

EVALUATION REPORT

FOLSOM LAKE COLLEGE

100 Clarksville Road
Folsom, California 95630

A Confidential Report Prepared for
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Folsom Lake College from October 14 through October 16, 2003

David B. Wolf, Chair

FOLSOM LAKE COLLEGE

Team Roster

October 14-16, 2003

Dr. David B. Wolf (Chair)
Former Executive Director
Accrediting Commission

Ms. Marge Maloney (Assistant)
Dean of Social Sciences
Chabot College

Ms. Brenda Baity
Associate Professor
East Los Angeles College

Mr. Robert Garber
Vice President, Student Services
San Diego Miramar College

Dr. Bill Brown
Trustee
Butte Glenn CCD

Ms. Tess Hansen
Instructor
Foothill College

Ms. Lil Clary
Associate Dean/Learning Resources
Allan Hancock College

Mr. Steven Kawa
Director, Administrative Services
Santiago Canyon College

Dr. Eva Conrad
President
Moorpark College

Dr. Earl Mitchell
Department Chair
Santa Ana College

Dr. Jackie Fisher, Sr.
Asst. Superintendent/VP Academic Affairs
Antelope Valley College

Ms. Virginia Moran
Director of Research & Planning
Crafton Hills College

SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: Folsom Lake College

DATE OF VISIT: October 14-16, 2003

TEAM CHAIR: David B. Wolf
Former Executive Director, Accrediting Commission

A twelve-member accreditation team visited Folsom Lake College in mid-October for the purpose of evaluating the institution's readiness for Initial Accreditation of Candidacy; Folsom Lake would be the fourth college in the Los Rios Community College District, and would serve the eastern section of the district, extending into the foothills of the Sierra Madre Mountains.

The college staff had worked very hard and prepared well for the visit. The Self Study was informative and forthright, though it required some supplementation with regard to planning details. Both the district and the college provided ready access to all of the individuals, sites and documents needed to validate the contents of the Self Study. In every case team members were treated with courtesy and professionalism.

The college is located in a very fast growing part of the Sacramento area, and thus accommodating growth is a primary challenge. Expansion at the main campus in Folsom, the El Dorado Center near Placerville, and the Rancho Cordova Center are all high priorities and the required physical facilities are largely planned and funded. Obtaining the operating revenues to properly staff and support the activities in these expanding spaces is a major problem facing the institution (and the district).

Current operations are well managed for the most part. The team observed excellent instruction, a "pioneering spirit" among employees, well cared for facilities (adapted in innovative ways, in some cases), and satisfied students. Staffing in some cases—especially classified staffing—may be too lean to result in operational efficiency. Much planning activity has been and is taking place, and the results of this are evident in many instances. However, attention to the organization of planning activities, and the linkages between various planning efforts and budget making is in order.

The pace of development at FLC has been torrid. It may be time to ease the throttle a bit and to revisit the foundation pieces upon which the college is to build: make sure that governance relationships are clear, understood and implemented as intended; make sure planning efforts are effective; make sure staffing patterns are appropriate and implemented; make sure that all necessary support services for students are available at the sites where students are and will be doing academic work.

The team found much that is being done in an exceptional manner at both the college and district level and would make the following commendations:

To the college for

- Successfully communicating, both internally and externally, the nature and importance of changing from “center” to “college” status
- The extent to which important information is readily and reliably available through convenient devices such as the “S-drive”
- Creating and supporting the Innovation Center which continuously provides development opportunities for college employees
- Infusing technology throughout the college, including instruction, faculty support and administration and decision making
- The diligence that has gone into the accreditation process to this point and is expected to continue
- The overall “pioneering spirit” that is reflected in the new institution, where most employees stretch to accommodate institutional needs, and remain flexible so that the unexpected can be promptly addressed
- The quality of the instruction that was observed, and the enthusiasm exhibited by most faculty in and around the classroom

To the district for

- Developing a budget allocation formula and process that is accepted by all parties and results in generally conflict-free fiscal decision making
- Board traditions that maintain focus on the district as a whole, and avoid individual Board members excessively identifying with one particular college
- Its focus on the future as evidenced by persisting in the passage of the local bond, attention to long-range facilities planning, and the recent policy to address growth exclusively through the development of centers associated with existing colleges
- Conservative financial planning which avoids long-term commitments which could threaten its overall fiscal health.

Recommendations

After carefully reading the Self Study, examining documentary, observational and interview evidence, and extensive discussion amongst team members in the light of the accreditation standards, the team offers the following recommendations to the college and the district:

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 (Standard 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).

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. (Standard 4A.4, 5.6, 6.1, 7A.1, 9A.1, 9A.2)

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

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 (Standard 7A.1, 9A.1, 9A.2).

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 (Standard 10B.6 and 10B.8).

The college has made some stellar beginnings, and established itself as a high quality supplier of higher education in its service area. The Los Rios District has done an excellent job of planning the college, and providing much of the needed resources for start-up. There is much energy in evidence at every level among college employees, and much intelligence apparent in the manner in which limited resources and modern technology have been wed to achieve service efficiencies. All of this and more bodes well for the development of a fine institution over the coming years.

ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT FOR

FOLSOM LAKE COLLEGE

**Comprehensive Evaluation Visit
October 14-16, 2003**

INTRODUCTION

Folsom Lake College (FLC) is the fourth college to be created within the Los Rios Community College District (LRCCD). This district serves the greater Sacramento area in California. With the development of the self study published in spring 2003 and the team visit addressed by this report, FLC seeks initial accreditation (and understands the possibility of candidacy or other outcomes).

The college is located near the town of Folsom, a short distance north of highway 50 about 25 miles east of the State Capitol. About 18 miles further east on highway 50, near the town of Placerville, is located the El Dorado Center that operates with permanent facilities on a district-owned site. About 15 miles to the west of the main campus on highway 50, the recently created Rancho Cordova Center operates in a leased store front. The college also conducts classes in a limited number of off-campus locations, most of them near the main campus. All of the operations associated with what is now FLC were, as of 1998, completely administered through Cosumnes River College (CRC). At that time a structure was introduced that began the separation of FLC from CRC. Thus, until the present, FLC has operated within the accredited status of CRC.

The planning for the college goes back as far as 1964, when the LRCCD first discussed the need for a campus to serve the eastern part of the district. In 1967 the 151 acres on which the main campus is being developed was acquired. Classes were first offered in Placerville in 1965, the site for the El Dorado Center (EDC) was secured in 1988, and the first permanent facilities for EDC opened in 1994. Operations on the main campus site commenced in 1993 in portable buildings, and the first permanent building on this site was occupied in 2001. The Rancho Cordova Center (RCC) opened in 2000. Anyone visiting the area east of Sacramento, including the lower foothills, must be impressed with the extensive residential and commercial development that has been and is underway. The LRCCD has persistently been studying the size and nature of this growth and attempted to place appropriate programming in locations that are and will be easily accessible.

The mission of the college is that of a comprehensive California community college. The major populations for which the curriculum is designed are recent high school graduates seeking transfer education and entry level vocational education, and older adults seeking job advancement and other opportunities. The college delivers coursework in traditional classroom settings and through proven technology-based modes. At the present time, approximately 20 certificate and Associate degree programs can be completed by taking

courses exclusively at FLC (though a student may have to attend classes at more than one FLC location in some cases). Some developmental skills and basic skills programs are available; of particular note are ESL and related courses offered to a significant enclave of Russian immigrants offered at RCC. FLC students are successfully completing college programs (currently under the formal label of Cosumnes River College) and moving on to jobs in the local economy and baccalaureate study (primarily at California State University, Sacramento, and the University of California, Davis). Discussions are underway that could lead to upper division coursework being offered at the main campus by CSUS.

A full range of student support services (counseling, EOP&S, DSPS, CalWORKS, financial aid, library and learning resources, assessment, bookstore) is available to FLC students at the main campus, and at EDC and RCC on a frequent, rotating basis. The college has adapted spaces to house student services that will ultimately be used for other functions at the Folsom campus; this has been done such that these services are in close proximity to one another and to major flows of students. The college has adopted a “Personal Learning Environment” approach to arraying instructional (and some student) services at the main campus and EDC. Students can thus find library, tutoring, computer lab, reading and writing centers and distance education capacities all in one building.

The current staff complement includes 63 full-time faculty, 146 adjunct faculty, 57 full-time classified staff, and seven administrators.

The FLC fall 2003 enrollment was 6,416 (headcount); fall 2002 enrollment was 8,314. About 2,000 of this total attend classes primarily at EDC. With planned build-out—perhaps near the end of the decade--the college is expected to serve between 15,000 and 20,000 students.

Growth is a major theme at FLC, and most of it is planned to take place at the Folsom campus. The first permanent building there involves 33,428 ASF. An expansion of 63,050 ASF is under construction, and the detailed planning for a third phase of 50,162 ASF was recently completed. Primarily through state and local bonding, the financial resources are already available to expand instructional, student support, athletic and arts facilities over the balance of this decade; in all, some \$163 million have been and will be committed to physical development. While the revenues for facilities have been largely secured, perhaps the most significant question facing the college (and the district) involves the required operating revenues to staff and maintain the programs that will be housed in these new spaces.

The accreditation history of FLC is an efficient one. In fall 2000 the Los Rios District filed an Eligibility Request for the college. This request was approved by the Commission in January 2001. A Substantive Change Report from Cosumnes River College noting the separation of FLC from CRC followed in fall 2002. The FLC self study was completed in summer 2003 and received by the Commission and visiting team in a timely manner.

The twelve-person visiting team arrived in Folsom on October 13 and conducted its organizational meeting at a hotel near the main campus. The next three days were spent exclusively in activities relating to verification of the information in the self study and to evaluation of FLC. Extensive review of activities on the main campus, EDC and RCC were conducted, and one of the smaller off-campus sites was visited. In all, the team conducted 71 different interview sessions, involving 412 persons (some persons participated in two or more interviews); team members visited 54 different classes, and interviewed 59 different students. The team conducted two open meetings (one at the El Dorado Center and one on the main campus) and there was extraordinary attendance at both.

The team greatly appreciated the care with which the college prepared for the accreditation process and the team visit. The self study was well prepared (more on this is noted below)—and notably very well edited to read in a consistent voice. The team room was carefully stocked with the appropriate documents, and on the rare occasion when additional information was requested, it was produced immediately. The team had access to all persons on campus, at centers and at the district office such that necessary information was obtained. In virtually every case interviews were handled in a complete and professional manner. The computer and other support requirements for the team were of top quality and worked in an exemplary fashion. The communication system between the Office of the FLC President and the team assistant worked very well, permitting regular adjustments to the complex of team member schedules and the provision of various support requests. The team especially appreciates the sturdy and attractive name badges that were provided and that virtually every member of the FLC staff wore *throughout* the team’s stay—this was enormously helpful to the team.

Further word is in order regarding the self study. Ample evidence abounds to demonstrate that great effort was expended in gathering information, carefully examining the major issues facing the college, and writing concise narratives in a manner consistent with the accreditation standards. For the most part each section of the self study was complete, and included appropriate evidence for the conclusions presented. The one significant shortcoming of the document pertains to the “Plan” discussions accompanying each standard. As the team was to learn once on campus, over 100 planning agendas had been created through the self study process. These were not, however, included in the self study in a manner that would link to the issues raised in the text. Rather, only summary statements about major plans were included. This matter was clarified once the team was on site; however, the team would have preferred the inclusion of these details in the Self Study document.

The team found much that is being done in an exceptional manner at both the college and district level and would make the following commendations:

To the college for

- Successfully communicating, both internally and externally, the nature and importance of changing from “center” to “college” status

- The extent to which important information is readily and reliably available through convenient devices such as the “S-drive”
- Creating and supporting the Innovation Center which continuously provides development opportunities for college employees
- Infusing technology throughout the college, including instruction, faculty support and administration and decision making
- The diligence that has gone into the accreditation process to this point and is expected to continue
- The overall “pioneering spirit” that is reflected in the new institution, where most employees stretch to accommodate institutional needs, and remain flexible so that the unexpected can be promptly addressed
- The quality of the instruction that was observed, and the enthusiasm exhibited by most faculty in and around the classroom

To the district for

- Developing a budget allocation formula and process that is accepted by all parties and results in generally conflict-free fiscal decision making
- Board traditions that maintain focus on the district as a whole, and avoid individual Board members excessively identifying with one particular college
- Its focus on the future as evidenced by persisting in the passage of the local bond, attention to long-range facilities planning, and the recent policy to address growth exclusively through the development of centers associated with existing colleges
- Conservative financial planning which avoids long-term commitments which could threaten its overall fiscal health.

Recommendations

After carefully reading the Self Study, examining documentary, observational and interview evidence, and extensive discussion amongst team members in the light of the accreditation standards, the team offers the following recommendations to the college and the district:

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 (Standard 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).
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. (Standard 4A.4, 5.6, 6.1, 7A.1, 9A.1, 9A.2)

3. The team recommends that the college ensure, through its planning processes, appropriate distance learning support services (Standard 4A.4, 4D.1, 4D.2, 4D.7, 5.6, 6.7).
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 (Standard 7A.1, 9A.1, 9A.2).
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 (Standard 10B.6 and 10B.8).

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

1. AUTHORITY

Folsom Lake College currently operates under the California approvals and accreditation associated with Cosumnes River College. The Folsom Lake site was approved as an official California community college center in 1993; the El Dorado site was approved as a center in 1968.

2. MISSION

The team confirmed that the college developed its mission statement in spring 2000, and the statement was approved by the Los Rios Community College Board of Trustees on October 18, 2000. The statement contains the information specified in the accreditation Eligibility Requirements.

3. GOVERNING BOARD

The Los Rios Community College District Board of Trustees is a seven-member body elected for staggered four-year terms from areas within the district. A non-voting student member is selected by students to serve on an annual basis. The team confirmed that the Board makes policy for the district and exercises oversight of its operations. Board members have no employment, family or personal financial interest in the district, and file a conflict of interest statement annually to this effect.

4. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

As of July 2000 FLC has had a Board-appointed president who has full-time responsibility for guiding the college.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

The team determined that the college has sufficient administrative staff, all adequately prepared and experienced, to operate the college.

6. OPERATING STATUS

The team certifies with no reservation that FLC is fully operational with students actively pursuing its degree programs.

7. DEGREES

According to admissions information, a majority of students enter FLC with the intent of taking a degree or certificate, or preparing for transfer to a four-year institution. Most of the college's offerings are associated with degree programs.

8. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The team certifies that FLC offers a range of degree and certificate programs, and that these programs are consistent with the college mission and are provided in a manner conventional to community colleges and consistent with Eligibility Requirements.

9. ACADEMIC CREDIT

FLC awards academic credit in a manner conventional for community colleges and consistent with generally accepted good practice.

10. EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES

The team examined course outlines, syllabi and the draft Catalog and found evidence that programs do have program purpose statements that are available to the public.

11. GENERAL EDUCATION

The team certifies that FLC has a clear general education component in its degree programs and that writing and computational skills are reflected in these requirements. Students are introduced to several areas of knowledge, consistent with the practice at California community colleges. General education courses appropriate for higher education are offered.

12. FACULTY

At the time of the accreditation visit the college had a complement of 59 full-time faculty members, with an array of expertise that aligned with college offerings. Faculty responsibilities are defined in Article 4 of the LRCCD Agreement with the Los Rios College Federation of Teachers.

13. STUDENT SERVICES

The team reviewed the student services provided by FLC and found them to be consistent with the needs of the student body and the college mission statement.

14. ADMISSIONS

The team found FLC admission policies in the draft Catalog and other publicly available documents. These policies are consistent with those required of California community colleges.

15. INFORMATION AND LEARNING RESOURCES

FLC operates libraries at the Folsom Lake campus and the El Dorado Center, and provides access to its library collections and electronic databases at all three of its major locations. While extensions of these services will be necessary with anticipated growth, existing services adequately support existing programs.

16. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The Los Rios Community College District has an enviable record for fiscal prudence. Even with current state-wide budget difficulties, the college retains an adequate financial base to support its programs currently. Continuing to do this will be a major challenge for the district.

17. FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The team examined the latest external audit available for the district (2001-2002) and was informed by appropriate district officials that the draft 2002-2003 audit contains no exceptions.

18. INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION

The team found ample evidence of planning for all important aspects of college operations. While much work remains to refine and coordinate this planning and make good use of evaluation efforts, both the district and the college have invested significantly in these efforts.

19. PUBLIC INFORMATION

FLC has developed a draft Catalog in which all of the requisite information is contained. In addition the college has prepared a draft Faculty Handbook and other documents that contain important information regarding college operations. These documents are readily available on campus.

20. RELATIONS WITH THE ACCREDITING COMMISSION

The self study contained a statement, signed by the President of the Board of Trustees and the college President which assures that the institution adheres to the Eligibility Requirements, Standards and Policies of the Accrediting Commission.

EVALUATION OF FOLSOM LAKE COLLEGE USING ACCJC STANDARDS

A note on the format and content of this team report is in order. This report pertains to an initial accreditation visit. Thus there are no recommendations from a previous visit to which the college can respond. This report thus is devoid of the customary "Responses to Recommendations of the Previous Team." There are a couple of occasions, however, where the recommendations from the last accreditation review of Cosumnes River College (of which Folsom Lake operations have been a part) does have bearing on the Folsom Lake College self study and where this is the case, mention of it is made in the text of the report.

STANDARD ONE INSTITUTIONAL MISSION

General Comments:

Based on materials presented in the self study, additional documents provided, and interviews with FLC personnel, it seems reasonable to conclude that FLC is in compliance with Standard 1. FLC is to be commended for having so many groups involved in developing their mission statement(s) and their vision statement.

Findings and Evidence:

FLC has a mission statement (perhaps more accurately a set of statements plus a related vision statement) that was developed by a wide constituent group including the Educational Planning Committee, faculty, staff, students, and administrators. A consulting firm (Moore, Lacoﬂano, Goltsam, Inc.) was retained to facilitate a college-wide retreat from which the mission statement(s) emerged. The LRCCD Board of Trustees approved the FLC mission statement(s) on 18 October 2000 (1.1).

The mission statement actually consists of eight separate, broadly-worded statements, and does define the institution and provide planning guidance in broad terms. Budget documents reveal that the mission statement(s) are indeed considered as a part of the budget development process. Interviews with various faculty members verify that the mission statement(s) are considered as budgets are developed (1.2).

The self study indicates that academic departments, instructional programs, and service areas which do not have mission statements that reflect the FLC mission statement(s) are expected to develop them. An analysis of the several master plan documents reveals that seven of the 25 department/areas do have mission statements, all departments are expected to have such complementary statements, and many are developing them. Those

departments that have such statements are using them in planning and budget development (1.3).

From discussions with various faculty members and administrators, it is clear that constituent groups view the mission statement as “theirs” and would take umbrage at suggestions that it be amended. Since the current statement is relatively new and a first one for the college, no practice of regular review and revision has yet been developed (1.4).

Conclusions:

The mission statement(s) exist and are printed on page 7 of the FLC 2003-2004 catalog. The college is in substantial compliance with Standard One.

The team would, however, draw attention to the inevitable need to re-examine the mission statement(s) on a regular basis, particularly for a college that will be rapidly growing and meeting community needs in a dynamic environment. In this regard, please note the recommendation appearing under Standard Three.

Recommendations:

None.

STANDARD TWO

INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY

General Comments:

The college is to be commended for its efforts to effectively communicate with its students and the surrounding community during its transition from an educational center to a complete college. It has been challenging for the institution to live in two worlds and attempt to maintain an accurate and comprehensive flow of information relative to both its actual and its prospective status. The college has very well accomplished this objective during this transition process, and by doing so has kept all constituencies adequately informed while building strong support for college goals (2.1).

Additionally the college should be commended for the development of a very effective intranet system; the “S” (Shared) Drive, where various policies, procedures, guidelines and useful information reside for staff member use, and for the development of its “Innovation Center” where faculty and staff enjoy an environment which provides technology training and encourages technological innovation. These resources assist faculty and staff in staying abreast of district and college policies and guidelines, and provide a collegial atmosphere where resources and information can be shared (2.2, 2.3, and 2.4).

The college should also be commended for all of the diligence, extra effort and hard work that has gone into, and will follow, the accreditation process. The processes of applying for college status and complying with the accreditation requirements have required significant amounts of dedication and extra work. The college community has risen to this task while effectively maintaining day-to-day operations (2.8).

Findings:

The college maintains an effective and accurate line of communication with its existing students and surrounding community at each of its major locations; Folsom Lake College, El Dorado Center, and Rancho Cordova Center. The schedule of classes, catalog information, academic policy and fee information, and various informational and marketing publications, clearly, accurately, and consistently represent the college to its constituencies. In all material respects, both the printed and electronic media are clear, thorough, attractive and user friendly. Attempts are made to keep both students and community members well informed regarding major college programs and activities. Moreover, the college has presented many publications in either Spanish or Russian, these being the primary languages of major student and constituency groups in certain locations within the college service area (2.1).

All faculty members are afforded academic freedom through an appropriate Board-approved policy and reasonable efforts are made to protect the integrity of the teaching process. Additionally, faculty members are clearly aware of those constraints that require that the delivery of instruction should be based on proven conclusions and objective data, that instruction should convey a variety of world views, and that it should not be solely

formulated on the personal convictions of the individual faculty member (2.2, 2.3, and 2.4).

In general, faculty and students are provided with clear expectations relative to academic honesty and sanctions for violation. The policies are clearly documented in district and college regulations. However, in terms of implementing the policies as effective procedures, the college has identified the need to revise, expand, and finalize the faculty and student handbooks, and expand faculty training in this area (2.5).

The college embraces the concepts of equity and diversity and demonstrates this through its policies and practices. The pursuit of equity and diversity is apparent throughout the majority of college and district plans, processes, and publications. It begins with the district and college mission and vision statements, flows through the various hiring and training processes, and impacts many of the operational practices of the college (2.6).

The college demonstrates a practice of honesty and integrity in its relationship with the Commission and has shown evidence that it wishes to comply with all Commission standards, policies, guidelines, public disclosures, and self study requirements. The institution has effectively complied with all necessary requirements to establish Eligibility for Accreditation, and is completing all the requirements called for by the accreditation process. The college has plans to regularly evaluate and revise institutional policies, practices, and publications to ensure integrity in the representation of its mission programs and services. Many of its plans and processes are in the developmental stage. However, there is a high degree of planning and process analysis that has recently been undertaken and will continue as a result of the accreditation process. Plans to evaluate and revise institutional policies, practices, and publications are included in the scope of this recent work, and the team expects most of these plans to be realized, based on the college's performance to date (2.8 and 2.9).

Evidence

The team examined numerous college documents and publications from each of the major college locations and reviewed various information resources at the district and college websites, and the college intranet (Shared Drive). The team also interviewed numerous students and employees, (faculty, administrative, and classified) regarding the quality and timeliness of college communications and publications, and the processes and procedures for maintaining integrity of this information. Everyone with whom team members spoke was very satisfied with the resources and information available and complete consistency was found in the representations made at various levels of the institution (2.1).

The team examined district and college documents containing policies and procedures which facilitate the support of academic freedom and instructional integrity, and provide guidance to faculty regarding their obligation to provide objective and open instruction, free from inappropriate personal bias and limitations. The district/college position is clearly documented in Article 17 of the "Los Rios Community College District Agreement with Los Rios College Federation of Teachers Local 2279, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO". The policies and guidelines are also clearly communicated through references in the New Faculty Hiring packet and training

materials, and draft copies of the Folsom Lake College Faculty Handbook, and Curriculum Manual (2.2, 2.3, and 2.4).

To validate that district and college policies and guidelines were being followed, the team conducted a group interview with eight of the most recently hired faculty at the college. There was complete agreement among the group that the district and college orientation and training processes had been outstanding and comprehensive, and that there was no doubt relative to the privilege of academic freedom, and their responsibility relative to sound objective pedagogy. Additionally, the team interviewed several individual students, and participated in a group interview with the Associated Students' leadership team, where faculty performance received an informal rating of 8-9 on a scale from 1-10. Also, the team visited numerous class sessions, and agreed completely that the teaching and learning processes observed appeared to meet all of the college standards and guidelines included in documents we had received (2.2, 2.3, and 2.4).

The team examined district and college documents and procedures that provide direction regarding academic honesty. The district/college position is clearly documented in Regulation 2441 of the Los Rios Community College District Policies, and the section titled "ACADEMIC HONESTY, CHEATING, AND PLAGIARISM" in the Folsom Lake College draft catalog. The policies and guidelines are also communicated through the draft Folsom Lake College Faculty Handbook and Student Code of Conduct. Team members also made inquiry of the eight recently hired faculty members discussed above, and received feedback that the district and college orientation and training in this area had been effective. Additionally, we interviewed the President and Dean of Students regarding the student code of conduct and student grievance policies. They indicated that problems in this area have been extremely sparse and all effectively resolved, but that procedures are being reviewed by the Matriculation Committee along with other policy and procedure issues (2.5).

The team examined district and college guidelines, documents and promotional materials that include advocacy for equity and diversity and provide evidence of the college/district goals in this area. The policies and guidelines are clearly communicated in the district and college mission and vision statements, college catalog, and various promotional and informational documents (2.6).

To validate that district and college policies and guidelines were being adequately communicated and effectively embraced, the team took the following steps: (1) reviewed the staff accreditation survey results pertaining to diversity; (2) made inquiries of the eight recently hired faculty discussed above; (3) estimated the level of diversity in the group of newly hired faculty discussed above; (4) discussed goals and techniques in this area with the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources; and (5) interviewed the President, the Dean of Students, members of Academic Senate leadership, and various administrators to assess their feelings regarding the level of commitment and progress in this area.

Regarding step (1) the survey results for question # 7 ("the college creates an environment that welcomes and encourages diversity", report 97.8% agreement. Regarding step (2) there was agreement among the group that the district and college commitment to this area was in evidence. Regarding step (3) the group of eight new

hires consisted of five males and three females, and appeared to consist of at least three non-white members. In connection with step (4) the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources emphasized the district's commitment in this area and described two key examples of that commitment. One example is her office's community outreach program where special efforts are made to recruit staff from various ethnic areas. Another, is a faculty internship program where interns from under-represented groups are recruited, trained, and paired with a full-time faculty member for intern teaching experiences, and are encouraged to apply as new positions open. Regarding step (5) there was complete agreement among everyone interviewed that the district and college policies and practices support the goals of equity and diversity (2.6).

Validation of the college's plans to practice honesty and integrity in its relationship with the Commission and to pursue a practice of regularly evaluating and revising institutional policies, practices, and publications began with the team's thorough reading and analysis of the accreditation self study and the prior documents pertaining to the process of meeting eligibility requirements and completing the initial accreditation process requirements of the Commission. In general, the team's observation has been that the college has pursued the correct application of the necessary protocols, standards, and guidelines for public disclosures and the completion of all self-study requirements. The following positive characteristics have underscored the self-study process: (1) broad participation by each college constituency: faculty, classified staff, administrative staff, and students; (2) the use of effective documentation and evidence gathering techniques; (3) open and candid communication regarding items requiring correction, completion, or further analysis.

The one area that resulted in some confusion has to do with "action plan" items. Faced with a large number of action plan items (over 140) developed by the various self study standards workgroups, the college decided to summarize the items into a more manageable format by pursuing the following process: (1) separating the items into "strategic" and "operational" issues; (2) prioritizing the strategic issues as those most critical to address first, and scheduled for completion within one accreditation cycle (6 years) or sooner; (3) assigning responsibilities and timelines for the completion of strategic items, and (4) awaiting the accreditation team's report and then prioritizing any forthcoming recommendations and those operational items noted above.

During the team's validation work confusion arose when procedural problems became apparent regarding the disposition of planning actions. Academic Senate leadership was allegedly excluded from the decision-making process regarding which items should be considered operational and which items should be considered strategic. The Senate leadership indicated that this work was done primarily by executive administration without consultation with the Senate. Others with whom the team spoke, including administrators and some faculty, do not agree with this interpretation of events. The team notes from the self study that a process for dealing with planning items was developed early in spring 2003 which was agreed to by all parties, including the Academic Senate. The President indicates that many of the strategic items are included in the "Folsom Lake and El Dorado Centers 2003-2004 Goals" document and are currently being reviewed under that structure. This document includes specific administrative responsibilities and a definite time line. A summary of follow-up items and staff responsibilities was

published by the Academic Senate without consultation with the President and delivered to the accreditation team. This document includes specific faculty responsibilities and timelines. There is overlap and coherence between the various follow-up analyses, and the energy that has gone into the steps above is to be applauded. All of the items have been captured for consideration in one venue or another. Additionally this work effort considers the necessity to establish or clarify processes for regularly evaluating and revising institutional policies, publications, etc. The team's concern is that the work could be more effectively pursued, and the environment could be more conducive to student success if administrative and Academic Senate leadership were working in a collegial fashion. Thus this issue is addressed in standard 10 (2.8 and 2.9).

Conclusions

The college has met the criteria of this standard, except with respect to the issues of governance and collegiality discussed above regarding standard 2.8. That general issue is documented in a recommendation in Standard Ten on Governance and Administration.

Recommendations

None.

STANDARD THREE INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

General Comments:

The sheer volume of documents that have been produced to establish planning and program review processes demonstrates the college's sincere effort to comply with accreditation standards. At this juncture, it appears gaps exist between research, planning, and evaluation that are not likely to be filled by the strategies identified in the self-study alone (*e.g.*, hiring a Research Analyst, or updating a strategic plan). However, there is ample human talent that can be used to close the gaps. Indeed, the college can be proud of its many faculty and staff members who have demonstrated the ability to accomplish any given task. The college may wish to take the time to critically evaluate its own work to date, and place in priority order the improvements it wishes to pursue.

Findings:

At this early point in the college's development, there is a need for improved clarity and alignment of research, planning and evaluation processes. Documents supporting planning and evaluation processes cited in the self-study exist in various stages of development, with ostensibly unrelated implementation timelines. Because of this lack of alignment, it is not clear how evaluation and planning are linked in a way that will serve the college's efforts to improve programs and services. Consequently, it is also not clear how the college can participate in meaningful, effective planning (3A.1, 3A.3, 3A.4, 3B.2, 3B.3).

There is a need to more clearly link research, planning and budgeting. Although a significant number of college faculty and staff are involved in planning, the College has not explicitly defined how the results of the planning efforts are linked to college goals and to resource allocations (3B.1, 3B.3).

The college has decided how best to obtain appropriate research and analytical skills, and this decision needs to be acted upon. The college has placed a high priority on hiring a Research Analyst; this demonstrates a commitment of some of the resources necessary to facilitate the effective use of research in planning and evaluation. However, staffing this position is only one step and will not fully address college needs or this standard; an equally important need exists to move beyond merely developing research data to allocating time to train college leadership in the appropriate uses of data in planning (3A.2).

A district institutional research website is provided by the district office of institutional research. While that website offers a plethora of planning-related data specific to Folsom

Lake College from 1998 through 2002, there are some misconceptions among faculty and administrators about what is available on that website (3A.1, 3B.2).

While the college is fully aware of the new Accreditation Standards and the emphasis on student learning outcomes, there is much to be done in defining and assessing student learning. Some nominal attempts have been made to develop outcomes at the program and institutional level, but much more remains to be done (3C.1, 3C.2).

Evidence:

Research and planning processes are not aligned: Educational Master Plans are updated annually; Instructional Program Reviews are conducted every 6 years; Student Services Program Review and operational planning are not clearly linked; and a draft “Strategic Planning Framework” cited in the self-study as resulting from a retreat in 1999 remains in outline form (3A.1, 3A.3, 3A.4, 3B.2, 3B.3).

A review of documents supporting planning found that the most evolved among them is the Educational Master Plan process, the purpose of which is to “inform decisions made across the college... on curriculum, services, staffing, facilities, equipment, staff development and projects” (p.3, Educational Master Plan, Instruction; template dated 01/12/2003). Several faculty members stated that plan development involved both full-time and part-time faculty, and was completed during spring, 2003. Currently, Educational Master Plans exist for 35 disciplines; 13 disciplines were not required to submit this year. Disciplines were required to integrate two objectives related to compliance with accreditation standards (curriculum review and student learning outcomes). Consistent with its purposes the format is comprehensive, enabling plan developers to set objectives, report and project enrollment and productivity data, review or revise current curriculum, describe new curriculum or delivery methods, detail resource and professional development needs, highlight interdisciplinary collaboration, and propose any new activities and/or unique projects (3A.1, 3A.3, 3A.4, 3B.2, 3B.3).

The status of other documents and/or processes described in the self-study as “instruments” to be used “to incorporate research into institutional planning and evaluation” are as follows: Instructional Program Reviews are planned for implementation in spring, 2004; Student Services Program Review has been completed for the Transition Center, and a reporting format has been drafted; and a document entitled “Technology Planning Goals & Objectives” has been drafted (3A.1, 3A.3, 3A.4, 3B.2, 3B.3).

A review of the supporting documents found clear descriptions of the intent to garner wide participation of all segments of the College in the planning process. However, no explicit links were found between the Educational Master Plans and college goals. There was also no explicit link found between those plans and the resource allocation process. The Educational Master Plan documentation includes a reporting of budget-related items, but that documentation exists separately from the documentation and processes described in the Budget and Institutional Facilities Planning Handbook (3B.1, 3B.3).

The self-study identified the need for training in the Analysis section for standard 3A.2 , but did not develop a corresponding plan to address the need. Moreover, discussion during a meeting of the Educational Planning Committee moved to the need to train faculty in the proper interpretation and use of the enrollment data used to develop each Educational Master Plan. Finally, the district institutional research director confirmed the need to train all decision-makers in how to access and properly use information from the research website in their planning and research efforts (3A.2).

One administrator stated the institutional research website permitted queries against live data. This same administrator described the website as easy to access, comprehensive, and potentially helpful, while it was also deemed to have been designed for use by a more skilled user. Two other administrators reported the data warehouse did not enable information specific to Folsom Lake College and was, therefore, not helpful in planning efforts. Several faculty members reported having some awareness of the data warehouse but characterized the information available as not helpful in faculty planning efforts (3A.1, 3B.2).

The Educational Master Plan template instructs disciplines to adopt two objectives, one of which is “Consider student learning outcomes throughout the curriculum.” A review of discipline plans found many plans did not adopt this objective (3C.1, 3C.2).

Conclusions:

Providing attention to the alignment of research, planning, and evaluation and making explicit the links between these efforts is likely to improve effectiveness and efficiency. Given the amount of work done to date, the amount of work that remains to be done, and limitations on existing human resources, the college should place a premium on ensuring no duplication of effort (3A.1, 3A.3, 3A.4, 3B.2, 3B.3).

Again, despite the volumes of documentation related to planning and budgeting processes, the links between planning and resource allocations are still informal. Requests processed by the Budget and Institutional Facilities and Planning Committee require justification of the request, but no systematic, coordinated effort exists which validates requests with planning documents. This is not to say the budget request process is ineffective, but rather that the links to unit-level planning (Educational Master Plans) are not explicit (3B.1, 3B.3).

The resources needed to fully integrate research, planning and evaluation include the hiring of a Research Analyst but also include the inculcation of a reliance on data throughout the college culture. In addition, training is needed to support efforts aimed at a better understanding of the uses of research and data in planning and evaluation.

The college must move beyond merely considering student learning outcomes. Sending faculty to more workshops in the spring is a positive first step; and hiring a Research Analyst can facilitate the data processing and analysis of the research inherent in implementing the assessment of student learning outcomes. Ultimately, the development

of student learning outcomes measures will be faculty-driven, and thus familiarizing the faculty with the attendant issues and techniques is of central importance (3C.1, 3C.2).

Recommendations:

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 (Standard 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).

STANDARD FOUR

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

General Comments:

The team was able to observe classes in a wide variety of disciplines at the main campus, the El Dorado Center, and the Ranch Cordova Center; in all the team members visited 54 classes. In addition, interviews were conducted with 59 individual students and a major topic of discussion was the student's level of satisfaction with the instruction being received. While other sources of information were also employed to reach conclusions, these two sources were particularly helpful in confirming impressions gained from discussions with faculty members, classified staff, administrators, prose and statistics. The team was impressed with the professional level of teaching observed, the enthusiasm that was typically evident in the classroom, and the positive comments made by students.

The team was impressed with Folsom Lake College's new 50,249 gross square feet building, which provides classrooms, "Personal Learning Environment" spaces, and a state-of-the art computer lab. The team praised the College's PLE approach, which affords students access to 120 computers, courses offered through distance education, research materials, self-paced online Computer Information Science courses, Math and English tutoring, and study rooms.

The team commends the maintenance and custodial staff at the Folsom Lake campus and the centers for maintaining clean and attractive facilities and grounds that directly contribute to the positive learning environment. It was evident that major consideration in resource allocation is given to supporting faculty members, instructional equipment, facilities, and material needs of the educational programs and services.

Findings:

FLC offers a range of programs that culminate in certificates and degrees, and other offerings in basic skills and continuing education; these are consistent with the mission statement published by the college. Programming does vary by major location (main campus, EDC, RCC) in a manner that attempts to match offerings with community needs; the most obvious example of this is at Rancho Cordova, where a large Eastern European immigrant population is served with a variety of ESL offerings. (4A.1)

The college, primarily through offerings at its own locations, but also in conjunction with Cosumnes River College, provides coursework in a manner which permits students to complete programs in a timely manner. The "Scheduling Needs and Student Concerns Survey," administered at each major college site, is used by the college to make decisions as to what courses will be offered at each location, and when. The capacity for offering

courses through distance education technology is being used in a manner to help fill student access gaps. (4A.2)

FLC is in the enviable position of never having had to eliminate a program and thus Standard 4A.3 is largely moot at this time. However, the appropriate bodies and procedures are in place—primarily through the college and the district curriculum committees—to manage such matters. (4A.3)

Growth has been and will be the major challenge for FLC. Investment in facilities and technology are readily apparent at all three major locations. Buildings are intelligently designed and well used, and technology—both for instruction, student support and internal communication—is current and comprehensive. While financial arrangements at the district level, to the degree these can be controlled locally, have been very well executed, the current state of California’s public finance is causing difficulties for the Los Rios District, and most especially for FLC as a new and growing institution. This reflects itself most profoundly in three areas: staffing (particularly classified positions), some immediate instructional support accounts (filling out the library collection) and equipment renewal (see also discussions under Standards Six, Seven, Eight and Nine). These matters will become of major significance as new facilities, already under construction, come on line in the near future. Instructional support functions for students taking courses on-line or using other distance education technologies need to be assured, especially as dependence on these offerings increases. (4A.4)

Academic advising is primarily provided by FLC professional counselors; a 900 student per counselor ratio is maintained per the LRCCD contract with the faculty union. Counseling services are available at all FLC sites either by full-time, adjunct, or rotating counselors. Reasonable efforts are made to make sure that counselors are kept abreast of changes in relevant transfer and occupational program matters, and counselors are included in college governance councils. (4A.5)

As presented in the draft 2003-2004 College Catalog, FLC does offer certificate and degree programs that align with the college mission statement(s). The college continues to develop self-standing programs from those that heretofore relied on Cosumnes River College for major components. Catalog data suggests that all programs are of appropriate length, and do feature appropriate course sequencing. (4B.1)

As presented in the draft FLC Catalog, all degree and certificate programs are identified in a manner that is consistent with usual parlance at transfer institutions and in the workplace. (4B.2)

The record is unclear as to the extent to which student learning outcomes are effectively employed at the certificate and degree level. Learning outcomes have been identified for some of these programs but no evidence could be found regarding the measurement of these outcomes at this level. Discussions are underway to address this matter, but detailed plans are not evident. (4B.3)

The design of degree programs with regard to general education content appear to be conventional for community colleges. Transfer programs are influenced by CSU and UC requirements, and vocational degree programs adhere to common practices to provide at least a minimum exposure to “the broad areas of knowledge.” (4B.4)

FLC uses satisfactory course completion as evidence that students completing degrees have appropriate competence in language and computation. (4B.5)

The Los Rios District has made laudable efforts in recent years to survey vocational students who have graduated from its colleges in an attempt to obtain, among other things, information about the adequacy of their preparation. This has been done for many of the vocational disciplines at FLC. In addition, some faculty members make efforts to track students after graduation. Exactly how this information is used to improve instruction appears to be faculty member specific. (4B.6)

All appropriate information regarding the general education requirements associated with FLC degrees are contained in the draft Catalog and on the college web site. (4C.1)

Brief statements in the draft Catalog offer a rationale for general education, and both district and FLC curriculum committees employ published routines for determining which courses align with specific “areas of knowledge.” (4C.2)

FLC’s attention to general education delivery is many faceted, reasonably clear, and takes advantage in many cases of learning opportunities that present themselves in the local community. The one area in which specific course or other activities are less clear has to do with “technology.” Given the degree to which technology is integrated into most aspects of student life at FLC, this would appear to be a general education area well covered for most students. (4C.3)

The college uses conventional community college means—satisfactory course completion in particular courses—to conclude that general education goals are achieved. Again, the team would urge that consideration be given to more overt definitions of these goals and means of measuring them, particularly for students completing degrees. In order for FLC to satisfactorily meet the 2002 Standards of Accreditation by the time of its next accreditation review, the college will need to identify specific student learning outcomes for general education, and determine a means of measuring student learning in each course that is part of the general education curriculum. (4C.4)

Curriculum development at FLC involves many steps and multiple reviews, almost all of which are performed by individual faculty members or groups of faculty. It includes comment from colleagues at other Los Rios campuses. The recently completed Curriculum Handbook explains this process. Separation of the FLC curriculum from the CRC curriculum remains a high priority task of FLC, particularly its Curriculum Committee. (4D.1)

FLC employs a variety of devices to assure instructional program quality, including program review, master planning, staff development (including new faculty mentoring) and faculty and staff evaluation systems. All of these systems are intelligently designed and operating, but perhaps with the exception of the faculty and staff evaluation and staff development systems, they are not yet fully implemented. The team would urge that full implementation of the program review system be completed, and that special attention be given to evaluation of the distance learning offerings (and note the usefulness of Accrediting Commission policy and guidelines in this regard). (4D.2)

The award of academic credit and the evaluation of student learning are practiced at FLC in a conventional manner. The Carnegie unit standard is generally applied, as contained in LRCCD policy. As noted in the Self Study, course outlines and syllabi contain course objectives, but not necessarily student learning outcomes, and methods for assessing student learning are final exams, research projects, etc. (4D.3)

FLC does not presently have a formal policy that guides decisions to accept credit for transfer to the college, though it does have a practice that is typical of community colleges. The college is advised to develop this policy and to do so in a manner consistent with Accrediting Commission guidelines (and not rely exclusively on accredited status of an institution in making these decisions). As noted in the Self Study, the process by which student services staff make decisions on course substitution is not understood by at least some members of the teaching faculty. Articulation agreements do exist with schools to which significant numbers of FLC students transfer. (4D.4)

The college offers an enviable array of delivery systems for its courses, and has made a very good effort to begin to assess the manner in which it meets student needs through a well developed survey. Especially noteworthy is the use of both interactive television at all three main sites, and on-line courses, as these delivery systems appear to be used in very sensible ways, consistent with good practice and a modest budget. (4D.5)

As noted above, FLC is in the process of separating its curriculum completely from that of Cosumnes River College. This provides the opportunity to examine each offering for currency, adequacy and appropriateness for FLC students. The Educational Master Plan and Instructional Program Review procedures, when working as specified, call for the review of courses annually and on a six-year cycle, respectively. These processes are generally in place, but their use is not yet universal. (4D.6)

The courses offered through electronic delivery systems appear to be appropriately developed and supported. The Innovation Center is certainly equipped to assist faculty to learn how to use classroom technology, and the investment in hardware and software is apparent at all major FLC facilities. As noted in the Self Study, the effectiveness of courses delivered electronically has yet to be assessed, though anecdotal information is positive. Substantial compliance with Commission policies is apparent. (4D.7)

Evidence:

The team reviewed the Draft Catalog, the Schedule of Classes for fall 2003, the Scheduling Needs and Student Concerns Survey, the Interim Class Cancellation Guidelines and Best Practices, the Educational Master Plan, the Enrollment Management Plan, and the Instructional Program Review Plan that were provided as evidence to support statements listed in the self-study. In addition summaries of demographic and other pertinent statistics were examined, e.g., the data contained in Facts About College Trends, and interviews with faculty, administrators and students were conducted. All of this evidence supported the information provided in the Self Study. Particularly the interviews, however, brought to the team's attention that not all academic departments have completed their component of the Educational Master Plan, and program reviews are beginning this year, thus limiting the degree to which improvement planning can be comprehensive. (4A.1, 4A.2)

Examination of the procedures used by the FLC and district Curriculum Committees indicated that the former could, and the latter has, dealt with the elimination or significant change to an academic program in a manner consistent with accreditation standards. (4A.3)

Direct examination of all facilities, including the equipment in use and the technology support available convinced the team that the current level and array of resources is very adequate to provide for the FLC academic programs. Interviews with the Vice President of Instruction and Student Development and the Vice President for Administration as well as examination of the various planning documents, drawings and models associated with the coming phases of facilities construction confirmed the thoughtfulness with which the plans for physical expansion have been developed. Evidence was not provided which would assure the adequate operating revenues will be available as these facilities are ready for occupancy to provide for staff, maintenance and ongoing equipment replacement. (4A.4)

Information from interviews with the Dean for Student Development and Enrollment Management and with members of the counseling staff at various FLC sites confirms the adequacy of the systems in place to provide academic advising. These sources also indicated that the schedule of meetings to convey student counseling information to counselors and, as appropriate, to classroom faculty is as presented in the self study. (4A.5)

The draft Catalog and the Educational Master Plan provide primary evidence regarding the structure of instructional programs. The information contained here was verified through interviews with faculty members and the instructional deans, and Vice President of Instruction and Student Development. (4B.1)

Program labels and descriptions were found in the draft Catalog. (4B.2)

Examination of course outlines and syllabi indicate that at this level reasonable attention is given to learning outcomes (though course objectives are often confused for student learning outcomes). Some evidence of measurement of learning at the course level is

clear. Similar evidence at the program or degree level is less clear. The draft Catalog does contain some information regarding expected program learning outcomes, but not all of these are obviously measurable. Interviews with academic leaders did not reveal how learning outcomes at the program level were to be measured, though FLC has been investing time in learning how other institutions are approaching these issues. (4B.3)

The draft Catalog and interviews with instructional leaders, both faculty and administrators, indicate that general education program structures are of the usual sort for community colleges, providing lists of courses that meet requirements, organized by area of knowledge. (4B.4)

Competence in language and computational areas at the degree level is, as reported in interviews with instructional administrators, certified by performance in specified courses. Since these courses are required for the degree, this would appear to be reasonable. FLC might consider, however, more program specific measures that would assure that degree awardees have the requisite language and computational skills *consistent with the specific degree*. (4B.5)

The team reviewed information from surveys conducted by the LRCCD which applied to FLC vocational students who had graduated from CRC/FLC programs. This is an excellent example of appropriate information for determining program effectiveness and is a potential tool for driving program improvements. The college has expressed a desire to expand this type of data collection with the expansion of local research capacity. Less clear at this time is how data on program completers is used to make changes in program content or process. (4B.6)

The draft Catalog contains the requisite information regarding general education requirements. (4C.1)

The draft Catalog contains a mission statement and a statement on general education rationale which provide the student with at least a minimum of information in this regard. LRCCD policy statements include language which guides the alignment of courses with specific general education knowledge areas. Interviews with faculty members and instructional administrators confirmed that the district and FLC curriculum committees are familiar with these guides. (4C.2)

While there does not appear to be a highly systematic system by which every aspect of general education is organized in the curriculum, there is ample evidence from direct observation of classroom activities, discussion with faculty members, and examination of course outlines and syllabi that a serious and reasonably pervasive effort is made to provide students with exposure to a range of general education substance and methods. (4C.3)

See comments under Findings. (4C.4)

The comprehensiveness of the FLC curriculum review procedures was confirmed by all

faculty members, instructional support staff and academic administrators with whom the team spoke. The centrality of the faculty voice is evident in the makeup of the college Curriculum Committee and its subcommittees. An examination of the new Curriculum Handbook reveals that it is well developed and of great potential usefulness to departmental faculty in particular. (4D.1)

The team reviewed the Education Master Plan, the Instructional Program Review document, the Mentor Handbook, the schedule of events offered at the Innovation Center, the flex day plan, and the evaluation procedures for faculty members. The team observed the manner in which instructional professionals interacted when working together on academic matters, and with notable exceptions, these were to the benefit of quality assurance (see also Standard 10). (4D.2)

The district policy manual, interviews with the Vice President of Instruction and Student Development, and with the academic deans and a number of faculty members, and especially examination of course outlines confirm the statements in the Self Study. (4D.3)

Discussion with the Dean of Student Development and Enrollment Management, confirmed the process used to make transfer-in and course substitution decisions. Conversations with counselors were at variance with the position of at least one faculty member as to the clarity and appropriateness of the course substitution procedures (and this confusion was noted in the Self Study). Articulation agreements were examined. (4D.4)

The team observed classes, seeing the various delivery systems and modes of instruction employed, and discussed these with faculty and students. The detailed results of the Scheduling Needs and Student Concerns Survey were studied. Course outlines and syllabi were examined. All of this supported the information in the Self Study. (4D.5)

The team examined the Educational Master Plan and the Instructional Program Review document, and spoke with administrators and faculty who are responsible for these processes. These parties note that these procedures are not yet fully in place—though there is much experience with them—and that some revisions are in order. As the college grows, maintaining adequate administrative capacity to adequately operate these systems was a concern expressed by several administrative and faculty leaders. (4D.6)

The team spent time in the Innovation Center, spoke with personnel there, visited all sites where interactive television was in use, visited most classrooms and spoke with many faculty who use instructional technology, especially interactive television. The contentions in the Self Study were confirmed. (4D.7)

Conclusions:

The college is in substantial compliance with Standard Four. College personnel have taken seriously their responsibilities with regard to the provision of a high quality

educational program, and it is readily apparent throughout institutional operations.

The college (and district) are to be particularly commended for the clearly specified role of the educational centers, and the excellent manner in which the El Dorado and Rancho Cordova Centers are operated and supported.

There are areas where the team would urge attention. These include:

Continued growth of the college is the ultimate theme at FLC and the facilities will be coming on line consistent with this emphasis. Will the requisite operating revenues be available to supply the concomitant faculty, support services, maintenance and ongoing equipment renewal? (4A.4, see also Recommendation 4)

Student learning outcomes are not yet well developed at the college, especially at the program and degree level. (4B.3, 4C.4, 4D.3)

The coordination of planning and evaluation is in need of serious examination generally (see Recommendation 1), and for educational programs as well. The college needs to enhance coordination of the program review and educational master planning processes. (4D.1, 4D.2, 4D.6)

General education goals need to be reviewed with an eye towards establishing clear measurability of progress towards their attainment. (4C.4)

A college policy needs to be developed to guide the acceptance of credit for courses taken at other institutions. (4D.4)

As noted under Standard Six the college has expressed a desire to expand its on-line and other distance education offerings, and must thus provide assurances that the necessary instructional (and student services) support services are available to students taking these courses. (4A.4, 4D.2, and please note Recommendation 2)

Recommendations:

Though no specific recommendations are offered here, the college's attention is directed to Recommendations 1, 2, and 3 where issues of direct relevance to Standard Four are addressed.

STANDARD FIVE

STUDENT SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT

General Comments:

Students at Folsom Lake College are well served by the efforts of the student services staff and leadership who provide assistance in an informative and supportive atmosphere. This positive and welcoming environment is conducive to creating an engaged student population and a collaborative work setting for the staff. The team would like to commend the hard work and dedication of the small staff of student services professionals who, in spite of significant enrollment growth and expanded duties, have accepted challenges and worked effectively to meet the needs of students at the college and its two centers.

Findings:

Folsom Lake College addresses the diverse learning needs of its students in an environment that is oriented toward promoting student access, progress, and success. The materials provided and activities observed articulate the college's commitment to students' needs and its understanding of the standards of good practice in the area of student support and development.

Access to services is at the heart of this commitment to students. Folsom Lake College has responded by developing and deploying a comprehensive array of student support and development services in an efficient and creative way. Besides providing admissions, counseling, financial aid, DSPS, EOPS and other associated services on the Folsom Lake campus, these same opportunities are available to students at the El Dorado and Rancho Cordova Centers. Although, in some cases, selected services are only provided on a limited basis by a single staff member who travels between locations, the promise to serve students when and where they attend is a core value that permeates the student services organization and team. However, the expanding population of students taking distance education classes may necessitate rethinking how services might be provided to students who may not have access to the three primary college locations. (5.3, 5.6)

The Los Rios Community College District has officially decided to accommodate some of the future growth in the district by creating centers that will be associated with each of the district's colleges, as opposed to creating new colleges. This makes even more significant the commitment to adequately provide support services to students attending these off-the-main campus locations. (5.6)

The college also supports student development by providing students and perspective students with access to information through publications such as the draft college catalog, class schedule, mailed schedule tabloid, various brochures and flyers, and a useful

Student Guide. In addition, online tools are available at both the college and district web sites to supplement printed materials. Although these online resources may pose some navigational challenges for certain individual students, the college is sensitive to this issue and readily helps students overcome obstacles in order for them to utilize these valuable tools. As a result, students have ready access to basic information that is necessary to understand college policies, requirements and expectations. (5.1, 5.2)

Students at the college also appear to be engaged and satisfied consumers. Members of the Associated Student Government are active, involved and welcome in college governance and planning activities. These student representatives are supported through a leadership class that supports them as campus leaders and helps the students coordinate activities at the college and the two centers. Elsewhere, students throughout the institution express a strong connection to the college, satisfaction with their learning experiences, and awareness of campus resources and opportunities. (5.4, 5.7, 5.8)

One aspect of the student support area that poses some challenges for students and staff is the adoption of relatively new student information system software. While the new People Soft system has expanded capabilities, some students expressed frustration with components of the system, particularly the online registration module. College staff also expressed that, while many aspects of the new system greatly enhance their access to information, system glitches and the need to compensate for some missing functions was time consuming and potentially impacted their ability to serve students. A particular concern in this area is the inability of the new system to process information for checking prerequisites. This system deficiency is problematic for the staff who attempt to manually check enrollment records before rosters are printed, and for students who inadvertently enroll in a class where they do not possess the required prerequisite. However, despite the stated problems, students and staff felt supported in their attempts to resolve issues, and they believed that their concerns were being appropriately addressed. In addition to the new People Soft system, the college has implemented a document imaging system for storing records in order to address the college's responsibility to provide secure and confidential permanent storage for student records. (5.5, 5.6, 5.9)

Finally, guided by a clear understanding of district practices and state policies, the college has developed a nearly comprehensive set of student support services. While some student satisfaction data has been available to inform this development, the college has only begun to formulate a program review process that will systematically evaluate these services and provide information that will enable planning and program improvement. The draft program review template is a positive first step in the right direction. (5.10)

Evidence

Evidence to support the findings for this standard resulted from a careful review of the self study, other documents and web resources readily available from the college. These sources included college publications, student satisfaction and accreditation survey

results, planning documents, the program review template, and student service guides. In addition, the college web site, including the student services, counseling and online orientation pages, were reviewed. Acquiring evidence for this standard also integrated visits to nearly all student services offices at the college and its two centers, collection of materials from these sites, and formal meetings and informal interviews with faculty and staff. Through the course of this review, staff from admissions, DSPS, EOPS, financial aid and counseling universally expressed a very positive attitude toward students, almost exhibiting an excitement about the work they do in their college and center offices. In addition, the college's counselors demonstrated in interviews that they were very positive about their role serving students, as well as proud about the relationships and integration of counseling with the instructional faculty. The most significant example of this strong connection is the priority given to two new counseling positions pending at the college. On the other side of the equation, the counselors expressed the concerns listed in the findings about the functionality of some aspects of the People Soft program. Finally, individual students were approached and asked to comment on their experiences, awareness and satisfaction with the student services programs at the college. In fact, there were students at the main campus, the El Dorado Center, and even off campus who actually approached team members in order to express their very positive attitudes toward the college. This accumulation of evidence supports the finding that students are satisfied and well served by a hard working, positive and optimistic student services team. However, these same interviews revealed the need to expand staffing and hours of service, hence the need to pursue systematic program evaluation in order to keep these services evolving. In addition, some students expressed frustration accessing and negotiating the online enrollment services. (5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6, 5.10)

The team reviewed the memorandum sent to the Accrediting Commission on May 1, 2003 titled "Proposal for College Centers." In this document the LRCCD Chancellor conveyed a district strategic decision to accommodate much of the anticipated growth in enrollment through the development of five permanent centers, each connected to an existing college. The intention is to meet the demands for service which are emerging throughout the district, in a manner which is cost effective. This kind of thoughtful anticipatory action is to be lauded. At the same time, the team notes the importance of including the delivery of all necessary support services to these centers in a manner consistent in range and quality with those available at the main campuses. (5.6)

Student leaders and other students were also contacted and interviewed about their participation in college governance activities, understanding of the accreditation process, and assessment of campus climate and activities. Feedback from the student leaders was informed and positive, while the responses given by the "student on the street" were positive, but somewhat vague. (Standards 5.4, 5.7, 5.8)

Conclusions:

Despite limited staffing, restricted budget growth, and the challenges of providing a comprehensive student services program at three physically distant locations, the college has adequately addressed the requirements of this standard. While there are many areas

of concern that still require attention, along with the new issues that will certainly arise during the transition from center to college, the team feels confident that the entire Folsom Lake College family possesses the skills and commitment necessary to master these challenges.

The district's strategic decision to accommodate enrollment growth through expanded emphasis on educational centers will require a commitment to support services at these off-the-main campus sites. (5.6)

While the team makes only one recommendation with district-wide implications for this standard, the college is encouraged to maintain its efforts to: 1) continue expansion of a comprehensive student support and development program through collaboration with the district in order to secure the funding and positions necessary to meet the needs of a growing student population (Standards 5.3, 5.4, 5.6, 5.8, 7.A.1), and 2) expand and improve the use of technology as a means of assisting the limited student services staff in providing access to comprehensive support services to students across the wide geographical area served by this institution. (Standards 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6, 5.10)

Recommendations:

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. (Standard 4A.4, 5.6, 6.1, 7A.1, 9A.1, 9A.2)

STANDARD SIX INFORMATION AND LEARNING RESOURCES

General Comments:

Learning resources and technology at Folsom Lake College are integrated to support service to students. The college has taken an innovative approach to the incorporation of technology throughout facilities and strongly encourages the use of technology in the classroom. Folsom, El Dorado and Rancho Cordova are providing hi-tech equipment in classrooms. Staff training in the area of technology is outstanding; support staff are able to meet the demand for timely maintenance and repair of computer and multimedia equipment.

The college has two different models for learning resources: a traditional library at El Dorado and a Personal Learning Environment (combining library, computer lab, tutorial, and several student services units) at the Folsom campus. While staffing remains static at the El Dorado Center, the Folsom library added a full time librarian in 2003. Faculty, students and other college staff described library staff as supportive and as people who go out of their way to help.

Findings:

The college is fortunate in that so many of its facilities are either recently developed or coming on-line in the next few years. The Folsom campus has a brand new inventory of technology resources and library materials and has a state of the art infrastructure. El Dorado Center facilities are less than 10 years old and do incorporate many new technologies in classrooms, though not to the extent represented at FLC. The library at the El Dorado Center is described as welcoming and 'homey' by faculty but has a limited collection and (see 6.5) is not well-supported in comparison to the FLC library operation. The team notes that the overall plan for the college features greater learning resource capacity at the Folsom Lake site which will be of service to both centers. (6.1)

Faculty have been involved in the selection of technology and information resources through personal contacts and surveys. (6.2)

With a few exceptions, learning resources and computer labs are available over an appropriate span of hours to ensure that students have access. The availability of resources to remote students or to students using non-college facilities (e.g. leased space) is extremely limited although the libraries' catalog and electronic resources are accessible via the web site. (6.3)

The college ensures that staff hired to provide information and technology services are selected based on criteria that include technology competency. The college offers numerous staff development opportunities and training support to keep faculty and staff current in the use of technology. (6.4)

The funding mechanisms for new facilities provide generous budgets for start-up operations. However, the college will face some challenges particularly as computer equipment reaches obsolescence and the Folsom library fund is exhausted. There is already a disparity in funding between the El Dorado campus, which is not receiving start up dollars and the Folsom campus both in technology and library materials. At present, existing staff are able to maintain all technologies (IT and audiovisual/instructional) in good working order. (6.5)

The college's library has several current agreements with library systems; these enhance the capability of the college to serve students, particularly in the ability to obtain interlibrary loans. (6.6)

There is no provision for assessing technology resources through a program review process, but the two libraries are initiating plans for a program review. Unfortunately, the college has not yet given adequate thought to planning and coordination of services for remote students although fifty-five classes are already offered in some form of distance learning. (6.7)

Evidence:

Interviews with staff indicate that technology is given a high priority at FLC and there is a perception that technology is strongly supported administratively. Computer services staff and others indicated that technology needs are met; in the event of a system failure, funds are quickly allotted to deal with the problem. It's no surprise that in a college that gives high priority to technology that the student and staff assessments of the electronic resources of the libraries are positive. Surveys done in 2002 indicate that 65% of students found the electronic materials appropriate and nearly 75% of faculty felt the same way. Unfortunately, the level of satisfaction with the print collections hovers at 36% for students and 34% for faculty. There are substantial differences between library collections at the Folsom site and at the El Dorado Center. The Folsom library has recently published materials, the result of a \$537,000 allocation as a new facility. At the El Dorado Center the library relies on a \$15,000 budget that must cover materials, supplies, and student level staffing. The Folsom Lake library has the newest resources in the entire district and is frequently asked to interlibrary loan items to other colleges in the district. In September, Folsom's library loaned over 60 items to other colleges. (6.1, 6.5)

Student access to services is generally appropriate. The Personal Learning Environment (PLE) at the Folsom site is open up to 14 hours per day. However, not all service desks are staffed the entire time. There is no librarian at the reference desk from 1-4 p.m. and the evening librarian leaves an hour before the PLE closes. The "Scheduling Needs and Student Concerns Survey" indicates that more students would use the PLE in the afternoon and evening than in the morning, yet most services have traditional 8-4 operations. Tutorial services are not available all hours the PLE is open. The El Dorado Center has limited hours in the library as it has only one full-time librarian. There are no library or tutorial services at the Rancho Cordova center or leased sites. There is no

assistance for students needing to use the library catalog at Rancho Cordova; no interlibrary loans are sent to Rancho Cordova as there isn't a staff person there designated to receive, set aside, and check out items. (6.3)

The PLE at Folsom has proven to be a valuable resource but students and faculty both complained that the name did not truly define the range of services available. One instructional faculty member noted that students attending FLC from other colleges in the district would look for 'learning resources' and not be able to find it. The same term is used for an entirely different service at the El Dorado Center, adding to the confusion. The fact that 35% of students didn't know enough about the library collection to express an opinion about its usefulness may derive from the inability of students to find it at all. Students and faculty contacted during the course of the team visit stated that they were very happy with the quality of services provided, indicating that the helpfulness of the staff was unequaled. However, faculty and classified employees in the PLE expressed concern that they often end up being asked questions well out of their area of expertise and commented that this is frustrating for students. (6.3)

Because the PLE is a temporary accommodation to provision of services (the next construction phase relocates several units and expands and reorients the library), a number of unrelated service desks are located on the main service floor. In all, there are 5 service stations, another cause for confusion. Signage is at waist level on the front of some counters & invisible from the main entrance. Another design flaw: the library catalog site is near the circulation counter but is completely out of sight of the library reference desk. This reduces the likelihood that students struggling with the catalog will be noticed and assisted. The staff at the circulation counter indicated that they try to keep an eye on these key computer stations, but they are sometimes unable to leave that station before the student leaves. (6.3)

Learning resources and information must be available to students using on-site services as well as those logging on via electronic resources. Folsom Lake College has taken its first steps toward providing equity of access to remote students by making the library catalog and electronic databases available via the Internet. Unfortunately, there is no effort to identify and coordinate other critical services or to plan for integration of remote services. When asked about the status of distance learning planning, one administrator told the team that it "wasn't even on the horizon". (6.7)

Conclusions:

Folsom Lake College supports learning resources and technology services and the provision of information resources for staff and students. The extensive facilities construction projects have resulted in new, state of the art resources for everyone at the Folsom site. Unfortunately, the El Dorado site lacks comparable funding. Staff at El Dorado make a valiant attempt to ensure students have library resources, but the library is cramped, limited in seating space, and struggling with limited storage capacity for materials. (6.1)

The PLE at Folsom campus has dedicated staff who have overcome problems based on the design of the service area to provide assistance to students. (6.3)

Funding disparities between the Folsom Lake and El Dorado sites may create challenges in terms of ensuring that students receive equal services. (6.5)

Planning for distance education is non-existent and will be critical in order to determine staffing and service priorities in learning resources. (6.7)

Recommendations:

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

STANDARD SEVEN FACULTY AND STAFF

General Comments:

The college is commended for its spirit of inclusivity and enthusiasm in the area of staff development. College faculty and administration showed great initiative and innovation in applying for and receiving a grant to create the Academy for Innovation in Teaching and Learning. While the grant money only lasted one year, the college staff was able to sponsor highly successful workshops that addressed pedagogical concerns. Even without the grant money, the college continues to host a variety of faculty workshops ranging from using technology in the classroom to building effective teams.

The Classified Senate has also taken a leadership role in creating staff development activities; such workshops as “Effective Communication in the Workplace” and “Conflict Management in the Workplace” have brought together staff from all areas to create an efficient and collegial atmosphere. From the number of people who participate in these activities and from the enthusiastic response of the faculty and staff interviewed, it’s clear that FLC deserves kudos for its broad-based staff development program.

Findings:

The accreditation visit has validated that the Folsom Lake College faculty are educated, trained, and experienced to provide a high quality of instruction to the students of the college. While the college is working towards decreasing its dependence on part-time faculty, overall the college is successfully meeting the needs of its programs given the tight budget constraints the state is currently experiencing. (7A.1)

The same cannot be said for classified staff hiring, however. Both classified staff and faculty decry the lack of clerical support resulting in top-level administrators taking valuable time to complete clerical tasks instead of conducting important leadership functions. This lack of support also results in essential record-keeping functions of the college (such as the completion of committee reports and minutes) being left undone. (7A.1)

The college has developed effective prioritization processes to identify staffing needs. For faculty, the area spokespersons meet with their respective departments to determine what hiring needs are warranted based on the department’s review of productivity and the number of classes offered. A committee consisting of the area spokespersons and the Vice President of Instruction then meets to prioritize the requests for recommendation to the college president. (7A.2)

A similar process is in place for classified hiring; specifically, various employees submit a Classified Staffing Proposal to the appropriate supervisor/dean/manager who in turn approves the staffing request and submits the proposal to the Classified Hiring Priorities Committee (consisting of membership from the three bargaining units as well as the four major college divisions). This committee then prioritizes the requests and submits them to the President for approval. If the President changes the priorities in any way, she immediately returns to the CHPC to communicate her reasons; thus, there is clear two-way communication between the committee and the President. (7A.2)

The hiring of faculty and staff is a similarly inclusive process. The high quality of faculty (selected from a diverse range of backgrounds and institutions) reflect the spirit of the college that encourages its staff to “go the extra mile” to serve the needs of students. The FLC classified staff uses these same faculty hiring policies as a model for their own procedures, which in turn results in a high quality of staff being hired. (7A.2, 7A.3)

Most evaluations are conducted systematically and regularly although a few challenges for the college remain. The large number of non-tenured faculty places a large burden on veteran faculty to conduct tenure-track evaluations. Similarly, and in part because of the shortage of clerical help, some managers conduct evaluations hurriedly which can feel cursory to some employees. Such hastily completed evaluations call into question how valuable the evaluations are in helping employees improve their job performances. (Standards 7B.1, 7B.2)

The matter of administrative evaluations is a bit problematic. The self study reports that a high percentage of employees are not informed about the administrative evaluation process. Many faculty and classified staff are left out of the administrative evaluation process altogether due to policies that allow the evaluated administrator to choose his/her evaluators. All employees within a given work group are not necessarily asked to participate in the evaluation of a manager (which is certainly the prerogative of the district/college). However, in some cases only those actively involved with the evaluation are aware of its existence, which results in some employees who are ill-informed about the process. (7B.1)

As mentioned in the general comments above, one of the major strengths of FLC lies in its staff development program. Broad-based participation in a variety of activities coupled with obvious enthusiasm on the part of faculty and staff result in a highly responsive and effective program. The staff development program, organized by the Professional Development Committee (a subcommittee of the Professional Activities Committee), provides training in areas that both faculty and staff find relevant to their job needs. Faculty members learn to use technology and pedagogies that they can immediately apply in the classroom; and staff members develop leadership skills that they can use to increase the effectiveness of their work groups. (7C.1)

The PDC determines staff development needs in response to external requirements; for example, workshops on student learning outcomes are planned in response to the new accreditation standards. More importantly, the college focuses on internal needs by

conducting bi-annual surveys to identify the technology requirements of faculty and staff. (7C.2)

For the most part, the college consistently follows the personnel procedures it has adopted for all employment processes. All constituencies are generally well informed about the hiring processes of administrators, faculty, and staff though, as mentioned earlier, there is some confusion about the evaluation processes of administrators. (7D.1, 7D.3)

The college is committed to hiring a diverse work force and illustrates this commitment through the continuous training of equity representatives who serve on hiring committees. (7D.2)

Evidence:

As stated in the self study and verified through the accreditation survey and through interviews with members of the Academic Senate, the faculty is satisfied with the pace in which faculty hiring is taking place. Throughout the visit, however, faculty from various areas expressed concern about the lack of clerical support for instructional deans. Despite this discontent, interviews with members of the classified staff indicate that the staff are happy with the prioritization process. (7A.1)

Despite the staff satisfaction with the prioritization process, it remains a concern of the accreditation team that classified staffing shortages continue to exist, especially given that the 1997 Accreditation Site Visit mentioned that staffing plans need to be implemented. Numerous interviews as well as the accreditation survey itself indicate the widespread feeling that the college is seriously understaffed. (7A.1)

A faculty hiring manual, which is produced at the district office, was recently revised with solid input from FLC faculty, thus creating local support for district-wide policies. Although a specific classified hiring manual does not exist for any of the three bargaining units, all classified staff members interviewed were intimately aware of the selection process. According to Classified Senate minutes, the Senate plays a major role in selecting the members of the hiring committee, including appointing the appropriately trained equity representative. (7A.2)

The process for administrative evaluations is outlined in the Los Rios Management Association handbook; a concern arises, however, with the inclusivity of the process. Many faculty and staff are simply unaware that an evaluation process exists or that particular evaluations are undertaken. (7B.1)

Evaluation criteria were verified in the faculty and staff evaluation forms which are located in each bargaining unit's contract. The evaluation forms for both faculty and classified staff include questions on the employee's job performance as well as their contributions to the college in general and to students in particular. (7B.2, 7B.3)

In evaluating the effectiveness of faculty evaluations, it's clear that there are mixed feelings among the faculty. Some faculty report that often great importance is placed on a relatively few comments (especially from the student evaluations) which can skew the evaluating faculty member's perception of the effectiveness of the faculty member being evaluated. This tendency to focus on the negative – in the name of representing all viewpoints – may account for the high percentage of faculty who feel the evaluation process is threatening. (Standard 7B.3)

The college regularly evaluates its staff development program. Every participant in a staff development activity participates in a written evaluation of the activity; these evaluations are kept in the binder and used both to improve and plan future workshops. (Standard 7C.2)

Each faculty member is contractually obligated to complete 12 hours of flex activities each year. A binder of recorded flex activities shows that while most faculty attend some of the same activities (six hours of opening day activities), the majority of faculty fulfill their requirement in a variety of ways, including serving on governance committees and attending professional development activities. The wide variety of activities speaks to the college's flexibility in encouraging faculty to attend activities they deem relevant to their job performance. (7C.2)

Written policies exist for the hiring and evaluation of faculty members; written policies also exist for the evaluation of classified staff in all three bargaining units; some of this policy is contained in collective bargaining contracts. District policies exist for the hiring of classified staff and for the hiring and evaluation of administrators. (7D.1, 7D.3)

Equity representatives are trained and given written policies that demonstrate the college's policies to ensure a fair hiring process. (7D.2)

Conclusions:

The college is commended for its broad-based approach to prioritizing faculty and staff hiring needs. All constituencies are well informed about and supportive of the processes used. (7A.1)

The college is strongly encouraged to develop local administrative evaluation processes that gather appropriate perspectives and are known to faculty and classified staff constituencies. (7B.1)

Recommendations:

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 plan for the demand for staff that will come with the opening of the new buildings. (Standard 7A.1, 9A.1, 9A.2)

STANDARD EIGHT PHYSICAL RESOURCES

General Comments:

Folsom Lake College's main campus and two centers are attractive and appear to be well maintained and kept clean.

All faculty and staff were courteous and well informed. It was obvious they were prepared for the team visit. Their extreme dedication to and affection for Folsom Lake College is apparent in all that they do from speaking about the college, to working in less than optimal space and doing more than is expected for their jobs.

The forward thinking of the district and the college in planning the new buildings is commendable.

The operations department has been awarded two grants to launch a recycling program. The Operations Supervisor wrote two grants totaling \$36,000 that will assist the college in meeting the state mandate for all agencies to reduce its waste to landfills by 50 percent by 2004.

The facilities support the excellent teaching that the team observed, and assist students in being fully engaged in their classes.

Findings:

The rapid population and economic growth of the FLC service area has resulted in increasing enrollment each semester, thus creating a constant need for additional facilities. The District is addressing these needs through an ambitious building and capital improvement program, financed through local and state bond money, on the main campus and at El Dorado Center. Further, the search will begin in 2004 for a permanent site for the Rancho Cordova Center. In the meantime, existing structures, both permanent and portable, have been designed or remodeled to accommodate the instructional, services, and operational processes without compromising the quality. (8.1)

The vice president of administration and the supervisors of campus operations at FLC and EDC oversee the management, maintenance, and operation of physical facilities. FLC employs an operations supervisor and 6 staff to complete maintenance, receiving, duplicating and printing, and custodial tasks. One of these staff is a maintenance technician. EDC employs an operations supervisor and 3 staff to complete custodial duties and maintenance. One of these staff is a maintenance technician. RCC employs one permanent full-time classified staff member to oversee the operation of the center. She reports problems to the supervisor of operations at FLC, who then dispatches the maintenance technician to the site or contacts the District maintenance department for assistance. Maintenance problems that may create safety problems or seriously interrupt

the operations of the facility are reported to and taken care of by the business manager of the Mather Field Business Park which leases the RCC to the District. The day-to-day custodial work is completed by a student worker, who works about two hours a day. (8.2)

Major maintenance problems are handled by the District maintenance department. A 4-person graveyard maintenance crew travels to the colleges and centers throughout the district to complete large repair and maintenance tasks that cannot be completed during regular hours of operation. The LRCCD uses the facilities condition inventory system to identify maintenance and major repair projects. (8.2)

As cited in the self study, there is no audiovisual technician. Support for maintenance and repairs of audiovisual equipment is primarily provided by a staff member from the distance education services department. However, no one characterized the lack of a technician as a real hardship. This is just another example of the entire college coming together to make do with what they have. (8.2)

One indication that FLC has made reasonable efforts to provide a safe environment for students and employees has been the determination by appropriate authorities that all campus sites are in compliance with ADA requirements and CA Title 24 building code. Safety plans are in place. Instructions for handling emergencies are posted in all work areas and classrooms. Mishaps, such as broken water mains and severed electrical lines during construction have provided several tests of the campus emergency response system. Safety committees are in place at the District level and the college level. The newly formed college safety committee (they have had 2 meetings) is now exploring the solution to the issue cited in the self study regarding the need to better inform all constituencies of how to report a problem or concern related to issues of access, safety, security, and a healthful environment. The campus has two police officers. EDC has one police officer and one safety officer. A private service is contracted to patrol the grounds at night and on weekends. At RCC, a security guard is on duty during the evening hours and on Saturdays, as needed. (8.3)

Individual departments or units determine their needs for equipment annually. Instructional departments are supposed to utilize their educational master plans to justify their needs. Since the plans are so new, it is not clear if they are being used for this purpose. Two departments with full-time faculty have not completed their plans. Also, not all of the departments staffed only by adjunct faculty have plans. (8.4)

The Information Technology Department provides support to departments for selecting, installing, and maintaining computers and their peripherals. The department is also responsible for determining replacement of equipment for the campus computer labs. Currently, replacement is on a 3-year rotational basis. (8.4)

Requests for replacement or purchase of equipment are made to the Budget and Institutional Facilities Committee for prioritization. Capital outlay funds cover the purchase of equipment for educational programs and services for the new buildings. Other equipment purchases are made primarily from college discretionary monies. No long-term plan exists for the future purchase or replacement of equipment in the new buildings or for other buildings although it is acknowledged that alternative sources of

funds must be sought. Maintenance of equipment, other than computer equipment, is the responsibility of the departments in which the equipment is housed. The IT Department maintains computer equipment. (8.4)

Inventory of equipment is maintained at the district using a database in PeopleSoft. All equipment assets over \$200 in value are tagged with a computerized bar coded tag. The district is in the very early stages of implementing a database system for inventory tracking (called FUSION) that links directly to the State Chancellor's office. LRCCD officials in the Facilities Management Department are "cautiously optimistic" that the system will work. There are no plans at this time to eliminate the PeopleSoft inventory tracking system. The campus operations department is responsible for tracking the move of equipment from one place to another on campus. IT tracks the move of computer equipment. (8.4)

The district Facilities Management Department utilizes the LRCCD Strategic Plan and works with the college to develop initial and final project plans for capital construction and scheduled maintenance and repair projects. A project planner is assigned by the Facilities Management Department to represent the interests of the district and college. The planner provides coordination and direction to the architects and others, and resolves issues and concerns that may arise during the design development. During construction, a project manager oversees the project and serves as the liaison between district and the college. While a strong and direct connection between the district activities and the college activities related to planning was widely revealed during the interviews with both district and campus personnel, the various planning documents do not reflect the connection. (8.5)

The facilities planning component of the Budget and Institutional Facilities Planning Committee (BIFPC), in consultation with representatives of the Educational Planning, Curriculum, and Matriculation and Student Success Committees, discusses and acts on financial and facilities issues. Four classified, 10 faculty (12 positions are allotted), and 1 administrator serve on this committee. The Budget and Institutional Facilities Planning Handbook outlines the practices and procedures that guide the budgeting process and facility planning. The FLC Participatory Governance and Collegial Consultation Model and committee membership documents identify the role of faculty in governance, including hiring and evaluation of personnel, educational program planning, and facilities planning. (8.5)

At the college level, planning for programming and design of buildings is overseen by a college steering committee made up of administrators, participatory governance committee chairs, Academic and Classified Senate leaders, and student body leadership. Also anyone who is affected by the process is invited to give input by attending committee meetings. Academic Senate leadership stated that planning meetings with district personnel, architects, etc. are not always scheduled at times that are convenient for faculty because of short-notice timelines. (8.5)

Evidence:

Numerous documents--including architectural drawings, minutes of meetings of various committees, and correspondence between the district and the college and with state agencies and the campus community--clearly detail the building and capital improvement plans for FLC and EDC. Interviews with District, FLC, and EDC personnel provide further proof of District and local support of this effort to provide adequate physical resources. Interviews with faculty and staff indicated they are satisfied with the physical facilities available to them to teach their classes and complete the tasks necessary to provide full service to students. Office space is cramped but adequate. Finally, observations of the existing buildings, ongoing construction, and the surrounding environment provide obvious reinforcement of their successful efforts. (8.1)

Interviews with District, FLC, EDC, and RCC personnel, including managers, faculty, and classified staff support the findings that the management, maintenance and operations of the physical plants are well done. Several faculty commented on the quick response rate of the operations department to any request for maintenance. Observations of the conditions of the existing buildings and the surrounding environment provide obvious proof of their successful efforts. (8.2)

Interviews with FLC, EDC, and RCC personnel, including the vice president of administration, supervisors, faculty, and the president of the Classified Senate support the findings that access, safety and security of facilities are well provided for. One recent example may demonstrate the effectiveness of college emergency response routines. As a result of construction work a gas line broke. All personnel who are required to respond to the emergency did so. The emergency cutoff system for the gas was immediately activated. No evacuations were necessary. The president of the Classified Senate could not describe any issues that would compromise access, safety, or security of employees. He noted lack of office space for employees and limited storage space for operations equipment and tools--matters that will be resolved with completion of the new construction. (8.3)

The findings related to the effectiveness of resource planning and evaluation and their link to other institutional planning were confirmed through interviews with District, FLC, and EDC personnel, including the LRCCD vice chancellor of administration, FLC vice president of administration, supervisors of operations, faculty, and the president of the Classified Senate. Documents reviewed included the Budget and Institutional Facilities Planning Handbook and the Folsom Lake College Technology Planning Goals and Objectives. (8.4)

The findings related to the effectiveness of resource planning and evaluation and their link to other institutional planning were confirmed through interviews with District, FLC, and EDC personnel, including the LRCCD vice chancellor of administration, FLC vice president of administration, supervisors, faculty, meetings with the Academic Senate leadership, the Educational Plan Committee, and the Budget and Institutional Facilities Planning Committee. Additionally the following documents were reviewed: District Strategic Plan, Folsom Lake College Technology Planning Goals and Objectives, Budget and Institutional Facilities Planning Handbook, Educational Master Plans, Program Review documents, and the FLC Participatory Governance Consultation Model. All

individuals interviewed agree that they are involved in or have the opportunity to be involved in facilities planning through their respective representative governing bodies. However, little evidence was found, either in discussions or through review of the documents, that the process of planning for physical resources is fully linked to other institutional planning. (8.5)

Conclusions:

The college substantially meets this Standard. All individuals interviewed report satisfaction with the level of services of physical resources at the three sites (8.1). The facilities are well maintained, and are felt to be accessible, safe and secure (8.2, 8.3). Equipment is in adequate supply, appropriate and well supported, though the lack of a concrete plan for obtaining funding from sources other than discretionary funds and capital outlay projects for future equipment purchases needs to be addressed (8.4).

The planning process at the district level works very well. It is linked to the district strategic plan and relies heavily on input from each college. Physical resource planning and evaluation does support institutional goals. However, college-level planning is not formally linked to other institutional planning and evaluation. (8.5)

Recommendations:

See Recommendation 1. Planning that relates to physical resources should be linked to the other relevant planning effort.

STANDARD NINE FINANCIAL RESOURCES

General Comments:

The procedures that both the district and FLC have in place to manage finances are impressive. Equally impressive is the widespread understanding and acceptance of these procedures. Even during the current statewide budget shortfalls there exists a confidence that the district can successfully manage finances and support the colleges and centers.

Equally notable is the collegiality that appears to exist between the FLC and the other three colleges. The FLC Vice President-Administration utilizes her counterparts at the other colleges as resources in handling complicated issues. There appeared to be no major dissension between FLC and the other three colleges.

Findings:

As is the case with many California community college districts, Los Rios is implementing a major capital construction program including several new facilities at Folsom Lake and El Dorado as well as a permanent location to replace their leased facility at Rancho Cordova. The total gross square footage to come on line within the next four years is over 256,087 square feet. This capital program fulfills most of the educational program needs and will support a full complement of student services. (9A.1, 9A.2, 9A.3)

On the other hand, there are stated staff needs that are unfilled due to budget restraints. While it is understandable that staff needs due to growth and technology are inconsistent with operating budget reductions, this circumstance will be difficult to resolve.

The district has a budget committee with representatives from each of the colleges, three from FLC. They meet monthly to review district finances and are involved with the allocation of funds to the colleges. This committee provides assurance that major issues such as the 2002-2003 mid-year budget cuts are handled with some consistency throughout the district. FLC also has a Budget and Institutional Facilities Planning Committee (BIFPC) which has twelve faculty positions, four classified positions and one administrator. There is an elaborate process documented in a handbook that describes how requests for funds are to be prepared and processed, and how funds are allocated. Categorical funds are also reviewed. A calendar is prepared identifying due dates and milestones. FLC also maintains a reserve to handle unexpected needs that may come up during the fiscal year. It is expected that funding requests have been reviewed to ensure linkage with educational master plan goals.(9A.1, 9A.4, 9A.5, 9B.3, 9B.6 and 9C.4)

Audits by external independent firms are conducted of both district funds and the district foundation which includes the foundations of the four colleges. There were no major instances of non-compliance reported. (9B.2)

Fees such as parking fees are consolidated at the district level but applied toward maintenance of parking facilities and cover a portion of the campus police expenses. Parking fees are periodically reviewed to ensure they're in line with other districts in the area. Commissions from food service vending and bookstore proceeds are maintained at FLC with excess bookstore proceeds kept in reserve for future bookstore needs. (9B.4)

District procedures ensure that contractual obligations are met and a sufficient reserve (3-5%) is maintained. Their method of not allocating all discretionary funds and having a contingency above and beyond the reserve allows the district to accommodate special needs that may come up during the fiscal year. (9C.2, 9C.3 and 9C.4)

Evidence:

The published capital program identifies the significant amount of building space that will be coming on line. Based on discussions with FLC staff, a preliminary review of positions required to support the facilities has been conducted which includes staffing for some of the services and programs the new facilities will accommodate. Conversations with FLC staff members bring out a strong confidence that the district, given its track record, will somehow find the financial resources to fund the staff positions associated with the implementation program. However, there are staff positions today which are needed in order to provide the level of service Folsom Lake would like to provide but because of budget restraints the district cannot fill. (9A.1, 9A.2 and 9A.3)

Interviews with the self-study work group for standard nine confirm the processes utilized by the district and by FLC and validate general acceptance of the structure to obtain widespread participation. Discussions with the Vice President –Administration also reaffirm the use of the documented procedures and role of the BIFPC. (9A.1, 9A.4, 9A.5, 9B.3, 9B.6 and 9C.4)

The 2001-2002 independent audits of the District and the Foundation were reviewed. The 2002-2003 audits have not been formally completed, however, preliminary drafts have been submitted to select District personnel. According to the Director of Accounting Services and the Vice Chancellor of Resource Development, there were no major non-compliance instances reported. In addition, a firm was contracted to perform the 2002-2003 audit that had not performed recent district audits, a practice that periodically brings new approaches and perspectives to financial review. (9B.2)

Discussions with the Vice President-Administration verify the procedures for finances associated with auxiliary activities as outlined in the self-study. (9B.4)

The self-study, discussion with the self-study work groups and with administrators confirm widespread acceptance of how both the district and FLC manage their finances

which allows them to handle special needs that come up during the year. (9C.2, 9C.3 and 9C.4)

Conclusions:

The procedures for managing the FLC discretionary funds are documented and practiced and appear to be well accepted. The college is to be commended for developing a financial process that generates confidence among the staff. (9A.1, 9A.4, 9A.5, 9B.3, 9B.6 and 9C.4)

If there are needed staff positions today that cannot be filled, it's unclear how the college and district will provide the significant financial resources for the operational and support staff required for the new facilities. Given the vagaries of the State budget and the impact on community colleges, it would be difficult to develop specific plans. Given the track record of Los Rios, plans may have already been initiated, for providing resources for staff needed at FLC, though the team was not presented with evidence to this affect. (9A.1, 9A.2 , 9A.3).

Recommendations:

See Recommendations 1 and 4.

STANDARD TEN GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

General Comments:

As the newest college in a four-college district, Folsom Lake College benefits from the established practices and communication pathways in this strong and effective district. The Los Rios District administration and staff have clearly defined roles that facilitate the dedication of college energy to on-campus students, faculty, staff, and issues. Faculty, staff, and administrators report positive reactions to the district roles in college governance and an uncommonly low level of college-district tension.

During the transition period from center status to college status, Folsom Lake College benefits from the opportunity to develop and implement college processes for participatory governance that match the campus climate.

Findings:

The Governing Board of the Los Rios Community College District consists of seven elected members plus an elected student trustee. The board members are elected by geographical region and for staggered terms to ensure continuity. (10A.1)

In conducting the policy work of the district, the Governing Board is guided by an extensive and clearly organized policy manual. The Governing Board oversees the development of the district's strategic plan and relies on this document plus board policies to guide the financial health and integrity of the four colleges in the districts. (10A.2)

The Governing Board appropriately delegates responsibility to the district chief executive officer (Chancellor) to implement the policies and the district's strategic plan. The comprehensive board policy manual is reviewed and up-dated periodically. (10A.3)

The Governing Board hires and evaluates the district Chancellor and confirms appointments of other major academic and administrative officers. (10A.4)

The Board Policy Manual outlines the size, duties, responsibilities, ethical conduct requirements, structure and operating procedures. In a single sentence, the Board Policy Manual requires that the Board conduct periodic self-evaluations of their performance. However, the process for conducting this evaluation is not defined in the Board Policy Manual and such evaluations have not been conducted. (10A.5)

Governing Board membership has been relatively consistent with the most recent Board member change occurring seven years ago. Although the Board is committed to new

member orientation, there has been not been a recent need to use or define this program. The Board is committed to ongoing government board development which is accomplished through participation at conferences and periodic workshop sessions. (10A.6)

The Board received frequent progress reports during the preparation of the Folsom Lake College self-study, culminating in the Board's approval of the final document in summer, 2003. (10A.7)

The President of Folsom Lake College presides over a rapidly growing faculty, staff, and student body. Thanks to local bond funds, facilities to accommodate current needs and growth projections require a college-wide focus on facilities planning. The President's leadership in preparing the college for the accreditation process and ensuring college-wide involvement in facilities planning is supported through the review of documents and interviews on campus and at the El Dorado Center. (10B.1)

In the midst of rapid change, the college administration effectively monitors processes to ensure effective educational and fiscal management. The creation of these processes for a new college has benefited from the opportunity to use established processes as the starting point. Through the system of district councils and the transfer of faculty leaders from other colleges in this district to Folsom Lake College, models of effective processes are readily available. (10B.2)

Current levels of staffing are an issue across the district due to state-wide budget reductions in funding for community colleges. Although both classified staff and faculty are needed at Folsom Lake College, the processes and formulas for allocating employees appear to be equitable and hold the promise for adequate staffing once budgets allow. Processes are in place to replace the current Vice President of Instruction and Student Support who will retire at the end of the fall semester. (10B.3)

Survey results indicate that a comfortable majority find administrative support for an effective teaching and learning environment to be positive. However, this was questioned by some members of the college community who interviewed by the team. This perception is cited in the self-study as an area requiring college-wide conversations in the coming year. (10B.3)

Administrators at Folsom Lake College are qualified to perform the tasks before them at this rapidly growing college. However, managers either share classified support or do not have any classified support, thereby hampering their effectiveness and increasing their workload. As cited in the self-study, a majority of the college community is not clear about the duties or evaluation processes for managers. (10B.4) Similarly, the role of administrators in institutional governance is not fully understood by the college community as documented by the Folsom Lake College Accreditation Survey. (10B.5)

The Folsom Lake College Participatory Governance Consultation Model developed in fall 2000 provides a blueprint for college decision-making by outlining the tasks of key

college committees and the roles of constituent groups as well as linking each group's tasks to Title 5 regulations. However, there is a mixed perception about the level of respect administrators have for faculty roles and responsibilities in college governance. In addition, the guiding documents for faculty and staff roles and responsibilities in college governance appear to be inconsistently used as a map for decision-making. (10B.6, 10B.8)

The Folsom Lake College Academic Senate has been evolving over the past five years guided by the Cosumnes River College Academic Senate. (10B.7) The Classified Senate has been similarly supported in establishing a group to participate in governance. (10B.9)

The Associated Student Government directs student activities and serves as the official voice of students in campus affairs. Inconsistency in faculty/staff leadership for this governance body hampered early development, but that situation was resolved two years ago by the employment of a permanent Student Government Advisor who teaches at both Folsom Lake College and the El Dorado Center. (10B.10)

The district board, chief executive officer, and staff provide effective leadership in fiscal, educational, facilities, and political realms. (10C.1, 10C.2, 10C.4, 10C.5) A mapping document delineates roles and responsibilities for each component of the district which, in combination with an interest-based conflict resolution practice, provides a model for the colleges' processes. (10C.3) The district administration and staff have established an effective communication network through the system of district councils that provide both formal and informal opportunities for the colleges to communicate with one another and with district staff. (10C.5)

Evidence:

The self-study conclusions related to the Governing Board membership and policies were validated through a review of documents and interviews with Board members. (10A. 1-7) As noted in the self-study, the Governing Board will fully comply with the accreditation standards when they implement the existing Board evaluation policy and conduct routine evaluations of their performance as a governing board. (10A.5)

The positive climate throughout this district merits special attention and praise. Interviews with faculty and staff at Folsom Lake College and the El Dorado Center as well as with Board members document a climate of support and positive interactions. Although Board members are elected by geographic region, the members are united in their adherence to the District Strategic Plan and do not serve as advocates for the college in his/her region. The modeling of this united, collegial approach extends to college-to-college interactions as reported at all employee levels at the Folsom Lake College. This surprising and refreshing climate of mutual support is maintained in part through a system of district councils that provide both formal and informal opportunities for the colleges to communicate with one another and with district staff. The district council for

Associated Student Government provides a similar network for student governance in the district. (10A.2, 10A.3, 10A.5)

On the Folsom Lake College Accreditation Survey (spring 2002), a significant proportion (64%) of full-time faculty rated the campus administration as failing to provide the leadership and management to support an effective teaching, learning, and working environment. This troubling perception was not echoed at the same high proportion of classified staff or part-time faculty. Interviews with faculty, staff, and administrators during the site visit consistently reflected the opinion that if the same survey were given in fall 2003, the ratings of administrative support for teaching/learning would be higher. (10B.3)

On the Folsom Lake College Accreditation Survey, a significant proportion (from 32% to 59%) of faculty, staff, and administrators responded “do not know” to questions about administrators’ duties, evaluations, and role in institutional governance. (10B.4, 10B.5) Interviews with faculty and staff indicate that their major concern relates to the lack of faculty and staff feedback in managers’ evaluations. (10B.4)

Based on survey results and interviews, both faculty and staff are aware of and respect their roles in the college and district governance processes as outlined in the Folsom Lake College Participatory Governance Consultation Model. All groups acknowledge the need to up-date this document developed in fall 2000, such as to more clearly define the roles of committees to prevent overlap of responsibility. (10.B6, 10B.8, 10B.9)

However, there is serious concern that the administrators do not consistently adhere to this documented Participatory Governance Consultation Model. On the survey 27% of the full-time faculty report their perception that faculty have little role in college decision-making. More troubling were reports from the visiting team members that in interviews on a number of different accreditation standards, both faculty and administrators indicate mistrust regarding one another’s roles and responsibilities (10B.6). In approximately half of the interviews related to governance full-time faculty and classified staff seriously questioned the administration’s commitment to comply with policies and participatory decision-making. Examples cited to support this claim are the lack of regard for meeting times of standing committees and the distribution of policies without consultation, such as the student grievance policy, publication guidelines, and dress code for employees. (10B.6, 10B.9)

Based on interviews and survey results, three key groups -- the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Associated Student Government -- have developed into representative supporting bodies which represent their constituencies in positive ways. All groups received timely mentoring from their counterparts at other colleges in the district and have been received as welcome and equal partners at the appropriate district councils for several years. Each group makes appropriate efforts to be inclusive on representative bodies for Folsom Lake College and the El Dorado Center. This is done through devices such as alternating meetings at each site, using teleconferencing

equipment to include both sites in meetings, and assignments split between the two sites for faculty and staff. (10B.7, 10B.9, 10B.10)

The effectiveness of the Governing Board, Chancellor, and district staff in providing effective leadership in fiscal, educational, facilities, and political realms is documented in interviews with Folsom Lake College faculty, staff, and administrators. (10C.1, 10C.2, 10C.3, 10C.4, 10C.5) The district-wide commitment to approaching issues with interest-based conflict resolution skills has permeated the district/college cultures and appears to be useful for both major and minor issues. (10C.5)

Conclusions:

The Los Rios Trustees are to be commended for their inclusive focus on all colleges and centers in the District equally in spite of their election by geographic region.

Although the Governing Board does not conduct routine evaluations of their performance as a board, lack of compliance with this standard does not jeopardize the accreditation of Folsom Lake College. (10A.5)

At Folsom Lake College, recent administrative staff additions are perceived to be more supportive of students and faculty, and thereby have created a positive swing in faculty perceptions that administrators are dedicated to supporting teaching and learning. (10B.3)

The survey results support the Folsom Lake College operational plan to distribute information college-wide to outline administrators' roles, responsibilities, and evaluation processes. (10B.4)

In the management evaluation processes developed by the Los Rios Management Association, administrators may request that evaluation surveys are distributed to appropriate college faculty and staff. The implementation of this provision may reduce or remove some of the tension surrounding this issue. (10B.4)

To comply with the accreditation standards related to governance and to foster an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect, faculty, staff, and administration have the responsibility to create, publicize, and implement processes which assure faculty and staff participation in crafting recommendations and making decisions. (10B.6, 10B.9)

District-wide support for participatory governance is evident in the creation and mentoring provided for the development of the Folsom Lake College Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Associated Student Government. (10B.7, 10B.9, 10B.10)

Los Rios District administrators and staff are to be commended for the stable and consistent support they provide to the colleges. (10C.1-10C.5)

Recommendations:

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 (Standard 10B.6 and 10B.8).