EVALUATION REPORT

**Folsom Lake College
10 College Parkway
Folsom, CA 95630-6798**

A Confidential Report Prepared for the
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Folsom Lake College
October 12-15, 2009

**Dr. Glenn R. Roquemore, Team Chair
President, Irvine Valley College**

II. Folsom Lake College Accreditation Team Roster, October 12-15, 2009

Dr. Glenn R. Roquemore (Chair)
President
Irvine Valley College

Ms. Sandy Jeffries (Team Assistant)
Executive Assistant to the President
Irvine Valley College

Mr. Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh
Vice President, Academic Affairs
Los Angeles Pierce College

Mr. Donald Brown
Professor – Music Librarian
El Camino College

Dr. Theda Douglas
Dean, Student Services
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College

Ms. Margaret Lovig
Department Chair, Paralegal Studies
Coastline Community College

Mr. Thomas Mohr
President
Cañada College

Mr. Christopher Tarman
Research and Planning Analyst
Irvine Valley College

Ms. Martha Tilmann
Dean, Coastside Distance Education, Community Education and Study Abroad
College of San Mateo

Dr. Mark Zacovic
Interim Chief Business Officer
Pasadena City College

III.   Summary of the Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION: Folsom Lake College

DATES OF VISIT: October 12-15, 2009

TEAM CHAIR: Glenn R. Roquemore, Ph.D.
                    President/CEO
                    Irvine Valley College

Folsom Lake College received its initial accreditation in 2004, and the succeeding years have brought significant growth in enrollment, and expansion of facilities. This evaluation report serves as the report for reaffirmation of accreditation.

The accreditation visiting team was comprised of ten members, including the team assistant. Prior to the arrival of the team, the following preparatory activities occurred:

- College staff began preparation of the self study report in spring of 2007;
- the team chair and team assistant visited Folsom Lake College in August 2009;
- the team chair participated in an ACCJC training session for chairs;
- with the exception of Chris Tarman (Researcher), all team members, including the team assistant, participated in an ACCJC training session;
- team members read the self study report and supporting evidence and other documents, which the College made available on-line, prepared lists of individuals and groups with whom they wanted to meet, and, in sub-teams assigned to Standards, prepared first drafts of the visiting team report.

The visiting team began its on-site work with a tour of the Rancho Cordova Outreach Center and later in the week visited the El Dorado Educational Center. The team room was located on the Folsom Lake College Campus. Team members interviewed faculty, staff, administrators, students, and trustees and reviewed all pertinent documents supporting the self study report.

All constituents of the college community are commended for exemplary engagement in the practice of participatory governance, for the development of a document which provides extensive opportunity for open and collegial dialogue, and for ensuring that the constituents at each of the centers are equal partners in carrying forth the practices of shared decision-making.

The team commends students of the college for their development of and participation in a vibrant program of student life that enriches the total educational experience of Folsom Lake College students. The student support services and the instructional faculty are commended for collaborative efforts to address the needs of at-risk students in coordinating services with the "Early Alert Program" and "Follow-Up Services Program" for students on academic

probation. Of note is the district's interest based approach (IBA) training initiative that to date has trained over 800 district employees.

The team also commends the Los Rios Governing Board, Chancellor, district, and all constituencies of Folsom Lake College for pursuing successfully two district-wide bond measures and for implementing a facilities construction plan resulting in a beautiful campus and state of the art facilities in which the highest quality of education is conducted on behalf of the citizens of the region.

The visiting team found the self study report well organized and generally well written, with clear citations of the issues the College believes are in need of attention. Although very sparse, the planning agenda was concise and related clearly to the findings developed through the self study process. The visiting team found that the College had responded well to the recommendations of the previous visiting team, noting that the college has met the standards cited with those recommendations. However, under the current standards, the team found that additional work and improvement are needed relating to Student Learning Outcomes, evaluating online courses, integrating SLO's into the planning cycle and developing methods to assess the effect of professional development on teaching and learning as noted in the recommendations listed below.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FOLSOM LAKE COLLEGE

Recommendation 1: The team recommends the college must complete the "development level" of student learning outcomes by establishing "authentic assessment strategies." The team recommends an action plan to reach the 2012 sustainability deadline be developed by fall 2010 (I.B.5, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, III.A.1.c).

Recommendation 2: The team recommends the college evaluate the educational effectiveness of electronically delivered courses including assessment of student learning outcomes, retention and success, and develop a distance education strategic plan (I.B.7, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.d, II.B.1, II.B.2, II.B.2.a, II.B.2.d, II.B.2.e, II.B.2.f, II.B.3.a, II.C.1, II.C.2.c, III.C.1.c, IV.A.2.b).

Recommendation 3: The team recommends the college comply with the Distance Education requirements such as obtaining substantive change approvals when 50% or more of a certificate or degree is obtainable in a distance delivery mode (II.A.1.b, II.A.2.d).

Recommendation 4: The team recommends the college strengthen its long-term strategic planning by integrating student learning outcomes into the cycle of planning to assist in the development of prioritized decisions (I.B.3, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, IV.A.2.b).

Recommendation 5: The team recommends the college develop and implement a comprehensive and systematic method to assess the impact of professional development on teaching and learning and the use of technology (III.A.5.b, III.C.1.b).

Recommendation 6: The team recommends a formal board policy be created incorporating input from classified staff and administrators in the annual evaluation process of the college president. The team further recommends a formal process be created relating to any unethical behavior by a board member (III.A.1.b, IV.B.1, IV.B.1.g, IV.B.1.h, IV.B.1.j, IV.B.2).

Recommendation 7: In order to ensure the sustainability of its infrastructure, the team recommends the college must calculate the real costs of facilities, ownership, including technology, over the next six years and then identify a reliable and ongoing revenue stream that will fund the significant increase in the operating budget (III.B.2.b, III.C.1.a, III.C.1.d).

Recommendation 8: In order to increase effectiveness of Standard II.C and Standard III.C, the team recommends the college complete a comprehensive evaluation of the learning support services provided in the following computer labs: FL1-35, FL1-107, FL2-240, FL5-09, FL1-07, FL5-109, EDC C-201, EDC C-202, FLC 1 PLE, EDC C204, and RCC 7 (II.C.1.c, II.C.2, III.C.2).

Recommendation 9: Although the *College Participatory Governance and Collegial Consultation* (*CPGCC)* document explains what the decision-making process entails, the team recommends the document be modified to explain how the process works and how it impacts the college and district (IV.A.1, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3).

IV.   INTRODUCTION

HISTORY OF FOLSOM LAKE COLLEGE

Folsom Lake College is one of four community colleges within the Los Rios Community College District. The district was founded in 1965 when voters in ten separate school districts covering five counties opted to consolidate. The election established a regional community college district of 2,400 square miles and brought together, under one governing board, the then-existing Sacramento City College and American River College. Cosumnes River College was added in 1970, and Folsom Lake College became the district's fourth and final college when it received its initial accreditation in 2004. Folsom Lake College's history dates back to 1966, when the Placerville Center began offering classes at the National Guard Armory on the El Dorado County fairgrounds. At that time the center was operated by American River College and served approximately 200 students. In 1977, the center moved to a new location above the fairgrounds, where it operated out of portable buildings. Known affectionately in the community as UBR, or "University Behind Raley's," Placerville Center remained under the auspices of American River College until 1985, when Cosumnes River College took over operations.

Because of the continued enrollment growth at Placerville Center and the keen interest and desire of the citizens of the Greater Placerville area to have a permanent community college center in Placerville, the Los Rios Community College District Board of Trustees authorized the purchase of approximately 19 acres of land (for one dollar) from the El Dorado County Board of Education. The site was approved by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and the State of California for a permanent site in 1988.

Placerville Center moved to the new site in 1994, at which time its name was changed to the El Dorado Center. The new facilities included Buildings A and B, which housed classrooms, science labs, a library, an art studio, student services, faculty offices, administrative offices, a bookstore, and an instructional television fixed signal (ITFS) classroom with cable broadcast capability. Construction of the new El Dorado Center cost approximately $10,000,000 and was funded by the state. In 1993, about a year before the initial El Dorado Center facilities were completed, Cosumnes River College opened up the Folsom Lake Center on a 151-acre parcel of land that the City of Folsom donated to the district in 1967. The new center, which combined two smaller centers previously operated at Folsom High School and Mather Air Force Base, included 13 new portable buildings housing 10 classrooms, a computer lab, a science lab, student services, administrative and faculty offices, a student lounge, bookstore, staff workroom, learning resource center, and two restroom facilities. Two of the classrooms were set up to receive ITFS broadcasts from the El Dorado Center and Cosumnes River College. Several years later, additional portable buildings were brought in to provide additional classrooms, two science labs, and a child development center. In 1999, construction began on Folsom Lake Center's first permanent building, Aspen Hall (FL1), with the new building opening in fall 2001. Aspen Hall houses student services, the library and personal learning environment (PLE), instructional television (iTV) broadcast facilities, the innovation center, one administration office, faculty offices, and classrooms The Rancho

Cordova Center was opened in fall 2000, utilizing rented facilities that housed four classrooms, a computer lab, a student services counter, and a faculty/counselor office. In spring 2004, the college was granted its initial accreditation, at which point the El Dorado Center (EDC), the Folsom Lake Center (FLC-main), and the Rancho Cordova Center (RCC) combined to form Folsom Lake College.

In 2002 district voters approved Measure A, which authorized the issuance of $265 million in general obligation bonds to fund new facilities throughout the district. As a result, there has been extensive new facilities construction at Folsom Lake College since its initial accreditation, with the following buildings being completed:

- Cypress Hall (FL2), fall 2005
- Buckeye Hall (FL3), fall 2005
- Aspen Hall (FL1) expansion, fall 2005
- Falcon's Roost (bookstore/cafeteria), spring 2006
- Building C (at EDC), spring 2006
- Campus Services building, fall 2006
- College Administration building, fall 2006
- Dogwood Hall (FL4), spring 2007
- Lilac Hall (FL5), spring 2007
- RCC expansion, fall 2007
- Physical Education building, spring 2009.

In 2008 district voters approved a second bond measure, Measure M, which authorizes the issuance of $475 million in general obligation bonds to fund additional facilities construction. Construction is currently underway at FLC-main on the Visual and Performing Arts Center, which is scheduled for completion by spring 2011. In fall 2009, the college will break ground at FLC-main on an expansion of the Falcon's Roost, which is scheduled for completion in fall 2010. In late summer 2010, grading and construction will begin on the PE/athletic fields. Work is currently underway to design the new career and technical education building at FLC-main (although state funding and a completion date are now uncertain). The district is currently in the process of securing property on which to site permanent facilities for the Rancho Cordova Center.

V: Responses to Recommendations of the Previous Evaluation Team

Recommendation 1

The college has implemented several planning-related activities that must now be evaluated in order to determine what has been effective and what has not. Because of the absence of clear links between the processes, the team recommends A) the development of a complete blueprint of the mission review, research, planning, and evaluation cycle in order to more clearly communicate these processes to faculty, staff and the community. This blueprint would include definitions of all relevant terms, detailing of the processes for implementing and evaluating the plans, and a clarification of links between college mission, goals, plans and resource allocations, (Standards 1.4, 3A.1, 3A.3, 3A.4, 3B.1, 3B.2, 3B.3, 4D.6, 5.10, 6.7, 8.5, 9A.1); and B) the proper training of decision-makers in accessing and using research resources currently available (Standard 3A.2).

A. After the Comprehensive Evaluation visit of 2003, Folsom Lake College created the *Blueprint for FLC Mission, Research, Planning and Evaluation*. This blueprint document guided the college in developing their new mission statement, first strategic plan, and new decision-making processes. The Board of Trustees approved both the college's mission statement and first Strategic Plan in September 2006. In 2008, the blueprint document was replaced by the *FLC Planning and Evaluation Cycle* document, which illustrates the linkages between college planning processes. The document includes a schematic that shows the cycle's four components: (1) needs assessment and evaluations; (2) plans; (3) resources; and (4) plan implementation. In addition, the various plans, resources, processes, and groups associated with each component of the planning and evaluation cycle are listed. Many other important blueprint documents pertaining to college planning and effectiveness have been developed since 2005 (e.g., *Enrollment Management Plan*, *Technology Plan*, along with the college's *Key Performance Indicators* report). Taken together, these documents represent a vast amount of work among the college's constituents and progress toward the development of institutional effectiveness.

B. Two staff positions have been filled. The college's first research analyst was hired in 2004 to lead the newly established Office of Institutional Research (OIR) in providing the college with research support. In 2007, the college hired a senior IT support specialist to support the research function and database components. Evidence points to efforts in training faculty and administrators to use and analyze data, especially data connected to the program review process. For example, the OIR has provided ongoing training to faculty on how to access and use data reports, frequent support/training at college governance committees and at weekly administrative and instructional staff meetings, regular semester workshop presentations, and presentations at new faculty orientation meetings. Data and written reports, including periodic surveys, environmental scans, and enrollment statistics, are published on the newly created *Insider* (developed by OIR) and OIR websites, providing support for the program review/institutional planning process.

In summary, it appears that the college has responded to this recommendation in a timely manner to complete the mission review, research component, planning, and evaluation cycle in order to provide communication of processes to faculty, staff and the community. Communication and visibility of reports and documents are available. While the college has made progress in this area, report-generating tools for faculty and administration are still in the development stage and the college should continue to expand its commitment to and use of data-based evidence by supporting the resource needs of the OIR.

Recommendation 2

The Los Rios District has developed a strategic plan to serve the people within the district through the creation of four colleges and a series of educational centers affiliated with each of those colleges. The team recommends that, in order to increase effectiveness, this plan should include appropriate provision for delivery of necessary instructional and student support services at all of the existing centers and at those that may be created in the future. (Standards 4A.4, 5.6, 6.1, 7A.1, 9A.1, 9A.2)

Three out of six centers in the district have reached educational center status, while the remaining centers are considered outreach centers. Currently, FLC operates two centers. The Rancho Cordova Center is currently an outreach center, whereas the El Dorado Center (EDC), the oldest and most fully developed center in the district, has achieved educational center status. In spring 2007, the Board of Trustees approved the district's *Centers Development Guidelines Document,* which outlines provisions for delivery of necessary instructional and student support services at all district centers and sites. This document was revised and updated in fall 2008.

In order to provide consistency across all district centers, the district specifies several general planning assumptions with the provision of specific staffing, curricula, and student services left to the colleges operating the centers. First, programs and services will be delivered at a breadth and level consistent with the growth of the college. Secondly, services supporting educational programs of the centers will be developed to meet student demand so that students are able to access basic services, such as the bookstore, counseling services, financial aid assistance, library resources, and enrollment services. Thirdly, faculty positions are appropriated through an allocation process based on growth and retirements and is funded through the "bucket model". This allocation process will determine the number of positions for each college and it will be the responsibility of the college to determine the number allocated to each unit, including the centers. Following these planning assumptions, it is expected that there will be a full-time faculty presence at the centers to provide programs and services. All faculty teaching at the centers will be part of the college's academic divisions. Fourthly, classified staff positions are allocated by growth, facility needs and available funds. The district considers seven (6.5 FTE) classified positions as the base level of support. College Police or security services will be provided in addition to this base staffing level. Lastly, the district specifies that a Dean should act as the administrative head of a center until a center generates significant FTEs that warrants the assignment of an administrative head at the Associate Vice President level.

In summary, significant progress has been made to provide appropriate provisions for delivery of necessary instructional and student support services at all existing centers and at those that may be created in the future.

Recommendation 3

The team recommends that the college ensure, through its planning processes, appropriate distance learning support services (Standards 4A.4, 4D.1, 4D.2, 4D.7, 5.6, 6.7).

Progress has been made to ensure distance education (DE) receives ample and appropriate support services. The technology infrastructure is more than adequate, often exemplary, and since the last accreditation team visit, the college has devoted significant attention to the technological infrastructure. The college utilizes instructional television (iTV) and distance education modes of delivery. iTV is used primarily to project live/interactive instruction to the Rancho Cordova and El Dorado Centers, and to students using public access television as well as transmitting prerecorded content to interested public access community users. For example, the library e-services have been improved, e-advising has been included, and a new learning management system, Desire2Learn (D2L), has been adopted. Distance education courses are well-supported with iTV and online/course management systems. A dean of Instruction and Technology as well as an information technology staff support technology services and distance education at all three locations with dedicated staff at each of the two centers. Faculty report a high level of satisfaction with the technology support services and the visiting team observed a high quality of functionality of the iTV services as well as many modern open access labs available at the three sites to access online classes and other online services. In addition to facilities and support services, the main campus boasts an innovation center staffed by a full-time faculty member dedicated to supporting innovations in instruction and the development of distance education.

DE is addressed in the *Educational Master Plan*, the *FLC Strategic Plan*, and the *Technology Plan*. The district also has written a *Distance Education Plan*. "Action Steps" and timelines, however, are vague. There is no evidence of a district-wide effort to orchestrate the DE curriculum, which translates to a missed opportunity for a borderless approach to DE. In addition, FLC has not developed a DE plan nor do they have policies governing the quality and selection of DE classes. Development of DE courses and programs is left to solely interested faculty members. Despite the absence of a plan, an analysis presented by the college upon the request of the visiting team shows five degree programs and eight certificate programs that exceed 50% in online instruction with several certificates being available 100% online. While the self study acknowledges this void and mentions that the Academic Senate plans to work on this, the faculty had little knowledge of this effort. The Senate should ensure relevant and accurate data is collected and used in the analysis of this work. Retention and success rates of online courses should be analyzed and used to improve the program. Additional data should be collected and used to guide the college in its development of a comprehensive strategic plan (See new Recommendation 4).

Recommendation 4

The team recommends that the college, with support from the district, develop short-term and long-term staffing contingency plans to alleviate (through appropriate plan implementation) the classified staff shortages that currently exist and to meet the demand for staff that will come with the opening of the new buildings (Standards 7A.1, 9A.1, 9A.2).

Identification of staff needs begins at the department and operating-units level through the annual Educational Master Plan (EMP) process. Requests go to the area administrator who prioritizes all area requests. This prioritized list gets forwarded to the appropriate vice president for further review. Area specific classified staff needs then go to the vice president of administration, who chairs the classified hiring prioritization committee. The committee prioritizes all requested classified positions into a single college list and forwards it to the college president for review, possible reprioritization, and approval. From there, the list goes to the District where it is evaluated with the other colleges' lists. The District does not use a particular formula when distributing classified staff positions to the four colleges. FLC sees this as an advantage since staff can be assigned where it is most needed. For example, the college received 32% of the general fund positions district-wide during the five-year period ending, June 2008. Therefore the college was awarded 43 classified new positions, which was a 72% increase in college classified staffing. Growth in classified staff hiring may change substantially, however, as the budget crisis worsens. Further, it appears that evidence provided under this recommendation refers to short-term staffing needs and there is no mention of a long-term contingency plan.

There does, however, appear to be a long-term staffing plan to address planned growth due to new construction. Funds budgeted for staffing needs of any new buildings are "banked" prior to the completion of the buildings. Therefore, necessary staffing is provided for the new buildings once they come online.

Recommendation 5

The team recommends that the college community give high priority to fostering trust by clearly outlining and guaranteeing the roles and responsibilities of faculty, staff, and administrators through the development and implementation of consistent processes that provide for the inclusion of all appropriate constituencies (Standards 10B.6 and 10B.8).

The college has responded to this recommendation by means of the formulation of the *College Participatory Governance and Collegial Consultation* (*CPGCC*) document (revised most recently in September 2009), which clearly specifies the membership and responsibility of all the participatory governance (PG) committees. There is full and enthusiastic participation by faculty, staff, and students on all PG committees. Faculty members chair the committees pertaining to teaching and learning, whereas administrators co-chair committees pertaining to the operational matters of the college. In addition, the *CPGCC* document

clearly defines and delineates the respective roles of the academic senate and the college president. The *Insider* website provides college-wide access to all documents pertaining to institutional planning, decision making and shared governance processes. In all interviews, including meetings of the Institutional Planning Committee (IPC), the Academic Senate, two college-wide forums, team visits to the Rancho Cordova Center and the El Dorado Center, there was a strong expression of support for and engagement in the shared governance processes delineated in the *CPGCC* document. There was also evidence of trust and communication between the constituencies. Faculty openly praised and displayed confidence in administrators. Deans and faculty leaders respected upper management.

In summary, the college has demonstrated considerable and exemplary efforts in encouraging broad-based participation in and communication of processes designed to improve student learning.

VI. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

Authority
Folsom Lake College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges and is approved under regulations of the California State Department of Education and the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

Mission
Folsom Lake College's educational mission as a community college is aligned with the Los Rios Community College District's educational mission statement. The Los Rios Community College District Board of Trustees approved the college's most recent revision to its mission statement in September 2006.

Governing Board
Folsom Lake College is one of four colleges in the Los Rios Community College District. The district is governed by a publicly elected seven-member Board of Trustees, joined by a non-voting student trustee. The Board of Trustees functions as an independent policy-making body capable of reflecting constituent and public interest in board activities and decisions, and is sufficient enough in size to fulfill its responsibilities consistent with the California Education Code. A majority of the board members have no employment, family, or personal financial interest in the institution.

Chief Executive Officer
Folsom Lake College has a chief executive officer whose full-time responsibility is to the institution. The Folsom Lake College president is appointed by the Los Rios Community College District Board of Trustees and reports to the district chancellor. The chancellor is appointed by and reports to the Board of Trustees.

Administrative Capacity
Folsom Lake College has sufficient academic and support services administrative staff members with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the college mission.

Operational Status
Folsom Lake College is operational, with over 9000 students enrolled. Most are actively pursuing vocational certificates, associate degrees, and/or transfer to four-year institutions.

Degrees
Folsom Lake College offers the Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degrees. It has 31 degree programs. A majority of students are enrolled in courses that are required for a certificate or degree program, and/or required for transfer to four-year institutions as described in the college catalog.

Educational Programs

Folsom Lake College's degree programs are congruent with its mission and are based on recognized higher education fields of study. The curriculum committee, a committee of the Folsom Lake College academic senate, ensures the programs are of appropriate content and length, and are conducted at levels of quality and rigor appropriate to the degrees offered. The degree programs meet California Code of Regulations, Title 5 curriculum requirements, and when combined with the general education component, represent two years of full-time academic work. The college also offers 38 vocational certificates in career and technical education.

Academic Credit

Folsom Lake College awards academic credits based on accepted practices of California community colleges under California Code of Regulations, Title 5. Detailed information about academic credits is published in the college catalog and schedules.

Student Learning and Achievement

Folsom Lake College has developed a framework by which student learning and achievement outcomes for all courses, programs, degrees and certificates are regularly and systematically assessed. Authentic assessment is underway for some programs, and results are being used for improvement. Outcomes for all degree and certificate programs are published in the college catalog. Outcomes for courses are described in the course outlines, which are on file in the instruction office.

General Education

Students must complete a minimum of 21 semester units of general education courses and demonstrate competency in writing, reading, and mathematical skills to receive an associate degree. The general education units include an introduction to major areas of knowledge, and degree credit for the college's general education courses is consistent with the levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education. The general education program has comprehensive student learning outcomes that will be assessed regularly.

Academic Freedom

Faculty and students at Folsom Lake College are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study. The college catalog contains the American Association of University Professors Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom, and also the Los Rios Colleges Federation of Teachers Statement on Academic Freedom. The Los Rios Community College District expresses its support for the principle in its Board Policy P-7142.

Faculty

Folsom Lake College has 107 full-time faculty and over 186 adjunct faculty. Faculty must meet the minimum requirements for their disciplines based on regulations for the Minimum Qualifications for California Community College Faculty established in California Code of Regulations, Title 5. A clear statement of faculty responsibilities exists in the faculty contract, and this includes assessment of student learning outcomes.

Student Services
Folsom Lake College provides a comprehensive array of student services for all its students, as well as basic skills courses for those students requiring better preparation for college level work.

Admissions
Folsom Lake College has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission as a public California community college and in compliance with California Code of Regulations, Title 5. Admissions policies are published in the college catalog and class schedules.

Information and Learning Resources
Folsom Lake College provides specific long-term access to sufficient print and electronic information and learning resources through its libraries and academic support programs to meet the educational needs of students and programs.

Financial Resources
Folsom Lake College, through the Los Rios Community College District, publicly documents a funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to support its mission and educational programs, and to assure financial stability.

Financial Accountability
The Los Rios Community College District regularly undergoes and makes available an external financial audit for the district and its colleges by a certified public accountant. The audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and Government Auditing Standards issues by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Institutional Planning and Evaluation
Folsom Lake College assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding improvement through an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and reevaluation. The college systematically evaluates how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes through various integrated processes that include strategic plan review, program review, student learning outcomes assessment, and educational master plan review. College planning and evaluation processes align with Los Rios Community College District processes.

Public Information
Folsom Lake College publishes in its catalog and schedule, and posts on its Web site, precise and up-to-date information on the following: General Information (including educational mission; course, program, and degree offerings; academic calendar and program length; academic freedom statement; available student financial aid; available learning resources; names and degrees of administrators and faculty; and names of Board of Trustees members); Requirements (including admissions; student fees and other financial obligations; and degree, certificate, graduation, and transfer requirements); Major Policies Affecting Students.

Relations with the Accrediting Commission

The college and the Board of Trustees hereby affirm that Folsom Lake College has consistently adhered to the eligibility requirements, standards, and policies of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. The College describes itself in identical terms to all its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accredited status, and agrees to disclose information required by the commission to carry out accrediting responsibilities. All disclosures by the College are complete, accurate, and honest.

VII. Evaluation by Standard of the College Using ACCJC Standards and Making Team Recommendations

STANDARD I: INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS

General Comments

The accreditation self-study presents only a few thoughtful plans for self-improvement, mostly regarding some minor revisions of ongoing self-evaluation of college governance structures; however, the Standard I self-evaluation provides evidence of strong movement in the direction of institutional effectiveness. The self-study report identifies five separate planning agendas for four out of the seven standard sub-sections for institutional effectiveness.

Folsom Lake College has done a tremendous amount of work toward creating a viable, effective college governance structure, which includes the following: (1) clearly-defined participatory governance duties for representatives from every constituency; and (2) clearly defined roles of academic senate and college president vis-à-vis administrative and academic decision-making. A commendable number of documents have been produced within the past three years; therefore, evidence of ongoing evaluation of institutional decision-making structures is present. Specifically, the following documents are enumerated in the self-study:

Newly created documents:

- *Education Initiative Plan*, spring 2004
- Career and technical education advisory boards, ongoing since spring 2008
- Institutional Planning Committee, spring 2005 (replacing the Educational Planning Committee)
- Professional Development Committee, spring 2005 (replacing the Professional Activities Committee)
- *FLC Strategic Plan*, spring 2006
- *Matriculation Plan*, fall 2006
- *Marketing Plan*, spring 2007
- *2008-09 Basic Skills Initiative Plan*, fall 2008
- *Intercollegiate Athletics Plan*, fall 2008
- *FLC Planning and Evaluation Cycle and Timeline*, fall 2008
- *Key Performance Indicators* annual report, fall 2007
- Program review for instruction (fall 2005), student services (spring 2008), administrative services (spring 2009), and president's services (spring 2009)
- *Enrollment Management Plan*, spring 2009
- *Technology Plan*, spring 2009

The following parts of the cycle have been reviewed and revised:

- Annual review of *2003 Accreditation Self Study* planning items, ongoing review since fall 2004
- Visual and Performing Arts Center planning, ongoing development since spring 1999
- Ongoing revision of the *Budget and Facilities Planning Handbook*, spring 2005, spring 2007, spring 2008, and spring 2009
- *Folsom Lake College - Institutional Self Study Report*
- Revised educational master plan process, fall 2004 and fall 2007
- Revised budget and facilities planning process, spring 2006
- Revised *College Vision, Mission and Values Statements*, spring 2006

Findings and Evidence

The college has developed a mission statement and has instituted policies and procedures, which ensure that this mission statement is considered during the planning process. The college mission statement infers an intended student population that extends to most everyone in the community, age 16 or older. The self-study states that this includes but is not limited to junior and senior high school students who want to take transfer-level courses through the college's advanced education program; former high school students working towards their high school GE; high school graduates as well as older, return-to-school students working on transfer and degree programs; employed and unemployed students enrolled in career and technical education programs designed to enhance employment and career skills; working professionals enrolled in courses to maintain work certificates and licenses; non-traditional students enrolled in basic skills and ESL courses; and life-long learning students of all ages enrolled in personal interest courses. Community demographic information is gathered by the Office of Institutional Research. This information is used in the development of program reviews and to assure that an appropriately broad range of educational opportunity is available to the community.

The college has established instructional programs for associate degrees and transfer to four-year colleges, career education, and remedial basic skills education as well as student development programs and services, which directly link to the college's mission statement. The Educational Master Plan (EMP) and Program Review processes require program decision-makers to connect program outcomes and plans to the college mission statement. The college's annual *Key Performance Indicators* (KPI) report, which provides a very broad look at institutional effectiveness and student success, is used to monitor how effectively strategic planning activities and strategies are moving the college towards achieving its goals. District research produces external and internal scans for the college that provide analyses of the planning environment. Surveys of students conducted by District research and the FLC OIR also help the college to align programs and services with student needs. The self-study also states that representatives from the college meet regularly with workforce advisory groups to ensure that services and programs meet student needs as well as those of local business and industry. Indeed, top administrators from the college and District are members of local business groups and workforce investment boards (I.A.1).

The Board of Trustees approved the college's mission statement on September 6, 2006. The statement is published in the college catalogue; posted on the college website, the *Insider*, and various college meeting rooms; and provided on all program review and educational master planning (EMP) forms (I.A.2).

Adopted in 2006, the college mission statement will be reviewed in spring 2010. The *FLC Planning and Evaluation Timelines* matrix demonstrates that the mission statement will be reviewed during the spring term every three years. The college already anticipates several circumstances that could impact changes in the current mission statement, such as a continuation of high levels of growth or significant changes in the demographics of the community. The evidence presented points toward the college meeting Standard I.A.3.

The self-study states that there is a broad acknowledgement among college employees that the college mission informs planning and related decision-making. This statement is supported by the positive responses to several employee survey items, especially Survey item #1, where a mean response of 3.26 out of 4 concurred with this statement: "The college's mission statement effectively informs planning and decision making" (I.A.4).

Broadly stated, Standard I.B addresses institutional effectiveness. Evaluation of institutional effectiveness is measured by (1) how well the institution encourages broad-based participation in and communication of processes designed to improve student learning; (2) how well the institution uses regular and systematic evaluations of its key planning and resource allocation processes so that the processes support student learning; and (3) the extent to which the institution demonstrates a concerted effort to measure and evaluate student learning. A cycle of assessment has been established by the *FLC Planning and Evaluation Cycle* document, and the college's planning, implementation, and evaluation processes align with the Los Rios Community College District processes, along with Board of Trustees policies and regulations.

College-wide dialogue constitutes an important component of the campus culture at FLC and appears to be a considerable strength of the institution. Since 2005, FLC has instituted a completely new strategic planning process during a time of considerable growth in facilities and student enrollment. Among others, the self-study notes the creation of the Participatory Governance (PG) committee structure with widespread representative participation from all college constituency groups. All minutes and agendas from the PG committees are posted on FLC's well-designed and navigation-friendly *Insider* webpage. Documented minutes and agendas provide evidence that the participatory governance committees undertake and complete an "enormous" amount of work every semester. The self-study also mentions the importance of the Academic Senate in fostering dialogue between the faculty, college administrators, and members of the PG committees. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) also plays a role in fostering dialogue by executing student and employee surveys, providing data for the departmental Educational Master Plans (EMP), conducting validation studies of assessments tests, and providing research that informs the *Key Performance Indicators* (KPI) report. In addition, the self-study notes regular flex week presentations,

campus dialogues with the president, and periodic meetings between career and technical education (CTE) program faculty and their corresponding advisory boards (I.B1).

Supporting documents provide significant evidence that FLC meets this standard. The *College Participatory Governance and Collegial Consultation* (*CPGCC*) document clearly describes the membership, objectives, responsibilities, and purpose of each PG committee. All PG committees have broad-based membership lists. A cursory look at the minutes for the Institutional Planning Committee reveals the collegial and self-reflective nature of the dialogue:

> "The IPC will continue to serve as the central locale for college planning and the place to raise issues and direct them to the appropriate committee for discussion. However, we must work on increasing the IPC's visibility, better communicate the work of IPC, and foster people's desire to enter leadership and participate more fully so that they are an integral part of the processes and plans the IPC has a part in developing." (IPC Minutes 5/11/09)

The college spent considerable resources developing a central repository of information on the *Insider* website. This website contains links to all important planning documents (e.g., the strategic plan, the *CPGCC* document, and planning and evaluation timelines), program reviews and EMPs, KPI report, instructional support, and other resource links. This is an important development for the college that allows all campus employees access to information. Indeed, the *Insider* website received a campus-wide award for improving institutional effectiveness. While feedback regarding the website has been gathered and analyzed, further assessment (e.g., employee surveys and/or web-analytic research) is needed to ensure that people know of its existence and the information that it contains (I.B.1).

Lastly, results from the accreditation employee survey indicate that the college embraces dialogue aimed at improving student learning and college processes. Strong majorities agreed with the statement, "Sufficient opportunities exist at the college for collegial, thoughtful dialogue aimed at improving student learning outcomes" and the statement, "Sufficient opportunities exist at the college for collegial, thoughtful dialogue aimed at improving institutional processes." Interviews at both centers confirm that this opinion is widely held, even at off-site locations.

Development of the college's strategic plan began in earnest during fall 2005. Environmental scans and other research gathering activities as well as the framework for the PG committees (i.e., *CPGCC* document) were completed at the end of 2005. The college also employed Moore, Iacofano, Goltsman (MIG) Group to assist in the development of the strategic plan. To elicit participation in the development of the college's strategic plan, FLC hosted a full-day Charrette, conducted student focus groups, and deployed an employee survey during the following spring term. The college elicited and received widespread participation in developing the strategic plan. The Board of Trustees approved the strategic plan in September 2006 (I.B.2).

The self-study states that the college president develops a list of measurable outcomes relative to each of five Strategic Plan goals. These include student success; teaching and learning effectiveness; access and growth; community, economic and workforce development, and organizational effectiveness. These goals are achieved through the participatory governance process, which is designed to provide effective decision-making for the college. Strong positive responses (3.20 overall mean) to accreditation survey item #4, "Faculty, staff, and administration work collaboratively toward the achievement of institutional goals" reflect the institution's collaborative nature (I.B.2).

The self-study specifies five overarching goals for the college, which mirror those developed by the Los Rios Community College District: student success; teaching and learning effectiveness, access and growth; community, economic, and workforce development; and organizational effectiveness. The college president then develops a list of measurable outcomes relative to each of the college goals annually. Along with indicators of success and designated responsible parties, these outcomes are posted on the *Insider*. Achievement of the college goals then rests on the annual EMP process and the PG process (I.B.2).

Goal setting is a critical part of institutional planning. It is obvious that FLC understands the importance of goals to the institution and much effort has been directed to developing and achieving college goals in the past three years. In addition, these goals are consistent with the stated mission of the college. After reviewing the *Strategic Plan Progress Matrix* and the *FLC Strategic Plan*, measurable objectives have been derived from the college goals and assigned to designated lead person(s)/unit(s). Members of the Institutional Planning Committee evaluate progress toward goal achievement annually. FLC meets Standard I.B.2 as outlined by ACCJC.

Major considerations of progress regarding Standard I.B.3 include the following: *Strategic Plan Progress Matrix*, updated annually and posted on the *Insider* website; linkage to the college mission statement of both the program review and educational master plan processes; the college president's annual goals and achievements includes a list of measurable outcomes regarding each of the five main strategic plan goals, and their relevant success indicators and responsible units; evidence of integrated planning and resource allocation; and the college Office of Institutional Research provides quantitative data to all operating units, data from surveys and focus groups, and data from the *KPI* report.

The self-study provides the following evidence of goal assessment: the *FLC Planning and Evaluation Cycle*; the *Strategic Plan Progress Matrix*; the EMP process; the "College Goals and Achievements" document; and the *KPI* report. The self-study reports that the IPC implemented a formal reporting process regarding progress made on the strategic plan. This process assigns evaluation of specific portions of the strategic plan to the college's vice presidents and appropriate PG committee chairs. These evaluations are reported to the IPC annually in the form of the *Strategic Plan Progress Matrix*. It is unclear if this evaluation is presented college-wide (active participants in the PG process clearly knew of the progress matrix, but it is unknown whether other less active participants are aware of the document). Indeed, the *Strategic Plan Progress Matrix* was not posted on the *Insider*, as described by the

self-study. Interviews indicate that the college does not quantify progress toward established college goals; however, strategic goals are evaluated and progress is monitored in detail (I.B.3).

Systematic program review through the EMP process (annual) and the program review process (six years for instruction; two years for CTE programs) occurs regularly, incorporates the use of data, and influences program planning. All instructional, support, and administrative departments participate in both processes. Augmentations to existing budgets are tied to the EMPs and are prioritized at the divisional level. Data provided by the Office of Institutional Research are incorporated with each EMP and program review. Discussions regarding the effectiveness of the EMP and program review process have occurred in three of the PG committees and changes to the processes have been implemented. In addition, SLOs (and progress in relation to the SLO cycle) are required, binding program evaluations to student learning. The EMP process appears to mesh well with the short-term operational plans within each area. It is unclear how assessment data from SLOs will lead to *institution-wide* prioritized decision-making as well as impact the medium- and long-terms plans of the college (I.B.3).

The *KPI* report provides institutional data on eight critical measurements of student success and is updated every fall semester. Future plans call for disaggregating these indicators down to the program level on an automated basis. The team encourages FLC to continue these valuable evaluative activities (I.B.3).

The *College Participatory Governance and Collegial Consultation* (*CPGCC*) document provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based and offers opportunity for input by all appropriate constituencies, and most planning occurs via participatory governance committees. Previously submitted mid-term report responses have addressed former concerns regarding issues of trust between faculty and administration. The campus visit supports the concept that an exceptional system of participatory governance exists on the campuses of the college, accompanied by a high level of trust among most of the various constituent groups and representatives (I.B.4).

The self-study reports that the high-profile development of the college in the past few years has been supported by a broad-based, inclusive planning process, and it enumerates more than ten buildings completed or under development. The team visit corroborates an effective and collegial environment for students, faculty and staff. Members of the community also have the same beautiful campus environment in which to gather and learn (I.B.4).

Along with the significant number of new buildings, FLC has experienced a high level of student FTE growth, and has correspondingly instituted a high level of staffing growth. Student survey results support the college's claim that students are included in the planning and decision-making process as well. Though not as positive, faculty survey results still indicate positive agreement with the statement that "The college's participatory governance process works well." The site visit revealed some discontent, or least misunderstanding, by

classified staff about how the well participatory governance process is representing their interests (I.B.4).

The *FLC Planning and Evaluation Cycle* document tends to support the college's claim that the planning process in place leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness, as it graphically illustrates how the planning process of each PG committee relate to the overall planning cycles for the college (I.B.4).

The Los Rios CC District is dealing with current funding cuts from the state in an effective and surprisingly smooth manner, providing enough replacement funding from other sources to affect manageable budgetary cutbacks throughout most District operations. Thus, FLC constituent groups are insulated at this time from more severe effects which otherwise might have been necessary (I.B.4).

The Office of Institutional Research has been the lead in the process to compile and disseminate research results at FLC. The current website, the *Insider*, contains a large number of sources for documents and data for college staff and faculty to use for planning and analysis. Extensive internal access is provided for reporting on quality assurance. Website links are provided to the public for the Annual Report, the Student Profile Report and the Measure "A" Citizens' Oversight Committee (I.B.5).

Since the last comprehensive accreditation site visit, the college has created or reviewed and updated many parts of the cycle. The following parts have been newly created: *Education Initiative Plan*, spring 2004; Career and technical education advisory boards, ongoing since spring 2008; Institutional Planning Committee, spring 2005 (replacing the Educational Planning Committee); Professional Development Committee, spring 2005 (replacing the Professional Activities Committee); *FLC Strategic Plan*, spring 2006; *Matriculation Plan*, fall 2006; *Marketing Plan*, spring 2007; 2008-09 *Basic Skills Initiative Plan*, fall 2008; *Intercollegiate Athletics Plan*, fall 2008; *FLC Planning and Evaluation Cycle and Timeline*, fall 2008; *Key Performance Indicators* annual report, fall 2007; Program review for instruction (fall 2005), student services (spring 2008), administrative services (spring 2009), and president's services (spring 2009); *Enrollment Management Plan,* spring 2009; and the *Technology Plan*, spring 2009 (I.B.6).

The following parts of the cycle have been reviewed and revised: Annual review of *2003 Accreditation Self Study* planning items, ongoing review since fall 2004; Visual and Performing Arts Center planning, ongoing development since spring 1999; Ongoing revision of the *Budget and Facilities Planning Handbook*, spring 2005, spring 2007, spring 2008, and spring 2009; *Folsom Lake College - Institutional Self Study Report*; Revised educational master plan process, fall 2004 and fall 2007; revised budget and facilities planning process, spring 2006; and revised *College Vision, Mission and Values Statements*, spring 2006 (I.B.6).

The *FLC Planning and Evaluation Timelines* chart, posted in many locations across campus as well as on the *Insider*, clearly documents when key college planning processes are scheduled to be reviewed and evaluated. Furthermore, the *CPGCC* document also charges

each PG committee to "…assess and revise as necessary committee processes and plans on a cyclical basis." (*CPGCC* document, p. 3) FLC adequately meets Standard I.B.6.

The college, through its participatory governance structure, engages in ongoing dialogue regarding its instructional programs, student support services, and learning support services. The college may need more time to fully realize the value of its recently-developed evaluation tools; however, FLC is in an advanced stage of developing the tools to complete a full cycle of evaluation, analyses and improvements (I.B.7).

Conclusions

In conclusion, Folsom Lake College has completed a considerable amount of work to address the accreditation standards for the college mission and institutional effectiveness. The faculty, administrators, and students of the college have had the distinct privilege of trying to shape something new in an exciting, growing and rapidly developing environment. College-wide dialogue constitutes an important part of the campus culture at FLC and appears to be a considerable strength of the institution. It was also readily apparent that members of the college were proud of the *CPGCC* document and its ability to create open dialogue and trust among all key stakeholders in the institution. To continue its extraordinary progress in fostering open dialogue and trust, the team recommends that FLC provide more concrete evidence in order to show that "…all constituent groups value and the honor the *CPGCC* document…" and that future assessments should be conducted to ascertain both the knowledge and effectiveness of this document in promoting collegial, self-reflective dialogue. Further, in order to more clearly elucidate and strengthen trust in the decision-making process, the team also recommends that the college develop a visual flow-chart that illustrates how the PG committees are related to each other, how decisions are made, and how members can engage the strategic planning process.

In order to strengthen the strategic planning process of evaluation, the team offers the following suggestions that may be helpful to FLC. First, in the process outlined by the self-study, specific strategies appear to be missing from the strategic plan (i.e., who, what, when, and how will objectives be achieved). Strategies are the engines that move the college toward its goals. As such, they need to specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time-sensitive. Responsible units/people are designated to achieving various aspects (strategies) of the strategic plan (as implied by the *Strategic Plan Progress Matrix*); however, it is unclear from the self-study on how this occurs. Is this a "ground up" or a "top down" process?

Secondly, the strategic planning agenda appears to be too aggressive – there are over 120 objectives listed in the *2008-09 Strategic Plan Progress Matrix*. In order to limit the workload and sharpen the focus of the PG committees, the team recommends paring this list of objectives to a more manageable number in the next strategic plan.

While FLC does track outcomes created by the strategic plan, a summary or metric of the annual evaluation of the strategic plan needs to be created and widely published to keep the college community informed about the progress the college is making in achieving its goals.

Currently, the status of objectives in the *Strategic Plan Progress Matrix* include the following designations: "Institutionalized"; "Completed"; "Partially achieved"; "In progress"; "Ongoing"; "Pending"; "Not yet done"; "Under consideration"; "In planning"; "Not applicable/ongoing"; and "No action." These categories are not helpful in assessing progress toward goal achievement. Therefore, the team strongly recommends that FLC develop mutually exclusive categories of progress whereby progress toward college goals can be measured and reported.

Further, the team visit revealed that some campus constituents are not aware of how budgets are allocated. Additionally, not all constituencies are aware of the relationship between budget and planning. In order to strengthen the governance process at FLC, the team recommends more effort in communicating about the budget process and how it relates to the strategic planning of the college.

Lastly, while SLOs and progress in relation to the SLO cycle are required in the annual EMP process, it is essential that the college integrate student learning outcomes with the *medium- and long-term* strategic plans of the college, not solely with short-term operational plans. Furthermore, data from SLOs should lead to *institution-wide* prioritized decision-making.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: The team recommends the college must complete the "development level" of student learning outcomes by establishing "authentic assessment strategies." The team recommends an action plan to reach the 2012 sustainability deadline be developed by fall 2010 (I.B.5, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, III.A.1.c.).

Recommendation 2: The team recommends the college evaluate the educational effectiveness of electronically delivered courses including assessment of student learning outcomes, retention and success, and develop a distance education strategic plan (I.B.7, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.d, II.B.1, II.B.2, II.B.2.a, II.B.2.d, II.B.2.e, II.B.2.f, II.B.3.a, II.C.1, II.C.2.c, III.C.1.c, IV.A.2.b).

Recommendation 4: In order to ensure the integration of SLOs into the FLC strategic plan, the team recommends that the college strengthen its long-term strategic planning by integrating student learning outcomes into the cycle of planning to assist in the development of prioritized decisions (I.B.3, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, IV.A.2.b).

STANDARD II: STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Standard II.A – Instructional Programs

General Comments

Since the college has established its accreditation status in 2004, considerable progress has been made within Student Learning Programs and Services. The college's *Mission Statement* is inclusive of Student Learning Programs and Services by focusing on transfer, training to enhance employment and career skills, and preparatory programs for student success. The college mission is also aligned with the Los Rios Community College District mission statement which includes transfer education, basic skills and English language proficiency, economic and workforce development, lifelong learning, and associate degrees and certificates.

The college offers comprehensive instructional and student services programs in both traditional and distance modes that are regularly reviewed. Instructional programs are of high quality and are enhanced by Library and Student Support and Learning Programs. In general, FLC has defined Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for courses and programs and in Student Services. Since assessment of SLOs has not yet occurred, the college appears to be in the latter stages of the SLO development rubric. The college has piloted assessments of SLO data in a select few programs.

Program Review is well-developed at the college with a clearly defined, well-publicized cycle to which instructional and student service programs appear to comply. The college recognizes that program review requires further outcomes evidence from SLO assessment. Program review is an important planning element that will need clearer integration with institutional planning steps, decision-making, and resource allocation processes; however, its processes are implemented on a regular, clearly defined cycle that is projected through the next accreditation timeline. Dialogue about program review is evident in the participatory governance committees and is informed by institutional research input. This basic framework supports a strong foundation to enhance the integration of program review into systematic goal-setting based on SLO assessment at the various levels, since the existing process considers student achievement measures.

The college considers the effectiveness of its program review process and already plans to enhance it with data from SLO assessment. Given the existing sophisticated program review process and the potential for formal integration into planning, decision-making and resource allocation processes, the addition of SLO data will greatly enhance the feedback loop, which will focus and empower the institution to improve these same student learning outcomes. With these improvements the program review process should achieve the elements of both Proficiency and Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement stages of the Program Review rubric of the ACCJC Institutional Effectiveness measures.

Findings and Evidence

The College should be commended on its strong commitment to active dialogue on critical accreditation issues pertaining to Student Learning Outcomes and program review. The Curriculum Committee has created subcommittees on program development and planning (PDP) and the Student Learning Outcomes Committee (SLO). The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) provides data for program review as well as for the Educational Master Plans (EMPs).

The main campus and two satellite center instructional programs target the local student population and local industry needs. The college conducts environmental scans to identify community needs and creates long terms plans for development of facilities and programs to anticipate and address these needs. The El Dorado Center (EDC) is a comprehensive educational center offering general education and transfer preparation instruction as well as some career and technical education (CTE) programs. This center is impressively endowed with a breadth of facilities that allow for science lab instruction as well as programs in fire technology relevant to the surrounding wilderness areas. Complemented with a small but well-rounded library, a learning/tutoring center, open access computer labs, a fitness center and most student services, EDC, with 1,400 full-time equivalent students (FTES) resembles a small college rather than a satellite center. This is consistent with its history which predates the main Folsom Lake College campus (II.A.1).

The Rancho Cordova Center (RCC) is a developing "store front" facility serving about 850 students or 270 FTES. It offers a limited range of classes in a reported seventeen disciplines that include a credit ESL program to serve the high proportion of immigrants in the community. Several CTE programs have been developed to train students for employment in local businesses. While the center lacks an on-site library facility or permanent bookstore, plans to grow RCC into a full, permanent center are evident through the emergent enrollment and additional offerings which incorporate a range of CTE programs (II.A.1).

The Folsom Lake College main campus serves about 4,300 FTES and is a growing comprehensive college. The breadth of instructional programs and services as well as the facilities development program mirror the expanding links to local industry that the centers and CTE dean and departments maintain. The OIR and the district provide research to track local industry needs (II.A.1).

The FLC Program Development and Planning (PDP) committee, a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee, is responsible for reviewing and recommending development of new instructional programs. The district's Program Placement Committee (PPC) is responsible for reviewing program proposals from all four Los Rios colleges for placement at specific colleges. The placement decisions are designed to prevent unnecessary and costly duplication. The college utilizes its comprehensive program review process as the means to assess the continued relevance of instructional programs (II.A.1.a).

The college uses a variety of environmental scans, census data, and high school graduation data to identify programmatic needs of students and to develop instructional programs in basic skills, transfer, and career and technical education. The college shows evidence that a culture of evidence has emerged early in its history (II.A.1.a).

Despite the existence of a formal process for program appraisal to discontinue instructional programs, there is no evidence of its implementation at this young institution. In July 2009, however, the child development center was eliminated after discussions with the affected employees and an emergency consultation between the college president and the academic senate president. This action was taken as a result of the documented fiscal crisis – the center would have consumed 40% of the instructional division's 2009-10 college discretionary funds while focused primarily on serving children from the community. The academic senate agrees that the consultation was in conformance with participatory governance standards established at the college. This program appraisal process should be expanded in practice to facilitate future deliberative reviews of declining programs (II.A.1.b).

The college utilizes instructional television (iTV) and distance education modes of delivery. FLC uses iTV primarily to transmit live/interactive instruction and prerecorded classes to the Rancho Cordova and El Dorado Centers. It also broadcasts to the community through public access television (II.A.1.b).

iTV and online/course management systems support distance education courses. In addition to dedicated staff at each center, additional staff includes a Dean of Instruction and Technology and an information technology staff member who support distance education and technology services at all three locations. Faculty report a high level of satisfaction with technology support services. The visiting team observed high quality of functionality of the iTV services, modern open access labs, and access to online services and classes at all three sites. In addition to facilities and support services, the main campus boasts of an innovation center staffed by a full-time faculty member dedicated to support innovations in instruction and the development of distance education (II.A.1.b).

As key academic leaders acknowledge, the college lacks a formalized plan at this time to develop comprehensive distance education programs. The college describes its process of distance education course development through faculty or departmental innovation and approval through the appropriate curriculum committee. Despite the absence of a formal plan, upon the request of the visiting team, an analysis presented by the college reflects five degree programs and eight certificate programs that exceed 50% in online instruction, with several certificates being available 100% online (II.A.1.b).

Even without a formalized plan, the college does appear to be in a good position to offer online programs. This is evidenced by the increasing course and program offerings, advanced facilities, online student support services, and staff development. Section B4 on "Teaching Tools and Technology" of the college's strategic plan includes several elements of a distance education master plan that may be developed into a comprehensive plan (II.A.1.b).

The college has satisfied most elements of the Development stage of the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness on Student Learning Outcomes. Supported by a faculty member with 40% reassigned time, the SLO committee helps to guide the development of instructional course and program SLOs. Student services programs have also developed SLOs for each service. The college has made sufficient resources available for the development of SLOs, as demonstrated by the progress in SLO definitions, the pilot assessments in four instructional departments, and nascent assessments in student service areas (II.A.1.c).

Effective fall 2009, the Curriculum Committee, supported by the Academic Senate, has mandated that courses taught must have SLOs defined in order to enforce universal development of SLOs. While 90% of courses have SLOs defined at this time, this approach will ensure that all courses will have defined SLOs in time to comply with commission requirements. All instructional programs have published program SLOs in the college catalog. Winter 2010 serves as the starting date in the college's timeline for assessing course SLOs when the college will define assessment methodologies across all programs (II.A.1.c).

The college conducted the development of course SLO definitions in a deliberative, collegial manner that referenced academic work on assessment. This approach should extend to discussions regarding SLO assessment. The SLO coordinator's reassigned time should be reviewed to ascertain if it is sufficient to support this coming step. The availability of an institutional researcher will most certainly help with this next phase (II.A.1.c).

There is clear evidence that both academic and administrative leadership support the development of SLO assessments. Meeting agendas and minutes reflect a systematic effort in this direction, as do plans and observed actions by faculty and administrators. Additionally, the academic senate has established a formal standing committee structure to guide the development of SLO definitions and assessments. This structure, in combination with a clearly identified plan and process for using SLO outcomes in program review, is further evidence that leadership groups have accepted responsibility for SLO definition and assessment and have established organizational structures to accomplish this goal (II.A.1.c).

With the exception of having established assessment strategies for all course and degree/certificate programs, the college has effectively satisfied all elements of the Development stage of the SLO rubric for evaluating institutional effectiveness and is prepared to engage in the practices of the next stage, Proficiency, in a timely fashion (II.A.1.c).

The college has scheduled an active program review agenda and has articulated a comprehensive planning cycle. This well publicized agenda poster accompanies the college mission and vision on posters around the campus. Instructional departments adhere to the two-year and six-year cycle of program review established formally for CTE and transfer programs respectively (II.A.2.a).

The Program Development and Planning subcommittee (PDP), a subcommittee of the academic senate's curriculum committee, continues to refine and improve the program review process. Instructional departments conduct this review process, which affirms the faculty's leadership role in establishing quality standards and in affirming program effectiveness and student achievement (II.A.2.b).

Courses, programs and degrees are clearly articulated with university transfer and/or career training needs. Course articulations are published and the content is overseen by the college's faculty-led curriculum committee. For CTE programs, the college maintains strong advisory committee ties with relevant industries, meeting twice annually (II.A.2.c).

Program review processes and cycles are well established, implemented systematically, and reviewed by relevant faculty led oversight committees. However, the following two areas should be addressed to improve the program review process: (A) broad implementation of the SLO assessment; and (B) better clarification of how resource allocations are tied to program review outcomes, strategic goals, or the college/district strategic plan (II.A.2.e).

A. Course and Program SLOs have been defined although program SLOs are not specifically identified as such in the college catalog. Course SLOs have been defined under a senate approved mandate that requires all scheduled courses to have defined SLOs, which are listed in official course outlines and published in syllabi. While commitment to and progress on SLO definition is commendable, limited assessment of SLOs has taken place to date.

   In the absence of systematic SLO assessment, program reviews cannot provide meaningful input to the prioritization of resource allocation as part of an integrated planning process. There is a broad variation in the quality of defined SLOs and the quality and accessibility of published program and course SLOs are impossible to ascertain and improve when SLOs have not been assessed.

B. The college has been successful in planning and implementing many instructional programs, services, and facilities in cooperation with the district and the sister colleges. It remains unclear how long-term planning is tied to student learning improvement at this young, rapidly growing college.

   The college follows the district lead on strategic planning. The college's *2006 Strategic Plan* was developed through the use of environmental scans and surveys of employees and students. The results were used to outline the detailed goals and objectives and main strategies. The *Strategic Plan Progress Matrix* shows that goal implementation is in progress with action items being completed and reported/approved by the Institutional Planning Committee. The opposite end of the planning spectrum identifies operational needs depicted in the annual departmental Educational Master Plans. However, the outcomes of these planning processes, particularly at the strategic level, are not assessed for efficacy, only for action and implementation (II.A.2.e).

There appears to be a gap in documenting the planning continuum between EMPs at the department level and strategic plans at the college and district levels. Planning discussions and deliberations are in fact taking place in the Institutional Planning Committee and in association with the college's administrative leadership. The administrators in turn carry forward planning conversations and resource priority lists to the district level. What is lacking is an easily transparent documented linkage between resource requests and both the college master plans and program specific plans. An intermediate planning document that encapsulates the extensive consultation on planning might help to clarify what is otherwise carried forward by mutual understanding of planning committee deliberations. Such a document would allow members of the college who are not directly involved in planning deliberations to understand the planning direction of the college.

Faculty and staff in instructional programs and student services are engaged in SLOs. SLO definitions have been established by each program not by external factors. This approach appears to have succeeded in giving ownership of the SLO process to the program participants and will support future improvements in the programs when SLO assessment identifies needs for improvement (II.A.2.f).

FLC does not currently employ departmental course or program examinations (II.A.2.g).

Established matriculation and articulation processes complement oversight through academic senate committees in an effort to maintain quality of curriculum. Attitudinal surveys affirm faculty's commitment to high academic standards (II.A.2.h).

Student learning outcomes, transfer, and/or career objectives of courses and programs are defined and aligned with course and program learning objectives. As identified by the college, SLO assessment informs faculty understanding of student learning and enables them to make continuous improvements in instructional programs to better support the students and strengthen the link between awarded degrees/certificates and documented learning outcomes (II.A.2.i).

The General Education subcommittee reviews the general education courses and verifies SLOs for courses that correspond to each academic area. Once SLOs are assessed, the resulting data will be used to evaluate the general education courses (II.A.3.a, II.A.3.b, II.A.3.c).

Board policies satisfactorily address degree and grade requirements. The curriculum committee reviews all degree program proposals (II.A.4).

Career and technical faculty work with advisory boards to ensure that course content and outcomes meet industry standards. When appropriate, the programs and courses are designed to be compliant with external licensing and certificate requirements. Standards appear high. Student surveys have provided input on the adequacy of the programs and employment outcomes (II.A.5).

FLC provides clear and accurate information about its educational programs. Transfer requirements to the UC/CSU systems along with the IGETC satisfying courses are communicated through the college catalog, course syllabi, and college brochures (II.A.6.a). In addition, the curriculum committee reviews all prospective program changes and discusses the ramifications for students. Counselors are informed in a timely manner and work with students to ensure they are aware of course substitutions and program completion (II.A.6.b).

Lastly, the college Public Information Officer (PIO) diligently ascertains the various publication vehicles to accurately and attractively represent the college. Prior to final publication, the PIO collaborates with the various student services offices, department heads, and faculty to validate and review college information. The PIO works with the student services office to create templates of flyers and brochures for distribution (II.A.6.c).

Policies affecting the academic integrity of the college, academic freedom, presenting issues fairly and honestly, and the freedom to teach are in place. The college has adopted independent policies on academic freedom and the ethical responsibilities of faculty. The accreditation student survey indicates that college faculty members are fair and appropriate in their presentation of controversial matters (II.A.7.a).

The college's policies are clear regarding student honesty and possible consequences for violating these policies. The academic honesty policy is posted in a number of places on campus as well as published in the college catalogue and on the college website. According to the student survey, some students indicated that they were unaware of the honesty policy (II.A.7.b). The college does not attempt to instill any particular belief or world view and board policies clearly address student conduct. The college has developed, through its faculty and staff, statements of professional ethics for faculty, classified staff, and administrators (II.A.7.c).

Conclusions

The college appropriately introduces students to the elements of a broad education in all general education courses while simultaneously continuing its commitment to lifelong learning. The college has a clearly defined enrollment management plan, which ensures that offerings at all three sites will support time to completion. Reports conducted by the institutional researcher support planning and sequencing of degree and certificate programs. Several established processes as well as academic and administrative structures oversee scheduling and strategic planning for degrees and certificates at the three sites. Student survey results confirm satisfaction with instruction and learning support.

With the two exceptions noted previously, the program review processes and cycles are well established, implemented systematically, and reviewed by relevant faculty led oversight committees. Two areas should be addressed to improve the program review process: (A) broad implementation of the SLO assessment; and (B) transparent documentation of the connection of resource allocation to program review outcomes and the medium- or long-term goals specified in the college's strategic plan.

Recommendations:

See Recommendation 1.

See Recommendation 2.

Recommendation 3: The team recommends the college comply with the Distance Education requirements such as obtaining substantive change approvals when 50% or more of a certificate or degree is obtainable in a distance delivery mode (II.A.1.b, II.A.2.d).

See Recommendation 4.

Standard II.B - Student Support Services

General Comments

In general, the self-study report addressing Standard II.B is comprehensive and well written. Student support services continue to demonstrate student-centered, access-driven goals for the availability of student support services online. The college provides efficient services for students by offering the following services online: registration/enrollment, including course additions and drops; financial aid application; assessment services; student orientation; parking permit purchase; as well as advisement and counseling (II.B.3, II.B.3.a).

Like the main campus, the Rancho Cordova and El Dorado Centers appear to have sufficient breadth of services to accommodate the needs of students. The college attentively adapts the type and level of service to the different and changing needs of the students from the communities at these two sites.

Findings and Evidence

The college engages in data-driven equitable access of student support services. The Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory is given every three years throughout the Los Rios district. The data is collected and used to improve student service program efficiency and to accommodate student needs. Future planning agendas include the implementation of on "on-line student services self assessment tool" (OLSS-SAT) which will be used to improve online services (II.B.3.a).

The college provides an atmosphere for student government that reflects an active and participatory environment. Students are engaged in dialogue and governance processes and participate in all committees on campus where broad constituencies are represented. Student government is highly respected by faculty, staff and administration constituencies (II.B.3.b).

Furthermore, students enjoy an active campus life at all three sites. The college has seventeen active clubs and twenty-five senators who represent various departments on campus and serve as advocates for the student-body. Student life programs include celebrating the arts,

aesthetics and diversity. The Associated Student Government (ASG) president is located on the Folsom Lake main campus. The president hosts bi-monthly ASG meetings for all three sites and coordinates activities with student representatives from the El Dorado and Rancho Cordova centers. The student life programs and activities encourage personal and civic responsibility, intellectual, aesthetic and personal development. The community-at-large is actively engaged in many of the activities sponsored by the student life committees, which include volunteer and financial health fairs, international events, health and wellness day, blood drives, earth week, and a host of other engaging activities. The student life also provides an opportunity for students to travel to Washington D.C. to attend the model congress and to attend local events at the California State Capitol to represent students and advocate for student rights (II.B.3.b, II.B.3.d).

Counseling services are offered at all three college sites through a staff of nine full-time counselors. FLC offers an impressive array of counseling services including academic, career, personal, crisis, multicultural, and personal development. Counseling services have been greatly impacted by the increase in student enrollment. To address this increasing clientele, counseling services now provides year-round, drop-in counseling (II.B.3.c).

The Associated Student Government has worked effectively with the counseling staff to improve counseling services and address student needs. This collaboration has led to the following changes: (1) coordination with a student counselor liaison; and (2) operation of a counseling booth in the Falcon's Roost during the lunch hour for more accessibility and convenience for students. In addition, "Get Connected" counseling events take place each spring at the FLC-main and EDC campuses. Lastly, the college publishes a counseling services webpage on the college website to improve visibility of counseling services (II.B.3.c).

The campus recognizes diversity by providing a variety of opportunities for engagement and participation. For example, the library houses a book/DVD collection on teaching multiculturalism and diversity. The college also developed a multicultural website which contains many links on multiculturalism and diversity. There is a multicultural student club that sponsors events that focus on international awareness. The administration encourages college faculty and staff to attend conferences related to diversity (e.g., The Conference on Race and Ethnicity in American Higher Education) as well as other professional development activities such as, "Globalization and Women," "Multiculturalism and Sexual Diversity," and "Death and Dying from a Tibetan Buddhist Perspective" (II.B.3.d).

The college uses assessment instruments in math, reading, writing and ESL. The college reevaluates all of its assessment instruments on a five-year cycle. Validation activities are conducted by discipline with the assistance of the OIR. The college follows state regulations for validating its assessment instruments (II.B.3.e).

Conclusions

This standard demonstrates a student-centered environment, open access and a variety of research-driven processes that enable the college and both centers to address retention, persistence and overall student success. Faculty and staff in this area are dedicated to the students and work cooperatively to serve them in a collegial atmosphere. The three sites work collaboratively to ensure that high quality and accessible services that provide opportunities for civic engagement for students as well as activities that celebrate diversity and cultural awareness. In order to strengthen the effectiveness of assessing electronically delivered courses, further evaluation is needed relating to student learning outcomes, retention and success, and the development of an educational strategic plan.

The college partially meets accreditation standards in this area.

Recommendations

See Recommendation 2.

Standard II.C - Library and Learning Support Services

General Comments

Library services have been well supported in their growth mode for the past six years. The college received enhanced state funding for the past six years to build the library to the benchmark collection level. With this collection level achieved, the funding has now leveled off.

Findings and Evidence

Tutoring services are provided at all three college sites. The college's tutoring services and computer labs are adequately funded and staffed. The tutoring center at FLC-main has one full-time coordinator and the EDC tutoring center has a 0.20 FTE reassigned faculty tutor coordinator. All tutoring centers are staffed by student tutors, classified temporary tutors, and tutors from four-year institutions. At FLC-main, the reading, writing, and math center is staffed by one full-time English professor and an instructional assistant. To serve the specific needs of the Rancho Cordova community, tutoring at RCC is limited only to ESL. Currently there is no Learning Skills Program on either of the campuses; however, there are future plans for 2010 to develop and implement a program to address the demand for learning skills. Academic courses and basic skills subjects are tutored at FLC-main and EDC. The tutoring center operates on a drop-in, first-come, first-served basis. The tutoring center is not equipped to accommodate the college's lab science students; however, the science skills center at FLC-main provides a location for science tutoring and specialized assistance in using equipment. The tutoring centers do not provide instruction in information competency, but the reading, writing, and math center at FLC-main (and the English center at EDC) do provide some instruction in information competency. These centers assist students with

research assignments, internet research techniques, and MLA writing format. Open computer labs are maintained on all three campus sites with FLC-main having more extensive hours (II.C.1, II.C.1.a).

In fall 2007, the OIR in collaboration with library staff developed student and employee satisfaction surveys for the FLC-main and EDC libraries in order to assess the effectiveness of the college library collection in addressing student needs. Results indicated that 77 percent of student respondents believed that the quantity of library materials is "the right amount for my needs," whereas 53 percent of employees felt that the quantity of materials is "too little." Half of student respondents and 81 percent of employee respondents reported that the quality of library materials is "excellent." Nearly all of the students and employees responded that library information is "current." Four out of five students (84%) indicated that they either usually (58%) or always (26%) find what they are looking for in the library. Most faculty report that the library usually (53%) or always (18%) meets the needs of their students (II.C.1.a, II.C.2).

The library also provides instruction through credit classes. "Library Research and Information Competency" (Library 318) is offered online during the first eight weeks of fall, spring, and summer semesters. The library also provides library instruction sessions in support of all college classes. In addition, the libraries at FLC-main and EDC provide instruction through daily public service interaction such as, reference library services (one-on-one) instructions, telephone calls, and e-mail responses to students, staff and faculty. The Library has developed student learning outcomes (SLOs) for Library 318 course which are located in the library EMP and program review documents (II.C.1.a, II.C.1.b).

The library has developed core information competencies which are based upon the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) "Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education". The library uses these competencies as the primary outcome measurements for all library services: Competency 1 requires that students be able to articulate the nature and extent of the information they need; Competency 2 expects students to access to resources and services that satisfy their information need effectively and efficiently; and Competency 3 specifies that students develop personal responsibility and an appreciation for lifelong learning (II.C.1.b).

The libraries provide on-site and remote access to over 40 research databases, which include more than 14,000 periodical titles and 10,000 eBooks. Students can access these databases from any district computer and other remote locations. Students can access other materials and services such as, internet subject directories, eReserves (electronic course reserves), research guides, tutorials, handouts, ILL request "Ask a Librarian" e-mail service, telephone reference, and book renewals. Distance education students can also apply online to receive a barcode to access the library's electronic resources and services. Both the library and computer lab staffs provide assistance to patrons who have disabilities. The FLC-main library has a lower-level circulation counter for disabled patrons (II.C.1.c).

Security issues related to the library are minimal. There are future assessment plans to determine security needs and explore security options for the FLC-main library and computer lab space (Standard II.C.1.d).

Conclusions

The division of Student Support Services, library and learning support services provide comprehensive services that promote student success. Librarians express satisfaction with the level of Information Technology support for the libraries and student needs. College librarians did express some concerns. In general, there is some difficulty communicating with part-time faculty, although there appears to be a connection with English/Humanities part-time faculty who tend to use the library more than others. Librarians also report some concerns about working through the district process to stabilize materials budgeting at the level that American River College has established.

The college partially meets accreditation standards in this area.

Recommendations

See Recommendation 2.

Recommendation 8: In order to increase effectiveness of Standard II.C and Standard III.C, the team recommends the college complete a comprehensive evaluation of the learning support services provided in the following computer labs: FL1-35, FL1-107, FL2-240, FL5-09, FL1-07, FL5-109, EDC C-201, EDC C-202, FLC 1 PLE, EDC C204, and RCC 7 (II.C.1.c, II.C.2, III.C.2).

STANDARD III: RESOURCES

Standard III.A - Human Resources

General Comments

Folsom Lake College is strongly committed to using its human resources effectively in achieving the mission and serving students. The staff and faculty of the college are appropriately skilled for their work and they exhibit a high degree of enthusiasm for their work. The college, in partnership with the district, offers the full complement of services and benefits to promote a satisfying, safe, and fair working environment. The college values and respects diversity of all types and this is exhibited in the hiring practices that are established by the college and the district. Importantly, human resource planning links with institutional planning, primarily through the program review process.

Findings and Evidence

The human resource function of the Los Rios Community College District is very centralized at the district office for all four colleges. As a result, Folsom Lake College employees and job applicants interact primarily and initially with staff at the district office with questions and concerns related to employment. The college participates fully in the well established employment process for filling positions at the college. The campus does have an equity officer who trains equity representatives to participate on hiring committees. There is broad participation by the constituency groups in the hiring process. The board of trustees has established separate policies and procedures for the hiring and employment of faculty, classified staff, and administrators, as well as job descriptions, minimum qualifications, and evaluation processes for each group (III.A.1).

There is a well-understood and well-accepted process for the prioritization of faculty hires that is well-documented. The same is true for classified hires. Requests for new hires, either faculty or classified, are designed to emanate from the program review process and EMPs. At FLC, the majority of the new positions are in support of the many new programs and buildings that are being developed and built which are each driven by student growth (III.A.6). The college president has the ability to re-prioritize the recommendations for hire and is solely responsible for the prioritization of new administrative positions (III.A.1.a).

The various collective bargaining agreements, which are negotiated district-wide and board policy, make clear the evaluation processes that are to be followed. The vice presidents are generally responsible for ensuring that evaluations are conducted for the employees in their particular unit and are done so on a regular basis. Evaluation of the faculty, both teaching and non-teaching, includes a component on the effectiveness of the faculty member in achieving student learning outcomes (III.A.1.c). Vice presidents are evaluated by the president, and the president is evaluated by the chancellor who receives information only from the faculty regarding the president's performance. In addition, the college has established, publicizes, and upholds professional ethics codes of conduct for all of its employees. The parameters of

these codes are guides by board policy and collective bargaining agreements (III.A.1.d). All personnel records are maintained in the employee's personnel file that is maintained at the district office (III.A.1.b, III.A.3.b).

The college's percentage of full time faculty closely mirrors the district-wide percentage of 67.7 percent. The district monitors all employment statistics for compliance with regulations and guidelines and to provide adequate numbers of employees to meet the educational needs of the students and the operational needs of the college. Folsom Lake College has been the recipient of a number of new positions since 2004, essentially doubling each of the staffs in the faculty, classified, and administrative works. The district and the other colleges of the district have recognized and responded favorably to FLC's need to build its base of employees as the newest college in the district (III.A.2).

The district's board policy clearly and succinctly spells out the requirements for employment activities at the college. There are a number of documents that support the board policies, including the Equity Handbook, the Faculty Hiring Manual, and the Classified Hiring Manual. Hiring committee participants are clear about the role and the responsibilities of the hiring committees (III.A.3.a).

The highlight of the collective bargaining processes at FLC is the use of the "interest-based approach" (IBA) in its workings. The district offers training workshops in the IBA on a regular basis. In addition, the college/district sponsors a Faculty Internship Program to provide potential employees with learning opportunities through faculty mentors. FLC has a college equity officer, trained by district staff, who trains college hiring committee participants to serve as equity representatives. There are on-going training opportunities for employees in the areas of sexual harassment avoidance, non-discrimination, disability accommodation, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Employees receive a "Rights and Reminders" memo each semester from the human resource department that covers additional topics such as drug and alcohol free work place standards. There is a diversity subcommittee of the institutional planning committee which reviews the college diversity statement and promotes workshops and training to foster a better understanding of diversity and its importance within the college mission (III.A.4.a).

The college's record in employment equity and diversity is tracked by the district's human resources department and it publishes the results annually. In addition, semi-annually this information is shared with the chancellor's executive committee and with the board of trustees (III.A.4.b).

The fabric of the college and of the district is strongly woven with integrity in the treatment of all employees and students. FLC literature is replete with the many written policies that mandate the fair and equal treatment of individuals at the college. Complaint filing procedures are widely known and widely distributed. The college has conducted satisfaction surveys ingrained with this topic and has received very favorable ratings from students and employees (III.A.4.c).

There is a high degree of satisfaction on the FLC campus among employees regarding professional development opportunities and programs. One of the college's participative governance committees is the professional development committee. Opportunities like the flexible calendar program, sabbatical leave, a training opportunities calendar, tuition and textbook reimbursement programs, various workshops, faculty chair training institutes, the classified leadership academy, and faculty travel support amalgamate into a rich and rewarding professional development environment (III.A.5.a).

The college is in the process of developing methods to evaluate on a systematic basis the results of its many professional development programs and plans to use the results to improve the programs (III.A.5.b).

Conclusions

The college partially meets this standard.

Recommendations

Recommendation 5: In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends the college develop and implement a comprehensive and systematic method to assess the impact of professional development on teaching and learning and the use of technology (III.A.5.b, III.C.1.b).

Recommendation 6: The team recommends a formal board policy be created incorporating input from classified staff and administrators in the annual evaluation process of the college president. The team further recommends a formal process be created relating to any unethical behavior by a board member (III.A.1.b, IV.B.1, IV.B.1.g, IV.B.1.h, IV.B.1.j, IV.B.2).

Standard III.B - Physical Resources

General Observations

Physical resources at FLC support student learning and services. Facilities' planning is integrated with both district and college planning. The Board policy, "Building Construction Program" guides the District's construction projects. The Budget and Facilities Planning Committee (BFPC) oversee college-level processes for new building construction as well as facility remodeling, renovation, modernization, and maintenance. BFPC is responsible for the *Budget and Facilities Planning Handbook* which delineates the college's budget allocation processes. Budget allocation processes are part of the college's overall evaluation and planning cycle. Building priorities are delineated in the educational master plan which in turn is tied to the college's program review. The college's *Facility Master Plan* developed in 1993, was updated in 2003, and is currently under revision. Other documents that guide facilities development include the district's *Five-Year Construction Plan,* the *Facilities Condition Index* and as is required by law, the *American with Disabilities Act (ADA).* The college and district's long-range capital planning processes produced numerous successful

construction projects. The college has engaged in extensive physical resource planning that support the institutional goals of the college and district.

Findings and Evidence

Two bond measures totaling $740 million were passed by district voters in 2002 and 2008. This has supported extensive new construction, expansion, and remodels in the Los Rios Community College District. At Folsom Lake College construction includes: a bookstore/cafeteria, five classroom "halls," and an administration, campus services and physical education building. A new "Building C" was constructed at El Dorado Center. A new Visual and Performing Arts Center is scheduled for completion by spring 2011 and further expansion to the bookstore and cafeteria should begin this fall. A new career and technical education building is planned and property will soon be secured for a permanent facility at Rancho Cordova Center. In addition to the bond funds, the District has used state capital funds and unrestricted bookstore funds to supplement building projects. There is high satisfaction among staff, faculty, students, and administrators with the design, planning, and implementation of the new campus and its centers (III.B.1.a).

Given the recent construction of Folsom Lake College and the El Dorado Center, the buildings, walkways, entrances, restrooms, and classrooms are all compliant with current building code and American with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. The Rancho Cordova Center leased facility was expanded and remodeled in fall which brought it into compliance with current safety and access codes. Security cameras are present and monitored at FLC. There are security cameras installed in the main hallways and entrances/exits, and in high risk areas. EDC also has security cameras and panic buttons in high risk areas. The parking lots at all sites are well lit, and there are visible emergency phones throughout. The college and centers have police on site who are visibly present (III.B.1.b).

There is collaboration between the district and the college in long-range facilities planning. There is a comprehensive long-term plan for the district including projections for all colleges and centers. The planning process is defined in *Budget and Facilities Planning Handbook* and is implemented in a participatory manner. The long range capital needs are guided by the college's *Facilities Master Plan* as well as the college's portion of the district's *Five-Year Construction Plan* (III.B.2.a).

Local physical resource planning is addressed through the college's participatory governance structure. Much direction is outlined at the district level but it is not without consultation with the college Budget and Facilities Planning Committee, the Curriculum Committee, and the Institutional Planning Committee. There does not seem to be a systematic assessment of the physical resources, but there is evidence of a pathway where concerns can be expressed, for example, the concern of insufficient space for science labs. This was a noted issue in the self-study (III.B.2.b).

Conclusions

The college partially meets this standard.

Recommendations

Recommendation 7: In order to ensure the sustainability of its infrastructure, the teams recommends the college must calculate the real costs of facilities, ownership, including technology, over the next six years and then identify a reliable and ongoing revenue stream that will fund the significant increase in the operating budget (III.B.2.b, III.C.1.a, III.C.1.d).

Standard III.C - Technology Resources

General Observations

FLC has a strong technology infrastructure, and the college's administration, student services, instructional, library, operation, and facilities, have been enhanced by the ongoing introduction of new technology. Two facility bond measures have funded numerous technology-based enhancements including fully equipped computer labs, SMART classrooms, TV-conferencing, and the Innovation Center. Additional support has been provided by state instructional equipment funds and TTIP funds. A "sink fund" has been established by the college for long term technology funding. The college and district IT departments work cooperatively to keep FLC consistent with district-wide technologies such as registration, the learning management system, administrative applications, telephone, and iTV services. FLC Instructional Technology (IT) is responsible for local equipment and specific instructional needs such as Chemistry, Biology, and Physics labs, and Art and Music studios. Even given the rapid growth of the college, there are regular and mostly adequate trainings for staff, faculty, and administrators. IT staffing is minimally adequate and will need to grow steadily as the college grows.

Findings and Evidence

The District and college IT provides dependable and comprehensive technology for the college and its centers. The college has a solid technology infrastructure for administrative and instructional applications and hardware. The District's IT provide extensive services including: design, implementation, operation and support of the networks, security, the learning management system, SOCRATES, PeopleSoft, telephone and video conferencing, and other district specific IT tasks. The college supports local equipment, including discipline specific equipment such as chemistry labs. The college's rapid increase of employees and growth of programs has created a demand for additional staffing. This requires attention as the college continues to grow (III.C.1.a).

Between FLC-main campus and the centers, there are over 10 computer labs. To better manage these labs, it is recommended the college complete a comprehensive evaluation of the learning support services provided in the following computer labs: FL1-35, FL1-107, FL2-240, FL5-09, FL1-07, FL5-109, EDC C-201, EDC C-202, FLC 1 PLE, EDC C204, and RCC 7. Questions that may help planning and support include: Are the labs properly staffed? Who do they serve? At what times? For what classes? Are the students satisfied? Could the lab be better utilized? (III.C.1.a)

Technology training is provided through various units: Office of Instructional Research, Student Services Training, Library Technical Training, Student Training, Office Productivity Training, Innovation Center, District Office Training, Audio Visual Training, and Instructional Television Training. Training opportunities also are available to faculty through Professional Development and to IT Technical staff via conferences. There is no evidence of a training calendar or any coordination across trainings. There are no "package" trainings, such as "Boot Camp for New Division Assistants." As the college grows and new faculty, staff, and administrators are hired, it will become important to establish a training calendar to ensure new employees are routinely and systematically trained in administrative, instructional, operational, student services, library, and facilities technology. The college is clearly committed to technology training and has built an environment that encourages use of technology. This commitment could be strengthened by establishing an annual assessment, analysis, and coordination of training needs (III.C.1.b).

The college acquired much of its technology through capital project funds. Now the challenge is to maintain the large numbers of computers and specialty instruments with preventative maintenance, repairs, and warranties, as well as the anticipated replacement costs over time. Currently these costs are the joint responsibility of the individual departments and their division. Requests for these funding are noted in EMPs then make its way through the process of reprioritizing with requests from other operational units. The budget and facilities planning committee established a "sinking fund" but it is expected to take a minimum of five years support the projected annual purchases and it is questionable if it will be adequate even then. To support annual maintenance costs, ongoing technology changes, equipment replacements and state-of-the-art technologies the college needs to increase its funding capacity to assure sustained, high-level technology functionality. Ultimately, success of these efforts will be dependent on: budget allocation processes that recognize the total cost of ownership, a realization and acceptance of the rising expectation of technology in education, development of a cohesive vision and plan for emerging technologies in instruction, student services, administrative, and research needs (III.C.1.c).

The college is relatively new and runs with a small, multi-functional IT team. Support staff is reportedly responsive, knowledgeable, and efficient. According to the student survey, the college is providing students with the learning environment they expect with regards to technology. There is however a need for additional support staff and resources as documented in EMPs and is regularly included in college resource prioritization processes (III.C.1.d).

Technology is thoroughly integrated into the college's priorities and planning. Of the five Institutional Goals, four explicitly mention the use or improvement of technology in their strategies.

INSTITUTIONAL GOAL	STRATEGIES
A-Student Success	A6. Assessing and Meeting Technology and Training Needs
B-Teaching & Learning Effectiveness	B4. Teaching Tools and Technology

INSTITUTIONAL GOAL	STRATEGIES
C-Access & Growth	C5. Distance Education
	C6. Technologies that Promote Access and Provide Student Support
E-Organizational Effectiveness	E3. Institutional Technology

The FLC Technology committee is the governance entity responsible for making recommendations on IT matters, including college IT plan and implementation. The following college governance committees provide input to technology decisions: Institutional Planning Committee, Budget and Facilities Planning Committee, Curriculum Committee, Professional Development Committee (training), and the Safety Committee. The college IT department works closely with district IT to provide hardware, software, network and planning support for college employees and departments. Ongoing district-wide IT collaboration is a high priority, and FLC representatives serve on governance groups and IT work groups. The college also utilizes its participatory governance structure to make recommendations regarding technology resources and support (III.C.2).

Conclusions

The college partially meets this standard.

Recommendations

See Recommendation 2.

See Recommendation 5.

See Recommendation 7.

See Recommendation 8.

Standard III.D - Financial Resources

General Observations

Driven by the missions of the district and the college, FLC enjoys a strong financial footing that focuses on the future. The Los Rios CCD uses a long established, collegially developed, and well accepted formulaic resource allocation model to distribute the discretionary dollars and other financial resources to the colleges. Board policy clearly delineates all areas of budget management and control in support of the efficient and effective business operation of the colleges and of the district. Of note, the college and the district utilize a three year budget model which forecasts the impacts of the California state budget on the college. In addition, the district and the colleges developed and agreed upon a financial plan that includes a three year, $20 million infusion of non-general fund unallocated reserve funds to partially alleviate the impact of budget cuts from the state. The district has gone beyond the basic requirements

of GASB in regard to reporting and funding retiree health benefits (aka other post employment benefits or OPEB) by fully funding the future financial obligation thus assuring employees of this important benefit. In addition, it is rather exceptional that the district has also fully funded its obligations for banked faculty load and for accrued vacation. The district's ERP, PeopleSoft, benefits the college by providing a comprehensive financial reporting package that provides a great level of detail to budget managers. Services such as purchasing, payroll, risk management, police services, internal audit, IT (in the wall), and facility planning are centralized at the district to support each of the colleges. FLC enjoys a strong relationship with the district office support entities which enables the college to effectively fulfill its mission. The FLC foundation, while nascent, has taken on an aggressive campaign in support of equipment and furnishings for the new fine arts complex along with developing an alumni association for FLC and operating the annual fund drive.

Findings and Evidence

Financial planning is an integral component of the institutional planning at FLC. The college's planning processes are tightly focused on fulfillment of the mission and in support of student learning and institutional effectiveness. The program review rubric includes a component to identify financial resources needed to implement the plan. Facility needs have been identified and are supported by both the state's capital outlay program and the district's locally funded general obligation bonds. The college and the district exhibit a high degree of integrity in its financial planning and financial operations (III.D.1.a).

The budget document utilized by the college and the district is a comprehensive presentation of the resources available and reflects the development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements necessary to operate the college and fulfill its mission of student success. This document and others in support of the financial resources and budget of the college are readily available to interested parties (III.D.1.b).

A series of board policies directs the district in regard to short and long range financial planning. The district has utilized a combination of long and short term debt instruments to maintain its financial integrity and full operational ability. The district maintains an 8% general fund contingency reserve as a minimum as set forth in board policy. The district has access to other contingency funds outside of the general fund, $20 million of which it proposes to utilize to ease the financial burden of the next three budget years (III.D.1.c).

The college and the district have long-standing, well-understood, and well-accepted processes for budget development and financial planning which are subject to input and review from all constituencies. There are a number of documents which outline and describe these processes. There is a district budget committee that meets monthly to ensure that procedures are responsive to strategic priorities. At the college level, there is a budget and facilities planning committee that is the recommending authority to the college president on budget allocation matters. Documents are readily available in print and electronically throughout the college (III.D.1.d).

The district and the college have adopted the PeopleSoft financial module to provide comprehensive financial management and reporting. Imbedded into the ERP are extensive controls. The report functioning of the system is electronically and financially sophisticated. Budget managers at FLC are provided budget reports twice a month and are able to request special reports on demand. The budget and facilities committee meets monthly to receive and review reports and updates on the college, district, and state budgets. The district coordinates the annual independent audits which are comprehensive for all college and all support entities, including the auxiliary operations, foundation, bond, and federal programs. The district's fiscal services division includes two full time internal auditors who assist the college in safeguarding resources and assuring strict controls and accountability (III.D.2.a, III.D.2.b).

The college and the district have a comprehensive risk management program, supported by board policy and an above average contingency reserve to help meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences should one arise. The practices that are in place are with the full support of the broad based constituency groups and reflect the district's and the college's support of the mission of the college and the core values of the district (III.D.2.c).

The district and the college successfully submit themselves to full review of their business and financial operations through a comprehensive external audit. The last 5 years of independent audits have resulted in unqualified opinions for the general and restricted funds of the district and have attested that the district and the college have met all the federal reporting requirements. The PeopleSoft financial module integrates a number of controls with which the district and the college can carefully and precisely manage its financial affairs. The district's fiscal services departmental structure includes two full time internal auditors who have the responsibility for substantial oversight and review of business operations. The citizen's bond oversight committee for Measures A and M provide additional vantage to ensure compliance with Proposition 39 requirements. The Folsom Lake College Foundation is subject to and successfully meets the scrutiny of an annual independent, external audit. Each of these practices safeguards and resources and assets of the district and ensures the integrity of the use of funds in support of the college and district mission. The results and recommendations of the various audits are used to improve financial management systems (III.D.2.d, III.D.2.e, III.D.2.g).

All contractual authority rests with the district level administrators and is well-documented and supported by board policy and operational guidelines (III.D.2.f).

The college budget receives scrutiny at many levels as the budget is developed and managed. There is a great deal of collegiality in the development of budget and the distribution of resources at both the district and college levels. Managers at FLC work closely together to use the college's discretionary allocation to decide how to best serve students and to best meet the college's mission. There is an expectation, supported by past practice that the college and the employees share equally in good and in bad financial times (III.D.3).

Conclusions

The college meets this standard.

Recommendations

None

STANDARD IV: LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

General Comments

Throughout the team visit, there was an obvious, strong spirit of partnership among members of the college community to support students. There were multiple expressions of support for and appreciation of the leadership forthcoming from every level of the college and district. Faculty and staff seem determined to preserve the culture of collegiality and shared responsibility.

The self study clearly responds to each ACCJC standard and clearly states the college's progress under each of the ACCJC standards by deliberately drawing particular attention to areas of strength as well as areas of improvement.

Wide-spread, open participation is woven throughout the fabric of college decision-making processes. The shared governance processes are extraordinary in their openness and balance of opinions, thereby producing informed decisions. The shared governance structures respect and keep intact the president's role and responsibility. The process incorporates regular communication between the college and academic senate presidents, a particular strength of the process and a strong indication of the determined spirit of the shared governance process.

The responses to the self study document have been verified through the examination of referenced documents and interviews with members of the governing board, academic senate, classified senate, and administration. This examination of evidence revealed that the shared governance processes are honored at a high level. The self study surveys, however, indicate some people are either unaware of the participatory governance structure or avenues for engaging the participatory governance process.

Elected geographically, the Governing Board effectively represents the educational interests of all segments of the college community through its policies and strong partnership with the chancellor. The Board appropriately oversees the quality and integrity of the district's many educational programs. The Board also maintains and develops policies according to federal and state requirements and professional standards of a fully functioning institution of higher education.

Findings and Evidence

The college's commitment to faculty and staff empowerment begins with its mission and values statements which emphasize the determination to provide educational excellence. The strategic plan is regularly reviewed. The *College Participatory Governance and Collegial Consultation* (*CPGCC*) document provides a comprehensive outline of the right and opportunity to participate in college decision-making processes. There is widespread support for shared governance. The self study indicates the need to further delineate the roles and responsibilities of the PG Subcommittees; however, the visit revealed that this revision had already occurred. Although the survey results indicates that classified staff and adjunct

faculty need to be made more aware of opportunities for involvement, the structure outlined by the *CPGCC* document clearly paves the way for faculty and staff to become engaged and to be heard. In general, faculty leaders are credited for their commitment to creating an environment of empowerment and innovation. Faculty and staff at each center were satisfied with the level of involvement within shared governance process, despite their distance from the main campus (IV.A.1).

The college has taken significant strides to offer training and improve communication. The district, in cooperation with union, faculty, staff, curriculum committee, and the research department, has provided a variety of training and workshops for new faculty, academic senate, faculty and staff evaluation, program review and master planning processes. For instance, the district encourages new employees to train in Interest Based Alliance (IBA) to enhance working relationships within in the college and district. The college faculty hiring prioritization process has migrated from being administration-led to an academic senate-led process that includes participation by the administration. The Professional Development Committee formulates specific processes to apply for and award professional development funds to support college-wide employee development (IV.A.1).

The *CPGCC* document is a comprehensive document which sets forth many aspects of Standard IV including decision-making roles, structures, and processes; governance structures, processes and practices; participatory governance committees, members, their charge, roles and responsibilities, authority, structure and processes of shared governance. It empowers all constituencies (staff, faculty, administrators and students) by guaranteeing them the right to engage in participatory governance. It lists the memberships of all participatory governance committees. It describes the coordinating council. It outlines the collegial consultation process involving the academic senate and college president in regards to academic and professional matters, and how academic and professional matters are determined and directed. As a result of on-going evaluation of the participatory governance process, a coordinating council, composed of eight members from all components of the college, has revised the *CPGCC* document twice since its inception. A shared governance workshop presented by the Academic Senates of California and the League of California Community Colleges triggered the 2005 revision, when defined the rights of the faculty and president (IV.A.2.a).

The self study included concern that the *CPGCC* document did not list the objectives, roles and purposes of each subcommittee, but that concern was relieved when a revised document addressing these concerns was distributed at an IPC meeting (IV.A.1, IV.A.2). The survey indicated that a small proportion of faculty and staff were dissatisfied with the level of participatory governance within the college (IV.A.2.b).

The *CPGCC* document also indicates the authority of the academic administrators and the faculty to develop and conduct learning programs and delineates the consultation process between the college and academic senate presidents on professional and academic matters. It explains how the elements are addressed, responsibilities and authorities, as well as the development and implementation of processes. Interviews indicate that the processes are

respected and the proposals affecting learning programs are routed appropriately. The college participates in district committees and the academic senates are represented on the chancellor's cabinet. The self study survey, interviews and discussions throughout the visit support the perception that the shared governance process is working well (IV.A.2.b).

Communication has improved through the sharing of information by the department chair to college departments and through use of the *Insider*, a document repository. Survey responses are favorable concerning the efficacy of collaboration, indicating all college components have a substantial understanding of institutional goals. Two areas of concern surfaced as a result of survey responses. The first is the process and role of adjunct faculty and some classified staff in shared governance, and the second, college-wide communication, which received less positive results than most other responses (IV.A.3).

The college, district and board each take the ACCJC's recommendations seriously ensuring the appropriate reports, including the midterm report and the self study, have all been submitted to the commission in a timely fashion. The chancellor and the district staff regularly communicate with the commission regarding the college centers, change in presidency, and accreditation matters. Reassigned time has been provided to coordinators and leaders of the self study process including the faculty accreditation chair, self study writer, a coordinator, an SLO coordinator, and curriculum technical leaders who facilitate and develop the course and program SLOs. Since 2004, the accreditation steering committee met regularly to ensure that the 2003 recommendations were discussed and appropriate action taken (IV.A.4).

The *CPGCC* document also describes the structure and processes of shared governance and why collaboration between the college and academic senate presidents is crucial. Any call for changes in the process is sent to the IPC to compose the suggested change. Several decision making processes have been improved through this process. The district academic senate has recently reviewed the district shared governance committees which resulted in updating the district structures. Evaluations of college presidents and review processes for administrators are delineated in board policy. The chancellor may use an online survey, created by the academic senate, to evaluate college presidents. The shared governance process has produced major changes in the structures of the college, including the renaming of the instructional areas, the designation of 21 department chairpersonships, new career technical programs, and a more transparent budget allocation process (IV.A.5).

The Governing Board of the Los Rios College District is composed of seven members elected to four year terms of office. Board policy calls for all seven board members to act together in the interest of the district and to act as a whole once a decision is made. Policy iterates the need to abide by the conflict of interest code and the general responsibilities of the board members pertaining to district stewardship. The accreditation survey indicates a high level of satisfaction with the leadership of the board and the chancellor. The longevity of service by the members of the board attests to satisfaction with the quality of their service (IV.B.1.a).

Responsibilities concerning supervision and control of educational programs, the use of district resources, and legal ramifications of its actions, are described in board policies. Policy covers contract authorization, hiring, and delegation of authority (IV.B.1.c). All board policies adhere to a three year review cycle and are published and accessible on the district website (IV.B.1.d).

The board receives direction concerning supervision and control, leadership responsibilities, adoption of policies, and evaluation from board policies. Policies cover a range of responsibilities regarding student registration, records, facilities, finance, curriculum, policy evaluation, educational programs, and goals. The district's vision, mission and values statements, and strategic plans are viewed regularly. The board is perceived as having addressed the integrity and quality of the district and, since 2004, has pursued student success and retention as well as teaching and learning effectiveness. The board has improved service to students through common course numbering and is in process of requiring the portability of testing results. The board is to be commended for its accomplishment of approval of a $475 million bond measure to carry out construction and renovation of facilities that address the educational needs of its districts for years to come (IV.B.1.b).

One third of the district's policies are reviewed each year with changes reviewed and suggested upon by general counsel. Changes are made in order to comply with federal and state statutes. Proposed changes are processed also through the shared governance structures of the district and reviewed by the vice-presidents and the executive level of the district before final implementation by means of board approval (IV.B.1.e).

The "Attributes and Conduct" section of board policies addresses board development and new member orientation. Orientations familiarize prospective and new board members to district policies and procedures. Staggered elections are addressed by board policy. Board minutes substantiate the training and development of board members (IV.B.1.f).

An informal discussion is incorporated into the annual performance process for board members as dictated by board policy. The chancellor and the board annually develop goals for the coming year and report publically on their level of accomplishment. Board minutes verify these actions (IV.B.1.g).

The twelve different elements of ethical behavior expected of board members are set forth in board policy. There is no stated process by which the board is directed to deal with an instance of unethical behavior, although no specific incident has occurred in recent years (IV.B.1.h).

Board minutes confirm that the board is regularly informed concerning the accreditation process, the accreditation standards, and the associated activities of the college relative to the ACCJC. The board has discussed the rubric for evaluating institutions in the areas of program review, institutional planning, and student learning outcome development. Board members actively discussed and fielded questions of faculty and staff relating to Standard IV and have submitted required accreditation reports. In response to the recommendations of the

2003 visiting team, the board approved the *Guidelines for Centers Development* and provided the necessary allocations to keep pace with the college's rapid growth. The board supported the development of student learning outcomes by the district's education initiative designed to improve the educational outcomes of freshmen (IV.B.1.i).

The board recruits, selects, establishes goals and performs annual evaluations on the district chancellor. The selection process solicits input from each component of the college community. The board is to be commended for including an evaluation instrument completed by constituent groups and community leaders. Policy emphasizes the administrative authority and delegates the administrative duties of the chancellor. The chancellor conducts annual evaluations of the presidents, as addressed in board policy (IV.B.1.j).

Conclusions

The college is making great strides toward engaging all faculty and staff in the processes of participatory governance and associated decision making. The new *CPGCC* document explains the process but lacks information about how the process works. There is evidence that the college is seriously implementing a commitment toward faculty and staff empowerment and institutional excellence as evidenced by surveys and interviews. The college is commended for supporting the shared governance process in expository ways, including the use of handbooks explaining how ideas and concerns are brought forward and carried through the decision making process. Documents pertaining to college planning, instructional support, student support, and governance are posted on the *Insider*. The PG processes are viewed as dynamic and continually improving as demonstrated by revisions affecting budget, area organization, master planning, and the structure of department chairs.

The *CPGCC* document addresses how academic and professional matters are taken to the academic senate and the curriculum committees. The district is commended for including college and district academic senate representation on the chancellor's cabinet to actively participate in policy changes and decision making (IV.A.1, IV.A.2.b).

The self study survey indicates some people are unaware of the structure of the participatory governance process and opportunities for involvement. The committee recommends that communication of the participatory governance processes be strengthened and a more extensive invitation be distributed to encourage constituency groups to engage in these processes, particularly adjunct faculty and students (IV.A.1, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3).

The college has increased its employee training efforts, providing five day new faculty orientation, evaluation and hiring workshops concerning both faculty and classified. The district encourages all employees to be trained in interest based alliance processes. The faculty hiring process has been modified from being administrator led to being led by the academic senate with administrative participation (IV.A.3).

The Governing Board is composed of seven members representing seven different geographical areas of the district. The board members conduct themselves as one body on

behalf of the educational interests of citizens within every part of the district. Board members are elected to their positions. The self study survey indicates high levels of satisfaction with the board's leadership and decision making (IV.B.1, IV.B.1.a).

The board systematically reviews policies concerning the teaching and learning programs of the district, legal authority, control and supervision, and the probity of the use of financial resources and contracts. It actively formulates new policies that ensure program quality, integrity and improvements (IV.B.1.b, IV.B.1.c).

The board is commended for calling for and funding the education initiative program which is designed to improve student success and retention. Another commendation is in order for acting to improve service to students by insisting upon common course numbering and portability of testing results across the district (IV.B.1.b, IV.B.1.i).

The board is loyal in its responsibilities regarding self evaluation and for following its policies regarding ethical behavior, although it does not possess a separate policy for actions to be taken should a board member be viewed as acting unethically (IV.B.1.g, IV.B.1.h).

Community members and constituency groups created an evaluation instrument as a tool to evaluate administration. The Board is commended for considering the results obtained from this instrument in its evaluation of the chancellor (IV.B.1.j).

Recommendations

See Recommendation 6.

Recommendation 9: Although the *College Participatory Governance and Collegial Consultation* (*CPGCC)* document explains what the decision-making process entails, the team recommends the document be modified to explain how the process works and how it impacts the college and district (IV.A.1, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3).