DRAFT

Version 1.3

Moorpark College

Focused Midterm Report

October 2013

Presented to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Moorpark College, 7075 Campus Road, Moorpark CA 93021

Table of Contents

Statement of Report Preparation

Preparations for the Moorpark College Focused Midterm Report 2013 began . . . . [NEED TO WRITE]

The timeline for the development of this report is: [Update with specific dates for actions in 2013 ?? See last Midterm Report and how we did it then]

October 2010	ACCJC team visits Moorpark College to validate the college's comprehensive self-study and review evidence of compliance with the accreditation standards.
January 2011	Moorpark College accreditation is reaffirmed with the requirement that the college complete a Focused Midterm Report with an emphasis on four college specific recommendations. The seven district recommendation must be addressed by October 2011 in anticipation of a follow up visit shortly thereafter.
Aug. 2011 – May 2013	Ed CAP monitors progress monthly on Planning Agendas from the Self-Study and Recommendations from the Commission report.
Jan. 2012 – May 2012	College provides input on progress of recommendations and planning agendas.
Aug. 2012 – Nov. 2012	Workgroups gather evidence and identify which planning agendas and campus recommendations need more work.
Dec. 2012 – Jan. 2013	Focused Midterm Report prepared.
Feb. 2012 – March 2013	Ed CAP and Campus community reviews and provides feedback on draft(s) of Focused Midterm Report.
April 2013	Ed CAP and Campus community reviews and provides feedback on final draft of Focused Midterm Report.
August 2013	VCCCD Board's first meeting of the Focused Midterm Report
September 2013	VCCCD Board of Trustees approves the College's Focused Midterm Report.
October 15, 2013	College sends the Focused Midterm Report and supporting documentation to ACCJC.

Response to Team Recommendations and Commission Action Letter:

College Recommendations

College Recommendation 1: Strengthen the planning process by incorporating annual, written reports describing progress toward the achievement of institutional goals and disseminate them to college constituencies. Develop and use consistent quantitative effectiveness measures and feedback mechanisms to improve the processes at the program and institutional level.

The college is in process on this recommendation.

Background: *In Spring 2007 (2008??), the Executive Vice President of Student Learning began conducting annual program review meetings with each program. These sessions included interactive dialogue and review of program plan data. Over successive years, the discussions were more formalized, and in 2009 (?) a summary of program status was added to the program planning documents.*

To strengthen the process, the college developed a written review and feedback process which was outlined in the 2012-2013 Making Decisions Document. To *incorporate annual, written reports describing progress toward the achievement of institutional goals,* the College began using a separate program plan evaluation summary form, which included analysis of program alignment with institutional goals, quantitative effectiveness measures, and a summary of the program goals for the following year. These summaries were sent to Department Chairs during summer and fall 2012 for review and comments. To complete the feedback process, and document the results, the Interim Executive Vice President presented a summary of the program review results to the Education Committee on Accreditation and Planning (EdCAP). 1-4

In Fall 2012, the College began its second cycle of this process, based on the revised program planning timeline (outlined in the Making Decisions Document). The program plan due date was postponed by a month to allow for the implementation of TracDat. The Interim Executive Vice President completed the program review meetings in early Spring 2013, and emailed the evaluation summaries to program faculty and staff, Department Chairs, and Deans. Programs were given time to review their results with program members before signing and returning the documents. In following the process, the Interim Executive Vice President will present a written summary of program review results to EdCAP during Spring 2013. The summary report will be posted in Tracdat to allow open access for all college constituents. 5-11

In 2006, the Institutional Researcher also began providing annual Institutional Effectiveness reports to share college data with the campus community. These reports are currently used during program planning, program development, program discontinuance, and strategic planning. As college updates the Educational Master Plans, we will be including an analysis of student achievement of institutional goals as part of the review process. Copies of the Institutional Effectiveness report are distributed to each Division, Academic Senate, other??, and are posted to the campus website and college portal. 12

To further College efforts to provide useful quantitative data for program analysis, the College purchased and implemented TracDat during Summer and Fall 2012. Through the combined effort of faculty, staff, and administrators, program plans data was entered into TracDat for each of the instructional, student service, and business service programs at the beginning of the semester to ensure that this information would be ready for use during the Fall 2012 program review process. The Faculty Development Committee and Institutional Researcher organized several training sessions to teach the college community how to use TracDat to document and maintain their program plans and Student Learning Outcomes assessment results. The campus-wide collaboration during this implementation period showed the strong campus support for this new system and new ability to track and monitor program plans and results. 13

During Spring 2013, the Institutional Researcher began working with TracDat representatives to develop a variety of quantitative reports, that will supplement the standard TracDat reports and give us program and institution-level data the College can use to analyze and measure institutional effectiveness over time. 14

Next steps:

- Complete 2nd cycle of program plan review and post results in TracDat.
- Add program review summary data to Institutional Effectiveness Report.
- Build the structure within TracDat to disseminate effectiveness data at program level.
- President's Council will create a steering committee to monitor, assess, and evaluate Institutional Effectiveness beginning fall 2013. The committee will develop a feedback process to disseminate this information to the campus community.

Evidence:

1. sample program plan
2. sample signed program summary spring 2012
3. EVP summary for 2012 review
4. EdCAP minutes fall 2012
5. Making Decisions Document
6. Lisa memo's stating Oct 15 program plan due date
7. Sample email with program summary attached fall 2013
8. sample emails from Jane
9. Sample EVP summary for 2013 review
10. TracDat screenshot of program summary data
11. EdCAp minutes spring 2013
12. sample reports, sample program plans, program disc list of documents provided the Rec Group, Senate minutes, screenshot of website, college portal??
13. # of TrackDat submissions, # of faculty/staff who helped enter data into Tracdat; Lisa's memos/calendar; Flex session
14. memos/disc between Lisa and the rep; sample reports

College Recommendation 2: In order to meet the Commission's expectation of reaching the proficiency level regarding student learning outcomes (SLO) development and assessment by fall 2012, the Team recommends that the College develop specific timelines which are disseminated and reviewed, provide written summary reports of SLO assessments and improvements, and assure that assessment results are used for course, program and institutional improvement. Additionally, the College shall ensure that in every class section, students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning outcomes consistent with those in the institution's officially approved course outlines. (IIA.1.c, IIA.2.a-b, IIA.2.f, IIA.2.i, IIA.3, IIA.6, IIB.1, IIB.4, IIC.2)

This college recommendation is completed.

Moorpark College's Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation that was sent to ACCJC on October 15, 2012 reports that the College has reached Proficient Continuous Quality Improvement in the implementation of student learning outcomes. [3.01] Since that time, the College has continued its work towards reaching the level of sustainability with its SLO processes.
To reach proficiency level, the College:

- Provided SLO workshops that assisted faculty in the SLO assessment process [3.02]
- Prepared comprehensive reports of SLO assessments and improvements [3.03]
- Held a 2012 Y'All Come for faculty and staff to share their assessment findings [3.04]
- Provided research resources to programs as they developed course, program and institutional SLOs and assessments[3.05]
- Provided technology that allows a strengthened tie between SLO assessment and program planning decisions [3.06]
- Provided training to faculty and staff on how to use SLO assessment results to inform program planning decisions. [3.07]
- Developed and approved 5-year assessment cycle [3.08]
- Proposed an SLO Assessment Review committee [3.09]

Additionally, the College has processes in place to ensure that in every class section, students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning outcomes consistent with those in the institution's officially approved course outlines. Each semester, Division Deans request that faculty submit each course syllabus to the Division Office staff for review. [3.10]

The College also communicates Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), General Education Learning Outcomes (GEOs) and Institutional Level Outcomes (ILOs) to students through the College Catalog and the College Web site. [3.11] In addition, the College utilizes CurricUNet to manage and maintain all official course outlines, and through this Web-based curriculum database, individuals are able to search each course outline to review its specific course SLOs. [3.12]

Evidence:
[3.01] Moorpark College's Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation that was sent to ACCJC (October 2012)

3.02 Flex Activities (2011 and 2012)

3.03 2010 and 2011 Comprehensive SLO reports

3.04 2012 Y'All Come Summary Report on Assessment Conversation that Lori and Lisa facilitated

3.05 IR Program Plan Meeting calendars (2010, 2011)

3.06 TracDat Screenshots

3.07 <mark>(2012 Flex Presentation: Learning Outcomes – Making Sense of Assessment Results)</mark>

3.08 5-Year Assessment Cycle

3.09 Proposal for Assessment Review Committee (see proposed charge and membership sent to VPCouncil on January 23, 2013 – conversations were taking place throughout fall 2012)

3.10 Welcome emails from EACH division that shows they request course syllabi.

3.11 Moorpark College Catalog

3.12 Moorpark College CurricUNet

College recommendation 3: Complete an evaluation of its self-placement process for English and mathematics and make modifications as appropriate and necessary.

This college recommendation is completed.

The English and Mathematics discipline faculty have each participated in on-going dialogue regarding assessment and self-placement into their courses. In addition, each program has completed at least one evaluation of the self-placement process and made modifications based on this process.

English:

In (date – Fall 2010???), the English Department began discussing the English self placement process. (Evidence: Department meeting minutes??) Based on these discussions, and analysis of the online testing process, the English Department made corrections and improvements to the online assessment process to make it more informative and easier to follow for students. (Evidence: sample online exam; minutes? Need timing -- Spring 2011? – when did you make the changes?) Previously, students were able to skip through questions on the online exam. Based on faculty recommendations, the District IT department made adjustments to the online exam so that student cannot skip sections. This change helps force to students complete the entire exam. The result is that it helps students take the assessment more seriously, and therefore, make better decisions about English class placement   (Evidence??).

In Fall 2010 and Fall 2011, the English Department also conducted an analysis of self-placement data for English. They compared success rates for students who self-placed into English M01A, M02, or M03. Based on their analysis, the English faculty determined that the success and retention rates were satisfactory, which supported that the college English self-placement process allowed students to place themselves as well as a standardized exam. (Evidence: self placement data 2010, 2011)

In November, 2011, the English Department met with local high schools and CSUs to compare and discuss college a variety of topics, including assessment and placement. The participants worked to align curriculum and Moorpark English faculty discussed innovations to ease transition from high school to college composition classes. For example, students who met specific criteria would be qualified to skip the placement process and enroll directly in English M01A if they choose.   (Evidence: minutes/notes from the meeting)

Based on department discussions, and meetings with faculty from local high schools, CSUs and adult schools, about the self-assessment process, in Fall 2012/Spring 2013, English faculty began creating sample English papers at different grade levels for English M01A. There will be a link from the student self-placement exam to the department website, where the sample papers will be maintained. This will help inform students of faculty expectations regarding quality of writing at each course level as students make their self-placement decision. (Evidence: emails, meeting minutes, sample papers)

At the end of Spring 2013, the English Department will analyze Spring 2012 and Spring 2013 completion data to gain a larger sample size and to compare spring results versus fall results to verify consistency and accuracy of the data.

Next Steps:

None. On-going assessment.

Mathematics:

In October, 2009, the College created a Workgroup that included faculty and staff from the Mathematics Department, Student Success Council, and Matriculation to begin researching common math placement exams. Their goal was to find a placement test that all new students could take to be accurately placed into math courses. (Evidence: Mathematics Department minutes 10/29/10)

In Spring 2011, the workgroup interviewed representatives from four placement test companies and instituted a pilot of M*yMathTest* assessment exam. The Math Department customized the exam and two math faculty piloted the placement exam in their courses. The faculty determined that the pilot was not successful because it did not include enough students to provide sufficient data to extrapolate results across all courses/students. (Evidence: emails between Chris/Brendan, pilot exam results, other?) However, faculty also evaluated the exam results and found that students who took the pilot exam scored poorly. Based on this evaluation, the Math Department made the following changes: 1) they offered students who took the exam an opportunity to remediate, 2) they rewrote/refined the assessment exam, and 3) planned to re-pilot the revised the exam in sections of Math M09, M01, M04A, M03, and M07 to correlate content with student mastery. (Evidence: ?)

In Fall 2011, the Math Department piloted the exam in five sections of each developmental math course. The goals of this assessment exam pilot were to increase the number of students taking the exam (increased data set) and to validate the assessment exam as a predictor of student success. Faculty evaluated the results and determined that the MyMathTest was not a good predictor of student success in a given math level. (Evidence: memo from Chris 10/19/11)

In Spring 2012, based on the issues with this exam, the Math Department began researching nationally recognized self-placement tests, but decided to wait for the state to finish its research on assessment before investing in another commercial exam. (Evidence: faculty discussions, minutes?)

In Spring 2013, the Math Department decided to revise the original math self-placement exam and implement this improved tool for use beginning summer 2013. The assessment exam was posted to the website in March, 2013 and new and returning students were notified about the assessment exam. Discipline faculty will collect data over the next year and analyze test results. (Evidence: Richard memo/brochure?? Corey??; string of memos between Pat, ITS, etc. meeting minutes from math dept 2/1/13; matric minutes feb/2013)

Next Steps:

None. On-going assessment.

Evidence:

- .
- .
- .
-

College recommendation 3: In order to improve effectiveness, the College should evaluate its committee structure as identified in the <u>Making Decisions at Moorpark College</u> document with a special focus on subcommittee charges and membership as they relate to the College's mission. This evaluation should give consideration to the creation of an executive council/committee that has constituency representation that advises the President regarding committee recommendations. Based on the evaluation, the College should develop and implement appropriate revisions to its governance structure and document them. (IVA.2-3)

This college recommendation is completed.

Moorpark College has evaluated and updated its governance structure, and has updated the *Making Decisions at Moorpark College* document accordingly. [4.01]

The decision-making process at Moorpark College is grounded in respect for the roles and scope of authority of each of the college's constituencies. This is most clearly demonstrated by the understanding and acceptance of committee members that their work product is a recommendation to a specific person or group.

At Moorpark College, groups that contribute recommendations to the decision-making processes are organized into four categories based on the group's responsibilities and its source of authority:

- Governance Groups
- Organizational Groups
- Advisory Committees
- Project Groups

The groups in all four categories are essential to the involvement of the college community in making decisions and being informed about issues of college-wide importance.

The Academic Senate recognizes and authorizes the six College Standing Committees as appropriate venues to conduct discussions regarding academic and professional matters. As such, these College Standing Committees carry out their work in matters of "ten plus one." The primacy of faculty in these discussions is ensured through the composition of committee membership, where faculty holds the majority.

It is the responsibility of the faculty co-chairs of the Standing Committees to ensure that their committee's delegated authority from the Academic Senate is accountable, and the committee's recommendations communicated. The Academic Senate Council ensures the integrity of these delegated activities in the College Standing Committees through the following procedure:

- Inclusion of the College Standing Committee faculty co-chairs as members of the Academic Senate Council
- Regular reporting and presentation of College Standing Committee recommendations by the faculty co-chairs at meetings of the Academic Senate Executive Council
- Participation of the Academic Senate President in the Presidents Council (*proposed*) to present concerns or endorsements regarding the recommendations of the College Standing Committees.

The membership of each College Standing Committee is outlined in the next section. Members are selected as follows:

- Faculty members are elected by their department or division (depending on criteria established for the governance group) and recommended to Academic Senate for appointment.
- Administrators are appointed by the Executive Vice President or Vice President of Business Services.
- Staff members are selected by the position they hold in the college or by elections conducted by the Service Employees International Union.

College Standing Committees may form Task Groups to perform particular organizational or data-gathering tasks as needed. Membership of a Task Group must be drawn from current members of its parent committee. No authority for recommendations is delegated to the Task Group by its parent committee except, through its findings, to inform discussions and the crafting of recommendations in the main forum of the College Standing Committee.

The primary functions of the College Standing Committees are to plan, monitor, and assess initiatives under their stated purview. All meetings of the College Standing Committees are conducted under the Brown Act.

Recommendations developed by governance groups must flow through on-campus processes in the prescribed sequence as delineated in the timeline/sequence for key college decisions referenced in Chapter 3. The College Standing Committees make recommendations to the College President only after following the on-campus process in the prescribed sequence before being forwarded to the College President.

The College President reviews the process and the recommendations, and either returns the recommendation for further consideration by the governance group or directs implementation of the recommendation. If the College President's decision differs from the formal recommendation, the President's final decision is communicated in writing, and includes the rationale for the final decision.

When a recommendation has District-wide impact, the College President forwards the recommendation for review by the Chancellor.

Evidence:

4.01 *Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2012*

Response to Planning Agendas Identified in the 2010 Institutional Self-Study

Standard I: Institutional Mission

Standard	Planning Agenda	Status
IB.3	Revise the Program Plan Template, making explicit the connection between Strategic Objectives and resources requests, including personnel, operations, facilities and technology areas. [Standard IB.3]	Template updated, and implemented in TracDat [1]
IB.4	Beginning 2010-2011, the Office of Business Services will report back to units on allocations made and deferred in preparation for planning in the subsequent year. [Standard IB.4]	Process developed and implemented [2]

[1.] The Annual Program Plan template, now available in TracDat, explicitly ties program planning objectives to the College's Strategic Objectives, fostering strategic planning conversations at the program level. Participatory governance committees discuss and prioritize resource requests from individual programs in relation to the overall needs of the College.

[2.] The college has a built a feedback process for resource allocation into its annual program planning cycle and this is now ongoing practice. In 2011-2012, a full cycle was completed by each of the three committees responsible for recommending resource allocations: Fiscal Committee, Technology Committee on Accreditation and Planning (TechCAP), and Facilities Committee on Accreditation and Planning (FacilitiesCAP).

As part of this process, at the beginning of each annual planning cycle, the Vice President of Business Services informs each of the three committees of the status of the requests prioritized the previous year. For example, the Vice President will outline which technology equipment was purchased, which items arrived at the campus, which items were still on order, and which items were still waiting to be ordered. Reporting this information completes the feedback process from the previous fiscal year, and begins the resource allocation process for the next year. A summary of the prioritization results is posted in TracDat and on the website.

Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

Standard	Planning Agenda	Status
IIA.1(c) IIA.2(b) IIA.2(i)	Complete the following tasks by 2012 to reach Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement in the implementation of student learning outcomes: ○ Complete the second assessment cycle of the degree and certificate program outcomes. ○ Complete the first assessment cycle of the general education outcomes. ○ Identify student learning outcomes for core competencies, and complete the first cycle of assessment. [Standard IIA.1(c)], [Standard II.A.2(b)] and [Standard II.A.2(i)] NB: core competencies = institutional outcomes	Completed [3]
IIA.2(a) & 2(e)	Implement and sustain the 5-year staggered cycle of curriculum review beginning 2010, and document the curriculum review status on Program Plans. [Standard II.A.2(a)] and [Standard II.A.2(e)]	Process developed and implemented [4]
IIA.2(c) & 3	Complete review of general education program in 2010-2011 and identify core sequences for disciplines within each general education category. [Standard II.A.2(c)] and [Standard II.A.3]	Process developed and implemented; assessment and review are ongoing [5]

[3.] Moorpark College's Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation was sent to ACCJC in October 2012. Also, see College Recommendation #3.

[4.] In Fall 2010, the Curriculum Committee implemented a 5-year cycle of curriculum review for every discipline. The process is ongoing. Every discipline scheduled during this time has completed the curriculum review process. Discipline curriculum status was included on discipline program plan documents in Spring 2011 and was added to the annual program evaluation summary documentation by the Executive Vice President in Spring 2012.

[5.] The College conducted a review of the general education program in 2010-2011. As a result of this work, the committee developed general education outcomes (GEOs), a rubric for general education course qualification, and a general education assessment process. Several campus discussions were held to present and gain campus input on the proposed GEOs and revisions to the GE pattern. They were approved by the Academic Senate in fall 2011. GEO assessment was implemented in spring 2012, and is ongoing. Each academic discipline has identified core course sequences as part of their program planning. These core course decisions inform scheduling patterns, curriculum development, and program resource requests.

IIA.6(b)	Complete the District policy and administrative procedure on program discontinuance. Align college local practice on program status review to comply with anticipated District policy and administrative procedure. [Standard II.A.6(b)]	Process developed and implemented; assessment and review are ongoing [6]
IIA.7(a)	Through venues of faculty professional development, the College will more widely disseminate the concept of distinguishing personal conviction from accepted professional views within a discipline. [Standard II.A.7(a)]	Completed [7]
IIB.1 & 4	Develop cluster outcome assessment methodology and implement in 2011-2012. [Standard IIB.1] and [Standard IIB.4]	Outcomes and assessment methodology developed; assessment and review are ongoing [8]
IIB.3(b)	Formally assess extra-curricular programs and their effectiveness in encouraging personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development. [Standard IIB.3(b)]	To be developed for the 2013-14 assessment cycle.
IIB.3(c)	Develop and implement a survey to assess student engagement and satisfaction with the Counseling Department. [Standard IIB.3(c)]	Process developed, implemented, and is ongoing [9]

[6.] In 2011, the Academic Senates from Moorpark, Ventura and Oxnard Colleges reviewed the District's Administrative Procedure on Program Discontinuance (AP 4012). The recommendations were forwarded through the appropriate channels and the revised Administrative Procedure on Program Discontinuance (AP 4012) was approved at the February 2012 VCCCD Board Meeting.

Also in 2011, the Moorpark College Academic Senate developed its recommendation to the Moorpark College President on how the revised AP 4012 could be aligned with the College's practice on program status review. Due to the urgency of needing to complete its 2011 program status review process, coupled with the absence of a completed district policy, it was agreed to develop an interim program status review process to be used in 2011, knowing that it might need to be refined once the AP 4012 was approved. The interim process was based upon the recommended AP 4012 that was under review at that time. Programs went through the interim program status review process in 2011 and recommendations were made.

This interim program status review process aligned with the February 2012 approved AP 4012, and therefore, the program status review process has been adopted and fully implemented.

[7.] The Faculty Development Committee offered a flex activity on this topic in Spring 2012 and the Academic Senate held a discussion on academic freedom versus personal conviction in Fall 2012.

[8.] In 2011, the service faculty and staff collaborated in defining student learning outcomes for each of the stages. The first assessment, conducted in fall 2011, was a survey based upon the achievement of outcomes for the "First 15"stage (for students having completed between 0 and 15 units). A Web-based survey was used and the College received a 6% response rate (482 students responded).

[9.] The VCCCD Student Perceptions Survey instrument addresses student engagement and satisfaction with all student service areas; the next administration of this long-standing survey is scheduled for Spring 2014

IIB.3(d)	Assess Multicultural Day and One-Campus, One-Book activities for currency and effectiveness at promoting the understanding of diversity in all forms. [Standard IIB.3(d)]	Partially developed, partially implemented [10]
IIB.3(d)	Add the element of diversity into the Moorpark College Student Perception Survey in the next cycle. [Standard IIB.3(d)]	In progress [11]
IIB.3(e)	Conduct a focused dialogue regarding assessment and placement in English and Mathematics. [Standard IIB.3(e)]	Completed [12]
IIC.1(a)	Complete the hiring of a third full-time Librarian by Fall 2010. [Standard IIC.1(a)]	Completed [13]
IIC.1(a)	Complete the reciprocal privileges arrangement with Ventura College and Oxnard College, and increase the availability of library material for students across the District. [Standard IIC.1(a)]	Completed [14]
IIC.1(b)	Continue to assess information competency of students, both within Library instruction and in the context of instruction in English and other disciplines requiring information research. [Standard IIC.1(b)]	Completed [15]

[10] Outcomes for Multicultural Day and "One-Campus, One Book" activities have been developed. Assessment has been conducted in classes that are engaging in the "One-Campus, One Book" activities and readings. Assessment of Multicultural Day is scheduled to take place during April 2013.

[11] The next administration of the VCCCD Student Perceptions Survey is scheduled for Spring 2014; The Institutional Research Advisory Committee is scheduled to review the instrument and its questions by Fall 2013.

[12] From 2010 to the current semester, the college has conducted on-going, focused dialogue regarding assessment and placement in English and Mathematics. These discussions have taken place within each department, within the Counseling Department, in Student Services meetings, and in Matriculation Workgroup meetings. The campus dialogue has been informed by assessment exam results, student success data, and input from local high schools, CSUs and adult schools. See College Recommendation #3.

[13] The college hired a full-time Librarian in Fall 2010. However, the librarian who took the position resigned at the end of the 2010-2011 academic year. After following the program plan and hiring prioritization processes, another Librarian position was approved and a new Librarian was hired Fall 2012.

[14] The three colleges implemented a Universal Borrowing system (Primo) in spring 2013. Librarians are teaching students how to use the new search tool.

[15] Moorpark College Librarians have developed and implemented a variety of assessment assignments for students who come to the library for instruction and for discipline faculty who require information research.

Standard III: Resources

Standard	Planning Agenda	Status
IIIA.2	Complete the re-organization of the College driven by the loss of two Academic Deans, and review the medium-term impact of the re-organization at the end of 2011-12. [Standard IIIA.2]	Completed [16]
IIIA.4(b)	The Human Resources Department will develop an equal employment opportunity plan based on the Model Equal Employment Opportunity Plan provided by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. The plan will contain specific plans and procedures for ensuring equal employment opportunity. [Standard IIIA.4(b)]	
IIIA.5(b)	The Office of Student Learning, in collaboration with the Faculty Development Committee, will review the curriculum and the implementation strategy of New Faculty Orientation to ensure currency and effectiveness. [Standard IIIA.5(b)]	Completed [18]
IIIB.1(b)	The Emergency Operations Committee will review the Emergency Incident Task List generated after the debriefing of the 2009 Guiberson Fire. An operating plan will be developed based on this review. The operating plan, once implemented, will be updated evaluated regularly for updates. The plan and its subsequent updates will be reported to District Emergency Management for overall coordination. [Standard IIIB.1(b)]	Completed [19]

[16.] The college completed a re-organization in 2010-2011, which continued to support the core competencies and helped balance the workload among the six remaining deans. The college organizational structure was reviewed at the end of 2011-2012, and to maintain stability across campus, the six divisions remained constant for fiscal year 2012-2013. In spring 2013, the college lost another dean and the College is currently completing the process to replace this position.

[17.] [[place holder]]

[18.] In reviewing the central place of New Faculty Orientation (NFO) in sustaining the quality of the academy, the President has chosen to retain the function of the NFO program within her executive office. Renewed effort has been made to ensure faculty leadership is sustained. The review of the NFO is complete.

[19.] The college Emergency Operations Committee meets periodically to review the Emergency Incident Task List. As items are completed, they are marked on the form. New items are added to the list as they arise. The on-going updates to the list refine and direct the college emergency operating plan. The committee continues to review, update, and add practice exercises and emergency response assistance to improve college emergency preparation. The college reports its emergency operations plans to District Emergency Management in an ongoing fashion.

IIIC.1(b)	Provide training to faculty and staff on accessibility technology. [Standard IIIC.1(b)]	Completed [20]
IIIC.1(d)	Strengthen the feedback process from the Vice President of Business to TechCAP regarding the details of budget/item allocations at the end of each annual program planning cycle. As one cycle ends and the next begins, the Vice President of Business Services will communicate back to the programs and the College the final list of resources allocated, and items that have been tabled. In cases of non-allocation, needs must be re-examined and incorporated into the next year's plan. The mechanism for this feedback loop exists, and will be used in the next planning cycle. [Standard IIIC.1(d)]	Completed [21]
IIID.1(a)	Improve the Program Plan Template to specifically address the impact of prior year budget allocation/increases on goal implementation. [Standard IIID.1(a)]	Completed [22]

[20.] Training on accessibility technology has been provided to faculty and staff. The Instructional Technologist has developed a faculty guide to making documentation and content accessible. In addition, online accessibility training sessions have been offered once a semester since 2010-11; accessibility tips and 508 compliance requirements are now included as part of the technology training provided to DE faculty; video captioning available through the DECT grant program; and the Staff Resource Center provides faculty access to necessary software tools to edit and scan documents, and to edit and caption videos.

[21.] The college has a built a feedback process for resource allocation into its annual program planning cycle and this is now ongoing practice. In 2011-2012, a full cycle was completed by the Technology Committee on Accreditation and Planning (TechCAP).

At the beginning of the cycle, the Vice President of Business Services informs the committee of the status of the requests prioritized the previous year. This completes the feedback process from the previous fiscal year, and begins the resource allocation process for the next year.

At the end of each academic year, the Vice President of Business Services writes a memo to the College President, Executive Vice President of Student Learning, and the Academic Senate President, that reviews the prioritization process and includes the committee's prioritization list. After reviewing the list, the President accepts the prioritization as recommended by the committees or makes changes to the lists. The Vice President of Business Services then reports back to the committee regarding the President's decision.

[22.] The college program planning document was revised to include an area for programs to respond to the following question: Did you receive these resources? The template also includes an area for programs to explain how resources received benefitted their programs and helped them achieve their program goals.

IIID.1(d)	Promote greater understanding and transparency in the budget development process by continuing to host Town Halls and similar forums. Continue to monitor the level of engagement and satisfaction of employees with subsequent surveys for comparison. [Standard IIID.1(d)]	Completed [23]
IIID.1(d)	Revise the document Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2008-2010 by adding a companion timeline to the program planning process that more clearly articulates the budget building component of planning. [Standard IIID.1(d)]	Completed [24]
IIID.3	The Business Services Division will complete the development of a "Balanced Scorecard" as a performance planning and resource management tool, and complete the first cycle of evaluation based on the new tool by the close of fiscal year 2011-2012. [Standard IIID.3]	Process developed, implemented, and process is ongoing [25]

[23.] The college continues to offer Town Hall and Y'All come meetings to promote a greater understanding of the budget development process. In Fall 2012 (?), the Vice President of Business Services also led a Y'All Come meeting to gain feedback from the college community to help ensure that the college was sharing timely budget information in a format that employees could understand and use.

The District continues to survey employees to monitor their level of engagement and satisfaction.

Note: This survey covers feedback for a wide range of District and campus topics.

[24.] Moorpark College has updated the Making Decisions document. Chapter 3 (Timeline and Sequences in Key College Decisions) now addresses both the Development and Review of Program Plans and Assessment (section 3.1) and College Budget Development Timeline (section 3.2).

[25.] The Business Services Division has completed three cycles of evaluation using its "Balanced Scorecard." Survey results were posted to the Business Services website.

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

Standard	Planning Agenda	Status
IVA.5	Develop a process to evaluate the effectiveness of the Fall Fling agendas and activities in advancing the College's planning efforts. [Standard IVA.5]	Process developed and implemented; assessment will be on-going [26]
IVB.2(c)	Conduct regular reviews of new and revised Board Policies and Administrative Procedures with College managers to ensure understanding and compliance. [Standard IVB.2(c)]	

[26.] An evaluation survey was administered in 2011; faculty, managers, staff and students were asked to provide feedback on the effectiveness of the Fall Fling agenda and activities. Evaluation results from the 2011 event suggested a need for more interactive activities; therefore, 2012 Fall Fling participants were asked to participate in several interactive activities. 2011 and 2012 participants continue to request additional information on the status of the College's budget, which is agendized each year.