Cypress College

{ Midterm Report }

Submitted by Cypress College to:
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,
Western Association of Schools and Colleges
October 2021

Midterm Report

Submitted by:
Cypress College
9200 Valley View Street
Cypress, CA 90630

Submitted to:
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Date Submitted:
October 2021

Midterm Report Certification Page

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From:

Dr. JoAnna Schilling, President
Cypress College
9200 Valley View Street
Cypress, CA 90630

I certify there was broad participation/review by the campus community and believe this report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

Signatures:

JoAnna Schilling (Sep 23, 2021 15:05 PDT)   Sep 23, 2021
_____
Dr. JoAnna Schilling, Chief Executive Officer   Date

Barbara Dunsheath (Oct 4, 2021 09:37 PDT)   Oct 4, 2021
_____
Dr. Barbara Dunsheath, President, NOCCCD Board of Trustees   Date

Fred Williams (Oct 4, 2021 09:45 PDT)   Oct 4, 2021
_____
Mr. Fredrick Williams, Interim Chancellor, NOCCCD   Date

Damon De La Cruz (Sep 27, 2021 08:33 PDT)   Sep 27, 2021
_____
Dr. Damon de la Cruz, President, Cypress College Academic Senate   Date

Lynette Young (Sep 28, 2021 10:02 PDT)   Sep 28, 2021
_____
Ms. Lynette Young, California School Employees (CSEA) Chapter 167   Date

Liana Koeppel   Sep 23, 2021
_____
Dr. Liana Koeppel, Faculty Co-Chair, Accreditation   Date

Eileen Haddad   Sep 23, 2021
_____
Dr. Eileen Haddad, Co-Chair and Accreditation Liaison Officer   Date

Table of Contents

Report Preparation

The preparation of the Cypress College 2021 Midterm Report was a collaborative process overseen by the Accreditation Steering Committee and led by the Accreditation Co-Chairs, Liana Koeppel, the Accreditation Faculty Chair, and Eileen Haddad, the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO). After the completion of the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER) in Fall 2017, work on many of the self-identified Plans for Improvement (PFIs) began almost immediately. In January 2018, the College received the action letter resulting from the accreditation site visit which included a single Recommendation for Compliance with a required Follow-Up Report, as well as four College and three District Recommendations for Improvement (RFIs). The Recommendation for Compliance was successfully addressed in the 2019 Follow-Up Report, and accreditation efforts since then have focused on implementing the plans resulting from the Follow-Up Report, as well as addressing the remaining PFIs, RFIs, and Quality Focused Projects in preparation for the 2021 Midterm Report.

The Midterm Report will primarily provide an update on progress, improvements, and outcomes related to the PFIs, RFIs, and Quality Focused Projects since the ISER and accreditation site visit in 2017 but will also include reflections on improving institutional performance via Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Institution-Set Standards (ISSs), as well as a fiscal report. Much of the organization and coordination of the work leading up to the Midterm Report was facilitated by the former ALO, Philip Dykstra, who has since retired and was replaced by Eileen Haddad, and Liana Koeppel who continues to serve as the Accreditation Faculty Chair. This work included ensuring the PFIs, RFIs, and Quality Focused Projects were cataloged, assigned responsible parties, had established timelines, and regularly discussed at Accreditation Steering Committee and other meetings. Throughout 2019 and 2020, status updates were solicited each semester from the designated responsible parties, and progress was tracked and documented.

In Spring 2020, as a result of COVID-19 and the emergency transition to remote work and online instruction, some accreditation efforts were put on hold as faculty and administration were focused on this transition. Especially impacted were the Distance Education leads, Treisa Cassens and Kathleen McAlister, who had the herculean task of shifting 100% of instruction to an online format in a matter of days. Despite the delay, the campus resumed accreditation-focused work in a remote environment, and the Accreditation Steering Committee continued meeting at least once every semester since the submission of the ISER to ensure continuous dialogue about accreditation beyond mandated reporting periods.

In Fall 2020, the Accreditation Co-Chairs began the initial writing of the Midterm Report. Progress reports from the responsible parties were solicited throughout Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 as writing was taking place, and updates were made to the report accordingly. In March 2021, a first draft the Midterm Report was completed, and the process to share it with the College governance bodies and constituency groups, as well as the Board of Trustees, for review and feedback began (see detailed timeline on p. 6). The report was finalized in Summer 2021 and received final approvals in early Fall 2021 before it was submitted to the Commission.

Accreditation Steering Committee Members

Committee Role	Name (and title when applicable)
Accreditation Faculty Co-Chair	Liana Koeppel
Accreditation Liaison Officer Co-Chair	Eileen Haddad, Interim Director of Institutional Research and Planning
Standard I Chair	Adel Rajab, Faculty
Standard II Chair	Kathy Wada, Faculty
Standard III Chair	Parwinder Sidhu, Faculty
Standard IV Chair	Lynn Mitts, Faculty
College President	JoAnna Schilling
Academic Senate President	Craig Goralski
Academic Senate President-Elect	Damon de la Cruz
Vice President, Administrative Services	Alexander Porter
Vice President, Student Services	Paul de Dios
Vice President, Instruction	O. Lee Douglas
Classified Representative	Lynnette Young
Standard Sub-Committee Chairs	Lisa Clark, Faculty Richard Fee, Faculty Joyce Peacock, Faculty Deidre Porter, Faculty Eldon Young, Dean
Quality Focus Essay Leads	Treisa Cassens, Dean Jennifer Coopman, Faculty Kathleen McAlister, Faculty

Note. Committee membership reflects roles and titles in Spring 2021.

Midterm Report Timeline

Term	Activity
Spring 2021	**March 2021** • Initial draft shared with Accreditation Steering Committee (3/10) • Accreditation Steering Committee met to discuss draft (3/17)
	April 2021 • Posted draft to College website with link to feedback survey and notified campus community via e-mail • Solicited feedback from campus community and relevant District parties via email • Presented draft in campus shared governance committees and solicited input • Included a link to draft and feedback survey in student campus newsletter (@Cypress)
	May 2021 • Report approved by Accreditation Steering Committee (5/5) • Report accepted by Academic Senate (5/6) • Report approved by President Advisory Cabinet (PAC) (5/13) • Report presented to Board of Trustees for a first read (5/25)
Summer 2021	**June - August 2021** • Final updates and edits
Fall 2021	**September 2021** • Shared final version of report with Academic Senate (8/26) • Shared final version of report with President Advisory Cabinet (PAC) (9/9) • Approved by the NOCCCD Board of Trustees (9/14)
	October 2021 • Submit Midterm Report to ACCJC (due October 15)

Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process

As a result of the comprehensive self-evaluation process, the College made 23 self-identified Plans for Improvement (PFIs). This section of the report provides an update on these plans that includes the responsible parties, the current status, completion timelines, and a narrative explaining how these plans have been integrated into planning and decision-making processes and improved institutional effectiveness.

> **PFI 1**
> Formalize and communicate the student complaint process. (Commission Policy)
>
> The Vice President of Student Services and Dean of Counseling will formalize the student complaint process to include maintaining records for a minimum of six years. The student complaint process will be included in the Student Handbook and posted on the college website.

Responsible Parties: VP of Student Services, Dean of Counseling and Student Development
Status: Work in Progress
Completion Timeline: Fall 2021
Narrative: The College's existing student complaint process had some limitations in that it was specific to sexual harassment and racial discrimination complaints. The ability for students to seek remediation for more general concerns was not easily discernable. As a result, the newly hired Dean of Counseling and Student Development is coordinating efforts to expand the student complaint process for the College. In collaboration with the Catalog writing team, the College decided to align the student complaint process with the process established at Fullerton College for consistency within the District. A draft of the student complaint process and related form was completed in Spring 2021 and is currently going through the College approval process (PFI 1.1 - Student Complaint Process; PFI 1.2 - Complaint Form draft). Once approved, the student complaint process will adhere to record maintenance requirements and be included in the College Catalog, Student Handbook, and posted on the College website.

Evidence:
- PFI 1.1 - Cypress College Student Complaint Rights Process for Catalog
- PFI 1.2 - Cypress College Student Complaint Form draft

> **PFI 2**
> Create a distinct and separate program review for new baccalaureate program. (I.A.2, III.B.3.)
>
> The Instructional Program Review Committee will create a distinct and separate instructional program review process for the baccalaureate degree in Funeral Service.

Responsible Parties: Instructional Program Review Chair
Status: Complete

Narrative: The Instructional Program Review Committee established a separate and distinct review process for the baccalaureate degree in Funeral Services that includes review of program outcomes, enrollment, student learning, and student achievement specific to the baccalaureate degree (PFI 2.1 - Baccalaureate Degree Program Review Form). The review of the baccalaureate program occurs on a separate four-year cycle from the Mortuary Science Department's regular program review (PFI 2.2 - Program Review Cycle).

Evidence:
- PFI 2.1 - Mortuary Science Baccalaureate Degree Program Review Form
- PFI 2.2 - Cypress College Program Review Cycle Schedules 2018 - 2026

PFI 3
Evaluate all instructional budgets. (I.B.7)

The Vice President of Administrative Services will conduct an evaluation of all instructional supply budgets and resource management processes.

Responsible Parties: VP of Administrative Services
Status: Complete
Narrative: Prior to 2019, the College received from the District a base budget that was supplemented by varying annual one-time funds to support expenditures. Thus, the College's budgeting process relied heavily on repeated advanced and competitive one-time allocations based on available funds each year. Upon his arrival in 2019, the current VP of Administrative Services initiated a review of the budgeting and resource management processes. The evaluation resulted in a shift to include the previous advanced one-time funds as part of a modified base budget that was more aligned with budgeted needs for each department. These budgets are now on a two-year cycle and include consideration for ongoing structural equipment, supply, and material needs that are reflective of actual expenses in the prior year. At the conclusion of the two-year budget cycle, actual spending is assessed to inform the budget for the upcoming cycle. The implementation of these changes included meetings with each dean and area manager to improve budget literacy and understanding of expectations, setting up monthly, auto-produced budget reports to be distributed to each area manager, as well as scheduling three budget meetings each year (October, January, April) to review and monitor budget performance (PFI 3.1 - Porter email; PFI 3.2 - Operational Budget Development 20/21; PFI 3.3 - Operational Budget Development 21/22; PFI 3.4 - Mid-Year Budget Meeting).

Evidence:
- PFI 3.1 - Alexander Porter, Vice President, Student Administrative Services, Budget email, November 21, 2019
- PFI 3.2 - Alexander Porter, Vice President, Student Administrative Services, Operational Budget Development 2020-21 email, March 31, 2020
- PFI 3.3 - Alexander Porter, Vice President, Student Administrative Services, Operational Budget Development 2021-22 email, March 31, 2021

- PFI 3.4 - Alexander Porter, Vice President, Student Administrative Services, Mid-Year Budget Review Meetings email, January 7, 2020

> **PFI 4**
>
> Develop a BP and AP to ensure 120 units for the pilot baccalaureate degree. (I.B.7, II.A.5)
>
> The District will prepare the necessary BP and AP to comply with the 120 minimum unit degree requirement prescribed by Title V for the pilot baccalaureate degree.

Responsible Parties: Vice Chancellor of Educational Services and Technology
Status: Complete
Narrative: In Fall 2017, Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 4100 entitled Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates were revised to include the baccalaureate degree and the Title V 120 minimum unit degree requirement for the baccalaureate degree pilot program (PFI 4.1 - BP 4100; PFI 4.2 - AP 4100).

Evidence:
- PFI 4.1 - NOCCCD Board Policy 4100 - Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates
- PFI 4.2 - NOCCCD Administrative Procedure 4100 - Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates

> **PFI 5**
>
> Provide more uniform dissemination of college information. (I.B.8)
>
> To improve reliability and accuracy, the College will engage in a review to make better use of more systemic, public dissemination of college information.

Responsible Parties: Director of Campus Communications
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: In an effort to provide a more uniform dissemination of College information, the Office of Campus Communications has implemented several changes. First, they created and distributed guiding documents to create more consistent, systemic, public dissemination of College information such as the Campus Identity Guide and Style Guide that outline stylistic and branding guidelines, as well as the Social Media Guidelines and Newsletter Guidelines that facilitate consistent language and content (PFI 5.1 - Campus Identity Guide; PFI 5.2 - Style Guide; PFI 5.3 - Social Media Guidelines; PFI 5.4 - Newsletter Guidelines; PFI 5.5 - Email Distribution). Second, a new webpage was launched that includes links to the aforementioned guides (PFI 5.6 - Identity and Style), as well as various Cypress College campaigns including #CyProud and Cypress+ (PFI 5.7 - Campaigns). Finally, working with the President, the College distributes a community newsletter entitled @Cypress that highlights campus news and events in an effort to provide systemic and reliable information to the campus and key community leaders (PFI 5.8 - @Cypress).

Evidence:
- PFI 5.1 - Cypress College Campus Identity Guide (Fall 2018)
- PFI 5.2 - Cypress College Style Guide webpage screenshot
- PFI 5.3 - Cypress College Social Media Guidelines
- PFI 5.4 - Cypress College Newsletter Guidelines
- PFI 5.5 - Cypress College Campus Identity Guide email, Spring 2020
- PFI 5.6 - Cypress College Identity and Style webpage screenshots
- PFI 5.7 - Cypress College Campaigns webpage screenshots
- PFI 5.8 - Cypress College @Cypress Newsletter, November 23, 2020

PFI 6

Improve local process of information provided to students and the public. (I.C.1)

The College will improve the process that ensures the integrity and accuracy of non-printed information and the increasing number of projects printed outside the District print shop process.

Responsible Parties: Director of Campus Communications, Catalog and Schedule Coordinator
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: For several years, the College has continuously moved away from printed materials in order to make better use of information-sharing through digital platforms. This transition drastically expanded during COVID-19 remote operations but was accelerated prior to the pandemic in several ways. In 2019 and 2020, the Office of Campus Communications and Office of Technology Services worked together to launch a new College website, which is the primary means of sharing information about the College to students and the public (PFI 6.1 - College Website). Additionally, the Office of Technology Services implemented a Cypress College mobile app called CypressConnect (PFI 6.2 - Mobile App). The website and mobile app both use a distributive method of information creation and publication, which created some issues related to approvals of information prior to publication. However, the offices are working to resolve these issues with new access controls and site-usage trainings, which are in development and soon to be implemented, along with modifications to publication and review processes—all of which should significantly improve accuracy (PFI 6.3 - Training Materials; PFI 6.4 - Posner Email). Ensuring the integrity and accuracy of the College website content continues to be the responsibility of the Office of Campus Communications, specifically the Web Content Specialist who was hired in 2016 to ensure more focused efforts in this area. These efforts have resulted in the previously discussed Campus Identity Guide that seeks to ensure the integrity of both printed and non-printed materials (PFI 6.5 - Campus Identity Guide). In addition, the forthcoming access controls and training have been designed to further these efforts.

Another area of progress in improving the accuracy of non-printed materials has been the shift to digital College Catalogs and Class Schedules. In 2018, the production of the College Catalog entered the final phase of a transition away from a static printed College Catalog to a digital version (PFI 6.6 - Digital College Catalog). The Class Schedule is available in both a designed,

digital, pdf version as well as an electronic database that provides real-time updates and the ability for students to search based on various criteria (PFI 6.7 - Class Schedule; PFI 6.8 - Schedule Database). At the same time, the production of these publications shifted from the campuses to the District Office. These transitions resulted in the expected challenges from making such significant changes, and accuracy procedures are being developed to address those issues. However, the College community is now benefitting from this substantial update to the production and distribution of these critical documents (PFI 6.9 - Posner Email).

Evidence:
- PFI 6.1 - Cypress College Website screenshot
- PFI 6.2 - Cypress College Mobile App screenshot
- PFI 6.3 - Cypress College Canvas Website Training course screenshots
- PFI 6.4 - Marc Posner, Director, Office of Campus Communications, Accreditation Website and Mobile App email, July 15, 2021
- PFI 6.5 - Cypress College Campus Identity Guide (Fall 2018)
- PFI 6.6 - Cypress College Catalog 2020-21 (Digital) screenshot
- PFI 6.7 - Cypress College Class Schedule Fall 2021
- PFI 6.8 - Cypress College Class Schedule Database screenshot
- PFI 6.9 - Marc Posner, Director, Office of Campus Communications, Accreditation Schedule and Catalog email, July 15, 2021

PFI 7

Restructure the Distance Education (DE) program personnel, policies, procedures, and documentation. (II.A.2)

The College will restructure the DE program with more clearly established areas of responsibility for faculty and management along with a review of relevant policies, procedures and documentation.

Responsible Parties: Distance Education Coordinators, Academic Senate
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: The 2017-2023 Distance Education Plan (DE Plan) addresses the restructuring of distance education (DE) personnel (pp. 21-22) and outlines the current campus DE guidelines (pp. 33-43), as well as future plans (pp. 23-30; PFI 7.1 - DE Plan). In addition, the DE Program completed their program review in Spring 2021 and identified several related goals such as ongoing evaluation of DE policies, procedures, and practices; establishing a permanent DE Project Manager; re-assessing the duties and compensation of the DE Coordinator; and hiring an instructional designer (PFI 7.2 - DE Program Review). Additional details about the restructuring of the DE program are included as part of Quality Focused Project 3 on Distance Education later in this report.

Evidence:
- PFI 7.1 - Cypress College Distance Education Plan 2017-2023

- PFI 7.2 - Cypress College Distance Education Specialized Instructional Program Review 2021

> **PFI 8**
> Disaggregate data in the SSQR and CSQR process (II.A.7)
>
> The College will disaggregate data based on demographics in the next review cycle for the Student Services Quality Review and Campus Services Quality Review.

Responsible Parties: Institutional Research and Planning Office
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: The Office of Institutional Research and Planning has expanded the data provided for Student Services Program Review (SSPR, formerly SSQR) and Campus Services Program Review (CSPR, formerly CSQR) to include disaggregated surveys and other data when applicable. Additionally, the SSPR form has been updated to include equity-related questions to allow for additional reflection on providing equitable services and outcomes to students (PFI 8.1 - Student Services Program Review Form; PFI 8.2 - Campus Services Program Review Form).

Evidence:
- PFI 8.1 - Cypress College Student Services Program Review Form
- PFI 8.2 - Cypress College Campus Services Program Review Form

> **PFI 9**
> Revise Mortuary Science PLOs (II.A.12)
>
> The Mortuary Science Department will revise its PLO to include the baccalaureate degree in Funeral Service.

Responsible Parties: Mortuary Science Department Coordinator
Status: Work in Progress
Completion Timeline: Estimated Fall 2021
Narrative: The Mortuary Science Department is governed by an external accrediting agency, the American Board of Funeral Service Education (ABFSE) Committee on Accreditation. Currently, ABFSE requires that schools under their accreditation use their prescribed Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) for all programs, regardless of the credential awarded (PFI 9.1 - ABFSE Accreditation Standards). The Mortuary Science Department Coordinator is currently working with the ABFSE to develop the baccalaureate degree accreditation standards that will include updated PSLOs for baccalaureate level programs (PFI 9.2 - Grande email). The PSLOs utilized for the baccalaureate degree will continue to be those approved by ABFSE, as required, until the revision is completed.

Evidence:
- PFI 9.1 - American Board of Funeral Service Education Accreditation Standards, January 1, 2020

- PFI 9.2 - Jolena Grande, Mortuary Science, Program Learning Outcomes email, February 16, 2021

> **PFI 10**
> Evaluate Distance Education (DE) course success rates across campus (II.A.16)
>
> The College will conduct a systematic evaluation of DE course success rates and implement any necessary changes.

Responsible Parties: Institutional Research and Planning Office, Distance Education Coordinator, Instructional Program Review Chair
Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: Distance Education (DE) course success rates across the campus are evaluated in several ways. Within Instructional Program Review, each department evaluates course success rates by instructional method (PFI 10.1 - Instructional Program Review Form). Additionally, the DE Program has an updated DE Plan for 2017-2023 that includes an evaluation of success rates by instruction method across the campus and makes comparisons to statewide trends (PFI 10.2 - Distance Education Plan, pp. 15-17). Finally, the DE Program is on a program review cycle to ensure a systematic and comprehensive evaluation occurs regularly (PFI 10.3 - Program Review Cycle; PFI 10.4 - Distance Education Program Review).

Evidence:
- PFI 10.1 - Cypress College Department Planning and Program Review Form
- PFI 10.2 - Cypress College Distance Education Plan 2017-2023
- PFI 10.3 - Cypress College Program Review Cycle Schedules 2018 - 2026
- PFI 10.4 - Cypress College Distance Education Specialized Instructional Program Review 2021

> **PFI 11**
> Enhance student services to Distance Education and off-site students (II.C.3)
>
> The Financial Aid Office, Veterans Resource Center, and Transfer Center will expand online services to meet the needs of DE and off-site students.

Responsible Parties: Dean of Counseling and Student Development
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: The College has enhanced the student services provided to Distance Education students in several ways. For example, the Financial Aid Office has expanded their online services to include Online Verification and an online FAFSA application process (PFI 11.1 - Financial Aid webpage). The Veterans Resource Center also now provides off-site students with access to information regarding its services and access to online counseling through the campus' Cranium Café (PFI 11.2 - VRC webpage). Additionally, the Transfer Center provides numerous online services via their webpage and a self-enrolling Transfer Hub site in Canvas,

including transfer documents, workshops, and classes ([PFI 11.3 - Transfer Center webpage](); [PFI 11.4 - Transfer Center Canvas Hub]()). Other student services departments are also utilizing Canvas to provide easy access to resources for DE students, and students may access these services in all of their Canvas courses via the "Student Services" link in course navigation ([PFI 11.5 - Canvas Example]()). The DE Team also plans to develop a "support hub" that would be accessible from Global Navigation ([PFI 11.6 - DE Agenda]()). Finally, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, as of Spring 2020, all student services successfully transitioned to serving students in a remote environment ([PFI 11.7 - Student Services webpage](); [PFI 11.8 - Student Services Newsletter]()).

Evidence:
- PFI 11.1 - Cypress College Financial Aid webpage screenshots
- PFI 11.2 - Cypress College Veterans Resource Center webpage screenshots
- PFI 11.3 - Cypress College Transfer Center webpage screenshots
- PFI 11.4 - Cypress College Transfer Center Canvas Hub screenshots
- PFI 11.5 - Student Services Canvas Page link example screenshot
- PFI 11.6 - Cypress College Distance Education Committee Meeting Agenda, May 13, 2021
- PFI 11.7 - Cypress College Student Services webpage screenshots
- PFI 11.8 - Cypress College Student Services Newsletter, Spring 2021

PFI 12

Improve Distance Education faculty evaluation process. (III.A.5)

The District and United Faculty will work on revising the evaluation process to require DE faculty to be evaluated in DE courses taught.

Responsible Parties: Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, United Faculty
Status: Work in Progress
Completion Timeline: TBD
Narrative: All faculty are evaluated regularly as per the United Faculty (UF) and Adjunct Faculty United (AdFac) union contracts ([PFI 12.1 - UF Contract](); [PFI 12.2 - AdFac Contract]()). At the time of the ISER, there were concerns related to whether faculty who taught both distance education (DE) and face-to-face courses were ever being evaluated in their DE courses, so the ability to ensure the evaluation of DE courses specifically was identified as an area for improvement. As the process of evaluating faculty is a contractual issue, potential revisions to the evaluation process necessitate negotiation between the faculty unions (i.e., UF and AdFac) and the District. The UF and AdFac leadership have been apprised of the issue, and the DE Plan outlines a process to facilitate the evaluation of DE courses once an agreement between the relevant parties has been reached ([PFI 12.3 - Distance Education Plan, pp. 40-41]()). Most recently, the District has identified incorporating evaluation language for distance education instruction as one of their successor agreement articles to be included in the upcoming negotiations ([PFI 12.4 - Successor Agreement Proposal]()).

Course evaluations were further complicated in the move to remote instruction when all classes became "distant." Despite these challenges, the College remains committed to the ongoing evaluation of instructors. The District utilized Qualtrics to facilitate remote student course evaluations in 2020-21 (PFI 12.5 - Qualtrics Instructions).

Evidence:
- PFI 12.1 - Collective Bargaining Agreement Between NOCCCD and United Faculty CCA-CTA-NEA, 2018-2021
- PFI 12.2 - Collective Bargaining Agreement Between NOCCCD and Adjunct Faculty United Local 6106 AFT/AFL/CIO, 2018-2021
- PFI 12.3 - Cypress College Distance Education Plan 2017-2023
- PFI 12.4 - Irma Ramos, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources, Successor Agreement Negotiations memo, March 31, 2021
- PFI 12.5 - Qualtrics Survey Instructions

PFI 13

Review and revise the Management Appraisal Instrument. (III.A.5, III.A.6)

The District will work with the DMA to review and revise the management appraisal instrument to assess the effectiveness in encouraging improvement through the use of learning outcomes.

Responsible Parties: Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, District Management Association
Status: Complete
Narrative: The Chancellor identified a workgroup with Districtwide representation to be charged with reviewing and revising the management evaluation process. The workgroup conducted a Districtwide survey to identify top leadership competencies and assess the effectiveness of the current evaluation process, reviewed relevant examples and resources, and incorporated recommendations from a NOCCCD Leadership Academy's group project on this topic (PFI 13.1 - Performance Evaluation Process).

The revised management evaluation process includes establishing goals, conducting quarterly, informal, check-in meetings between managers and their direct reports, and performing formal evaluations of all managers on three-year cycles that utilize leadership and technical competencies selected for NOCCCD. In addition to a new management performance evaluation form (PFI 13.2 - Management Performance Evaluation Form), several other appraisal instruments were developed to facilitate the evaluation including self-evaluation and goal-setting guides (PFI 13.3 - Goal-Setting and Employee Self-Evaluation Guide; 13.4 - Goal Setting Guide) and ongoing check-in guidance (PFI 13.5 - Ongoing Check-In Guidance).

These proposed changes to the evaluation process were shared at the District Management Association (DMA) Coffee Break meeting and at several virtual open forums in March 2021 for feedback from managers (PFI 13.6 - Thomas-Volcy email; PFI 13.1 - Performance Evaluation Process) before going through the regular DCC approval process (PFI 13.7 DCC Agenda; PFI

[13.8 - DCC Summary](#)). The BOT approved the adoption of NOCCCD AP 7240-7 Management Employees - Evaluation and rescinded Administrative Guide Policy 2002, Management Evaluation on May 25, 2021 ([PFI 13.9 - AP 7240-7](#), [PFI 13.10 - BOT Minutes. p. 186](#)). The District distributed the newly approved process and Administrative Procedure to the managers via email ([PFI 13.11 - Brown Thunder email](#)).

Evidence:
- PFI 13.1 - NOCCCD Management Performance Evaluation Process
- PFI 13.2 - NOCCCD Management Performance Evaluation Form
- PFI 13.3 - NOCCCD Goal-Setting and Employee Self-Evaluation
- PFI 13.4 - NOCCCD Goal Setting Guide
- PFI 13.5 - NOCCCD Ongoing Check-in Guidance
- PFI 13.6 - Ty Thomas-Volcy, President-Elect, District Management Association, Evaluation Feedback Open Sessions email, March 11, 2021.
- PFI 13.7 - NOCCCD District Consultation Council (DCC) Agenda, April 26, 2021
- PFI 13.8 - NOCCCD District Consultation Council (DCC) Summary, April 26, 2021
- PFI 13.9 - NOCCCD Administrative Procedure 7240-7 Management Employees - Evaluation
- PFI 13.10 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, May 25, 2021
- PFI 13.11 - Simone Brown Thunder, District Human Resources Manager, Management Performance Evaluation Process email, July 1, 2021

PFI 14

Include SLO participation in the adjunct evaluation process. (III.A.6)

The District will initiate discussions with AdFac to include participation in the SLO assessment process in the evaluation of adjunct faculty.

Responsible Parties: Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, Adjunct Faculty United
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: The Adjunct Faculty United (AdFac) 2017-2020 contract now includes SLO data entry as a part of the adjunct instructor evaluation instrument ([PFI 14.1 - AdFac Contract, Appendix B, p. 4](#)). Despite the contractual change, many faculty, both adjunct and full-time, are not aware of the obligations, which has slowed the increases in SLO participation rates. However, the College is working to communicate the SLO participation requirement more broadly in several ways ([PFI 14.2 - Instructional Program Review Annual Report, p. 12](#)). For example, the SLO Coordinator regularly disseminates SLO data collection instructions via email, including an FAQ sheet that addresses adjunct participation specifically ([PFI 14.3 - Coopman emails](#); [PFI 14.4 - eLumen Instructions](#); [PFI 14.5 - FAQ Sheet](#)). In addition, regular discussions of adjunct participation occur in SLO Committee meetings ([PFI 14.6 - SLO Meeting Minutes](#)). While adjunct faculty are obligated to enter SLO data, more robust participation and compensation still need to be discussed and included to ensure that the SLO assessment process is valuable and meaningful.

Evidence:
- PFI 14.1 - Collective Bargaining Agreement Between NOCCCD and Adjunct Faculty United Local 6106 AFT/AFL/CIO, 2018-2021
- PFI 14.2 - Cypress College Instructional Program Review Annual Report 2020-2021
- PFI 14.3 - Jennifer Coopman, SLO Coordinator, Spring 2021 CSLO Assessments email, June 24, 2021
- PFI 14.4 - Cypress College Assessing SLOs through eLumen Instructions
- PFI 14.5 - Frequently Asked Questions about CSLOs and CSLO Assessment
- PFI 14.6 - Cypress College SLO Committee Meeting Minutes, August 31, 2020

PFI 15

Conduct a longitudinal analysis pertaining to the six EEO categories. (III.A.12)

The District will maintain data on the six EEO categories year-to-year and conduct a longitudinal analysis with at least three years of data.

Responsible Parties: Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, District Management Association
Status: Complete
Narrative: The District collects and analyzes employment diversity data annually. The District Director of Equity and Compliance presented the EEO Commitment to Diversity report at the November 24, 2020 NOCCCD Board of Trustees meeting (PFI 15.1 - BOT Meeting Minutes, p. 9). The report included a presentation highlighting District applicant and new hire demographics for 2019-20, five-year applicant and new hire demographics for 2015-20, District comparative data, District employee demographics, faculty hiring trends, departments and categories with underrepresentation, and Districtwide diversity activities (PFI 15.2 - EEO Commitment to Diversity Report 2015-2020).

Evidence:
- PFI 15.1 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, November 24, 2020
- PFI 15.2 - NOCCCD Institutional Commitment to Diversity Report, November 24, 2020

PFI 16

Develop a full-time faculty professional code of ethics with articulated consequences. (III.A.13)

The District will work with Academic Senate to develop a professional code of ethics with articulated consequences for violations of professional ethics.

Responsible Parties: Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, United Faculty, Academic Senate
Status: Work in Progress
Completion Timeline: TBD
Narrative: Board Policy 3003 entitled Code of Ethics for Faculty was adopted in 1981 and has been "under review by the Academic Senates" for an indeterminate amount of time (PFI 16.1 - BP 3003). The current iteration of the Code of Ethics for Faculty consists of philosophical and

ideological statements regarding the role and responsibilities of faculty members, but it does not specifically address consequences for violations of those statements. As a result, the review of the Code of Ethics for Faculty is, again, in ongoing discussions. Most recently, the Code of Ethics for Faculty was agendized by the Academic Senate President at the October 22, 2020, February 11, 2021 and May 20, 2021 Senate meetings (PFI 16.2 - Minutes; PFI 16.3 - Minutes; PFI 16.4 - Minutes). After extended discussion, the Senate identified several key issues that warranted further involvement of other campus and district groups. As the ACCJC Standard requirement of "consequences" has potential evaluative implications, the discussions necessitate faculty union and District Human Resources involvement. In addition, since a negotiated Code of Ethics for Faculty would apply Districtwide, Fullerton College and North Orange Continuing Education (NOCE) involvement was deemed necessary as well. The Senate directed the Accreditation Faculty Chair to contact the relevant faculty leadership to initiate such discussions (PFI 16.2 - Minutes). At this point, it seems that a two-fold approach is warranted: 1) the review of the Code of Ethics for Faculty by the Academic Senates, and 2) the negotiation of the articulated consequences by the faculty unions and District.

Evidence:
- PFI 16.1 - NOCCCD Administrative Guide 3003 - Code of Ethics for Faculty
- PFI 16.2 - Cypress College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, October 22, 2020
- PFI 16.3 - Cypress College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, February 11, 2021
- PFI 16.4 - Cypress College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, May 20, 2021

PFI 17

Improve security through replacement of campus locks. (III.B.1)

The College will replace locks on campus with interior locking mechanisms to provide extra security in case of emergency lockdown.

Responsible Parties: VP of Administrative Services, Director of Physical Plant
Status: Complete
Narrative: All campus locks with interior locking mechanisms were retrofitted to be enabled from within the room to improve security. The project was completed in May 2019 (PFI 17.1 - Fleming email; PFI 17.2 - Jeffredo email).

Evidence:
- PFI 17.1 - Philip Fleming, Director, Physical Plant & Facilities, Lock Retrofit email, April 25, 2019
- PFI 17.2 - Marcia Jeffredo, Locksmith, Lock Retrofit email May 10, 2019

PFI 18

Complete the assessment of the Network Refresh Project. (III.C.2)

District Information Services will complete an assessment of the wired, wireless video, and voice network to better serve students and staff.

Responsible Parties: District Director of Information Services
Status: Work in Progress
Completion Timeline: May 2022
Narrative: The NOCCCD Network Refresh Project began in 2015, and after initial approval by the Board of Trustees (BOT) to authorize expenditures, a steering committee was formed to oversee the project. By 2018, the Assessment and Network Design Phases were completed, and the results were presented to the BOT (PFI 18.1 - BOT Minutes, p. 48) who subsequently approved the Procurement and Implementation Phase (PFI 18.2 - BOT Minutes, p. 107). However, to take advantage of the advancements in technology that had been made since the initial proposals had been approved, in May 2019 the BOT agreed to reject all previous bids that had been received (PFI 18.3 - BOT Minutes, p. 125). In July 2019, a Network Refresh summary was presented to the BOT detailing the Network Refresh Project procedures; the BOT approved funding and awarded the contract to Vector USA who is now implementing the project (PFI 18.4 - Network Refresh Board Summary; PFI 18.5 - BOT Minutes, p. 6). In June 2020, a change order was approved by the BOT, which extended the project completion deadline to December 2021 (PFI 18.6 - Network Refresh Board Resolution). A subsequent change order in February 2021 to addresses impacts of COVID-19 related delays extended the completion date of the Netword Refresh Project to May 2022 (PFI 18.7 - Network Refresh Board Action).

Evidence:
- PFI 18.1 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, May 9, 2017
- PFI 18.2 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, May 22, 2018
- PFI 18.3 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, May 14, 2019
- PFI 18.4 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Network Refresh Summary, July 18, 2019
- PFI 18.5 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, July 23, 2019
- PFI 18.6 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Network Refresh Resolution, June 23, 2020
- PFI 18.7 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Network Refresh Action, February 9, 2021

PFI 19

Increase collaboration and solicitation of input in financial decision-making. (III.D.1, III.D.2)

The College and District will work together to increase collaboration and solicitation of input from constituency groups as an intrinsic element of the financial decision-making process.

Responsible Parties: Vice Chancellor of Finance and Facilities, VP of Administrative Services
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: In the years since the ISER, the College and District have made significant efforts to increase collaboration and solicitation of input from constituency groups with regard to fiscal

decision-making. At Cypress, the College has revamped its financial decision-making processes by strengthening the alignment of resource allocation with the Program Review process. In addition, there is a more robust budget evaluation by divisions and less reliance on the One-Time Funding process as discussed in PFI 3 (PFI 19.1 - PBC Minutes). At the District, a new budgeting model was implemented in 2020-21 that allows for more autonomy in decision-making for the Colleges (PFI 19.2 - Proposed Budget, p. 43-60). For example, each College is now able to decentralize revenues, utilize performance-based funding, and benefit from savings for innovations such as sustainability initiatives. At District Consultation Council (DCC) and Council on Budget and Facilities (CBF) meetings, which are composed of constituent representatives from across the District, there is more transparency and dialogue about state and local resource allocation processes (i.e., Student Centered Funding Formula, Resource Allocation Model), including discussion on how to allocate one-time funds (PFI 19.3 - DCC Summary; PFI 19.4 - CBF Summary).

While both the College and District have proactively engaged in efforts to increase opportunities for collaboration and input, those efforts have not yet been fully recognized by the campus community. The most recent Employee Campus Climate Survey conducted in Fall 2019 identified transparency in planning and decision-making, along with meaningful involvement in shared governance, as key areas for improvement (PFI 19.5 - Employee Campus Climate Survey). It should be noted that the perceptions regarding decision-making processes have improved since 2017 but remain low with an average of just over 50% agreement overall, as low as 43% among full-time faculty (see Employee Campus Climate Survey p. 7). Faculty leadership posit that while many in the campus community have recognized the improvements made, they are overshadowed by significant lapses in collaboration in specific instances that may explain the Climate Survey results (PFI 19.6 - Goralski email). The College and District will continue to work to address these issues in both practice and perception.

Evidence:
- PFI 19.1 - Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee Meeting Minutes, November 21, 2019
- PFI 19.2 - NOCCCD Proposed Budget and Financial Report 2020-21
- PFI 19.3 - NOCCCD District Consultation Council Meeting Summary, January 25, 2021
- PFI 19.4 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, April 12, 2021
- PFI 19.5 - Cypress College Employee Campus Climate Survey Results 2019
- PFI 19.6 - Craig Goralski, President, Academic Senate, Communication email February 8, 2021

PFI 20
Submit a substantive change for awards 50% or more online. (IV.A.4)

The College will submit a substantive change with more than 50 awards that can now be achieved more than 50% online.

Responsible Parties: Accreditation Liaison Officer

Status: Complete

Narrative: As the College was finalizing the Substantive Change Proposal in Spring 2017, ACCJC revised the Substantive Change Inquiry process to a simplified electronic form submission via their website. The College completed the electronic form and received receipt of confirmation and indication that a substantive change was not warranted at that time (PFI 20.1 - ACCJC Letter). However, in Spring 2020, the College moved to remote instruction in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. As the emergency stay-at-home orders continued, the College made adjustments to ongoing terms for instruction as dictated by the State Chancellor's Office and ACCJC. The College identified the courses and programs to be offered 50% or more online and submitted Emergency Temporary Distance Education Addendum Blanket Approval requests to the State Chancellor's Office (PFI 20.2 - ETDE Submission, July; PFI 20.3 - ETDE Submission, November), and notified ACCJC as requested (PFI 20.4 - ACCJC Response, July; PFI 20.5 - ACCJC Response, December).

Evidence:
- PFI 20.1 - ACCJC Substantive Change Letter March 21, 2018
- PFI 20.2 - Cypress College Emergency Temporary Distance Education Submission July 9, 2020
- PFI 20.3 - Cypress College Emergency Temporary Distance Education Submission November 30, 2020
- PFI 20.4 - ACCJC Response July 10, 2020
- PFI 20.5 - ACCJC Response emails December 1, 2020

PFI 21

Evaluate dissemination of resource allocation and financial accountability processes. (IV.D.2)

The District will evaluate the dissemination of its resource allocation and financial accountability processes to make them easily accessible and centralized.

Responsible Parties: Vice Chancellor of Finance and Facilities

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: The District has made efforts to disseminate information regarding resource allocation and accountability processes in several ways. In Fall 2017, the District began the process of reviewing and revising the resource allocation procedures that had been employed for several years. The Resource Allocation Workgroup (RAW), a shared governance subcommittee, was established to begin the review of the current budgeting processes and make recommendations to the Council on Budget and Facilities (CBF) and the District Consultation Council (DCC). Over the next three years, RAW met regularly to develop the new Resource Allocation Model (RAM) and kept District shared governance groups apprised of their progress (PFI 21.1 - CBF Summary; PFI 21.2 - DCC Summary; PFI 21.3 - Accreditation F&F Write-Up). The proposed RAM was presented and discussed at NOCCCD Board meetings and shared at the College by the VP of Administrative Services at the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC), and Management Team meetings (PFI 21.4 - PBC Minutes; PFI 21.5 -

[Management Team Minutes](); [PFI 21.6 - BOT Minutes, p. 818]()). In addition, District representatives hosted a Districtwide Budget Allocation Model Forum to provide an opportunity to learn about the RAM as well as District and College budget processes ([PFI 21.7 - Budget Forum email]()). Currently, CBF has assigned the District Budget Officers the task of developing a new Resource Allocation Handbook, which is still in development ([PFI 21.8 - Resource Allocation Handbook draft]()).

Evidence:
- PFI 21.1 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, July 13, 2020
- PFI 21.2 - NOCCCD District Consultation Council Meeting Summary, October 28, 2019
- PFI 21.3 - NOCCCD Accreditation Finance and Facilities Write-up, November 2020
- PFI 21.4 - Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee Meeting Minutes, September 17, 2020
- PFI 21.5 - Cypress College Management Team Meeting Minutes, September 11, 2020
- PFI 21.6 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, November 26, 2019
- PFI 21.7 - Marc Posner, Director, Office of Campus Communications, Budget Forum Announcement email, December 9, 2020
- PFI 21.8 - NOCCCD Resource Allocation Model Handbook draft

PFI 22

Improve district communication efforts to ensure effective operations. (IV.D.6)

The District will look for ways to improve communication efforts through more Districtwide forums for conversation and engagement.

Responsible Parties: Chancellor
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: There have been several efforts made on behalf of the District to improve communications to ensure effective operations. For example, the District has hosted several on-campus events to promote increased communication opportunities. Coffee with the Chancellor was held regularly (pre-COVID) as an opportunity for informal and open discussion with members of the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor ([PFI 22.1 - Coffee Flyer](); [PFI 22.2 - Coffee email]()). The District has also hosted Open Forums to provide information and solicit feedback on various specific districtwide projects, including resource allocation processes and the recent Educational and Facilities Master Plan ([PFI 22.3 - Budget Forum email](); [PFI 22.4 - EFMP Open Forum email]()). Additionally, in response to requests for more direct access to key District Services such as Human Resources and Finance, regular Campus Office Hours were held weekly for each campus ([PFI 22.5 - District Office Hours email]()). Some of the campus meetings were suspended during remote operations, and resumption should continue once campuses reopen. Finally, the District conducted a Districtwide Climate Survey in Spring 2021 that included items to assess the efficacy and improvement of District communication efforts. The survey results indicate moderate effectiveness in communication and information sharing efforts ([PFI 22.6 - District Survey email](); [PFI-22.7 - PACE Summary]())

Perceptions regarding the efficacy of these efforts vary. While many people recognize that there has been increased outreach by the District, the perception is that overall these efforts have not significantly improved communication between the College and the District. Several factors have been identified to be potential causes. First, the College recognizes the negative impact that recent contract negotiations between the District and employee groups has had on trust and communication, and the need to repair the rift. The distrust has led to the common sentiment that meetings and forums are held to disseminate information as opposed to an opportunity for genuine interaction and meaningful engagement. Others have noted that the scheduling of important meetings does not always take faculty schedules into account, often scheduled during peak teaching times or conflicting with other faculty meetings. For example, the Resource Allocation Model (RAM) Open Forum was held on Thursday December 10, 2020 from 3:00-5:00 pm, which was during the last Academic Senate Meeting of the semester. Moreover, in a related communication issue, recent interactions at Board of Trustees meetings have led to the perception that voices have been "chilled" by Board leadership: opportunity for discussion and input is frequently suppressed. The College, District, and Board of Trustees should continue to work towards repairing the damage and re-building the trust, respect, and communication necessary for ongoing improvement and effective operations.

Evidence:
- PFI 22.1 - Coffee with the Board of Trustees and Chancellor Flyer, Fall 2017
- PFI 22.2 - Christina Mix, Interim Executive Assistant, Coffee with the Chancellor email March 9, 2020
- PFI 22.3 - Marc Posner, Director, Office of Campus Communications, Budget Forum Announcement email, December 9, 2020
- PFI 22.4 - Christina Mix, Interim Executive Assistant, Educational and Facilities Master Plan, Open Forum email, February 6, 2020
- PFI 22.5 - Cheryl Marshall, Chancellor, NOCCCD, Campus Office Hours email, February 18, 2020
- PFI 22.6 - Cheryl Marshall, Chancellor, NOCCCD, District Climate Survey email, April 20, 2021
- PFI 22.7 - PACE Climate Survey Executive Summary, Conducted April-May 2021

PFI 23

Conduct annual assessments of the budget allocation model and formula allocation. (IV.D.7)

The District will conduct an annual assessment of the budget allocation model and formula allocation and more effectively disseminate evaluation results to all stakeholders.

Responsible Parties: Vice Chancellor of Finance and Facilities
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: The development of the new Resource Allocation Model (RAM) began in 2017 and was recently approved and implemented for 2020-21 (PFI 23.1 - Proposed Budget 2020-21, pp. 43-60). The RAM essentially shifts resource allocation to the campuses, which then allocate an agreed upon percentage of 9.25% back to the District for central services. The development of

the RAM included comparisons between the old and proposed models using actual 2018-19 and 2019-20 budget figures to assess the efficacy of the model ([PFI 23.1 - Proposed Budget 2020-21](), [PFI 23.2 - CBF Meeting Summary, August 2019]()). Since 2020-21 is the first year of implementation, the model has not yet been evaluated, however the Council on Budget and Facilities (CBF) is developing an evaluation plan that will be discussed upon its completion ([PFI 23.3 - CBF Meeting Summary, December 2020]()). Results of the evaluation will be shared and discussed at appropriate shared governance committee meetings.

Evidence:
- PFI 23.1 - NOCCCD Proposed Budget and Financial Report 2020-21
- PFI 23.2 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, August 12, 2019
- PFI 23.3 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, December 14, 2020

Response to Team Recommendations for Improvement

The ACCJC action letter following the accreditation site visit in October 2017 specified four College Recommendations and three District Recommendations for Improvement. The College also received one Recommendation for Compliance (College Recommendation 2) that was successfully addressed in the Follow-Up Report submitted in February 2019 and will not be included in this report.

Below is a status update on each of the Recommendations for Improvement (RFIs) made by the visiting team that includes the responsible parties, current status, completion timeline, and narrative of what actions the College has taken as a result of the recommendations and how these actions have improved institutional effectiveness.

College Recommendations for Improvement

> **College Recommendation 1 (Improvement)**
> In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the college continues its efforts to operationalize a more robust, sustainable, and continuous dialog about the results of SLO assessments and the use of those results for improvement in support of student learning. (IB.1, IB.4, IB.8, IB.9)

Responsible Parties: Instructional SLO Faculty Coordinator, Non-Instructional SLO Coordinator
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: As a result of the Recommendation for Compliance issued after the 2017 accreditation site visit, the College developed the College Outcomes Assessment and Review Cycle (COA) Plan (CR 1.1 - COA Plan). Addressed in detail in the 2019 Follow-Up Report, the COA Plan was designed to facilitate a campus-wide culture of assessment and the use of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) across all areas of the campus. The COA Plan also addresses this College Recommendation for Improvement as it seeks to further elevate the prominence of SLO assessments and promote subsequent, robust dialogue about the results of SLO assessments in support of student learning (CR 1.2 - Follow-Up Report). Some of the essential elements of the COA Plan include required annual assessment of SLOs in all courses, departments, and programs, assessment of Institutional and Program Student Learning Outcomes (ISLO/PSLOs), and the inclusion of SLO assessments and reflections in all instructional and non-instructional program reviews (CR 1.1 - COA Plan).

In an effort to further operationalize the dialogue about SLO assessments and the use of the results, SLOs were made more robust in the Program Review process in that departments are required to analyze, discuss changes, and identify plans for improvement based on the results of SLO assessment (CR 1.3 - Instructional Program Review Form; CR 1.4 - Student Services Program Review Form; CR 1.5 - Campus Services Program Review Form). The Program Review processes also now include a compliance status that is impacted by SLO participation, and the compliance status is considered in resource allocation and funding processes (CR 1.6 -

One-Time Funding Request Form; CR 1.7 - Faculty Request Form). Specifically, departments that are deemed "Not in Compliance" may be subject to limitations on budget requests. Departments are given the opportunity, however, to provide evidence to change their compliance status before the next review cycle (CR 1.8 - Program Review Evaluation).

The dialogue about SLO assessments and their impact on student learning go beyond the four-year cycle of the Program Review process. SLO assessments occur annually, and departments and programs discuss SLO results in regular department meetings and in Professional Development Flex Day activities (CR 1.9 - Flex Proposals). In addition, the SLO Committee, comprised of representatives from all instructional divisions, meets regularly to discuss program review components including SLO participation and CSLO status reports (CR 1.10 - SLO Committee Minutes). Furthermore, the College plans to share ISLO/PSLO results at President Advisory Cabinet (PAC) meetings as part of the campus-wide efforts towards ongoing improvement of institutional outcomes.

One challenge the College faced when operationalizing a more robust dialogue surrounding SLO assessment results was that adjunct faculty were not specifically required to engage in CSLOs per their Adjunct Faculty United (AdFac) union contracts. In fact, many departments refused to ask adjunct faculty to participate in any way as not to violate the contracts. Since a significant proportion of courses at the College are taught by adjunct faculty, this had significant impacts on CSLO completion rates, and the College and District needed to address this barrier before additional progress could be made. The issue was further exacerbated by a protracted contract negotiation that was finally resolved in 2019. The new contract more specifically identifies SLO assessment data entry as an administrative clerical requirement of adjunct instructors as a part of their evaluation (CR 1.11 - AdFac Contract, p. 53).

A related challenge was that the College implemented a new learning outcomes management information system called eLumen in Fall 2017. Full-time faculty were trained on the use of the new system and expected to begin using the system to house CSLO data. Due to the aforementioned contract negotiations, adjunct faculty were not required by all departments to participate, so in an effort to increase CSLO participation rates prior to the contract resolution, the College provided a training stipend to adjunct faculty who entered CSLO data (CR 1.12 - PBC Minutes). As a result, Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 showed marked increases in CSLO participation rates, but in the absence of the stipend, those rates again dropped in Fall 2018 and Spring 2019. However, once the new AdFac Contract was ratified, CSLO rates are now beginning to show improvement as more adjunct faculty are being made aware of the new requirements and are engaged in CSLO assessments (CR 1.13 - CSLO Status Reports).

Finally, the transition to remote operations as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic impacted SLO assessments, in part due to the inability to translate assessment tools into a remote format, as well as the other complications of a sudden transition to remote teaching. The Instructional SLO Coordinator made substantial efforts to provide assistance, training, and support to instructors to transition this work to a remote environment (CR 1.14 - eLumen Instructions; CR 1.15 - SLO FAQs; CR 1.16 - Coopman email).

Taken together, the College has seen increased participation in SLO assessments and dialogue surrounding SLO assessment results and student learning, despite the various setbacks. For example, departments that completed their Instructional Program Reviews in 2019-20 assessed over 90% of the courses offered (CR 1.17 - IPR Annual Report 2019-20). The COA Plan provided a framework for these efforts, and the integration of SLOs within Program Review and resource allocation processes operationalized these efforts within sustainable College planning processes. Moving forward, the College will shift focus to further enhance the dialogue surrounding SLOs and the use of SLO results to improve both student learning and, more broadly, institutional effectiveness.

Evidence:
- CR 1.1 - Cypress College Outcomes Assessment and Review Cycle Plan
- CR 1.2 - Cypress College Follow-Up Report in Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation, March 1, 2019
- CR 1.3 - Cypress College Department Planning and Program Review Form
- CR 1.4 - Cypress College Student Services Program Review Form
- CR 1.5 - Cypress College Campus Services Program Review Form
- CR 1.6 - Cypress College One-Time Funding Request Form 2021-22
- CR 1.7 - Cypress College Full-Time Faculty Position Request Form
- CR 1.8 - Cypress College Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation template
- CR 1.9 - Cypress College Mandatory Flex Day Activity Proposal examples, 2019-2021
- CR 1.10 - Cypress College Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee Minutes examples, 2020-2021
- CR 1.11 - Collective Bargaining Agreement Between NOCCCD and Adjunct Faculty United Local 6106 AFT/AFL/CIO, 2018-2021
- CR 1.12 - Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee Meeting Minutes, March 15, 2018
- CR 1.13 - Cypress College CSLO Status Reports Fall 2017 through Fall 2020
- CR 1.14 - Cypress College Assessing SLOs through eLumen instructions
- CR 1.15 - Frequently Asked Questions about CSLOs and CSLO Assessment
- CR 1.16 - Jennifer Coopman, SLO Coordinator, CSLO Completion Reminder email, December 9, 2020
- CR 1.17 - Cypress College Instructional Program Review Annual Report 2019-20

College Recommendation 2 (Compliance)
In order to meet the standards, the college must complete a full review of its processes related to the assessment and review cycle of Student Learning Outcomes for all instructional courses/programs to ensure that all courses, programs, and directly related services are improved (IIA.2, IIA.16)

Status: Complete

Narrative: The Recommendation for Compliance was addressed in the 2019 Follow-Up Report (CR 2.1 - Follow-Up Report), which was accepted by ACCJC in June 2019 (CR 2.2 - ACCJC Letter).

- CR 2.1 - Cypress College Follow-Up Report in Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation, March 1, 2019
- CR 2.2 - ACCJC, Compliance and Reaffirmation letter, June 28, 2019

College Recommendation 3 (Improvement)

In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the college ensure that in every class section students receive a course syllabus that includes learning outcomes from the institutions officially approved course outlines. (II.A.3)

Responsible Parties: VP of Instruction, Deans
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: At the time of the accreditation site visit in 2017, academic divisions each had their own procedure to confirm the inclusion of CSLOs in course syllabi. These procedures were effective in ensuring that all syllabi included CSLOs, and during the site visit, nearly all of the syllabi randomly selected by the evaluation team for inspection included CSLOs. However, upon review, the team determined that the CSLOs in the reviewed syllabi were not consistently those from the official Course Outline of Record (COR).

A number of complicating factors led to this issue. First, the curriculum approval process has a long lag time between approval and activation, which leads to confusion regarding which and when CSLOs are "official." Second, the various software systems utilized in curriculum (e.g., CurricUNET, eLumen, Banner) do not seamlessly interface with each other and require human intervention to update, which resulted in confusion about where "official" CSLOs were located and when they were finalized. In addition, division offices had each developed their own CSLO confirmation process that varied in efficacy. Finally, the sheer volume of paperwork to individually inspect the syllabus for each course section to confirm the accuracy of the specific wording of each CSLO is a daunting task that naturally lends itself to occasional errors.

Since the discrepancy of official CSLO information on course syllabi was identified, there have been several, varied attempts to address the problem. When the College decided to search for a new Curriculum approval software, there was hope that a system that seamlessly interfaced with eLumen would be selected to solve for that issue (CR 3.1 - Grote emails). Unfortunately, there was a lack of agreement on a single program to be used by all colleges in the District, which complicated the decision-making process. Those discussions were then paused while the State Chancellor's Office explores obtaining a system to be made available to all colleges statewide. In the meantime, the College continues to explore ways to clarify the location and activation date of "official" CSLOs and the best way to confirm accuracy.

The SLO Committee has made repeated efforts to facilitate the inclusion of official CSLOs in course syllabi. The SLO Coordinator emails faculty before the start of each semester, with a reminder to include active CSLOs on syllabi with attached instructions detailing how to find

active CSLOs for courses in CurricUNET ([CR 3.2 - Coopman emails](#); [CR 3.3 - CurricUNET Instructions](#)). In addition, the active CSLOs on course syllabi requirements are articulated in the SLO FAQ sheet emailed to all instructors each semester ([CR 3.4 - SLO FAQs](#)). The instructional materials are also posted on the Cypress College SLO webpage ([CR 3.5 - SLO webpage](#)). Finally, SLOs on syllabi are discussed regularly at SLO Committee meetings, and representatives are asked to follow-up with faculty in their divisions ([CR 3.6 - SLO Committee Meeting Minutes](#)).

In conjunction with these efforts, the College recognized that a uniform process to be utilized by faculty and deans needed to be developed. During this time, however, there was an instability in leadership in the area of Instruction at the College. A structural change from a single Executive Vice President to two Vice Presidents (VP of Instruction and VP of Student Services) and the sudden departure of a newly hired VP of Instruction (VPI) put the efforts to resolve the syllabus CSLO issue on hold. However, this effort was renewed upon the arrival of a new VPI in Fall 2020, and the VPI worked with the deans to devise a multi-stage effort to rectify the issue.

Accurate CSLOs in course syllabi requires procedures to both 1) ensure inclusion of CSLOs in syllabi as well as 2) confirm their accuracy. Working in conjunction with the Instructional SLO Coordinator, an ad hoc work group consisting of deans and faculty was convened to work out the two processes ([CR 3.7 - AdHoc Meeting Invitation](#)). In order to facilitate faculty inclusion of accurate CSLOs in their course syllabi, a multi-pronged effort is in development.

First, to facilitate inclusion,
1. The Curriculum Specialist generates an SLOs Report (in July and January) that identifies any revised CSLOs that become active in the upcoming semester ([CR 3.8 - SLOs Report](#)), and the Instructional SLO Coordinator sends the report to Department Coordinators to have them ensure that the updated, active CSLOs are utilized in their faculty syllabi ([CR 3.9 - Coopman DC email](#))
2. The Instructional SLO Coordinator continues to send the reminder email to faculty to include CSLOs in their syllabi, with the access instructions, several weeks before each semester ([CR 3.2 - Coopman emails](#))

Second, to confirm accuracy,
1. The deans will send a standard email to their faculty requesting submission of course syllabi one week prior to the start of the semester ([CR 3.10 - Douglas email](#)). The email reminds the instructor of the need to confirm the accuracy and currency of the active CSLOs for the course as a necessary element for compliance, as well as provides a link to the Course Outline of Record in CurricUNET ([CR 3.11 - SLO Process draft 4](#)).
2. At the start of the semester, the dean shall ensure that CSLOs listed on syllabi are the official, active CSLOs listed in CurricUNET. This may entail assigning a staff member to review syllabi and to inform faculty if their CSLOs need updating. If a staff member is unavailable, the dean shall then consult with the Vice President of Instruction for additional support ([CR 3.11 - SLO Process draft 4](#)).

Evidence:
- CR 3.1 - Silvie Grote, Curriculum Committee Chair, Curriculum Software emails, October 18, 2018; April 8,2019
- CR 3.2 - Jennifer Coopman, Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee Chair, SLOs in Syllabi Reminder emails
- CR 3.3 - Cypress College Finding Active CSLOs in CurricUNET
- CR 3.4 - Frequently Asked Questions about CSLOs and CSLO Assessment
- CR 3.5 - Cypress College Student Learning Outcomes webpage screenshots
- CR 3.6 - Cypress College Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee Minutes examples, 2020-2021
- CR 3.7 - Eldon Young, Dean, Language Arts Division, SLO Processes Zoom Meeting email, April 15, 2021
- CR 3.8 - Student Learning Outcomes Report, Fall 2021
- CR 3.9 - Jennifer Coopman, Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee Chair, New/Revised CSLOs Effective Fall 2021, July 19, 2021
- CR 3.10 - Lee Douglas, Vice President, Instruction, SLOs in Syllabi emails February 7, 2021; February 9, 2021
- CR 3.11 - SLO in Syllabus Processes draft 4

College Recommendation 4 (Improvement)

In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the college assess and review the overall process for resource allocation to assure alignment with institutional goals, and to promote transparency and communication of resource allocations processes. (I.A.3, I.B.9, III.D.3)

Responsible Parties: Vice President of Administrative Services
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: At the time of the accreditation site visit and in subsequent years, the College experienced several upper-level management retirements and resignations that resulted in substantial change in leadership. As a result, work on some accreditation projects needed to be delayed until the new leadership had a chance to settle into their positions and assess the College's practices and procedures.

The current Vice President of Administrative Services (VPAS) began his tenure at Cypress College in 2019. Prior to his tenure, the College maintained a historical base budget that had not been adjusted for several years. As available funds were recognized, they were allocated via two separate one-time funding processes at the College. The first was an Advanced One-Time Funding process, which was essentially a repeated, annual allocation made for regular expenses that were identified at the start of each year. The second was a Competitive One-Time Funding process that addressed other funding needs that arose throughout the year. Both of these one-time funding decisions were made utilizing the shared governance process and were tied to College and District Strategic Directions as part of the decision-making process (CR 4.1 - Porter email).

After a review and assessment of the resource allocation processes was conducted, the VPAS began to institute changes to these processes for the campus beginning in the 2019-20 fiscal year. Specifically, departments were asked to propose a full budget that would be inclusive of previous "Advanced One-Time Funding" allocations to develop a modified base budget that was more in line with annual projected department needs. The modified base budgets reflected actual spending in the prior year as well as anticipated equipment and supply expenses of the coming year (CR 4.1 - Porter email, 2019). As this constituted a new process, the campus budget office provided the necessary support to assist with the development process. Support included workshops and one-on-one meetings between managers and the Administrative Services staff throughout Spring 2019 to review expenses, provide budget templates to develop the new budget, and detail the elements to be included (CR 4.2 - Ceppi email). Additionally, the budgeting process moved to a two-year cycle to allow for more efficient use of carry-forward budget balances and instituted ongoing (three times per year) budget performance review meetings between managers and Administrative Services staff (CR 4.1 - Porter email, 2019). Taken together, these changes greatly improved both transparency and communication regarding the budgeting and resource allocation processes utilized by the College.

While significant work had been accomplished with regard to budget development and planning, there was still a need to review the one-time funding process that was used to address unanticipated expenditures. In Fall 2019, the shared governance Planning and Budget Committee (PBC), under the leadership of the VPAS, began a review of the College's Competitive One-Time Funding practices and made several changes including a more robust alignment with institutional goals. First, the One-Time Funding process was linked more directly to Program Review by requiring requestors to connect their resource requests to the established needs and/or goals identified in their Program Review (CR 4.3 - One-Time Funding Request Process; CR 4.4 - One-Time Funding Request Form). The College Mission Statement and District/College Strategic Plans continue to be important components of the process and are used, along with Program Review, to evaluate submitted requests (CR 4.5 - One-Time Funding Assessment). Second, the pool of available funds is more clearly identified from the outset to provide greater context and transparency to the amount of funding available for allocation. Finally, the previous request limitations were removed to provide greater flexibility in determining a department's actual funding needs (CR 4.6 - Porter Email, 2020).

In addition to the changes made to resource allocation processes thus far, the Faculty Hiring Prioritization and Classified Position Prioritization processes are also being reviewed and revised by the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) to ensure alignment with institutional goals and better promote transparency and communication. The review discussions will include how best to utilize Program Review to promote increased alignment with the College's goals, planning, and strategic directions (CR 4.7 - PBC Minutes; CR 4.8 - Faculty Request Form)

The Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) discussions surrounding these budgeting and resource allocation processes are designed to communicate to the various members (faculty, management, and staff) the guiding principles and goals of the budgeting process (CR 4.6 - Porter email, 2020). The changes to department budgeting, the revised One-Time Funding

process, as well as the pending revisions to Faculty Hiring Prioritization and Classified Position Prioritization are indicative of significant progress towards improving alignment with institutional goals, as well as the transparency and communication of resource allocations processes.

Evidence:
- CR 4.1 - Alexander Porter, Vice President, Student Administrative Services, Budget Process email November 21, 2019
- CR 4.2 - Matt Ceppi, Administrative Services Consultant, Budget Workshops email, May 1, 2019
- CR 4.3 - Cypress College One-Time Funding Process Memo 2019-2020
- CR 4.4 - Cypress College One-Time Funding Request Form, 2019-2020
- CR 4.5 - Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee One-Time Funding Assessment Form, 2019-20
- CR 4.6 - Alexander Porter, Vice President, Student Administrative Services, One-time Funding Requests email, February 21, 2020
- CR 4.7 - Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee Meeting Minutes, December 3, 2020
- CR 4.8 - Cypress College Full-Time Faculty Position Request Form

---

College Recommendation 5 (Improvement)
To increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the college develop a structure to organize governance information in a manner that is accessible. Additionally, the team recommends continued effective communication through the consistent development and dissemination of robust committee meeting minutes that include constituent dialogue and feedback. (IV.D.1)

Responsible Parties: President
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: In order to improve the organization and dissemination of shared governance information, the College moved away from an internal shared drive ("the J: drive") and created the Cypress College Governance webpage on the College website (CR 5.1 - Governance webpage). The page includes a list of shared governance committees and links to their individual webpages. Each committee webpage has descriptive information regarding the purpose and membership of the group as well as links to agendas, minutes, and other relevant resources (CR 5.2 - Senate webpage). The webpages are easily and directly accessible via the Employees tab at the top of the College website (CR 5.3 - Employees Tab). While the implementation of the Governance webpage has created a much-improved structure to house and easily access shared governance information, continued work regarding ongoing maintenance is still necessary. The College is working to create maintenance and update procedures to ensure that the pages remain effective and accurate. In addition, plans to further clarify the relationships between the various governance committees and identify how the committees work together are underway.

The College has also made a more concerted effort to promote the development and dissemination of more robust committee meeting minutes in various leadership committees across the campus. For example, the Curriculum Committee began to distribute the meeting agenda and minutes broadly via email to the campus community in 2019, in addition to posting them on the Governance webpage (CR 5.4 - Curriculum Minutes email). Additional efforts included informing shared governance and other campus committees about the Recommendation for Improvement and directing them to review their minutes to ensure that they met the advised criteria of the standard. For example, reminders about the need for robust minutes were made in various shared governance and leadership meetings when appropriate (CR 5.5 - Academic Senate Minutes, p. 8). The College also created a training template for writing meeting minutes and directed personnel responsible for recording minutes to review the materials and plan to post meeting minutes to the appropriate governance webpage within one week of their approval (CR 5.6 - Training Template, CR 5.7 - Schilling email). Ensuring regular posting of minutes will be an element of the Governance webpage update and maintenance process that is in development.

Evidence
- CR 5.1 - Cypress College Governance webpage screenshots
- CR 5.2 - Cypress College Academic Senate webpage screenshots
- CR 5.3 - Cypress College Website, Employees Tab screenshot
- CR 5.4 - Marbelly Jiram, Curriculum Specialist, Curriculum Agenda and Minutes email examples
- CR 5.5 - Cypress College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, February 25, 2021
- CR 5.6 - Cypress College How to Take Minutes Template for Training
- CR 5.7 - JoAnna Schilling, President, Meetring Minutes for Shared Governance Committees email, August 25, 2021

District Recommendations for Improvement

> **District Recommendation 1 (Improvement)**
> In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the district fully implement its new plan to review all chapters of the board policies and associated administrative procedures over a 6-year cycle. (IV.C.7).

Responsible Parties: Chancellor
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: The District (NOCCCD) has developed a 6-year review cycle for Board Policies (BP) and Administrative Procedures (AP) to ensure ongoing review and updates of all seven chapters (DR 1.1 - BP/AP Review Cycle). In response to the Recommendation for Improvement issued by the visiting team, the NOCCCD Board of Trustees (BOT) held a Board Policy Study Session on September 25, 2018 to review and discuss development and review processes utilized for District policies and procedures. In this study session, the BOT determined that a subcommittee to review policies should be established to gain a mutual understanding of what needs to be updated and to determine priority and future action (DR 1.2 - BOT Minutes, p. 133).

The BP and AP review process begins in District Consultation Council (DCC). As a shared governance committee, DCC utilizes the Microsoft Teams platform to provide members ample opportunity to comment on policies and procedures to be reviewed prior to DCC meetings. All comments are shared during the meeting to facilitate the review. Once approved, the policies and procedures are forwarded to the Board of Trustees for their review and posted to the District website upon approval (DR 1.3 - DCC Summary, pp. 3-4; DR 1.4 - BOT Minutes, pp. 115-116). The established BP and AP Review Cycle and related processes ensure that all Board policies and procedures are reviewed over a 6-year cycle (DR 1.5 - BP/AP Tracking).

Evidence:
- DR 1.1 - NOCCCD Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Continuous Review Cycle
- DR 1.2 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, September 25, 2018
- DR 1.3 - NOCCCD District Consultation Council Meeting Summary, April 22, 2019
- DR 1.4 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, April 23, 2019
- DR 1.5 - NOCCCD Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Review Cycle Tracking, April 26, 2021

> **District Recommendation 2 (Improvement)**
> In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the governing board review both its BP 2740 and AP 2740 to create a clear direction for the ongoing training program for board development. Both policy and administrative procedures should reflect that all board members engage in ongoing training program for board development, including new member orientation. (IV.C.9).

Responsible Parties: Chancellor

Status: Work in Progress

Completion Timeline: TBD

Narrative: The Board Policy Subcommittee that was established as a result of the Board Policy Study Session discussed above in District Recommendation 1 began their review with policies in the 2000s, including BP 2740. The Board of Trustees (BOT) discussed the need to add more substance to the policy and create better balance between ongoing education and new trustee education in both the BP and the AP, and the matter was referred to the Board Policy Subcommittee for further discussion (DR 2.1 - BOT Minutes). In May 2019, the Subcommittee provided an update on their progress, noting that in their review of BP 2740 that changes to that policy might necessitate changes to AP 2740 as well (DR 2.2 - BOT Minutes, p.169).

The Subcommittee completed their review of BP 2740 in May of 2020 and presented the revisions to the BOT for a first read. At the June 23, 2020 meeting, the BOT discussed the proposed changes and made additional recommendations for revision, including a title change, inclusion of additional topic areas, as well as changes to language in order to avoid limiting topics to just those specifically listed in the BP (DR 2.3 - BOT Minutes, p. 121; DR 2.4 - DCC Agenda, p. 29). The revised BP was referred to legal counsel for review, but no revisions were recommended (DR 2.4 - DCC Agenda, p. 25).

The proposed BP 2740 was then discussed at District Consultation Council's (DCC) October 2020 meeting who added "equity, inclusion, and anti-racist practices" to the listing of relevant areas for professional development before approving the revised board policy and forwarding their recommendations to the BOT for their consideration (DR 2.5 - DCC Summary, p. 6; DR 2.6 - BOT Agenda, p. 33). In November 2020, after additional discussion and final revisions the Board approved BP 2740 and the revised policies were posted to the District website (DR 2.7 - BOT Minutes, p. 259; DR 2.8 - BP 2740).

The revisions to BP 2740 represent a substantial increase in the ongoing training and professional development of BOT members. Specific changes to language provide clear direction for ongoing training and development. In addition, more specific delineation of elements of the new trustee orientation provide greater clarity of content and expectations (DR 2.6 - BOT Agenda, p. 33). Finally, professional development and education participation are tracked and documented to ensure ongoing engagement (DR 2.9 - BOT Participation Tracking). AP 2740 will be reviewed by DCC to determine whether modifications based on the revised BP 2740 are warranted.

Evidence:
- DR 2.1 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, September 25, 2018
- DR 2.2 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, May 28, 2019
- DR 2.3 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, June 23, 2020
- DR 2.4 - NOCCCD District Consultation Council Meeting Agenda, October 26, 2020
- DR 2.5 - NOCCCD District Consultation Council Meeting Summary, October 26, 2020
- DR 2.6 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Agenda, November 24, 2020
- DR 2.7 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, November 24, 2020 must add

- DR 2.8 - NOCCCD Board Policy 2740 - Board Professional Development
- DR 2.9 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Professional Development Participation, September 14, 2021

> **District Recommendation 3 (Improvement)**
> To increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the Colleges and NOCCCD review the current budget model to ensure financial resources are sufficient to address productivity factors, FTES targets, and the impact in the model of adjunct, overload and re-assign time needed to support and sustain student learning programs and services. (III.D.1, III.D.4).

Responsible Parties: Chancellor
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: As a result of the work leading up to the ISER, the District was aware of the concerns regarding the budget model that existed at that time, and discussions of a new budget model began soon after in Fall 2017. These discussions began in the Council of Budget and Facilities (CBF), and a subcommittee of CBF called the Resource Allocation Workgroup (RAW) was established to explore a new budget model (DR 3.1 - CBF Summary). The RAW, which included fiscal officers, faculty, classified staff, and confidential employees, began their work in January 2018 (DR 3.2 - CBF Summary).

Early work of the RAW included the development of their purpose, reviewing the parameters of SB 361, and outlining the principles and vision for the proposed model. The guiding principles for the proposed model were finalized and approved by CBF in May 2018 (DR 3.3 - CBF Summary), and the workgroup began to develop a new resource allocation model referred to at the time as the "Push-Out Allocation Model." The basic premise of the model was to shift (or "push out") the funding received from the State to the Colleges that would then be responsible for managing their allocations. The District would receive funds back from the Colleges (or "budget centers") to cover the centralized services provided.

In December 2018, the work of the RAW was significantly impacted by the switch in the funding formula utilized by the State Chancellor's office from SB 361 to the Student-Centered Funding Formula (SCFF). The SCFF was a major shift from previous funding mechanisms, and the District contracted an outside consulting firm, Cambridge West, to provide guidance and support the District to implement the SCFF into the parameters of the Push-Out Allocation Model being developed.

The RAW worked to create the District's new resource allocation model, renamed the Resource Allocation Model (RAM), which was first presented to CBF in August 2019. The RAM was tested by utilizing the previous 2018-19 budget figures, as well as a side-by-side comparison of the upcoming 2019-20 budgeting process, with the goal of seeing the impacts of the new model and better understanding how and why each campus received their allocation (DR 3.4 - CBF Summary). The RAW continued to run projections comparing the old and new budgeting models, determining District percentages and updating chargebacks, and they reported their results at CBF meetings (DR 3.5 - CBF Summary; DR 3.6 - CBF Summary).

Through the spring and summer of 2020, the RAM was regularly discussed at CBF meetings, and it was decided to implement the RAM in 2020-2021 (DR 3.7 - F&F Write-Up). At the July 2020 CBF meeting, a detailed breakdown of site revenues and expenditures was presented, as well as highlights of the differences between the two models. There was significant discussion that included explanations about how the RAM allowed for the campuses to look at their revenues as a source to fund additional Operating Allocations and Extended Day, which were specific concerns with the previous model (DR 3.8 - CBF Summary).

The RAM was rolled out with the 2020-21 Proposed Budget (DR 3.9 - 2020-21 Proposed Budget), and initial impacts were evaluated at the December 2020 CBF meeting in order to make necessary adjustments. District staff solicited input, suggestions, and recommendations from CBF, and several discussions took place to identify what needed to be adjusted. The Budget Office was requested to identify components that worked well, as well as make recommendations for changes to be discussed at a future meeting (DR 3.10 - CBF Summary).

A presentation of the RAM was made to the campuses via a virtual Open Forum in December 2020, which was then posted to the District website (DR 3.11 - Open Forum; DR 3.12 - Open Forum video). The new Budget Allocation Handbook that will align with the RAM is currently in development (DR 3.13 - CBF Summary). As the RAM has been newly implemented for 2020-21, an evaluation will be conducted at the end of the fiscal year and adjustments will be made accordingly.

Evidence:
- DR 3.1 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, November 13, 2017
- DR 3.2 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, February 12, 2018
- DR 3.3 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, May 14, 2018
- DR 3.4 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, August 12, 2019
- DR 3.5 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, October 14, 2019
- DR 3.6 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, December 9, 2019
- DR 3.7 - NOCCCD Accreditation Finance and Facilities Write-up, November 2020
- DR 3.8 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, July 13, 2020
- DR 3.9 - NOCCCD Proposed Budget and Financial Report 2020-21
- DR 3.10 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, December 14, 2020
- DR 3.11 - NOCCCD Budget Allocation Model Forum screenshot, December 10, 2020
- DR 3.12 - NOCCCD Budget Allocation Model Forum, December 10, 2020: Video Link
- DR 3.13 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, October 12, 2020

Reflection on Improving Institutional Performance: Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Institution Set Standards (ISSs)

Reflection on Student Learning Outcomes (Standard I.B.2)

ACCJC Standard I.B.2 states: "The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services." Reflect on the college's assessment processes since the last comprehensive review.

What are the strengths of the process that helps lead the college to improve teaching and learning?

The SLO assessment process has seen significant improvements since the implementation of the College Outcomes Assessment (COA) and Review Cycle Plan that was developed as a result of the Recommendation for Compliance received by the College in 2018. The COA Plan, in conjunction with the efforts of the Instructional and Non-Instructional SLO Coordinators, has resulted in increasing participation in the SLO assessment process across all areas of the College. One of the goals of the COA plan was to create a culture of assessment wherein all departments participate in annual assessments of their programs and services. This campus-wide focus on ongoing assessment creates a shared experience and commitment to the College's pursuit of student learning and achievement, and it highlights the need for all areas of the campus to work collectively to achieve this shared goal.

Establishing a culture of assessment has had the added benefit of making the use of data a more normalized and expected element of other processes. More specifically, the engagement in regular assessment has made the use of data more universal and underscores the role of data and its importance in making decisions. As a result, data driven decision-making has become the standard expectation across campus.

Another strength of the SLO process has been the impact on courses and teaching methodologies. More departments are regularly discussing SLO results at department meetings, often as part of their required Flex Day activities (SLO.1 - Combined Flex Agendas). When Flex activities were expanded to include department sponsored events, the incentive to engage in SLO discussions was increased. Much of the resistance towards SLO participation was grounded in the lack of time available to engage in department discussions given the busy schedules of faculty. Providing the opportunity to fulfill Flex obligations while meeting to discuss SLOs eliminated the barrier and increased participation. Flex Day discussions include examining benchmarks, developing activities and teaching strategies to address difficulties in subject matter, reviewing grading policies, sharing best practices, and revising curriculum based on SLO results.

What growth opportunities in the assessment process has the college identified to further refine its authentic culture of assessment?

Significant progress in SLO assessment participation has been made; however, a key factor to ongoing success lies in the need for increased adjunct faculty participation. As of 2019, adjunct faculty are required to participate in the data collection and entry of SLO assessment tools as part of their administrative duties. However, their contract does not specifically require adjunct faculty to participate in other aspects of the SLO process such as SLO development or the critical discussion of SLO results. While some departments have robust participation from adjunct faculty in SLO discussions, that is not yet the culture across the entire campus. Even more critical is that adjunct faculty are not compensated for their time in these meetings. Depending on the semester, adjunct faculty teach approximately 40% of the total number of courses taught on campus and are the sole instructor for approximately 20%. As such, compensated adjunct participation in SLO conversations is the necessary next step in the effective use of SLOs to promote student achievement and success.

The SLO process would also benefit from continuing to improve the usefulness of the SLO data gathered. Because the College fell behind in SLO completion rates, efforts have thus far been focused primarily on meeting the requirements established. In order for the process to be most effective, however, the focus needs to move beyond compliance. As the use of SLOs becomes common practice, efforts to make the process more meaningful can continue to grow. Improvement efforts such as revising CSLOs and PSLOs to make them more meaningful, developing effective assessment tools, and learning how to better use data are all areas to be explored and developed. These improvement efforts have already begun with instructional departments re-examining their SLOs to maximize their usefulness, as well as the SLO Coordinator working with Department Coordinators to help improve the processes used. Continued progress in this direction will help refine the process and create more meaningful results.

A third area of growth lies in the increased use of disaggregated data in SLO analysis discussions. Thus far, the focus on the SLO process has been to increase SLO assessment participation and mapping the CSLOs to campus ISLO/PSLOs within the College's four-year Program Review cycle. The next phase will include incorporating disaggregated SLO data into the Program Review process to identify and address potential equity gaps in disproportionately impacted groups.

Another area of growth is in the potential expanded use of department PSLOs. Currently, the College has established four ISLO/PSLOs that are designed to be analyzed at the institutional and program levels, and some departments have developed additional PSLOs for department use or as required by external accrediting bodies. In addition, the College uses the Associate Degree and Certificate Assessment Plan (ADCAP) in order to assess ISLOs for degrees and certificates. Recent graduates are sent a survey that assess how well their program of study met the College's ISLOs (SLO.2 - ADCAP Survey). However, degree and certificate PSLOs are not part an instructional department's SLO process, and further discussion regarding the role of PSLOs for degrees and certificates is warranted.

Provide examples where course, program, or service improvements have occurred based on outcomes assessment data.

There are numerous examples of improvements made in courses, programs, and services as a result of the SLO process. Some examples include

- The Aviation and Travel Careers Department moved to utilize improved standardized Computer Based Interactive Training (CBIT) course modules to improve online and hybrid courses, as well as worked with the English Department to create an English course for CTE students based on PSLO results (SLO.3 - Combined Program Review).

- The Accounting Department worked to improve SLO results by identifying various successful methodologies, including homework, case studies, events, and workshops to teach foundational concepts, and encouraged all instructors to integrate them into their courses. In addition, the Department revised their curriculum to better utilize the textbook publisher homework program: this measured the results for each individual SLO and isolate a specific SLO more effectively, and it provided easier and more effective collection of results by instructors for each individual SLO (SLO.3 - Combined Program Review).

- The Dental Hygiene Department developed curriculum and revised prerequisites to better prepare students for success in the program as well as modified the mode of delivery for courses when the SLO results indicated less success in fully online courses (SLO.3 - Combined Program Review).

- The Health Information Technology Department revised the approach to present projects to students by breaking down the overall content of the assignment into smaller increments and providing feedback at completion of each stage of the project to help improve student success (SLO.3 - Combined Program Review).

- The Communication Studies Department worked in conjunction with adjunct faculty to create more similar experiences for students by creating guidelines for courses that all instructors utilize when designing their individual classes. Guidelines included ranges for total required minutes of speaking and individual speech assignments, weighting of public speaking and communication theory emphasis in course construction, common writing requirements and weighting (SLO.3 - Combined Program Review).

- The Chemistry Department identified challenging concepts and created an original lab manual and lab activities that incorporated specific practices to increase CSLO success. Additionally, as a result of their PSLO results the Department intensified their focus on critical thinking and problem-solving skills in introductory chemistry courses as well as increased the exposure to current events that relate to chemistry in the non-science major chemistry courses (SLO.3 - Combined Program Review).

The College has also made improvements in non-instructional service areas as well.

- Disability Support Services (DSS) used their SSSLO results to identify areas of improvement in terms of tracking students who use the accommodations and services available. DSS recognized the disparity between the number of students who are eligible and the number of students who actually utilize the available accommodations. Plans to develop a process to accurately identify each group to compare the success rates of each in order to better target and promote the use of DSS services is underway (SLO.4 - DSS Program Review).

In those areas where assessment may be falling behind, what is the college doing to complete the assessments per the college's schedule?

The Instructional SLO Committee has made substantial efforts to support increasing participation rates for departments who are falling behind. The SLO Coordinator sends regular reminder emails to encourage timely SLO completion (SLO.5 - Coopman emails). In addition, the SLO Committee has developed and distributed training materials including an FAQ sheet that includes deadline dates, as well as instructions on finding CSLOs and entering eLumen data (SLO.6 - SLO FAQs; SLO.7 - Finding CSLOs). The SLO Committee regularly discusses how to improve SLO completion rates, and representatives are asked to make announcements in Division meetings and follow up with Department Coordinators (SLO.8 - SLO Committee Minutes, November 2020; SLO.9 - SLO Committee Minutes, March 2021).

In addition, the College has made efforts to better integrate SLO participation into other campus processes. As discussed earlier, the College made substantial changes to the Program Review process to make SLO participation more impactful (see College RFI 1 and QFE 1). A department's Program Review now includes an evaluation page that identifies commendations and recommendations, as well as assigns a compliance status (SLO.10 - Program Review Evaluation). A department will receive a status of In Compliance, Compliance-Needs Improvement, or Not in Compliance, and the compliance status is determined in large part by a department's CSLO completion rates. In addition, the Program Review Evaluation is now a required element of resource allocation requests, and a department's status may impact their request (SLO.11 - One-Time Funding Request Process). Specifically, departments that are deemed "Not in Compliance" may be subject to limitations on budget requests. Departments are given the opportunity, however, to provide evidence to change their compliance status before the next review cycle. The inclusion of the compliance status was designed to both incentivize SLO assessment participation as well as provide a level of accountability.

Finally, the work to complete SLOs in the Administrative Service areas continues. The College was in the process of revising the existing Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUOs; now called Administrative Service Outcomes) when the need to focus on the College's upcoming accreditation cycle delayed those efforts. After completing the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report, Accreditation team visit, and required Follow-Up Report, work on the ASO revisions resumed. The COA Plan implementation included a re-examination of SLOs in both the Student and Administrative Service areas, and both SSSLOs and ASOs were revised. In addition, the

Program Review process and cycle for both Student Service and Administrative Service areas were revised. Plans to begin the new four-year Program Review cycle (to include the newly revised SSSLOs and ASOs) were in progress when the College was forced to close due to COVID-19. Since that time, all Administrative Services efforts have been focused on effectively sustaining the business of the College in the remote environment. The College plans to renew the efforts to assess ASOs when on-campus business resumes.

Evidence:
- SLO.1 - Cypress College Flex Agenda Proposal examples 2019-2020
- SLO.2 - Cypress College Associate Degree and Certificate Assessment Plan (ADCAP) Survey
- SLO.3 - Cypress College Instructional Program Review SLO examples
- SLO.4 - Cypress College Disability Support Services Program Review 2019
- SLO.5 - Jennifer Coopman, Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee Chair, Data Entry Reminder email examples, 2020-2021
- SLO.6 - Cypress College Frequently Asked Questions about CSLOs and CSLO Assessment
- SLO.7 - Cypress College Finding Active CSLOs in CurricUNET
- SLO.8 - Cypress College SLO Committee Meeting Minutes, November 2, 2020
- SLO.9 - Cypress College SLO Committee Meeting Minutes, March 1, 2021
- SLO.10 - Cypress College Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation template
- SLO.11 - Alexander Porter, Vice President, Administrative Services, Cypress College One-Time Funding Process for 2019-2020 Memo, February 21, 2020

Reflection on Institution Set Standards (Standard I.B.3)

ACCJC Standard I.B.3 reads: "The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information." Using the most recent Annual Report, the College will reflect on its trend data on institution-set standards for course completion, certificate completion, degrees awarded, and transfer.

Has the college met its floor standards and its stretch (aspirational) goals?

The trend data reported in the College's 2021 ACCJC Annual Report indicates that the College has consistently met the institution-set standards for course completion, certificate completion, degrees awarded, and transfer for at least the past two years (ISS.1 - ACCJC Annual Report). Specifically, course completion rates have been stable over the past three years at 73%, and have consistently exceeded the floor standard of 72%. Certificate completion, degrees awarded, and transfers have not only met their respective floor standards but have realized significant increases over the past three years. With regard to certificates, the introduction of the IGETC and GE Breadth certificates in 2018-19, in addition to other new certificates, contributed to a dramatic increase from 690 certificates awarded in 2017-18 to 2,442 in 2019-20. The increases in degrees and transfers have also been impressive with 1,387 degrees awarded in 2017-18 to 1,860 in 2019-20, and 848 transfers in 2017-18 to 1,242 in 2019-20. As a result of these notable

increases, aspirational stretch goals for these metrics have also been attained. The exception is course completion with an established stretch goal of 76%, which the College has not yet achieved.

The College also has a baccalaureate program that has awarded 15 degrees over the past three years. The College met the institution-set standard and stretch goal in 2018-19 but fell two degrees short of meeting the standard in 2019-20. Because the program is new, with the first cohort beginning in Fall 2017, the focus has been on program growth, which will ultimately lead to more degrees awarded in future years.

What initiative(s) is the college undertaking to improve its outcomes?

In order to improve student outcomes, the College has been engaged in a variety of large-scale initiatives designed to support student learning, equity, and success. For example, the College has adopted a Guided Pathways framework to support student success with an emphasis on equity. With the support of a Title V grant, Guided Pathways has established cross-functional Completion Teams within eight of the College's academic divisions, each of which include a faculty data coach, faculty peer coach, and counselor, as well as members from student services and administration who work together to support the students within the division. The Completion Teams provide unique support to students by holding major-specific events or orientations, working with departments to develop curricular pathways in Program Mapper, and providing resources and equity trainings to faculty, among other activities to help students in their divisions succeed (ISS.2 - Guided Pathways 2.0).

Additionally, as a result of AB 705 legislation, placement tests were phased out of the assessment process for English and math in 2018-19. Instead of placement tests, the College developed a guided self-placement (GSP) tool used to recommend the appropriate transfer-level English and math course to students (ISS.3 - GSP Link). This was a transformative change in the assessment process that, along with the resulting innovative curricular changes made by faculty, produced narrowing equity gaps and significant increases in student completion of transfer-level English and math across all ethnic groups (ISS.4 - 2019-20 AB 705 Report).

Another large-scale initiative the District has undertaken to improve student outcomes is the North Orange Promise. The North Orange Promise gives first-time, full-time students at Cypress College access to free tuition for their first two years of college, in addition to a variety of academic and learning support services. Specifically, students who are a part of the North Orange Promise receive comprehensive counseling and tutoring services, as well as supplemental scholarships for qualifying students. The North Orange Promise provides a more streamlined onboarding process for incoming students while giving them access to the necessary tools and support for academic success (ISS.5 - North Orange Promise).

Finally, an effort the College is hoping to expand upon to support student success is auto-awarding degrees and certificates for qualifying students. In Spring 2021, the Career Technical Education (CTE) Division initiated a small-scale pilot project to identify students who have

successfully completed coursework for five specific low-unit certificates but had not applied for the award (ISS.6 - PAC Minutes). Through this pilot project, 54 students were identified and subsequently notified that they had earned one or more certificates and that they would automatically be awarded the certificates unless they elected to opt out. None of the students elected to opt out, and a total of 79 certificates were auto-awarded. The College is currently exploring ways to effectively streamline the auto-awarding process in order to accommodate all degrees and certificates (ISS.7 - Meeting Summary; ISS.8 - Stanco email).

How does the college inform its constituents of this information?

The College informs its constituents of student achievement trend data, institution-set standards, and goals in several ways. Institution-set standards and aspirational stretch goals are reviewed, discussed, and reestablished annually in the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC), which is the College's primary shared governance planning committee. The process includes examining recent data trends, evaluating whether goals were met, discussing goal-setting methodologies, and determining appropriate actions as needed (ISS.9 - PBC Minutes; ISS.10 - PBC Minutes). Subsequently, a summary of the discussion and the agreed-upon standards and goals are shared with President Advisory Cabinet (PAC) for approval (ISS.11 - PAC Minutes). Both PBC and PAC include representation from all constituent groups, and each representative is responsible for sharing the dialogue and information with their respective constituents. Additionally, institution-set standards and goals are posted on the Institutional Research and Planning webpage and are evaluated in an annual Institutional Effectiveness Report that is shared with the Board of Trustees, and it is posted on the Institutional Research and Planning webpage (ISS.12 - IER; ISS.13 - Haddad email; ISS.14 - IRP webpage).

Evidence:
- ISS.1 - ACCJC Annual Report 2021
- ISS.2 - Cypress College Guided Pathways From Version 1.0 To Version 2.0 DHSI Title V Grant Kickoff, Completion Team slides, November 1, 2019
- ISS.3 - Cypress College Guided Self-Placement screenshots
- ISS.4 - Cypress College Impacts of AB 705 Implementation One-Year Throughput Rates, Course Success Rates, and Racial Equity, 2019-20
- ISS.5 - NOCCCD, North Orange Promise webpage screenshots
- ISS.6 - Cypress College President Advisory Cabinet Meeting Minutes, February 25, 2021
- ISS.7 - Auto-Awarding using Degree Works Meeting Summary, March 23, 2021
- ISS.8 - Gabrielle Stanco, District Director, Research, Planning, and Data Management, Degree Works Training email, June 14, 2021
- ISS.9 - Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee Meeting Minutes, November 19, 2020
- ISS.10 - Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee Meeting Minutes, December 3, 2020
- ISS.11 - Cypress College President Advisory Cabinet Meeting Minutes, December 10, 2020

- ISS.12 - Cypress College Institutional Effectiveness Report 2020-2021
- ISS.13 - Eileen Haddad, Interim Director, Institutional Research and Planning, Cypress College 2021 Community Report email, April 9, 2021
- ISS.14 - Cypress College Institutional Research and Planning Office Institutional Effectiveness Reports webpage screenshot

Outcomes of the Quality Focus Projects

The Quality Focused Essay (QFE) projects that were proposed in 2017 were in response to the general directive of ACCJC to target areas where the College needed improvement. During the process of self-evaluation, the Accreditation Steering Committee identified three areas of importance to long-term improvement and student learning that included Student Learning Outcomes, Distance Education, and Funding Mechanisms. The Commission revised the directive at their 2019 conference to encouraged schools to propose QFE projects that more directly focused on improving student learning and achievement. As such, the updates to the QFEs below were guided by the original directive.

Quality Focused Essay 1: Student Learning Outcomes

Desired Goal for QFE 1
Cypress College will re-double its efforts to focus on closing the identified gaps in the College's SLO completion process and further integrate SLOs into the College's ongoing efforts to improve student success.

Action Step 1: Revisit and Streamline SLOs, PLOs, AUOs, and ILOs
The College will improve the institutional effectiveness of outcomes by revisiting and streamlining all campus SLOs, PLOs, AUOs, and ILOs to provide meaningful connections.
Responsible Parties: Instructional SLO Coordinator, Non-Instructional SLO Coordinator, Department Chairs
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: After receiving the Recommendation for Compliance from the accreditation visiting team, the College focused its efforts on reviewing its SLO assessment processes and developing a plan to ensure a review cycle for all courses, programs, and directly related services to ensure ongoing improvement. The result was the College Outcomes Assessment and Review Cycle (COA) Plan which was approved and implemented in 2018. The COA Plan includes annual SLO assessments, revisions to Institutional and Programs Student Learning Outcomes (ISLO/PSLOs), and mapping SLOs to ISLO/PSLOs to be included in Program Review, among other elements (QFE1.1 - COA Plan). As such, the COA Plan also addressed many of the Action Plan items of this QFE.

As one of the primary goals of the Recommendation for Compliance was increasing SLO assessment participation rates, particularly Course SLOs (CSLOs), campus efforts were initially focused on these efforts. The Instructional SLO Committee worked to get faculty to engage in more regular and consistent assessments of the existing CSLOs as required by the COA Plan. Given the historical resistance of faculty that resulted in the low participation rates in the first place, the SLO Committee decided to delay the "revisiting and streamlining" CSLOs plans of this QFE until participation rates improved and faculty were more comfortable with the assessment process. In addition, the College had just obtained a new learning outcome management information system, eLumen, and significant work was necessary to train faculty

on the new system and map the existing CSLOs to department PSLOs for inclusion in Program Review. The SLO Committee determined that the best course of action would be to utilize the four-year program review cycle to have all instructional programs learn how to use eLumen, determine how best to increase CSLO assessment rates, and complete their PSLO mapping. Once all departments have completed their first cycle, the SLO Committee will refocus efforts on streamlining CSLOs and improving assessment methodologies to make them more meaningful and effective. The current four-year Instructional Program Review cycle will conclude in 2021-22, and the next phase will begin in Fall 2022 (QFE1.2 - Program Review Cycle).

The College's work on non-instructional SLOs was also impacted. SLOs in the student services areas (SSSLOs) were well-established at the time of the accreditation visit. In fact, one of the College's Commendations specifically praised the SLO work done by student services (QFE1.3 - External Evaluation Report). Nonetheless, the implementation of the COA Plan necessitated some changes to the SSSLO process to help make assessments more meaningful and better align with the goals of the COA Plan. At the same time, the Non-Instructional SLO Coordinator was working to refine the Administrative Service Outcomes (ASOs, formerly AUOs) process to align with the COA Plan.

In addition to the changes in non-instructional SLOs, significant changes have been made to the program review process in the student and administrative services areas. Specifically, the College has added a Student Services Program Review (SSPR) Committee to facilitate and support the program review process for student services (QFE1.4 - PAC Minutes). The SSPR Committee ensures tracking and further elevates the prominence of SLO discussions in these areas (QFE1.5 - SSPR Rubric). A similar committee is being explored for Administrative Services areas.

Finally, the Accreditation SLO Subcommittee, a committee formed as part of the COA Plan development to examine the College's existing ISLO/PSLOs and better facilitate a campus-wide culture of assessment, reconvened in 2020 to address some identified gaps and lack of clarity in ISLO/PSLO mapping and assessments. The Subcommittee successfully reformatted the ISLO/PSLOs from a chart to a narrative form to improve clarity, understanding, and meaningfulness, as well as added an equity component that will be incorporated into future mapping cycles (QFE1.6 - ISLO/PSLOs). The Subcommittee continues to meet to address some challenges in non-instructional areas, but significant improvements in institutional effectiveness have been realized as a result of the progress in streamlining SLOs thus far.

Action Step 2: Increase Participation in Learning Outcomes
The College will increase faculty and administration participation rates in learning outcomes reporting.
Responsible Parties: Instructional SLO Coordinator, Department Chairs
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: As discussed above, the COA Plan was developed in response to the SLO-related Recommendation for Compliance received from the accreditation visiting team. One of the first elements of the COA Plan to be developed was the annual assessment of SLOs across the

campus. According to the COA Plan, all areas of the campus (Instruction, Student Services, and Campus Services) are required to assess a minimum of one SLO annually (with courses assessed each semester). Departments determine which SLOs will be assessed as well as set outcome standards. SLO assessment results are included in the department's program review, which occurs on a four-year cycle. The annual/semester assessment of SLOs was in an effort to increase participation rates by making assessments a regular practice, akin to submitting grades (for courses) and annual review of department effectiveness. While various factors have contributed to the ups and downs of participation rates (see College RFI #1), the College is making steady improvements.

SLO assessments have also been elevated in the Program Review process. All areas of the campus participate in Program Review on a four-year cycle. Instructional Program Review (IPR), Student Services Program Review (SSPR), Campus Services Program Review (CSPR), and Specialized Instructional Program Review (SIPR) have all reviewed and modified the forms used to expand SLO assessments and participation rates as part of the program review process. In addition, program review processes now include a summary page that identifies commendations and recommendations, as well as assigns a compliance status ([QFE1.7 - Program Review Evaluation](#)). The Program Review Evaluation is now a required element of resource allocation requests, and a department's compliance status may impact their request ([QFE1.8 - One-Time Funding Form](#); [QFE1.9 - Faculty Request Form](#)). The inclusion of the compliance status was designed to both incentivize departments to improve/maintain their SLO assessment participation as well as provide a level of accountability.

SLO participation rates have also been impacted by the recent inclusion of reporting SLO data as a clerical duty required in the adjunct faculty contract. As discussed in College RFI #1, most adjunct faculty had previously not been participating in SLO data collection due to varied interpretations of the nature of those duties. The recent contract agreement clarified that duty, and more adjunct faculty are participating in CSLO assessments as they are made aware of the change ([QFE1.10 - AdFac Contract, p. 53](#)).

Action Step 3: Establish and Implement a Committee of Chairs
The College will establish a Committee of Chairs to improve collaboration to eliminate achievement gaps and increase student achievement.
Responsible Parties: Instructional SLO Coordinator, Non-Instructional SLO Coordinator
Status: Work in Progress
Narrative: The goal of establishing a "Committee of Chairs" was to increase collaborations across campus in order to work together to increase student achievement. When the Committee of Chairs proposal was presented in various leadership meetings, a number of concerns were raised about committee proliferation as well as overlap of various existing committees since the same people tend to sit on multiple committees. A new committee with a different mix of the same voices was deemed repetitive and unnecessary. Given these concerns, the creation of the Committee of Chairs was postponed until other options had been explored.

Instead, efforts to collaborate and decrease the work being conducted in "silos" has taken other

forms. First, there has been an effort to integrate representation on Instructional and Student Services Program Review Committees. This integration allows for better understanding of the needs identified by programs during their review process. For example, the Student Services Program Review (SSPR) liaison who sits on the Instructional Program Review (IPR) Committee is able to hear about student service needs identified and is able to align processes more directly (QFE1.11 - Program Review Annual Report, p. 7).

A second effort to collaborate across areas has been the increased collaboration between Instructional and Non-Instructional SLO Coordinators. Prior to the implementation of the COA Plan, the SLO Coordinator was in Instruction. While SLO efforts in student and campus Services had been ongoing, they were limited by the lack of an official Non-Instructional SLO Coordinator, and the work in each area had been independent of each other. The Instructional and Non-Instructional SLO Coordinators have been working together on the Accreditation SLO Subcommittee and are identifying appropriate ways to integrate their efforts to help increase student achievement.

Third, the work in Guided Pathways has increased cross collaboration across the campus in multiple ways. The Guided Pathways Steering Committee is co-chaired by faculty and management, with membership representing all areas of the campus. In addition, the College received a Title V Grant that resulted in the creation of cross-functional Completion Teams to help facilitate student equity and achievement that are comprised of faculty, student services, and management personnel (QFE1.12 - Guided Pathways 2.0).

Finally, instead of creating the proposed Committee of Chairs, the College has made efforts to utilize existing shared governance committees such as President Advisory Cabinet (PAC) and the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) to have more robust dialogue and discussion about student achievement data and related institutional effectiveness metrics (QFE1.13 - PAC Minutes; QFE1.14 - PBC Minutes). The impact of these efforts will be examined over time to determine whether they have successfully improved collaboration and student achievement, and adjustments will be made accordingly.

Action Step 4: System for SLO Tracking and Disaggregation
The College will secure an improved information system to house SLO tracking and disaggregation amongst cross platform integration.
Responsible Parties: Instructional SLO Coordinator, Non-Instructional SLO Coordinator
Status: Complete
Narrative: The College obtained the eLumen learning outcome management information system in 2017. CSLOs and Instructional ISLO/PSLOs have been entered into the system and are being utilized by instructional departments in both CSLO assessment discussions and Instructional Program Review. Since eLumen was initially configured for courses, the College has encountered challenges in trying to utilize eLumen for non-instructional areas; however, various solutions are currently being explored.

As the focus of SLO efforts has been on increasing participation rates and integrating SLOs into Program Review, the College has not yet disaggregated SLO data. The integration of SLO data into program review has come in stages. First, CLSO data was included for department review, then PSLO data was added. In order to avoid overwhelming faculty, many of whom were new to CSLO discussions, the inclusion of disaggregated CSLO data has been delayed until all departments go through the current cycle and will begin in Fall 2022.

Evidence:

- QFE1.1 - Cypress College Outcomes Assessment and Review Cycle Plan COA Plan
- QFE1.2 - Cypress College Program Review Cycle Schedules 2018 - 2026
- QFE1.3 - ACCJC External Evaluation Report, November 28, 2017
- QFE1.4 - Cypress College President Advisory Cabinet Minutes, March 25, 2021
- QFE1.5 - Cypress College Student Services Program Review Rubric
- QFE1.6 - Cypress College Digital Catalog 2021-22, Institutional and Program Student Learning Outcomes webpage screenshots
- QFE1.7 - Cypress College Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation template
- QFE1.8 - Cypress College One-Time Funding Request Form 2021-2022
- QFE1.9 - Cypress College Full-Time Faculty Position Request Form Faculty Request
- QFE1.10 - Collective Bargaining Agreement Between NOCCCD and Adjunct Faculty United Local 6106 AFT/AFL/CIO, 2018-2021
- QFE1.11 - Cypress College Instructional Program Review Annual Report 2020-2021
- QFE1.12 - Cypress College Guided Pathways From Version 1.0 To Version 2.0 DHSI Title V Grant Kickoff, Completion Team slides, November 1, 2019
- QFE1.13 - Cypress College President Advisory Cabinet Minutes, December 10, 2020
- QFE1.14 - Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee Meeting Minutes, April 15, 2021

Quality Focused Essay 2: Distance Education

Desired Goal for QFE 2
Cypress College will continue its efforts to improve and expand its DE program to meet current definitions and standards for distance education and to address the needs of 21st century learners. This includes a reorganization of the DE Program, evaluation of the current courses and technology utilized, and writing and finalizing a new DE plan.

Action Step 1: Reorganize Distance Education Personnel

The College will increase program and institutional effectiveness by reorganizing the Distance Education Program personnel.

Responsible Parties: President, Academic Senate

Status: Complete and Ongoing

Narrative: The Distance Education (DE) program was initially supported by a full-time faculty coordinator, a full-time instructional designer, and an administrative assistant. After Title V grant funding expired in 2013 and a series of personnel changes, the coordinator position remained

vacant for 2.5 years. From 2014-2016 the DE program was supported by an administrative assistant and a temporary special projects director. During this time, the context for the DE Program changed substantially, and the Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC) was not empowered to make decisions related to the implementation of changes as necessary.

In 2016, the duties of the faculty DE Coordinator were revised, and this position was allocated 60% reassigned time beginning Spring 2017. In addition, the College assigned a Dean of Distance Education to provide administrative support. The DE team also includes a full-time, temporary Special Projects Manager and full-time DE Assistant, and they are supported by the DE Committee comprised of faculty representatives from each of the divisions, a Disability Support Services (DSS) specialist, and the Academic Computing manager.

Plans to further reorganize the infrastructure of the DE Program have been outlined in the new DE Plan and DE Program Review. The plans include reclassifying the DE Assistant, establishing a permanent DE Project Manager, reassessing the duties and compensation of the faculty DE Coordinator, and hiring an instructional designer (QFE2.1 - DE Plan; QFE2.2 - DE Program Review).

Action Step 2: Update Literature to advertise the Distance Education Program
The College will update campus literature to effectively advertise the DE program and clarify course criteria and expectations as defined by delivery mode.
Responsible Parties: Distance Education Coordinator, Department Coordinators, Deans
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: The College has made efforts to improve the clarity of information regarding Distance Education (DE) course offerings in campus publications in several ways. Previously, DE courses were identified in the Class Schedule by type of DE mode utilized, "online" and "hybrid," and distinct icons were used to identify each. However, confusion regarding what constituted a "hybrid" course ensued as each instructor was able to set their own parameters and had varying conceptions of what "hybrid" meant.

The College adopted the definitions developed jointly by the Distance Education and Education Technology Advisory Committee and California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (QFE2.3 - DE Guidelines). The DE Guidelines recognize and define the three types of online courses: "Fully Online" (FO), "Partially Online" (PO), and "Online with Flexible In-Person Component" (OFI). Whenever a FO, PO, or OFI section requires an activity that cannot be completed online or asynchronously, that requirement must be noted in the Schedule of Classes. In addition, the College defines Web-Enhanced courses as in-person classes that offer students access to class materials and resources online (QFE2.1 - DE Plan).

The College planned to utilize the updated terminology and new icons for 2020-21 before COVID-19 forced the campus to move to remote instruction. Instead, the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 Class Schedules required detailed explanations of the nature of the remote instruction utilized for each course. Distinctions between "Online," "Remote," and "Hybrid" modes were defined and identified so that students would know whether the courses would be taught

asynchronously or synchronously, or a combination of both (QFE2.4 - Fall 2020 Schedule; QFE2.5 - Spring 2021 Schedule). Implementation of the new terminology and updated icons as well as the specific on-campus requirements for partially online courses are planned for both the pdf and searchable Class Schedules when the College returns to more regular on-campus instruction (QFE2.6 - Cassens email).

Action Step 3: Evaluate Needs of Distance Education Students and Faculty
The College will administer a survey to identify and calculate the specific needs of DE students and faculty.
Responsible Parties: Distance Education Coordinator, Faculty Distance Education Coordinator, Institutional Research and Planning Office
Status: Complete and Ongoing
Narrative: Ascertaining the needs of Distance Education (DE) students and faculty has been an ongoing endeavor of the DE Program for several years. Results of the student and faculty surveys conducted in 2016-17 provided the basis for many of the goals and objectives of the DE Plan. The DE Faculty Satisfaction Survey identified various needs, including technical support and access to training. As a result, plans to revise DE instructor training included increasing availability and frequency, providing more online training options, compressing content to reduce training length, increasing support for training, accessibility and course development, and creating certification processes for previous online teacher training. The DE team began implementing these goals, and the number of faculty completing training to become DE certified increased substantially, resulting in significant growth in DE instruction (QFE2.1 - DE Plan).

In the DE Student Satisfaction Survey conducted in Fall 2016, students expressed that regular and substantive interaction (RSI) (between students and with the instructor) contributed to their satisfaction with online learning and was critical for learning and persistence. In addition, survey results indicated that students highly value timely feedback, instructor responsiveness, and student-student interactions in discussions (QFE2.7 - DE Survey). The DE Plan specifically details the standards online courses must meet with regard to RSI (QFE2.1 - DE Plan). In Spring 2020, the DE Committee developed an RSI Policy that reflected the 2019 changes to Title 5, Section 55204. The RSI Policy was amended in Fall 2020 to reflect changes in federal guidelines issued by the Department of Education in August 2020, and it was approved by the Academic Senate in January 2021 (QFE2.8 - RSI Policy).

In Spring 2020, distance education at the College changed dramatically as a result of COVID-19 and the move to remote instruction for the entire campus. The DE Team facilitated this transition within days of the campus closure; the campus closed on a Friday and classes resumed 5 days later. With such an abrupt shift to online teaching, the College worked to ensure that students would be able to finish the semester by providing equipment, additional training for students and instructors, and increased support for the various tools necessary for a successful transition. The College conducted numerous surveys in Spring 2020 of both staff and students to determine what their needs were in the remote environment for both the remainder of Spring 2020 (QFE2.9 - Employee Telecommuting Results; QFE2.10 - Student Needs Survey) and the

subsequent terms ([QFE2.11 - Student Survey Results, Fall](); [QFE2.12 - Student Survey Results, Spring]()).

Plans for regular and ongoing surveys are in progress but have been delayed until the College returns to campus and resumes the previous more traditional forms of DE instruction used prior to COVID-19. The DE team hopes to provide an opportunity for students to better understand the difference between traditional "online" classes versus "remote" instruction before administering surveys to ensure more accurate results. In addition, the College is discussing plans to participate in the Chancellor's Office survey used to complete its biennial DE Report that was originally scheduled for Spring 2020 but delayed due to COVID-19 ([QFE2.13 - McAlister email]()).

Action Step 4: Create a Distance Education Plan
The College will create a Distance Education Plan to update policies and practices related to distance education and improve program quality.
Responsible Parties: Distance Education Coordinator, Faculty Distance Education Coordinator
Status: Complete
Narrative: The Cypress College Distance Education Plan 2017-2023 had been in development since the expiration of the previous plan in 2017. As the Distance Education (DE) program went through a transitional period from 2017-2019, the Plan's development was delayed, which is explained in the Forward of the DE Plan. The DE Plan was completed in 2020, but campus approval was delayed due to the shift to remote instruction. The Plan was approved by the Academic Senate and President Advisory Cabinet (PAC) in Spring 2021 ([QFE2.14 - Senate Minutes](); [QFE2.15 - PAC Minutes]()). The DE Plan updates campus policies and practices related to DE instruction, outlines DE course guidelines, identifies student and faculty support structure, and sets program goals and objectives to promote learning and ongoing student success ([QFE2.1 - DE Plan]()).

Evidence:
- QFE2.1 - Cypress College Distance Education Plan 2017-2023
- QFE2.2 - Cypress College Distance Education Program Review 2021
- QFE2.3 - Distance Education Guidelines 2019
- QFE2.4 - Cypress College Class Schedule, Fall 2020
- QFE2.5 - Cypress College Class Schedule, Spring 2021
- QFE2.6 - Treisa Cassens, Dean, Library, Learning Resource Centers, and Distance Education, Catalog vs Schedule Language email, March 18, 2021
- QFE2.7 - Cypress College Fall Distance Education Student Satisfaction Survey, 2016
- QFE2.8 - Cypress College Regular and Substantive Interaction Policy for Distance Education Courses
- QFE2.9 - Cypress College Employee Telecommuting Survey
- QFE2.10 - Cypress College Student Needs with Remote Instruction
- QFE2.11 - Cypress College Student Needs for Fall 2020 Remote Instruction
- QFE2.12 - Cypress College Fall 2020 Student Needs Survey Results

- QFE2.13 - Kathleen McAlister, Distance Education Coordinator, Surveys email, March 9, 2021
- QFE2.14 - Cypress College Academic Senate Minutes, January 28, 2021
- QFE2.15 - Cypress College President Advisory Cabinet Minutes, March 25, 2021

Quality Focused Essay 3: Extended-Day Funding

Desired Goal for QFE 3
Budget Centers within NOCCCD should receive from the District sufficient resources to be able to meet their FTES targets within their allocations.

Action Step 1: Modify the Extended Day Funding Model
The College will work with the District to modify the EDFM to provide adequate resources to meet and sustain college FTES targets.
Responsible Parties: District Consultation Council, Board of Trustees
Status: Complete
Narrative: During the preparation of the ISER in 2017, the College identified concerns related to the budgeting model being utilized at the time. Historically, the campuses received an ongoing allocation through the District's Extended Day Funding Model (EDFM) as part of the budget process. That allocation only covered a portion of the total amount spent on extended day expenses, and the campuses were dependent on using carryover funds to supplement these costs (QFE3.1 - 2020-21 Proposed Budget, pp. 43-60). Over several years, the College was seeing increasingly significant drops in carryover balances as the funds provided by the District were deemed insufficient, requiring the campus to use local revenue to fund instruction (QFE3.2 - 2017 ISER, pp. 434-436).

As a result of the ISER and the Recommendation for Improvement received from the accreditation visiting team, the District began a major review of the budgeting process and ultimately developed the recently implemented Resource Allocation Model (RAM) (see District RFI 3). While the RAM was in development, the District provided supplemental, extended day one-time funding allocations to the College to cover the EDFM deficits (QFE3.3 - 2019-20 Proposed Budget, pp. 69-70).

In addition to the development and implementation of the RAM, the introduction of the Student-Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) by the State Chancellor's Office fundamentally changed how community colleges received their funding. Previous funding mechanisms relied primarily on FTES; however, the SCFF changed the funding formula to a combination of FTES and other performance and population-based metrics. The District incorporated the SCFF into the RAM that was under development (QFE3.4 - CBF Summary).

The implementation of the RAM and SCFF have profound impacts on how instruction and other expenses are funded at the College. The RAM identified four "budget centers": the three campuses, Cypress, Fullerton, and NOCE, along with District Services. Resources are allocated

to the three campuses, where each contribute 9.25% of revenues to District Services. The model incorporates the SCFF apportionment revenues, other state revenues, and other/local revenues. All personnel and operating costs are covered by the individual budget center, and Districtwide expenses are paid for by all four budget centers (QFE3.5 - CBF Summary). By "pushing out" the revenues to the budget centers, the responsibility, decision-making, and control of resources is shifted to the College.

The SCFF has also had significant impacts on revenue received by the College. While the majority of funding (70%) still comes from FTES, the College has the ability to generate the remaining 30% by serving specific student populations and increasing various student success metrics, resulting in the institution having an additional means to impact the revenue earned than in the previous model.

The greater control over budgeting decisions at the College as a result of the RAM, in addition to the greater influence on revenues received as a result of the SCFF, empowers the College to determine how best to allocate resources. The College is able to fully fund all instruction (regular and extended day) first and budget other expenses accordingly. As such, the College is no longer reliant on the funding allocated from the District but rather on its own earnings and management of resources. However, it should be noted that the transition of responsibility has underscored the importance of developing effective enrollment management strategies given the impacts on revenue available for other resource allocation requests (QFE3.1 - 2020-21 Proposed Budget, p. 43).

The RAM was implemented for the first time in 2020-21; the impacts will be evaluated at the end of the fiscal year and adjustments made by the District accordingly. At the campus level, the impacts of the RAM and SCFF will be discussed as part of the annual evaluation of budgets.

Evidence:
- QFE3.1 - NOCCCD Proposed Budget and Financial Report 2020-21
- QFE3.2 - Cypress College Institutional Self Evaluation Report, 2017
- QFE3.3 - NOCCCD Proposed Budget and Financial Report 2019-20
- QFE3.4 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, April 8, 2019
- QFE3.5 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, November 2, 2020

Fiscal Reporting

The College has no fiscal concerns to report. The 2021 Annual Fiscal Report is included below.

ACCJC ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES
WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

2021 Annual Fiscal Report
California Community College
Reporting Year: 2019-2020
Final Submission
04/08/2021

Cypress College
9200 Valley View Street
Cypress, CA 90630

General Information

#	Question	Answer
1.	Confirm College Information	**Confirmed**
2.	District Name: Is the college a single college district?	**North Orange County Community College District** **No**

2. Additional Information:
If the college is a single college district, questions 21a, 21b, 22, 23 and 24 will "auto fill" from 18a, 18b, 4a, 6a, and 6d respectively.

	a. Name of College Chief Business Officer (CBO)	**Alexander Porter**
	b. Title of College CBO	**Vice President, Administrative Services**
	c. Phone number of College CBO	**714-484-7313**
3.	d. E-mail of College CBO	**aporter@cypresscollege.edu**
	e. Name of District CBO	**Fred Williams**
	f. Title of District CBO	**Vice Chancellor, Finance and Faciltities**
	g. Phone number of District CBO	**714-808-4746**
	h. E-mail of District CBO	**fwilliams@nocccd.edu**

3. Additional Information:
The District CBO email address will be copied on the final report once it has been approved by the CEO.

DISTRICT DATA (including single college organizations) Revenue

(Source: Unrestricted General Fund, CCFS 311 Annual, Revenues, Expenditures, and Fund Balance)

		FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
	a. Total Unrestricted General Fund Revenues (excluding account 8900)	$ 230,355,433	$ 244,818,724	$ 240,173,047
4.	b. Other Unrestricted Financing Sources (Account 8900)	$ 1,081,156	$ 1,318,197	$ 1,133,749

i. Other Unrestricted Financing Sources (account 8900) is primarily comprised of (if applicable):

Year	Description	Amount	Sustainable/One-time
FY 17/18	Financial Aid Interest Transfer	$ 81,156	One-time
FY 17/18	Redevelopment Fund Transfer for Capital Outlay	$ 1,000,000	One-time
FY 18/19	Financial Aid Interest Transfer	$ 127,996	One-time
FY 18/19	Various Fund Transfers	$ 1,190,201	One-time
FY 19/20	Financial Aid Interest Transfer	$ 133,749	One-time
FY 19/20	Redevelopment Fund Transfer for Capital Outlay	$ 1,000,000	One-time

4. Additional Information:
ACCJC does not count other unrestricted financing sources as a regular and ongoing source of revenue, unless it is a sustainable annual revenue.

5.	(Source: Unrestricted General Fund, CCFS 311 Annual, Revenues, Expenditures, and Fund Balance)	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
	a. Net (Adjusted) Unrestricted General Fund Beginning Balance	$ 59,164,219	$ 79,069,940	$ 96,720,639
	b. Net Unrestricted General Fund Ending Balance, including transfers in/out	$ 79,069,940	$ 96,720,639	$ 89,857,130

5. Additional Information:
a. Use adjusted beginning fund balance from CCFS 311 Annual.
b. This amount is the amount reported on the CCFS 311 report after transfers in/out

Expenditures/Transfers (General Fund Expenditures/Operating Expenditures)

6.	(Source: Unrestricted General Fund, CCFS 311 Annual, Revenues, Expenditures, and Fund Balance)	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
	a. Total Unrestricted General Fund Expenditures (including account 7000)	$ 211,530,868	$ 228,486,222	$ 248,170,305
	b. Total Unrestricted General Fund Salaries and Benefits (accounts 1000, 2000, 3000)	$ 191,192,496	$ 202,815,874	$ 208,495,086
	c. Other Unrestricted General Fund Outgo (6a - 6b)	$ 20,338,372	$ 25,670,348	$ 39,675,219
	d. Unrestricted General Fund Ending Balance	$ 79,069,940	$ 96,720,639	$ 89,857,130
	e. If the report year closed with an Unrestricted General Fund deficit, does the district anticipate to close 2020-21 with a deficit?		No	
	i. If yes, what is the estimated unrestricted deficit?		N/A	

6. Additional Information:
d. 6.d. same as 5.b., which includes transfers in/out

Liabilities

7.		FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
	Did the District borrow funds for cash flow purposes?	No	No	No

8.	Total Borrowing/Total Debt — Unrestricted General Fund	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
	a. Short-Term Borrowing (TRANS, etc)	N/A	N/A	N/A
	b. Long Term Borrowing (COPs, Capital Leases, other long-term borrowing):	N/A	N/A	N/A

8. Additional Information:
a. list total short-term Unrestricted General Fund Borrowing/Debt
b. list total long-term Unrestricted General Fund Borrowing/Debt (not G.O. Bonds)

9.		FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
	a. Did the district issue long-term debt instruments or other new borrowing (not G.O. bonds) during the fiscal year noted?	No	No	No
	b. What type(s)	n/a	n/a	n/a
	c. Total amount	N/A	N/A	N/A

10.	Debt Service Payments (Unrestricted General Fund)	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
		$ 0	$ 0	$ 0

10. Additional Information:
This amount also includes transfers made from the Unrestricted General Fund to any other fund for the purposes of debt service payments.

Other Post Employment Benefits

11.	(Source: **Most recent GASB 74/75 OPEB Actuarial Report**)	FY 19/20
	a. Total OPEB Liability (TOL) for OPEB	$ 116,771,371
	b. Net OPEB Liability (NOL) for OPEB	$ 5,599,904
	c. Funded Ratio [Fiduciary Net Position (FNP/TOL)]	95.2 %
	d. NOL as Percentage of OPEB Payroll	3.76 %
	e. Service Cost (SC)	$ 3,059,846
	f. Amount of Contribution to Annual Service Cost, plus any additional funding of the Net OPEB Liability	$ 7,601,257

11. Additional Information:
Annual contribution to the Service Cost is generally the pay-as-you-go cost paid by the unrestricted general fund. Any contribution to the NOL is generally above that amount, and is paid into an Irrevocable Trust during the fiscal year. Please list both amounts here. Note this does not include any change in value or investment earnings of the trust.

12.	Date of most recent GASB 74/75 OPEB Actuarial Report – use valuation date (mm/dd/yyyy)	09/25/2020

13.		FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
	a. Has an irrevocable trust been established for OPEB liabilities?	Yes		
	b. Amount deposited into Irrevocable OPEB Reserve/Trust	$ 8,346,685	$ 9,652,804	$ 7,601,257
	c. Amount deposited into non-irrevocable Reserve specifically for OPEB	$ 1,358,357	$ 1,308,736	$ 1,411,780
	d. OPEB Irrevocable Trust Balance as of fiscal year end	$ 96,104,279	$ 104,932,484	$ 111,171,467
	e. Has the district utilized OPEB or other special retiree benefit funds to help balance the general fund budget in 2019/20?			No

13. Additional Information:
b. Add amounts deposited during the fiscal year. These amounts are usually included in the District's Annual Audit.
e. If "yes", that description and amount should be reported in 4.b.i. for FY 19/20

Cash Position

14.	Cash Balance at June 30 from Annual CCFS-311 Report (Combined General Fund Balance Sheet Total — Unrestricted and Restricted-accounts 9100 through 9115)	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
		$ 86,932,464	$ 108,134,477	$ 100,793,388

15.	Does the district prepare cash flow projections during the year?	Yes
	b. Does the district anticipate significant cash flow issues during 2020-21?	No

b. Significant cash flow issues are defined as needing additional cash equal to or exceeding 15% of unrestricted general fund revenues

Annual Audit Information

16.	Date annual audit report for fiscal year was electronically submitted to accjc.org, along with the institution's response to any audit exceptions (mm/dd/yyyy)	03/01/2021

NOTE: Audited financial statements are due to the ACCJC no later than April 9, 2021. A multi-college district may submit a single district audit report on behalf of all the colleges in the district.

		FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
17.	a. List the number of audit findings for each year (enter 0 if none):	0	0	1

b. From Summary of Auditors Results (Annual Audit) for 2019-20 (this is usually a single page at the beginning of the Findings and Questioned Costs section):

Financial Statements

i. Type of auditor's report issued	Unmodified
ii. Internal Control Material Weaknesses identified	No
iii. Internal Control Significant Deficiencies identified	No

Federal Awards

i. Type of auditor's report issued on compliance	Unmodified
ii. Internal Control Material Weaknesses identified	No
iii. Internal Control Significant Deficiencies identified	Yes
iv. Qualified as low-risk auditee	Yes

State Awards

i. Type of auditor's report issued on compliance	Unmodified
If qualified, how many state programs were qualified	N/A
ii. Internal Control Material Weaknesses identified	N/A
iii. Internal Control Significant Deficiencies identified	N/A

Other District Information

			FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
18.	a.	Final Adopted Budget — budgeted Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) (Annual Target)	31,951	34,597	33,824
	b.	Actual Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) from Annual CCFS 320	32,447	33,268	33,337

18. Additional Information:
a. Resident FTES only.
b. Report resident FTES only. Please use actual FTES, not hold harmless FTES.

		FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
19.	Number of FTES shifted into the fiscal year, or out of the fiscal year	-2,149	0	0

19. Additional Information:
d. If the District shifted both in and out of a fiscal year, report the net (positive or negative). A negative number may be entered. For FTES shifted into a given year, that same amount should be subtracted from the corresponding report year.

19. Additional Information:
d. If the District shifted both in and out of a fiscal year, report the net (positive or negative). A negative number may be entered. For FTES shifted into a given year, that same amount should be subtracted from the corresponding report year.

| 20. | a. During the reporting period, did the district settle any contracts with employee bargaining units? | No |
| | b. Did any negotiations remain open? | Yes |

c. Describe significant impacts of settlements. If any negotiations remain open over one year, describe length of negotiations, and issues

> **Academic Full-Time negotiations for the 18-19 fiscal year were opened prior to 6/30/18 and were not settled as of fiscal year end 6/30/20.**

College Data

NOTE: For a single college district the information is the same that was entered into the District section of the report.

21.		FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
	a. Final Adopted Budget � budgeted Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) (Annual Target)	10,230	11,599	11,950
	b. Actual Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) from Annual CCFS 320	10,765	11,582	11,622
	c. Is the college experiencing enrollment decline in the current (2020-21) year?			Yes
	i. If yes, what is the estimated FTES decline?			-444

21. Additional Information:
Report resident FTES only.

22.		FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
	Final Unrestricted General Fund allocation from the District (for Single College Districts, use the number in 4a.)	$ 66,693,550	$ 72,143,246	$ 81,740,167

23.		FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
	Final Unrestricted General Fund Expenditures (for Single College Districts, use the number in 6a.)	$ 76,713,547	$ 83,263,500	$ 90,308,476

23. Additional Information:

24.		FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
	Final Unrestricted General Fund Ending Balance (for Single College Districts, use the number in 6d.)	$ 8,112,421	$ 12,701,621	$ 12,607,131

25.		FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
	What percentage of the Unrestricted General Fund prior year Ending Balance did the District permit the College to carry forward into the next year's budget?	100 %	100 %	100 %

26.		Cohort Year 2014	Cohort Year 2015	Cohort Year 2016
	USDE official cohort Student Loan Default Rate (FSLD) (3 year rate)	16 %	10 %	11 %

District and College Data

	a. Were there any executive or senior administration leadership changes at the College or District during the fiscal year, including June 30? List for the District and for the College.	Yes

27.	b. Please describe the leadership change(s)	
	For a significant portion of 2019/20, the Vice President, Instrucion (CIO) was vacant. The position was recently filled in September, 2020.	
	c. How many executive or senior administration positions have been replaced with an interim, or remain vacant?	0

27. Additional Information:
Senior administrative leadership generally includes the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the college/district and any administrators who report to that position and/or sit on the CEO's cabinet or executive committee. 'Senior executive leadership' always includes the chief business official, chief financial officer of the college/district.

The data included in this report are certified as a complete and accurate representation of the reporting college.

Appendices

Appendix A: List of Evidence

PFI 1.1 - Cypress College Student Complaint Rights Process for Catalog
PFI 1.2 - Cypress College Student Complaint Form draft
PFI 2.1 - Mortuary Science Baccalaureate Degree Program Review Form
PFI 2.2 - Cypress College Program Review Cycle Schedules 2018 - 2026
PFI 3.1 - Alexander Porter, Vice President, Student Administrative Services, Budget email, November 21, 2019
PFI 3.2 - Alexander Porter, Vice President, Student Administrative Services, Operational Budget Development 2020-21 email, March 31, 2020
PFI 3.3 - Alexander Porter, Vice President, Student Administrative Services, Operational Budget Development 2021-22 email, March 31, 2021
PFI 3.4 - Alexander Porter, Vice President, Student Administrative Services, Mid-Year Budget Review Meetings email, January 7, 2020
PFI 4.1 - NOCCCD Board Policy 4100 - Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates
PFI 4.2 - NOCCCD Administrative Procedure 4100 - Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates
PFI 5.1 - Cypress College Campus Identity Guide (Fall 2018)
PFI 5.2 - Cypress College Style Guide webpage screenshot
PFI 5.3 - Cypress College Social Media Guidelines
PFI 5.4 - Cypress College Newsletter Guidelines
PFI 5.5 - Cypress College Campus Identity Guide email, Spring 2020
PFI 5.6 - Cypress College Identity and Style webpage screenshots
PFI 5.7 - Cypress College Campaigns webpage screenshots
PFI 5.8 - Cypress College @Cypress Newsletter, November 23, 2020
PFI 6.1 - Cypress College Website screenshot
PFI 6.2 - Cypress College Mobile App screenshot
PFI 6.3 - Cypress College Canvas Website Training course screenshots
PFI 6.4 - Marc Posner, Director, Office of Campus Communications, Accreditation Website and Mobile App email, July 15, 2021
PFI 6.5 - Cypress College Campus Identity Guide (Fall 2018)
PFI 6.6 - Cypress College Catalog 2020-21 (Digital) screenshot
PFI 6.7 - Cypress College Class Schedule Fall 2021
PFI 6.8 - Cypress College Class Schedule Database screenshot
PFI 6.9 - Marc Posner, Director, Office of Campus Communications, Accreditation Schedule and Catalog email, July 15, 2021
PFI 7.1 - Cypress College Distance Education Plan 2017-2023
PFI 7.2 - Cypress College Distance Education Specialized Instructional Program Review 2021
PFI 8.1 - Cypress College Student Services Program Review Form
PFI 8.2 - Cypress College Campus Services Program Review Form
PFI 9.1 - American Board of Funeral Service Education Accreditation Standards, January 1, 2020

PFI 9.2 - Jolena Grande, Mortuary Science, Program Learning Outcomes email, February 16, 2021

PFI 10.1 - Cypress College Department Planning and Program Review Form

PFI 10.2 - Cypress College Distance Education Plan 2017-2023

PFI 10.3 - Cypress College Program Review Cycle Schedules 2018 - 2026

PFI 10.4 - Cypress College Distance Education Specialized Instructional Program Review 2021

PFI 11.1 - Cypress College Financial Aid webpage screenshots

PFI 11.2 - Cypress College Veterans Resource Center webpage screenshots

PFI 11.3 - Cypress College Transfer Center webpage screenshots

PFI 11.4 - Cypress College Transfer Center Canvas Hub screenshots

PFI 11.5 - Student Services Canvas Page link example screenshot

PFI 11.6 - Cypress College Distance Education Committee Meeting Agenda, May 13, 2021

PFI 11.7 - Cypress College Student Services webpage screenshots

PFI 11.8 - Cypress College Student Services Newsletter, Spring 2021

PFI 12.1 - Collective Bargaining Agreement Between NOCCCD and United Faculty CCA-CTA-NEA, 2018-2021

PFI 12.2 - Collective Bargaining Agreement Between NOCCCD and Adjunct Faculty United Local 6106 AFT/AFL/CIO, 2018-2021

PFI 12.3 - Cypress College Distance Education Plan 2017-2023

PFI 12.4 - Irma Ramos, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources, Successor Agreement Negotiations memo, March 31, 2021

PFI 12.5 - Qualtrics Survey Instructions

PFI 13.1 - NOCCCD Management Performance Evaluation Process

PFI 13.2 - NOCCCD Management Performance Evaluation Form

PFI 13.3 - NOCCCD Goal-Setting and Employee Self-Evaluation

PFI 13.4 - NOCCCD Goal Setting Guide

PFI 13.5 - NOCCCD Ongoing Check-in Guidance

PFI 13.6 - Ty Thomas-Volcy, President-Elect, District Management Association, Evaluation Feedback Open Sessions email, March 11, 2021.

PFI 13.7 - NOCCCD District Consultation Council (DCC) Agenda, April 26, 2021

PFI 13.8 - NOCCCD District Consultation Council (DCC) Summary, April 26, 2021

PFI 13.9 - NOCCCD Administrative Procedure 7240-7 Management Employees - Evaluation

PFI 13.10 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, May 25, 2021

PFI 13.11 - Simone Brown Thunder, District Human Resources Manager, Management Performance Evaluation Process email, July 1, 2021

PFI 14.1 - Collective Bargaining Agreement Between NOCCCD and Adjunct Faculty United Local 6106 AFT/AFL/CIO, 2018-2021

PFI 14.2 - Cypress College Instructional Program Review Annual Report 2020-2021

PFI 14.3 - Jennifer Coopman, SLO Coordinator, Spring 2021 CSLO Assessments email, June 24, 2021

PFI 14.4 - Cypress College Assessing SLOs through eLumen Instructions

PFI 14.5 - Frequently Asked Questions about CSLOs and CSLO Assessment

PFI 14.6 - Cypress College SLO Committee Meeting Minutes, August 31, 2020

PFI 15.1 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, November 24, 2020

PFI 15.2 - NOCCCD Institutional Commitment to Diversity Report, November 24, 2020
PFI 16.1 - NOCCCD Administrative Guide 3003 - Code of Ethics for Faculty
PFI 16.2 - Cypress College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, October 22, 2020
PFI 16.3 - Cypress College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, February 11, 2021
PFI 16.4 - Cypress College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, May 20, 2021
PFI 17.1 - Philip Fleming, Director, Physical Plant & Facilities, Lock Retrofit email, April 25, 2019
PFI 17.2 - Marcia Jeffredo, Locksmith, Lock Retrofit email May 10, 2019
PFI 18.1 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, May 9, 2017
PFI 18.2 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, May 22, 2018
PFI 18.3 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, May 14, 2019
PFI 18.4 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Network Refresh Summary, July 18, 2019
PFI 18.5 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, July 23, 2019
PFI 18.6 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Network Refresh Resolution, June 23, 2020
PFI 18.7 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Network Refresh Action, February 9, 2021
PFI 19.1 - Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee Meeting Minutes, November 21, 2019
PFI 19.2 - NOCCCD Proposed Budget and Financial Report 2020-21
PFI 19.3 - NOCCCD District Consultation Council Meeting Summary, January 25, 2021
PFI 19.4 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, April 12, 2021
PFI 19.5 - Cypress College Employee Campus Climate Survey Results 2019
PFI 19.6 - Craig Goralski, President, Academic Senate, Communication email February 8, 2021
PFI 20.1 - ACCJC Substantive Change Letter March 21, 2018
PFI 20.2 - Cypress College Emergency Temporary Distance Education Submission July 9, 2020
PFI 20.3 - Cypress College Emergency Temporary Distance Education Submission November 30, 2020
PFI 20.4 - ACCJC Response July 10, 2020
PFI 20.5 - ACCJC Response emails December 1, 2020
PFI 21.1 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, July 13, 2020
PFI 21.2 - NOCCCD District Consultation Council Meeting Summary, October 28, 2019
PFI 21.3 - NOCCCD Accreditation Finance and Facilities Write-up, November 2020
PFI 21.4 - Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee Meeting Minutes, September 17, 2020
PFI 21.5 - Cypress College Management Team Meeting Minutes, September 11, 2020
PFI 21.6 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, November 26, 2019
PFI 21.7 - Marc Posner, Director, Office of Campus Communications, Budget Forum Announcement email, December 9, 2020
PFI 21.8 - NOCCCD Resource Allocation Model Handbook draft
PFI 22.1 - Coffee with the Board of Trustees and Chancellor Flyer, Fall 2017
PFI 22.2 - Christina Mix, Interim Executive Assistant, Coffee with the Chancellor email March 9, 2020
PFI 22.3 - Marc Posner, Director, Office of Campus Communications, Budget Forum Announcement email, December 9, 2020
PFI 22.4 - Christina Mix, Interim Executive Assistant, Educational and Facilities Master Plan, Open Forum email, February 6, 2020

PFI 22.5 - Cheryl Marshall, Chancellor, NOCCCD, Campus Office Hours email, February 18, 2020

PFI 22.6 - Cheryl Marshall, Chancellor, NOCCCD, District Climate Survey email, April 20, 2021

PFI 22.7 - PACE Climate Survey Executive Summary, Conducted April-May 2021

PFI 23.1 - NOCCCD Proposed Budget and Financial Report 2020-21

PFI 23.2 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, August 12, 2019

PFI 23.3 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, December 14, 2020

CR 1.1 - Cypress College Outcomes Assessment and Review Cycle Plan

CR 1.2 - Cypress College Follow-Up Report in Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation, March 1, 2019

CR 1.3 - Cypress College Department Planning and Program Review Form

CR 1.4 - Cypress College Student Services Program Review Form

CR 1.5 - Cypress College Campus Services Program Review Form

CR 1.6 - Cypress College One-Time Funding Request Form 2021-22

CR 1.7 - Cypress College Full-Time Faculty Position Request Form

CR 1.8 - Cypress College Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation template

CR 1.9 - Cypress College Mandatory Flex Day Activity Proposal examples, 2019-2021

CR 1.10 - Cypress College Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee Minutes examples, 2020-2021

CR 1.11 - Collective Bargaining Agreement Between NOCCCD and Adjunct Faculty United Local 6106 AFT/AFL/CIO, 2018-2021

CR 1.12 - Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee Meeting Minutes, March 15, 2018

CR 1.13 - Cypress College CSLO Status Reports Fall 2017 through Fall 2020

CR 1.14 - Cypress College Assessing SLOs through eLumen instructions

CR 1.15 - Frequently Asked Questions about CSLOs and CSLO Assessment

CR 1.16 - Jennifer Coopman, SLO Coordinator, CSLO Completion Reminder email, December 9, 2020

CR 1.17 - Cypress College Instructional Program Review Annual Report 2019-20

CR 2.1 - Cypress College Follow-Up Report in Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation, March 1, 2019

CR 2.2 - ACCJC, Compliance and Reaffirmation letter, June 28, 2019

CR 3.1 - Silvie Grote, Curriculum Committee Chair, Curriculum Software emails, October 18, 2018; April 8,2019

CR 3.2 - Jennifer Coopman, Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee Chair, SLOs in Syllabi Reminder emails

CR 3.3 - Cypress College Finding Active CSLOs in CurricUNET

CR 3.4 - Frequently Asked Questions about CSLOs and CSLO Assessment

CR 3.5 - Cypress College Student Learning Outcomes webpage screenshots

CR 3.6 - Cypress College Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee Minutes examples, 2020-2021

CR 3.7 - Eldon Young, Dean, Language Arts Division, SLO Processes Zoom Meeting email, April 15, 2021

CR 3.8 - Student Learning Outcomes Report, Fall 2021

CR 3.9 - Jennifer Coopman, Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee Chair, New/Revised CSLOs Effective Fall 2021, July 19, 2021
CR 3.10 - Lee Douglas, Vice President, Instruction, SLOs in Syllabi emails February 7, 2021; February 9, 2021
CR 3.11 - SLO in Syllabus Processes draft 4
CR 4.1 - Alexander Porter, Vice President, Student Administrative Services, Budget Process email November 21, 2019
CR 4.2 - Matt Ceppi, Administrative Services Consultant, Budget Workshops email, May 1, 2019
CR 4.3 - Cypress College One-Time Funding Process Memo 2019-2020
CR 4.4 - Cypress College One-Time Funding Request Form, 2019-2020
CR 4.5 - Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee One-Time Funding Assessment Form, 2019-20
CR 4.6 - Alexander Porter, Vice President, Student Administrative Services, One-time Funding Requests email, February 21, 2020
CR 4.7 - Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee Meeting Minutes, December 3, 2020
CR 4.8 - Cypress College Full-Time Faculty Position Request Form
CR 5.1 - Cypress College Governance webpage screenshots
CR 5.2 - Cypress College Academic Senate webpage screenshots
CR 5.3 - Cypress College Website, Employees Tab screenshot
CR 5.4 - Marbelly Jiram, Curriculum Specialist, Curriculum Agenda and Minutes email examples
CR 5.5 - Cypress College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, February 25, 2021
CR 5.6 - Cypress College How to Take Minutes Template for Training
CR 5.7 - JoAnna Schilling, President, Meeting Minutes for Shared Governance Committees email, August 25, 2021
DR 1.1 - NOCCCD Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Continuous Review Cycle
DR 1.2 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, September 25, 2018
DR 1.3 - NOCCCD District Consultation Council Meeting Summary, April 22, 2019
DR 1.4 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, April 23, 2019
DR 1.5 - NOCCCD Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Review Cycle Tracking, April 26, 2021
DR 2.1 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, September 25, 2018
DR 2.2 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, May 28, 2019
DR 2.3 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, June 23, 2020
DR 2.4 - NOCCCD District Consultation Council Meeting Agenda, October 26, 2020
DR 2.5 - NOCCCD District Consultation Council Meeting Summary, October 26, 2020
DR 2.6 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Agenda, November 24, 2020
DR 2.7 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, November 24, 2020 must add
DR 2.8 - NOCCCD Board Policy 2740 - Board Professional Development
DR 2.9 - NOCCCD Board of Trustees Professional Development Participation, September 14, 2021
DR 3.1 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, November 13, 2017
DR 3.2 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, February 12, 2018
DR 3.3 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, May 14, 2018

DR 3.4 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, August 12, 2019

DR 3.5 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, October 14, 2019

DR 3.6 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, December 9, 2019

DR 3.7 - NOCCCD Accreditation Finance and Facilities Write-up, November 2020

DR 3.8 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, July 13, 2020

DR 3.9 - NOCCCD Proposed Budget and Financial Report 2020-21

DR 3.10 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, December 14, 2020

DR 3.11 - NOCCCD Budget Allocation Model Forum screenshot, December 10, 2020

DR 3.12 - NOCCCD Budget Allocation Model Forum, December 10, 2020: Video Link

DR 3.13 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, October 12, 2020

SLO.1 - Cypress College Flex Agenda Proposal examples 2019-2020

SLO.2 - Cypress College Associate Degree and Certificate Assessment Plan (ADCAP) Survey

SLO.3 - Cypress College Instructional Program Review SLO examples

SLO.4 - Cypress College Disability Support Services Program Review 2019

SLO.5 - Jennifer Coopman, Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee Chair, Data Entry Reminder email examples, 2020-2021

SLO.6 - Cypress College Frequently Asked Questions about CSLOs and CSLO Assessment

SLO.7 - Cypress College Finding Active CSLOs in CurricUNET

SLO.8 - Cypress College SLO Committee Meeting Minutes, November 2, 2020

SLO.9 - Cypress College SLO Committee Meeting Minutes, March 1, 2021

SLO.10 - Cypress College Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation template

SLO.11 - Alexander Porter, Vice President, Administrative Services, Cypress College One-Time Funding Process for 2019-2020 Memo, February 21, 2020

ISS.1 - ACCJC Annual Report 2021

ISS.2 - Cypress College Guided Pathways From Version 1.0 To Version 2.0 DHSI Title V Grant Kickoff, Completion Team slides, November 1, 2019

ISS.3 - Cypress College Guided Self-Placement screenshots

ISS.4 - Cypress College Impacts of AB 705 Implementation One-Year Throughput Rates, Course Success Rates, and Racial Equity, 2019-20

ISS.5 - NOCCCD, North Orange Promise webpage screenshots

ISS.6 - Cypress College President Advisory Cabinet Meeting Minutes, February 25, 2021

ISS.7 - Auto-Awarding using Degree Works Meeting Summary, March 23, 2021

ISS.8 - Gabrielle Stanco, District Director, Research, Planning, and Data Management, Degree Works Training email, June 14, 2021

ISS.9 - Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee Meeting Minutes, November 19, 2020

ISS.10 - Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee Meeting Minutes, December 3, 2020

ISS.11 - Cypress College President Advisory Cabinet Meeting Minutes, December 10, 2020

ISS.12 - Cypress College Institutional Effectiveness Report 2020-2021

ISS.13 - Eileen Haddad, Interim Director, Institutional Research and Planning, Cypress College 2021 Community Report email, April 9, 2021

ISS.14 - Cypress College Institutional Research and Planning Office Institutional Effectiveness Reports webpage screenshot

QFE1.1 - Cypress College Outcomes Assessment and Review Cycle Plan COA Plan

QFE1.2 - Cypress College Program Review Cycle Schedules 2018 - 2026

QFE1.3 - ACCJC External Evaluation Report, November 28, 2017
QFE1.4 - Cypress College President Advisory Cabinet Minutes, March 25, 2021
QFE1.5 - Cypress College Student Services Program Review Rubric
QFE1.6 - Cypress College Digital Catalog 2021-22, Institutional and Program Student Learning Outcomes webpage screenshots
QFE1.7 - Cypress College Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation template
QFE1.8 - Cypress College One-Time Funding Request Form 2021-2022
QFE1.9 - Cypress College Full-Time Faculty Position Request Form Faculty Request
QFE1.10 - Collective Bargaining Agreement Between NOCCCD and Adjunct Faculty United Local 6106 AFT/AFL/CIO, 2018-2021
QFE1.11 - Cypress College Instructional Program Review Annual Report 2020-2021
QFE1.12 - Cypress College Guided Pathways From Version 1.0 To Version 2.0 DHSI Title V Grant Kickoff, Completion Team slides, November 1, 2019
QFE1.13 - Cypress College President Advisory Cabinet Minutes, December 10, 2020
QFE1.14 - Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee Meeting Minutes, April 15, 2021
QFE2.1 - Cypress College Distance Education Plan 2017-2023
QFE2.2 - Cypress College Distance Education Program Review 2021
QFE2.3 - Distance Education Guidelines 2019
QFE2.4 - Cypress College Class Schedule, Fall 2020
QFE2.5 - Cypress College Class Schedule, Spring 2021
QFE2.6 - Treisa Cassens, Dean, Library, Learning Resource Centers, and Distance Education, Catalog vs Schedule Language email, March 18, 2021
QFE2.7 - Cypress College Fall Distance Education Student Satisfaction Survey, 2016
QFE2.8 - Cypress College Regular and Substantive Interaction Policy for Distance Education Courses
QFE2.9 - Cypress College Employee Telecommuting Survey
QFE2.10 - Cypress College Student Needs with Remote Instruction
QFE2.11 - Cypress College Student Needs for Fall 2020 Remote Instruction
QFE2.12 - Cypress College Fall 2020 Student Needs Survey Results
QFE2.13 - Kathleen McAlister, Distance Education Coordinator, Surveys email, March 9, 2021
QFE2.14 - Cypress College Academic Senate Minutes, January 28, 2021
QFE2.15 - Cypress College President Advisory Cabinet Minutes, March 25, 2021
QFE3.1 - NOCCCD Proposed Budget and Financial Report 2020-21
QFE3.2 - Cypress College Institutional Self Evaluation Report, 2017
QFE3.3 - NOCCCD Proposed Budget and Financial Report 2019-20
QFE3.4 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, April 8, 2019
QFE3.5 - NOCCCD Council on Budget and Facilities Meeting Summary, November 2, 2020

Appendix B: Acronym Page

Accreditation Compliance and Recommendation Committee .... ACRC
Adjunct Faculty United .... AdFac
Administrative Service Outcomes .... ASOs
Administrative Unit Outcomes .... AUOs
Associate Degree and Certificate Assessment Plan .... ADCAP
California School Employees Association .... CSEA
Campus Services Program Review .... CSPR
College Outcomes Assessment .... COA
Council on Budget and Finance .... CBF
Course Student Learning Outcomes .... CSLOs
Distance Education .... DE
District Consultation Council .... DCC
District Management Association .... DMA
Institution Set Standards .... ISS
Institutional Student Learning Outcomes .... ISLOs
Instructional Program Review .... IPR
North Orange County Community College District .... NOCCCD
Planning and Budget Committee .... PBC
Plans for Improvement .... PFI
President Advisory Cabinet .... PAC
Program Student Learning Outcomes .... PSLOs
Quality Focus Essay .... QFE
Recommendations for Improvement .... RFI
Regular and Substantive Interaction .... RSI
Student Service Student Learning Outcomes .... SSSLOs
Student Services Program Review .... SSPR
United Faculty .... UF