## AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION/DISCUSSION/INFORMATION</th>
<th>MINUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Call to Order/Introduction of Substitutes</strong></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Review of Agenda</strong></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Oral Communications</strong> Members of the audience may speak to non-agenda items (2 minutes per speaker)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Approval of Meeting Minutes 11/28/12</strong></td>
<td>D/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Accreditation Update</strong> Topic Leader(s)—Rachel and Rory</td>
<td>I/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Budget Overview</strong> Topic Leader(s)—Victoria, Graciano</td>
<td>I/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. ARCC report changes:</strong> <a href="http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/TechResearchInfoSys/Research/ARCC/ARCC2.aspx">http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/TechResearchInfoSys/Research/ARCC/ARCC2.aspx</a> Topic Leader(s)—Dennis, Kathie</td>
<td>I/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Update on Transitions</strong> Topic Leader(s)—All</td>
<td>I/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. CPC Meeting Schedule changes:</strong> February 20, 2013 at 2:00 February 27, March 6, March 20, and May 1, 2013 at 1:00 pm (Curriculum Committee)</td>
<td>D/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Adjourn</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**TRUST + HUMANITY + CIVILITY + OPTIMISM**

The mission of Cabrillo College is to enhance the intellectual, cultural, and economic vitality of our diverse community by assisting all students in their quest for lifelong learning and success in an ever-changing world. Our purpose is to provide an accessible and effective learning environment which aids students in their pursuit of transfer, career preparation, personal fulfillment, job advancement and retraining goals. Our core values are academic freedom, critical thinking, and respect for all people and cultures. Our commitment is to encourage excellence, offer a balanced curriculum, promote teaching methods for diverse learning styles, and involve and enrich our community.
Executive Summary of 2013 Accreditation Self-Evaluation

In general, the College finds that it meets the standards of the ACCJC for (1) Institutional Mission and Effectiveness, (2) Student Learning Programs and Services, (3) Resources, and (4) Leadership and Governance. These four categories are broken into eleven sub-sections, each of which contains evaluations of the major areas within the sub-section and a plan for the overall sub-section. These evaluations and plans are summarized as follows, beginning with the status of the four recommendations from the last accreditation visit. The full versions of the evaluations and plans from the standards start on page 6.

Recommendations from 2007

1. The team recommends that Student Support Services develop and implement student learning outcomes and measurements for all its departments, collect and analyze the data, and link the results to planning and program improvement.

This recommendation has been met as of fall 2012. Beginning in 2008, the various departments wrote four SLO’s, tied directly to the college Core Four. After some initial assessment, departments realized that the SLOs needed to be revised and assessment methods refined. All departments have now developed more accurate SLOs and assessments methods that provide useful information about how to improve student learning. Departments have written comprehensive program plans, with recommendations linked to data obtained through SLO assessment, student survey data, and individual program data collection methods. SLO assessment has now been integrated with the program review process in Student Services. Standard 2B.1 and the SLO and Program Planning chapter discuss the process that Student Services took to achieve their goal of meeting the recommendation.

2. The team recommends that the next master plan include an emphasis on planning for distance education and all off campus sites with regard to instruction and support services. Further, the master plan should address the evolving classified staffing needs in light of new technologies, facilities expansion, and operational needs.

Our Governing Board accepted the Distance Education Strategic Plan in July 2009, which was updated in November 2012 with Administrative Unit Outcomes as well as SLOs. In Standard 3A we address classified staffing and the prioritization process for filling classified positions. The Service and Program Reduction Advisory Committee (SPARC) was created in 2009 as an avenue for classified staff input in reductions and reorganizations of staff due to the recent years of sustained budget cuts, explained in more detail in Standard 3A.2. Additional reference to how we have positively responded to this recommendation can be found in 3D.4.

3. The team recommends that the college adopt a formal reserve policy. The college should establish a clear written reserve policy to protect the financial stability of the college in the support of institutional effectiveness.

The Governing Board approved a formal reserve policy in February 2008. The reserve is fully funded. This issue is addressed specifically in Standard 3D.4 and the plan for Standard 4A.
4. The team recommends that the college update the "Governance Manual" (1999) to reflect the current governance processes used by the constituent groups of the college. The college should describe the charge of the committees and the composition of the membership and how often they meet.

Significant updates to the Governance Manual have taken place since the last accreditation visit. All board policies will have been updated by the time of the site visit in October 2013, and the Governance website contains descriptions of committees with the charge, composition and frequency of meeting. The Faculty Senate website also has a list of governance committees with Senate membership. The shared governance groups that most influence policy on campus are clearly represented by the CPC.

Synopsis of evaluations and plans from standard sub-sections

1A: Mission
Cabrillo’s Mission was developed through a collaborative process and defines our purpose, student population, and commitment to student learning. It is published, but should be posted throughout the College in various places. It should be included in the College Strategic Plan, Educational Master Plan, and reviewed periodically along with the Vision statement, both for content (effectiveness and relevancy) and for the effectiveness of the process used to develop it.

1B: Improving Institutional Effectiveness
Institutional dialog about the continuous improvement of institutional processes and student learning is ongoing, self-reflective and collegial. Priorities are aligned with the College Mission and Strategic Plan, and goals for improvement and their assessment is discussed in CPC. Ongoing program planning occurs at several levels of the College, and the integrated planning cycle should be made systematic and fully implemented at each department, division and component level with a comprehensive, six-year cycle with annual updates, including Administrative and non-Instructional Program Planning.

2A: Instructional Programs
Instructional programs meet the College mission, are of high quality regardless of the type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location, and include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or an interdisciplinary core as well as a component of general education. Educational planning requires dialog that relies on the expertise of faculty, college policies make clear the institution’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge, and faculty surveys indicate that the vast majority (97.3%) of instructors feel that academic freedom is upheld by the college. As instructional planning has become more complicated the college will need to develop processes that are more inclusive, efficient, effective, and readily available. There should be a design review process for DE courses prior to course delivery.

The SLO assessment process in Instruction is well-established and robust, and the College has moved to the proficiency stage where the SLO process has become part of the fabric of the institution. Qualitative measurement is strong, produced by dialog which is the most enjoyable and productive part of the process for many departments, and the numerical reporting of assessment results will now be explored as quantitative measurement is developed. An emphasis
on quality assurance has become the major focus of the SLO efforts in Instruction, and four major areas have been identified for improvement: adjunct participation, timely completion of the assessment, reporting of results, and digitalizing the reports. More intensive training for program chairs and Deans, special meetings for the programs chairs of small departments to brainstorm solutions to their specific challenges, and a program chair section on the SLO website are some of the recommendations from the Outcomes Assessment Review Committee (ARC) to address these challenges.

Students and prospective students are provided clear and accurate information about courses, programs and transfer policies, and students receive a syllabus for each course that specifies the SLOs, which are consistent with the official course outline. The purpose, content, course requirements and expected SLOs are described for degrees and certificates, and students completing CTE certificates and degrees are able to meet standards in employment and licensure requirements. Online registration is a challenge for less technically sophisticated students, and the college continues to seek improvements in making information as complete and user-friendly as possible, including helping guide students define and meet their educational goals.

**2B: Student Support Services**

Student support services maintain their quality through evaluation of programs and services regardless of where and how they are delivered, making improvements and allocating resources based upon these assessments. The college catalog includes all the required components, and further improvements should be made to create a more cohesive, integrated and user-friendly document with a clearer and more integrated process for revision.

All Student Support Services programs have completed program plans incorporating data from SLOs and AUOs, and a common assessment cycle and tool for future program reviews is being designed. The Campus Climate Student Survey is used to measure student satisfaction with all services across campus, and departments review the results and use specific program data to analyze trends for program improvement and respond to changing State regulations. After plans are reviewed within the SS component, they should be seen and incorporated at the institutional level. Student Services faculty staffing needs should be given equal weight as instructional staffing in the College-wide faculty staffing prioritization process, particularly as the Student Success Act of 2012 is instituted. An implementation plan for the requirements of this legislation will need to be developed.

Students can now use self-service tools to access information online such as degree and enrollment verifications, which contributes to student success and addresses an ongoing goal and student learning outcome. These online services also provide useful feedback which can improve processes. Guided enrollment is a new service for students through a partnership between the Learning Communities Center and Assessment that provides learning community information directly after the assessment session for students who place at basic skills in math or English. Improvements to the ESL assessment and placement procedures are ongoing.

The challenges with counseling services from the last accreditation have been partially addressed with reorganization and a new division. The next cycle of improvement will address improving counseling facilities to facilitate student flow, access and consolidation of services, some of
which may need to be included in the next bond campaign. Admissions and Records and Financial Aid are now combined under Enrollment Services, which facilitates sharing resources, talents, ideas, and responsibilities between the two departments, as well as more efficient planning and training. This integrated communication model should be expanded to all Student Services programs to identify systems and processes for the evaluation, redesign and distribution of forms.

2C: Library and Learning Support Services
Library and learning support services are of sufficient quality, currency, depth and variety to provide appropriate resources for educational offerings, regardless of location or means of delivery. The library and learning centers all participate in campus planning processes, and are evolving and adapting to changing budget realities, increasing the level of cooperation and sharing among the different centers. This will continue, with a goal of increasing shared spaces, more standardized practices and hours, and other shared utilization of resources. Student feedback has provided a strong reality check to staff perceptions of assumed student needs, and the learning centers will use the program planning process to evaluate their effectiveness in contributing to student success.

3A: Human Resources
District hiring procedures are designed to ensure that qualified personnel are hired to maintain the integrity and quality of Cabrillo’s program and services. Instructional program planning drives decisions to hire faculty, and classified staffing is evaluated on an on-going basis through a regular planning process that includes instructional program planning and administrative departmental review. Management position requests are reviewed by the College Cabinet, administrative staff and CPC. The 2011 Accreditation survey reflects that faculty, staff and administrators believe the college’s policies and practices demonstrate appropriate concern for issues of equity and diversity, and the Staff Development Committee and the Teaching and Learning Center have been successful in providing appropriate training opportunities for faculty and staff.

The ability to increase classified staff and faculty has been limited by State budget reductions, and in an attempt to address staffing needs of new facilities, some reallocation and/or reorganization of resources and positions has taken place within the components. The college will continue to evaluate academic/instructional programs so that staffing patterns conserve resources to best support student achievement, and continue to evaluate what level of services can be offered while remaining fiscally responsible by creatively addressing student needs.

3B: Physical Resources
Since 2007, the District has completed the majority of the capital construction projects from the Facilities Master Plan. Physical resources support institutional programs and services effectively, and evaluation of facilities and equipment is done on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account. Challenges exist in finding ways to provide sufficient facilities staff to maintain resources in optimum condition for longevity and a positive learning environment, including developing a total cost of ownership model for responsible budget planning. A plan will be developed to more fully integrate maintenance planning with facilities and equipment, which will include a process to evaluate how these resources are being allocated along with the
reallocation and renovation of existing space to ensure the best possible learning environment for students given the current fiscal restraints. Alarm and key distribution systems will be improved to enhance security.

**3C: Technology Resources**

Since the last accreditation visit, Cabrillo has developed an integrated college web site and has implemented emergency response applications and a disaster recovery plan for IT, along with significant upgrades to the college network infrastructure and voice over IP (VOIP) telecommunications for all offices and the majority of classrooms. A new storage area network (SAN) and the R18 conversion to Colleague have improved services to all students, faculty, and staff. New internal processes include the IT Project and Planning Charter, which validates projects and verifies project requirements. Over 200 faculty and 16,000 students each year use Blackboard Learn, the learning management system used for online, hybrid, and web-enhanced instruction. A new Virtual Desktop Infrastructure (VDI) project will save significant costs with the service and support needs for labs, with 330 virtual clients deployed in 2012. The 2011 accreditation survey indicated an overall positive trend in staff and faculty satisfaction with the IT Department, but almost twenty-percent still feel their assigned computer does not meet their needs and classified staff would like to see more time for training on applications. The survey also showed that wireless connectivity and effective smart classrooms are in need of improvement. A wireless coverage audit will be conducted to identify gaps in coverage and areas of excessive overlap. Enhancements are also planned for college infrastructure, data access, and security, which will improve the effectiveness of Colleague, MIS reporting, SQL data warehouse, document management, and web-based services.

**3D: Financial Resources**

Financial planning is conducted with transparency, in accordance with the District’s mission and goals, and with responsible allocation of resources to maintain fiscal solvency and support institutional planning. There are appropriate control mechanisms in place to assure the financial integrity and responsible use of resources, which occasionally bring to light deficiencies that need to be corrected in internal processes. Efforts to integrate institutional and financial planning will include presenting complex fiscal items such as cash flow and fund balance needs in light of the ever changing fiscal environment, and reviewing the existing reserve policy in light of increasing deferrals from the State and the resulting strain on the District’s cash flow.

**4A: Decision Making Process**

Shared governance structures work collaboratively on behalf of institutional improvements, and communication and dialogue at the College is widespread and effective. Communication to the public regarding educational quality at the College is accurate, and the response to past Commission recommendations has been timely and complete. The institutional values, embodied in the Mission and the Core Four, are familiar to all and used at all levels of institutional practice and process. Institutional leaders create opportunities for staff at all levels and students to take initiative in improving the programs and processes with which they are involved. The College should explore the feasibility of establishing a Classified Senate in order to provide a platform for classified and confidential staff to participate in shared governance and institutional effectiveness improvement separately from the union role.
Written policies on governance procedures specify appropriate roles for staff and students, as well as the academic roles of faculty in the planning of educational programs and services. The faculty and our academic administrators are relied upon by the college for recommendations regarding student learning programs and services. The Faculty Senate, Curriculum Committee, Academic Council and the Outcomes Assessment Review Committee all provide avenues for faculty input on instructional programs. The College should explore the feasibility of transitioning from “network drives” to an online portal or a secure Google Site.

4B: Board and Administrative Organization
The 2011 Faculty and Staff Accreditation Surveys show that 72% of the faculty and 68% of the staff agreed that the Board’s policies support the quality, integrity and effectiveness of student learning programs and services, while 79% and 58% respectively agreed that the administration provides effective leadership for the college. Two-thirds of the faculty (69%) agreed that the Faculty Senate is effective in making recommendations in academic and professional matters. The Board will continue to review its policies regularly and will follow an annual schedule for self-evaluation in which Accreditation standards will be incorporated.

The president retains primary responsibility for the quality of services Cabrillo provides, and serves as an effective leader in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, as well as assessing institutional effectiveness. The ongoing public support for the college is reflected in Foundation contributions surpassing $16 million dollars.

EVALUATIONS AND PLANS

STANDARD I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.

Standard 1A: Mission
The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

EVALUATION
Taken together, Cabrillo’s Mission and Vision Statements define our purpose, describe our intended student population and highlight our commitments and strategies towards student learning. Additionally, since our last self-evaluation we have gone through an inclusive process to update and more fully develop our statements and have met this part of the standard.

1. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population

EVALUATION
The above description can be summed up in the following flowchart:

```
Mission/Vision Statements -> Core 4 -> SLO’s/AUO’s
  |                 |                 |
  |                 |                 |
  | Assessments    | Continuous Improvements |
```

This process reveals the fact that the Mission Statement and Vision Statement guide a cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation. Thus the College establishes student learning programs and services that are aligned with our Mission Statement and Vision Statement, which together define our purpose, character, and student population.

2. **The mission statement is approved by the governing board and published.**

**EVALUATION**

While this standard has been met at the basic level, it has been suggested that the college consider posting the Mission and Vision Statements in more public places, such as classrooms throughout the college, the Student Activities Center (Building 900), the Enrollment Services Center (Building 100), the Cabrillo Theater, and the College Gym.

3. **Using the institution’s governance and decision-making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.**

**EVALUATION**

Typical of Cabrillo’s governance and decision-making processes, our latest revised Mission and Vision Statements were the product of a planned, collaborative, inclusive, campus-wide dialog which was driven by an analysis of the previous Mission Statement. As such, we are justifiably proud of the final outcome of this process. However, there has been no formal analysis of the effectiveness and relevancy of the revised statement or an analysis of the process itself, nor has one been institutionalized. Thus it is felt that as the college embraces the idea of a periodic review of Mission and Vision Statements we ought to include analysis of the outcome as a part of that process.

4. **The institution’s mission is central to institutional planning and decision-making.**

**EVALUATION**

Clearly, the mission statement is an important part of Cabrillo’s planning and decision-making processes. The Fall 2011 Staff/Faculty Survey from Cabrillo’s Planning and Research Office (PRO) indicates that most faculty, staff, and managers/administrators agree that the mission statement guides institutional planning. 90.1% of faculty, 76.3% of staff, and 100% of Managers/Administrators either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “Cabrillo’s mission statement guides institutional planning.” This is a substantial increase from the PRO Staff and
Faculty Survey, 2005 in which fully 37% of the staff and 27% of the faculty “neither agreed nor disagreed” with the statement. [12]

The current survey results; the dialog and analysis that took place as a part of the re-writing of the Mission Statement; our reliance on our Mission Statement’s core concern for student success as a basis for planning, decision-making, and improving; and the core concern for student success as a guidepost for executing painful, but necessary, budget-cutting indicate that the college meets this standard. However, the Mission/Vision Statements are not explicitly stated as part of the College Strategic Plan (CSP).

**PLAN FOR STANDARD 1A**
1. Include the new Mission and Vision Statements into the emerging College Strategic Plan.
2. Post the new Mission/Vision Statements in public places such as classrooms throughout the college, the Student Activities Center (Building 900), the Enrollment Services Center (Building 100), the Cabrillo Theater, and the College Gym.
3. Keep the Mission/Vision Statements integral to the Educational Master Plan (EMP) process.
4. Continue the process of periodically reviewing the Mission and Vision Statements, following the regular review approved by CPC. [13].

**Standard IB: Improving Institutional Effectiveness**

*The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.*

1. *The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.*

**EVALUATION**
The College meets the Standard. By staying consistent with the College Mission and *College Strategic Plan (CSP)* the College is addressing priorities to ensure that fiscal funding aligns with the College Mission in the face of deficits that run in the millions of dollars. The planning process to develop a new *Educational Master Plan* includes many opportunities for input from the College, including an online, campus-wide survey, and on-campus interviews and meetings with various stakeholders at the College.

By aligning the *Educational Master Plan* with the *CSP* and the Mission Statement, the College remains focused on producing and supporting student learning. In evaluating its processes for effectiveness, the institution examines evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes
and administrative unit outcomes, in order to refine those processes for increased student learning.

Opportunity for improvement exists in the area of administrative program planning, which is not as developed at the College as instructional program planning and is still refining its processes for maximum effectiveness.

2. *The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.*

**EVALUATION**
The College meets the standard. The College Strategic Plan goals are clearly stated with measurable objectives that have been widely discussed and regularly assessed. The Outcomes Assessment Review Committee (ARC), charged with review of SLOs and AUOs from all areas of the college, produces an annual report that is discussed by several shared governance committees and posted online for all the College community to read. ARC is also charged with Institutional Effectiveness considerations, and makes recommendations regarding college-wide processes such as administrative program planning templates. All departments of the college undergo program review processes to evaluate and improve the outcomes of their work and its impact on students. The College Planning Council (CPC) serves as a forum to discuss institutional goals, objectives, and College-wide issues, and work towards their resolution. The creation of the Services and Program Reduction Advisory Council (SPRAC) as a subcommittee of CPC in 2011 is in alignment with this role.

3. *The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and reevaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.*

**EVALUATION**
The College is working toward full compliance with the standard. Many departments of the College have a full planning cycle implemented which is integrated with resource allocation and systemic re-evaluation, and other areas are still clarifying procedures that will make these processes systemic, cyclical and transparent. The College Planning Council (CPC) is a shared governance committee of the College that is advisory to the President and in which all constituent groups are represented, and in which Budget referendums are vetted and approved by the Governing Board. The CPC meetings are a formal, but open dialogue and forum and are open to members of the entire College community. The current budget crisis modality shows how much we are doing correctly. Clearly this is the most difficult planning process, and although it is not pain-free, it is functional in its current form.
4. The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

**EVALUATION**
The College meets the standard. Planning is broad-based, resulting in improvement of institutional effectiveness, and the necessary resources are allocated within the capacity of the institutional budget.

5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

**EVALUATION**
The College meets the standard. Extensive assessment data is collected and integrated into key planning documents for quality assurance, and feedback from the College website where information about institutional quality is posted serves to assess the effectiveness of this communication to the public.

6. The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

**EVALUATION**
The College meets the standard. Ongoing planning processes at several levels of the College incorporate systematic review and modification of all parts of the cycle. Room for improvement exists in ensuring that the review process of the planning cycle is systematic at all levels of the college.

7. The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

**EVALUATION**
The College meets the standard. The program planning/instructional planning process is entirely rooted in dialogue, as is the development of SLOs and AUOs. As plans are formalized, the dialogue continues, taking on a more campus-wide consideration—more dialogue and more evaluation takes place. The quality of the planning itself is evaluated, as well as that of the SLOs/AUOs and their assessment. Resources for growth are assigned based on this evaluation, and ultimately, the entire institution is evaluated based on these criteria.

**PLAN FOR STANDARD 1B**
1. Fully implement the Integrated Program Planning cycle at all of its stages throughout the College at each department, division and component level.
2. Develop a staggered, comprehensive, six-year cycle with annual updates for all departments undergoing Administrative/non-Instructional Program Planning.
STANDARD II: Student Learning Programs and Services

The institution offers high-quality instructional programs, student support services, and library and learning support Services that facilitate and demonstrate the achievement of stated student learning outcomes. The institution provides an environment that supports learning, enhances student understanding and appreciation of diversity, and encourages personal and civic responsibility as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all its students.

Standard 2A: Instructional Programs

The institution offers high-quality instructional programs in recognized and emerging fields of study that culminate in identified student outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, employment or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs consistent with its mission. Instructional programs are systematically assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes. The provisions of this standard are broadly applicable to all instructional activities offered in the name of the institution.

1. The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity.

EVALUATION

The College meets the standard. While instructional programs meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity regardless of location or means of delivery, the procedure to evaluate DE course design during the faculty evaluation process would be improved by requiring a design review prior to course delivery. The SLO assessment process in Instruction is well-established and robust. The college has moved from the set-up stage in SLOs to one in which the process has become part of the fabric of the institution. In the campus accreditation survey, two questions were specifically asked about instructional SLO processes with impressive results.

1. “Cabrillo assesses student learning outcomes and uses the results to make improvements.” Only nine of the 164 respondents disagreed.
2. “Cabrillo relies on the faculty (and advisory committees when applicable) to determine competency levels and measureable students learning outcomes” Only six of the 162 respondents disagreed.

Similarly, a survey undertaken in Fall 2011 by the SLO Assessment Review Committee asked respondents to indicate how they felt about the following two statements:

1. “SLO assessment provides a way to look at how well students are mastering course material or learning from a Library or Student Service encounter.” One hundred twenty faculty responded; 73.4% of adjuncts (36 total) and 76.1% of faculty (54 total) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.
2. SLO assessment provides an opportunity for useful dialogue about how to improve teaching and learning. Out of the one hundred and twenty-three respondents, 75.5% adjunct faculty (37 total) and 86.5 % of fulltime faculty (64 total) agreed or strongly agreed.
It is the dialog aspect of Cabrillo’s SLO assessment process that seems to be both the most enjoyable and productive for many departments. In its 2012 Program Plan, the Physics department wrote, “This process has proved very beneficial to our department. It sparked many interesting discussions about teaching methodologies as well as highlighted our students’ strengths.” The Computer Applications/Business Technology department stated “We have found this to be a productive way to have focused discussions on course and student success and ways to increase them.” Perhaps putting it best, in 2011, History wrote “The SLO review process set up a framework for dialog among all of the members of the department that has transformed Flex week meetings into lively and always useful conversations about teaching: best practices, assignments, evaluation instruments and rubrics, and most importantly, how our students are achieving the department’s stated SLOs…The SLO assessment meetings have led to a rich, valuable and ongoing dialogue on student success. We have cultivated a truly collaborative department and our shared expertise has led to much improvement in the quality and uniformity of instruction.”

This is not to say that the institutionalizing SLO assessment in Instruction has been without its challenges. However, with the advent of the SLO Assessment Review Committee and its assigned duties, Cabrillo has created a process that regularly analyzes those challenges and suggests way to meet them. For instance, in its 2011 annual report, the SLO Assessment Review Committee noted that Program Chairs and Deans are now the primary trainers of departmental faculty, as compared to the past when the SLO Coordinator took on that role through numerous flex workshops. This is borne out by data from ARC’s SLO survey in which adjunct faculty indicated that their primary means of learning about SLO assessment methods was the program chair. The ARC report states “Yet, many Program Chairs are new to the position, and sometimes the college. In addition, the HASS and VAPA divisions have new deans who have come from other schools. Training is clearly needed, focused on how to organize and keep track of the Revolving Wheel of Assessment for individual departments and how to encourage adjunct participation.” This need is echoed in the 2011 program plan from Political Science “Adding SLOs to our program planning over time has significantly impacted the planning process itself…The time involved in conceptualizing how to apply this new paradigm, taking part in the necessary training and actually implementing the assessment has been significant. Although part time faculty members have been willing to participate, SLO assessment puts an undue burden on them.” The 2011 Sociology program plan highlighted another of ARC’s concerns. “…The Program Chair duties of a one full time contract department …have been overwhelming…The assessment process has suffered.”

These challenges are reflected in the program plans from other departments. To meet them, the Outcomes ARC committee has recommended more intensive training for program chairs and Deans, special meetings for the programs chairs of small departments to brainstorm solutions to their specific challenges and a program chair section on the SLO web site. Addressing these issues, along with others listed in the Outcomes Assessment Committee annual reports, is now the major focus of the SLO efforts in Instruction. This new emphasis on quality assurance is a natural outgrowth of the college’s SLO efforts. Now that the Instruction has experienced five years of all departments following the Revolving Wheel of Assessment, it is time to reassess and make improvements. The Outcomes Assessment Review Committee, the Council on Instructional Planning and the Faculty Senate have noted four major quality assurance challenges
in Instruction and are working on plans to address them. The challenges are with adjunct participation and timely completion regarding SLO Assessment, reporting of assessment results, and digitalizing SLO assessment reporting. The plans are detailed in the SLO Assessment and Program Planning chapter of the report.

Another challenge that ARC began meeting last year and that was taken up by the Faculty Senate in Fall 2011 is the numerical reporting of assessment results on the Assessment Analysis forms. The current forms ask program chairs to summarize department data in a narrative format which arose out of Cabrillo’s great valuing of the dialog portion of SLO assessment. However, in a meeting with the Technical Assistance Team from the Bridging Resources and Information and Culture grant that Cabrillo received from the Research and Planning Group of California, it was suggested that Cabrillo explore adding a numerical component. The SLO ARC committee brought this idea to the Faculty Senate who approved a pilot project that commenced in 2012. Eight departments volunteered to participate. The Senate will be carefully monitoring if this addition “takes away” from the dialogue that is such a rich part of the current process.

Other challenges facing SLO assessment in Instruction, as noted in the ARC reports, are:

- Providing on-line posting and storage of SLO Assessment Analysis forms.
- Creating a web tool for program chairs to check their department’s place on the Revolving Wheel of Assessment and the SLO assessment tasks due each semester.
- Revising the SLO web site, including a special section for Program Chairs.

These challenges will be discussed, monitored and met through on-going discussions in the Outcomes Assessment Review Committee itself and the bodies it reports to, especially the Academic Senate, Strategic Planning Committee, College Planning Committee and the governing board. According to the ACCJC SLO rubric, Cabrillo is proficient.

Faculty survey results indicate that 96.3% of instructors agree that the college encourages the use of different teaching methodologies as a response to learning styles of students. Faculty also agree (90%) that Cabrillo assesses student learning outcomes and uses the results to make improvements. Finally, survey results also demonstrate that the vast majority of instructors believe that dialogue among faculty regarding the continuous improvement of student learning is strongly evidence-based.

2. The institution assures the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, developmenta, and pre-collegiate courses and programs, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training courses and programs, programs for international students, and contract or other special programs, regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location.

EVALUATION
The college meets the standard in assuring the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution. These standards are upheld regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location. Since 2007 the ongoing process of SLO assessment has been institutionalized to a large extent. Nearly every course contains
SLO’s in the Course Outline of Record, and department faculty have engaged in the evaluation and assessment of SLO’s and the Core Four learning outcomes as part of ongoing efforts at improving student success. Faculty surveys suggest that these assessment efforts are effective and that these assessments are useful in helping the college to achieve its mission.

Still, as the assessment process goes forward there are significant challenges to make it work better and quality assurance efforts are being put into effect, as outlined in 2A.1.c. Increasing adjunct participation in SLO assessment, staying on schedule, digitalizing assessment reporting data, employing quantitative measurements, and making the program planning process more useful and efficacious – all these remain challenges for the college in moving forward on SLO assessment.

CurricuNet is working well for the college. After a steep learning curve for many faculty and staff after its adoption in 2007, most members of the Curriculum Committee and most administrators see its benefits in improving the process of curriculum development. However, many faculty and staff have found it to be frustrating and sometimes difficult to use for basic curriculum reform. At the course level, some departments continue to be challenged to archive all course syllabi from all faculty.

3. The institution requires of all academic and vocational degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy that is clearly stated in its catalogue. The institution, relying on the expertise of its faculty, determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum by examining the stated learning outcomes for the course.

EVALUATION
The College meets the standard of requiring all academic and vocational degree programs to have a component of general education based on a philosophy that is clearly stated in its catalogue. All processes of planning require dialog about educational programs. This dialog is ongoing, robust, directed, and inclusive, relying on the expertise of faculty to determine the appropriateness of including each course in the GE curriculum.

4. All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core.

EVALUATION
The college meets the standard that all degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or an interdisciplinary core.

5. Students completing vocational and occupational certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment and other applicable standards and are prepared for external licensure and certification.

EVALUATION
The College meets the standard. Students completing CTE certificates and degrees are able to meet standards in employment and licensure requirements. Useful information on job placement
has been generated by the Completer/Leaver surveys and by tracking the numbers of certificates earned in CTE programs. However, obtaining complete and accurate data is extremely difficult, and students in some programs, such as Welding or Culinary Arts, may find immediate employment after only one or two courses, without completing any formal certificate or degree. The Fact Book contains information on the employment status of former CTE students.

6. The institution assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. The institution describes its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning objectives consistent with those in the institution’s officially approved course outline.

**EVALUATION**
The College meets the standard. Students and prospective students are provided clear and accurate information about courses, programs and transfer policies. The purpose, content, course requirements and expected SLOs are described for degrees and certificates. In each course students receive a syllabus that specifies the SLOs, which are consistent with the official course outline.

The automated telephone registration system, Hawknet, was discontinued in 2010. Online registration continues to be a challenge for less technically sophisticated students, and the college continues to grapple with the challenge of making all pertinent information – on courses, registration, financial aid, etc. – as complete and user-friendly as possible. Room for improvement in institutional processes exists to help guide students to define and then meet their educational goals, as state-mandated reforms – parts of the Student Success regulations - are implemented over the next few years.

7. In order to assure the academic integrity of the teaching-learning process, the institution uses and makes public Governing Board-adopted policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or worldviews. These policies make clear the institution’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.

**EVALUATION**
The College meets the standard of policies that make clear the institution’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge. Faculty Survey results indicate that the vast majority (97.3%) of instructors feel that academic freedom is upheld by the college.

**PLAN FOR STANDARD 2A**
As instructional planning has become more complicated the college will need to develop processes that are more inclusive, efficient, effective, and readily available. The basic structure for high quality student academic achievement is already in place. Now the challenges include:

- Involving more of the faculty in SLO assessment and improving instruction;
- Creating a better system of SLO assessment, reporting of results, and program planning that requires less time to complete and process;
• Strengthening existing processes to ensure full compliance with college SLO standards.
• Making policies and practices more intuitively available on the web.

Standard 2B: Student Support Services
The institution recruits and admits diverse students who are able to benefit from its programs, consistent with its mission. Student support services address the identified needs of students and enhance a supportive learning environment. The entire student pathway through the institutional experience is characterized by a concern for student access, progress learning and success. The institution systemically assesses student support services using student learning outcomes, faculty and staff input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of these services.

1. The institution assures the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery support student learning and enhance achievement of the mission of the institution.

EVALUATION
The College has met the standard and the recommendation from the previous accreditation site visit through its collection of qualitative and quantitative data that evaluates programs and services despite their location and means of delivery and identifies program and service improvement and resource allocation based upon these assessments.

All Student Support Services programs have completed program plans incorporating data from Student Learning Outcomes assessment and including the assessment results in recommendations for program improvement and resource allocation, and have established a 6 year program planning cycle with annual updates. The College utilizes the Campus Climate Student Survey, administered every two years, to measure student satisfaction with all services across campus, and each department reviews the results to analyze trends and areas for program improvement. In addition, each department uses specific program data to comply with and respond to changing State regulations and student needs.

2. The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following:

EVALUATION
The College has met the standard through its inclusion of all required components of the standard and areas noted for review and improvement in the 2007 report have been addressed. In addition, the college has made the catalog available through use of mobile-friendly devices and in formats accessible to students with disabilities. We should make further improvements to create a more cohesive, integrated and user-friendly document.

3. The institution researches and identifies the learning support needs of its student population and provides appropriate services and programs to address those needs.
EVALUATION
The college meets the standard. Student Support Services is committed to equitable access to all students through assessed and revised processes, increased use of technology and assessed and improved in-person services, regardless of location or means of delivery. Personal and civic responsibility are advocated for and supported through student services activities and programs. Implementation around Admission issues and security of records has been analyzed and improved in response to changes in federal and state laws. Counseling services have undergone program review and a cycle of assessment, resource allocation and implementation in order to support student access, development and success. The challenges identified in the last report around structure, decentralization of counseling services and facilities have been partially addressed with a new division, and the next cycle of improvement will address improving counseling facilities to facilitate student flow, access and consolidation of services. With the need for more effective use of resources and time, these are important issues. Improvements to the ESL assessment and placement procedures are also ongoing.

4. The institution evaluates student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

EVALUATION
The 2007 Accreditation team recommended that Student Services develop and implement student learning outcomes and measurements for all its departments, collect and analyze the data, and link the results to planning and program improvement. This recommendation has been completed by all departments as of fall 2012.

In addition, the following self-identified recommendation was made by Student Support Services in 2007: Student Services will continue to implement a systematic and on-going cycle of program planning, evaluation and assessment for all Student Services and Support programs, including the Counseling Division, allowing sufficient opportunities for dialog within and among programs. SLOs will be integrated throughout the departments’ plans along with effective assessment practices and instruments to measure their success.

All departments have now developed comprehensive program plans, with recommendations linked to data obtained through SLO assessment, student survey data, and individual program data collection methods, such as the online application questionnaire on CCCAPPLY and student/employer ratings of student employees’ competencies in various employment related areas. The data obtained and analyzed by each of the Student Services programs, and the data-driven recommendations for self-improvement, can be found within each Program Plan posted on the VPSS web site. The list of SLOs and AUOs for each program and service is also posted, along with the six year program planning assessment schedule.

The Student Services Council (SSC) meets monthly to share information on program developments, student needs, and areas for collaboration, as well as reviewing program plans and annual updates as scheduled. SSC is comprised of directors and managers of all Student Services programs, the two Student Services deans and the Vice President of Student Services, along with
their executive assistants, and the Dean of Education Centers who also serves as a liaison to the Instruction Council (IC). SSC has developed the following mission statement:

*The Student Services Council shares information and fosters dialog around Student Services issues, programs and services; identifying best practices that promote student success and learning outcomes. The council serves as an important avenue of information to student services staff through the student services managers, coordinators and directors.*

The departmental planning process uses multiple types of student-generated data in its recommendations for program improvement, and those plans are reviewed and revised by all Student Support Services areas at the Student Services Council. The VPSS brings program plan recommendations with budget implications to the College Planning Council, which is advisory to the President. The VPSS then presents a report to the Board of Trustees, summarizing the recommendations from the Student Services program plans. This demonstrates a continuous cycle of evaluation and planning and supports college-wide dialog. As indicated by a recent campus survey conducted by PRO for the SLO Assessment Review Committee, Student Services staff would benefit from being involved in campus trainings and discussion to have a better understanding of SLOs and be directly involved in planning, assessing and modifying services in order to ensure that everyone is part of the effort to assist students be successful.

**Specific services with additional evaluation and improvement goals:**
Admissions and Records and Financial Aid are now combined under an Enrollment Services umbrella. A new position, Director of Enrollment Services, oversees the two departments. Cross training of staff in both departments is taking place to better serve students. Sharing resources, talents, ideas, and responsibilities between the two departments leads to more efficient planning and training. The changes will be evaluated by impacted staff and managers. The process is being designed now. Those assessments will be shared with the shared governance committee, CPC.

The National Student Clearinghouse is a tool of our evaluation process. Since our last accreditation, Cabrillo has expanded the use of the National Student Clearinghouse for Degree Verification, Student Self-Service, Enrollment Verifications, and other available information. This contributes to student success by providing students with self-service tools that they can access at any time, which is an ongoing goal and student learning outcome. It also provides feedback that contributes to the improvement of processes by tracking transfer and degree attainment when students leave Cabrillo College.

**Evaluation of Guided Enrollment (Learning Communities and Assessment Evaluation)**
Matriculation services are integral to learning community students’ progress. One of its main foci is to offer “guided enrollment” after a student tests in assessment. This is a partnership between the LC faculty/program and the Assessment Center as a way to direct those at the basic skills level with high touch needs to become aware of and hopefully enroll in a success-focused educational program. The Guided Enrollment subcommittee has evaluated the strengths and weaknesses of this service for improvement.
The Student Services component is designing a common assessment cycle and tool for future program reviews, which will need to contain some unique features that are different from instructional areas. An area for improvement in the process is to ensure that after plans are reviewed within the SS component, they are seen and incorporated at the institutional level. Another area for improvement is to ensure that Student Services faculty staffing needs are given equal weight as instructional staffing in the College-wide faculty staffing prioritization process. This is especially important as the Student Success Act of 2012 is instituted.

**PLAN FOR STANDARD 2B**
Identify responsible parties/services and a timeline to implement the required Student Success Act and other T5 and Ed Code services; orientation, assessment and education planning, enrollment priorities, academic progress and probation/dismissal, appeals processes.

Analyze and develop a plan to improve counseling/transfer space to better serve students and support the faculty and staff. Include these plans in the next bond campaign when launched.

Identify a more integrated and clear structure and process for revising the catalog.

Identify systems and processes for integrated communication among SS programs and staff to evaluate, redesign and distribute documents/forms.

Continue to improve and implement a systematic and ongoing/continual cycle of program planning, evaluation and SLO assessment with improved links to college resource planning.

**Standard 2C: Library and Learning Support Services**

*Library and other Learning Support Services for students are sufficient to support the institution's instructional programs and intellectual, aesthetic, and cultural activities in whatever format and wherever they are offered. Such services include library services and collections, tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, and learning technology development and training. The institution provides access and training to students so that library and other learning support services may be used effectively and efficiently. The institution systematically assesses these services using student learning outcomes, faculty input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of the services.*

1. The institution supports the quality of its instructional programs by providing library and other learning support services that are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to facilitate educational offerings, regardless of location or means of delivery.

**EVALUATION**
The college meets the standard. Library and learning support services are of sufficient quality, currency, depth and variety to provide appropriate resources for educational offerings, regardless of location or means of delivery. Instruction is provided for students to develop skills in information competency. The library and learning centers are consistently among the top-rated services in student satisfactions surveys. The library provides a dynamic learning environment, continuously evaluating its information resources through annual surveys and feedback from students and faculty, and expanding the reach of its services by establishing a robust and growing Watsonville Center presence, as well as a full complement of services to remote users.
learning centers are actively evolving and adapting to the changing needs of student, and changing budget realities. In addition, the increasing level of cooperation and sharing among the learning centers will help maintain high levels of student service in spite of constrained resources.

2. The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

EVALUATION
The college meets the standard. The library and learning centers all actively participate in campus program planning processes, and continuously review and adapt services as required by student needs and student feedback. The increased focus on responsiveness to demonstrated student needs has increased the appreciation for student surveys and other feedback mechanisms which provide a strong reality check to staff perceptions of assumed student needs.

PLAN FOR STANDARD 2C:
For the Library and Learning Support Services, the college will pursue ongoing efforts to increase support for student learning. The college will:

- Continue active coordination among the library and learning centers, with a goal toward increasing shared spaces, more standardized practices and hours, and other shared utilization of resources.
- Continue implementation of the shared scheduling software, with a goal of 100% utilization among learning centers, as appropriate.
- Use the program planning process to evaluate the effectiveness of learning centers in contributing to student success.

STANDARD III – RESOURCES
The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Accredited colleges in multi-college systems may be organized such that responsibility for resources, allocation of resources and planning rests with the system. In such cases, the system is responsible for meeting standards on behalf of the accredited colleges.

Standard 3A. Human Resources
The institution employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services wherever offered and by whatever means delivered, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Personnel are treated equitably, are evaluated regularly and systematically, and are provided opportunities for professional development. Consistent with its mission, the institution demonstrates its commitment to the significant educational role played by persons of diverse backgrounds by making positive efforts to encourage such diversity. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.
1. The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services.

EVALUATION
The College meets the standard. College hiring procedures follow detailed regulations, from both District policy and state regulations. Guidelines for hiring of personnel were developed by campus constituent representatives, including the Governing Board, administration, faculty and classified employees. All District hiring procedures, including the advertising of positions, formation and training of hiring committees, and the interview process, are designed to ensure that qualified personnel are hired. Instructional program planning drives the positions that are to be filled at the College, based on documented needs that arose in program plans. The College has made faculty assessment of SLOs a component of every faculty member’s evaluation process. There is a Code of Ethics for the Governing Board and there are numerous related policies for staff, faculty, and administration in a variety of publications.

2. The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution’s mission and purposes.

EVALUATION
The College administers its available resources to meet the standard. In July 2009, the Governing Board approved the Distance Education Strategic Plan, which was updated in October 2012 and included an emphasis on planning for distance education and for all campus sites. This plan addressed evolving classified staffing needs in light of new technologies, facilities expansion, and operational needs. In 2009-2010, HR developed and posted Guidelines for Search and Selection Committee Members in order to help clarify College hiring processes. In Fall 2011 a campus-wide faculty and staff survey was done for the Self Evaluation, which included opinions as to whether there are sufficient faculty and classified staff to meet the needs of the College. [28] The results indicate that the opinions vary.

The College has expanded its facilities over the past several years and new buildings have been completed. As stated in the Midterm Report, dated October 5, 2010, under self-identified recommendations for 3.A.1., the College authorized the following 8 FTE new classified support staff positions to support facility and plant expansion: 6 custodians, 1 lead custodian, and 1 grounds maintenance worker over 2009-2010. In light of budget realities, the college has attempted to address staffing needs of new facilities with some reallocation and/or reorganization of resources and positions within the components. [XXX] – evidence reference from Mid-term Report (10/05/10)

There have also been reductions of class sections and reductions in services due to overall operating budget reductions. The College has also experienced restructuring/reorganization in some departments (such as Admissions and Records and Financial Aid), because workflow processes have been affected by greater use of electronic procedures.
Hiring decisions relating to instructional faculty are based on instructional program planning. Cabrillo’s ability to increase current classified staffing levels has been hampered by State budget reductions that have directly affected the funding the College receives. The process for reviewing management position requests is done by the College Cabinet, administrative staff and CPC.

3. The institution systematically develops personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered.

EVALUATION
The College meets the standard. Employment procedures and personnel policies are governed by Board Policy (BP) and Administrative Regulations (ARs), faculty and staff contracts, Ed Code, and Federal and State labor laws. The College makes these policies available on the Human Resources webpage, as well as posting them physically. The College provides and ensures a system of security and confidentiality for personnel and employment records.

4. The institution demonstrates through policies and practices an appropriate understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity.

EVALUATION
The College meets the standard and continues to strive to promote diversity and equity as part of the College culture, as shown by recent survey results. The 2011 Accreditation survey reflects that faculty, staff and administrators believe the college’s policies and practices demonstrate appropriate concern for issues of equity and diversity.

5. The institution provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs.

EVALUATION
The College meets the standard. Efforts to highlight the importance of professional growth and training at Cabrillo are a result of a strategy included in the 2008-2011 College Master Plan, and the Staff Development Committee and the Teaching and Learning Center have been successful in providing appropriate training opportunities for faculty and staff. The Staff Development Committee evaluates Flex activities, and the results of participant surveys and the Staff Development Committee survey response assessments are used to ensure that future activities meet the needs of faculty and staff. The results of two campus-wide surveys in 2010-2011 and feedback from Flex event evaluation forms indicate that the top needs for faculty and staff are training in newer technologies, interpersonal communication skills, and emergency preparedness. (As noted above, there has been a recent increase in training sessions related to emergency preparedness.)

6. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.
EVALUATION
The College meets the standard. The Governing Board adopted goals for 2011-2012 which state in part that “Student Success will be the priority” in determining:

- Staffing patterns that conserve resources to support student achievement;
- Allocation of resources to creatively address student needs and increase achievement of student goals.

The Board is committed to shared governance and values the timely recommendations to the College Planning Council (CPC) to inform board decisions. Cabrillo continues to evaluate its staffing needs on an on-going basis through a regular planning process that includes instructional program planning and administrative departmental review. However, in the past several years, state budget reductions have had a major impact on the College’s ability to hire faculty and staff. Given staffing realities in light of available financial resources, the College continues to evaluate the scope of services and programs possible. As previously stated, the academic Program Reduction/Elimination Task Force develops numerical criteria to rank academic/instructional programs. The Task Force recommendations are advisory to decisions regarding reduction and elimination of academic programs and are reviewed by Faculty Senate before information goes to the College Planning Council (CPC). Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUOs) also inform program planning. Additionally, the recently established Services and Program Reduction Advisory Committee (SPRAC) serves in an advisory role regarding decisions in the reorganization of programs and/or reduction of services involving classified staff. SPRAC provides advisory reports to the College Planning Council (CPC).

PLAN FOR STANDARD 3A
Consistent with the Governing Board’s adopted 2011-2012 goals developed in a climate of budget uncertainty and shrinking fiscal resources, the college will:

- Continue to evaluate academic/instructional programs so that staffing patterns conserve resources to best support student achievement
- Continue to evaluate what level of services the college can offer while remaining fiscally responsible by allocating resources to creatively address student needs and increase achievement of student goals

Standard 3B -- Physical Resources
Physical resources, which include facilities, equipment, land and other assets, support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

1. The institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, independent of location or means of delivery.

EVALUATION
Since 2007, the District has completed the majority of the capital construction projects from the Facilities Master Plan. These projects were identified in the College’s Facilities Master Plan.
(FMP) generated in 1999 and reflect the educational goals and physical resource requirements from the previous College Master Plan (CMP) of 1996.

In the course of compiling this Self Evaluation, several areas were identified as concerns with regards to physical resources:
- The current budget does not provide enough operating budget to properly maintain facilities (custodial, maintenance and grounds). This issue has become more of a problem as the new buildings come on line with a higher level of sophistication. State funding for scheduled maintenance and instructional equipment is inadequate to support maintaining facilities and equipment in the current state of operating condition, despite the commitment from the Board to support an ongoing funding source.
- The campus burglar alarm system and key control system needs to be improved in order to provide a higher level of security for campus equipment. While a plan is underway to address these issues, adequate staffing will be essential to the success of the systems.

A survey conducted by PRO in 2005 shows that faculty and staff responded favorably on most topics related to physical resources. These areas included:
- The adequacy of physical accommodations for people with disabilities;
- A feeling of safety on campus during the day and the night;
- The adequacy of office equipment;
- The involvement of faculty in the selection of educational equipment;
- The presence of systematic planning for budget priorities.

The following areas elicited strongly favorable responses, but with some decline since 2003 among faculty and staff:
- Campus buildings provide a safe and healthy environment in which to work and learn;
- The campus landscaped areas are attractive and safe;
- Classroom equipment, software, and network connections are adequate;
- Instructional equipment in the classroom is adequately maintained.

In the 2010 Campus Climate Survey the students expressed favorable opinions on the Cabrillo Campus itself, the maintenance of buildings, roads, and lawns, and the quality of police protection. However, parking remained an area of low ratings.

2. To assure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account.

EVALUATION
The College meets the standard. Evaluation of facilities and equipment is done on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account. Physical resources support institutional programs and services effectively. Room for improvement exists in finding ways to provide sufficient facilities staff to maintain resources in optimum condition for longevity and a positive learning environment.

PLAN FOR STANDARD 3B
As the college nears completion of its ambitious building program, the optimal use of the physical resources of the college will be an ongoing challenge. To meet these challenges, the college will:

1. Develop a plan to more fully integrate facilities, equipment, and maintenance planning, which will include a process to evaluate how resources are being allocated for facilities and equipment to ensure the best possible learning environment for students given the current fiscal restraints.
2. Continue (through the FPAC and CPC) to solicit broad input into the process of reallocation and renovation of existing space.
3. Continue to enhance security by improving the alarm and key distribution systems.
4. Develop a total cost of ownership model for facilities and equipment and implement such a program where it best serves the needs of the college.

**Standard 3C: Technology Resources**

*Technology resources are used to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning.*

1. *The institution assures that any technology support it provides is designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, college-wide communications, research, and operational systems.*

**EVALUATION**

The college meets the standard. Many industry standard principles are now utilized to manage projects and the scope of information associated with them. The primary objective is successful deployment of the project, through communication, a clear understanding of the requirements, management participation, and documentation. The IT Project and Planning Charter insures proper documentation for establishing the validity of a project, and many other details are included to ensure that project requirements are verified. [1]

Since the last accreditation visit, Cabrillo’s information technology accomplishments include development of an integrated college web site, implementation of Alert-U, and emergency response application, implementation of a disaster recovery plan for IT, significant upgrades to the college network infrastructure, and voice over IP (VOIP) telecommunications for all offices and the majority of classrooms. [1] The installation of a new storage area network (SAN) and completion of the R18 conversion to Colleague has improved services to all students, faculty, and staff. [7] Over 200 faculty and 16,000 students each year are using Blackboard Learn, the learning management system used for online, hybrid, and web-enhanced instruction. [3] The Distance Education Committee, in collaboration with the CCFT Distance Education Task Force wrote a Distance Education Plan, and the faculty contract and faculty evaluation process now contains performance standards for online teaching. [3]

A new Virtual Desktop Infrastructure (VDI) project has provided a new direction for the technological landscape at Cabrillo. Leveraging an opportunity to redesign Labs in the Building 300 renovation project, the server infrastructure and requirements for zero clients were planned and implemented for use in spring 2012. The new VDI strategy will save significant costs with the service and support needs for the Lab. Whereas the goal for 2012 was to deploy 250 virtual clients for both new and established labs, 330 was the actual number of clients deployed.
The survey conducted in late 2011 indicated an overall positive trend in staff and faculty satisfaction with the IT Department. Additionally, IT communications and services are relevant and timely. However, almost twenty-percent still feel their assigned computer does not meet their needs. In addition to the loss of productivity and frustration that exists with employees using old equipment, there is a more significant support requirement for older equipment as well. One of the primary objectives of the IT Department is to develop and implement a Virtual Desktop Infrastructure (VDI) for use throughout Cabrillo. Additionally, classified staff would like to see more time for training on applications. Schedules often restrict access, and obtaining release time to train can be an issue. One other area to address based on the current survey includes the following two areas; wireless connectivity at Cabrillo (Hawknet), and effective smart classrooms. The IT Department’s goal will be to conduct a wireless coverage audit to identify gaps in coverage and areas of excessive overlap.

The Information Technology Department has three primary goals. Each of those goals contains multiple short term and long term objectives. They are summarized as:

1. Improve College effectiveness through enhancements to the following systems:
   - Colleague, MIS reporting, SQL data warehouse, document management, and web.
2. Enhance student, faculty, and staff technology use with improvements to infrastructure development, data access, and security.
3. Improve efficiency of College services through development of technology solutions to support a successful college environment.

2. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and uses the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement.

EVALUATION
The college meets the standard. The institution ensures that technology and facility decisions are based on the results of evaluation of program and service needs, including those for Distance Education, and that those needs are met effectively as a result of prioritization and plans for improvement.

PLAN FOR STANDARD 3C
1. Develop and implement a Virtual Desktop Infrastructure (VDI) for use throughout Cabrillo.
2. Conduct a wireless coverage audit to identify gaps in coverage and areas of excessive overlap.

Standard 3D: Financial Resources
Financial resources are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. Financial resources planning is integrated with institutional planning at both college and district/system levels in multi-college systems.
1. The institution relies upon its mission and goals as the foundation for financial planning.

EVALUATION
The College meets the standard. Financial planning is conducted with transparency, in accordance with the District’s mission and goals, and with responsible allocation of resources to maintain fiscal solvency and support institutional planning.

2. To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of financial resources, the financial management system has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making.
   a. Financial documents, including the budget and independent audit, have a high degree of credibility and accuracy, and reflect appropriate allocation and use of the financial resources to support student learning programs and services.

EVALUATION
The College meets the standard. There are appropriate control mechanisms in place to assure the financial integrity and responsible use of resources, which give evidence of their effectiveness by occasionally bringing to light deficiencies that need to be corrected in internal processes.

3. The institution has policies and procedures to ensure sound financial practices and financial stability.

EVALUATION
The College meets the standard. The financial policies and procedures in place ensure sound financial practices and financial stability.

4. Financial resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement of the institution.

EVALUATION
The previous accreditation report resulted in the following three recommendations:
1) The team recommends that the college adopt a formal reserve policy. The college should establish a clear written reserve policy to protect the financial stability of the college in the support of institutional effectiveness. (III:D.2.c.).
2) Refine and improve the classified staff hiring prioritization process and communicate its mechanisms to the staff of the college.
3) Review the roles of the CPC and the President's Cabinet in the financial planning process, as part of an overarching effort to more clearly define the roles of these two governing bodies.

The District responded by adopting each of the three recommendations. In spring 2008, the Governing Board approved a formal reserve policy and the District has since fully funded the required reserve. In fall of 2007, a classified staff hiring prioritization process was developed and implemented. Although recent budget constraints have put this self-identified item on hold, the College has instituted a managed hiring process. Finally, in the spring of 2007, CPC membership
developed a definition of shared governance and delineated the role of CPC specifically in regards to the master plan, budget and resource allocation, and serving as the steering committee for the accreditation process.

Currently, the District continues to prioritize efforts to integrate institutional and financial planning. The District is committed to maintaining data integrity, transparency, and timely delivery of information, all within its participatory governance structure.

**PLAN FOR STANDARD 3D**
The college will continue to work on improving its communication methods with its constituencies regarding important fiscal matters and will work on early identification and resolution of critical fiscal challenges. To that end, the College will:
- Explore different methodologies of delivering and presenting complex fiscal items, such as cash flow and fund balance needs in light of the ever changing fiscal environment.
- Review existing reserve policy in light of increasing deferrals from the State and the strain these deferrals place on the District’s cash flow.

**STANDARD IV: LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE**
*The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.*

**Standard 4A. DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES**
*The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.*

1. **Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence.** They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. **When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.**

**EVALUATION**
The College meets the standard. Institutional leaders create opportunities for staff at all levels and students to take initiative in improving the programs and processes with which they are involved. The institutional values, embodied in the Mission and the Core Four, are familiar to all and used at all levels of institutional practice and process.

2. **The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes.** The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work
together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.

EVALUATION
The faculty and our academic administrators are relied upon by the college for recommendations regarding student learning programs and services. According to survey results, strong majorities of faculty feel that their representation on CPC allows for effective input of ideas concerning policy and planning decisions. [Faculty Survey, 12/11] This representation is in addition to the ongoing work of the Faculty Senate, the Curriculum Committee, and the Academic Council and the Outcomes Assessment Review Committee which all provide avenues for faculty input on our programs.

3. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution’s constituencies.

EVALUATION
The College meets the standard. Written policies on governance procedures specify appropriate roles for staff and students, as well as the academic roles of faculty in the planning of educational programs and services. Shared governance structures work collaboratively on behalf of institutional improvements, and clear examples of these improvements exist. Communication and dialogue at the College is widespread and effective.

4. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self study and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.

EVALUATION
The College meets the standard. Documentation shows that the response to past Commission recommendations has been timely and complete; communication to the public regarding educational quality at the College are accurate, and there are several indications of full and responsible compliance with USDE regulations.

5. The role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

PLAN FOR STANDARD 4A
The College should explore the feasibility of establishing a Classified Senate in order to provide a platform for classified and confidential staff to participate in shared governance and institutional effectiveness improvement separately from the union role. The College should explore the feasibility of transitioning from “network drives” to an online portal or a secure Google Site.
Standard 4B. Board and Administrative Organization

In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.

1. The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system.

EVALUATION
Overall, the Governing Board policies and practices meet the criteria of Standard IVB part 1.

According to the data in the 2011 Faculty and Staff Accreditation Surveys, 72% of the faculty and 68% of the staff agreed that the Board’s policies support the quality, integrity and effectiveness of student learning programs and services. In addition, the survey shows that more than two-thirds of the faculty (69%) agrees that the Faculty Senate is effective in making recommendations to the Governing Board in the Senate’s purview of academic and professional matters.

Despite the economic challenges facing community colleges, the dedication, leadership, and vision of Cabrillo’s Governing Board have contributed to the overall success of the college in the last few years. The ongoing public support for the college is reflected in the contributions to the Foundation for an endowment surpassing $16 million dollars, which places the college in the top 2 percent of the 112 community colleges in California, far exceeding the relative size of the institution.

Since the last accreditation self-evaluation, the Board has addressed areas for improvement by establishing annual retreats which are held in September and by revising its code of ethics policy (BP 1105) in 2007 to include consequences of any violation. The review of policies is ongoing and the Board utilizes the policy and procedures service provided by the Community College League of California.

2. The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

EVALUATION
The College meets the standard.

The 2011 Faculty and Staff Accreditation Surveys ask respondents about the current administration rather than the president specifically, but a majority of the faculty and staff who responded (79% and 58% respectively) agreed that the administration provides effective leadership for the college.
By acting as a catalyst and change agent when necessary, honoring the shared governance process, and maintaining a high-profile presence and level of participation in the community, the president retains primary responsibility for the quality of services Cabrillo provides. He also serves as an effective leader in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, as well as assessing institutional effectiveness.

Recommendations from the last self-study focused on encouraging the Board to enact policies that would allow it to better evaluate and assess how well it performed in achieving its goals. These recommendations have largely been met:

(1) Create a review cycle for policies, manuals, and procedures.
   The review cycle for Board Policies and Procedures is an ongoing process which started in 2006. The goal is to have all policies and procedures reviewed between 2007 and fall 2013, before the site visit of the accreditation team. Since the last accreditation visit, the college has implemented a number of legally required policies that were not in place at the time of the last accreditation. The Governance Manual is a living document (on the college website) that is regularly updated when committees make changes to their formal charges. Since the last self-study, a website has been established for the College Planning Council (CPC), which is included in the Governance Manual. All members of the college may now easily access agendas, minutes and meeting handouts of the CPC, and the website is updated regularly after each meeting.

(2) Schedule regular retreats to review the role and function of the board.
   The Board has participated in a retreat led by an outside facilitator each September since 2006.

(3) Conduct its self-evaluation according to the schedule and manner determined in the policy.
   The last survey to evaluate the Board as part of its self-evaluation went out to the campus community in August 2010. According to Policy (BP 1310) the self-evaluation should occur annually, so this is still an area of improvement.

**PLAN FOR STANDARD 4B**
The Board will continue the process of reviewing all policies, manuals and procedures according to the review cycle established, and will schedule annual self-evaluations as stipulated in Board Policy 1310. In addition, the Board will incorporate Accreditation standards into the assessment of its own performance.
Overview

Governor Brown released his 2013-14 state budget proposal on January 10th with the declaration that the state no longer faced a structural shortfall. He then proposed spending increases in K-12 and higher education, an expansion in Medi-Cal to implement federal healthcare reform, and essentially proposed a “status quo” budget for the remaining program areas of the budget. The Administration is proposing a $138.6 billion (B) budget ($97.7 B General Funds (GF); $41 B Special Funds) which is roughly a 5% increase over the prior year. However, the spending increases outlined for K-12 and higher education are dependent upon significant policy reform in each segment.

The Administration estimates adoption of the proposed budget solutions would result in the following operating surpluses over the next four years ($1B in 2013-14; $47 million(M) in 2014-15; $994M in 2016-17.) In contrast, over the last five years, each budget unveiled in January identified a structural shortfall --- last year’s, for example, was estimated to be $9.2B. The 2013-14 proposed budget marks a turning point in that the state’s underlying expenditures and revenues are roughly in balance.

Proposition 98 — 2012-13 Current Year (CY) and 2013-14 Budget Year (BY)

The budget includes revenue generated from both Propositions 30 and 39 (with the two expected to generate a combined $7.2B in 2013-14). The Administration calculates the Proposition 98 guarantee at $56.2B for 2013-14 which is $2.7B greater than the revised 2012-13 minimum guarantee of $53.5B.

Proposition 98 Components

Total Guarantee
2012-13: $53.5B
2013-14: $56.2B

K-12/Community College Split
2012-13  CCC 10.83%  K-12 89.17%
2013-14  CCC 11.38%,  K-12 88.62% (with the inclusion of the adult education funding shift)
(each .001 percent of P-98 funding equals $56M)

Year-to-year change
CCC:  +$597 million
K-12:  +$2,061 million

The Administration’s Proposition 98 proposal for the budget year is premised on a Test 3 calculation which is based on the change in per-capita General Fund. Test 3 is used in low revenue years when General Fund revenues decline or grow slowly. A “low revenue year” is defined as one in which General Fund revenue growth per-capita lags behind per-capita personal income growth.

The cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) factor is calculated at 1.65%; however, only select K-12 categorical program are proposed to receive a COLA. It should be noted that both K-12 and community colleges received no COLA adjustment for the five years of 2008-09 to 2012-13; however, K-12 will
eventually have its foregone COLA scored and restored through the 2012-13 fiscal year under the governor’s proposal. The K-12 deficit factor adjustment essentially backfills the lost purchasing power once the state’s budget situation improves. For K-12, the Governor is proposing that under the new “Local Flexibility Funding,” no deficit factor would be created for K-12 beginning in the 2013-14 fiscal year. While there is neither a statutory timetable for the repayment nor a statutory requirement to create a deficit factor, K-12 has consistently elevated this as a top priority and the factor has historically been funded. It should be emphasized that for the community colleges, the lack of COLA for the period 2007-08 through 2012-13 created a cumulative loss of purchasing power totaling 18.3% and translates into roughly $994 million.

Another aspect of Proposition 98 which warrants further discussion involves the “scoring” of the revenue attached to Proposition 39 (see below “CCC 2013-14 Proposed Budget” for a summary of the proposal). In November 2012, voters approved Proposition 39 which closes a loophole on taxes for multistate business and is expected to raise $1 billion annually. For the first five years, half of the money is slated to fund energy efficiency and clean energy projects in California schools and other public buildings; the second half goes to the General Fund.

The administration proposes that all the funds generated by Proposition 39 count toward the Proposition 98 guarantee and projects that Proposition 39 will increase state revenues by $440 million in 2012-13 and $900 million in 2013-14. Scoring all Proposition 39 revenue in Proposition 98 has the effect of increasing the minimum guarantee by $426 million in 2012-13 and an additional $94 million (for a total increase of $520 million) in 2013-14. The Governor further proposes to allocate all Proposition 39 energy efficiency and clean energy projects over the next five years exclusively to K-14 ($450 million in 2013-14 and $550 million annually.)

The LAO strongly criticizes this maneuver. The LAO questions deviating from the longstanding practice of “scoring” designated ballot measure revenues toward the Proposition 98 guarantee and expresses concerns that voters were told the revenues would be “scored” in a completely different manner in the official voter guide.

The difference between the Administration and the LAOs approaches is summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Prop 98</th>
<th>Non-98</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$56.200 B</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$56.200B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(incl $450)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAO</td>
<td>$55.940B</td>
<td>0.450 B</td>
<td>$56.390B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excludes $450 m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add'tl amt owed (diff between Administration and LAO)</td>
<td>$190M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CCC portion | $ 21M |
| K-12 portion | $ 169M |

In terms of overall impact, the question for the colleges is whether the system would prefer $21 million of unallocated Proposition 98 resources and also have the opportunity to compete for a portion of non-Proposition 98 $450 million energy efficiency project funds proposed by the LAO or the Governor’s proposal.
California Community Colleges
The community colleges are projected to receive a $597 million Proposition 98 increase in 2013-14. The 2013-14 main budget bill is contained in AB 73 and SB 65, and while both documents have been released, little detail on the major policy proposals is available. The Administration has a February 1st statutory deadline to release the proposed Education Trailer Bill; however, even that document will be a work in progress until the final budget is adopted in July.

The following are the highlights contained in the Governor’s Budget Summary with additional information to provide overall context to the proposal:

2013-14 Proposed Budget

- $315.7 million -- Shift Adult Education/K-12 Apprenticeship to Community Colleges. The Governor’s rationale outlines a desire for better coordination, more accountability, and the belief that the CCCs are better positioned than K-12 to address the needs of adult learners. Currently, the $15.7 million K-12 Apprenticeship program IS NOT flexed while the $7.2 million CCC Apprenticeship program IS flexed. (See “Adult Education” agenda item for more information).

- $196.9 million -- Undesignated Schedule (1) Apportionment Increase. The Governor purposely did NOT specify a category for these funds. Schedule (1) typically provides cost of living adjustments (COLAs)/SB 361 funding rate increases. Enrollment restoration/growth is typically provided in schedule (4), and categorical restorations would be shown in one of the 23 categorical schedules contained in the budget. The preliminary COLA rate for 2013-14 is 1.65%, and if it were included, it would yield $90 million. In addition, a 1% or 1.5% enrollment restoration/growth factor would equal $55 million or $82 million, respectively.

- $179 million -- Deferral Buy-Down. The current outstanding deferral amount is $801 million; the proposed budget would reduce that to $622 million. The proposal reduces outstanding debt; however, until the debt is reimbursed, the colleges/districts do not receive a programmatic benefit, but could incur lower overall borrowing costs each year. The 2011-12 Budget Act marked the highest deferral amount ($961 million) for the colleges.

- $49.5 million -- Support for Projects to Improve Energy Efficiency and Expand Use of Alternative Energy pursuant to Proposition 39. The Governor proposes a total of $450 million in 2013-14 and $550 million annually for schools and community colleges through 2017-18. These funds would all count toward meeting the Proposition 98 guarantee, and the Administration proposes to allocate funding based upon ADA and FTES, respectively. In FY 2013-14, $49.5 million is proposed for community colleges and $400.5 million is proposed for K-12. In addition, the Administration proposes that the California Department of Education (CDE) and the Chancellor’s Office (COCCC) consult with the California Energy Commission and the Public Utilities Commission to
develop guidelines for districts in prioritizing the use of the funds and report project expenditures to the CDE and the COCCC upon project completion.

- $16.9 million -- Expand Online Courses for Matriculated Undergraduates. The Administration’s expressed goal -- to increase students’ ability to “progress through college efficiently and use technology to deliver quality education to greater numbers of students in high-demand courses” -- has three parts: 1) expand courses which “fill” quickly and serve as prerequisites to other degree or certificate courses; 2) create a single, common, centralized “virtual campus” to deliver online courses; and 3) expand options for students to earn college credit for demonstrating knowledge and skills through “credit by exam.”

- Policy Reform – Fiscally-Neutral Proposals
  
  o Over a multi-year period, shift the census date for apportionments from early in the academic term to the course completion date. While this proposal is designed to be cost neutral, districts with low completion rates would be required to reinvest “savings” into student support services while districts with higher completion rates would receive a higher apportionment rate.

  o 90-credit-unit Cap for Students to Receive State-Subsidized Instruction. Upon completion of the 90-unit cap, students would be required to pay the full “cost” ($194 per credit-unit) for additional credit units. Colleges would be allowed to grant case-by-case waivers for students who exceed the cap due to circumstances beyond their control. Ninety units reflect 150% of the 60 units necessary for transfer. It is estimated that fewer than eight percent of students would be impacted by this proposal. Under this proposal, the Governor treats all students equally, unlike previous the earlier proposal which linked unit caps/satisfactory academic progress to Board of Governors’ (BOG) Fee Waiver recipients only.

  o Require All Financial Aid Recipients, including BOG Fee Waiver Applicants, to Complete a Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). The Administration has acknowledged concerns related to AB 540 students, and has expressed intent to allow the CA Dream Act application to serve as a proxy for income verification. The CA Dream Act application information, which is already in use by colleges, has not been integrated by the Student Aid Commission with information collected in the regular Cal Grant database. This has resulted in college personnel spending a considerable amount of time key-entering Dream Act application data in the first year of the new form.

- Technical Adjustments
  
  o Education Protection Account (EPA) -- $187.2 M in additional GF to mitigate against a lower EPA revenue projection in the BY and $27.5 M in additional GF in the CY (from $855.5 million to $667.8 million in the BY; and from $855.5 million to $828 million in the CY);
- Property Tax/RDA -- $133.2 M in additional GF to mitigate against a lower Property Tax/RDA projection in the BY and $47.8 M in the CY;
- A reduction of $2.9 million for the Student Financial Aid Administration categorical program as a result of fewer 2011-12 BOG waivers claimed than originally estimated.

2012-13 Current Year Revisions

- Technical Adjustments
  - $27.5 M GF backfill for lower-than-projected EPA revenues
  - $47.8 M GF backfill for lower than projected Property Tax/RDA proceeds

Analysis

The Administration has outlined significant policy reforms tied to its proposed reinvestment. The budget summary specifically outlines the following policy objectives:

- move decisions to the local level;
- decrease time-to-completion;
- improve the overall completion rate; and
- improve the transfer rate to colleges/universities.

The Adult Education proposal contained in the budget will be addressed in the board agenda item entitled “Adult Education.”

An undesignated apportionment increase has not been proposed in almost twenty years. Generally speaking, apportionment increases are usually clearly delineated between enrollment restoration/growth and COLA. While the budget summary is silent in terms of how funds shall be disbursed, in the absence of legislative direction, the BOG would make the determination. However, every budget process involves a substantial amount of legislative oversight and, although the BOG is a 17-member board, there will only be nine voting members as of the end of January 2013.

The provision of $179 million for deferral buy-down represents roughly 22% of the outstanding deferrals. In a significant departure from the “wall of debt” rhetoric expressed last year, the Administration proposes that roughly half of the new revenues (excluding the adult education shift) be used for programmatic increases, and the other half for reducing the outstanding deferral, with the entire K-14 deferral to be repaid by 2016-17. Budget writers would need to obligate an average of $207 million each year to fully repay the remaining $622 million CCC deferral (assuming the 2013-14 Budget Act includes $179 million for deferral buy-down). In the CY, the state paid down $159 million of outstanding deferral, thereby “freeing” up a like amount of dollars in 2012-13. Given that the system earmarked $159 million in the CY for repayment, simply designating the same amount for deferral buydown in 2013-14 would “free-up” $20 million for undesignated programmatic increases.

The Administration’s Proposition 39 proposal specifies that these funds may be spent for facilities’ projects or workforce training activities; however, the proposed allocation mechanism
(distribution via FTES) does not prioritize the allowable activities. In addition, a $45-per-FTES allocation would mean our smallest district (Palo Verde), would receive a total allocation of $62,100, which may not represent sufficient resources to undertake an energy efficiency project or a training program. In the event that the FTES allocation model is selected, consideration should be given to provide a minimum allocation for small districts. In addition, the board should weigh in on the Proposition 39 and Proposition 98 interaction noted above in the Proposition 98 section.

The online education augmentation represents the policy proposal for which the least amount of information is available. It is hoped that by the time of the board meeting, additional information such as a policy brief from the Chancellor’s Office, will be available.

The census proposal, while cost-neutral and in stark contrast to the $400 million census change advocated two years ago by the Administration, is problematic in two ways. First, the administration proposes to reward completion with a higher apportionment rate but this would dis-equalize the funding rates of SB 361. In addition, the proposal outlines an automatic expenditure redistribution between the unrestricted apportionment and as-yet-undetermined “restricted” categorical programs. It is unclear what specific “outcome” the Administration is seeking, and therefore it is unknown whether such an automatic redirection would achieve the desired outcome. In addition, such automatic expenditure redirection could impact a district’s ability to meet its “50% Law” obligation if “instructional” expenditures are no longer able to be counted toward the “50% Law” calculation at an arbitrary point in the fiscal year.

The 90-unit credit cap proposal implies a level of system technological capability which does not exist. Within a district/college the number of credit units acquired by a student is readily available; however, because the system lacks a unique student identifier number it will be almost impossible to monitor accurately at a statewide level. The system office could come up with a rough proxy; however, given the financial stakes, enforcement may be difficult. While the technological components lag behind, it is nonetheless important that clear signals about expectations be provided for both students and the institutions.
## General Apportionment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2007-08 Revised Budget Act</th>
<th>2012-2013 Budget Act</th>
<th>2012-2013 Revised</th>
<th>2013-2014 Governor's Budget</th>
<th>GOV BUD compared to 12-13 REV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Apportionments</td>
<td>3,079,349</td>
<td>1,139,297</td>
<td>1,116,797</td>
<td>1,819,821</td>
<td>703,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth for Apportionments</td>
<td>106,373</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General Apportionments</td>
<td>3,185,722</td>
<td>1,139,297</td>
<td>1,116,797</td>
<td>1,819,821</td>
<td>653,024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Categorical Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2007-08 Revised Budget Act</th>
<th>2012-2013 Budget Act</th>
<th>2012-2013 Revised</th>
<th>2013-2014 Governor's Budget</th>
<th>GOV BUD compared to 12-13 REV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship - CCC FLEXED</td>
<td>15,229</td>
<td>7,174</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship - K-12 NON-FLEXED</td>
<td>33,100</td>
<td>20,037</td>
<td>20,037</td>
<td>20,037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills</td>
<td>101,803</td>
<td>49,183</td>
<td>49,183</td>
<td>49,183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Aid Administration</td>
<td>156,786</td>
<td>64,273</td>
<td>64,273</td>
<td>64,273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Opportunity Programs and Services</td>
<td>106,786</td>
<td>64,273</td>
<td>64,273</td>
<td>64,273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>15,505</td>
<td>9,332</td>
<td>9,332</td>
<td>9,332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Students</td>
<td>115,011</td>
<td>69,223</td>
<td>69,223</td>
<td>69,223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Services for CalWORKs Recipients</td>
<td>43,580</td>
<td>26,695</td>
<td>26,695</td>
<td>26,695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care Education Program</td>
<td>5,242</td>
<td>5,254</td>
<td>5,254</td>
<td>5,254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation</td>
<td>101,803</td>
<td>49,183</td>
<td>49,183</td>
<td>49,183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate for the Community Colleges</td>
<td>48,675</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Employment Opportunity</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty Health Insurance</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty Compensation</td>
<td>50,828</td>
<td>24,907</td>
<td>24,907</td>
<td>24,907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty Office Hours</td>
<td>7,172</td>
<td>3,514</td>
<td>3,514</td>
<td>3,514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications and Technology Services</td>
<td>26,197</td>
<td>15,254</td>
<td>15,254</td>
<td>15,254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund for Student Success</td>
<td>6,156</td>
<td>3,792</td>
<td>3,792</td>
<td>3,792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>40,690</td>
<td>22,929</td>
<td>22,929</td>
<td>22,929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Education and Articulation</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant and Instructional Support</td>
<td>27,345</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Technical Education</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare Tax Bail Out</td>
<td>6,836</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Support</td>
<td>20,957</td>
<td>13,378</td>
<td>13,378</td>
<td>13,378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Ed</td>
<td>16,910</td>
<td>16,910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical Sub-total</td>
<td>688,717</td>
<td>411,629</td>
<td>411,629</td>
<td>741,343</td>
<td>329,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 6870-101 Item</td>
<td>3,874,439</td>
<td>1,550,926</td>
<td>1,578,426</td>
<td>2,561,164</td>
<td>982,738</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Subtotal General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2007-08 Revised Budget Act</th>
<th>2012-2013 Budget Act</th>
<th>2012-2013 Revised</th>
<th>2013-2014 Governor's Budget</th>
<th>GOV BUD compared to 12-13 REV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Bond Debt Service</td>
<td>63,111</td>
<td>63,657</td>
<td>63,657</td>
<td>63,583</td>
<td>(56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCMAT</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandates</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>33,338</td>
<td>33,338</td>
<td>33,335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency Projects (Prop 39)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>961,000</td>
<td>961,000</td>
<td>801,094</td>
<td>(159,906)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferral (SBX4 16 Sec XX)</td>
<td>855,470</td>
<td>827,970</td>
<td>668,250</td>
<td>(159,720)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Protection Act</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDA Backfill/Offset</td>
<td>(97,969)</td>
<td>47,794</td>
<td>(47,794)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal General Fund</td>
<td>4,142,120</td>
<td>3,415,002</td>
<td>3,542,843</td>
<td>4,225,516</td>
<td>662,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Property Taxes</td>
<td>1,970,767</td>
<td>2,402,170</td>
<td>2,256,477</td>
<td>2,171,022</td>
<td>(85,455)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Total Proposition 98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2007-08 Revised Budget Act</th>
<th>2012-2013 Budget Act</th>
<th>2012-2013 Revised</th>
<th>2013-2014 Governor's Budget</th>
<th>GOV BUD compared to 12-13 REV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Proposition 98</td>
<td>6,112,887</td>
<td>5,817,172</td>
<td>5,799,320</td>
<td>6,396,538</td>
<td>597,218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cabrillo College Decision Making

Governing Board (Sets Priorities)

Faculty Senate
Optional Path for Academic and Professional Matters

President

Cabinet

CPC

Administrative Council Managers

College Mission (Core Functions)

Constituent Groups

Components are:
- President's Office
- Administrative Services
- Instruction and Student Services

Constituent Groups are:
- Faculty Senate
- Student Senate
- Cabrillo Classified Employees Union
- Cabrillo Federation of Teachers and Confederals