Fall 2015 Planning Symposium Summary

The Fall 2015 Fullerton College Planning Symposium was held August 11, 2015 and brought together 39 members of the college community representing students, classified professionals, faculty, and managers. The half-day activities focused on three major items: 1) the process for Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative goal setting, 2) campus-wide Key Performance Indicators, and 3) campus-wide electronic document warehouse. There was broad participation from those who attended and lively discussions during the symposium activities. Several next steps were identified and will be detailed below.

Process for Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Goal Setting

The California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) and Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) is working as a collaborative team in order to advance the institutional effectiveness of California Community Colleges, significantly reduce the number of accreditation sanctions and audit issues, and enhance the system's ability to serve students effectively. Of chief concern at the planning symposium was discussing how the Fullerton College community will address the goal setting component of the IEPI. Colleges are required to submit goals for all indicators currently identified by the CCCCO. Discussions at the planning symposium highlighted the importance of including members from all campus constituencies, ensuring the college community is fully aware of the indicators and their definitions to have productive discussions about goals, and utilizing the college's existing committee organization structure for the goal setting process rather than create a new level of committee work. To address some of these points, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP) is creating resource documents and workshop presentations to inform college constituencies of the IEPI indicators, data analysis and reporting, and goal setting theory. Additionally, the Planning and Budget Steering Committee, a subcommittee of President's Advisory Council and a shared governance committee, was identified as the group to lead the goal setting process and proceed with ample participation from college students, faculty, classified professionals, and managers. The decision to have PBSC spearhead this effort will be determined at a forthcoming PAC meeting.

Discussion of Key Performance Indicators

Fullerton College has an extensive history using a comprehensive set of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for instructional program review. The Fall 2015 Planning Symposium was a place to review the current indicators, discuss additions or revisions of the indicators, and explore the potential for creating a set of KPIs for non-instructional program review. Planning symposium participants felt the KPIs are useful in the review of instructional programs. Several additions were discussed, including term persistence rates, course completion and course success rates by subpopulations, and disaggregating degrees, certificates, and transfers. Additionally, information beyond the KPIs, such as student motivation and satisfaction as well as student service participation, are desired, and the conversation on how to collect that information and report it will continue campus wide. Regarding non-instructional KPIs, it was understood that student service areas are often so different from each other that it is difficult to determine a set of "standard" indicators. However, it was expressed that if the college can coordinate a set protocol for the documenting of services provided, as well as the participation levels in various programs, then OIRP can begin to analyze and report that information uniformly across non-instructional programs. Currently, OIRP is working with the NOCCCD Information Services department to create a KPI report that is automated and regularly accessible with some of the revisions and additions.

Electronic Document Warehouse

Over the past academic year, the need for a central repository of planning and decision-making documents has become apparent to the Fullerton College community. During the spring semester and over the summer, the college has been in contact with several software providers of electronic recordkeeping systems. While the decision of which software product should be utilized has yet to be decided, and input from all campus constituencies continues to be gathered, it is clearly evident that the need to begin a document collection process is of high priority. This future process will help facilitate the creation of a warehouse of documents for planning, as well as serve as a repository of evidentiary documents for the college accreditation self-evaluation. As a result of valuable input from the college community, OIRP created a guide and process for documenting and warehousing planning documents, with a specific interest in committee documents. This guide was discussed at the symposium, and the feedback was positive. The guide was revised and forwarded to campus committee chairs for implementation. Once the college makes a decision on the software to be used, the process will continue with OIRP serving as the point to upload the documents. The documents will be available on the campus J: drive, and also online once the software is purchased.

Resource Documents

Fullerton College
Fall 2015 Planning Symposium
Agenda
Tuesday, August 11, 2015
9am – 1:30pm
Room 227

9:00am	Welcome and President's Remarks
9:15am	Process for Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Goal Setting
10:15am	Break
10:20am	Fullerton College Key Performance Indicators
11:30pm	Lunch
12:30pm	Electronic Recordkeeping System Update
1:15pm	Closing Remarks

Activity #1: Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Goal-Setting Process

For this activity, work in small groups to discuss the questions. Select a speaker who will report out on the group's conversation at the end of the activity.

1. Imagine you have been employed at FC for less than one year, what information would you need to engage in informed IEPI goal setting?

   o Identify some current resources available to educate and inform campus constituencies.

   o What type of information do campus constituencies need to engage in IEPI goal setting?

2. What can various departments across campus do to inform campus constituencies and engage stakeholders in goal setting?

3. What is the ideal process to gather input from all campus constituencies for IEPI indicators?

   o Provided is a chart with a sample process for IEPI goal setting. Review the process chart and discuss the potential benefits and drawbacks of the process. Are there areas you would change?

Activity #2: Key Performance Indicators Discussion

For this activity, work in small groups to discuss the questions listed below. Select a speaker who will report out on the group's conversation at the end of the activity. For this activity, keep in mind the goal of identifying information everyone can easily understand – information that could be used as a meaningful guide to program planning and evaluation on campus.

1. What information do you find vital to evaluating the performance of instructional programs?

2. What information do you find vital to evaluating the performance of non-instructional programs?

3. Examining FC goals and objectives, what information do programs need to evaluate their progress towards achieving campus-wide goals and objectives?

On a separate sheet we have provided definitions for the current KPIs used in instructional program review. Review and discuss the following:

1. Do they accurately reflect the information programs need for evaluation and planning?
   o Do these definitions make sense?
   o Are there definitions you would revise or change completely?

2. Examining the current list of KPIs, what information is not available that you believe is useful for program evaluation and planning?

3. What opportunities are there to incorporate KPIs for non-instructional programs? What existing information is available that can be provided to these areas?

Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative

Framework of Indicators - Fullerton College

College/District Indicator	Brief Definition	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	5-Year Avg
Student performance and outcomes							
Completion Rate (Scorecard):	Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students starting first time tracked for six years who completed a degree, certificate or transfer-related outcome.						
· College-Prepared	Student's lowest course attempted in Math and/or English was college level	73.5	73.6	72.9	72.2	71.7	72.78
· Unprepared for College	Student's lowest course attempted in Math and/or English was pre-collegiate level	41.2	41.7	41.4	43.9	40.9	41.82
· Overall	Student attempted any level of Math or English in the first three years	49.4	49.9	48.8	50.7	48.5	49.46
Remedial rate (Scorecard):	Percentage of credit students tracked for six years who started below transfer level in English, mathematics, and/or ESL and completed a college-level course in the same discipline.						0.00
· Math	See above	33.9	34.2	35.8	39.1	36.1	35.82
· English	See above	47.9	48.3	49.2	47.9	46.1	47.88
· ESL	See above	42.5	34.2	37.2	34.7	41.3	37.98
Career Technical Education Rate (Scorecard)	Percentage of students tracked for six years who completed more than eight units in courses classified as career technical education in a single discipline and completed a degree, certificate or transferred	56.1	56.4	57.6	58.6	57.2	57.18
Successful course completion (Datamart)	Percentage of students who earn a grade of "C" or better or "credit."	66.5	69.1	70.8	68.1	67.6	68.42
Completion of degrees (Datamart)	Number of associate degrees completed.	1,632	1,404	1,335	1,280	1,240	1378.20
Completion of certificates (Datamart)	Number of Chancellor's Office-approved certificates completed.	268	160	329	289	335	276.20
Number of students who transfer to 4- yr institutions (Datamart)	Number of students who transfer to a four-year institution, including CSU, UC, or private university.	1,863	1,730	1,825	2,085	1,427	1786.00
Accreditation Status							
	Reaffirmed/Warning/Probation/Show Cause/Restoration/	No Action	No Action	Warning	No Action	No Action	
Date of next visit	Informational item - no target collected.	Fall 2017					
Fiscal viability and programmatic compliance with state and federal guidelines							
Salary and Benefits	Salaries and benefits as a percentage of unrestricted general fund expenditures, excluding other outgoing expenditures	89.7	91.2	91.5	89.1	91.6	90.62
Full-Time Equivalent Students	Annual number of full-time equivalent students	19,465	16,667	17,187	20,523	20,152	$ 18,798.80
Annual Operating Excess/(Deficiency)	Net increase or decrease in unrestricted general fund balance	1,506,699	4,670,508	435,226	5,565,382	5,419,569	$ 3,519,476.80
Fund Balance	Ending unrestricted general fund balance as a percentage of total expendi	27.3	27	30.6	28.7	26	27.92
Cash Balance	Unrestricted and restricted general fund cash balance, excluding investme	41,780,041	37,112,295	30,778,549	38,127,531	37,139,145	$ 36,987,512.20
Audit Findings	Modified opinion, material weaknesses, or significant deficiencies as identified in an annual independent audited financial statement	Y					

1 Metric dependent upon external variables (UC and CSU transfer admission policy) and therefore collected as information. Colleges would NOT be expected to identify a goal.

In year one, three years of baseline trend data would be prepopulated and sent to each college by the Chancellor's Office. Each college would use a collegial consultation process to set goals (short term and long term) for the subsequent year and return a spreadsheet to the Chancellor's Office with the goals in June.