EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

Fresno City College
1101 East University Ave.
Fresno, CA 93741

A confidential report prepared for
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the External Evaluation Team that visited
Fresno City College and State Center Community College District
March 5, 2018- March 8, 2018

Erika Endrijonas, Ph.D.
Chair

Inserted page from Commission

Table of Contents

List of College Team Members

Dr. Erika Endrijonas (Chair)
President
Los Angeles Valley College

Ms. Michelle Fowles (Team Assistant)
Dean, Institutional Effectivness
Los Angeles Valley College

Ms. Alicia Aguirre
Professor, Humanities and Social Sciences
Cañada College

Dr. Julianna Barnes
President
Cuyamaca College

Ms. Marvelyn Bucky
English Professor & Reading Program
Coordinator
Cuyamaca College

Dr. Howard Irvin, Jr.
Vice President, Student Services
Los Angeles Southwest College

Ms. Deborah Ludford
District Director, Information Services
North Orange County Community College
District

Ms. Nohemy Ornelas
Associate Superintendent/Vice President
Student Services
Allan Hancock College

Dr. Edward Pai
Dean, Institutional Effectiveness
Los Angeles Harbor College

Dr. Elizabeth Pratt
Dean Career and Technical Education and
Economic Workforce
College of Marin

Mr. Mario Rodriguez
Associate Vice Chancellor of Finance
Los Rios Community College District

Dr. Deborah Wulff
Vice President of Academic Affairs & ALO
Cuesta College

Summary of the External Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION: Fresno City College

DATES OF VISIT: March 5, 2018 – March 8, 2018

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Erika Endrijonas

A twelve-member accreditation team visited Fresno City College (FCC) March 5 – March 8, 2018 for the purpose of determining whether the College continues to meet Accreditation Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies and Standards, and USDE regulations. The team evaluated how well the College is achieving its stated Mission and provided recommendations to meet the Standards and to improve institutional effectiveness.

In preparation for the visit, the team chair attended a team chair workshop on December 7, 2017 and conducted a pre-visit to the campus on January 16, 2018. During this visit, the chair and team assistant met with the President, Vice President of Instruction, the faculty co-chair of Accreditation who is also the Accreditation Liaison Officer, and other key personnel involved in the self-evaluation process. The entire external evaluation team received team training provided by staff from the ACCJC on February 7, 2018.

The evaluation team received a hard copy of the College's self-evaluation and a flash drive with the related evidence eight weeks in advance of the site visit. The team determined that the self-evaluation addressed the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission Policies, although the narrative could have been more concise and included more examples because the Team had to request a significant amount of additional evidence in order to affirm whether the College met the Standards. During the visit, the team confirmed that the College community participated in the creation of the Institutional Self-Evaluation (ISER). In fact, the team was especially impressed by the use of a campus trivia contest to engage the college community in understanding the accreditation process and by the Classified Staff's victory over the Academic Senate in that trivia contest. Further, the ISER contained two self-identified Action Projects for institutional improvement as part of the Quality Focus Essay.

On Tuesday, March 6, 2018, the team members visited Fresno City College located in Fresno, California. The visit began with a breakfast reception, where the team was introduced to at least 40 members of the College community and was followed by a tour of the campus. During the evaluation visit, team members conducted 43 formal meetings, interviews, and observations involving at least 90 college employees and students. Team members also visited online classes in addition to interacting with students and staff in various offices and areas on campus. Two open forums were held, one during the day, and one during the early evening, to provide

community members and college personnel opportunities to meet with members of the evaluation team. Both forums were very well-attended, especially by external community members from the local business community and the local K-12 unified school districts.

The team reviewed materials supporting the self-evaluation mostly in electronic form via provided flash drives, internal college systems (CurricuNET and TracDat), and the College's public website pages. The team reviewed a broad array of evidence including program review and student learning outcomes documents, course syllabi, college policies and procedures, enrollment information, committee minutes, and college governance structures and documents.

The team greatly appreciated the assistance of key staff members who helped the team with requests for individual meetings and other needs throughout the evaluation process. Scheduling interviews with campus personnel was very well-organized, and the Information Technology staff was especially helpful when the team experienced problems with internet access and functionality.

The team found the college to be in compliance with all of the Eligibility Requirements, Commissions Policies, USDE regulations, and most of the Standards. The team issued three recommendations for improvement and one recommendation for compliance. The team was impressed with the collegiate feel to the Fresno City College facilities and grounds. The team issued one Commendation for their partnerships with their local K-12 districts and business and industry, which has exponentially increased dual enrollment and certificate and degree opportunities for the community.

Several members from the FCC team joined selected members from the teams visiting Clovis Community College and Reedley College on Monday, March 5 at the district office where they met with four Board members, the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, and other district staff members. This district team found the District to be in compliance with the Eligibility Requirements and most of the Commission Policies and Standards. The district team made recommendations for compliance and improvement to the District.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2018 External Evaluation Team

College Commendation

The Team commends Fresno City College for building partnerships in the community with local K-12, workforce, and business and industry, which has resulted in an annual increased dual enrollment of 2772 high school and middle college students, and 149 certificate training and 6 degrees to adult students through the Career Technical Center. (II.A.1, II.A.10, II.A.14)

College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

College Recommendation #1 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the Team recommends that the college clarify its plan to improve student achievement when performance falls below the Institution-Set Standards. (I.B.3, I.B.4)

College Recommendation #2 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the Team recommends that the College ensure all course syllabi include the correct, approved student learning outcomes. (II.A.3).

College Recommendation #3 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends consistent tracking and assessment of outcomes for library and library support services. (II.B.3)

College Recommendation #4 (Improvement): In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the Team recommends that the College continue to strengthen its administrative structure and capacity. (IV.B.2)

District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

District Recommendation #1 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the District expedite and follow its comprehensive timeline to ensure regular review of all Board Policies and Administrative Regulations. (I.B.7, I.C.7, II.A.4, II.A.5, III.A.11, IV.C.7)

District Recommendation #2 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the District ensure all personnel are systematically evaluated at stated intervals in accordance with the bargaining agreements and Board policies. (III.A.5)

District Recommendation #3 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District implement an administrative program review process to inform District planning efforts for technology and complete its District technology plan. (III.C.2)

District Recommendation #4 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District and Colleges strengthen its planning to ensure reliable access, safety, and security of information. (III.C.3)

District Recommendation #5 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the District strengthen the functions of District committees to broadly communicate formal outcomes and recommendations. (III.D.1, IV.D.2, IV.D.3, IV.D.6, IV.D.7)

District Recommendation #6 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the Board continue to strengthen its efforts to act as a collective entity and reach a mutual understanding with the Chancellor about the delegation of authority. (IV.C. 2, IV.C.12)

Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority

The team confirmed that Fresno City College is authorized to operate as a postsecondary, degree-granting institution based on continuous accreditation by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The ACCJC is a regional accrediting body recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and granted authority through the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008.

The college meets the Eligibility Requirement.

2. Operational Status

The team confirmed that the College is operational and provides educational service to approximately 25,000 students annually, with the majority (86 percent) enrolled in degree or transfer-level courses. Approximately 64 percent are enrolled full time.

The College meets the Eligibility Requirement.

3. Degrees

The team confirmed that degree opportunities and transfer courses are clearly identified in the college catalog. The majority (89 percent) of courses offered lead to a degree and/or transfer. Students can select from 300 degree and certificate programs, including 24 Associate Degrees for Transfer. Approximately 62 percent of Fresno City College students have identified their educational goal as transfer.

The College meets the Eligibility Requirement.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The District's current chief executive officer is qualified for the position and has served as chancellor since January 2016. His full-time responsibility is to the District; he possesses the requisite skills and authority to provide leadership for the District.

The College President/CEO of Fresno City College reports directly to the District Chancellor. The College President/CEO does not serve as a member of the board nor as the board president. The current president was approved by the Board of Trustees and began serving in August 2016.

The college meets the Eligibility Requirement.

5. Financial Accountability

The College's Financial Aid department has developed numerous internal checks and balances as well as self-audits to verify compliance with federal Title IV regulations and requirements. Ongoing professional development promotes comprehensive understanding of current laws and regulations. The loan default rate is within acceptable range. The College has addressed prior deficiencies found in a federal audit and is now in compliance with methods in place to maintain compliance. External, independent audits for the District and college have no findings representing reportable conditions, weaknesses, or instances of noncompliance related to contractual agreements with external entities.

The college meets the Eligibility Requirement.

Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with
Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies

The evaluation items detailed in this Checklist are those which fall specifically under federal regulations and related Commission policies, beyond what is articulated in the Accreditation Standards; there may be other evaluation items under ACCJC standards which address the same or similar subject matter. Evaluation teams will evaluate the institution's compliance with standards as well as the specific Checklist elements from federal regulations and related Commission policies noted here.

General Instructions: The form should contain narrative as well as the "check-off."
  a. *The team should place a check mark next to each evaluation item when it has been evaluated.*
  b. *For each subject category (e.g., "Public Notification of an Evaluation Visit and Third Party Comment"), the team should also complete the conclusion check-off.*
  c. *The narrative will cite to the evidence reviewed and team findings related to each of the evaluation items. If some content is discussed in detail elsewhere in the team report, the page(s) of the team report can be cited instead of repeating that portion of the narrative.*
  d. *Any areas of deficiency from the Checklist leading to noncompliance, or areas needing improvement, should be included in the evaluation conclusions section of the team report along with any recommendations.*

This Checklist will become part of the evaluation team report. Institutions may also use this form as a guide for preparing documentation for team review. It is found as an appendix in the team and institutional self evaluation manuals.

Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive evaluation visit.
☒	The institution cooperates with the evaluation team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment.
☒	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions* as to third party comment.

[Regulation citation: 602.23(b).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The College has a link to the ACCJC form for third party comment on the Accreditation website. According to the College, no third party comments have been received, but the College is prepared to work with the ACCJC in the event that any comments are submitted.

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. Course completion is included as one of these elements of student achievement. Other elements of student achievement performance for measurement have been determined as appropriate to the institution's mission.
☒	The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance within each instructional program, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. The defined elements include, but are not limited to, job placement rates for program completers, and for programs in fields where licensure is required, the licensure examination passage rates for program completers.
☒	The institution-set standards for programs and across the institution are relevant to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement; the defined elements and expected performance levels are appropriate within higher education; the results are reported regularly across the campus; and the definition of elements and results are used in program-level and institution-wide planning to evaluate how well the institution fulfills its mission, to determine needed changes, to allocating resources, and to make improvements.
☒	The institution analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(i); 602.17(f); 602.19 (a-e).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The College has developed an Institutional Effectiveness Index (IEI) that defines elements of student achievement performance across the institution. The elements, including course completion, are appropriate to the institution's mission. The IEI has identified a six-year baseline and target measures. The College developed the "Core 9" in fall 2017 to promote dialogue on student achievement within the institution. IEI elements are used in the College's program review process to provide data on student achievement performance to instructional programs. Defined elements include job placement and licensure passage rates. Institution-set standards for the institution and programs are relevant and appropriate within higher education. Reports are regularly reported across the campus through the IEI and Core 9 and used in appropriate college processes at the program and institution levels. The College has dialogue regarding the IEI and Core 9, and college processes assure that standards are set through appropriate participation. Evidence was provided that the college uses institution-set standards to analyze its performance.

Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Evaluation Items:

☒	Credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education (in policy and procedure).
☒	The assignment of credit hours and degree program lengths is verified by the institution, and is reliable and accurate across classroom based courses, laboratory classes, distance education classes, and for courses that involve clinical practice (if applicable to the institution).
☒	Tuition is consistent across degree programs (or there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).
☒	Any clock hour conversions to credit hours adhere to the Department of Education's conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice.
☒	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits*.

[Regulation citations: 600.2 (definition of credit hour); 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.24(e), (f); 668.2; 668.9.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

Board policy (BP) dictates that units of credits are awarded according to higher education norms and the college follows federal standards for clock-to-credit-hour conversions in the awarding of credit, although as noted later in this report, Board Policies should be reviewed in a more timely manner. Course outcomes are part of requirements on the official course outline of record. The achievement of stated programmatic learning outcomes is the basis for awarding degrees and certificates. Programs going through the review cycle report on progress in assessing program and course-level outcomes. The college also requires programs to utilize student achievement data for a deeper understanding of program learning outcome achievement. Administrative Regulation (AR) 7122 delineates the instructors' duties and responsibilities which includes systematic evaluations of students of student's progress consistent with established student learning outcomes. Units of credits are based on Title 5 regulations and reviewed in the curriculum committee. The Board of Trustees reviews and approves all curriculum prior to being sent to the State Chancellor's Office.

The achievement of stated programmatic learning outcomes is the basis for awarding degrees and certificates. BP 4100 and AR 4100 and 4105 govern the awarding of degrees and certificates in all modalities. AR 7122 outlines the instructors' responsibilities which includes evaluation of student progress and student learning outcomes.

Transfer Policies

Evaluation Items:

☒	Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public.
☒	Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer.
☒	The institution complies with the Commission *Policy on Transfer of Credit*.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.17(a)(3); 602.24(e); 668.43(a)(ii).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

Board Policy 5120 and Administrative Regulation 5120 outline the process for students who wish to transfer to a CSU or UC. As directed in Board Policy and Administrative Regulation 4050, the college maintains articulation agreements and close evaluation processes at all levels for students transferring in and out of Fresno City College. The Curriculum Committee ensures that courses are comparable at all levels with courses offered outside of the college.

BP 5120 and AR 5120 address the Mission which includes the transfer of students to baccalaureate-level institutions. BP 4050, Articulation with Other Post-Secondary Institutions, was last updated August 2008. The policy stipulates that each college will assign an Articulation Officer. BP 4050 also addresses high school articulation agreements. Currently, the college has 24 Associate Degrees for Transfer and 247 Course Identified (C-ID) courses.

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution has policies and procedures for defining and classifying a course as offered by distance education or correspondence education, in alignment with USDE definitions.
☒	There is an accurate and consistent application of the policies and procedures for determining if a course is offered by distance education (with regular and substantive interaction with the instructor, initiated by the instructor, and online activities are included as part of a student's grade) or correspondence education (online activities are primarily "paperwork related," including reading posted materials, posting homework and completing examinations, and interaction with the instructor is initiated by the student as needed).
☒	The institution has appropriate means and consistently applies those means for verifying the identity of a student who participates in a distance education or correspondence education course or program, and for ensuring that student information is protected.
☒	The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offerings.
☒	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education*.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi); 602.17(g); 668.38.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The college evaluates student progress and outcomes through program and institutional outcomes, and program improvement through program review and survey results, which includes location and means of delivery. Distance Education courses are required to meet the requirements of the Course Outline of Record Addendum, which ensures all distance education courses meet the content and methodology for teaching distance education and are equivalent to those of face-to-face courses and programs. Fresno City College identifies definitions and guidelines for best practices for "regular and effective contact" The College will be updating "regular and substantive" interaction between instructor and students in the next DE Handbook. Unless they have completed another training program, faculty are required to be certified by @One or the current online training program called "OLTT" Online Teacher Training. The training is based on best practices identified using the Online Education Initiative Course Design Rubric. A fulltime Director of Distance Education and Instructional Technology provides administrative leadership for the College's online program. Features in the College's learning management system (Canvas) that facilitate substantive interaction include tracking student use within the course, student satisfaction surveys, tracking the number of students who use NetTutor (24/7 online tutoring), and Quest for Success, which are modules that student are automatically enrolled into once they have registered for a distance education course. This aligns with Smarter Measure, a color-coded software that indicates students' use. Planning for the future use of Smarter Measure will include a trigger to contact students who are not successful in the Quest for Success Modules.

Student Complaints

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online.
☒	The student complaint files for the previous six years (since the last comprehensive evaluation) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint policies and procedures.
☒	The team analysis of the student complaint files identifies any issues that may be indicative of the institution's noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.

☒	The institution posts on its website the names of associations, agencies and govern mental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities.
☒	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Representation of Accredited Status* and the *Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions*.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(ix); 668.43.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

Student complaints and discipline fall under the purview of the Vice President of Student Services, who has designated the Dean of Student Services to handle all student complaints and discipline issues. The College provided the team with the policy on the Student Discipline and Student Complaint processes and procedures. The Team reviewed a sample of complaints, including six (6) complaints; five (5) were adjudicated and one (1) was active. All complaints are tracked on a spreadsheet on a secured drive. All complaint processes and procedures are available in the College catalog and on the College website.

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution provides accurate, timely (current), and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies.
☒	The institution complies with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status*.
☒	The institution provides required information concerning its accredited status as described above in the section on Student Complaints.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1))(vii); 668.6.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The College offers pre-collegiate level curriculum identified in the catalog and in the course numbering system. AP 4222 provides guidance defining pre-collegiate work. BP 4020 and AP 4022 guides the college in the development of curriculum for pre-collegiate, and non-credit. The Institutional Effectiveness and Academic Success Committee and the Student Equity Committee review the remedial data (scorecard and IE Index) benchmark data and target for 28 effectiveness indicators. The College identified nine core (Core 9) measures regarding institutional effectiveness to facilitate college-wide dialogue. Recommendations were made to the committees, resulting in the revision of the program review template to include usage of benchmark and target data. There is evidence of alignment between pre-collegiate level curriculum and college-level curriculum in order to ensure clear and efficient pathways for students.

The program review and curriculum processes allow faculty the opportunity to ensure the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards. Integration of curriculum review and update through program review allow for improvement in teaching and promote student success. Offering distance education is required to move through the curriculum approval process and is currently integrated into the program review and curriculum cycle.

Title IV Compliance

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program, including findings from any audits and program or other review activities by the USDE.
☒	The institution has addressed any issues raised by the USDE as to financial responsibility requirements, program record-keeping, etc. If issues were not timely addressed, the institution demonstrates it has the fiscal and administrative capacity to timely address issues in the future and to retain compliance with Title IV program requirements.
☒	The institution's student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by the USDE. Remedial efforts have been undertaken when default rates near or meet a level outside the acceptable range.

☒	Contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive educational, library, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required.
☒	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations* and the *Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV*.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(v); 602.16(a)(1)(x); 602.19(b); 668.5; 668.15; 668.16; 668.71 et seq.]

Conclusion Check-Off:

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The College presented evidence on the required components of theTitle IV Program. FCC and the District work to ensure a default rate lower than 30 percent. The District entered into a contract with i3 Group to provide data management and student borrower outreach activities, default aversion and delinquency prevention activities, student loan assistance hotline, and counseling services to improve their default rates. The college has been cleared on all but one item in the May 2015 federal audit. The delay is due to a change in the auditor and all necessary documentation has been provided. The default rate the 2013 cohort is 23.4 percent and 20 percent for the 2014 cohort, both in the acceptable range.

Compliance with Title IV is monitored by the college Financial Aid department. FCC had a significant substantive change for programs exceeding 50 percent online approved in July 2012 for 23 degrees, including a degree in Business Administration, a degree and certificate in Child Development, a degree and certificate in Health Information Technology and a degree and certificate in Library Technology.

The Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration and District General Counsel review all contractual agreements and comply with the Commission *Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations* and the *Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV*.

There have been no findings by independent auditors indicating reportable conditions, weaknesses, or instances of noncompliance related to contractual agreements.

Standard I

Standard I.A: Institutional Mission

General Observations

Fresno City College's mission statement has clearly stated goals which are appropriate for a public two-year institution: "As California's first community college, Fresno City College provides quality, innovative education programs and support services directed toward the enhancement of student success, lifelong learning, and the economic, social, and cultural development of our students and region."

As part of an integrated planning model, the mission, vision, and core values drive the strategic goals, which guide Program Review, Unit Planning and Action Plans, resource allocation, and implementation of changes. These changes are evaluated in progress reports and assessment of institutional effectiveness, which are then used to update the college strategic goals and objectives every four years.

Findings and Evidence

Based on a four-year cycle, the College recently reviewed and updated its mission through committee consultation involving the various constituencies. Fresno City College's Mission Statement was approved as part of the 2017-2021 Strategic Plan by the Strategic Planning Council (SPC) in May 2017 and was subsequently approved by the Board of Trustees in August 2017. The Mission demonstrates a commitment to improving the quality of life for individuals in the community through educational advancement. (I.A.1, I.A.4)

In order to fulfill its mission, Fresno City College offers close to 300 degree and certificate programs, ranging from accounting to welding technology. Furthermore, the 2013-2017 Strategic Plan identified changing student demographic needs. As a result, Fresno City College increased distance education (DE) classes from 153 sections in fall 2015 to 214 sections in fall 2016.

The College collects data through the Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE) Committee, with a specific focus on student success to ensure informed decision-making in fulfilling its mission. These results are analyzed and updated on a six-year cycle and made available via Tableau, an interactive data software program implemented in 2015-2016. Disaggregated data on enrollment patterns and student achievement are provided to identify areas of improvement. This information is integrated into Program Review reports, Strategic Plan reports, and grant writing initiatives to address achievement gaps. (I.A.2)

The college utilizes disaggregated data by modality to implement continual improvements to course offerings and educational goals. Additionally, program review reports require goals, resource allocation, and hiring requests to be tied to the college mission and strategic plan. Program review reports also incorporate discussion of student learning outcomes, program learning outcomes, and institutional learning outcomes in describing program improvement goals.

Although the course retention and success rates are traditionally lower in online courses, Fresno City College has increased these outcomes to 88% retention and 68% course success, which demonstrates that requiring instructors to complete the certification process is having a positive effect on student success.

Fresno City College's Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE) Committee also developed 29 institutional effectiveness measures fall 2013 in order to ensure the College is using data to support its mission, including five student success measures and six student success scorecard measures. The committee examined six years of data and set new improvement targets which will be re-examined on a six-year cycle. After analyzing IRE data showing lower course success and transfer level completion rates for Basic Skills students, the College took steps to increase student success. These efforts include using high school GPA to place students into higher level classes to reduce exit points, creating math Extending the Classroom (ETC) and English Peer-Assisted Student Success (PASS); embedded tutoring programs, as well as accelerating student pathways to transfer level by deleting the lowest level math and English courses from four levels below transfer to three levels below transfer. The team found initial improvements based on these efforts. (I.A.2)

The College determines how effectively it is accomplishing its mission through data-driven decisions by requiring an analysis of program retention and success rates in comparison to the college's retention and success rates and the Institutional Effectiveness Index targets as part of program review. As a result, student success data guides program goals, and requests for resource allocation, including hiring of new personnel. (I.A.1, I.A.2)

The Educational Master Plan (EMP) serves as the central planning document for the College and includes the mission, vision, and core values. Based on internal and external scans, the EMP provides context for the student population in support of the mission. The Strategic Plan further emphasizes the mission by creating a strategic focus for the goals developed in the EMP. The Strategic Planning Council uses data to inform the development of the Strategic Plan, with a particular emphasis on measures to address equity gaps. (I.A.2, I.A.3)

The College has established Institution- Set Standards and uses the Institutional Effectiveness Index to set goals for the institution. These are defined in the Core 9 Indicators and the College is implementing solutions to address the achievement gaps. This effort promotes data-informed decisions about how to best serve the students. (I.A.2, I.A.3)

Conclusion
The College meets the Standard.

Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance
None.

Standard I.B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations
Fresno City College has processes at the institution, program and course levels to engage faculty and staff in broad discussions of student achievement and learning. The College adopted the Institutional Effectiveness Index (IEI) and Core 9 Institutional Set Standards to establish key performance indicators that include local, state, and federal measures of student achievement. College governance processes annually review trend data on these indicators to establish institutional baselines and goals for performance. These data are used in assessment and planning processes to guide institutional improvement. The IEI and Core 9 are vehicles for communicating institutional performance and standards for academic quality. Disaggregated program-level data are reviewed and discussed through the program review process. Course-level data are reviewed in the learning outcomes assessment process. The college has defined institution-set standards as baselines for the 29 effectiveness measures.

Findings and Evidence
The College has established processes and initiatives in place to promote a substantive and collegial dialogue on student achievement and student learning. College governance processes promote this dialogue at the institutional level. Program review and unit planning processes are discussed at the programmatic level. Student learning outcomes assessment activities document dialogue at the course level. The institutional focus on the IEI and the Core 9 integrates the institutional efforts to improve academic quality, equity and institutional effectiveness. (I.B.1)

Interviews with faculty and staff verified that the College maintains a schedule of course assessment based on plans developed in the Comprehensive Program Review. This schedule is used to manage the process and the college receives regular reports on SLO assessment progress from the Outcomes Assessment Coordinator. The team was provided evidence that 87 percent of courses have been assessed. The College has faced challenges in managing the process and has identified an improvement plan in the QFE. (I.B.2)

The College has developed indicators for student achievement and reviews those measures annually. These are articulated through the Institutional Effectiveness Index (IEI), a set of 29 measures of institutional effectiveness adopted in 2014. The IEI include measures for course success, awards, licensure, job placement, and completion using IPEDS and state measures. Annually, the Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee reviews these measures to establish institutional baselines and goals. The Office of Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning publishes data for the current year through interactive dashboards that allow institutional and program-level analysis during program review and planning processes. The College President led the effort to develop the "Core 9" Institution-Set Standards in fall 2017. Although there was evidence to support planning and activities to achieve targets, interviews and a review of the evidence demonstrated an uneven understanding and use of institution-set standards to establish expectations for institutional and program performance. The team found that individuals were unable to explain the institution-set standards or how they were applied to

program performance and what occurred when a program did not meet the institution-set standards. The College's use of the Core 9 demonstrates a clear commitment to promoting productive dialogue about institutional improvement based on the targets. However, the use of institution-set standards for student achievement in the systematic evaluation of institutional and program performance is in its nascent stages. The team found a lack of clarity on college expectations when program performance falls below institution-set standards. (I.B.3, I.B.4)

Evidence supports a well-established program review process that addresses all units of the college. Over 250 programs are reviewed on a five-year cycle. The program review process includes analysis of disaggregated data by program type and mode of delivery. The Strategic Planning Council (SPC) monitors completion of the program review and receives reports out twice a year on the status. The Program Review Committee oversees the process and meets weekly to review and approve the program reviews. Results are communicated to SPC and other college committees for action and posted to the College's website. Although the team found evidence of improvements based on program review results, the completed documents did not consistently show the effective use of student achievement data for institutional improvement. Interviews revealed that the program review template was undergoing revision and would likely include a more structured approach to evaluation of the data at the program level. Similar to the SLO process, the college has faced challenges in managing the program review process with the resources available and has identified a solution path in the QFE. (I.B.5)

Evidence demonstrates that the college uses disaggregated data at the institutional, program and subpopulation levels in program review, learning outcomes assessment, and in unit planning processes. Committees, such as the Student Equity Committee, use disaggregated institutional data to identify and address performance gaps. The program review process requires programs to "note any disproportionate impact" at the program level. The program review process identifies unit goals that are used to guide the annual unit planning process. Annual unit plans are the basis for the resource allocation process through the submission of action plans. (I.B.6)

Board Policies and Administrative Regulations to ensure that all academic programs, student services, resource management, and governance structures support the mission of the College and District have not been regularly reviewed. The College uses a variety of approaches to evaluate its practices to assure academic quality. For example, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) is used to assess student engagement and to develop recommendations with action plans to address student needs and accomplishment of the mission. The Integrated Plan uses equity as a framework its goals are aligned with the college's Strategic Plan to improve educational outcomes for students who are disproportionately impacted. (I.B.7)

Results of assessment and evaluation activities are communicated internally and externally in a variety of ways. Program review and learning outcomes results are presented in their respective oversight committees. These results are then communicated to other college governance and operational bodies where they are used to promote college-wide discussion around academic quality. The adoption of the Core 9 has focused the evaluation of performance and guided the

improvement efforts by establishing targets. The college integrates program review, unit planning and resource allocation processes that are aligned with college priorities and leads to institutional improvement. (I.B.8, I.B.9)

Conclusions

The College meets the Standard. Through interviews and evidence collected at the College, the team confirmed that there is college-wide dialogue on student achievement and learning outcomes and that these processes are systematic. Evidence was provided that the results of these processes are used for improvement in the College. There is a continuous cycle of program review, unit planning and learning outcomes assessment and the college appropriately monitors these processes. The College has institution-set standards for student achievement that include state and federal measures for completion. It is recommended that the College continue its implementation of the institution-set standards and increase efforts to clarify expectations for institutional and program performance when standards are not met. Finally, many Board policies and Administrative Regulations were last updated in 2008 or before and require review and revision.

<u>Recommendations</u>

College Recommendation #1 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the college clarify its plan to improve student achievement when performance falls below the Institution-Set Standards. (I.B.3, I.B.4)

District Recommendation #1 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the District expedite and follow its comprehensive timeline to ensure regular review of all Board Policies and Administrative Regulations. (I.B.7, I.C.7, II.A.4, II.A.5, III.A.11, IV.C.7)

Standard I.C. Institutional Integrity

General Observations
The college demonstrates institutional integrity in its operation. The college maintains appropriate relationships with the ACCJC. There are Board policies on academic freedom and responsibility. Additional policies promote honesty, responsibility and academic integrity. The college, through a variety of policies, procedures and practices, assures that clear, accurate and current information is available to the College community and public.

Findings and Evidence
The College relies on the website and catalog to communicate with the public where current information about accreditation, the mission statement, learning outcomes, educational programs and student support services may be found. The college provides an online catalog for students. The team found evidence of an established procedure to ensure the catalog contains updated information. The catalog describes the instructional delivery applied in DE courses and programs as well as expected interaction between faculty and students. The catalog includes descriptions of certificates and degrees and learning outcomes are included with the descriptions of programs. The College has processes at the Deans' level to verify that SLOs are included in course syllabi. The College publishes information on the total cost of education in the college catalog and through the college website. (I.C.1, I.C.2, I.C.4, I.C.6)

The College collects and shares data on student achievement and student learning internally and externally. The Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee is charged with reviewing data defined by the college's Institutional Effectiveness Index and "Core 9" Institution-Set Standards and setting college baselines and targets. Achievement data is published annually and communicated to various governance committees and integrated in program review and unit planning processes. The institution makes its data and analysis public to internal and external stakeholders locally through the college website and publication of various documents. The College provides data at the state and federal levels to meet state and federal reporting and disclosure requirements. (I.C.3)

Board Policies (BP) 2405 and 2410 outline the process for creating new or revising existing policies and regulations. College policies, procedures and academic regulations are published in the college catalog which is reviewed regularly. It is not clear that there is a regular or systematic review of policies and procedures, although examples of revised policies were provided. The college has and publishes, both online and in the catalog, governing board policies on academic freedom and responsibility (BP 4030). It is clear that these policies apply to both faculty and students. The last revision on this policy was in 2008. BP 5500 articulates the board policy on student behavior and this communicated through the college and district website and the college catalog. (I.C.5, I.C.7, I.C.8)

The College presents its expectations of faculty conduct through board policies that are published on the college and district websites and in the Faculty Handbook. The last revision of

the Handbook was in 2012. The college does not instill specific beliefs or world views. Board policy defines a code of ethics for administrators (BP 3150, last updated 2004), faculty and coaches (AR 7122, updated 2008). (I.C.9, I.C.10)

The College has no operations in foreign locations. (I.C.11)

The College communicates matters of educational quality and institutional effectiveness through the College website and participation in state and federal data reporting systems. All accreditation results are published on the College website and disclosure of Commission-required information appears in place. The college has consistently met all of its reporting deadlines. The College is in good standing with the commission and communicates its accreditation status appropriately. (I.C.12, I.C.13)

The College is a publicly funded, open access community college that makes the delivery of high quality education its paramount goal. (I.C.14)

Conclusions
The college meets the Standard. However, many Board policies and Administrative Regulations were last updated in 2008 or before and require review and revision.

<u>Recommendations</u>
District Recommendation #1 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the District expedite and follow its comprehensive timeline to ensure regular review of all Board Policies and Administrative Regulations. (I.B.7, I.C.7, II.A.4, II.A.5, III.A.11, IV.C.7)

Standard II

Standard II.A. Instructional Programs

General Observations
The College offers a wide range of programs for students, including degrees for transfer and degrees and certificates in career technical education (CTE), pre-collegiate/basic skills, noncredit skill building, noncredit CDCP short-term vocational programs, and continuing education. Instructional programs are aligned with the institutional mission and purpose and are appropriate for higher education. The institution assesses students' retention and persistence progress through completion of degrees and certificates, and transfer, in addition to comprehensive program review and student learning outcomes assessment processes.

Findings and Evidence
The College offers approximately 300 programs in alignment with the Mission and student educational goals. Distance Education courses are required to meet the requirements of the approved Course Outline of Record and Distance Education Addendum, which ensures all distance education courses meet the content and methodology for teaching distance education and are equivalent to those of face-to-face courses. The College has defined and provided guidelines for what constitutes "regular and effective contact" interaction between instructor and students and will be updated in the next Distance Education Handbook. Unless they have completed another training program, faculty are required to be certified by @One or the current online training program called "OLTT" Online Teacher Training. The training is based on best practices identified using the Online Education Initiative Course Design Rubric. A fulltime Director of Distance Education and Instructional Technology provides administrative leadership for the College's online program. Features in the Canvas learning management system that facilitate substantive interaction include student satisfaction surveys, tracking the number of students who use NetTutor (24/7 online tutoring). Students who enroll in a distance education course are automatically enrolled in Quest for Success, modules that teach students to navigate a distance education course. Quest for Success aligns with Smarter Measure, a color coding software that indicates students use. Planning for the future, the Smarter Measure program will trigger an action step for contact with students who are not successful in the Quest for Success Modules. Canvas also has the ability to track student use within the course. (II.A.1, II.A.7)

The Program Review process, a 5-year cycle, provides for continuous improvement of instruction at the course and program levels. All program reviews are completed on a 5-year cycle and CTE programs must be reviewed every two years. Student learning outcomes are assessed during the five-year cycle. As part of Program Review, annually programs develop Unit Plans, which are aligned with the College's strategic goals; the results of program review are used in institutional planning. After program review is completed, the programs move through the curriculum update process. Program review includes assessment results for learning outcomes, and a student learning outcomes calendar, which requires all courses to be assessed at least once before each instructional program review on the five-year cycle.

All courses and programs, no matter what modality, are assessed. The deans' semester checklist require all syllabi to include student learning outcomes. Learning outcomes have been developed for all courses and are mapped to program outcomes. The Curriculum Committee officially approves courses, degrees and certificates, which includes student learning outcomes on the official Course Outline of Record. All courses and programs are forwarded to the board of trustees for final approval. (II.A.3)

Student Learning Outcomes are integrated into the program review process, curriculum, and catalog utilizing the TracDat platform. However, when the team reviewed 20 course section syllabi, over 75 percent did not have the correct student learning outcomes that were reflected on the official Course Outlines of Record. Additionally, when the team reviewed 10 percent of the distance education course syllabi, approximately 70 percent either did not reflect the proper student learning outcomes or lacked student learning outcomes completely. (II.A.3)

The college and the district follow a GE philosophy as described in BP and AR 4025, as well as the college catalog. The Curriculum Committee determines the appropriateness of courses for GE placement. The courses include student learning outcomes aligned with the GE area Institutional Learning Outcomes. The College has adopted Institutional Student Learning Outcomes in communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, and the ability to engage in diverse perspectives. In addition, systematic use of the College outcomes survey provides data on students' perceptions on the achievement of the ISLOs that can be disaggregated. The college systematically analyzes data and evidence and uses the results to improve programs and courses in its efforts to improve achievement of learning outcomes and student success. (II.A.2, II.A.3, II.A.12, II.A.16)

The college offers pre-collegiate level curriculum identified in the catalog and in the course numbering system. AP 4222 provides guidance defining pre-collegiate work. BP 4020 and AP 4022 guide the college in the development of curriculum for pre-collegiate, and non-credit. The Institutional Effectiveness and Academic Success Committee and Student Equity Committee review the remedial data (scorecard and IE Index) benchmarks data and target for 28 effectiveness indicators. The Career Technical Center offers both credit and non-credit programs including Career Development College Preparation (CDCP) and short-term vocational programs in Auto Technology and Machine Technology. There is evidence of alignment between pre-collegiate level curriculum and college-level curriculum in order to ensure clear and efficient pathways for students. The Institutional Success Committee, Academic Success Committee and Equity Committee review the remedial data and make recommendations for the program review template. (II.A.4)

The curriculum review process ensures the relevancy of the curriculum regardless of modality. It includes a review of data on student success, retention and completion for both face-to-face and distance education classes. The curriculum review process provides a mechanism for regular review and updating of course outlines to ensure appropriate academic standards are met for both courses and programs. The established criteria address the breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing,

time to completion and learning of each program. All degrees meet the minimum degree requirements of 60 semester credits. However, a review of Board policies and Administrative regulations related to degree and certificate requirements has not been conducted since 2008 and current policies do not reflect all degrees being awarded. (II.A.1, II.A.5)

Full-time equivalent students and waitlists are analyzed for schedule development each semester. The Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning works closely with instructional deans to review course section data on a weekly basis to make necessary schedule adjustments until the census date. The College also participates in the Online Education Initiative (OEI) pilot. Some CTE programs are scheduled with cohorts and have a clear pathway defined. The catalog lists classes required for all degrees and certificates. Many majors list a recommended sequence of classes per semester over a two-year period. (II.A.6)

The College addresses the needs and learning styles of its students through analysis of enrollment and achievement data by subpopulation and modality. The college is also working with the Center for Urban Education and, the Center for Organizational Responsibility and Advancement to improve equitable outcomes for students. The college recognizes the importance of professional development in ensuring that faculty are responsive to the needs of students through modes of delivery, teaching methodologies, and learning support services. Both Math and English are in the early processes of implementing accelerated course work. (II.A.7)

BP and AR 4260 define the requirements and process for pre- and co-requisites, which requires approval by the Curriculum Committee. Distance Education student readiness is determined through the voluntary Quest for Success assessment. The English department norms a student evaluation rubric for assessing English papers once per semester.   The College implemented Multiple Measures as part of the Common Assessment Initiative pilot. (II.A.8)

The achievement of stated programmatic learning outcomes is the basis for awarding degrees and certificates. BP 4100 and AR 4100 and 4105 govern the awarding of degrees and certificates in all modalities. AR 7122 outlines the instructor's responsibilities which includes evaluation of student progress and student learning outcomes. (II.A.9)

Policies and procedures are clearly communicated to students through the catalog and website, for the purpose of transferring to a CSU or UC. The College maintains articulation agreements and close evaluation processes at all levels for students transferring in and out of the College. The Curriculum Committee ensure that courses are comparable at all levels with courses offered outside of the college.

BP 5120 and AR 5120 addresses the mission that includes the transfer of students to baccalaureate-level institutions. BP 4050, Articulation with Other Post-Secondary Institutions, was last updated August 2008. The policy stipulates that each college will assign an Articulation Officer. BP 4050 also addresses high school articulation agreements. Currently, the college has

24 Associate Degrees of transfer and 247 Course Identified courses. The College has Instructional Service Agreements and offered 35 dual enrollment sections in the fall 2017 and 99 sections in the spring 2018 (II.A.10)

The College has adopted Institutional Student Learning Outcomes in communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, and the ability to engage in diverse perspectives. The mapping process and assessment of outcomes during program review cycle provides the framework for ongoing assessment practices. The college assesses Institutional Student Learning Outcomes annually by surveying graduating students. Results have been disaggregated with limited results. The College plans to look at disaggregated long term trends going forward. Outcomes Assessment Committee analyzes the results and presents findings to the Strategic Planning Council. (II.A.11)

BP and AR 4025, state the Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education with awarding degrees. General education is designed to introduce students to the variety of means to comprehend the world. BP and AR 4025 delineate the appropriateness of courses for placement in GE pattern, which is reflected in the catalog. BP and AR 4020 define the program and curriculum development and course and program deletion and approval for new programs through the District's Educational Coordinating and Planning Committee (ECPC) district wide curriculum approval. (II.A.12)

The curriculum review process requires discipline faculty to determine the student learning outcomes and competencies required for courses and degrees. (II.A.13)

AR 4102 requires all CTE programs have an Advisory Committees and meet at least annually with the discipline's Advisory Committee. Evidence from minutes of the Advisory Committees including curriculum updates, equipment needs, updated labor market information, and student learning outcomes are stated in the Program Review. CTE programs are responsible for monitoring, documenting, and communicating with the Advisory Committee how students are progressing toward the competencies, objectives, and student learning outcomes. In compliance with Title 5 and AR 4021, the college's CTE programs complete occupational program reviews every two years. Gainful employment requirements for programs are posted on the FCC website and reported to applicable accrediting agencies. The institutional effectiveness index includes these measures. (II.A.14)

Programs are offered at various locations and modalities including the Center for Career Technology and at high schools throughout the county and through distance education. Fresno City College has a Middle College site close to campus and a vibrant dual enrollment program with local high schools.

CTE programs also include data on employment trends and uses the CTE Launch Board as a source for student employment data. All degrees and certificates are assessed for currency, appropriateness within higher education, teaching and learning strategies, and student learning

outcomes through the five-year curriculum update, which is required in program review and outcomes and achievement data provided for program review. (II.A.14)

Board Policy and Administrative Regulation 4020 provides direction for new program approval processes and deletion of courses and programs. AR 4021 addresses program discontinuance for Career and Technical Education and describes the process. If a program is discontinued, students have catalog rights and work with counselors and faculty to complete in a timely manner. BP and AR 4020 and AR 4021 were reviewed and there is evidence that the discontinuation process is followed in the program planning process. (II.A.15)

Conclusions
The College meets the Standard, except for II.A.3.. While the College offers courses and programs that meet its students' educational needs, a representative sampling of course syllabi did not include the correct, approved student learning outcomes.

Recommendations
College Recommendation #2 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College ensure all course syllabi include the correct, approved student learning outcomes. (II.A.3)

District Recommendation #1 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the District expedite and follow its comprehensive timeline to ensure regular review of all Board Policies and Administrative Regulations. (I.B.7, I.C.7, II.A.4, II.A.5, III.A.11, IV.C.7)

Standard II.B. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations
Learning support services at Fresno City College include the Library, Tutorial Center, the Writing and Reading Center, Extending the Class, Peer Assisted Study Sessions (PASS), and the Academic Computing Lab, all of which are housed in the Library and Learning Resource Center complex. Tutoring support has recently added online services to accommodate an increase in Distance Education classes through NetTutor. Additionally, due to increasing student need, satellite areas of library and tutoring services have been developed in the sciences building to meet the specific research and tutoring needs for STEM classes. The library has recently increased its online resources to meet increasing demands for off-site research needs.

Findings and Evidence
Learning support services including the Tutoring Center, Writing and Reading Center, Extending the Class (ETC), and Peer Assisted Study Sessions (PASS) have been created to support student success on campus. Based on IRE data collected from 2014-2017, in the last three years, the demand for ETC program tutoring has increased from over 13,000 visits to 16,000 visits, with an increase in one-on-one tutoring session hours from over 16,000 to over 19,000 hours to assist students with reading, writing, and study skills in content area classes, particularly in the sciences. Additionally, the PASS English tutoring program more than doubled the number of tutoring sessions compared to the previous year with over 20,000 visits each semester, totaling more than 40,000 hours of one-on-one assistance in 2017 for students needing assistance improving their academic reading and writing skills. The increased demand and services provided have exceeded the current space, even as the College seeks to find appropriate space to meet the student support need.

Based on institutional data, over 1400 tutoring appointments were denied spring 2017 and over 1900 were not fulfilled fall 2017 due to the inability of the center to accommodate requested student tutoring sessions. IRE data collected in recent years demonstrates significantly higher course GPA, retention, and success rates for both the ETC and PASS tutoring programs. Funding for the programs is based on temporary Basic Skills and Equity grant money. (II.B.1, II.B.3)

In order to maintain proper procedures for supporting student learning, staff are trained and protocols are in place for safely securing and storing student records, passwords, and test information. Sensitive data and documents are also destroyed at the end of each semester. Laptops and other electronic devices used during student tutoring sessions are checked out and returned before the end of the tutoring session, and then stored in a locked cabinet. The building, computer labs, and tutoring rooms are also secured with an alarm system when not in use. Moreover, Technical Support Services on campus maintain and troubleshoot issues with computers to ensure they effectively meet student and staff needs. (II.B.2, II.B.4)

Additionally, library services are provided at multiple locations on-site, at satellite locations, and through Distance Education. The library served over 36,000 students in 2016-17, with over 70 percent of the students seeking face-to face instruction. Demand for e-books, reserve textbooks on demand, and services for Distance Education services continue to grow. Fresno City College provides a variety of database subscriptions on an annual basis through the California Community Colleges Council of Chief Librarians, which assists in accessing online information as well as print sources held in the library. The College has an interlibrary loan program allowing materials to be shared at no cost between collaborating institutions in the United States.   The College also contracts with a variety of companies for online and site location safety and security issues, as well as providing and maintaining library equipment with the following companies: 1) OCLC to aid off-campus users in gaining access to restricted online sources; 2) 3M Security Systems to prevent loss of materials located in the library through security gates at library entrance and exit points; 3) Sebastian Company to maintain safety in the library through video cameras monitored by the District Police Department; 4) Ray Morgan Company to maintain printers and copiers in the library; and, 5) Jamex Company to maintain copy cards and pay stations. (II.B.1, II.B.2)

Although library surveys have not been consistently administered due to staffing issues over the last 10 years, library meeting minutes from 2016 discussed data in terms of making changes to library services and collections. The College outcomes surveys from 2010, 2013, and 2016 indicate a "general satisfaction with library services" in terms of factors such as sources available for research. The College plans to administer this survey again in spring 2018 to gain further information on specific services which have been problematic, including the performance consistency of copy cards and pay stations. Due to a lack of leadership over an extended period of time without a permanent dean, outside services provided to the library and learning support programs have not been evaluated regularly to ensure they are consistently meeting the College's needs. Library services are scheduled to be formally evaluated on a five-year cycle through Program Review, as well as annual Unit Plans stemming from the Program Review report. However, due to unstable staffing, the current Program Review report has been delayed until spring 2018. A new Acting Dean of Library and Student Learning Support Services has recently been appointed; nevertheless, this is not a permanent position so stable leadership is still needed to ensure consistency in library and tutoring services. (II.B.1, II.B.3, II.B.4)

Conclusions
The College meets the Standard. The College provides comprehensive Library and Learning Support services, but a shortage of space has limited the College's ability to meet the growing demand for tutoring and other support services.

<u>Recommendations</u>
College Recommendations (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends consistent tracking and assessment of outcomes for learning resources. (II.B.3)

Standard II.C. Student Support Services

General Observations
The College responds to the needs of its student population through the implementation of an equitable and comprehensive program of student support services that demonstrates its commitment to a level of quality that enhances student learning and achievement regardless of location or means of delivery. Student support services faculty and staff provide appropriate and reliable support services to students in order for them to be successful in their pursuits.

Findings and Evidence
The College uses program review to regularly evaluate the quality of its student support services to ensure that the services support student learning and enhances the College's mission. In addition to program review, the College uses the annual review of service unit outcomes, the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), The Student Equity Plan, the Basic Skills Plan and student surveys to ascertain the effectiveness of student support services. The effects of the College's efforts are positively reflected in the national Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). Service areas analyze student success data and make recommendations for improvement. Student surveys are developed in collaboration with and administered regularly by the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning (OIRAP) in order to evaluate support services, counseling services, and related campus events. A variety of assessment methods are used to continually assess learning support outcomes and evaluate effectiveness of support services. The College utilizes service unit outcomes (SUO), student learning outcomes (SLO), annual planning goals, and related data reports to ensure quality of support services and to achieve its mission to enhance student success. (II.C.1, II.C.2)

Examples of program improvements include hiring a Director of Counseling and Special Programs to provide leadership to the department, and a decision to become a participant in the California Education Planning Initiative (EPI). An electronic student educational planning tool was implemented that includes a student portal, a degree planner, an Early Alert system, and an integrated, paperless health records system in the Health Services Center.

The College provides services and resources in different modalities to include individual and group counseling, online counseling, workshops, presentations, print and online media, website information and resources and college success courses. Available online services include the admissions application, college orientation, course enrollment and withdrawal, probation sessions, student fee pay, class scheduling viewing, grades, transcripts, and degree evaluations. The College extended its use of technology to serve students off-campus and make resources more accessible regardless of location. (II.C.3)

The College supports co-curricular programs through the Athletics Department and through the Associated Student Government (ASG). The College offers 20 sports for students, eleven women's and nine men's. The College's highly successful athletic programs have won numerous

conference championships and have competed for state and national championships. In 2012, the College's Athletic Department received the inaugural crowning achievement in college athletics, the Learfield Sports Directors' Cup, which honors institutions maintaining a broad-based program, achieving success in many sports, both men's and women's. However, the team found that the Athletic Director experiences challenges with game-day management responsibilities when required to attend multiple, concurrent activities and the College concurred that this issue needs to be addressed. (II.C.4)

The College provides co-curricular and athletic programs that are aligned with the College's mission and contributes to the social and cultural dimensions of a student's educational experience by considering student interest, participation, and results of program review. The College's co-curricular activities are student-centered and focus on student development and student success. An example of ASG's contribution to the social and cultural dimensions of a student's educational experience was their participation in the 'Unity Walk", where ASG and the College joined the surrounding community groups in a walk of unity against police brutality and use of force. (II.C.4)

The College provides comprehensive counseling/advising services through the Counseling Department, and grant-funded initiatives, categorical and special programs such as Cal-WORKS, EOPS, CARE, DSPS, Transfer, Veterans, IDILE (transfer program), The Network Scholars, Puente, Strengthening Young Men By Academic Achievement (SYMBAA) Program and United Southeast Asian Americans (USEAA) Program. Counseling services are provided to students through a variety of means including traditional in-person counseling, online counseling, phone appointments, the student portal, and via email. (II.C.5)

The College has leveraged many of the SSSP plan and Student Equity mandates to provide students comprehensive and timely information to assist with their selection of programs of study and educational goals. Counseling faculty establish standards and adopt best practices to guarantee that students receive consistent, useful, and timely information regarding academic requirements including financial aid, tuition and graduation and transfer requirements and policies. "Counseling on the Green" provides drop-in, "first-come first-serve" counseling services outside of the Counseling Center, in the cafeteria, or in the College mall. Counselors attend monthly counselor meetings, annual retreats and local, state, and national conferences annually for skill enhancement. (II.C.4, II.C.5)

Through interviews and during observations of the Counseling Department and external offices that house counselors, it was evident that not all counseling offices were fully enclosed to ensure confidentiality of all counseling and advising sessions. Because this may have Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPPA) implications, the College might consider, as a best practice, that all counselors be provided with confidential space.

The College has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission. FCC is open to anyone possessing a high school diploma or who is 18 years of age or older if that individual is able to benefit from the programs and services offered at the College. The College follows District Policy 5010 regarding its admissions practices and is an open access institution, although this policy has not been reviewed recently or updated since 2004. This policy includes special admission of part and full-time K-12 students, F1 International students, non-citizens, and persons who do not possess a high school diploma or equivalent. The College adheres to these policies when admitting students. Information about academic programs that have special admission/selection processes, such as nursing, is included in program applications and on the website. These policies are published in the catalog and in the class schedule and are available on the College website. (II.C.6)

Students use CCCApply, a California Education Code compliant online admission application to apply for admission to any State Center Community College District (SCCCD) college. The College administers the following instruments from the State Chancellor's Office approved assessment placement instruments list: College Tests for English Placement (CTEP) for native speaker English placements; Combined English Language Skills Assessment (CELSA) for EMLS; CSU/UC Mathematics Diagnostic Testing Project (MDTP) for elementary algebra and intermediate algebra. In 2016, the College began using Accuplacer for both English and English as a Second Language (ESL) testing. The program review process evaluates the effectiveness of practices, policies and procedures, and instruments used by Admissions and Records and the Assessment Center. (II.C.7)

The College's governing board policies outline the maintenance and security of student records as mandated by federal regulations, California Education Code and the California Code of regulations, Title 5. The district maintains procedures to ensure that access to student records is restricted only to those individuals permitted such access by law and who require such access to operate of the district. The student record confidentiality policy and information is available on the College website. The majority of student support services utilize the Colleague UI system for maintenance of student records which is backed up every 30 minutes on off-site servers. The College follows published guidelines to comply with student record related Education Codes, FERPA, and HIPAA. The student record release of information is available in print and on the College's website. (II.C.8)

Conclusions
The College meets the Standard. The College provides appropriate and reliable student support services.

Standard III

Standard III. A: Human Resources

General Observations

The College and District have hiring processes for faculty, staff, and administrators that includes both proper qualifications and competitive processes. Written policies are in place for the evaluation of all personnel. The institution has sufficient staff, faculty, and administrators to support the functions of the college. The institution provides a substantial level of professional development opportunities.

Findings and Evidence

Board policies, administrative regulations, and a personnel commission outline the hiring rules of classified, staff, faculty and administrators. The personnel commission coordinates the hiring for classified administrators, with input from representatives from the College and District. The faculty hiring process includes input from the faculty, with the Academic Senate reviewing the equivalency applications. Minimum qualifications are appropriately reviewed for educational administrators and faculty. Administrator hiring is coordinated by the District with input from departmental administrators. (III.A.1, III.A.2, III.A.3)

The District's website contains all job openings and they are posted on a variety of external websites. Job postings include essential functions of the position, minimum qualifications, desirable qualifications, duties, knowledge and abilities, and current opportunities and challenges related to mission-critical needs at the College. (III.A.1)

Degrees held by faculty and administrators are from accredited institutions and are listed in the College catalog. Applicants with degrees from non-U.S. institutions are referred to an evaluation service to establish equivalency with minimum qualifications. (III.A.4)

The evaluation process generally follows contractual agreements, and assesses the effectiveness of the individuals; however, the Team found multiple lapses and omissions of evaluations. After reviewing a statistically significant sample of employee evaluations, over 15 percent either did not have evaluations completed in the time-frame according to their contractual agreement or did not have their evaluations completed at all. (III.A.5, III.A.6)

The institution has a sufficient amount of faculty as compared to other similar-sized colleges. The program review cycle drives the need for additional faculty, which includes the rationale for additional positions. Four separate committees review the requests to ensure the most appropriate requests are considered and prioritized. (III.A.7)

Each fall semester, the Office of Instruction conducts an adjunct orientation, and most divisions also offer an orientation specific to their respective faculty. Each division follows contract agreements regarding the purpose criteria and the process/schedule for part-time and adjunct

evaluation. Adjunct faculty are provided professional development opportunities through flex-days, direct paid training, online, and through the Academic Senate Travel and Conference Committee. (III.A.8)

The institution has comparable numbers of staff working toward accomplishing its mission as other similar-sized colleges. Classified employees' minimum qualifications are guided by the rules and policies established and approved by the Personnel Commission and the Board of Trustees. Requests for new positions through program review follow the same process as faculty position requests. Requests can also be made through the President's Executive Council. (III.A.9)

The institution has comparable numbers of administrators working toward accomplishing its mission as other similar-sized colleges. The recently completed external report makes a compelling case for increased administrative capacity in instruction and student services. In response to this, the college has added positions in Educational Services and Institutional Effectiveness to better support the teaching and learning environment. (III.A.10)

The board of trustees is responsible for board policies and Chancellor's Cabinet develops administrative regulations. The vice chancellor of human resources is responsible for the administration of District personnel policies and procedures, which are outlined in board policies and administrative regulations. However, these policies have not been consistently reviewed or updated. The District has developed a tracking system for some board policies and administrative regulations with a responsible staff person and a date for review, although the plan and timeline provided to the Team did not include a schedule for all Board Policies and Administrative Regulations. (III.A.11)

Numerous board policies note their commitment to equal opportunity in education and employment and the institution promptly and fairly investigates allegations of discrimination. While the institution's employees do not reflect the makeup of their student population, the district continues to focus on these metrics, provides trainings, and adjusts hiring practices to make improvements in this area. (III.A.12)

There are written codes of professional ethics for all employees that are widely publicized and disseminated. The College values ethics and these principles are an integral part of the Fresno City College strategic plan as well as the stated mission, vision, and core values of the institution. (III.A.13)

The College has provided a wide breadth and depth of professional development offerings to its employees, which, in the past, lacked coordination. In order to enhance the professional development offerings, a six-month limited term professional development coordinator was appointed and is collaborating with the District's coordinator. This synergy has enabled the college and district to improve efficiency with their professional development budget by

supporting district-wide professional development initiatives. The College plans to hire a permanent full-time coordinator by July 2018. (III.A.14)

All employees have the right to examine their individual personnel file at any time mutually convenient to the employee and the District. These records are housed in the secure locations across the district according to the type of employee. (III.A.15)

Conclusions
The College meets the Standard, except for III.A.5.

The District has policies in place to conduct regular evaluations of all employee groups, yet they are not regularly completing these evaluations. The District has recently begun a new process to ensure all board policies and administrative regulations are reviewed for relevance; however, this is a new practice and many board policies and administrative regulations are significantly outdated.

Recommendations
District Recommendation #1 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the District expedite and follow its comprehensive timeline to ensure regular review of all Board Policies and Administrative Regulations. (I.B.7, I.C.7, II.A.4, II.A.5, III.A.11, IV.C.7)

District Recommendation #2 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District ensure all personnel are systematically evaluated at stated intervals in accordance with the bargaining agreements and Board policies. (III.A.5)

Standard III.B: Physical Resources

General Observations
Fresno City College was the first community college in California. The campus is located in the center of Fresno with a satellite campus in southwest Fresno and there are plans to build another satellite campus in west Fresno. Two voter-approved Bond measures, Measure E in 2002 and Measure C in 2016, have provided $646 million in resources to improve the aging campus and to add needed instructional space. The college atmosphere is welcoming to students and community members with beautiful grounds and historic buildings. The central quad and numerous gathering places throughout the campus provide quiet study spaces as well as areas for students to interact. The Career and Technology Center in southwest Fresno provides needed educational opportunities and services for students to prepare for a variety of occupations. Further expansion in a new facility in west Fresno will house additional programs and services to serve the community.

Findings and Evidence
Fresno City College (FCC) and the State Center Community College District (SCCCD) work cooperatively to ensure that all locations are safe and that sufficient resources are provided to maintain each facility. The committee structure was recently changed to provide better communications and collaboration by consolidating two campus committees (Environmental Health and Safety Committee and the FCC Facilities Advisory Committee) and including significant representation from SCCCD. During the visit, at the meeting of the newly formed Facilities/Environmental Health and Safety Committee, the team observed the discussion of and revision to the Operating Agreement. SCCCD committees include FCC staff such as the District Technology Advisory Committee and the District Facilities Coordinating Committee.

The team found evidence in campus and District documentation, plans, documented open forums and meetings that these processes include representatives from College and District constituencies.

The SCCCD Police Department services the campus with 24-hour dispatch for police, ambulance and fire. The department also monitors intrusion alarm systems, CCTV cameras, ingress and egress of buildings/rooms and fire alarms. SCCCD Police Department can issue crime and emergency alerts via the 1ST2Know text alert system. Emergency notifications can also be issued via the Voice over IP phone system and a radio-telephone system. Campus phones all have two-way communication capability with the dispatch center. Cameras are installed throughout the campus and the Career & Technology Center has a speaker system for verbal communications. The SCCCD Police Department has a contract with the Fresno Police Department to patrol during non-peak times to assist when they are short of staff. (III.B.1)

Professional development activities are also provided to promote the safety and security of the educational environment. SCCCD and FCC announces professional development opportunities via email such as Active Shooter Response Training and Fire Extinguisher Training. In addition,

information is available on the website for students, staff and the community. Online safety training is also available on the Environmental Health and Safety website. (III.B.1)

The District and College plan, acquire, build, maintain and upgrade physical resources to assure effective utilization to meet the College needs. Thoughtful and comprehensive long term planning is evidenced in the SCCCD 2012-2025 Facilities Master Plan, the Instructional Support 5-Year Plan and the 5-Year Construction Plan. College and District committees and departments work together to evaluate facilities and equipment on a regular basis. Evidence of this is provided in operational plans such as the SCCCD Scheduled Maintenance Plan 2016-2022, SCCCD Integrated Pest Management Plan, FCC Building Services Administrative Review, FCC Annual Unit Plans and Room Inspection documents.

Twice yearly, the FCC facilities department staff conducts an assessment of each room on campus and documents needed repairs and upgrades. Findings are recorded in a Master Facilities Review document so necessary work can be identified, tracked, and completed. The District Grounds Services and Maintenance Operations staff also conduct sidewalk inspections. The SCCCD Department of Environmental Health and Safety regularly reviews campus facilities to meet regulatory requirements including Cal/OSHA, Cal/EPA, Hazardous Materials, State Pesticide Regulation and Chemical Hygiene. In addition, they do Injury and Illness prevention inspections to meet the requirements of BP 6800. SCCCD created an Americans with Disabilities (ADA) database to assist in upgrades to meet ADA guidelines and Title 24 of the California Building Code requirements.

Mechanisms are in place to report concerns and issues regarding facilities on campus. These include the Facilities Modification Request system to request changes and upgrades, the School Dude system to submit requests for service and repairs and the Safety Report form to identify health and safety hazards. These assist the SCCCD Department of Health and Safety and the FCC Administrative Services to identity and prioritize requests and also contribute along with the facilities reviews to the 5-year plan for scheduled maintenance.

The basis for long term facilities planning is found in the SCCCD 2012-2025 Facilities Master Plan which was the basis for a successful $646 million bond measure in 2016. This bond will fund a new science and engineering building, parking a first responder academy, improvements in the Career and Technology center, ADA improvements, and technology improvements. Items that have resulted from the plan are a west Fresno center and a high school located on the campus. Program planning began in spring of 2017 which included faculty staff, community and board member input. SCCCD has also secured additional funding from the Fresno Transformative Climate Communities Collaborative and the City of Fresno along with a philanthropic offer for land to augment the bond and District monies in the completion of the identified projects.

Short term planning is driven by the FCC Integrated Planning Process. Every 5 years, each academic and administrative unit goes through a program review process. In the interim period

between program review cycles, annual unit plans are prepared which identify resources needed during the year. Resources are then requested using an Action Plan Resource Request Form. These requests include facility's needs. Input from Action Plan Resource Requests, campus inspections, information from the School Dude system, and Safety reports are used to regularly update the five-year Scheduled Maintenance and Equipment Replacement Plans. (III.B.2)

The FCC Facilities Advisory Committee meets and discusses facilities projects and needs regularly. The committee includes FCC and SCCCD staff so there is college/district coordination. The Facilities Condition Assessment (FUSION system), inspections done for the Injury and Illness prevention program, inspections done by the SCCCD Department of Environmental Health and Safety, inspections done by FCC facilities staff, requests from FCC departmental Action Plans, insurance loss reports form the Joint Powers Authority and preventative maintenance and service calls reports from the School Dude system are analyzed and used to develop and update the District five-year Scheduled Maintenance Plan. The items are prioritized by the FCC Facilities Advisory Committee and completed as funding permits. (III.B.3)

Total Cost of Ownership is considered in the decision making regarding the maintenance and acquisition of physical resources. Long range capital plans are submitted to the state as Initial Project Proposals (IPP) and Final Project Proposals (FPP) once approved by the Board of Trustees. In addition, the College maintains a five-year Scheduled Maintenance Plan, a ten-Year Technology Expenditure Plan, and updates the Space Inventory in the State Chancellor's Fusion system. Specific needs are addressed in the annual campus Action Plans where the costs for staff and equipment are proposed including one-time and ongoing costs. A revision to the Facilities Master Plan is underway with community input sessions held in spring 2017. (III.B.4)

Conclusion
The College meets the Standard.

Standard III.C: Technology Resources

General Observations
The State Center Community College District (SCCCD) and Fresno City College (FCC) emphasize the effective use of technology in the support of teaching and learning, student support and success, and administrative functions to assist students and staff as evidenced by a significant investment in staff to support the use of technology, equipment and systems, and training of staff and students in the use of technology. Fifteen members of the SCCCD Information Systems department, 17 members of the FCC Technology Support Services (TSS) department and three members of the Distance Education and Instructional Technology department provide systems and services to support learning, assessment, and teaching with infrastructure and productivity tools as outlined in the District Strategic Plan 2017-2020, the FCC Campus Technology Plan 2015-2019, and the FCC Distance Education Plan 2015-2018. The FCC Technology department staff assists in the delivery of SCCCD Information Systems and services in addition to supporting the classroom, computer labs, and local infrastructure to enhance the learning environment.

Recommendations regarding the use of technology across SCCCD are discussed by the District Technology Advisory Committee which is a participatory governance committee with representation from constituents across the District. The Technology Advisory Committee (TAC) at the College focuses on campus operational needs. There are district and college members on both committees to provide coordination of activities and streamlined communications.

Findings and Evidence
Technology resources are used to support student learning, student services, and institutional effectiveness. As noted in the District/College Functional Map, the FCC Information Technology Department is primarily responsible for this function with support from the District. The FCC Information Technology Department provides audio/visual technology, wireless network connectivity, phones, video surveillance, ADA classroom technology, help desk services, mobile device management and support for administrative computing to meet campus computing needs. At the District level, the SCCCD Information Technology department provides the wide area network infrastructure, an enterprise resource planning system for finance, human resources and student information system (Colleague), email system (Microsoft Office 365) and other related systems as confirmed in interviews with district and college technology staff. FCC participates in statewide initiatives to meet specific technology needs including the Online Educational Initiative (OEI) and the Common Assessment Initiative (CAI). (III.C.1)

As identified in the District/College Functional Map, planning is a shared responsibility between the colleges and the district. At the district level, the District Strategic Plan 2017-2020 is the basis for planning. The plan was approved by the Board on February 7, 2017. Subsequent to that approval, a District-level goal leader was identified and an area-specific SCCCD Integrated Planning Summary was developed. These summaries highlight the district-wide planning efforts

that have occurred in coordination with the 2012-2016 Strategic Plan. The team found that the SCCCD Integrated Planning Summary for Technology Planning is incomplete. During interviews with District Information Technology management and staff regarding planning, it was verified that there is no regular administrative program review completed for the Information Technology department.

Interviews and committee meetings also confirmed that a new District Technology Advisory Committee has been formed and is in the process of finalizing the Operating Agreement for the committee. Once the agreement is completed, the District Technology Advisory Committee will commence work on a Technology Plan for the District that will be vetted district wide. (III.C.2)

Operational plans for equipment replacement are prepared and executed by the FCC Technology Services department as evidenced by a ten-year Technology Expenditure Plan. Technology, staffing, and resource requests, other than ongoing equipment replacement, are identified by the campus departments during the Annual Unit Plan and Action Plan processes. Technology requests are forwarded to Technology Support Services (TSS) department for recommendation of an appropriate solution which meets campus standards. Examples of written standards used in this process include the SCCCD Telecommunication Infrastructure Cabling System and the FCC Control Systems in Lecture Rooms document. TSS then provides the department with a recommended solution including the one-time and ongoing costs. Funding is secured by the requesting department through the Action Plan process. Surveys are done annually with staff and students to assess effectiveness of technology on campus, and the Technology Advisory Committee analyzes and discusses the results as reflected in meeting minutes and confirmed in interviews. Solutions are then requested using the Action Plan process to address deficiencies as appropriate. (III.C.2)

Reliable, safe, and secure technology resources are the primary responsibility of the colleges and a shared responsibility with the District. Through interviews with both District and College staff, it was confirmed that the District backup is done to the FCC data center and a copy of the District database is also stored in the Amazon Web Services cloud. Likewise, the District hosts the campus backup systems. However, there is no evidence of offsite Disaster Recovery/Business Continuity plan for the District or FCC. (III.C.3)

As part of the Bond effort, the FCC Security Master Plan 2015-16 was developed. This plan focused on physical security for the campus including video surveillance, building access and control and fire suppression. The video surveillance system is shared across the District and is implemented by College staff. The initial product was purchased with Bond funds but ongoing and expansion costs are paid by the College as needed. Recently, the College changed all door lock systems to enhance building and room security. Door fobs are used to control access across the campus. As confirmed by the team in interviews, fire suppression enhancements are being implemented at the other colleges currently with the District and FCC to follow. (III.C.3)

Support, including training, in the effective use of technology is the primary responsibility of the College with support from the District. FCC and SCCCD have provided the appropriate instruction and support for faculty, staff, students, and administrators for their respective systems as evidenced by training opportunities through Atomic Learning, Flex Day activities, SCCCD Classified Professionals Technology Training Series, and other opportunities. As new systems have been acquired, training has been funded as part of the implementation process. The training of technical staff on new technologies and systems was identified by the College as a weakness and the Team confirmed that the college plans to address this issue in the coming year. (III.C.4)

Policies and administrative regulations are in place at the district which guide the appropriate use of technology in the teaching and learning process include Board Policy 3720 Computer Use, Administrative Regulation 3720 Computer and Network Use, and the SCCCD Use Policy. These are available on the District website. The College incorporates these policies in the New Employee Orientation which is provided to employees during account login creation process. (III.C.5)

Conclusions

The College meets the Standard except for III.C.2 and III.C.3. The College provides technology to support the teaching and learning environment, student services, and administrative functions of the College. The College has developed Technology and Distance Education Plans through committees with broad participation.

The District planning process for technology is not adequate to support the mission, operations, programs and services of the District because a process for continuous improvement such as administrative program review has not been developed. As well, the District does not have a documented comprehensive plan for the District and campus operations that would ensure reliable access, safety, and security.

Recommendations

District Recommendation #3 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District implement an administrative program review process to inform District planning efforts for technology and complete its District technology plan. (III.C.2)

District Recommendation #4 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District and Colleges strengthen its planning to ensure reliable access, safety, and security of information. (III.C.3)

Standard III.D: Financial Resources

General Observations
The institution has demonstrated the workings of a high quality financial framework, both at the district level and at the college level. In addition, they have demonstrated a thoughtful approach to creating an internal controls framework for programs, payments, and purchases. The College and District use processes that gather input to allocate financial resources in a manner that supports the educational mission of the College.

Findings and Evidence
District board policy and administrative regulations provide the foundation which ensures integrity and stability in the planning and management of financial affairs. This is also demonstrated by the District's Resource Allocation Model and the multi-year process that started in 2011 and continues today. For transparency, the District combines an estimate of projected state and local revenues to determine what funds are then available for district-wide allocation to the colleges and District office cost centers, and posts the documentation on its website. While all colleges and centers appear to have sufficient resources to support programs and improvement, and while the College's budget allocation process was understood throughout the visit by the College, the District's budget allocation process was not as clear to key individuals at the College. Specifically, it was unclear to College constituents interviewed by the Team how the allocation model ensure sufficient resources for the effective operation of the colleges and district. (III.D.1)

At the college level, financial planning is linked to funding programs and services that are congruent with the achievement of institutional goals and objectives. College and district plans are used to inform the development of strategic goals. The integrated planning process links unit goals and resource requests, not only to the mission-aligned strategic goals but also to specific institutional plans. (III.D.2)

The Strategic Planning Council approves the action-planning calendar, outlined in the Action Planning Handbook. Results from program review inform the annual unit planning process which serves as the means of identifying resources needed to achieve unit goals that support institutional planning. Training is provided to ensure all constituencies have the opportunity to participate in the process. (III.D.3)

District-level financial planning starts with the vice chancellor of finance and the administration's funding projections. The District has appropriate controls over budget transfers, requisitions, purchase orders, and vendor payments. The vice chancellor, vice president of administration, and each department budget manager have online and real-time access to their financial information. (III.D.4, III.D.5)

The District provides financial information at the District, College, and Center levels. The District emails its budget development calendar and end-of-year deadlines to all budget

managers each year in order to provide sufficient timing to support institutional financial planning and management. The District annually provides tentative and final budget books, which include a narrative regarding the colleges' detailed financial information for all District funds and expenditure information, including the current year and two prior years for comparative analysis. (III.D.6)

An independent firm audits the District annually and evaluates internal controls. The independent auditor presents audit findings directly to the Board of Trustees in an open, advertised public session. These findings are presented to the President's Advisory Council and are responded to appropriately. A district-wide accounting group meets monthly to discuss current accounting issue and policies and procedures, which also updates policies and provides access to them through the intranet. (III.D.7, III.D.8)

The College's Administrative Services Office reviews each grant regularly, all grant invoicing, and each individual transaction, which are also reviewed by the general counsel and vice chancellor of finance and administration. The District Finance Office reviews all contracts and is cautious with items such as insurance and indemnity clauses, term and termination, evergreen renewals, warranties, expenses, and governing law. The District can terminate contracts for cause, and monitors contracts for compliance with state and federal regulations. The College, District and Foundation review auxiliary requests to ensure appropriate use of fundraised resources. The Board of Trustees regularly reviews investments with the guidance of the vice chancellor of finance and administration. (III.D.10, III.D.16)

While the Board of Trustees adopted a policy of six percent reserves, the District has historically been over this amount, and recently, the District has adopted a minimum 17 percent reserve to be an indicator of fiscal strength through the Institutional Effectiveness Planning Initiative goal-setting process. In addition, the ending balance for the Fresno City College unrestricted allocation for the past three years has averaged three percent. (III.D.9)

The actuarial plan for other post-employment benefits (OPEB) is current and prepared as required by appropriate accounting standards. The District has established and consistently funded the OPEB liability in an irrevocable trust. The District began addressing large vacation balances in 2013 by limiting management and confidential employees to a maximum of two years of vacation accruals on the books, and has recently negotiated this into the bargaining agreements for classified employees. In addition, the District has fully funded the liability associated with this vacation balance. One-time and ongoing funds have been set-aside to prepare for increased employer pension contribution rates. The District's prudent fiscal planning eliminates the need for any locally incurred debt instruments to be utilized. (III.D.11, III.D.12, III.D.13)

The District has an established Bond Oversight Committee to ensure that bond expenditures are consistent with the passage of the bond language in Measure C.   The Foundation and Measure C had no audit findings for the most recent fiscal year. (III.D.14)

The District contracts with an outside firm to identify and keep student borrowers in a current repayment status and to lower the cohort default rate. The College Financial Aid Department regularly monitors student financial aid activity, offers loan and debt counseling, and conducts financial aid workshops. (III.D.15)

Conclusions

The College meets the Standard. The College utilizes sound budgeting principles, and resource allocations are linked to program plans and institutional effectiveness measures.

The District utilizes a Resource Allocation Model that appears to fund all of the colleges, centers, and the District office sufficiently, although how the model works is not clear to all constituent groups. The District maintains a healthy reserve to promote fiscal stability.

Recommendations

District Recommendation #5 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the District strengthen the functions of District committees to broadly communicate formal outcomes and recommendations. (III.D.1, IV.D.2, IV.D.3, IV.D.6, IV.D.7)

Standard IV

Standard IV.A: Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations
Fresno City College provides for participation in decision making and collaboration through its participatory governance and administrative structure as defined in the District board policies and administrative regulations, which includes involvement by faculty, staff, administrators, and students. The College gains input from four major constituent groups, including the Associated Students Government, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Management Council. Institutional governance is valued and members of the campus community are respected for their expertise and encouraged to participate.

Findings and Evidence
The College implements well-developed planning processes that support student learning and success. The primary planning body consists of the Strategic Planning Council, which has representatives from administration, classified staff, faculty, and students. Decisions are made through consensus. The Academic Senate and the State Center Federation of Teachers solicit faculty governance involvement in a variety of ways in order to ensure faculty representation. To support participatory governance and special projects, the College gives reassigned time for positions requiring an extensive time commitment. As the main recommending body for planning-based decisions, the Strategic Planning Council serves as the umbrella for the College advisory committees with primary responsibility for developing, implementing, and assessing the Strategic Plan by linking Program Review to planning and budgeting. The 19-member SPC includes seven Academic Senators, four Administrators, one ASG Student, and five Classified Professionals (three CSEA and two Classified Senate). This process facilitates participation of faculty, classified personnel, administrators, and students in budgetary decisions. (IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.3)

Campus-wide constituent groups are represented on ten committees which serve an advisory role for the Strategic Planning Council, including the Budget Advisory Council, Distance Education Committee, Enrollment Management Committee, Facilities Committee, Human Resources Committee, Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee, Outcomes and Assessment Committee, Program Review Committee, Student Equity Committee, and Technology Advisory Committee. The College sets institutional standards to inform and guide planning and monitor various performance indicators including 29 measures in the following key Core 9 areas:

- Student Success
- Student Success Scorecard
- Academic Excellence
- Student Satisfaction and Engagement
- Promote Integrated Planning
- Fiscal Stability

- Efficient Use of Resources
- Promote Institutional Dialogue
- Licensure Exam Passing Rate and Job Placement Rate. (IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.3)

There are clear board policies in place which give authority over curriculum and student learning programs and services to faculty and academic administrators. The Curriculum Committee is a subcommittee of Academic Senate and has clear processes in place for reviewing and approving curriculum proposals, which are managed in CurricUNET. Approved curriculum proposals are sent to the Education and Coordinating Planning Committee (ECPC) for a second review and approval, and subsequently sent to the Board of Trustees for final approval. (IV.A.4, IV.A.5)

The processes for decision-making are well-documented in the College Governance Handbook. In order to communicate decision-making processes widely, the College utilizes email, the College website, convocation, and open forums. The College also conducts campus wide surveys in order to further improve institutional effectiveness. The FCC full-time faculty contract requires committee work as part of the evaluation process, and compensates for service time, showing a strong commitment to receiving input from a variety of voices on campus in creating college policies, planning, and budgets. (IV.A.6)

Fresno City College evaluates the effectiveness of policies, processes, and procedures at a variety of levels. Evaluations are systematic and results are used for institutional improvement and effectiveness. Specifically, the College's Strategic Plan is updated every four years. The current Fresno City College 2017-2021 Strategic Plan focuses on educational excellence and leadership, community collaboration, and institutional effectiveness and fiscal stability. During the 2016-2017 academic year, SPC utilized input from constituent groups in the development of the 2017-2021 Strategic Plan. Moreover, based on data collected through the annual SPC surveys, FCC began participating in an Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative through the Partnership Resource Team's Institutional Innovation and Effectiveness Plan in 2016 to further improve leadership and governance, integrated planning, and student learning outcomes. (IV.A.5, IV.A.7)

Conclusions
The College meets the Standard.

Standard IV.B: Chief Executive Officer

General Observations
Board Policy 2430 delegates full responsibility and authority to the chancellor, who, in turn, delegates the responsibility and authority to the College President to serve as chief executive officer (CEO) of the institution. The current college president stepped into her position in August 2016 as the first permanent President since the sudden death of the former president, and amidst an unusually high turnover rate in administrative leadership. Since her arrival, the president has demonstrated her commitment to ensuring the quality of the institution in the areas of planning, budget, personnel, and institutional effectiveness. She has established new positions and hired several new administrators bringing much needed leadership stability to the College thanks to an external assessment of the College's leadership capacity. Open lines of communication with the internal community and engagement with the external community are also hallmarks of her presidency.

Findings and Evidence
The College president has primary responsibility for leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, personnel, and institutional effectiveness at Fresno City College. In her leadership capacity, the president is actively engaged in participatory governance and safeguards the voice of all constituent groups. Interviews with constituent leaders validated the perception that she is genuinely interested in ensuring that all voices are heard and considered as part of the decision-making process.

In the area of planning, the president was actively engaged in the reboot of the educational master plan and coordinated the strategic plan and facilities master plans. She also serves as an active member of the primary planning council at the college, the Strategic Planning Council. Resource allocation, including resources allocated for personnel, is aligned with the College's program review and planning processes. The president's role in the budget process is delineated in the Action Plan Resource Request Handbook. She works closely with the vice president of administrative services to develop and review the budget and to ensure that resources are allocated appropriately, and according to process.

The president is actively involved in the hiring processes for personnel and makes the final hiring decisions for faculty, administrators and key staff. Most recently, the president led a team of 12 to the Center of Urban Education's Institute for Equity in Faculty Hiring at Community Colleges, showing her commitment to diversity in hiring and equal employment opportunities. Additionally, the president's commitment to professional development is evidenced by the establishment of a professional development coordinator at the College.

The president plays a key role in institutional effectiveness as evidenced by the direct reporting link between the president and the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning with the Director of Institutional Research serving on the President's Executive Council. Under

the direction of the president, in fall 2017, the Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee identified the "Core 9" institutional set standards (IV.B.1)

The college president is engaged in district-level dialogue, as appropriate, with the Chancellor, the presidents of the other two colleges in the district, and district personnel. There are now four vice presidents at Fresno City College, including three over the divisions of instruction, student services and administrative services. They are given administrative authority over their respective divisions. There is a newly developed vice president position, currently filled by an interim, that oversees institutional effectiveness and who will eventually provide leadership to aspects of instruction and student services. Each vice president has deans and/or other managers who engage in the day-to-day operations of their respective areas. In addition to the new vice president, a number of new managerial positions were added including: director of college relations and outreach, director of counseling, director of admissions and records, director of distance education, and dean of instruction, student success and learning. In fall 2017, the president had the former State Chancellor conduct an assessment of their organizational structure and these additions were in part a response to the recommendations. The College will continue to expand and strengthen its administrative structure to ensure better alignment with the size and complexity of the institution (IV.B.2).

The president guides institutional improvement through the College's established planning processes and structures. The Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning Office was established in 2010 and has grown from a staff of one to five. The director of research reports directly to the president and together they have established a data-informed institution. Additionally, the 2017-2021 Strategic Plan, which serves as the central planning document for the College includes the College mission, vision, core values, and strategic goals and objectives. The Strategic Planning Council, which reports to the president, is responsible for the development, implementation, and evaluation of the strategic plan. Additionally, the president was involved in the reexamination of the Educational Master Plan which allowed it to be reestablished as the driver, along with the strategic plan, for facilities planning. (IV.B.3)

The president provides leadership, along with the faculty Accreditation Liaison Officer, for accreditation and is actively engaged in accreditation-related work. Shared engagement in the accreditation process is evident among students, staff, faculty, and administrators. Understanding accreditation and its related requirements and standards is of importance to the president. She herself is experienced with accreditation having served on teams, some of which she chaired. She actively encourages staff, faculty, and administrators to become well-versed on accreditation providing opportunities for them to serve on teams or to attend trainings. She creates opportunities for sharing and open dialogue about accreditation which includes updates at convocation and open forums. (IV.B.4)

The president ensures compliance with statutes, regulations, and board polices consistent with the mission, including effective control of budget and expenditures. She's meets weekly with her executive team and has bi-weekly one-on-one meetings with the vice presidents to ensure

compliance with all regulations. Key college governance and advisory committees include the Mission on their agendas to guide discussions and decision-making. Both College and District committees, including the President's Advisory Council and Management Council, both of which are chaired by the president along with the District Communications Council, review policy and regulatory changes in collaboration with representatives from each of the constituent groups. (IV.B.5)

The president engages regularly with the internal and external communities, with the support of the Public Information Officer. Utilizing different modalities, including emails, electronic newsletters, and open forums, she keeps lines of communication open with the College community. Convocation, Coffee with Carole, and Pizza with the President are some of the ways in which she carries out effective communication with the College community. Meetings with constituent leaders validated that her communication style is open, respectful, and collegial. A key part of the president's vision is to strengthen the "community" aspect of the "community college." In addition to her own engagement with the community, she has opened the door for her administrative team to connect with educational and industry leaders. During the open forums, many educational and industry leaders were in attendance and spoke highly of the president and her leadership team for the work that they are doing to strengthen external partnerships. For example, most recently, she re-invigorated the partnership with Heaton elementary school which is adjacent to Fresno City College to provide early opportunities for elementary-aged students to experience college. The president also serves on a number of boards including the California State University Fresno Alumni Board, the San Joaquin Clean Energy Organization, and the California Partnership for San Joaquin Valley. She also participates in Fresno Economic Development Corporation and Rotary International. (IV.B.6).

Conclusions
The College meets the Standard. The president is an engaged, thoughtful leader who promotes the mission of the College to the internal college constituencies and external community stakeholders. She recognized early in her tenure that the college administrative structure needed to expand in order to better meet the mission of the College.

Recommendations
College Recommendation #4 (Improvement): In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the Team recommends that the College continue to strengthen its administrative structure and capacity. (IV.B.2)

Standard IV.C: Governing Board

General Observations
The State Center Community College District (SCCCD) Board of Trustees is comprised of seven elected members and one non-voting student member, who are responsible for the oversight of three colleges including Fresno City College, Reedley College, and Clovis Community College and two educational centers: Madera Community College Center and Oakhurst Community College Center. SCCCD serves approximately one million people across more than 5,500 square miles, including most of Fresno and Madera counties and parts of Kings and Tulare counties.

The Board establishes policies that are consistent with all three Colleges' missions. The chancellor of the District executes policies and procedures and provides oversight to the operations of all three colleges through the respective college president who reports directly to the chancellor of the District.

Findings and Evidence
The District's locally-elected Board has the authority over and has adopted the necessary policies to assure the proper operation and the financial stability of the District. Board Policy 2012, last updated in February 2017, defines board authority and responsibility which includes responsibility for establishing policies, assuring fiscal health and stability, monitoring institutional performance and educational quality. Several other board policies such as Board Policy 2410 "Policy and Administrative Regulations," Board Policy 2510 "Participation in Local Decision Making," and Board Policy 2405 "Review of Board Policies," delineate the legal authority of the Board for policy development, provide for constituent group participation in the development and approval of board policies, and establish a regular review of board policies, respectively. On an annual basis, the Board reviews the district mission, vision, values, goals, strategic objectives and key performance indicators indicating their commitment to student learning programs and services. (IV.C.1)

Board Policy 2715 "Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice" illuminates the importance of trustees to work together as a collective unit. The Board has expended energy through Board development workshops and its Board self-evaluation to ensure that it acts collectively and within its broad authority to act in support of its collective decisions. While the Board holds robust discussion when in session, once a vote takes place, if an item is passed, Board members act in support of the decision as confirmed from interviews with four of the Trustees. To strengthen their commitment to BP 2715, the Board has worked closely with the chancellor and a consultant to clarify their roles and responsibilities, which includes working more effectively as a cohesive body. (IV.C.2)

There are clearly defined policies for selecting and evaluating the chancellor and presidents of the SCCCD. Specifically, BP 2431 "Chancellor Selection," BP 7250 "Educational Administrators, and AR 7220 "Administrative Recruitment and Hiring Procedures" establish the guidelines for the recruitment and selection of the chancellor and presidents. The Board makes

the final selection for the chancellor position while the chancellor, in consultation with the Board, makes the final selection for college presidents. Both the chancellor and college presidents are evaluated on an annual basis. BP 2435 "Evaluation of the Chancellor" delineates the process and criteria used for the evaluation of the chancellor. Similar processes are in place for the presidents. (IV.C.3)

The SCCCD Board of Trustees is comprised of seven trustees elected by the constituents of seven designated areas. There is also a student trustee, who is a non-voting member, who is elected by the student body each year. BP 2010 defines that governing board members must not be employees of the district nor hold other incompatible office. BP 2012 indicates that the Board is responsible for representing the public interest and advocating for and protecting the District. A number of other board policies and procedures provide the foundation to ensure that the aforementioned responsibilities are met. BP 2345, "Public Participation at Board Meetings" further demonstrates the Board's commitment to providing the public opportunity for comment and input. (IV.C.4)

Board policies are consistent with the District mission and vision, both of which were updated when the new strategic plan was adopted in 2017 and demonstrate the Board's commitment to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services. The Board demonstrates its responsibility for educational quality through approval of curriculum, through the review of reports such as scorecard data, and through the approval of colleges' plans (e.g. student equity plan and educational master plan). Legal matters, such as real estate transactions, personnel issues, and labor negotiations, are also the responsibility of the Board. The Board adheres to regulatory and Board Policy practices that demonstrate that it has ultimate responsibility for legal matters. The District's full-time general counsel provides the Board with advice as appropriate. Board Policy 2012 and Board minutes demonstrate that the Board exercises ultimate responsibility for resource distribution based on the recommendations of the chancellor to whom the planning is delegated. (IV.C.5)

BP 2010 "Board Membership" specifies the size and structure of the Board, with BP 2012 outlining the Board's duties and responsibilities. Operating procedures such as the election of Board Officers, the Board's regular meetings, and Board evaluations are also codified via board policies. (IV.C.6)

The Board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws which include setting district policy and exercising oversight over educational programs and quality, and budgetary and legal matters. BP 2405 "Review of Board Policies" and BP 2410 "Policy and Administrative Regulations" delineate the requirements for a regular cycle of review of policies and administrative regulations. District counsel serves as a resource when establishing and reviewing policies and administrative regulations, and the District subscribes to the Community College League of California's Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Service to ensure legal requirements are met. While the Board does show evidence of reviewing and updating some of its policies and administrative regulations, there was no evidence of a regular cycle of review for

all policies and regulations. Interviews with the chancellor and Trustees indicate that this is a priority and that the establishment of BoardDocs will facilitate this systemic, timely review of policies and regulations in the future. (IV.C.7)

The Board regularly engages in the review of key indicators of student learning and achievement and institutional plans. Examples include the review of scorecard data, the College's Student Equity/Integrated Plan, the Basic Skills Plan, the Colleges' strategic plans and the Colleges' educational master plans. The District strategic plan includes defining Key Performance Indicators, and the Board also receives regular updates during Board meetings and special study sessions throughout the year on these indicators. (IV.C.8)

The Board has an established policy for Board education and Trustee orientation, although the policy cited in evidence is dated 2003. Board development includes workshops, study sessions, and attendance at conferences related to effective trusteeship and advocacy, and a comprehensive new trustee orientation. New Board members attend the Community College League of California orientation and have the benefit of being trained by the chancellor and experienced Board members.

Board Policy 2100 structures four-year Trustee terms with staggered elections every two years to allow for continuity of Board membership. The Board also has a process for filling off-cycle vacancies. (IV.C.9)

The Board has an established process for self-evaluation as outlined in Board Policy 2745. To strengthen the self-evaluation process and their roles as Trustees, the Board worked with a consultant in 2016. A new, comprehensive self-assessment was developed to strengthen the performance of the Board as a whole as well as the performance of each Trustee. The survey element of the board self-evaluation includes numerous Likert scale questions that assess the Board's effectiveness in promoting and sustaining academic quality and institutional effectiveness. All Governing Board members participated in the survey and the facilitated self-evaluation workshop, and the results of the self-evaluation summary of strengths, areas of development, and goals were published. The team found evidence through Board meeting minutes, validated through meetings with the chancellor and Trustees, that the Board's self-evaluation is conducted regularly. (IV.C.10)

Board Policy 2715 articulates the Board of Trustees' code of ethics and prohibition on conflicts of interest. There are nine standards of practice in the policy to which board members must adhere and that state "violations of this policy may subject the member violating it to censure by the Board." Board members are required to file conflict of interest forms. Board members have no employment, family ownership, or other personal financial interest in the District or any of the Colleges. (IV.C.11)

The Board delegates full responsibility and authority to the Chancellor to implement and administer board policies as outlined in Board Policy 2430. Interviews with the chancellor and

trustees indicate that mutual understanding of the policy on "delegation of authority" needs additional attention. As such, the Board continues to work with a consultant to define and refine the difference between policy and operation. The Board holds the chancellor accountable for District operations through his job description, performance goals, and annual evaluation. The Board works with the chancellor to set annual performance goals guided by his job description and the District strategic plan. (IV.C.12)

Board Policy 3200 requires that the chancellor ensure that Board members are informed about accreditation organizations, relevant reports, and accreditation actions by all agencies that accredit district institutions or programs. Board members receive training at the district on Accrediting Commission Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, Commission policies and accreditation processes. Board members also receive accreditation updates from institutional CEOs at Board meetings and participate in district and external workshops on good trusteeship, including their roles in accreditation.

Board attention to accreditation requirements, status, and the maintenance of the Board Policy on accreditation are cited as support for the district colleges' efforts to improve. The Board self-evaluation of board roles and responsibilities includes trustees' accreditation responsibilities. (IV.C.13)

Conclusion
The College meets the Standard. The Board acts appropriately and according to its established policies, although many Board Policies and Administrative Regulations have not been reviewed recently or according to an established schedule. While the Board acts with one voice, once a vote has been taken, the perception of the appropriate delegation of authority to the Chancellor is not uniform among Board members.

Recommendations
District Recommendation #1 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the District expedite and follow its comprehensive timeline to ensure regular review of all Board Policies and Administrative Regulations. (I.B.7, I.C.7, II.A.4, II.A.5, III.A.11, IV.C.7)

District Recommendation #6 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the Board continue to strengthen its efforts to act as a collective entity and reach a mutual understanding with the Chancellor about the delegation of authority. (IV.C. 2, IV.C.12)

Standard IV.D: Multi-College Districts

General Observations
The State Center Community College District (SCCCD) is made up of three colleges, Fresno City College, Reedley College, and Clovis Community Colleges and two educational centers including the Madera Community College Center and Oakhurst Community College Center. The district Chief Executive Officer (CEO), identified as the district chancellor, reports to a seven-member Board of trustees. The chancellor selects and supervises the college CEOs – the presidents – and a district office where several vice chancellors and other administrative staff report to the chancellor. The district office is an administrative operation that does not directly conduct any educational programs. The three SCCCD colleges are accredited separately while the district office is only evaluated through the accreditation review of each college where its operations directly impact the college.

Findings and Evidence
The chancellor establishes clearly defined roles, authority and responsibility between the college and the district. The district functional map clearly defines district and college roles where each has primary or secondary roles in fulfilling each accreditation standard subsection. The chancellor, as district CEO, exercises his leadership in guiding the development of the functional map through the Chancellor's Cabinet.

The chancellor provides leadership in setting and communicating expectations through two bodies: Chancellor's Cabinet which comprises the district's executive leadership; and, the Communications Council, which comprises the chancellor, presidents, academic and classified senate representatives, and faculty and classified union representatives. Chancellor's Cabinet agendas demonstrate how the chancellor directs district-wide activities and provides for coordination between, and support for, the colleges. (IV.D.1)

The district organizational chart identifies functions and personnel who provide district wide services. Additionally, 14 district-level committees are described in the Role of Constituents in District Decision Making document. The document delineates the coordination of a broad range of functions that include fiscal and human resource allocation recommendations, district-wide curriculum review, planning, institutional research, facilities, inter-institutional leadership collaboration and workforce education planning among others areas. Charge and composition were presented for these committees and taskforces along with integrated planning summary documents identifying goals and delineating college and district responsibilities. However, the absence of minutes or notes about committee actions or progress reports on the planning summary forms made it difficult for the Team to review how these representative governance bodies contribute to the decisions made by the chancellor and his staff on resource allocation and support to the colleges and educational centers. (IV.D.2)

The District Budget and Resource Allocation Advisory Committee (DBRAAC) is charged with recommendations on the resource allocation model, cost-savings and revenue strategies, and

processes for resource allocation among several duties. DBRAAC, however, currently limits its activity to conducting an annual resource allocation model evaluation even though the model remains static and is not adjusted to respond to the findings of the evaluation. (IV.D.3)

While all colleges and centers appear to have sufficient resources to support programs and improvement, and while the colleges' budget allocation processes were understood throughout the colleges, the District's budget allocation process was not as clear to key individuals across the district. Given this, it would be beneficial for the District to re-evaluate the resource allocation model to ensure sufficient resources for the effective operation of the Colleges and District and to provide additional clarity and transparency to the process. (IV.D.3)

Board Policy 2430 "Delegation of Authority" delegates to the Chancellor the executive responsibility for administering the policies adopted by the Board and executing all decisions of the Board requiring administrative action. The chancellor then delegates authority to the college presidents. The framework for CEO accountability is established through annual goal-setting between the chancellor and each college president. College presidents are evaluated annually based on these mutually-established goals and based on a number of other criteria related to relationships, management, and leadership/personal qualities as outlined in the evaluation tool. Interviews with the chancellor and presidents validated that the evaluations are conducted annually. (IV.D.4)

There is a high degree of integration between district and college planning and in the evaluation of student learning. This is illustrated by the currency and alignment of the development of college and district strategic plans, and their joint evaluations. The District Strategic Planning Committee (DSPC) meets twice monthly and produces the district strategic plan and action agendas specific to all aspects of operational plans. The DSPC guides the joint assessment of key performance indicators by the district and each college to monitor and improve student learning and achievement and institutional effectiveness. The DSPC was instrumental in the development of the 2017-2020 Strategic Plan, with evaluation, integration, and collaboration serving as its foundation. (IV.D.5)

The district presented a detailed document detailing the roles of constituent groups in district decision-making. A structure of 14 committees addresses planning, finance, quality of educational programs, professional development, technology, facilities, and other areas but efficient district communication and coordination would help to ensure effective operations. The structured memberships of these committees include representatives from the colleges and district office. The charges of the committees appear to indicate that communication happens primarily through the committee chairs. (IV.D.6)

The district provided two sets of documents as evidence of evaluating and maintaining the integrity of decision-making processes. The first was a detailed delineation of primary, secondary or shared district and college responsibility for each accreditation standard. The second was a series of documents updated in 2017 that delineate the leadership roles and

responsibilities and assigned functions of college and district committees in meeting the planning goals of the district. The goals addressed are: communications, strategic plan, facilities, human resources, institutional research, resource development, student access, student learning, and technology planning.

The evidence referenced in these standardized planning summaries includes dates of activities and decisions taken and refers to agendas and minutes of committee meetings which were not provided.

The work of reviewing, updating, and refining role delineations, governance and decision-making is evidence that the district CEO ensures these roles and functions are being evaluated. The evidence cited does not reflect formal evaluation; the results communicated describe the updated planning document and governance responsibilities, but not the evaluation itself. (IV.D.7)

Conclusions

The College meets the Standard. There is a robust structure of district wide committees whose functions include integrated planning and resource allocation review and recommendations. The evidence of these bodies performing their collective complimentary functions is incomplete. Thus, an overall review under the direction of the chancellor of the efficacy of each committee as well as the overall capacity of these governance bodies to communicate their processes, findings and recommendations to the chancellor's cabinet would be beneficial.

<u>**Recommendations**</u>

District Recommendation #5 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the District strengthen the functions of District committees to broadly communicate formal outcomes and recommendations. (III.D.1, IV.D.2, IV.D.3, IV.D.6, IV.D.7)

Quality Focus Essay

The first Action Project for Fresno City College focuses on Student Learning Outcomes and building a culture of assessment to support and sustain student learning. The project began with a self-evaluation process that identified the need for enhancing the SLO Assessment process throughout the campus community. The Action Project has three primary goals: 1) To increase professional development opportunities for outcomes and student learning; 2) To integrate outcomes and campus process; and, 3) to examine current practices to ensure they are meaningful and alter them as necessary.

It is evident that the College has made some major strides in offering professional development to build awareness and to develop a "culture" of the need for assessing Student Learning Outcomes. Multiple professional development opportunities were offered to the campus community including utilizing an Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) grant to provide training. (1 B.1, 1B II, II A.1) The College is continuing to work through Goal II, Integrating Outcomes and Campus Processes. Most notably, the College established a permanent Outcomes Assessment Coordinator with 100 percent release time to facilitate and integrate SLO Assessments with the Program Review and Curriculum Committees. (I.B1, II.A.4, II A.11) The College is currently migrating its Student Learning Outcomes assessment platform to a more integrated eLumen Platform. The College's efforts to examine current practices to ensure that assessment is meaningful is in the beginning stages. Once the College has set an agreed upon Student Learning Outcomes Assessment process, the third goal, *to examine current practices to ensure they are meaningful and alter them as deemed necessary*, will be easier to complete.

The second Action Project for the College focuses on student achievement and improving Core 9 results. The primary goal is for FCC to integrate the use of the Institutional Effectiveness as one of the primary vehicles for promoting and meeting the Core 9 Indicators. The three specific goals include 1) Engage the College in dialogue about Core 9 indicators and possible evidence-based solutions to improve results; 2) Select specific evidence-based solutions that support achievement of Core 9 indicators; and, 3) Create a Core 9 Achievement Plan to implement identified solutions.

It is evident that the College has made strides in engaging the entire college in building the awareness of and dialogue around the Core 9 indicators. FCC's educational master plan and strategic plan both include goals specific to student achievement. The program review process incorporates Core 9 measures. Department Unit plans are aligned to Core 9 goals. The College has identified the eLumen platform to automate and integrate these processes. The use of evidence-based decision-making is growing. Interviews with college committees and review of the evidence provided by the college identified an uneven understanding and use of institution-set standards to establish expectations for institutional and program performance. In

implementing this Action Project, the College is encouraged to provide additional clarity on college expectations when performance falls below institutional-set standards.