

Accreditation Midterm Report

Recommendation 1: Institutionalize Integrated Planning

To fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the college institutionalize its new integrated planning model through a systematic cycle of evaluation, planning, resource allocation, implementation and re-evaluation. Evaluations should be informed by quantitative and qualitative data analysis in both instructional and non-instructional areas. Particular attention should be paid to communication and dialogue about both the process and its results throughout the college (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, IV.A.3, IV.A.5)

Overview

Foothill College's current planning model, first implemented in 2009-10, has become an institutionalized process for planning and resource prioritization. The Planning and Resource Council (PaRC) serves as the main shared governance body, with representatives from all campus constituents, including Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Associated Students of Foothill College (ASFC), Administrative Council and President's Cabinet. The systematic cycle of evaluation, planning, resource allocation, implementation and re-evaluation is an integral aspect of PaRC and, as the centralized body where planning discussions and decisions occur, and whose recommendations are sent to the President, efforts to promote collaboration, dialogue and transparency has become increasingly formalized over the past two planning cycles. Data plays a significant role in guiding discussion at PaRC and in other shared governance settings to ensure that recommendations to the President are evidence-driven. Increased efforts have been made to document these conversations and their results with shared governance participants and with the larger campus community in order to demonstrate transparency and continued efforts to increase institutional effectiveness.

Planning Model Update

The college planning and resource prioritization process is documented in the annual planning calendar, which is posted on the Planning and Resource Council's (PaRC) website. This calendar, which sets the agenda and priorities for the year, is reviewed every summer and presented for approval at the first PaRC meeting in the fall quarter. [CITE Annual PaRC planning calendar] This calendar is aligned with the six-year planning calendar that captures a more extended timeline for key planning processes, including accreditation, SLOs/PLOs, program review, planning and resource prioritization. [CITE FH 6-yr planning calendar] Both documents are publicly available and distributed to the college community so that all constituents are informed of the upcoming agenda items.

As PaRC continues to serve as the centralized organization where planning and resource prioritization discussions occur, these conversations are documented through detailed minutes and posted on the PaRC website, all of which are accessible to any interested constituents. This communication is also used to help with evidence-based decision-making related to planning and resource allocation.

The annual governance survey continues to serve as a primary vehicle to evaluate the College's planning and resource prioritization process. This survey, administered every spring, is open to all College employees and asks a range of questions to determine if the integrated planning process is inclusive, accessible and responsive. For example, the survey asks respondents to identify key elements of the planning process, and to indicate whether they were provided feedback regarding their program review and resource prioritization process. This cycle of improvement continues to be documented and disseminated, as the survey results are used by PaRC to set the agenda for the Integrated Planning and Budget Taskforce (IP&B) that meets during the summer. (EVIDENCE- survey forthcoming)

In the past two cycles, the IP&B focused on revising the program review templates to make them more reflective, emphasizing the dialogue that is occurring and affecting SLOs along with program planning and goals. Many of these changes were initiated based on feedback and conversations that occurs as part of the cycle of improvement as the College constantly evaluates, implements and re-evaluates. (EVIDENCE- IP&B minutes- flesh out? PaRC and IP&B minutes, 12-13 and 11-12?)

Core Mission Workgroups

The continued integration of the core mission workgroups is a key component of the College's integrated planning and budget model. These groups, whose membership is open to the college community, include administrators, faculty, staff and student representatives. The tri-chair leadership of each workgroup (includes an administrator, faculty and staff member) also composes the primary voting membership of PaRC. These core mission workgroups report to PaRC regarding their annual objectives and reflect on their progress over the course of the year (or longer, depending on the objective). PaRC website

One result of this continuous conversation about how the institutional goals are being promoted by the existing core mission workgroups led to the creation of a new workgroup that supports student equity initiatives. Based on feedback and dialogue regarding student equity issues and concerns, the College began a process of examining internal and external data and these discussions were documented in multiple settings beyond PaRC, such as Academic Senate, Classified Senate and Administrative Council. These conversations led to the creation of a student equity task force, culminating in the creation of a student equity workgroup that was approved by PaRC in Fall 2013. This outcome demonstrates the responsiveness of the college's planning process that occurs through a process of evaluation, assessment, reflection, and discussion. (EVIDENCE- minutes) (Aug 27th minutes shows that it was taskforce into work group- cite minutes from PaRC- see Oct 2 PaRC minutes).

Along with their basic skills, transfer and workforce counterparts, these groups provide documentation and support at the college level to inform and advance the institutional goals and to promote institutional-level student learning outcomes (IL-SLOs). These workgroups can develop objectives that address an institutional goal

in different ways. For example, to improve student outcomes (and close the achievement gap), the basic skills, transfer and student equity workgroups applied different approaches focusing on shortening the basic skills pathways; understanding and supporting the educational goals of underserved student groups; and documenting disproportionate impact along various student outcome indicators. {CITE workgroup objectives/reflections from 2013-14 Nov 20th mtg and June 4th 2014} These initiatives rely on metrics, targets and data to document progress toward these objectives.

Given their role and focus on supporting/advancing the institutional goals, the core mission workgroups also serve as a planning group, collaborating on key processes such as revisiting and reaffirming the college vision and institutional goals. These conversations are brought back to PaRC to continue the dialogue with other members of the college community and help further integrate the planning process into a more systematic cycle of evaluation, planning, resource allocation, implementation and re-evaluation. (Cite May 21st PaRC minutes).

Resource Prioritization Process

The resource prioritization process is now fully integrated into the College planning process. While the recommendations culminate in the Operations Planning Committee (OPC) and are approved by PaRC before the President makes the final funding decisions, all resource requests must be documented and included in program review. Discussions occur at the department and/or division levels to prioritize these resource requests. The division deans then submit these prioritized lists to their reporting Vice Presidents, who then compile and further prioritize these requests into one resource request list. As part of the transparency and communication process, the Vice Presidents present their recommendations at PaRC and OPC, allowing for questions and additional inquiry. This document is also available to the college community as it is posted on the resource allocation website. [CITE weblink- to prioritization process..?] Cite PaRC mtg the VP's part and OPC minutes- find dates and cite)

OPC uses the program reviews and its accompanying data as evidence to make resource recommendations and revises its resource prioritization rubric annually to effectively reflect the evolving program review templates. These recommendations are presented at PaRC, allowing for further discussions about the college's funding priorities, especially as it relates to the college mission and institutional goals. After completing its third funding cycle, the OPC continues to reflect and evaluate on the funding process, and makes its recommendations to PaRC by providing feedback to further integrate the planning and resource prioritization process, including suggestions to the program review templates. [CITE PaRC documents from last spring] Cite template from PaRC- approved rubric for OPC) Go to IP&B's cite- OPC and PRC's recommendations for IP&B

Program Review Process: Program Review Committee

One key component that was more recently incorporated into the planning process is the Program Review Committee (PRC), which just completed its second cycle. This shared governance group, which is also organized along a tri-chair model with administrative, faculty and staff representation, evaluates comprehensive program reviews (which occurs on a three-year cycle for all instructional, student service and administrative units). This committee is charged with assessing programs and units to ensure that their program review documents demonstrates currency, relevance, and appropriateness. Additionally, these documents are reviewed for stated goals and outcomes as related to student learning and program effectiveness. (Cite the PRC charge on website)

To help keep the process open and transparent, the PRC develops a rubric documenting how the program reviews are being evaluated. The PRC is required to present their recommendations at PaRC and discussion is encouraged among PaRC members and representatives from the programs being reviewed. This publicly documented dialogue helps the College identify any emerging concerns regarding program planning, use of (or lack of) data in decision-making, and possible program viability issues so that remediation can occur. Note that the remediation process requires that programs meet with their administrator(s) to develop a plan to properly address the area(s) of concern. In the 2013-14 cycle, the PRC cited declining enrollment in Spanish as a possible program viability issue because there might be a possibility that full-time faculty load could not be assigned/satisfied based on the current course offerings. The PRC then updates PaRC regarding all remediation plans and indicates the program's next step in the program review cycle, which can include recommending beginning the discontinuance process, completing another out-of-cycle comprehensive review, or returning the regular program review cycle. (Cite- rubric revision- on PRC's site – Also cite PaRC mtg minutes from April's remediation plan/Apr 28? and the May 21st- update)

As program review documents become an increasingly integrated and central component to the College planning and resource prioritization process, it is also becoming a more transparent process to all college constituents. These documents, along with the PRC's rubrics, are publicly posted and have led programs to document their efforts in ways that are accessible to those outside their unit. [Cite posted PRs and the PRC posted completed rubrics] This result has promoted discussion across programs and interest in how the various instructional and non-instructional units serve students and support their educational goals. Additionally, program review is being viewed as a living and fluid process, one that engages the college community regularly and serves to document how programs and units are serving students effectively. This continuous cycle of evaluation, discussion, implementation and re-evaluation ensures that institutional effectiveness remains a regular focus of the planning dialogue.

The Use of Data

Both quantitative and qualitative data are used in the planning and resource prioritization process, specifically as it relates to evaluation and assessment of institutional effectiveness. Institutional Research & Planning continues to play a key role regarding data dissemination, discussion, and interpretation. One example includes the use of program review data sheets that provide detailed information regarding enrollment, student demographics, and success rates down to course-level detail. Labor market data are also generated to assist with the program review process. Interest in trying to understand the students being served and whether they are being served effectively has led to an increase in institutional research requests as non-instructional units have requested assistance in qualifying or quantifying their students' success. For example, the Transfer Center requested additional demographic data to determine if their outreach efforts needed to be retargeted so that all student population groups were accessing the services needed. [CITE Memo to Transfer Center]

The dialogue resulting from presentations regarding the Student Success Scorecard, student demographic and outcomes data, and external scans provide context and currency to understand how students (demographics, goals, etc.) may be changing over time and considers whether the college has been responding to these changes. [CITE PaRC presentations from 2013-14 for Scorecard; 2012-13 for student demographic/outcomes and external scan PaRC website?

http://www.foothill.edu/president/parc/minutes/parc2012-13/parc120512/FH_students_revisit%20mission2012.pdf

http://www.foothill.edu/president/parc/minutes/parc2012-13/parc020613/External_Environ_2012v3-1.pdf

Note that these discussions do not only occur at PaRC, but also conversations from presentations made at Academic Senate, Classified Senate, ASFC College Council, Administrative Council as well as at the division and department levels. [CITE Various IR presentations, such as CCSSE and also memos, such as ENGL enrollment data] CITE- research project site

Another example where the College reviews data regularly in planning and evaluation is with the establishment and revisiting of the institutional-set standards. Discussion occurs at PaRC to consider the recommendations (by IR) regarding the use of specific metrics and methodology to help establish the institutional-set standards. Programs and units are prompted to discuss these standards as targets related to their own goals, placing their efforts in context on a college level to help determine institutional effectiveness. This annual process serves as a re-evaluation process to ensure that these standards remain current, based on the most recent data and reflect how the College can better serve its students. Cite PaRC presentation for standards – the second read (I did the first read) Early March- or mid

[THESE NOTES MAY BE REPEATIVE--Communication and Dialogue

PaRC discussion and minutes
Use of program review as primary document
Program viability
Resource prioritization
 PaRC—faculty/staff
 OPC—Funding requests (from collegewide funds)
Increase Transparency—posting of program review documents, posting of the PRC and OPC rubrics and recommendations
Program review discussion occur at the department, division and administrative levels, with feedback back to the department/division
Emphasis on dialogue is asked in program review document and in governance survey]

Planning Agendas Update

Standard I.B.7.

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

FH Planning Agenda

Foothill College will continue its efforts to improve assessment of its program reviews and the evaluation mechanisms used in improving instructional and non-instructional programs and services. The college intends to strengthen the assessment of its program reviews by updating the current program review template and adding this functional responsibility to a college governance committee such as the Operations and Planning Committee (OPC). This will ensure a rigorous assessment of program reviews, focused on enhancing student outcomes and promoting program improvement and relevance. Through this process institutional effectiveness can be increased with stronger linkages between program review and planning.

Update

To improve assessment of the program review process and its accompanying documents, the college continues to annually revise and update its program review template, based on feedback from the campus community. In addition to documentation about students served, student learning outcomes and program goals, this process also reflects a closer scrutiny into areas such as institutional-set standards (see 2013-14), student equity (see 2013-14), and online course success (for 2014-15) [CITE program review templates from each year]. The program review process serves as an opportunity for reflection, dialogue and improvement and has expanded beyond the instructional context. In fact, program review process involves the participation of all instructional, student services and administrative units, as all these components actively seek to enhance student outcomes and promote program improvement and relevance [CITE program review 3-yr timeline].

All units are currently on a three-year cycle, completing a comprehensive program review template every third year and an annual template during the years in

between. The assessment of the comprehensive program review documents are conducted by the Program Review Committee (PRC), a shared governance group created in 2012-13 and charged with focusing on the assessment of program units and their viability [CITE link to the PRC website]. The PRC develops a rubric to help evaluate the program review documents and shares their recommendations with PaRC. To ensure this cycle of improvement through dialogue is relevant and improves institutional effectiveness and responsiveness, the PRC uses a “red”, “yellow”, and “green” rating system and requires a remediation process for all programs and units receiving a rating other than “green.” [CITE PRC charge] The remediation process is shared at PaRC with continuing discussion and recommendations for the program’s next cycle. The goal of this process is to ensure stronger linkages between program review and data/evidence-based planning as well as documentation of the dialogue and remediation efforts should there be program viability concerns. As such, the college is not only able to identify when programs or units are encountering challenges but can better document the planning efforts and initiatives undertaken to promote increased student outcomes.

An example of how this process has enhanced dialogue and reflection can be seen in the Student Activities program review document over the last two cycles. The PRC’s review of this student service unit’s program review promoted a broader discussion of whether existing campus events and activities reflect the needs and interests of all students. The process led Student Activities to more actively document and assess student experiences, which allows the unit to demonstrate program effectiveness and responsiveness. [CITE Student Activities program review 2012-13 and 2013-14] Changes in program reviews, citing both last year and this year for student activities

The work of the PRC is also reflexive as it responds to the feedback from both PaRC and the programs and units being reviewed. This group meets after each recommendation cycle to discuss efforts to continually improve and streamline this process [CITE PRC minutes from 2012-13 and 2013-14]. For example, based on the initial feedback from the 2013-14 cycle, the PRC will work more closely with the Integrated Planning & Budget Taskforce (IP&B), which revises the program review templates based on shared governance feedback, to ensure better alignment between the templates and the rubrics.

Standard II.A.1.c.

The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates and degrees; assesses students’ achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.

FH Planning Agenda

The academic senate, along with the Office of Instruction & Institutional Research, will continue to support and enhance the program assessments and a more formalized assessment cycle will be in place by Spring Quarter 2012.

Update

[THIS SECTION IS ROUGH AS I AM NOT SURE WHAT WAS STATED IN RECOMMENDATION 2, WHICH MAY HAVE SOME OVERLAP WITH THIS PLANNING AGENDA.]

As of the 2012-13 planning cycle, Foothill College formalized the program review process to make student learning outcomes a prominent focus, especially as it relates to assessment, dialogue and reflection. With the establishment of the Program Review Committee (PRC), which conducts a review of all programs, services and units participating in a comprehensive program review cycle, a rubric was created, where some of the criteria reviewed included whether the SLO discussion is student-focused and how such dialogue is leading to any changes in course and program-level-SLOs.[CITE 2013-14 PRC rubric]

[MAY NOT BE NEEDED--The implementation of TracDat provides a centralized repository to identify, create, assess and reflect on student learning outcomes (SLOs), which also allows the college to easily track and document how SLO cycle is occurring at the course and program levels.]

Recommendation 2: Student Learning Outcomes

In order to meet the Commission's 2012 expectation for meeting student learning outcomes standards that require the identification and assessment of appropriate and sufficient student learning outcomes, and the use of assessment data to plan and implement improvements to educational quality, the team recommends that the college accelerate the assessment of program-level student learning outcomes, service area outcomes and administrative unit outcomes, and use the results to make improvements. (II.A.1.c, II.A.2.e, II.B.4, II.C.2)

Overview

The 2011 Self-Study documented the initial progress made from 2009 through 2011 in Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (EVIDENCE- self study link). Based on the recommendations from the evaluation team visit in October 2011, which stated that the college should accelerate the assessment of its program-level student learning outcomes, service area student learning outcomes and administrative unit student learning outcomes, Foothill College continued its cycle of assessment (EVIDENCE- cycle) and has made significant progress for continuous quality improvement.

In the three areas identified, the college has progressed in assessment and development of student learning outcomes through training of all faculty and staff and implementation of software, incorporating best practices and leading to improvements of the overall cycle.

Institutional Advancement

Progress has been made in the following areas to address recommendations related to accelerating student learning outcomes.

TracDat was implemented to track SLOs, and training has continued in all areas to address deficiencies with SA-SLOs, AU-SLOs and PL-SLOs. Since 2012, further training has occurred with faculty, staff and administrators to improve their understanding of TracDat and increase levels of participation to all programs. As of the 2012-2013 year, all programs and departments use TracDat to assess their respective SLOs.

All programs, services and administrative units participate in the program review process annually, and one-third of all participants complete a comprehensive program review, which discusses data points and analysis (EVIDENCE- Program review schedule). All program reviews continue to include an annual report of their SLO assessments, indicating goals aligned with these assessments and identifying requests for resources to support those goals. As these completed program reviews move through the cycle, improved documentation of the prioritization phase link resources to program reviews. In 2012-2013, the program review document for Theater Arts was noted to have deficiencies in some areas relating to PL-SLO assessment. The following year, the program review showed considerable

improvement on reporting and institutionalizing the PL-SLO assessments in the department (Cite PRC cite and Theater Arts program review documents).

The program reviews include SA-SLOs, AU-SLOs and PL-SLOs and their respective outcomes, along with detailed narratives about the effectiveness of student learning outcomes. Part of the narrative also asks to address if any changes or improvements have been made through the program review process and the assessment of student learning outcomes. All program reviews are assessed and rated through a rubric approved by PaRC. The rubric rates each program review, looking at among other things, how well student learning outcomes are represented and used to make improvements for students.

All program reviews include a report of their PL-SLO assessments, indicating the goals aligned with these assessments and identifying requests for resources to support those goals. Once a program identifies its resource requests, the program review goes to the division dean for academic programs, and the respective vice president or president for non-academic programs. (Example needed for department developing certificate).

Program Level Student Learning Outcomes

Starting in fall 2013, each academic division plus student services has a representative SLO coordinator. The coordinators offer workshops, trainings and general assistance to faculty and staff in the area of PL-SLO assessment.

Fall 2013 had a professional development workshop open to all faculty and staff in SLO assessment (EVIDENCE- prof develop page). The SLO coordinators met with their divisions on a regular basis and were available to all faculty and staff for assistance with SLO assessment. SLO Coordinators were also at Academic Senate meetings (EVIDENCE- Academic senate mtg agenda/minute links) on a regular basis to provide progress updates and invite program faculty to contact them to arrange individualized help sessions. Communication also took place through the Office of Instruction's quarterly newsletter that are sent to all faculty and posted online. There is a dedicated section to SLO Coordinators in each newsletter (EVIDENCE- newsletter link).

An example can be seen in the Pharmacy Technology department, where specific changes to the program were made based on the program review cycle. In the 2013-2014 year, the program review noted that comparing multiple sources of data pertaining to PL-SLO's, we are able to assess our curriculum and implement changes to the curriculum. The program review went on to note the PL-SLOs not only tied the program more closely to the college mission, but also to the accreditation standards of the American Society of Health System Pharmacists (ASHP). (Cite Pharm program review, p. 20)

Another example of changes due to program level assessments occurred in the Art department. Through assessment, the department rewrote and updated the ART AA degrees and instituted a new ART AT transfer degree in keeping with the overall goals of the college and the State to move towards more transfer friendly curriculum and degrees. These changes enable our students to provide both core curriculum and degrees that are acceptable to the State and to multiple other institutions including higher educational level private art institutions.” (ART program review, page 10). As of Spring 2014, all programs have PL-SLOs in place, and assessments occurred on 100 percent of PL-SLOs for the 2013-2014 year.

Administrative Unit Student Learning Outcomes

The Administrative Unit Student Learning Outcomes were expanded after the self-study was submitted to include Deans along with Vice Presidents. Each assessment cycle allowed each administrative unit the opportunity to review outcome statements, and to revise them to be better aligned with the accreditation standards. AU-SLO assessments were embedded in the program review and in the resource allocation cycle, just like CL-SLOs. All administrative units have completed the most recent cycle of AU-SLO assessment (TracDat AU-SLO report).

Instruction and Institutional Research found that through the AU-SLO assessment that, “The assessment of AU-SLOs is leading to more collaboration with the workgroups, and an emphasis on data driven decisions with regards to curriculum, and other student support services. (I&IR program review). The increased collaboration led to an increased connection and dialogue campus wide, due to the workgroups, which are centered on the college mission. In the time since 2012, all administrative units have had AU-SLOs in place, and all have been assessed (Cite AU-SLO page).

Service Area- Student Learning Outcomes

Service areas completed program reviews with SLOs and assessments embedded in the document.

One example of improvement was noted in the Transfer Center, which has an SA-SLO dedicated to improved student knowledge of transfer information and to increase the number of students who complete at Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG). This led to the creation of TAG workshops, which were increased from the 2012-2013 to 2013-2014 school year. This increase was a noted reason in the Transfer Center program review for a higher number of TAGs filled out by students. (Transfer Center program review, page 5). The assessment of the SA-SLO mentioned that despite a staffing deficit in the center, the number of workshops was adequate for the student population.

As of October 2013, 100 percent of the college’s service areas have identified SA-SLOs, and 98 percent have fully completed the 2012-2013 year of SL-SLO

assessment. This percentage is an increase from 95 percent in the 2011-2012 year. This increase coincides with a dedicated SLO coordinator for student services coming onboard for the first time in Fall 2013. This SLO coordinator was integrated in the cohort of instructional SLO coordinators and held workshops for most services areas on campus.

Recommendation 3: Comparable Support Services

To fully meet the standard, the college must ensure equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable student and learning support services regardless of location or delivery method. (II.B.3, II.B.3.a, II.B.4, II.C.1.c)

Foothill College continues to offer equitable access to student services for students, regardless of location or instructional modality. Currently student support services offered in-person at Middlefield Campus include enrollment services, financial aid, bookstore, basic health services, student activities, general counseling, counseling for students with disabilities, placement testing, accommodated testing, tutoring and outreach (<http://www.foothill.edu/middlefield/services.php>).

In addition to the support services listed above, The Middlefield Campus also offers several Non-Credit English as a Second Language (NCEL) classes for its students, as well as support services for Basic Skills instructors and students such as: registration help; outreach; mentoring; textbook assistance; and career advising. In Winter 2014, Middlefield installed a SARS kiosk, and began offering in collaboration with the Teaching & Learning Center (TLC), reading, writing and grammar support for students on Mondays from 1pm to 7pm and Wednesdays from 1pm to 5pm. Students can receive a 20-minute tutoring session with a faculty tutor on any topic related to their academic coursework. Additionally, there is a conversation/pronunciation group from 1pm to 2pm on Mondays for the non-native speakers determine to improve their fluency. The service is free and tracked through SARS. Middlefield plans to add some Non-Credit Basic Skills (NCBS) courses in math for Fall 2014 and expand TLC tutoring offerings. (Cite evidence-scheduling flyer, etc).

Supplementing these services and providing support for online learners, Foothill offers comprehensive support services online and is continually adding new programs. Topping the list for most usage is ASK Foothill a 24/7 online, on-demand Questions and Answer knowledgebase of close to 1,500 questions and answers (www.foothill.edu.ask). The program is contracted with IntelliResponse and hosted on an off-site server which has not gone down during our entire 4 year contract. The knowledgebase is updated weekly and we have had as many as 13,000 hits per month and currently average 6,800/per month. Students can find most every question they have about Foothill College online and also can escalate their question to a college employee if they do not receive the answer they need.

Student applications, registration, add/drop, payment and all other enrollment functions are provided to all students online, through CCCApply (https://secure.cccapply.org/applications/CCCApply/apply/Foothill_College.html) and My Portal in Banner. We contracted with TouchNet this year to provide online payment plans for college fees, and currently about 600 students are using this online option. Functional online student services aligning with campus in-person programs include eTranscripts, (transcript and enrollment verification requests for last academic year, 25,975 averaging 2,164/month) (<https://www.credentials->

inc.com/tplus/?ALUMTRO001199) Financial Aid TV (unduplicated “hits” 5,695, averaging 475/month) (<http://www.foothill.edu/aid/videos.php>) and Counseling (academic advising) which is scheduled through SARS Grid and can be in-person, by phone, chat or Skype (19,143 appointments made, averaging 1,595/month) (<http://www.foothill.edu/counseling/>). Additionally the counselors have continued to provide current and accurate information on the Online Advising Forum (<http://www.foothill.edu/fga/advisingforums.php>). The Disability Resource Center provides the accommodation process online (<http://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/1608971/Spring-14-Early-Summer-Student-Accommodation-Request-Form>) and DRC counselors can meet with students in-person, by phone, chat or Skype (2,137 accommodation requests submitted online for last academic year, averaging 534/month). Psychological counselors are similarly available. All academic advising is captured in Degree Works (<https://degreeworks.fhda.edu/IRISLink.cgi?SERVICE=SCRIPTER&SCRIPT=SD2WORKS>) an online student education planning tool that both students and counselors have access to and utilize to develop a course of study. Degree Works interfaces with Banner, and thus far 6,843 students have plans in progress online through Degree Works.

Foothill also adopted an online appointment system for placement testing and accommodated testing. Register Blast had 13,302 students make placement testing appointments through their online system (<http://www.registerblast.com/foothill/Home/Page/4>) and disabled students scheduled 2,040 accommodated over the last academic year.

Career services are provided through counselors, and online programs including EUREKA, Internbound, (<https://www.internbound.com/>), InternMatch, (<http://www.internmatch.com/>), LearnUp, (<http://www.learnup.com/>), Career Central Network (<http://www.collegecentralnetwork.com/foothill/>), Smart Hires (<https://www.smarthires.com/>) and AfterCollege (www.aftercollege.com). An extensive selection of free student success workshops are provide through a partnership with Innovative Educators’ Student Lingo series (www.studentlingo.com/foothill). These college success workshops are viewed on average 268 times each month, for a total of 3,216 views last academic year.

We are currently partnering with Innovative Educators to develop an online orientation program that focuses on specific college populations and student needs. This will be operational by Fall 2014.

Foothill is also piloting a new career connection program, Mepedia, (www.mepedia.com)

which *Fast Company Magazine* calls “linked in for the millennials”. We are evaluating K-16 Bridge (<http://www.k16bridge.org/>) as an online career pathways program linking high schools and colleges and are expanding the use of Guidebook, (<https://guidebook.com/>) a free mobile application with all student services information and special event information for access anywhere, anytime.

We also leverage OpenStudy, (<http://openstudy.com/>) free online study groups and are planning to implement Smarthinking (<https://www.smarthinking.com/>) online tutoring this Spring for EOPS students.

Recommendation 4: Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) & Faculty Evaluation

To meet the commission's 2012 expectation for meeting student learning outcomes standards, the team recommends that the college and the Foothill-De Anza Faculty Association work together to incorporate student learning outcomes into the faculty evaluation process. (III.A.1.c)

The District and the Faculty Association renegotiated the faculty evaluation process. Effective Fall Quarter of 2012 faculty are evaluated on their participation in the SLO/SAO processes at both Foothill and De Anza colleges. The new language is in the professional contributions section and applies to all faculty. (4.1: Faculty evaluation form, J1).

Standard III.A.1.d.

The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all its personnel.

FH Planning Agenda

Adopt a written ethics policy for all college and district employees.

Update

Board policy related to “Standards of Ethical Conduct” was approved and adopted on June 20, 2011 [Cite Board Policy 3121 weblink Board website] All Foothill-De Anza Community College District employees are expected to operate in accordance with California state law. Additionally, this obligation requires that all employees are accountable for ethical conduct, avoiding use of their positions for personal gain or private benefit; promoting an atmosphere free from fraud, abuse of authority and misuse of public resources; creating a work environment free from unlawful discrimination and harassment; treating other employees, students and community members with respect and courtesy; and protecting confidential information.

[NOTE: site visit was conducted in October 2011]

Standard III.C.1.b.

The institution provides quality training in the effective application of its information technology to students and personnel.

FH Planning Agenda

The campus will conduct a needs assessment in order to determine specific educational technology training needs. Upon completion of the needs assessment the campus will develop a training plan in coordination with ETS, to prioritize and address the areas of need on campus.

Update

A faculty and classified staff professional development survey was administered in Spring 2013, with specific focus on technology needs and interests. The faculty survey was administered this survey in paper form at meetings for each division, and division deans were provided with a link to the online version of the survey so that they could invite those faculty who could not attend the Division meeting to complete the survey online. The staff survey was administered completely online.

The survey questions explored interest in Software Tools & Online Pedagogy, Foothill Software Tools, and Instructional/Educational Technology. Software Tools & Online Pedagogy (e.g. Microsoft WORD, PowerPoint, Excel; Photoshop; Voicethread; Camtasia, Active learning exercises for online learning; ePortfolios) received a majority of votes (65% among faculty; 79% among staff), followed by Instruction/Educational Technology (e.g. , ETUDES refresher, Online Videoconferencing via CCC Confer; Google Search Tips; Make Your Own Instructional Videos; Twitter; Online Library Resources) among faculty (62%) and Foothill Software Tools among staff (e.g. My Portal; Outlook Calendar; TracDat; Degree Works; Group Studio via My Portal)(61%) [CITE faculty and staff survey results (via surveygizmo). Are the results publicly available?].

The survey results prompted a comprehensive program of faculty and staff development workshops in the 2012-13 year, which included training opportunities and seminars focusing on areas such as Banner training, portal training, training in using the Argos research tool and workshops on common software tools [CITE professional development calendar]. These assessment and programming efforts are also documented in the Technology Master Plan update. [CITE Tech Task Force update, April 11, 2014]?

Meetings between the Dean of Foothill Global Access and the Vice Chancellor of Technology are planned in the coming year to discuss a coordinated plan with ETS to continue the process of prioritizing the areas of need for Foothill College. Ask Pam – meetings? Minutes? Is there evidence or will be?