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

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

Descriptive Summary

Fresno City College is committed to developing an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue focusing on the improvement of student learning and institutional processes. The Strategic Planning Council (SPC) is a major component for this dialogue. It is the vehicle that Fresno City College has established to implement College mission and goals. However, this dialogue is not limited to the SPC.

Dialogue occurs throughout the campus within a variety of constituent groups. Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Associated Student Government and administration are all active participants in discussions about student learning and institutional processes. Since the last accreditation cycle, the College has made a concerted effort to engage the entire campus community in dialogue regarding programs, processes and planning. All committees which report to the SPC are comprised of members from all four constituent groups (faculty, staff, students and administrators). These representatives are charged with keeping their constituencies informed of the committees' work and agenda, and solicit input on issues from their constituents. At Deans Council and Academic Senate, for example, reports on committee work are standing agenda items (IB.1: Deans Council and Academic Senate agenda).

Dialogue among campus organizations include vigorous debate within the Academic Senate, Curriculum Committee and divisions regarding student learning outcomes (SLOs), and more recently, the budget (IB.2: Senate, Curriculum and division meeting minutes on SLOs and budget).

Representatives of all constituent groups are in dialogue. The president of Associated Student Government (ASG) reported that: 1) A member of ASG is in attendance at Classified Senate meetings; 2) A member of Academic Senate attends ASG meetings; 3) ASG and the Inter-club Council (ICC) participate in College wide committees, (Budget Advisory Committee, Facilities Committee, Program Review, etc.); 4) A student trustee is a member of the State Center Community College District Board of Trustees; 5) The ASG president is a member of the President's Cabinet; and 6) ASG maintains a Facebook page and a student life web page to maintain communication with students.

The Classified Senate is represented at ASG meetings, President's Cabinet, Communications Council, and makes regular reports to the State Center Community College District Board of Trustees.

The president of the Academic Senate reports senate business at President's Cabinet, Board of Trustee meetings, and opening day activities that include all faculty. These examples are documented by the agendas/minutes of these meetings (IB.3: Agenda and Minutes of President's Cabinet and the Board of Trustees). Other venues in which dialogue occurs are committee meetings, flex day activities, department and division meetings, as well as reports provided by representatives to their constituent groups.

Robust dialogue is occurring on campus. Yet keeping such a large organization informed and up-to-date is an overwhelming task. The president sends out
weekly communiqués entitled “City at a Glance” (IB.4: Samples of “City at a Glance”) which highlight some of the pressing issues of the College and contains a weekly calendar of events. Every day of the week at least one committee is meeting. Divisions typically meet with department chairs at least once a month and departments typically meet monthly. The President’s Cabinet, which meets bi-monthly, is comprised of all constituent groups, and receives reports from the SPC, the Chancellor’s Cabinet and other committees as needed.

While the College is committed to developing dialogue and has the vehicle in place for directing the dialogue, issues have been identified. The most pressing issue in respect to dialogue is keeping accurate, up-to-date, easily accessible information available to the College community. The College utilizes its webpage and Blackboard to archive documents (minutes, survey results, planning agenda, etc.). The content of these sites is not centrally managed and often the people responsible for content do not keep it updated. Also, with many different people maintaining the sites, the style varies from site to site, making navigation difficult. The College webpage is of particular concern in this area. Without a dedicated webmaster, it is up to individuals in various areas or on various committees to keep pages up-to-date. Editing the webpage is difficult and requires training, which is not provided on a regular basis.

For example, in spring 2007, the Strategic Planning Council surveyed the College community. “[O]nly 50 percent of the respondents agreed that the council reported effectively within the campus and community. Comments made on the survey indicate that the council needs to develop stronger and more effective communication strategies.” As a result, the report cited two recommendations under communication: 1) “Improve communication between council members and their constituent groups and with the College community,” and 2) “Improve communication between the College and the community.” (IB.5: Strategic Planning Council 2007 Survey). The council underwent another evaluation in spring 2008. However, it appeared that the results of this survey, as well as the spring 2010 survey were not made available. It was discovered that the links from the College website to the Blackboard data were not properly configured. As a result, what appeared to be a break down in effective continuous communication was actually a programming error. The ongoing, collegial, self-reflective communication about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes was taking place and being documented, but the communication was not available to all constituent members because of this error. This specific issue was finally resolved, but other webpages are still years out-of-date (IB.6: Blackboard sites for Associated Student Government and the Budget Advisory Committee).

Results from the 2010 SPC survey indicate that since 2007, the College community has increased in understanding of the SPC’s work in establishing goals and objectives for the College as well as establishing priorities for planning and resource allocation (IB.7: 2010 SPC Survey). Clearly, communication between the SPC and the College community has improved; however more improvement is needed.

In previous years, the SPC survey was sent to selected groups, such as current and past SPC members, ASG, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, CSEA, and President’s Cabinet. In spring 2011, the SPC revised the survey questions to access broader perceptions about integrated planning at the College (IB.50: 2011 SPC Survey). The survey link was sent to all employees and ASG members at the College. A total of 224 respondents completed the survey. Approximately 71 percent of respondents indicated that they are aware of the College’s goals and objectives. Seventy six percent of the respondents felt that planning information was important to them; however, it seemed that most information related to integrated planning was not properly communicated with the campus community. Therefore, respondents rated low agreement on most of the survey items. In fall 2011, SPC will review the survey results to continue to develop strategies to improve communication.

While communication has been taking place, it is unclear that an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue has been effectively occurring. Some of this may be attributed to the fact that the College’s webpage has not been maintained and was not properly linked with Blackboard. Some constituent members have relied upon the webpage while others have relied on Blackboard. At this time, there are three
primary methods used to communicate on campus: the College webpage, Blackboard, and Outlook e-mail. Because there are so many venues, individuals may not find what they are specifically looking for. Without consistent and easily accessible information, dialogue may not be effective across campus. This highlights the need for the College to implement a standard protocol for communications, posting of new information as well as archiving that information for future reference. This problem of effective dialogue is further challenged by the difficulty some committees have encountered in obtaining information from the District Office.

Another pressing issue for the College is the integration of the College’s strategic plan with the District’s. The District’s 2008 plan is outdated and has not provided measurable benchmarks for the College to measure progress (IB.8: District Strategic Plan). As a result of the Fresno City and Reedley College self study processes the State Center Community College District (SCCCD) began to work toward updating the District wide strategic plan, and has recently launched a survey to gather evidence for this update (IB.9: email form the current chancellor).

The District updated the 2008 Strategic Plan in May 2011 and has developed supporting structures and processes for future planning. The objective for updating the 2008 Strategic Plan is to bring the strategic plan into alignment with the plans and planning processes at the colleges and centers, as well as to make the 2008 Strategic Plan current. The updated goals and objectives in the strategic plan are drawn from the goals of the District and the college/center educational master plans and strategic plans.

The updated strategic plan is grounded in current trends and demographic data; the changes to goals and objectives are supported by internal survey results; and the process is directed by a representative District wide Planning Workgroup, along with consultants from The Brain Trust.

The 2008 Strategic Plan does not include any major revisions to the District’s vision, mission or values as those areas will be addressed as part of the comprehensive strategic planning in January 2012. This update also serves as a foundation for future planning with the Comprehensive Strategic Planning process in 2012 (IB.10: Updated 2008 Strategic Plan).

During summer and fall 2011, the goals and objectives of SCCCDD’s strategic plan will be assessed by the colleges and centers. Each college and center will respond to the goals and objectives of the plan as part of the measurement and evaluation of the plan. The evaluation of the 2008 Strategic Plan will be presented to the Board of Trustees in October 2011 and will be used to support the direction of the comprehensive review for the 2012–2016 Strategic Plan. The 2008 Strategic Plan expires in 2012 and will transition with the development of the 2012–2016 SCCCDD Strategic Plan.

In developing supporting structures for District wide integrated planning, SCCCDD is proposing a District wide planning calendar that aligns District and college planning to include the alignment of District strategic plan goals and objectives with college/centers strategic plans. This planning calendar establishes a timeline for ongoing planning, leading up to the comprehensive strategic plan in January 2012. The proposed planning calendar reflects a timeline for the District’s strategic plan from fall 2012–2016 and a coordinated timeline for the colleges and centers to develop their strategic plans from fall 2013 to 2017 (IB.11: Planning Calendar).

Additional supporting structures for planning includes a proposed framework for accountability and assessment of District goals and objectives for the 2012–2016 Strategic Plan that evaluates the strategic plan for ongoing planning and assessment. The framework for accountability measurement and assessment of the 2012–2016 Strategic Plan includes the identification of a goal(s) and corresponding objective(s); baseline and target data; assessment method(s); assessment results; the person(s) responsible; and the final status or resolution of a given activity (IB.12: Framework for Accountability and Assessment).

The SCCCDD 2008 Strategic Plan does not adequately reflect an assessment framework for determining the completion or effectiveness of a specific goal and objective. In December 2008, there was a one year status report on the 2008 Strategic Plan that was pre-
sented to the Board of Trustees. Then in fall 2010 a follow up status report on the strategic plan was completed but this report was not presented to the Board of Trustees for review and approval.

To ensure ongoing and integrated planning at the District level that is integrated with the planning of the colleges and centers, the District created the Strategic Planning Workgroup. This body is made up of representatives from all colleges and centers and is reflective of various constituent groups. The Workgroup’s charge is the immediate update of the 2008 Strategic Plan, the identification and development of support structures and processes for planning, and the development of operational guidelines for a District wide planning and governance group. These proposed guidelines will transition the existing Strategic Planning Workgroup from an ad hoc group for planning to the District Planning Council (DPC) for ongoing planning, accountability and assessment (IB.13: Draft Operating Agreement for DPC).

A long term planning issue that the District is responding to is the integration between District wide planning and resource allocation. In response to the need to establish a District wide Resource Allocation Model that coordinates with planning, the District established the Resource Allocation Model Taskforce (RAMT). The RAMT met in May 2011 and has established a planning calendar for fall 2011. The RAMT is comprised of 24 members that represent all constituent groups, colleges and centers within the District. The charge of the RAMT includes developing the SCCCD Resource Allocation Model and developing operational guidelines to transition the existing taskforce into a Resource Allocation Model Council (RAMC). The RAMC will be a standing District wide governance group.

Also, as part of District integrated planning, a pilot departmental review will be implemented at the District Office. The program review will be integrated with annual operations to establish planning in District Office units. This process will begin summer 2011 and every unit within the District Office will participate according to a published schedule. Also, members of the Chancellor’s Cabinet will establish goals and end of year reports based on the outcomes of the strategic plan goals and objectives. This practice will solidify the link between District planning and planning at the colleges and centers.

**Self Evaluation**

The College is working toward meeting this standard. Although there is robust campus dialogue, the College must improve campus wide communications. Determining where and how to archive documents for consistent and easy access will be a critical part of improvement.

Additionally, the State Center Community College District must update its strategic plan and the College plan must align with the District plan.

**Planning Agendas**

1. The College will develop and implement a comprehensive communication plan.
2. The College strategic plan will more closely align with the District strategic plan.

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

**Descriptive Summary**

Fresno City College sets goals and outcomes to improve effectiveness as outlined by the SPC. The 2010–2012 Strategic Plan is posted on Blackboard and is available in printed brochure form (IB.14: 2010–2012 FCC Strategic Plan). The outcomes are clear, concise, and effective. However, until recently, the information provided by the webpage regarding the SPC has been outdated. The list of members reflected the membership in 2007 (IB.15: FCC Strategic Plan Website). The calendar of events has not been updated and there was nothing listed under “View Past Events” (IB.16: SPC Website Calendar).
This would lead most members of the College community to assume nothing has occurred with the SPC. As previously discussed, this problem has been resolved (IB.17: Updated SPC Website).

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard, although it is unclear whether all institutional members understand the goals. According to the 2010 SPC Faculty and Staff Survey, 80 percent of respondents knew the SPC established goals and objectives and 57 percent knew that the SPC monitors progress toward these goals. The issue of communication and lack of easily accessible information makes it difficult for the campus community to stay informed.

**Planning Agenda**

As noted in IB.1, the College will develop and implement a comprehensive communication plan.

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

**Descriptive Summary**

Fresno City College assesses progress toward goals and uses the results for improvement. Assessment is ongoing and usually systematic. Progress toward goals is, at times, a part of the planning process at unit levels and a determinant in the allocation of resources. The College uses both qualitative and quantitative data for assessments. Strategic planning has been integrated into the College, but is not fully connected to allocation of resources.

Each year academic divisions and service areas are required to submit a list of goals and measurable objectives which support the College’s strategic plan. Progress towards these stated goals and measurable objectives is assessed at the midterm (January) and end of the academic year (May) (IB.18: Five-column Goals and Objectives Chart). There is evidence that the SPC reviews these goals and objectives, but there is not yet a process in place to make these goals and objectives a driving force in resource allocation.

Academic divisions base goals and objectives on program review. Each program review contains a list of goals for the program, and as program reviews are updated (every two years for occupational programs and every five years for non-occupational programs) goals may be changed and/or edited based on successful completion of the goal or a change in the program or its environment. For example, Human Services Social Work Option has, for the past three years, had a goal to implement a 25 month program aimed at county social service workers. This goal was established to support the College’s Strategic Goals 1 and 3 and was modeled after a very successful 25 month program in the Business Division. The Human Services Advisory Board was very supportive of the concept, which would allow students to continue work while enrolling in an evening and Saturday program. The Human Services program faculty were at the point of launching the program in spring 2009 when the economy shifted severely. Although the plan remains and is still a goal of the Human Services Program, the goal is “pending” until the economy improves (IB.19: Human Services Goals, Human Services 25 Month Program flyer, Human Services Program Review).

The president meets with the chancellor to discuss unit goals and objectives, as well as progress towards these goals. Resource allocation to support goals and objectives is minimal, as there are few funds available outside of the general operating budget to support such measures. For example, in the Social Sciences Division, one of the objectives listed for 2009–2010 and 2010–2011 is to raise the success and retention levels in general education classes (Soc 1A, PolSci 2, Econ 1A and B, Psych 2). The faculty have utilized ETC (Extend the Classroom) in several courses with great success. Yet funding for ETC has been reduced due to current budget issues (IB.20: Five-column Goals and Objectives Chart, ETC report, Feb. 16, 2011).
Under the updated integrated planning model, which will be implemented in fall 2011, the Strategic Planning Council will review goals and objectives and use analysis of progress made to support decision-making for resource allocation. This is contingent upon a budget allocation model from the District Office which funds College programs and services beyond salaries and benefits.

Self Evaluation
The College meets the standard. Progress toward goals is a driving force in the decision making process of the Strategic Planning Council. A District budget allocation model will enhance the College’s ability to make data driven budgetary decisions.

Planning Agenda
None.

Descriptive Summary
Fresno City College has a broad-based planning process with multiple avenues for input by various constituencies. This planning process is utilized to allocate resources and to improve institutional effectiveness.

At the heart of the planning process is the Strategic Planning Council (SPC) which is comprised of faculty, staff, students and administrators (IB.21: SPC Operating Agreement). The SPC meets twice a month during the academic year and as needed during the summer. The following model is a graphic representation of the campus communication flow for strategic planning.
As illustrated in the Planning Communication flow chart on page 102, all constituent groups have access to the SPC, both directly (Academic Senate/AFT, Associated Student Government, Classified Senate/ CSEA, President’s Cabinet) and through their representation on advisory committees and the Program Review Committee (IB.22: Operating Agreements for Advisory Committees). The primary vehicle for bringing an issue or request to the SPC is an action plan (IB.23: Action Plan Template). Action plans are requests for action such as funding, personnel, facilities, or institutional research. They are submitted directly to the SPC or through advisory committees. The SPC considers the action plan from the perspective of the College’s strategic plan and if the request supports the College goals, places the request in the queue for funding or other appropriate support.

To help the College community understand the planning process, the SPC worked to present the planning process in a simpler format as presented in the integrated planning process flow chart model on the next page. The integrated planning process poster has been distributed to all main departments/offices. Planning process information and the accompanying flow chart will be presented on Opening Day August 11, 2011.
The majority of action plans come to the SPC through the program review process. This process, developed and refined over the past six years, has become the primary vehicle for initiating programmatic changes on campus. All programs and services on campus are required to complete program review every five years (IB.24: Program Review Schedule 2006–2011). Additionally, occupational instructional programs are required to submit an occupational program review every two years in accordance to Title 5.

The Program Review Committee is composed of representatives from all campus constituencies. The importance given to the program review process is illustrated by the composition of the committee, which includes all of the campus vice-presidents as well as the president of the Academic Senate. (IB.25: Program Review Operating Agreement). The committee meets nearly every week of the academic year (IB.26: Program Review Calendars). The committee considers, on average, six program reviews each month. Action plans emanating from program review go directly to the SPC support team which directs the plans to the appropriate advisory committee for review and recommendation to the SPC (IB.27: Program Review End-of-Year Reports).

In addition, the Fresno City College Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) makes recommendations to the SPC and College president. This assures that expenditures are within available resources and budget allocations are based on the College planning process. Review of recommendations from various campus committees is also conducted by the BAC, which include recommendations from the Human Resources, Facilities, and Health and Safety committees (IB.28: Budget Advisory Committee Operating Agreement; IB.29: Sample BAC Meeting Minutes).

Perhaps the best assessment of the planning process can be seen through two case studies which follow the process from the inception of an idea through the actualization of that idea.

**Case Study #1. Hiring Faculty, 2008.** The last time Fresno City College had funding to hire new faculty positions was in the 2007–2008 academic year. By May 2008, the College had hired five new faculty—one in English, one in ESL, one in dental hygiene, and one in computer information systems. As can be seen in the minutes from the SPC (IB.30: SPC Meeting Minutes Oct. 25, 2007), the council accepted the recommendations from the Human Resources Committee (IB.31: Human Resources Meeting Minutes Oct. 12, 2007). Prior to that, the Human Resources Committee met on two occasions to debate and prioritize the positions (IB.32: Human Resources Meeting Minutes Sept. 21, 2007 and Sept. 28, 2007). All of the positions the Human Resources Committee prioritized had been supported by the Program Review Committee (IB.33: Program Review Recommendations).

**Case Study #2. Shade Structure for the Fresno City College Child Development Center (CDC).** This request for funding originated from the Child Development Department’s Program Review (IB.34 Child Development Program Reviews 2008 and 2010). As a result of the need demonstrated in the Child Development Program Review, the department submitted a decision package to the Social Sciences Division dean for prioritization within the division’s request for decision package funds. Each fall, divisions write requests for decision package funding. The requests are then prioritized by the division (typically via department chairs). Division deans then take the prioritized requests to deans’ council where funding is recommended based upon division priorities. As requests for funds always far exceed the funding available, only the top priorities of divisions can be funded. In October 2008, a shade structure for the CDC was the number one priority of the Social Sciences Division (IB.35: Social Sciences Division Executive Meeting Minutes, Sept. 2008). This was the only Social Sciences Division request funded through decision packages this cycle. In December 2009 the Budget Advisory Committee recommended to the SPC that the canopy be funded (IB.36: Budget Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes, Dec. 9, 2009). On January 28, 2010, the SPC approved the Budget Advisory Committee’s recommen-
education for funding for the shade structure as a part of the College’s decision package request (IB.37: SPC Meeting Minutes Jan. 28, 2010). In November 2010, the State Center Community College District took action to hire a contractor to begin work on this shade structure and periphery updates to the CDC (IB.38: SCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, Nov. 2, 2010). The shade structure is now in place.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard. Fresno City College utilizes a broad-based planning process to allocate resources as demonstrated through specific case studies.

Planning Agenda

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

Fresno City College uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies through several processes.

Fresno City College collects student demographic data, such as gender, ethnicity, and age, acquired mainly through the admission application. (IB.39: SCCCD Admissions Application). The College collects enrollment data and student achievement data primarily through the Datatel system. Enrollment data collected include student load, enrollment trends, and student educational goals. Additionally, the College tracks student achievement data which include the number of degrees/certificates awarded, transfers to UC/CSU by ethnicity, transfers to UC/CSU by destination campus, student GPA, retention rates and student success (IB.40: FCC Transfer and Student Success data).

The College supports an Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning Office which includes a newly hired (fall 2010) director of institutional research, assessment and planning, an institutional research coordinator and an administrative secretary. The director reports to the vice president of instruction. The institutional research staff compiles and maintains all data collected by the College and distributes it as requested by state and federal agencies, College administration and College committees.

Yearly student demographic and achievement data are provided to the California Community College Chancellor’s Office for inclusion in the annual ARCC (Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges) report. The ARCC report lists college performance indicators over a three year period. The data include student progress and achievement, pre-collegiate improvement (Basic Skills, ESL), college demographics and profile, and peer group standings (IB.41: ARCC 2010 Report).

Fresno City College also reports institutional-level student achievement, student, faculty and staff demographic, and financial data to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), managed by the National Center for Education Statistics under the U.S. Department of Education. IPEDS publishes an annual Data Feedback Report that provides feedback on a range of selected indicators and data on how the institution performs relative to a comparison group of institutions. (IB.42: IPEDS Annual Data Feedback Report, 2009).

Since 2005, the College has been in the process of defining and implementing student learning outcomes at the institution, program, and course levels. A Fresno City College Outcomes and Assessment Committee has been formed to provide assistance in writing, assessing and analyzing student learning outcomes at course, program and institutional level. The committee facilitates reporting and archiving assessment results, reviews reports related to student learning outcomes and assessment, works cooperatively with the Program Review Committee, the Curriculum Committee, the Accreditation Steering Committee, and the Strategic Planning Council and facilitates dialogue and provides reports to the campus community on outcomes and assessment activities.
The College has begun the process of formally assessing course-level and program-level student learning outcomes. By the end of fall 2011, the College aims to assess at least one student learning outcome from at least one course in each department. The assessment results will be recorded on forms developed by the Outcomes and Assessment Committee. It is yet to be determined whether these assessment results will be forwarded to the Curriculum Committee, the Office of Instruction or posted to Blackboard.

Program-level outcomes will be assessed by mapping their link to the overall institutional-level outcomes. The goal of the committee is to have all programs mapped by the end of the spring 2011 semester, with results reported to either/or the Curriculum Committee, the Office of Instruction or posted to Blackboard.

The College identifies its constituents as internal and external. External constituents include future students, area high schools, employers, the District Board of Trustees and the community-at-large. Documented assessment results are made public via the Fresno City College website, the State Center Community College District website, and the District Fact Book. Additionally, reports on Fresno City College compiled by ARCC are made public on their respective websites, and are discussed by the President’s Cabinet. Most recently, the President’s Cabinet reviewed and discussed the 2010 ARCC data on April 14, 2011 (IB.43: President’s Cabinet Meeting Agenda and Minutes Apr. 14, 2011). ARCC data is also presented annually to the Board of Trustees (IB.44: Board of Trustees Retreat Agenda, Mar. 25–26, 2011; Meeting Agenda and Minutes Apr. 5, 2011). IPEDS data have also been discussed at President’s Cabinet meetings (IB.45: President’s Cabinet Meeting Agenda and Minutes Feb. 18, 2010).

The Fresno City College website presents institutional research data and includes student demographic data such as gender, race/ethnicity, age, student load, enrollment status, and GPA. (IB.46: FCC Institutional Research Webpage). Additionally, institutional research posts ARCC data on the website. The data include student progress and achievement, students who earned 30+ units, fall to fall persistence rates, success in credit vocational and credit basic skills courses, and basic skills improvement rates. The College plans to present the ARCC data to the entire College community at its opening day session in August 2011.

The District website also provides institutional research data for Fresno City College through the District intranet. All relevant student demographic and achievement data is publicly available via the Fresno City College Fact Sheet and the District Fact Book (IB.47: SCCCD Factbook).

Internal constituents are identified as current students, faculty, classified staff, and administration. In addition to the same resources available to external constituents, faculty, staff and administration have access to assessment data through several methods including the College and the District institutional research websites.

Program review is the primary means by which programs periodically review (five-year intervals) the effectiveness of their programs and course offerings. The program review self-study report requires extensive use of student achievement and demographic data which is provided by the College’s institutional research coordinator. The Program Review Committee maintains all data and the information is available for examination at the Blackboard website (IB.48: FCC Program Review Blackboard site).

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard. Fresno City College distributes a wide variety of assessment data to its constituencies.

**Planning Agenda**

None.
**IB.6** The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

**Descriptive Summary**

All campus committees review their operating agreements on an annual basis. If a committee decides changes are needed to its operating agreement (if, for example, a committee realizes that the knowledge and expertise of a dean is needed on a committee, and adding that dean to the committee would make the committee’s work more effective and efficient), the changes must be approved by the appropriate constituent groups.

Although this process can be cumbersome and long, the process allows for all groups to provide input on changes. Such perspective allows for dialogue and a growing awareness of the needs of constituent groups.

As the planning and evaluation processes of the College have matured, the Program Review Committee has revised the program review instructional self-study form twice, and added a two-year occupational program self-study form. The administrative unit self-study form is currently under review for revision by the appropriate constituencies. It is anticipated that a revised administrative unit self-study form will be implemented in spring 2012 (IB.49: Program Review Minutes and Annual Reports). Additionally, due to survey results, the program review coordinator has increased the number of trainings on preparing a program review report, and has added trainings on data analysis.

The SPC has also spent considerable time reviewing its operations, particularly its communications with constituent groups and the planning structure on campus. The faculty and staff surveys, as well as self-evaluations, have led to changes in how the SPC conducts business and changes in SPC communication with the campus community. (IB.5; IB.7; IB.50).

With the fall 2010 hiring of a campus director of institutional research, assessment and planning, the College is moving forward to systematically plan, review and revise its research agenda. One of the first acts of the new director was to put a research request form online so that requests could be tracked and analyzed for effectiveness and planning. The director headed up the effort to create a Fresno City College Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee to assist in setting a College research agenda. This committee met for the first time on May 3, 2011 (IB.51: Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee Operating Agreement and IR Request Form).

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard. Fresno City College reviews its planning and resource allocation models to improve effectiveness.

**Planning Agenda**

None.

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

**Descriptive Summary**

The main mechanism for Fresno City College to evaluate effectiveness is through the program review process. A master calendar for program review has been created for both instructional and non-instructional programs (IB.24: Program Review Calendars).

The results of all program reviews are integrated into College wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making. The results of all program reviews are posted on an internal web site that is accessible throughout the College as part of the institutional effectiveness discussion. The College evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting student achievement and student learning outcomes.
Program review is embedded in practice across the College using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness. Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of the discussion about program effectiveness. Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review development including Academic Senate and administration, for example.

Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality. The program review coordinator is a fulltime faculty member with 40 percent reassigned time. The Program Review Committee has developed a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement through action plans. Also, a summary of the committee’s work is sent to the SPC each semester for review.

Self Evaluation

Fresno City College meets the standard. Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement. The College reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness. The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in improvements in student achievement and learning.

Planning Agenda

None.
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