, May 16, 2012). To ensure transparency regarding allocation of re-assigned time, OPC presented to PaRC a list of all existing re-assigned time (1.30: PaRC minutes, June 6, 2012). Ultimately, the college decided not to use the general fund for most re-assigned time requests (1.31: Reassign time decisions, Resource Allocation Prioritizations 2011-2012). When OPC reflected on its primary objective in Spring 2012, the workgroup assessed 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 (1.32: OPC Reflection template, PaRC attachments to minutes, June 6, 2012).

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 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. All stages of the resource allocation process are accessible because each step is posted online (1.11: Resource Allocation Prioritizations 2011-2012) 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 from the Spring 2011 Governance Survey, the Integrated Planning and Budget taskforce (IP&B) created a new annual program review template (1.33: IP&B minutes, August 31, 2011; 1.34: IP&B minutes, September 13, 2011) that was presented to and approved by PaRC (1.35: PaRC minutes, October 5, 2012). 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 (1.36: Program Review templates, Section 2.4, 3.1 and 3.3 of annual template).

IP&B was then tasked to reflect on the program review process; 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 (1.37: IP&B minutes, June 26, 2012). These program review templates (annual and comprehensive) were created and revised in several IP&B meetings held in Spring and Summer 2012. PaRC approved changes to the annual program review template in Spring 2012 and reviewed and approved the 2012-13 comprehensive templates at their first 2012-13 meeting (1.38: PaRC minutes, June 20; 1.39: PaRC minutes, October 3, 2012).

These conversations about the annual and comprehensive program review templates also initiated a dialogue about who would complete a program review (1.40: IP&B minutes, January 31, 2012). IP&B, with feedback from PaRC, recommended that all instructional, student services and administrative units would participate in this process (1.41: Approved Program Review Templates for 2012-2013; 1.42: IP&B Taskforce update, PaRC attachments to minutes, April 18). The inclusion of divisional program reviews incorporates the deans more fully in the 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 inclusive approach allows the college to document, assess, reflect, evaluate and improve on their progress toward the institutional goals.

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 (1.43: PaRC minutes, May 16, 2012). 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 (1.44: Program Review Committee webpage). 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 sent to PaRC for approval in Fall 2012 (1.39: PaRC minutes, October 3, 2012). 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 (1.30: PaRC minutes, June 6, 2012; 1.38: PaRC minutes, June 20, 2012). The PRC is expected to report to PaRC after its evaluation of the program reviews and before final resource allocation decisions are made (1.22: Resource Allocation Process, final draft, PaRC attachments to minutes, February 1, 2012).

Evaluation of Planning Model

An integral part of the planning model is the evaluation component. As part of the three-year planning cycle, PaRC will review the college mission in 2012-13, including defining the student population, IL-SLOs and institutional goals (1.1: PaRC calendar, 2012-2013). While this function of PaRC was not previously explicit in the governance handbook, this update has been made to reflect this key role (1.12: Integrated Planning and Budgeting Handbook). This opportunity allows the college to assess and reflect on its current processes, and the results will be shared with the campus community through various channels, including the PaRC planning calendar and the President's presentations at Leadership and Opening Day (1.45: Foothill Leadership Retreat 2012; 1.46: Foothill Opening Day 2012).

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 (1.47: Revisiting College Goals and Metrics, PaRC attachments to minutes, April 25, 2012). The data regarding success rates 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 (1.48: 2011-12 Strategic Planning Update/Accountability Report for Community Colleges (ARCC), Board of Trustees Agenda, August 27, 2012). 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 (1.41: Approved Program Review Templates for 2012-2013; 1.49: Core Mission objective and reflection template 2012-2013, PaRC attachments to minutes, October 3, 2012). 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. Initial revisions to the ESMP occurred in Summer 2012 and will be reviewed by PaRC in Fall 2012 for additional feedback (1.1: PaRC planning calendar, 2012-2013).

Foothill College administered its annual governance survey in June 2012 and the results were reported back to PaRC (1.38: PaRC minutes, June 20, 2012). Ongoing efforts in program improvement are seen in the annual charge given to IP&B from the survey recommendations. Some of the planning components that may be modified include having President's Cabinet report out more regularly and having academic and classified senate agendaize PaRC discussions (1.50: Governance survey results presentation, PaRC attachments to minutes, June 20, 2012).

A main focus of the governance survey included evaluating the planning process and communicating the process to campus constituents. 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%) (1.50: Governance survey results presentation, PaRC attachments to minutes, June 20, 2012). 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 (1.51: Governance survey raw data, PaRC attachments to minutes, June 20, 2012).

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 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). The survey results also indicate that PaRC members are reporting back to their constituents by email and by at departmental/division meetings on a monthly basis (53%) (1.50: Governance survey results presentation, PaRC attachments to minutes, June 20, 2012; 1.51: Governance survey raw data, PaRC attachments to minutes, June 20, 2012).

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 and 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 is 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) and analysis 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 (1.52: Math 48 and 1A memo, September 4, 2012). 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.

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 (1.53: Health services program review 2011-2012, section 1; 1.54: Financial Aid program review 2011-2012, 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 (1.54: Financial Aid program review 2011-2012, 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 (1.55: Math 1A tracking memo, September 20, 2011). Other longitudinal research track transfers using data provided by the University of California (UC), California State University (CSU) and State Chancellor's Office (1.56: 2010-2011 CSU and UC Transfer Numbers, February 1, 2012; 1.57: 2009-2010 In-State Privates and Out-of-State Transfer Numbers, April 19, 2012). Submissions to the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) help the college better understand students' transfer destinations over time; such data are helpful for programs where transferring rather than earning an AA/AS or certificate may be the primary indicator for completion (1.55: Math 1A tracking memo, September 20, 2011; 1.58: STEMway transfers memo, June 25, 2012).

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 (1.50: Governance survey results, PaRC minutes, June 20, 2012). Other qualitative data assists the college in assessing whether its administrative unit outcomes were being met (AU-SLOs) (1.59: AUO survey results, President's Cabinet, September 17, 2012). Such evaluations allow the college to ensure that its goals are stated clearly and are accessible to all campus constituents. Documented conversations as highlighted in meeting minutes document the process, highlighting areas for improvement that can supplement quantitative data.

Other data sources continue to enhance existing data already being collected by the college. While 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 Economic Modeling Specialists International (EMSI) provides vocational and demographic data that can be used to keep programs relevant. The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) documents students' experience both in and out of the classroom and its survey results 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 (1.60: CCSSE results, Dean's meeting, September 12, 2012; 1.61: CCSSE results). 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 continued its cycle of Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment (2.2: PaRC Planning Calendar) and has taken 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 newof every 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 inAfter adopting TracDat as a new tracking tool for SLOs, the college worked to train faculty, staff and administrators to use 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 throughout 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 [were](#) 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 4Cs as [its](#) 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 [aon an annual](#) rotating cycle each year.

Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes

In 2011–2012, [Foothill 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 part of its opening day activities. The SLO coordinators also presented small group workshops on [Sept. 30](#), [Oct. 5](#), [Oct. 7](#), [Nov. 1](#), [Nov. 2](#), [Dec. 2](#), 2011 and [Jan. 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 [Oct. 14, 2011 \(English\)](#), [Dec. 6, 2011 \(CHLD\)](#), [Jan. 20, 2012 \(ESLL\)](#) and [Jan. 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 [sought](#) to ensure that course-level SLOs are aligned with program-level SLOs. Beginning in [On April 4, 2011](#), the SLO coordinators distributed 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. 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 [all](#) program faculty for every program and updated faculty [them](#) 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-[to](#)-one basis to help increase understanding about what is required and needed [the process](#) 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 completed the 2011–2012 cycle of assessment. ([Evidence: 2.18 TracDat PL-SLO Report](#)) This completion rate is taking into account the established assessment cycle and deadlines which are aligned with the college's quarter system. The 2011–[2012](#) 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 [is](#) 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 reached proficiency in the SLO processes, the focus shifted to increasing ongoing assessment and evaluation of those results. The college has determined rather than two collegewide SLO coordinators, this effort will be better served by identifying an SLO coordinator for each academic division, helping to 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 [are](#) 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 1/10/12](#)) 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 [was](#) developed for this proposed course and the resource request has been [was](#) prioritized [ranked](#) as a high priority (2.23: [Funded B Budget Requests](#)). Another broader result of assessments used [example of](#) at the planning level [assessments](#) is [are](#) seen in the requests for faculty FTE, staff FTE and faculty reassigned time (2.24: [PaRC Minutes 1/18/12](#)). This dialogue, which culminated in PaRC, was the first time a collegewide 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, [a list compiled by reviewing each request through a defined rubric.](#) 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 [college president](#). Given the constraints on college funding, the process resulted in a [\\$300,000](#) reduction in reassigned time funding of \$300,000, an annual savings to the college (2.25: [Reassigned 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 [Sept. 20–21, 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 [C](#)continued emphasis [will be placed](#) on sharing the assessment results, refining the cycle of program review and assessment, and improving student learning.

Administrative Unit-Service Learning Outcomes (AU-SLOs)

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 AU-SLO workshop on [Sept. 12, 2011](#), and [Sept. 17, 2012](#), 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 Integrated Planning and Budget (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 operational functions of the AUs, which were relevant, but not a necessarily a valid assessment of students and their outcomes.

AU-SLOs were discussed and revised on Sept. 17, 2012 (2.30: AU-SLO Presentation). Administrative unit outcomes statements were discussed and revised, resulting from a consideration about the difference between AU objectives and AU outcomes (2.31: I&IR Four Column). This dialogue helped the units think about their outcomes in relation to learning, resulting in a change in knowledge, skills, attitudes and/or behavior. 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 Example).

Just as with program-level SLOs, AU-SLO assessments were embedded in program review and in the resource allocation cycle. The decision to fund web content coordinator support resulted from An example of a request that used SLO assessments and program review would be the funding of web content coordinator support in the Marketing and Communications Department. This request originated in the Marketing and Communications program review for 2011-2012 This was originally requested in the program review document in Fall 2011 (2.32: MarComm Program Review) and was discussed in PaRC (2.33: PaRC Minutes: May 2, 2012), (2.34: PaRC Minutes: May 16, 2012)and Cabinet. This request was discussed in PaRC (2.33: PaRC Minutes: May 2, 2012), (2.34: PaRC Minutes: May 16, 2012) and Cabinet as moreAdditional data also supported data came in to support the high demand ofneed for help with website 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 website 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, as a result, funds although the position 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, Currently, 100 percent of all administrative units that were identified in 2011–2012 have fully completed the 2011–2012 yearmost recent cycle of AU-SLO assessment (2.37: TracDat AU-SLO Report). In the past year, Most recently, the college has identified additional administrative units that had been overlooked duringwere not included in the first year of the new revised program review process. These AUs include the offices of the division deansDivision offices, the Krause Center for Innovation and the academic and classified senatesInternational Progress Office. 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 they should be included them in the integrated planning and budget process. The Planning and Resource CouncilPaRC expanded the list of administrative units that would needrequired to complete a program, identify review and establish and assess AU-SLOs (2.38: Program Review Types and Schedule). For the 2012–2013 academic year, allAll identified AUs will be trained and will participate in this process.to participate in this process in 2012-2013.

Service Area-Student Learning Outcomes (SA-SLOs)

Since the writing of the 2011 Self-StudyOver the past year, Foothill College continues the process of integrating the SLO cycle and program review in the Student Services Division. immense strides have occurred in the SA-SLO arena at the college. This sphere of the 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 areawith leadership and the tracking system. These challenges were addressed with the formation of aA Service Area-SLO core team that was formed in September 2011 to address, establish and integrate the SA-SLO cycle. Participation and direction of this core team involved vice presidents and staff from both the Office of 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 timeline and handbook were created in a joint collaborative effort (2.39: SA-SLO Handbook) in between instruction and student services in September 2011, andwith the topic of SA-SLOs was as the primary focus. This information was presented and discussed at of the a subsequent Student Services Division mMeeting (2.40: c2011 SS Division Meeting).

The SA-SLO core team also met on Sept. 28 and Oct. 11, 2011, and created an SA-SLO cycle flow chart (2.41: Cycle) 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 occurred on Oct. 19, 2011, to establish a timeline was established with the goal of 100% for 100-percent SA-SLO completion by the November 2011 deadline.

To accomplish this task, the SA-SLO core team offered several workshops and trainings during Fall Quarter the fall term. On Nov. 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 TracDat system. Many individual sessions were also offered to meet the range of schedules within the service areas.

There were many robust discussions similar to those of AU-SLOs. This process allowed service areas to reflect on their assessments and focus their program improvement efforts. For example, several service areas first initially wrote their SLOs with a service in mind, but after assessment and some reflection, they revised their SA-SLOs to focus on a more direct assessment of the attainment of a student skill, ability or knowledge set knowledge, ability or skill. For example, Pass the Torch (PTT), a service area program that links students who excel in English, ESL and math with students those who want support in these same core courses, decided to adjust revise their SA-SLOs after one year. The active Their SLOs for the area now describe a student learning an outcome that is demonstrated after a service is provided, rather than just stating a service that is provided (2.43: PTT SA-SLO Assessment Plan). Additionally, many new assessment methods are being used as new software and data solutions are implemented at the college.

SA-SLOs were are an integral part of the planning and resource allocation process at the college in the past year. Service areas completed program reviews with and embedded their SLOs and related assessments embedded in the document. All resource requests, such as the need for more support in counseling, 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 This process culminated in a funded request for the funding of a \$30,000 request for additional front desk workers to help with the student traffic in counseling support the registration of online and summer students. SA-SLOs continue to be relevant as the admissions and records department, using data provided by the institutional research office, will continue to focus on determining whether increasing numbers of students are able to register online rather than in person 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 SA-SLO core team attended the League for Innovation in the Community College conference in March 2012 to share their efforts and collaborate with other colleges that were in the first SA-SLO cycles. (2.47: League SA-SLO Presentation). Team members were then invited to deliver the same presentation to present at the Classified Leadership Institute in June 2012 where there were many attendees who were new to the SA-SLO

process. The 2012–2013 year of the SA-SLO cycles began with the core team inviting two service areas to present their SA-SLO assessment results to the Student Services Division meeting on Sept. 20, 2012 (2.48: SS 9/20/12 Division Meeting Agenda) in order to, encouraging dialogue and interdepartmental inquiry provide examples to the other service areas. Several SA-SLO workshops continue to be scheduled by the core team (EVIDENCE: Opening Day Schedule Sept. 21, 2012) with direct collaboration of the Foothill College Classified Senate.

At the time of this writing, 100 percent of the college's service areas have identified SA-SLOs, and 86 percent 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 in advance of 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 evaluation by the college in terms of the services provided at the Middlefield Campus. Through this process, the college has reaffirmed its comprehensive delivery of services at Middlefield, (3.1 Student Services Homepage) has enhanced its communication to students regarding services offered at the Middlefield Campus, and confirmed its delivery of key services outlined in the *Evaluation Report*, including disability support services, tutorial services and health services. The following section details how Foothill delivers services at its full-service 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 (3.2 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 over-the-counter medication, first-aid supplies, flu shots, massage chairs, and health information and referrals to the main campus. For example, in Fall 2012, the

Health Services Office will offer free flu shots to currently enrolled students Oct. 23–24, from 5:30–8 p.m. at the Middlefield Campus. For students to access the broader array of services, they must visit the main campus, which is up to a 15-minute drive by car and 25-minute ride by bus from the Middlefield Campus. (3.3 Health Services Website, 3.4 Health Services Brochure, 3.25 Middlefield Website Services webpage) The Foothill College Health Services Office is open Mondays through Fridays from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. and provides a comprehensive set of services at little or no cost to students, including immunizations, HIV testing, referral to low-cost clinics, strep-throat testing, preventative health literature and access to Planned Parenthood services. (3.3 Health Services Website, 3.4 Health Services Brochure)

In addition, following the site evaluation team’s recommendation, Foothill College has begun working with Planned Parenthood’s Mountain View office to create a new arrangement for serving Foothill College students. This office is located just three miles from the Middlefield Campus at 225 San Antonio Road in Mountain View. Foothill is currently in negotiations with Planned Parenthood Mountain View to provide Foothill students the same reduced-cost services that are provided at the Foothill College Health Center. At the time of this report the plan is still pending.

Disability Services: The Disability Resource Center (DRC) on the main campus works closely with Middlefield Campus to provide the same level of service to Middlefield students. Students request services through the DRC, and staff and faculty respond to students’ needs on site at Middlefield to ensure services are easily accessed (3.6 DRC website; 3.5 Middlefield services webpage). Margo Dobbins, the disability access and compliance supervisor who oversees the DRC, meets with students and faculty at the Middlefield Campus as needed or requested, to determine accommodations and deliver services (3.6 DRC website). The Middlefield Campus also provides testing accommodations for students with disabilities in the student services area known as the “Hub”. In addition, a DRC counselor is available at Middlefield one day per week for drop-in appointments and available by appointment other days. (3.56 Disability Resource Center Website; 3.25 Middlefield services website.)

Tutorial Services: Foothill College offers a diverse array of tutorial services to meet the varying needs of students as they progress through 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. The Middlefield Campus is flexible in offering specific tutorial services depending upon the courses offered during a particular academic term. For instance, when developmental math courses were offered in 2011, the Middlefield Campus offered tutorial services two days a week. In past years the Child Development program offered tutorial services at Middlefield to meet specific needs. In addition to offering referrals to the main campus, service for programs such as Pass the Torch and Puente at the Foothill College Tutorial Center provides online services to students at the Middlefield Campus and all off-campus and online students through OpenStudy (3.67 Tutorial Center Website; 3.78 Etudes (Foothill Global

[Access\) Website Homepage](#)). OpenStudy is an online tutorial system [that offers](#) peer-to-peer tutorial assistance in numerous subjects.

To ensure [that](#) students are aware of all services, Middlefield Campus [maintains](#) a comprehensive information resource program [that features](#) 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 [Foothill College](#) Middlefield Campus offers the following:

- On-site outreach services [to area high schools and community organizations](#) through the College [and](#) Career Connections Office (3.8 Foothill College and Career Connections [Website](#));
- Admissions and [registration \(conducted daily\)](#);
- Assessment and [placement testing](#), including testing at local high schools and educational centers [\(conducted daily\)](#);
- Financial [aid](#) by appointment [and drop-in service \(conducted two days per week\)](#);
- Counseling [services, by appointment or drop-in that include](#) career and transfer [guidance](#), disability, personal and academic counseling [\(conducted two days per week\)](#). One Middlefield [counselor](#) is certified in [disabled students, programs and services](#) (DSPS) counseling. The [counselors](#) at Middlefield collaborate with other departments both on the main campus and at Middlefield to ensure [that](#) students [experience](#) college success.
- Library services [are](#) 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 [operates](#) a reserve book program [in which](#) textbooks for classes being offered are [made](#) available to students to use on site ([3.2 Middlefield Website Services](#)). Students [also](#) have access to all of the college's library databases, which they can access in the computer lab at [the](#) Middlefield Campus.
- As on the main campus, Middlefield students have on-site monthly access to legal services.
- Safety and [emergency preparedness is an ongoing priority at the Middlefield Campus](#). Staff distribute an emergency resource sheet to all faculty [and staff](#) at the start of each quarter [which details emergency contact information, emergency procedures, and](#) advice specific to the Middlefield Campus [and its unique student population](#).

To serve the needs of Spanish-speaking students, the Middlefield Campus offers one-to-one Spanish-speaking recruitment, a Spanish-[language](#) hotline, enrollment and admissions assistance. This is accomplished largely in part with the outreach staff at [the](#) Middlefield [Campus](#), and through the Foothill College Career Connections [website](#) (3.8

Foothill College and Career Connections website) which offers workshops and mentors for new students.

The Family Engagement Institute (FEI), housed at Middlefield Campus, engages in significant outreach, and offers **noncredit** parenting classes and family workshops **primarily for** underserved, Spanish-speaking families in Mountain View. Each summer the FEI **also** offers Stretch to Kindergarten, in partnership with **Mountain View-Whisman 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. (3.9 FEI **W**website)

In addition, **AskFoothill**, an online question-and-answer tool, (receiving 13,000 **inquiries** per month) is available to assist students, **potential students and community members by providing** information about Foothill College, and is now offered in Spanish. This **tool eliminates the need for students to wait in line to get answers to many general information questions. It is particularly helpful for online and evening students. AskFoothill may also help address some recruitment and retention needs of Hispanic students at Middlefield Campus and the main campus. (3.10 AskFoothill)**

Recommendation 4: Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) & Faculty Evaluation

To meet the **commission's** 2012 expectation for meeting student learning outcomes **standards**, the team recommends that the college and the **Foothill-De Anza 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)