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PREFACE

Overview

This manual is the functional policy document for Santa Fe’s approach to Institutional Effectiveness (IE). The Institutional Effectiveness Manual, Revised Fifth Edition serves two main purposes:

1. To define and depict Institutional Effectiveness for the College
2. To establish the charge to the Resource and Planning Council (RPC), which is the comprehensive, organizational entity for the integration of planning and resource allocation at Santa Fe

The manual contains policy and procedures used at the “college level” and “unit level” to assess the College’s institutional effectiveness to include comprehensive substantive change procedures and to assess student learning outcomes. Moreover, this manual demonstrates how Santa Fe’s commitment to institutional effectiveness supports our mission.

Quality delivery and authentic assessment of student learning is the major focus for all academic, administrative, and educational support units. This manual identifies those units and defines the procedures employed for all planning and assessment. To ensure its relevance, this manual is periodically updated with the most current information to assist and guide practitioners through the IE process at Santa Fe College.

History of the Santa Fe IE Manual

The original Institutional Effectiveness Manual published in 2000 replaced the Strategic Planning Process for Institutional Effectiveness, A Practitioners Guide that was published in 1993. In 2001, the Southern Association for Institutional Research (SAIR) awarded Santa Fe “Best Planning Document, First Place” for our Institutional Effectiveness Manual. In 2004, Santa Fe was highlighted along with its IE Manual as one of only five colleges with “Distinguishing Features Used as Best Practices” by Florida’s Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education during its Level III review of all 28 colleges’ Level II Program Review internal institutional processes.
Further Information

More information about planning and assessment at Santa Fe is available via the Institutional Effectiveness, Research & Planning files and publications in the SACS Resource Room of the Alan J. Robertson Administration Building.
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BACKGROUND

Santa Fe College has a long history of employing strategic planning as a means for demonstrating institutional effectiveness. Since 1985, the strategic planning processes at the College have centered on five-year planning cycles and one-to-three-year operational plans. Students, the academic community, local industry, and community needs have guided the revision process of the College’s Mission Statement, values, college goals, initiatives, and college strategies upon which the strategic plan is based.

The Santa Fe Mission Statement was revised in spring 2010 and incorporated into the College’s current Strategic Plan, 2010-2015

Since 1996, the College has worked toward refining its institutional effectiveness planning system to be more centrally coordinated, comprehensive, participative, and responsive to the needs of the College. It currently does so at two levels:

1. The College Level: The latest strategic plan and its accompanying “Initiatives” bring about these improvements to demonstrate institutional effectiveness at the college level and accompanying strategic initiatives.

At the college level, the College has instituted the Resource & Planning Council (RPC) to evaluate the viability of the proposed strategic initiatives as means to realize the College’s Mission and Goals.
2. **The Unit Level**: The strategic plan continues to follow the five-year cycle and is operationalized through integrated planning and resource allocation on an annual cycle with assessment conducted at the unit level. Units include educational programs, academic discipline areas, educational support services, administrative support services, and programs associated with research and service projects.

At the unit level, the College has developed a planning and assessment system to systematically evaluate instructional programs as well as administrative and educational support services. Each planning unit links its planning and assessment processes back to the College’s Mission, Goals, and Strategic Initiatives.

The College checks the pulse of its institutional effectiveness processes by:

1. Developing planning unit SMART objectives (assessment plan and resource request).
2. Reviewing how the assessment results are used (outcome achievement and continuous improvement).
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INTRODUCTION

The SACS-COC, Resource Manual for the Principles of Accreditation speaks to the general expectations for Institutional Effectiveness (IE). In addition, it gives overarching direction (non-prescriptive) intended to stimulate thinking when assessing compliance with the Core Requirement (CR) 2.5, Institutional Effectiveness, and Comprehensive Standard (CS) 3.3.1, Institutional Effectiveness.

Santa Fe College’s IE Manual includes excerpts from the SACS-COC Resource Manual at key points to underscore the correlation between those guidelines and the College’s IE policy and procedure. Excerpts are liberally employed with bolding/underlining added for emphasis:

Institutional effectiveness is the systematic, explicit, and documented process of measuring performance against mission in all aspects of an institution. The purpose of this Core Requirement is to assure that the institution has an appropriate approach to effectiveness that supports its mission.

CR 2.5 Institutional Effectiveness

The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that

(1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes;

(2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and

(3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission.

A commitment to continuous improvement is at the heart of an ongoing planning and evaluation process. It is a continuous, cyclical process that is participative, flexible, relevant, and responsive. The approach to institutional effectiveness includes all programs, services, and constituencies and is strongly linked to the decision-making process at all levels, including the institution’s budgeting process.

With this context of IE from SACS-COC, Santa Fe College’s approach to institutional effectiveness includes:

1. The periodic review of the mission and IE processes (within this manual)
2. The commitment of College leadership to integrate planning and resource allocation with continuous improvement
3. The documentation of the evidence for all these integrated, linked processes

**NOTE:** Even though the concept of institutional effectiveness may not be explicitly referenced in all of the SACS-COC Comprehensive Standards, the compliance certification process assumes that all programs and services, wherever offered within the context of Santa Fe College’s activities, are reviewed as part of the institutional effectiveness processes. A critical connection must be made between CR 2.5 and CS 3.3.1 as both relate directly to institutional effectiveness, but each addresses a different aspect:

- CR 2.5 requires that Santa Fe has an effective process for continuous improvement and mission accomplishment.
- CS 3.3.1 requires that Santa Fe identify outcomes (resulting from the process required in CR 2.5), assesses outcomes achievement, and demonstrates improvement based on analysis and use of the results. In addition to applying to all SF academic programs, this CS also applies to all administrative and educational support programs.

We are obligated to demonstrate that Santa Fe accomplishes its goals and objectives in a systematic, process-oriented way. And so, institutional effectiveness is about planning to validate mission and goals, assessing outcomes and objectives, and ultimately, it is about demonstrating improvement. In addition, when Santa Fe College significantly modifies or expands the scope of its mission and/or programs (e.g. opening a new site or initiating new baccalaureate degree programs); the College is responsible to notify the Commission:

- CS 3.12.1 requires that Santa Fe notify the Commission of changes in accordance with the substantive change policy and, when required, seek approval prior to the initiation of changes.

This *Institutional Effectiveness Manual, Revised Fifth Edition*, presents Santa Fe College’s institutional effectiveness (IE) process with all its components; each of its chapters focuses on specific and relevant procedures and guidance to implement the IE process.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview

The Institutional Effectiveness Manual is the functional policy document for Santa Fe’s approach to Institutional Effectiveness (IE). IE is the systematic, explicit, and documented process of measuring performance against mission in all aspects of an institution. Moreover, IE is about (1) planning to realize mission and goals, (2) assessing outcomes and objectives, and, (3) ultimately, demonstrating improvement.

To meet certain state, federal, and SACS-COC (The Commission) requirements for accreditation, the College is obligated to demonstrate that it accomplishes its IE goals and objectives in a systematic, process-oriented way. In short, this manual provides the College with a means to meet these obligations for implementation and assessment of its IE policy and procedure for continuous improvement.

Relative to this goal, this manual serves two main purposes:

1. To define and depict IE policy and procedure for the College
2. To establish the charge to the Resource and Planning Council (RPC), which is the comprehensive, organizational entity for the integration of planning and resource allocation at SF

In doing so, this manual contains policy and procedures used at the “college level” and “unit level” to assess the College’s IE, including (1) the procedures for reporting substantive change and (2) the assessment of student learning outcomes. Moreover, this manual demonstrates how Santa Fe’s commitment to IE supports our mission:

In keeping with our values and goals, Santa Fe College, a comprehensive public institution of higher education serving North Central Florida and beyond, adds value to the lives of our students and enriches our community through excellence in teaching and learning, innovative educational programs and student services, and community leadership and service.
Implementation

The College’s approach to IE includes:

1. The periodic review of mission and IE processes
2. The commitment of College leadership to integrate planning and resource allocation with continuous improvement
3. The documentation of the evidence for all these integrated, linked processes

In addition, when Santa Fe College significantly modifies or expands the scope of its mission and/or programs (e.g. opening a new site or initiating new baccalaureate degree programs), the College is responsible to notify the Commission. Additional points relevant to the implementation of the IE process are featured in the synopsis of the manual’s chapters at the end of this executive summary. The Santa Fe College Model of Integrated Institutional Effectiveness represents this process visually (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Santa Fe College Model of Integrated Institutional Effectiveness
**Delivery and Assessment**

The major focus for all academic, administrative, and educational support units is **direct and indirect support of student learning**. This manual identifies the units and defines the procedures employed for all planning and assessment. To ensure its relevance, this manual is periodically updated with the most current information including substantive change policy to assist and guide practitioners through the IE process at Santa Fe College.

At the unit level, the College has developed a planning and assessment system to systematically evaluate instructional programs as well as administrative and educational support services. Each unit links its planning and assessment processes back to the mission statement, college goals, and strategic initiatives of the College. The College checks the pulse of its institutional effectiveness processes by (1) developing unit SMART objectives (integrated assessment plan and resource request) and (2) reviewing how the assessment results are used for outcome achievement and continuous improvement.

Santa Fe’s commitment to continuous improvement and innovation is at the heart of College’s ongoing IE process. IE at Santa Fe is based on two primary, continuous cycles (strategic and operational) which are **participative, flexible, relevant**, and **responsive** to the community served. Linked to decision-making at all levels, the College’s approach to IE includes all programs, services, and constituencies.

**Leadership for Institutional Effectiveness at SF**

The strategic planning process is cyclical, comprehensive, and integrates planning and resource allocation with appropriate assessment. Each summer at the Leadership Team Workshop, the President’s Staff (President, Provost, Vice Presidents, and Associate VP for College and Community Relations) identifies a set of “strategic initiatives” based on issues surfaced by the RPC and a thorough review of data analyses and key performance indicators. These **Strategic Initiatives** specify the actions the President’s Staff believes are important to achieve the **College goals** and realize the College’s **Mission Statement**. Each fall, the progress on the **Strategic Initiatives** is carried forward to the RPC which fosters further development college-wide with the ultimate goal of supporting those initiatives identified as most feasible within existing resources.
Synopsis of Individual Chapters in *The IE Manual*

The chapters of this *IE Manual* present the College’s IE process with all its components as well as procedures and guidance for implementation. The following list summarizes each chapter in the manual:

### CHAPTER 1: Santa Fe’s Institutional Effectiveness Process and the Principles of Accreditation.

The College meets its commitment to IE primarily through:

- The President’s Annual Retreat
- The Resource and Planning Council (RPC)
- The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP in topic development stage)
- SMART objectives
- Strategic Initiatives and Goals

To demonstrate IE in accountable terms as systematic, ongoing, integrated, and research-based, Santa Fe College’s IE process blends master and strategic planning at the College-level with the Planning Unit-level focused on objective development and resource allocation. The *Santa Fe College Model of Integrated Institutional Effectiveness* is introduced in this chapter to illustrate the interconnections between four overarching system components of Inputs, Processes, Outcomes, and Impacts as supported by College resources which include oversight, procedures, systems and process owners.

### CHAPTER 2: Strategic Planning

The strategic planning process is cyclical, comprehensive, and integrates planning and resource allocation with appropriate assessment. Each year, the President’s Staff identifies a set of “strategic initiatives” based on issues surfaced by the RPC and a thorough review of data analyses and key performance indicators. These *Strategic Initiatives* specify the actions the President’s Staff believes are important to achieve the College goals. In this process, Planning Units conduct annual planning, evaluation, and assessment relevant to accomplishing these College goals. The planning basis for SF’s IE processes is strategic planning with the end product being realized as the current, five-year *Santa Fe College Strategic Plan 2010-2015* document.
CHAPTER 3: The Master Planning Process (5+ Years)

The College follows the categorical taxonomy of planning for higher education: (a) Academic Planning, (b) Resource Planning, and (c) Facility Planning. Such planning encompasses aspects as diverse as Student Support Services, Human Resources, and new construction and implementation of learning technologies.


The RPC carries forward the initiatives of the President’s Staff regarding future directions and priorities that ensue from these IE processes. The RPC focuses on the integration of budgetary needs with a matched emphasis on planning and assessment as the basis for decision-making at the College. These budget and resource allocation activities, as integrated with unit planning, serve as the implementation phase of the overall IE process. The Santa Fe College Strategic Plan 2010-2015 is designed to carry forward all integrated budget and planning actions for the next five years and is aligned with the next SACS-COC decennial visit slated for 2012.

CHAPTER 5: The Unit Planning (Annual)

Unit planning activities, as integrated with budget and resource allocation, serve as the operational phase of the overall IE process. Procedures for this phase of planning are defined in this chapter. Moreover, this chapter closes the loop on the planning unit processes in support of internal goals and objectives as well as any objectives which may link to specific Strategic Initiatives.

CHAPTER 6: Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Process

This chapter outlines the process for assessing student learning outcomes for both the College’s General Education package and Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs. The assessment ranges from the micro perspective of individual faculty assessing the effectiveness of curriculum to a macro level assessment of college-level general education competencies and the extent to
which graduates have attained them. This process leads the College to an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) to identify key issues for broad-based improvement of student learning and support for students.

CHAPTER 7: Discipline/Program Review for Instructional Units

This chapter provides guidance, procedures, and templates for instructional units to use as they pursue their planning and program review process every three years.

CHAPTER 8: Program Review for Administrative/Educational Support Units

This chapter provides guidance, procedures, and templates for non-instructional units to use as they pursue their planning and program review process every three years.

CHAPTER 9: Performance Management Process

This chapter associates the employment performance management process to institutional effectiveness, in particular goal-setting and assessment elements, at the institution.
SACS-COC defines institutional effectiveness this way:

**CR 2.5, Institutional Effectiveness**

The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that...
(1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes;
(2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and
(3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission.

Institutional effectiveness is the systematic, explicit, and documented process of measuring performance against mission in all aspects of an institution. The purpose of SACS-COC Core Requirement (CR) 2.5, Institutional Effectiveness, is to assure that Santa Fe College has an appropriate approach to effectiveness that supports our mission. Santa Fe College’s mission is:

_In keeping with our values and goals, Santa Fe College, a comprehensive public institution of higher education serving North Central Florida and beyond, adds value to the lives of our students and enriches our community through excellence in teaching and learning, innovative educational programs and student services, and community leadership and service._

Santa Fe’s commitment to continuous improvement and innovation is at the heart of our ongoing planning and assessment—Institutional Effectiveness (IE) process. The College’s IE is based on a continuous cycle which is participative, flexible, relevant, and responsive to the community we serve. The College’s approach to IE includes all programs, services, and constituencies and is linked to decision-making at all levels and across all units.
Integration of Institutional Effectiveness across All Units
A comprehensive institutional effectiveness planning and evaluation process was developed at the College as an on-going, integrated, institution-wide, research-based process which accomplishes three goals:

1. Incorporates a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes.
2. Results in continued improvement in institutional quality.
3. Demonstrates that the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission.

This process has been in effect since the Fifth-Year Interim Report in 2008 and has evolved into a sustainable, comprehensive planning and assessment process since the Level II substantive change on-site visit in February 2010.

Graphic Model of the Institutional Effectiveness Process
The institutional effectiveness process is now best portrayed through a graphic model entitled “Santa Fe College Model of Integrated Institutional Effectiveness” (Figure 2).

Figure 2: Santa Fe College Model of Integrated Institutional Effectiveness
Full support for the model is detailed in this updated fifth edition of the *SF Institutional Effectiveness Manual*. The model delineates the appropriate linkages through processes which fully integrate both academic and non-instructional program review with streamlined efficiencies in both oversight and evaluation for sufficiency and ultimately the use of results for improvement. This latest edition of the *IE Manual* serves as the College’s actionable document with comprehensive process and procedures for planning, budgeting, and assessing results for continued improvement.

In addition to refinements and deliberate process improvements to fully integrate all processes, the College made a significant commitment in resources, both monetary ($10,845 for 2010-11, with $8,995 for annual renewals) and personnel development by funding and implementing Concord USA’s Xitracs Accreditation Management System. The implementation of this system will reduce redundancy in processes while strengthening linkages between the Strategic Initiatives and planning unit SMART objectives; doing so enables the College to concentrate more on results and the use of results than on process.

The Santa Fe College Model of Integrated Institutional Effectiveness illustrates the interconnections between four overarching system components of Inputs, Processes, Outcomes, and Impacts as shown at the top of the chart (*Figure 2*). These four components serve to guide the College’s integration of institutional effectiveness processes at all levels of the institution. The model depicts two tiers which address all of the elements of the model, the relationships among the inputs, and processes to arrive at outcomes and impacts:

| Tier 1 |
The first tier, Integrated Institutional Effectiveness Processes, begins with the mission and goals of Santa Fe College demonstrating a mission-focused process. The model outlines five distinct but interrelated processes:

1. **Strategic Planning** (Chapter 3)
2. **Master Planning** (Chapter 2)
3. **Program Review** (Chapters 6 and 7)
4. Student Learning Outcomes (**SLO**) **Assessment** (Chapter 8)
5. **Unit Planning** (Chapters 5 and 9)

These five interrelated processes drive to outcomes and impacts College-wide.
Tier 2

The second tier, Resources-Oversight-Systems-Procedures-Process Owners, addresses the integration of resources and operating practices as the framework for how the institution actually accomplishes its mission and pursues continuous improvement. The Santa Fe College Model of Integrated Institutional Effectiveness is outlined below.

Extending to all college work units, the College’s institutional effectiveness process integrates:
1. Strategic planning and effectiveness
2. Annual planning and assessment
3. Student learning outcome assessment
4. Program review for academic and non-instructional programs/units.

Resources: Oversight, Procedures, Systems, and Process Owners
The Santa Fe College Model of Integrated Institutional Effectiveness (Figure 2) illustrates the interconnections between all resources to include oversight, procedures, systems and process owners as shown in the second tier. The Resources-Oversight-Systems-Procedures-Process Owners’ tier addresses the integration of resources and operating practices as the framework for how the institution actually accomplishes its mission and pursues continuous improvement.

The President’s Staff
The President’s Staff (President, Provost, Vice Presidents, and Associate VP for College and Community Relations) conduct a retreat in August each year. Data and performance indicators are reviewed for the previous year. Internal and external environmental factors are considered for impacts on current programs and services as well as initiatives under consideration. As the logical outcome to this process, the Strategic Initiatives are conceptualized/drafted/reviewed for subsequent implementation by the Resource and Planning Council, other constituents including the College Senate and its committees (Curriculum Committee, etc.), Career Service Council, the District Board of Trustees (DBOT), etc., and the College as a whole.

The Resource and Planning Council (RPC)
The Resource and Planning Council (RPC) is charged by the President with the responsibility to integrate Santa Fe’s budget and planning functions through the
development and maintenance the College’s IE formal process as executed through this IE Manual. The College has a number of internal and external planning constituents to engage. Figure 2 illustrates the context for these constituents and stakeholders. The RPC is empowered to make decisions about the planning and budgeting functions and carries forward the initiatives of the President’s Staff regarding future directions and priorities that ensue from these IE processes.

Overview of IE Process’s Blending of Master and Strategic Planning
Santa Fe College’s IE process blends master and strategic planning at the College-level with the Planning Unit-level focused on objective development and resource allocation. The College does so to demonstrate IE in accountable terms, as a systematic, ongoing, integrated, and research-based process that affects all aspects of the College’s operations. This integration is best illustrated by two examples:

1. The revision of the College’s Mission Statement
2. The consequential revision of the College’s Strategic Plan

Revision of the College’s Mission Statement
At the college-level, master planning and strategic planning embrace the College’s current mission statement.

Referencing Core Requirement 2.4 and Comprehensive Standard 3.1, the College last began a review of its mission statement in February 2010.

**CR 2.4 Institutional Mission**
The institution has a clearly defined, comprehensive, and published mission statement that is specific to the institution and appropriate for higher education. The mission addresses teaching and learning and, where applicable, research and public service.

**CS 3.1, Institutional Mission**
3.1.1 The mission statement is current and comprehensive, accurately guides the institution’s operations, is periodically reviewed and updated, is approved by the governing board, and is communicated to the institution’s constituencies.

Over several meetings, the RPC as a whole explored and generated alternative formulations based on the principles of specificity. Having identified the most
viable alternatives, the RPC voted to make the following statement the College’s new mission statement:

In keeping with our values and goals, Santa Fe College, a comprehensive public institution of higher education serving North Central Florida and beyond, adds value to the lives of our students and enriches our community through excellence in teaching and learning, innovative educational programs and student services, and community leadership and service.

The RPC felt that this mission statement:

1. Satisfies the SACS Principles which require a mission statement to be “specific to the institution.”
2. Clearly defines the College’s unique role as an institution of higher learning as required by the Principles.
3. Meets the requirement in the Principles that mission statements address teaching, learning, and public service.

Following this selection by the RPC during its March 25, 2010 meeting, the College’s new mission statement was vetted in a variety of venues, beginning with the President’s Staff. The RPC received President’s Staff Review of the Updated Strategic Plan with the new Mission Statement and endorsed a minor change in wording. Subsequently, RPC representatives of the Santa Fe Senate, Career Service Council, and Student Senate presented the revised Mission Statement to their constituents; ultimately, the mission statement was put on the agenda for approval by the Santa Fe District Board of Trustees (DBOT). It was officially adopted during the June 15, 2010 DBOT meeting.

Consequential Revision of the College’s Strategic Plan
In the process of finalizing the updated mission statement, the College also conducted a systematic review of its goals and outcomes; consequently, the College updated its strategic plan as the following sub-sections demonstrate. This updated strategic plan (SF Strategic Plan 2010-2015) includes:

1. The expanded mission statement
2. The college values and goals
3. Three new comprehensive strategic initiatives:
   • Excellence in Teaching and Learning
• Constituent Relationship Management
• Organizational Development

The SF Strategic Plan is fully integrated and supported by all departments through the submission of SMART (Specific, Measurable, Aligned, Realistic, and Time-bound) planning objectives and standards of planning and performance which support the individual strategic initiatives, and/or goals stated in the SF Strategic Plan 2010-2015. Planning and assessment at the unit level serves as the cornerstone of IE at SF. Annual budget requests are developed in parallel to SMART objectives development with assessment to improve educational programs, student learning outcomes (SLO) plus administrative support services, educational support services, as well as public/community service outcomes. This process demonstrates the integration of planning, assessment, and resource allocation that characterizes the IE Process at Santa Fe College as seen in Figure 3.
Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)
Institutional Effectiveness (IE) is also about how Santa Fe College addresses the process of assessment that supports all areas of the institution including student learning outcomes (SLO). At the Planning Unit level, IE focuses on the design and improvement of all education experiences to include enhanced student learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CS 3.3, Institutional Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas: (Institutional Effectiveness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.2 administrative support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.3 educational support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.4 research within its educational mission, if appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.5 community/public service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning Units are units defined by the College to align with the SACS-COC comprehensive standard areas listed above. Refer to Chapters 6 and 7 for current listings/schedules for the SF Instructional Units and Planning Units respectively. These units focus on institutional effectiveness by tying their unit-level budget requests and planning objectives back to the Strategic Initiatives and College goals. Along with developing the objectives that respond to or answer the questions “why and how,” each and every objective supports a specific initiative and goal. The Planning Units’ processes include the development of assessment plans and expected outcomes. At ‘midpoint’ and end of each assessment period (> one year < three years; long range), the Planning Units are responsible to report out on whether the outcome(s) were achieved and how the results will be used for improvement.

Substantive Change
Santa Fe College also responsibly considers the impact of all IE processes including the full range of planning and resource allocation activities for the potential of initiating a substantive change. When the potential of a substantive change appears on the horizon, Santa Fe is obligated to inform SACS-COC of such changes in accord with Comprehensive Standard 3.12.

| CS 3.12, Responsibility for compliance with the Commission’s substantive change procedures and policy. |
The Commission on Colleges accredits the entire institution and its programs and services, wherever they are located or however they are delivered. Accreditation, specific to an institution, is based on conditions existing at the time of the most recent evaluation and is not transferable to other institutions or entities. When an accredited institution significantly modifies or expands its scope, changes the nature of its affiliation or its ownership, or merges with another institution, a substantive change review is required.

Furthermore:

**CS 3.12.1, The institution notifies the Commission of changes in accordance with the substantive change policy and, when required, seeks approval prior to the initiation of changes. (Substantive change)**

Past examples of Santa Fe’s substantive change reviews include (Table 1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Substantive Change Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Application for The Initiation of Distance Learning Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prospectus for the Santa Fe Watson Center (Off-Campus Site)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Name Change Process (from Santa Fe Community College to Santa Fe College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Application Seeking Accreditation at the Baccalaureate Degree Level (Level II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prospectus for the Santa Fe Davis Center (Off-Campus Site)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Abbreviated Substantive Change Prospectus for Additional Level II Program: Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Past Examples of Santa Fe’s Substantive Change Reviews*

To assist those involved with the College’s IE process, Santa Fe College’s Directive: Substantive Change Notification to SACS-COC (Appendix A) delineates the types of substantive change and those primary and corollary offices of responsibility to prepare the notifications.

**Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)**
In full concert with our IE process, Santa Fe College pursues improvement of student learning at all levels. As such, our college is responsible to continually
develop broad-based institutional processes by which key issues emerge from our assessment activities that focus on learning outcomes and the learning environment. SACS-COC refers to the culmination of such assessment activities within Core Requirement 2.12—that the development of a “Quality Enhancement Plan or QEP is intended to be customized and designed to meet the needs of our College.

\[ \text{CR 2.12, Quality Enhancement Plan} \] The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) that includes an institutional process for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment and focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution. ( )

SACS conveys that pursuing a QEP is an opportunity for an institution to be creative in an area related to compliance with the Principles and specifically within Comprehensive Standard 3.3.12.

\[ \text{CS 3.3.2, Institutional Effectiveness/Quality Enhancement Plan} \] The institution has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that (1) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP; (2) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP; and (3) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement. (Quality Enhancement Plan)

At the time of our next on-site review in 2012, SACS-COC would expect our college to have in place all components that are characteristic to any workable plan, including:

(1) a focused topic (directly related to student learning),
(2) clear goals,
(3) adequate resources in place to implement the plan,
(4) evaluation strategies for determining the achievement of goals, and
(5) evidence of community development and support of the plan.”

Our QEP opportunity can be developed from the framework of our 21st Century Learning Project as it has been informed by the pursuit and validation of authentic assessment at the learning outcomes level. Over the next two years (2010-12),
subcommittees will pursue topic development of the SACS Quality Enhancement Plan or QEP.

These subcommittee efforts will be directed by what we know about our students through data-driven/data-informed reporting and assessment. The results will reveal a clear picture of the opportunities that we can focus our energies on the appropriate QEP topic for improved student learning.

Table 2 presents the IE annual calendar cycle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF Institutional Effectiveness Calendar</th>
<th>Integrated Planning, Budget, and Assessment for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>July</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SMART Obj – Submit Expected Outcomes (CY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performance Evaluations Deadline (PY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appraisal Plans [Perf Stds/Goals] (CY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Program Review – Data Review (CY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SACS Focused Report &amp; QEP (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual Assessment &amp; Improvement Report (PY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Program Review – Draft Report (CY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SMART objective assessment (CY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General Education Learning Outcomes (GELO) formal assessment (CY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CTE SLO formal assessment (CY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SMART Objective Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GELO formal assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CTE SLO formal assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SACS On-Site Visit (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Program Review – Submit Reports (CY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual PR Progress Reports to Provost (PY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GELO Assessment Status Report (CY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CTE SLO Assessment Status Report (CY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SACS Annual Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• RPC Info Gathering for Integrated Planning &amp; Budgeting Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SMART Obj – Mid-Point Progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All (Integrated) Program Review – Notification of Schedule (CY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26
| February | • Divisions Integrated Planning & Budgeting Presentations to RPC  
• PRA (Integrated) Academic Program Reviews – Complete QC (PY)  
• All Program Reviews/All Planning Units – incorporate plans and results into budget/resource allocation process |
| March | • Divisions Integrated Planning & Budgeting Presentations to RPC  
• Dept Continuation Budgets to VPs  
• Budget Requests Submitted  
• SACS Compliance Certificate (2012) |
| April | • CFO Verifies Base Budget  
• President’s Budget Committee Convenes  
• Continuation Budgets Approved by VPs  
• Capital Outlay Requests Approved by VPs  
• Non-Instructional PRs – completed (CY) |
| May | • Budgets and Plans to President’s Budget Committee for Approval  
• SMART Obj - Final Results (CY)  
• Strategic Initiative Workgroups Report (CY)  
• PRA (Integrated) Non-Instructional Program Reviews – Complete QC (PY) |
| June | • DBOT Budget Workshop  
• DBOT Approved Budget to State and Presented to SF College Community  
• Budgets Allocated/On-Line  
• Level II AA/Articulated AS (PY)  
• Level II CTE (PY)  
• Academic Program Reviews – Data Collection/Review (CY)  
• GELO Assessment Final Report & Plans for next AY (PY)  
• CTE SLOA Final Report & Plans for next AY (PY) |

Table 2: SF Institutional Effectiveness Calendar

| Planning and Budget | Green |
| Level I Program Review | Red |
| SLOA and SACS 2012 | Blue |
| Personnel | Yellow |

<p>| (CY) | Current Year |
| (PY) | Prior Year |
| CTE | Career &amp; Technical Education |
| GELO | General Education Learning Outcomes developed by FCS committee; adopted by SF |
| PRA | Program Review Assessment Teams |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QEP</th>
<th>Quality Enhancement Plan required by SACS-COC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SACS</td>
<td>Southern Association of Colleges &amp; Schools, Commission on Colleges (COC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes (Assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>Specific, Measurable, Aligned, Realistic, Time-bound planning objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Complete Glossary is located in appendices.
CHAPTER 2:
THE STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS

Strategic planning is a disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what an organization is, what it does, and why it does it.

Bryson

Overview

The planning basis for SF’s institutional effectiveness (IE) processes is strategic planning with the end product being realized as the current, five-year Santa Fe College Strategic Plan 2010-2015 document at (Figure 4). Strategic planning is vital to an institution striving for continual improvement in institutional effectiveness, decision making, sound resource allocation, and the teaching/learning continuum. As a leadership tool, strategic planning is about envisioning a future state for the College and striving to achieve that state. Santa Fe uses strategic planning as the process that encompasses a series of planned actions for obtaining improvements. The end product of strategic planning culminates in an outline—the College’s Mission Statement, Values, College Goals along with long term Strategic Initiatives—which has a thematic emphasis to give broad direction for the Planning Units’ activities within our IE processes.

Santa Fe’s mission statement and college goals provide direction for the college over a five-year cycle. The strategic planning process is cyclical, comprehensive, and integrates planning and resource allocation with appropriate assessment (Figure 4). From Santa Fe’s strategic planning process, Planning Units conduct annual planning, evaluation, and assessment. Every five years since 1985, the mission statement and College Goals have been reviewed and revised by a broad-based college committee, now titled the Resource and Planning Council or RPC (formerly the College Planning Council). The Santa Fe College Strategic Plan 2010-2015 has a basis in the College’s environmental scanning of key data and trends plus institutional performance indicators. The original strategic plan was presented in draft form to the Board of Trustees for approval.
Strategic planning is particularly well suited to an environment of change, and Santa Fe has a long tradition of embracing change through innovation. Strategic planning is a useful tool not only to define the future direction for the College but also to serve as the framework for evaluating the College’s progress and success in achieving that future state. The Santa Fe College Strategic Plan 2010-2015 sets the direction for the College by defining the College’s purpose in its mission statement and through deriving the College Goals, which are broad, thematic areas of College activity.

The College’s Strategic Plan consists of the Mission Statement and Values, which are contained in the Santa Fe College Strategic Plan 2010-2015 (Appendix B). College Goals are consistent with this mission statement of purpose and are the result of careful, formative development by the Resource and Planning Council and President’s Staff.

Process for Strategic Planning

Each year, the President’s Staff reviews the current set of “initiatives” based on issues surfaced by the RPC, through environmental scanning efforts, plus a thorough review of data analyses and key performance indicators. These
Strategic Initiatives (Appendix B) posted; most current year Initiatives) specify the actions the President’s Staff believes are important to achieve the College Goals.

In the process of finalizing the updated mission statement, the College also conducted a systematic review of its goals and outcomes; consequently, the College updated its SF Strategic Plan 2010-2015 which includes three new comprehensive strategic initiatives:

- Excellence in Teaching and Learning
- Constituent Relationship Management
- Organization Development

The SF Strategic Plan is fully integrated and supported by all departments through the submission of SMART (Specific, Measurable, Aligned, Realist, and Time-bound) planning objectives and standards of planning and performance which support the individual strategic initiatives, and/or goals stated in the SF Strategic Plan 2010-2015.

Substantive Changes: As the President’s Staff identifies potential Strategic Initiatives; the vice presidents assume functional responsibility for identifying and reporting any “substantive change” that could arise from implementation of any particular Initiative. Should an Initiative involve any modification or expansion that would qualify as a Substantive Change, Santa Fe College is responsible to notify SACS-COC of planned changes in accordance with CS 3.12 and, when required, seek approval in advance. To assist those involved with the College’s Strategic Planning Process, refer to Appendix A which delineates all the types of substantive change and those primary and corollary offices of responsibility at Santa Fe College who will prepare the notifications. The Office of the President with the following divisions/vice presidents has functional responsibility for substantive change notification with coordinating assistance by the College’s SACS Liaison (Vice President for Assessment, Research, and Technology):

- Office of the President: Any change in the established mission or objectives of Santa Fe College.
- Development: Establishment of an additional location (center or branch campus), geographically apart from SF Northwest Campus.
- Finance and ITS: Any change in legal status, form of control, or ownership of Santa Fe College.
• **Academic Affairs**: Significant changes in content or delivery method, additional coursework and programs at current accreditation level (associate and baccalaureate); substantial change in program length or change between credit and clock hours; or 25% or more of a program’s credit through distance learning.

• **Administrative Affairs**: Corollary responsibility to identify any/all substantive changes that may arise during the development of the annual *Strategic Initiatives*.

• **Student Affairs**: Corollary responsibility to identify any/all substantive changes that may arise during the development of the annual *Strategic Initiatives*.

The *Strategic Initiatives*, as brought forward by the President’s Staff, are prioritized annually by the Resource and Planning Council with a focus on integrating College resource allocation and planning actions (Budget Requests and SMART Planning Objectives). The *Initiatives* are assessed annually for continued applicability, achievement of results, and use of results for improvement.

**Background, History, and Evolution of the Strategic Plan at SF**

At Santa Fe College, planning for institutional effectiveness takes place in separate but related processes at the **college level** and at the **unit level**. Unit level planning is addressed in Chapter 5, *Unit Planning: Integrated Resource Allocation and Planning*.

**College Level Institutional Effectiveness through Strategic Planning**

As stated earlier in this chapter, Santa Fe has a rich history employing strategic planning and has continued to build upon the approach developed in 2000 and now reflected in *Santa Fe College Strategic Plan 2010-2015* document. True to the 2000 approach, this current version of the College’s strategic plan format is divided into two sections reflected on two separate pages:

**Section 1: Policy**
The first section is broad and general: it consists of the Mission Statement, Values, and Goals. This may be thought of as the policy portion of the strategy; it is reviewed every five years by the Resource and Planning Council and endorsed by College constituents.

Section 2: Implementation

The second section contains the College goals with associated Strategic Initiatives. This is the implementation section of the strategy and it is assessed annually by the RPC to determine status of accomplishment of the initiatives and to prioritize them for the integrated resource allocation/budget development process and planning unit objectives development.

The whole strategic plan document has a certain logic to its level of detail, in that the plan funnels our thinking from broad to specific. It begins with a broad Mission Statement that has succinct clarity, and then becomes progressively specific (more detail), all the way down through the Strategic Initiatives.

While drafting this strategy as representatives of the college, representatives to the 2000 College Planning Council (forerunner to the RPC) included their college constituents in the drafting process. In June 2000, the draft plan was presented to the College at an open forum so that interested people could have appropriate input and ownership for the strategy. In July 2000, the Board of Trustees approved this Strategic Plan in form and function.

Elements of the Strategic Plan reflect the deliberate but evolutionary nature of its development. While the Mission and Vision were not originally slated to be unified, the Mission as it was agreed upon by the original CPC was so appropriate to the purpose of the College as well as its direction that the CPC decided to make the mission and vision the same. The 2000 Mission/Vision read: “Adding value to the lives of our students and enriching our community.”

Together, the Mission/Vision and the Values constituted the purpose or “Mission Statement” as it was referred to under the previous Criteria for Accreditation (SACS-COC). The CPC believed that the Mission/Vision in Strategic Plan 2000 clearly defined the College’s purpose and described its characteristics through the values or beliefs in a way that is relevant for all the components of the College.
and its operations. With the evolution to the “Principles,” the College’s RPC has since referenced Core Requirement 2.4 and Comprehensive Standard 3.1 as the impetus of the College’s most recent review culminating in the following updated mission statement:

\[
In\;keeping\;with\;our\;values\;and\;goals,\;Santa\;Fe\;College,\;a\;comprehensive\;public\;institution\;of\;higher\;education\;serving\;North\;Central\;Florida\;and\;beyond,\;adds\;value\;to\;the\;lives\;of\;our\;students\;and\;enriches\;our\;community\;through\;excellence\;in\;teaching\;and\;learning,\;innovative\;educational\;programs\;and\;student\;services,\;and\;community\;leadership\;and\;service.\]

The Goals were derived by the CPC as unprioritized groupings of the Strategic Initiatives. The order of listing of the Goals was originally roughly chronological, reflecting the college’s involvement with students, from recruitment to graduation. The Strategic Initiatives resulted from issues that were identified by a classic SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats). The SWOT analysis was part of the deliberations of the CPC as it developed the early stages of the strategic plan. The identified issues formed the raw material for a special CPC retreat where the Council formed the first draft of the Mission/Vision, Values, Goals and Initiatives.

The definition of the Strategic Initiatives constitutes the planning and outcome identification phases of institutional effectiveness planning at the college level. While the Mission Statement/Goals portion of the strategic plan is essentially on a five-year cycle, the College annually reviews progress towards the Strategic Initiatives that are based on the mission statement and goals. The Strategic Initiatives are assessed annually.
CHAPTER 3:
MASTER PLANNING (5+ YEARS)

Hollowell, Middaugh, and Sibolski

Overview
Santa Fe College follows the categorical taxonomy of planning for higher education which comprises: Academic Planning, Resource Planning, and Facility Planning (Hollowell, Middaugh, and Sibolski, 2006). Their taxonomy guides the Master Planning at Santa Fe College as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Planning</th>
<th>Resource Planning</th>
<th>Facilities Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Instructional Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student Support Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residential Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Budget Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investment Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development/Fund-raising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Renewal/Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Campus Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: A Categorical Taxonomy of Higher Education Planning

Source: Hollowell, Middaugh, and Sibolski, 2006

The most recent Master Plan process at Santa Fe began with President Sasser appointing the members of the Master Planning Committee in January of 2008. Additional members were subsequently added, including Institutional Effectiveness, Research & Planning and student government representatives. This Master Plan consists of three phases:

Phase I: Inventory and Analysis
The first phase of the Master Planning process was completed by Emo Architects and the report delivered to the College in hard copy and on CD. This document represents a collaborative effort between Emo Architects,
Facilities, Institutional Effectiveness, Research & Planning, and Academic Affairs.

**Phases II and III: Conceptual Design and Final Master Plan**

The remaining two phases include the conceptual design phase (where we wish to go—Facility Planning) and the final Master Plan (how we get there—Resource Planning). Emo Architects facilitated the conceptual phase by conducting two, four-hour charrettes to help employees brainstorm and articulate our direction for the next 10-20 years.

As **Figure 5** illustrates, Master Planning is an integrated aspect of IE at Santa Fe College:

![Santa Fe College Model of Integrated Institutional Effectiveness](image)

**Substantive Changes**

When our Master Planning identifies a significant, future modification or expansion in scope, Santa Fe College is responsible to notify SACS-COC of planned changes in accordance with CS 3.12 and, when required, seek approval in advance. To assist those involved with the College’s Master Plan processes, the SF Master Plan delineates all the types of substantive change and those
primary and corollary offices of responsibility at Santa Fe College who will prepare the notifications (Appendix C). For example, with the Master Planning emphasis on the Academic Planning as well as Facilities Planning, the following, potential substantive changes could surface that would be referred to the appropriate division/vice president:

• **Academic Affairs:**
  - Significant changes in content or delivery method
  - Additional coursework and programs at current accreditation level (associate and baccalaureate)
  - Substantial change in program length or change between credit and clock hours
  - 25% or more of a program’s credit through distance learning.

• **Development:**
  - Establishment of an additional location (center or branch campus) geographically apart from SF Northwest Campus.

**Academic Planning**
The Long Range Plan (LRP) for Academic Affairs, initially drafted in July 2007 was reviewed on October 16, 2008 and reaffirmed with minor revisions. The Academic Affairs LRP, i.e. **Academic Planning** provides the major direction for the College’s Master Plan process.

The Academic Planning aspect of the Master Plan talks to what we are about at Santa Fe and sets the stage for what we do ‘first’ in terms of most all other planning processes. The division of Academic Affairs at SF initiates the Master Plan process with its LRP beginning with an academic overview which elaborates upon the mission of the college, student orientation and enrollment, areas of study and preparation and future direction with regard to academic offerings and philosophy.

**Mission and Goals: Academic Affairs**
The mission of the Academic Affairs division at Santa Fe College is to provide an academically engaging environment grounded in the principles of a learning college and supportive of the College’s overall mission. To support its learning-centered mission and practice, the division has three comprehensive goals:

• Access
• Engagement
• Innovation

The division also has adopted **Santa Fe’s Learning College Principles:**

• Situate all learning, programs, and initiatives within the college’s vision, mission, and values.
• Engage learners as active, responsible, and full partners in their education.
• Promote access for a diversity of students through traditional and alternative programs.
• Assist and promote learning through collaborative and cooperative activities and support services.
• Support the needs of faculty and staff in their efforts to serve students.
• Embrace a culture of innovation and evidence to promote student access, retention, and success.
• Offer curriculum that meets the demonstrated needs of students, the community, and the workplace.

In delivering educational services, moreover, Academic Affairs endorses Chickering and Gamson’s *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education.* Good practice in undergraduate education:

• Encourages contact between students and faculty.
• Develops reciprocity and cooperation among students.
• Encourages active learning.
• Gives prompt feedback.
• Emphasizes time on task.
• Communicates high expectations.
• Respects diverse talents and ways of learning.


**NOTE:** The following projections are not prioritized.

1. **Support for Active and Collaborative Learning among Students.**
   Instruction will increasingly move from traditional lecture format to interactive learning that cannot be delivered effectively in many current college classrooms. So, newly built or renovated classrooms must provide
flexible spaces, technology, and furnishings to support active and collaborative learning among students.

2. **Universal Integration of Technology with Baseline Equipment.**
   To support learning and engagement, classrooms should have universal integration of technology with the following baseline equipment:
   - Multimedia Cart
   - Computer
   - DLP Projector (minimum >2000 lumens, XGA resolution)
   - VCR/DVD player
   - Powered Speakers
   - Audio/video switcher and associated cables and adapters
   - Gang plate for VGA, S-video, RCA video connections and associated cabling
   - Security cables or devices

   The following equipment should be provided for more specialized spaces:
   - Smartboard (interactive whiteboard) OR Sympodium
   - Flat panel monitor (unless a Sympodium is used)
   - Powered signal splitter
   - Digital document camera
   - Microphone
   - VGA switcher for two computer inputs
   - Ceiling mounted speakers and an amplifier
   - Classroom response system receiver
   - Wireless keyboard and mouse
   - Laser pointer with slide advance for PowerPoint presentations
   - Bluetooth slate for remote annotations (Schoolpad or Airliner)

3. **Increased Availability of Online and Hybrid Instruction.**
   To meet student demand and maximize current facilities, the division will increase availability of online and hybrid instruction, allowing for significant expansion of classes without additional classroom buildings. To support this instruction, the college must invest in additional “virtual” campus space (e.g., property in Second Life, online conferencing spaces, etc.), professional development and additional “virtual” services.

4. **Increased Non-classroom Space to Support Students.**
   As the division increases non-traditional learning options, the College will need to provide increased non-classroom space to support students,
including assessment labs at all centers; a larger, more flexible assessment center on the NW campus; and more ‘emporium’-style computer classrooms that can serve multiple disciplines.

5. **Instructional Incubator Space.**
   To support its move to more non-traditional, 21\textsuperscript{st} century instructional methods, the College must provide faculty with an instructional incubator space to develop new learning methodologies.

6. **Infrastructure and Capital allocation for Technology.**
   The College needs a technology infrastructure to support the increased demands on technology, a capital allocation plan to support technology refresh programs, and a security infrastructure to assure the safety of equipment.

7. **Consistent Baseline of Instructional Services for Students.**
   All general-focus college centers will provide a consistent baseline of instructional services for students, including interactive video classes, enabling them to complete a general AA-transfer degree onsite.

8. **Sustainability in Designing Educational Experiences.**
   All programs will consider sustainability in designing educational experiences for students, including the micro-scaling of all labs and limiting most routine printing.

9. **Specialized Spaces for Program Growth in Specific Workforce Areas.**
   Program growth in specific workforce areas seems almost guaranteed. Looking ahead at workforce demands, it is clear that the largest new sector growth will be in life science careers. In addition, increased demand for health science, first responder, and University-Transfer programs is anticipated to continue through 2012. These programs require the provision of specialized spaces (especially wet and simulation labs) that will need to be increased.

10. **Support of ADA Programs.**
    As the pipeline of students who have made significant use of ADA accommodations to complete secondary education continues to grow, the College will need to provide space and services necessary to assure these students receive the required accommodations.

11. **Expansion of University Center.**
    The College continues to see an increasing number of students who wish to complete baccalaureate and advanced degrees in-district but cannot attend the University of Florida. To meet this need, Santa Fe must expand—in size, opportunities, and partners—its University Center into a
clearly defined and marketed entity on campus with an appropriate location.

12. **Support for Dual Enrollment Programs.**
The College continues to grow its dual enrollment programs, and this aspect of higher education is receiving increasing attention and encouragement at the state level. The space and support assigned to this program must be aligned to the students served and state expectations for participation on behalf of the college.

13. **Support for Specific Cohorts**
The division will continue to grow and support engagement opportunities for specific student cohorts (e.g., honors, international, learning communities, research in undergraduate education). These programs will require spaces suitable for small student groups to collaborate and create communities of ideas and practice. The College should provide these programs with appropriate support for their mission (i.e. marketing).

14. **Universal Scheduling.**
The division will move to centralized scheduling of classroom spaces to better leverage existing and future facilities.

15. **Increased Shared-Use Office Space.**
As the College grows its reliance on part-time faculty, it needs to provide more office space designed for shared use.

16. **Support of Specialty Programs.**
As the College adds new and grows existing specialty programs (e.g., honors, international, sustainability, My Brother’s Keeper), it is critical that they be provided with sufficient space and appropriate support for their mission (e.g. marketing).

**Resources and Facilities Planning**

**Again,** the categorical taxonomy of planning followed by Santa Fe College comprises: (1) **Academic Planning,** (2) **Resource Planning,** and (3) **Facility Planning** (Hollowell, Middaugh, and Sibolski, 2006). At the point that the division of Academic Affairs’ LRP was conceptualized, the call went out to the other divisions of Student Affairs, Administrative Affairs, Finance and Information Technology Services to develop supporting documents with their division-specific needs in the areas of Human Resources, Facilities, and Technology which in turn support Academic Planning. The results of the supporting documents are presented in **Appendix C.**
In addressing the Resources and Facilities Planning, we inventoried and analyzed 10 topical areas within the Phase I document (major themes for the Phase II document are 3, 4, 5, and 8 bolded below):

1. Campus and urban design
2. Land use
3. Academic environment
4. Academic and support building
5. Traffic circulation and parking
6. Infrastructure and utilities
7. Permitting process
8. Capital improvement
9. Design standards (architectural and landscape)
10. Recreation, athletics and open space

Additional details regarding this aspect of planning are found in Appendix D.

Educational Plan Survey
In 2010-11, the College will undergo an Educational Plan Survey process which is a systematic study of existing educational and ancillary plants and the determination of future needs, for the purpose of providing an appropriate educational program and services for each student.

The reason for a survey is to formulate plans for housing the educational programs, student population, faculty, administrators, staff, and auxiliary and ancillary services of the community college district. The objective of the comprehensive fixed capital outlay plan is to propose a building program for the college for a period of five years.

The survey involves developing a program facility list, or model of space needs, for each official site. The process for determining space needs uses student enrollment projections, space needs generation formulas, space utilization formulas, educational program information, and size of space and occupant design criteria.
CHAPTER 4:  
THE RESOURCE AND PLANNING COUNCIL:  
INTEGRATED RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND OPERATIONAL PLANNING

The Resource and Planning Council (RPC) is the umbrella organization for institutional effectiveness at SF. Originally formed in January 2000 as the College Planning Council, the RPC continues to be broad-based in membership and serves as the principal planning organization at the College, as illustrated in Figure 6:

Figure 6: Santa Fe College Model of Integrated Institutional Effectiveness

Appropriate, integrated planning and assessment are important processes for any organization. As part of these processes, systematically identifying and prioritizing the College’s Strategic Initiatives for implementation are key RPC activities.

Under the leadership of the President and assisted by the Co-Chairs of the RPC (Vice President for Assessment, Research, and Technology and Vice President for
Administrative Affairs), the Resource and Planning Council provides the leadership for our College institutional effectiveness system, which includes strategic planning. In so doing, the Council will ensure that our College mission statement reflects our College’s values, purpose and direction so that we may better serve our students and communities. Our institutional effectiveness system also addresses College performance in an accountable way so that we may demonstrate Santa Fe’s commitment and success in providing quality programs for our students.

The RPC replaced the College Planning Council (CPC) and the previous Institutional Effectiveness Planning Committee (IEPC) as the leading Santa Fe planning organization. Meeting monthly during key program/budget periods to review planning and funding issues, the Council is composed of approximately 30 members representing a broad spectrum of the College population; membership rotates periodically. The subsequent Council membership continues the work of revitalizing and improving upon the College’s planning process to ensure that the College is responsive to community needs and continues to provide quality programs for our students.

In 2008, the Council conducted a midpoint review of the College strategic plan, which had been reviewed on a five-year cycle since 1985. The RPC recommended revisions to the strategic plan to include a new value and strategic goal to address sustainability in education and operations as well as a minor revision to the Strategic Goal for “Technology”.

Referencing Core Requirement 2.4 and Comprehensive Standard 3.1, the College last began a review of its mission statement in February 2010 through the works of the Resource and Planning Council. Over several meetings, the RPC, as a whole, explored and generated alternative formulations based on the principles of specificity. Having identified the most viable alternatives, the RPC voted to make the following statement the College’s new mission statement:

In keeping with our values and goals, Santa Fe College, a comprehensive public institution of higher education serving North Central Florida and beyond, adds value to the lives of our students and enriches our community through excellence in teaching and learning, innovative educational programs and student services, and community leadership and service.
The RPC felt that this mission statement:

1. Satisfies the SACS Principles which require a mission statement to be “specific to the institution.”
2. Clearly defines the College’s unique role as an institution of higher learning as required by the Principles.
3. Meets the requirement in the Principles that mission statements address teaching, learning, and public service.

Following this selection by the RPC during its 25 March 2010 meeting, the College’s new mission statement was vetted in a variety of venues, beginning with the President’s Staff. The RPC received President’s Staff Review of the Updated Strategic Plan with the new Mission Statement and endorsed a minor change in wording. Subsequently, RPC representatives of the Santa Fe Senate, Career Service Council, and Student Senate presented the revised Mission Statement to their constituents; ultimately, the mission statement was put on the agenda for approval by the Santa Fe District Board of Trustees (DBOT). It was officially adopted during the June 15, 2010 DBOT meeting.

In the process of finalizing the updated mission statement, the College through the leadership of the RPC also initiated a systematic review of its goals and outcomes; consequently, the College updated its *SF Strategic Plan 2010-2015* which includes three new comprehensive strategic initiatives:

1. Excellence in Teaching and Learning
2. Constituent Relationship Management
3. Organization Development

The RPC continues to focus on the integration of budgetary needs with a matched emphasis on planning and assessment as the basis for decision-making at the college. *The Santa Fe College Strategic Plan 2010-2015* is designed to carry forward all integrated budget and planning actions for the next five years. The next strategic planning process will be initiated after the SACS-COC reaffirmation is completed.
CHAPTER 5: UNIT PLANNING Process (Annual)

Introduction

At Santa Fe College, planning for institutional effectiveness takes place in separate but related processes at the college level and at the unit level, as illustrated in Figure 7. College level planning is addressed in Chapter 2, Strategic Planning.

Santa Fe College Model of Integrated Institutional Effectiveness

Integrating Institutional Effectiveness Processes at SF

At the unit level, institutional effectiveness planning is performed to support unit purpose and goals that are tied to the College Mission, Strategic Initiatives, and Goals. Guidance for Santa Fe unit level planning and SMART planning objective development, and assessment are contained in this chapter.

The planning units initiate new annual, “operational” planning in May-June timeframe (see IE Calendar). These annual, operational plans begin with the development of an expected outcome, requisite assessment plan, alignment with College Mission (justification) and, as appropriate, the identification of resources.
needed for budgetary purposes. Unit planning objectives are reviewed by the respective vice presidents; in particular those objectives for which resources are needed and will require a “Budget Request.”

Overview

The unit planning process is designed to direct the resources of the College toward the fulfillment of the current Mission Statement, consistent with established Values, College Goals, and Strategic Initiatives. The establishment of SMART Objectives (Specific, Measurable, Aligned, Realistic, and Time Bound) are influenced by many factors including research-based information regarding the College’s strengths and weaknesses, the thoughtful analysis of environmental scanning factors affecting the College, as well as innovative ideas and recommendations for program and service improvements. Note: SMART is acronym of the first letters of words representing criteria for well-developed objectives.

A commitment to planning and assessment at scheduled intervals makes sense—as such a system supports the College’s overall, GLOBAL “institutional effectiveness” and ensures the College continues to remain in compliance with the SACS-COC Principles of Accreditation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Requirement</th>
<th>2.5 Institutional Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and (3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission. (Institutional Effectiveness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive Standard</th>
<th>3.3 Institutional Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas: (Institutional Effectiveness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.2 administrative support services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.3.1.3 Educational Support Services

**Note: Substantive Change:** When our planning process indicates a significant modification or expansion in scope is planned, Santa Fe College is responsible to notify SACS-COC of planned changes in accordance with CS 3.12 and, when required, seek approval in advance. To assist those involved with the College’s IE process, Appendix C delineates the types of substantive change and those primary and corollary offices of responsibility to prepare the notifications.

Institutional Effectiveness (IE) is also about how Santa Fe College addresses the process of assessment that supports all areas of the institution including student learning outcomes (SLO). At the unit level, planning focuses on the design and improvement of all activities including enhanced student learning. In doing so, it seeks to meet the SACS-COC Comprehensive Standard 3.3, Institutional Effectiveness:

In general, assessment is the complementary component to planning for institutional effectiveness. It is the method by which the College and its units determine effective, accessible, and responsive educational services in a multicultural environment related to the College’s mission.

In other words, assessment is about looking at what we accomplish: (1) the outcomes, which are the products of our college, its programs, and our graduates and (2) the processes that lead to those outcomes. With the right attention to assessment, the quality of our programs and the support we provide for them can improve; such improvement drives our need for assessment and helps define our means of achieving it. At Santa Fe College, we have chosen not to enter a debate about whether “outcomes” or “processes” solely determine institutional effectiveness; instead, we incorporate outcomes and processes as important, interdependent parts of the same system that comprises institutional effectiveness.

**Establishing SMART Planning Objectives**

When planning units initially develop and refine their objectives (May-June), they identify and document the following four of seven planning steps:
**Step 1:** Write the “Expected Outcome” through SMART planning objective process (Specific, Measurable, Time-bound)

**Step 2:** Indicate the “Justification” to “align” the planning objective to SF Mission (Aligned)

**Step 3:** Establish an “Assessment Plan” to reinforce specific SMART steps (Measurable, Realistic, Time-Bound)

**Step 4:** Identify any “Resources” needed to integrate planning with budgeting

**Mid-Point Status of Annual SMART Planning Objectives**

At the cycle’s mid-point (January), document the progress towards achievement and status for each objective in the fifth step of seven planning steps:

**Step 5:** Indicate status of Expected Outcome at this mid-point

**Assessment of SMART Planning Objectives for Improvement**

To perform outcome assessment, the units will submit their “actual outcome” and “use of results” through the completion of the SMART Objective forms which served as the assessment plan at the beginning of the annual planning cycle (see IE Calendar).

At the annual cycle’s end (June), document the following results for each objective as the final two steps of the seven-step planning process:

**Step 6:** Indicate the “Actual Outcome” and confirm if Expected Outcome was achieved/not achieved

**Step 7:** Document the “Use of Results” by stating how the results could be used beyond this assessment to apply to other areas.

Unit-level panning activities are depicted in the SF IE Calendar (Table 4).
## SF Institutional Effectiveness Calendar
### Integrated Planning, Budget, and Assessment for Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>July</strong></td>
<td>• SMART Objectives – Submit Expected Outcomes (CY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Performance Evals (PY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appraisal Plans [Perf Stds/Goals] (CY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Program Review – Data Review (CY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SACS Focused Report &amp; QEP (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August</strong></td>
<td>• Annual Assessment &amp; Improvement Report (PY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Program Review – Draft Report (CY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September</strong></td>
<td>• SMART objective assessment (CY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• General Education Learning Outcomes (GELO) formal assessment (CY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CTE SLO formal assessment (CY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October</strong></td>
<td>• SMART Objective Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• GELO formal assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CTE SLO formal assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SACS On-Site Visit (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November</strong></td>
<td>• Academic Program Review – Submit Reports (CY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December</strong></td>
<td>• Annual PR Progress Reports to Provost (PY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• GELO Assessment Status Report (CY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CTE SLO Assessment Status Report (CY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SACS Annual Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January</strong></td>
<td>• RPC Info Gathering for Integrated Planning &amp; Budgeting Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SMART Obj – Mid-Point Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• All (Integrated) Program Review – Notification of Schedule (CY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February</strong></td>
<td>• Divisions Integrated Planning &amp; Budgeting Presentations to RPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PRA (Integrated) Academic Program Reviews – Complete QC (PY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• All Program Reviews/All Planning Units – incorporate plans and results into budget/resource allocation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March</strong></td>
<td>• Divisions Integrated Planning &amp; Budgeting Presentations to RPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dept Continuation Budgets to VPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Budget Requests Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SACS Compliance Certificate (2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April

- CFO Verifies Base Budget
- President’s Budget Committee Convenes
- Continuation Budgets Approved by VPs
- Capital Outlay Requests Approved by VPs
- Non-Instructional PRs – completed (CY)

May

- Budgets and Plans to President’s Budget Committee for Approval
- SMART Obj - Final Results (CY)
- Strategic Initiative Workgroups Report (CY)
- PRA(Integrated) Non-Instructional Program Reviews – Complete QC (PY)

June

- DBOT Budget Workshop
- DBOT Approved Budget to State and Presented to SF College Community
- Budgets Allocated/On-Line
- Level II AA/Articulated AS (PY)
- Level II CTE (PY)
- Academic Program Reviews – Data Collection/Review (CY)
- GELO Assessment Final Report & Plans for next AY (PY)
- CTE SLOA Final Report & Plans for next AY (PY)

Table 4: SF Institutional Effectiveness Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning and Budget</th>
<th>Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level I Program Review</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOA and SACS 2012</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CY)  | Current Year
(PY)  | Prior Year
CTE   | Career & Technical Education
GELO  | General Education Learning Outcomes developed by FCS committee; adopted by SF
PRA   | Interdisciplinary or Program Review Assessment Teams
QEP   | Quality Enhancement Plan required by SACS-COC
SACS  | Southern Association of Colleges & Schools, Commission on Colleges (COC or “The Commission”)
SLO   | Student Learning Outcomes (Assessment)
SMART | Specific, Measurable, Aligned, Realistic, Time-bound planning objectives
Notes:

**Expected Outcomes:** When writing an Expected Outcome, keep the end in mind—that the outcome is the results you expect to achieve from an initiative, action, “thing” and not the other way around. That is, the “thing” is not what you hope to achieve—rather it facilitates the outcome that you hope to achieve—a specific improvement.

**Key Point:** The outcome is more related to the “why” something should be pursued and less about the “what” seems like a good idea or task to take on. Generally, an idea or task is part of an assessment plan/strategy for achieving an outcome – the idea or task itself is not the outcome. Your expected outcome and SMART planning objective may stem from the analysis of data from various sources (surveys, accountability reports, external trends, state and federal mandates, etc.).

The SF Xitrac Administrator compiles all divisions’ Actual Outcomes and Use of Results into an Annual Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Report which is published each August. This annual report is used to demonstrate accountability to external audiences including SACSCOC peer evaluators) and to inform internal audiences (RPC, District Board of Trustees, college personnel) of the progress we are making toward achieving our objectives, goals, and strategic initiatives; thus our institutional mission. Establishing the annual cycle provides a framework to ensure SMART Planning Objectives are submitted for all planning units on a regular basis and that the assessment process is accomplished for improvement.
CHAPTER 6: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES PROCESS

Institutional Effectiveness (IE) is also about how Santa Fe College addresses the process of assessment that supports all areas of the institution including student learning outcomes (SLO). At the Planning Unit level, IE focuses on the design and improvement of all education experiences to include enhanced student learning. As Figure 8 demonstrates, this focus

Santa Fe College Model of Integrated Institutional Effectiveness

Integrated Institutional Effectiveness Processes at SF

Resources: Oversight – Procedures – Systems – Process Owners

SACS defines student learning outcomes and competencies assessment through these two comprehensive standards:

**CS 3.3, Institutional Effectiveness**

3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement
based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas:
(Institutional Effectiveness)
3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes
3.3.1.2 administrative support services
3.3.1.3 educational support services
3.3.1.4 research within its educational mission, if appropriate
3.3.1.5 community/public service

**CS 3.5 Educational Programs: Undergraduate Programs**

3.5.1 The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which graduates have attained them. (College-level competencies)

In general, assessment complements planning for institutional effectiveness. It is the method by which the College and its units determine effective, accessible, and responsive educational services in a multi-cultural environment related to the College’s mission. In other words, assessment is about looking at what we accomplish:

1. The outcomes, which are the products of our college, its programs, and our graduates

2. The processes that lead to those outcomes

With the right attention to assessment, we can improve the quality of our programs and the support we provide for them. Such improvement drives our need for assessment and helps define our means of achieving it. At Santa Fe College, we have chosen not to enter a debate about whether outcomes or processes solely determine institutional effectiveness; instead, we incorporate outcomes and processes as important, interdependent parts of the same system that comprises institutional effectiveness. In this system, we focus on two main elements:

1. **Assessment:** Assessing student learning outcomes (SLO) represents a primary means for realizing that goal at Santa Fe. SLO assessment is recognized as the most difficult part of institutional effectiveness. While determining what facilitates learning and what does not is difficult, doing so is necessary if we are to have education programs that improve and can adapt to change. Moreover, such improvement and adaptability will contribute to student learning and success. To achieve those goals,
institutions and instructors measure student learning against outcomes and standards generated by federal, state, institutional, and individual agencies. As the following sections illustrate, Santa Fe College actively uses such resources as a major component of our institutional effectiveness system.

2. “Input”: The other part of our institutional effectiveness system is “input” or the quality of student who enters our college seeking to achieve personal goals. While this input is part of the institutional effectiveness system, we have chosen not to control input because our first college goal is “Outreach and Access: Identify, access, and meet community needs to promote open access to the college.” However, the College can and must seek to measure and control our education and support processes and their outputs and outcomes. By doing so, the quality of the Santa Fe experience can continue to improve.

**General Education and BAS Program Level Learning Outcomes**

All educational programs at Santa Fe College identify expected outcomes and assess the extent to which student learning outcomes (SLOs) are achieved. To identify and assess learning outcomes in its educational programs, Santa Fe College’s Division of Academic Affairs has identified college-level, general education competencies and the extent to which graduates have attained them (CS 3.5.1, College-level competencies) by embracing Florida’s statewide learning outcomes, also referred to as the GELOs or “General Education Learning Outcomes” categories. These categories include:

1. **Communication:**
   - Read, write, speak, and listen effectively.

2. **Critical Thinking:**
   - Reflect, analyze, synthesize, and apply.

3. **Scientific Reasoning:**
   - Understand and apply scientific principles and methods.

4. **Mathematical Reasoning:**
   - Understand and apply mathematical principles and methods.

5. **Information Literacy:**
   - Find, evaluate, organize, and use information.
6. **Global Socio-Cultural Responsibility:**
   Prepare the student to participate actively as informed and responsible citizens in social, cultural, global, and environmental matters.

**Methods of Assessing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) at Santa Fe College**

As the following review illustrates, the College actively promotes and enables the assessment of student learning outcomes at the institutional and the individual instructor levels.

**Assessment at the Institutional Level**

The College undertook an intense and integrated approach to revising the way it assesses SLOs. To do so, it followed a three-phase approach:

1. Mapping of General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) to appropriate curriculum
2. Institution of an online assessment tool for measuring and collecting SLOs
3. Use of that data as part of a regular assessment process (both at the semester and annual levels)

This approach is detailed in the following sections.

**1. Mapping of GELOs**

In order to create a curricular map, the chairs and directors of the disciplines that offer general education coursework met on 16 February 2010 to map one of each of the five General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) to each of Santa Fe’s eleven general education categories. The Curriculum Committee also vetted the mapping by the chairs and directors in its March and April 2010 meetings. As a result of these actions, the following condition now applies: to meet all of the general education requirements, a student must take courses which, in total, cover all five of the College’s general education learning outcomes (GELOs).

**2. Institution of Online Assessment**

After this mapping, the College modified the eStaff interface to enable faculty to assess students’ GELO competency in those sections which they teach. Beginning in the Spring semester 2010, a new column was added to the grade roster for every course in each of the eleven general education
categories. This column contains two checkboxes that allow the instructor to indicate whether or not a student has met the learning outcome mapped to that course. Which embedded assessment the faculty member chooses to use in a particular course was determined either by the faculty member or by the department as a whole. For example, Mathematics decided to use a comprehensive final as the assessment tool, while Humanities and Foreign Languages decided to have each instructor evaluate a particular assignment as the indicator of achievement of the mapped learning outcome. Faculty members are required to document which assessment was used for verification of GELO achievement. Note that, depending on the weight of the particular assignment, a student (1) may or may not achieve a GELO and (2) either pass or not pass the course. For a screenshot illustrating this assessment screen with representatives examples, please see Figure 9.

![Figure 9: eStaff Interface](image)

Information Technology Services (ITS) created a database that houses this information and which allows the College to aggregate the data in a number of ways, ultimately providing information that can be used to enhance student achievement. Data aggregated at the college level will indicate how successful our students are at meeting our general education goals. Aggregated at the course level, the data helps formulate curricular
changes within that particular course. Aggregated at the section level, the data helps an individual faculty member modify her or his instruction when necessary to improve learning outcome achievement.

To help ensure consistency in the evaluation of assignments used to verify GELO attainment, academic departments met and discussed the development of rubrics during their departmental meetings (late spring and early summer). In addition, the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs met with the chairs and directors of the general education departments (English, fine arts, humanities and foreign languages, mathematics, natural sciences, social and behavioral sciences) along with the chair of business programs. A list of assumptions and questions regarding rubrics was presented at the meeting. In addition, a set of key possible evaluative criteria for our GELOs was developed from rubrics that were developed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (For more details, refer to the document “Thoughts Regarding Rubrics”).

3. Use of SLO Data as Part of Regular Assessment Process
GELO data is collected and distributed for each semester. The data are incorporated into the semester review for action plans; these reviews are reported out according to the process and procedure defined for the primary method of GELO. During the fall semester, meetings are conducted with faculty from each of the departments responsible for reporting the GELO data. During these faculty meetings, an overview of the collection and analysis process is conducted and questions are fielded that faculty may have regarding the process. These reporting of results and overview of the process help faculty realize the centrality of such data collection and analysis to the College, their respective department, and to them as individual faculty.

Assessment at the Individual Instructor Level
In addition to the use of the primary institutional assessment method, instructors may also choose to assess SLOs using a secondary means, those assessment options available through the College’s learning management system (LMS) ANGEL.

The Center for Academic Technologies, which oversees the ANGEL LMS, establishes individual “course shells” for each section offered whether traditional, hybrid, or Open Campus course. These shells are the basic course space
automatically created for every course that is being offered every semester within ANGEL. As with other LMSs, ANGEL supports presentation of course materials, communications/discussions with students, assignment submissions, etc. Academic Technologies provides ongoing face-to-face training in the use of ANGEL and has created a number of Flash tutorials to help faculty learn the major features of ANGEL. In addition, Academic Technologies has a training program established for faculty unfamiliar with ANGEL.

Every instructor who teaches for Santa Fe College has a system access which supports identifying expected outcomes and associating those SLOs with assignments and assessments within that instructor’s course shells. Moreover, the ANGEL LMS provides instructors with administrative privileges to enable, create, import, and publish outcomes through ANGEL standards. Santa Fe uses these standards to align with the State’s GELOs at the institution level for associate degree programs and to align with specific program level outcomes for the baccalaureate programs. Instructors can browse, search, and associate these standards to align with student assignments and assessments. ANGEL’s Learning Outcomes Management (LOM) gives instructors insight into student performance against these LMS standards with a level of confidence that course content is aligned to institutional and program level (in the case of the BAS) outcomes. Most important, ANGEL shows instructors what is working (and what isn’t) so instructors can take action to remediate students and refine curriculum for improvement.

Again, in the ANGEL LOM terminology, standards are statements of what students should know and be able to do. Standards are managed by a standards administrator within ANGEL, and can be manually created or gathered from outside organizations such as accreditation bodies and state/federal agencies. Standards are organized hierarchically, and can be mapped to content within ANGEL. These mappings allow extensive reporting on student and course performance against such standards.

Instructors map content and assessments by quickly browsing or searching for standards. Mapping progress reports shows instructors which content items and assessments are mapped to each standard to identify gaps in coverage for outcomes assessment.

Instructors use the Reports tab in ANGEL to investigate trends for the entire course or individual students to continue on the right path to achieving desired
learning outcomes. ANGEL LOM performance reporting extends to students, encouraging their active participation and ownership of their own learning. Individual student performance reports ensure that students know where they stand against standards, such as GELOs or BAS program outcomes as appropriate.

**Program and Course Level Learning Outcomes Using the Learning Management System (LMS)**

ANGEL LOM objectives are similar to standards in that they are also outcomes, but objectives are created and managed by instructors within their courses—that is, course-level outcomes. Objectives allow instructors to design educational outcomes that best fit that course’s curriculum. Objectives can be mapped to standards. Single or multiple standards may be mapped to any objective. Instructors access these standards by selecting content items which have their own set of settings tabs that determine content, access, **standards, objectives**, etc. Again, in the ANGEL LOM terminology, all content items have the following tabs:

1. **Standards or GELOs or BAS SLOs**
   (which allow instructors to map content to standards established and controlled by the institution)

2. **Objectives or Program Level or Course Level SLOs**
   (which allow chairs and directors to create **program level outcomes** as well as allow instructors to create **course-level outcomes** and map content to these specified objectives.)

The Report tab in ANGEL provides access to several reports which help an instructor track student progress in the course. The default reports include the option “Learning Outcomes” which provides reports for objectives that are mapped to content and/or standards that are mapped to content. This feature provides an overview of the outcomes mapped to the content with the number of items meeting the standard/objective, the content type, and the name of the content item. In addition, the Report tab provides access to other reports which help an instructor track student progress in the course. Item analysis shows a summary of responses by question of a quiz or survey. Instructors can review student performance for individual assessment items that meet the specific learning outcomes which are mapped to the overall assessment.
Assessment Using the Learning Management System (LMS)

Assessment using the LMS process (secondary) follows the patterns outlined for standards and objectives. Instructors can map any number of assignments to the outcomes and standards loaded into ANGEL and/or can generate a set of criteria designed to assess assignments and student learning associated with them. Upon review of this data, instructors can choose to drill down to the individual student level to determine individual competencies as well as individual elements constituting an assignment (e.g. a particular question’s correspondence to a set of outcomes and/or standards). Using such tools, instructors can chart student learning within a section or semester and/or against other sections and semesters that they have taught; doing so, instructors can assess the validity of certain methodologies and pedagogies as part of their larger assessment of student learning and their own success as instructors. Moreover, the College encourages instructors to include such assessments in their faculty self-evaluations as a strategy for gaining further insight on their own teaching and their students’ learning—part of the larger cultural goal of continuous improvement as an organic and self-sustaining process. In short, through the options available on ANGEL, instructors have a tool for assessing student learning outcomes that is very facile, effective, and efficient; furthermore, that tool provides the College with an active means for assessing student learning outcomes and promoting an environment of instructional effectiveness throughout the College.

As these reviews demonstrate, Santa Fe College is dedicated to ongoing identification and assessment of student learning outcomes as part of its larger focus on the integration of such assessment into the College’s institutional effectiveness.
CHAPTER 7:
DISCIPLINE/PROGRAM REVIEW FOR
INSTRUCTIONAL UNITS

This chapter is designed to provide guidance, procedures, and templates for instructional units to use as they pursue their planning and program review process every three years. Assessment for institutional effectiveness in academic departments should be aimed at bringing about excellence in educational programs and associated student learning outcomes. The approach must be systematic and define expected outcomes through well thought-out objectives and assessment plans with results achievement and prescribed methods for analyzing those results for further improvement. Figure 10 illustrates how this level of review functions within the larger process of IE at Santa Fe:

Figure 10: Santa Fe College Model of Integrated Institutional Effectiveness

Institutional Effectiveness (IE) is about how Santa Fe College addresses the process of assessment that supports all areas of the institution including student learning outcomes (SLO). At the Planning Unit level, IE focuses on the design and improvement of all education experiences to include enhanced student learning. Expectations for evaluating IE in academic programs, student learning outcomes,
and general education competencies are delineated in the comprehensive standards of the SACS-COC Principles of Accreditation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CS 3.3</th>
<th>Institutional Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas: (Institutional Effectiveness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifically,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CS 3.5</th>
<th>Educational Programs: Undergraduate Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5.1 The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which graduates have attained them. (College-level competencies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning Units are units defined by the College to align with the SACS-COC comprehensive standard listed above. Instructional Units are planning units defined by the Academic Affairs division to maximize the efficiency of the discipline/program review process. Table 5 lists the Instructional Units within the current Discipline/Program Review schedule.

**Scheduling Instructional Units for Review**

Related programs are grouped as much as possible to maximize the efficiency of the process and minimize the time commitment of any one group of faculty, related programs. Doing so also provide those undergoing review with the opportunity to share insight and resources.

Programs with external accreditation requirements are scheduled in the year following their accreditation review wherever possible with the goal of maintaining the groupings. In this way a program need only prepare one review for both purposes, with minor adjustments to suit one or the other set of report requirements. Similarly, each academic program is placed in the schedule either in the same year as a Level II Review is scheduled or in the year following that review.
The current Discipline/Program Review Schedule is provided at the end of this chapter in Table 5.

**Introduction to Discipline/Program Review Process**

**Mission and Program Evaluation**
The College’s overall effectiveness depends upon defined expectations for, relationships among, and continual improvements in the performance of its personnel, instructional programs and educational support services as they relate to access, student learning and success.

Clearly, the commitment to improve and excel becomes meaningful only if the College:

1. Evaluates itself
2. Carefully analyzes the results of that self-evaluation in order to identify strengths and weaknesses
3. Then implements strategies to build on strengths and to correct any weaknesses

To ensure its status as a dynamic learning college, the College must continually improve access, student learning, and success.

The Academic Affairs division actively supports these goals through a variety of means. Primarily, it does so by embracing a culture of inquiry, evidence and innovation to promote student access, learning and success. It also does so through its mission: to provide an academically engaging environment, grounded in the principles of a learning college and supportive of the college’s overall mission. That mission is also supported by research that is focused on continuous improvement of student learning.

**Discipline/Program Review Philosophy and Implementation Plan**
The Discipline/Program Review process is shaped by concepts from multiple sources. Among these are:

1. The College’s mission and values
2. Academic Affairs’ mission

4. The Division of Florida Colleges within the Florida Department of Education (FDOE). The review process will be implemented for each program and discipline according to a defined three-year planning cycle.

A “program” is any college approved bachelor’s, associate degree, or certificate program. These programs include AA, AS, AAS, BAS and certificate programs. A “discipline” is a subject area in Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) which is a component of the Associate in Arts degree program.

**SACS-COC: The Commission’s Philosophy and Compliance with the Principles**

At the heart of the Commission’s philosophy of accreditation, the concept of quality enhancement presumes that Santa Fe College (1) is engaged in an ongoing program of improvement and (2) can demonstrate how well the college fulfills its stated mission. Although evaluation of our college’s educational quality and its effectiveness in achieving its mission is a difficult task requiring careful analysis and professional judgment, Santa Fe is expected to document the quality and effectiveness of all its programs and services. To provide guidance on that “documentation” expectation, *The Principles of Accreditation* present the following Core Requirement which Santa Fe College has embraced to establish the program review “process” as outlined in this document:

CR 2.5. *The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and (3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission. (Institutional Effectiveness)*

In addition, the Commission’s following Comprehensive Standards address Santa Fe’s cycle of ongoing self-evaluation (Program Review) as a major component to successful operations for access, learning, and student success:

**CS 3.3.1: The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas: (Institutional Effectiveness)**
CS 3.3.1.1: Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

CS 3.4.1: The institution demonstrates that each educational program for which academic credit is awarded is approved by the faculty and the administration. *(Academic program approval)*

CS 3.5.1: The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which graduates have attained them. *(College-level competencies)*

FDOE Requirements

General Criteria for Academic Programs
At the state level, Florida’s colleges are required by law to assess all academic programs *at least* every five years. Within the criteria presented for this assessment are guidelines for:

1. The extent of employee participation
2. The format of assessment documents
3. The use of assessment results

In this regard, FDOE recommends that all colleges:

1. Develop and maintain a comprehensive system for program review providing planning, assessment, and improvement through formal structured procedures for the purpose of evaluating all institutional programs on a regularly scheduled time cycle.

2. Promote an inclusive academic environment surrounding the entire college by encouraging all faculty, staff, and administrators to participate in program review activities, resulting in a program review process that permeates all areas of the institution.

3. Document their formal structured procedures for program review to fully validate the existence of program review activities.

4. Include the following in discipline/program reviews:
   a. Program Profile
   b. Student Learning Outcomes
   c. Strengths and Weaknesses
d. Recommendations to Improve Programs

e. Program Efficiency or Productivity

f. Future Issues

5. Document what was done to address a deficiency identified by assessment activities, thereby demonstrating actual use of assessment results to improve programs and to establish a continuous learning and improvement cycle.

Specific Assessment of Associate of Arts Degrees

The Division of Florida Colleges (formerly Division of Community Colleges or DCC) which oversees the Florida College System (FCS) of the Florida Department of Education suggests strategies specific to the assessment of Associate in Arts degree programs, acknowledging that these programs are particularly “complex and challenging” because they provide the bedrock for both “further study” and “life after formalized education.” The Division’s AA Program Review Model: Institutional Responsibilities—Expanded Guidance” (as revised 6/9/2009) relays following four components for in-depth, local program review:

1. The academic leadership at each college is expected to develop a comprehensive five-year design for reviewing the components of the Associate in Arts programs that is consistent with the developed standards for re-accreditation adopted by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); in particular, the design should support the specific criteria of Comprehensive Standard 3.3 Institutional Effectiveness.

2. Each institution is expected to develop a local process that encourages annual planned meetings between college program faculty and colleagues from each university program with significant student enrollment from that college.

3. Each college is expected to develop a process for the internal dissemination of the data on student performance that is assembled as a part of the annual reporting process.

4. The activities of each college in support of local program review activities will be communicated to the staff of the DCC in order to facilitate the compilation of a comprehensive report on such activities.
Discipline/Program Review Purpose and Goals

Purpose
The fundamental purpose of the review process is to improve access, student learning and success that will contribute to the continual effectiveness of Santa Fe College.

Goals
The Discipline/Program Review process will:

• Provide a framework for engaging discipline/programs in systematically assessing their policies, procedures, and practices, and making changes based on that assessment.

• Create a *culture of inquiry, evidence and innovation* by using data as a significant part of the framework for directions for positive change.

• Increase attention to *student learning outcomes*, including direct and indirect measures.

• Establish linkages by encouraging collaboration between discipline/program review procedures and other college processes, including budget planning and development.

• Complement the College’s planning processes by requiring internal unit planning with an external perspective of the quality of the academic programs (SMART Objectives).

• Provide a structured process that accommodates the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP).

• Provide data/information for response to accreditation/certification agencies.

• Establish benchmarks for future measurements in order to observe changes over time.

• Improve cost effectiveness and efficiency.

• Establish an institutional profile for program assessment by the State to include:
  o individual program reviews
  o benchmarks for completion rates in high volume programs
- retention of graduates in baccalaureate programs
- GPA comparisons between SF and other community college graduates (and SUS native students in baccalaureate programs)
- graduate satisfaction rating
- employer satisfaction rating
- upper division satisfaction rating

**THE SELF-STUDY PROCESS**

**Self-Study Report**
All instructional units will be reviewed on a three-year cycle, unless otherwise required for reaffirmation of accreditation. The schedule for reviews will be determined by the Resource and Planning Council. The review process requires development of a self-study report within the context of:

1. The SF mission, values and goals
2. Academic Affairs mission and goals
3. Results of an environmental scan
4. Results of data set reviews

The areas to be addressed in the self-study report include those recommended by FDOE plus three additional areas:

1. Innovations
2. Governance
3. Leadership

Brief informed responses are requested for questions or statements listed under each area as outlined in the Associate of Arts Degree Self-Study Template *(Appendix D)*.

The review process provides opportunity for all faculty and staff in the discipline/program to engage in the assessment process and to develop a broader sense of how well the discipline/program has provided access to students and facilitated student learning and success. The entire discipline/program should participate in identifying any necessary changes within the context of a “culture of inquiry, evidence and innovation.”
Note that programs are encouraged to provide additional information other than that requested in the template if the additional information will contribute to assessing the unit’s effectiveness.

The process involves two steps:

1. The environmental scan
2. Analysis of the data sets

**Step 1: The Environmental Scan**
The first part of the self-study process is the environmental scan. This scan is an analysis of environmental factors that impact the unit’s ability to accomplish its mission/purpose/goals. In this regard, the first step in the review process should involve meetings of chairpersons/directors with the Vice President for Assessment, Research, and Technology.

Agendas for these meetings may include the following:

1. Identifying key stakeholders including both internal and external (A stakeholder is anyone who expects to gain or lose by what the unit does or how the unit performs.)
2. Confirming the process used to measure the satisfaction of stakeholders
3. Determining opportunities that exist to improve services to stakeholders
4. Determining potential in addressing defined employment/manpower needs in the community, state, and/or nation, including the current economic situation or employment needs of the local community
5. Considering any additional data requirements outside the template requirements and describing how analysis of these additional data would be useful to further develop the unit’s plans

In most cases, needed data and format for ease of review will be identified at these meetings. Unless absolutely necessary, disciplines/programs should refrain from taking on the burden of gathering additional data.

**Step 2: Analysis of the Data Sets**
The next step in the review process is an analysis of key data indicators regarding the discipline/program performance in providing access and facilitating student learning and success. Some indicators are mapped into the current set of AACC
core indicators. The elements in the data set should be provided by Institutional Research (IR) with support of appropriate internal offices and other external sources. Where possible, the data should reflect three year trends, unless otherwise indicated, and presented in clear and concise formats. To this end, IR facilitates academic year data updates to chairs/directors (information copy to the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs or designee), after spring data is certified to the State and by the end of each summer term.

As with the environmental scan, IR staff will provide the data needed for responses in acceptable formats, unless absolutely necessary, departments should refrain from taking on the burden of gathering additional data. Data sets for disciplines or programs respond to items listed in the template found in Appendix D.

**Vice President for Assessment, Research, and Technology**

The Vice President for Assessment, Research, and Technology has the following responsibilities related to program reviews:

- Develop a three-year schedule to review AA, AS, AAS, PSAV, CTE and CCC programs.
- Coordinate implementation of the review process.
- Provide technical assistance to chairs and directors.
- Orient faculty and staff who serve on teams that review self-study reports.
- Assess the effectiveness of the review process and recommend improvements to the President’s staff.

The self-study report should be no more than 25 pages in length. Upon completion, the report will be submitted to the Vice President of Assessment, Research, and Technology for assignment to a Program Review Assessment Team (PRA).

**Program Review Assessment Teams (PRA)**

Complementary groupings of completed program reviews are given by the Vice president for Assessment, Research, and Technology to Program Review Assessment Teams. Each team reads and discusses each program review they are assigned, meets with the review’s authors to ask any questions they may have.
and provide feedback on the review, and produces a summary form for the Resource and Planning Council. The summary form includes an institutional effectiveness audit component (in the form of a checklist with spaces for brief comments), space for a narrative describing features of the program review the assessment team considers exemplary, space for a narrative describing suggestions from the assessment team to the program review authors (to strengthen either the review process or the review itself), and space for descriptions of resource needs or potential strategic initiatives/goals identified within the program review.

All summary forms are presented to the Resource and Planning Council (RPC), which considers planning and resource allocation implications. The summary forms are also included in the college’s annual Assessment Report. The summary forms and full program reviews, in electronic form, are retained by the Vice President of Assessment, Research, and Technology and shared with sponsoring administrators as appropriate. Copies of the summary forms are sent to the associated program reviews’ authors along with any printed copies of their full program reviews. The Program Review Assessment Team will familiarize themselves with the process and its expected outcomes by reviewing the self-study reports with specific focus on:

1. The unit’s strengths and weaknesses within the context of documented evidence

2. The action plans for improvements using SMART objectives (see Chapter 5 of this IE Manual)

In the case of a Discipline/Program Review, the summary form prepared by the assigned Program Review Assessment Team will be forwarded to the Provost and Vice President for review and action. Observations confirmed by the Provost and Vice President will be addressed in the succeeding annual progress reports of the unit.
**Table 5: Discipline/Program Review – Instructional Units Schedule**

**Discipline/Program Review – Instructional Units Schedule**

To maximize the efficiency of the process and minimize the time commitment of any one group of faculty, related programs are grouped as much as possible to also provide them with the opportunity to share insight and resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program or Area</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emerging Technologies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS – Clinical Lab Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotechnology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Foundations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS - HSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS – Health Services Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Information Technology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Assisting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Office Specialist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction &amp; Technical Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeships</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARV</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Development Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program or Area</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Related Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiovascular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Medical Sonography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences for Health Programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgical Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Technology Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Information Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Media Technology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Design</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Media Production</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institute for Public Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramedic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Technology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo Animal Technology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities &amp; Foreign Languages</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5: Discipline/Program Review – Instructional Units Schedule*
CHAPTER 8:
PROGRAM REVIEW FOR ADMINISTRATIVE/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT UNITS

This chapter is designed to provide guidance, procedures, and templates for non-instructional units to use as they pursue their planning and program review process every three (3) years. Assessment for institutional effectiveness in administrative support and educational support divisions/departments should be aimed at bringing about excellence in programs and services offered to internal and external clients. The approach must be systematic and define expected outcomes through well thought-out objectives and assessment plans with results achievement and prescribed methods for analyzing those results for further improvement. **Figure 11** illustrates how this level of review functions within the larger process of IE at Santa Fe:

---

**Figure 11: Santa Fe College Model of Integrated Institutional Effectiveness**
Institutional Effectiveness (IE) is about how Santa Fe College addresses the process of assessment that supports all areas of the institution including student learning outcomes (SLO). At the Planning Unit level, IE focuses on the design and improvement of all administrative and education support activities which directly or indirectly enhance student learning. Expectations for evaluating IE in non-instructional programs are delineated in the comprehensive standards of the SACS-COC Principles of Accreditation.

### CS 3.3 Institutional Effectiveness

3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas:

**(Institutional Effectiveness)**

Specifically,

- 3.3.1.2 administrative support services
- 3.3.1.3 educational support services
- 3.3.1.4 research (not applicable for SF)
- 3.3.1.5 community/public service

Planning Units are units defined by the College to align with the SACS-COC comprehensive standard listed above. Table 5 lists the Planning Units within the current Program Review schedule.

At the Planning Unit-level—the pulse of the IE process, annual budget requests are developed in parallel to SMART objectives development with assessment to improve programs, administrative support services and educational support services outcomes. Refer to the “SF Institutional Effectiveness Calendar” and SF IE Model for continuity.

**Program Review – Planning Units Schedule**

To maximize the efficiency of the process and minimize the time commitment of any one group, related programs are grouped as much as possible.

As a contribution to the above planning process, each Administrative/Educational Support Services Unit conducts a formal, in-depth, internal review every three years to review the programs and services they are offering to internal/external clients.
Within the review process, units identify:

- unit missions (related to College mission)
- unit goals (related to College goals)
- outcome objectives and administrative objectives
- a method of assessment
- needs for change and future issues based on results of assessment

Each year, units undergoing review make presentations to their Vice Presidents. The summary report on the unit’s accomplishments, needs for improvement and critical issues uncovered in the process, is distributed to the President’s staff by the VP.

Each unit is required to make a one-year follow-up report (closing the loop) to the unit Vice President identifying their progress in the following areas:

- Progress made on identified strategies for change (from program review)
- Effective uses of new budget reallocation
- Continued needs within the unit

Introduction and Purpose

The Review Process

Learning, student success and access are at the core of the College’s mission. The College values include open access, academic excellence, diversity, civility, honesty and integrity, life-long-learning, collaboration with the community and assessment, accountability, and improvement.

The College’s overall effectiveness is measured in terms of realizations of its mission. These realizations are dependent upon defined expectations for, relationships among, and continual improvements in the performance of its personnel, academic programs, and educational and administrative support units.

The demonstration of institutional effectiveness requires evaluation of all instructional support units to determine the degree to which unit goals and objectives are achieved within the context of institutional mission.
The SACS-COC Principles of Accreditation also present standards for effective institutions that include on-going self evaluation as a major component of successful operation. Therefore, a structured, ongoing process of review will be implemented to assess each unit’s contribution to institutional effectiveness that it will yield useful information for unit improvement.

The purpose of the Administrative/Educational Support Services Unit Review is for service areas of the College to perform an internal review of the programs and services they are offering to internal/external clients. This will help to insure that service delivery is meeting the needs of students, faculty, staff, the institution as a whole and the community. Employees within the unit are to be involved in the review process. At least one external (to the unit) group should be involved through surveys or focus groups. Examples could include directors from other center or next year’s reviewees as per the schedule. Units are placed on a review schedule that will rotate on a three-year basis. Appendix E contains a brief descriptive outline of the process for review of these units.

**Required sections by all programs/units:**

In order to address SACS standards for review of administrative and educational support services (3.3.1.2 and 3.3.1.3); sections I.A, III. A - D. and IV. C - E of this document on the review outline will be required by all programs. Other elements of the review process allow for some freedom among programs/services. This overall review process has been refined to assist each unit in gaining helpful information and insight from the process. An expanded description of questions and statements listed under each area appears in the Administrative/Educational Support Program Review Template for. A description of the review process appears in Appendix F.

**Program Review Assessment Teams (PRA)**

Complementary groupings of completed program reviews are given by the Vice President for Assessment, Research, and Technology to Program Review Assessment Teams. Each team reads and discusses each program review they are assigned, meets with the review’s authors to ask any questions they may have and provide feedback on the review, and produces a summary form for the Resource and Planning Council. The summary form includes an institutional effectiveness audit component (in the form of a checklist with spaces for brief
comments), space for a narrative describing features of the program review the assessment team considers exemplary, space for a narrative describing suggestions from the assessment team to the program review authors (to strengthen either the review process or the review itself), and space for descriptions of resource needs or potential strategic initiatives/goals identified within the program review.

All summary forms are presented to the Resource and Planning Council (RPC), which considers planning and resource allocation implications. The summary forms are also included in the college’s annual Assessment Report. The summary forms and full program reviews, in electronic form, are retained by the Vice President of Assessment, Research, and Technology and shared with sponsoring administrators as appropriate. Copies of the summary forms are sent to the associated program reviews’ authors along with any printed copies of their full program reviews. The Program Review Assessment Team will familiarize themselves with the process and its expected outcomes by reviewing the self-study reports with specific focus on:

1. The unit’s strengths and weaknesses within the context of documented evidence
2. The action plans for improvements using SMART objectives (see Chapter 5 of this IE Manual)

Table 6: Administrative/Educational Support Program Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisement Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Center (Starke)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blount Downtown Center (Gainesville)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Innovation &amp; Economic Development (CIED)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling, Career Resource Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Center (Archer)</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development, Office of</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Resource Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Educational Support Program Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6: Administrative/Educational Support Program Review**

**CHAPTER 9: PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROCESS**

**Overview**

Simply put, performance management ensures that goals (college and unit) are consistently met in an effective and efficient manner (McNamara, 2007). Information in this chapter identifies the relationship of those planning and assessment activities to employee performance management at Santa Fe College (Figure 12).
Figure 12: Santa Fe College Model of Integrated Institutional Effectiveness

Appropriate references for Santa Fe College personnel performance management include:

Santa Fe College Rule 3.3 addressing Full-Time Administrative, Faculty, and Technical and Professional Positions states that “The duties and responsibilities for each position are set forth in the Standards for Planning and Performance and are located in the Office of Human Resources. Evaluations will be conducted annually, based on the Standards for Planning and Performance and the Standards of Excellence, and will be housed in the Office of Human Resources.”

In addition, the College Senate Professional Committee promotes professional standards of excellence at the College for faculty and contract personnel. The Committee encourages in-service training activities and other developmental programs. The Committee also coordinates and provides input for the development of guidelines for the yearly process of faculty and contract personnel evaluations. A primary document which ties faculty performance management to planning assessment is the Santa Fe Full-Time Faculty Self-Evaluation Guidelines which address designing
courses, delivering instruction, and evaluating student learning with additional emphasis on establishing and evaluating progress towards goals.

Furthermore, Santa Fe College Rule 3.12 states that “All career service employees shall be evaluated in a manner approved by the President. Evaluation shall be based on criteria related to performance.”

Units focus on and carry out the College Strategic Plan by supporting the Mission along with applicable Strategic Initiatives and College Goals as they apply to each unit’s purpose statement, unit goals and SMART planning objectives. Ultimately, the unit and supervisor’s goals translate to employee goals identified within individual performance plans (standards and appraisal). A unit’s SMART planning objectives may also be addressed as goal(s) in employee performance plans. Goals in performance plans hold certain strong advantages in the workplace (McNamara, 2007) to:

1. Provide clear direction to both supervisor and employee
2. Form a common frame of reference around which the supervisor and employee can effectively communicate
3. Clearly indicate success, and can facilitate strong sense of fulfillment for employee and supervisor
4. Help clarify the roles of the supervisor and employee.

According to McNamara (2007), employee goals should be SMARTER. The SMART acronym is described in Chapter 5 of this IE Manual as the guideline to developing annual planning objectives. SMARTER with the added “ER” in this reference to performance plans stands for:

- **Specific**
- **Measurable**
- **Aligned**
- **Realistic**
- **Time Bound**
- **Extending capabilities** (professional development)
- **Rewarding** (merits and awards)
If any goal seems insurmountable to the employee, then the supervisor may break goals down into smaller goals, or sub-goals or objectives. Each of these should be SMARTER, as well.

The relationship or how to “communicate” the College’s Strategic Plan to employees can be graphically demonstrated in levels and layers with the terminology taking on somewhat different connotation and meaning depending on the layer or level. It does not make a huge difference as to whether a goal in an employee performance plan is developed from a unit’s SMART planning objective, which in turn, may support a college-level goal or Strategic Initiative; what **is** important is to identify what is important to accomplish and how to go about accomplishing it—the terminology may differ in the hierarchy, but should

---

### Communicating Strategic Plan to Employee Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF Strategic Plan</th>
<th>Division, Department, Program Plans</th>
<th>Employee Performance Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Statement &amp; Values</td>
<td>Purpose Statements</td>
<td>Position Accountabilities and Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(College) Goals</td>
<td>(Unit) Goals</td>
<td>Unit and Supervisor Goals to Employee Goals and Performance Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>S.M.A.R.T. Objectives</td>
<td>Goals in Employee Performance Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels and Layers...for instance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What might be a departmental <strong>SMART Objective</strong> might also be a <strong>Goal</strong> in an employee’s performance plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Employees develop strategies and tactics to achieve their goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Figure 13: Communicating Strategic Plan to Employee Level* adapted from McNamara, C. (2007). *Field guide to nonprofit strategic planning and facilitation.* (3rd ed.). Minneapolis, MN: Authenticity Consulting, LLC.*
| **AY** | **Academic Year (fall, winter/spring, summer terms)** |
| **CY** | **Current Year** |
| **FY** | **Fiscal Year (July 1\(^{st}\) thru June 30\(^{th}\))** |
| **PY** | **Prior Year** |
| **RY** | **Reporting Year as defined by Florida DOE (summer 1E, fall 2B/E, plus spring 3B/E) B = beginning of term and E= end of term** |
| **Assessment** | **According to Ewell, refers primarily to the methods that an institution or program employs to gather evidence of student learning.** |
| **CTE** | **Career & Technical Education** |
| **Evaluation** | **According to Ewell, refers to evidence-gathering processes that are designed to examine a much wider domain of institutional performance.** |
| **Expected Outcome** | **The “why” of a planning or program objective. What we hope to achieve through strategies or initiatives undertaken.** |
| **GELO** | **General Education Learning Outcomes developed by FCS committee; adopted by SF** |
| **IE** | **According to Ewell, Institutional Effectiveness is the examination of the extent to which the institution as a whole attains all of the performance goals it establishes for itself.** |
| **PRA** | **Program Review Assessment Team** |
| **Outcome** | **Refer to Expected Outcome or SLO(A).** |
| **Output** | **An indirect indicator of learning such as retention rate, graduation rate, enrollment data, satisfaction rate, etc. (Jones, 2005). According to Ewell, results of what an institution does including student activities and investments; such as numbers of graduates, numbers of credits produced through instruction, or types of service or research products generated.** |
| **QEP** | **Quality Enhancement Plan required by SACS-COC** |
| **RPC** | **Santa Fe College’s Resource & Planning Council** |
| **SACS** | **Southern Association of Colleges & Schools, Commission on Colleges (COC or “The Commission”)** |
| **SLO (SLOA)** | **Student Learning Outcomes (Assessment). A directly measurable change in student learning and/or the learner as the result of engaging in a learning activity or program (Jones, 2005). According to Ewell, something that happens to an individual** |
student (hopefully for the better) as a result of his or her attendance at a higher education institution and/or participation in a particular course of study. Note: Per SACSCOC, grades are not a measure of what students have or have not learned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SMART</strong></th>
<th>Specific, Measurable, Aligned, Realistic, Time-bound planning objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SMARTER</strong></td>
<td>SMART performance plans with E = Extending capabilities thru professional development and R = Rewarding thru merits/ awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWOT</strong></td>
<td>Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX A

Directive: Substantive Change Notification to SACS-COC

Original Issue Date: June 1, 2009
Update: July 20, 2010

Purpose:
To give direction to the College in meeting SACS-COC (“Commission”) policy by providing internal procedures for notifying the Commission of substantive changes and, when required, by seeking approval prior to the initiation of changes (Comprehensive Standard 3.12). By definition, Substantive Change is a significant modification or expansion of the nature and scope of an accredited institution.

Reference:
Refer to functional policy and procedures delineated in the current SF Institutional Effectiveness Manual:
A Practitioner’s Guide to Planning, Assessment, & Improvement located at:
http://www.sfcollege.edu/rpc/

Procedures:

1. The College will follow the substantive change procedures of SACS-COC and inform the Commission of such changes in accord with those procedures.

2. If any SF office is unclear as to whether a change is substantive in nature, contact the SF SACS Accreditation Liaison (by position; Vice President for Assessment, Research, and Technology) for additional guidance and clarification.

3. The most current Commission policy and guidance on reporting substantive changes may be viewed at: http://www.sacscoc.org/SubstantiveChange.asp (from SACS-COC homepage; left hand menu bar).

The table identifies most common substantive changes (refer to SACS-COC Policy on Substantive Change), approval and notification requirements/timeframes plus the SF offices of
primary and corollary responsibility to initiate the approval/notification. Notification consists of a letter from SF’s President to the President of the Commission summarizing the proposed change, providing the intended implementation date, and listing the complete physical address, if the change involves the initiation of an off-campus site or branch campus. Again, contact the SF SACS Accreditation Liaison (by position: Vice President for Assessment, Research, and Technology) for details regarding any/all changes that may meet these requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16 Types of Substantive Change</th>
<th>Prior Approval/Notification Required</th>
<th>Notify SACS In-Advance (by)</th>
<th>Offices of Primary and Corollary Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1. Initiating coursework or programs at a more advanced level than currently approved</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>OPR: Academic Affairs (specific C/D/dept + Provost endorsement) OCR: BAS Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expanding at current degree level—that is, additional courses or programs that represent a significant departure, either in content or method of delivery, from those offered at Santa Fe’s 5th Year Interim Report) Examples: • A change from clock hours to credit hours. • Substantial increase in the number of hours for successful program completion.</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>OPR: Academic Affairs (specific C/D + Provost endorsement) OCR: Curriculum Committee (specific to LAS, CTE, BAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*3. Initiating branch campus or off-campus site (an additional location geographically apart from the main campus)</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>OPR: Development/Facilities OCR: AA, Finance &amp; ITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Off-campus Sites… (where a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4. Student obtain 50 percent or more of program</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>OPR: Academic Affairs (Center Dean/Director, Dean of Ed Centers + Provost endorsement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student can obtain 25-49 percent of credit</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
<td>Prior to implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Adding significantly different programs at an approved site (only if programs are currently approved)</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
<td>Prior to implementation</td>
<td>OPR: Academic Affairs (Center Dean/Director, Dean of Ed Centers + Provost endorsement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating distance learning…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Offering 50 percent or more of program</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>OPR: Academic Affairs (specific C/D/dept + Provost) OCR: AVP, Center for Academic Technologies + Provost endorsement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Offering 25-49 percent</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
<td>Prior to implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Initiating programs/courses offered through contractual agreement or consortium</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
<td>Prior to implementation</td>
<td>OPR: Academic Affairs (specific C/D + Provost) OCR: Finance &amp; ITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*10. Initiating a merger/consolidation</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>OPR: Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>OPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Altering significantly the educational mission of the institution</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>OCR: Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCR: President's Staff (VPs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Relocating a campus</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
<td>Prior to implementation</td>
<td>OPR: Academic Affairs (Center Dean/Director, Dean of Ed Centers +Provost endorsement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*13. Changing governance, ownership, control, or legal status</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>OCR: Administrative Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCR: President's Staff (VPs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Altering significantly the length of a program</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>OPR: AA (specific C/D +Provost)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCR: Curriculum Committee (specific to LAS, CTE, BAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Initiating degree completion programs</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>OPR: AA (specific C/D +Provost)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCR: Curriculum Committee (specific to LAS, CTE, BAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Closing an institution/program; initiating teach-out agreements (see Commission policy)</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>OCR: Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCR: President’s Staff (VPs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adding value to the lives of our students and enriching our community

Mission Statement

In keeping with our values and goals, Santa Fe College, a comprehensive public institution of higher education serving North Central Florida and beyond, adds value to the lives of our students and enriches our community through excellence in teaching and learning, innovative educational programs and student services, and community leadership and service.

Values

Santa Fe College is a dynamic, innovative learning community committed to

• Academic excellence, academic freedom, and intellectual pursuit
• Individual, social, and global responsibility
• Honesty, integrity, and civility
• Cultural diversity and equity
• Collaboration with our community
• Open access
• Lifelong learning
• Assessment, accountability, and improvement
• Sustainable use of environmental, social, and economic resources

Goals

• Outreach and Access
  Identify, assess, and meet community needs to promote open access to the College.
• **Delivery Alternatives**  
  Assess student needs and outcomes as well as create innovative and flexible learning opportunities.

• **Educational Programs**  
  Provide learning opportunities and academic support to ensure the highest levels of academic performance.

• **Student Affairs**  
  Provide research-based, learner-centered program of services that supports access and student engagement from matriculation to goal attainment.

• **Workforce Development**  
  Provide student-centered workforce programs in collaboration with local employers and economic development agencies.

• **Human Resources**  
  Recruit, develop, assess, and retain quality full- and part-time faculty and staff.

• **Technology**  
  Provide information and communications technology infrastructure and services to support the College’s mission.

• **Resources**  
  Develop, obtain, and allocate the necessary resources to implement the College’s mission.

• **Sustainability Education and Operations**  
  Create, develop, and enhance programs to reduce waste, conserve energy and green space, protect water resources, and promote wellness of students, faculty, and staff.
## Santa Fe College Strategic Initiatives

**Alignment of Goals to achieve institutional excellence in operations (Run), improved focus and capabilities (Grow), and continued innovation as a charter member of the League for Innovation in the Community College (Transform)!**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Initiative (SI) Category</th>
<th>Working Definition (Operationalized)</th>
<th>(College) Goals Addressed by this SI</th>
<th>Who Is Responsible?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellence in Teaching and Learning (ETL):</strong></td>
<td>Santa Fe will provide an academically challenging environment in support of the College’s mission and goals and will strive to enhance our educational excellence by encouraging, engaging in, and developing best and promising practices in support of intellectual, social and personal development. Examples of opportunities for improvement include an increased utilization of technology in teaching, redesigning curriculum for STEM, increasing interdisciplinary offerings, documenting student attainment of general education learning outcomes, engaging students at outlying centers using i-link courses, verifying identification of students enrolled in courses, providing training to increase effectiveness of faculty and staff, establishing a career ladder for faculty and staff (e.g. Master Instructor Certification).</td>
<td>Delivery Alternatives, Educational Programs, Student Affairs, Sustainability Education and Operations</td>
<td>President’s Staff Level: Provost &amp; Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constituent Relationship Management (CRM):</strong></td>
<td>Santa Fe will pursue Constituent Relationship Management to recognize this widely-implemented strategy for managing and nurturing Santa Fe’s interactions with its constituents (potential and current students, faculty, staff, community at large). CRM involves using technology to organize, automate, and synchronize College processes—principally services including marketing, customer service, and technical support. The overall goals are to find, attract, and win new students, nurture and retain those the College already has, entice former students back, and reduce the costs of marketing and services. CMR generally denotes a College-wide strategic initiative embracing all constituent-facing departments and even beyond. When Santa Fe’s implementation is effective, people, processes, and technology work in synergy to increase efficiencies and effectiveness while reducing operational costs.</td>
<td>Outreach and Access, Educational Programs, Student Affairs, Technology, Resources, Sustainability Education and Operations</td>
<td>President’s Staff Level: Vice President for Administrative Affairs and Vice President for Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Strategic Initiative** | Organization Development (OD):

---
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### SI Category

**Working Definition (Operationalized)**

Santa Fe will pursue Organization Development (OD) as a planned, organization-wide internal review to increase Santa Fe's effectiveness and viability. OD is neither "anything done to better an organization," nor is it "the training function of the organization"; it is a particular kind of change process designed to bring about a particular kind of end result. OD can involve interventions in Santa Fe's "processes," as well as organizational reflection, system improvement, planning, and self-analysis. Santa Fe will respond to change with this strategic initiative intended to change the beliefs, attitudes, values, and structure of organization so that the College can better adapt to new technologies, marketing and challenges, and the dizzying rate of change itself. In doing so, it will promote a strategic mindset that relies on a culture of evidence and promotes human capital.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(College) Goals</th>
<th>Addressed by this SI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources, Resources, Technology, Sustainability Education and Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Who Is Responsible? | President's Staff Level: Vice President for Development and Associate Vice President for College & Community Relations |
### 5/10/25 Year Master Planning Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Human Resources</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Affairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Student Life**     | • Create a new full-time Coordinator or Specialist position to lead the Office of Community Service.  
                       | • Hire a full-time Coordinator for the Leadership Institute.  
                       | • Create a new full-time Specialist position to implement Student Life-based programs at all of the Centers.  | • Be able to renovate the 1st floor of Bldg S per current floor plan.  
                       | • Occup the front of S Bldg; use it as an International Center for the current International Student Services, Multicultural Students Center, and ESL Office.  
                       | • Build on campus housing for Santa Fe students.  | • Be given access to server-side scripts that would enable “RSS” feeds and the ability to use online databases to better control & display website data.  
                       | • Purchase a video broadcasting system that would enable Student Life to send a combination of campus news & TV news to screen in buildings throughout campus.  |                                                   |
| **Athletics**        | • Create a new full-time Specialist or Coordinator position for Intramural Sports  
                       | • Women’s Volleyball Coach and Assistant  
                       | • Create a new full-time Career Service Office Manager position  | • Renovate/expand the Gym - Gym is 20+ years old, bleachers are uncomfortable; the old outdoor basketball court & racquetball courts: site of future Fitness Center?  
                       | • Additional gym space for volleyball practice  
                       | • On-campus housing  
                       | • New gymnasium (on NW39th Ave?)  |                                                   |
| **Advisement Center**| • Add two full-time Academic Advisers (one whom could be an Assoc Director).  
                       | • Create a new full-time Career Service Receptionist position  | • Creation of student tracking in advisement services  
                       | • Video technology for training advisors at the centers  
                       | • Move course substitution process online.  
                       | • Online tutorial for use of degree audit  |                                                   |
| **Student Development Programs** | • Career Resource Center: Needs a full-time staff assistant  
                       | • Counseling Center: Add 2 full-time counselors  | • Counseling Center wants it own space  
                       | • All Student Development Instruction faculty should be in same space  | • Give CRC administrative rights in their computer lab.  
<pre><code>                   | • Video technology to provide services at Centers  |                                                   |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Registrar/Records/Welcome Center</strong></th>
<th><strong>Financial Aid</strong></th>
<th><strong>Office of Diversity</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • SDI: Hire more full-time faculty to improve the current 30% full-time/70% part-time faculty ratio.  
  • SDI: Base a full-time faculty member at the Andrews or Watson Centers to teach classes in those Centers.  
  • Create a full-time Career Service support position for Veterans Affairs.  
  • Welcome Center needs a new full-time admissions adviser focused on recruitment.  
  • MBK: Create a full-time Coordinator, housed within the Office of Diversity.  | • Increase the size of the 2nd floor computer lab.  
  • Renovate 1st floor of R to create a better “Welcome Center” with a central greeting area to welcome new students to the College, plus space for admissions advisers to work, and several computer where new students can complete their applications.  
  • Create International Student Center.  | • Move appeals/petition to online.  
  • True call center  
  • Auto-graduate system in 5-10 years  |
| • Be allowed to fill the three currently-vacant positions.  
  • Create 2-3 full-time IT support positions devoted to Financial Aid systems.  | • Renovate the Financial Aid office to maximize utilization of space keeping privacy laws in mind.  | • Add three full-time advisers to Track specific group of students’ scholarship and keep them focuses on career aspirations.  
  • Hire adjunct faculty to provide tutoring services.  
  • Create office space for additional advisers listed above.  
  • Create a centralized tutoring location that can be bettered monitored than current set-up.  
  • Incorporate a Roundtable Room into the office that is more conducive to the program, in terms of set-up, furniture, & lighting – think a “tea room.”  | • Utilize video technology to allow for interaction between SFC students & other schools to focus on learning style differences.  |
### Dental Programs
- Community Dental Health Coordinator (assume need to hire to teach new program)
- Oral Preventive Assistant (assume need to hire to teach new program)
- Advanced Dental Hygiene Practitioner (assume need to hire to teach new program)
- Increase electronic record-keeping.
- Digital radiography (computers in all operatories)
- Sterilization equipment upgrade
- Dental chairs
- Dental equipment

### Humanities and Foreign Languages
- Tenure-track speech position
- Tenure-track philosophy position
- Tenure-track humanities position
- Tenure-track position in Spanish
- Tenure-track position in another foreign language
- International Center ($10 M)

### Santa Fe Center for Global Leadership
- Dedicated office space
- Two seminar rooms
- Small meeting and/or retreat and/or training and/or executive center

### Educational Centers
- Faculty for BAS programs
- Faculty for signature program at each Center
- Facilities for students in BAS programs
- Facilities for signature programs offered at each center

### Institute for Public Safety
#### Aviation
- Flight simulators
- Weather instrumentation
- Navigation models
- Computers

#### Corrections
- Faculty for Workforce education
- Mock jail

#### EMS
- Capital equipment for expanded scope of practice for paramedics
- CWE needs vehicles, equipment and technology.
| **Fire** | • Faculty to teach AS degree | • Fire training facility ($3-6 M) - partnership with GFR and ACFR |
| **Law Enforcement** | • PSAV need expanded facilities for tactical training. | • Background investigations and pre-employment screening for smaller partner agencies |
| **Selection Center** | • Dedicated testing facility | • Computers for computerized testing |
| **Infrastructure** | • Renovation of auditorium  
  • Crime scene lab  
  • EMS labs for expanded roles  
  • Convert firearms ranges to trap system.  
  • Incident command lab  
  • Jail lab  
  • K-9 ranges  
  • Mock city  
  • Physical ability testing lab  
  • Add lanes for vehicle operations range  
  • Shoot house | • More technology in classrooms  
  • Enhance security system  
  • Enhance water supply and management for fire training facility  
  • Running man target system  
  • Turning target system  
  • Light system for range |
| **Public Safety Management BAS degree** | • Staff | |
| **Fine Arts** |  |  |
| **Music** | • Offices (4 more)  
  • Classrooms  
  • Practice space (7 more) | • 2 kilns  
  • 4-5 pottery wheels |
| **Art** | • Renovate M Building for offices and additional classrooms. |  |
| **Dance** | • Additional space may be needed (in addition to the fine arts hall). |  |
| **Storage** | • Theatre props, Dance, Music and Theatre costumes, Music equipment, theatrical equipment, banquet accessories and GCO equipment |  |
| **Theatre** | • Retrofit E-129 as Black Box teaching space. | • New sound equipment  
  • Recording equipment |
| Parking  | • E-129 storage  
|         | • E-129 seating  
|         | • Lighting grid  |
|         | • Secure space for loading and unloading costumes.  |
APPENDIX D: RESOURCES AND FACILITIES PLANNING

In 2007, two subcommittees were formed:

1. **Instructional Subcommittee** (Chair: Paul Hutchins)
   a. Suggested membership:
      i. Academic department chairs and directors (initial visioning), including library and academic foundations, High School Dual Enrollment
      ii. Center directors
      iii. Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning
   b. Major issues to consider:
      i. What will the academic departments look like in 5-10 years?
      ii. What challenges will the academic divisions face in the next 5-10 years?
      iii. How will technology impact the way instruction is delivered?
      iv. What curricular changes will need to occur?
      v. What will the typical student look like in 5-10 years?
      vi. Will current space and technology be adequate to meet instructional needs?
      vii. How will online and hybrid classes affect instruction?

2. **Support Services Subcommittee** (Co-Chairs: Tim Nesler and Dan Rodkin)
   a. Suggested membership:
      i. Facilities services
      ii. ITS
      iii. Student Affairs
      iv. Library
      v. Centers
      vi. Police
      vii. Academic Technologies
viii. Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning

b. Major issues to consider:

i. What services MUST support services continue to deliver or add based on the Long Range Plan created by Academic Affairs?

ii. What challenges will support services face in the next 5-10 years that will impact its ability to deliver services?

iii. What collaborative partnerships need to be formed?

iv. How will center enrollment impact services?

v. How will online and hybrid classes impact support services?

vi. How will the virtual campus expand in the next 5-10 years?

vii. How can the impact of vehicles on our campus be decreased while increasing enrollment?

What to do next:

1. Instructional Subcommittee:

   a. Meet with chairs and directors to ascertain their future needs. The needs of the department should align with those of Academic Affairs.

   b. Have chairs and directors contact their professional organizations and relate these organizations’ long-range visions to Academic Affairs long range plan.

2. Support Services Subcommittee:

   a. Meet with supporting departments to align their individual long-range plans with those of Academic Affairs.

   b. Identify resources necessary to increase the virtual campus, both administrative and academic.

Analyze enrollment patterns, growth and centers development.
APPENDIX D: TEMPLATE FOR RESPONSES FROM DISCIPLINES OR PROGRAMS TO DATA SETS

Template for Responses from Disciplines or Programs to Data Sets

Data sets for disciplines or programs to respond to items in the template may include elements from the following categories:

1. **Student Characteristics and Access**
   a. Total unduplicated headcount by ethnicity, gender, and age range
   b. Total student credit hours
   c. Full-time equivalent or FTE (calculated)
   d. Total full-time and part-time
   e. Total day, evening, and weekend
   f. Total by county of residence
   g. Total students in distance learning courses or programs
   h. Total first time in college

2. **Faculty**
   a. Total full-time faculty tenure and tenure track, by ethnicity and gender
   b. Total part-time faculty, by ethnicity and gender
   c. Full-time to part-time faculty ratio by FTE (calculated)
   d. Total annual credit hours or contact hour by contract for full-time faculty
   e. Faculty to student ratio (calculated)

3. **Scheduling**
   a. Number of flex term sections by term and by site
   b. Number of distance learning sections
   c. Courses and programs with no enrollment (e.g., cancelled sections, courses left on hold)
4. **Cost Effectiveness/Efficiency**
   a. Instructional cost per FTE student
   b. Full cost per FTE
   c. Average class size by course
   d. Number and percent of filled sections

5. **Curriculum**
   a. Learning outcomes for the discipline/program in measurable terms
   b. General education outcomes for discipline program in measurable terms
   c. Summary of revisions in courses and rationale
   d. Addition and deletion of courses and rationale
   e. Summary of program revisions and rationale
   f. Program deletions and rationale
   g. Programmatic articulation with K-12 and universities (UF)

6. **Indirect Measures of Student Learning**
   a. Retention and success rates in each course in discipline/program by ethnicity and gender
   b. Retention and success rates in distance learning courses
   c. Success rates of students as they progress through required developmental and college-level courses in mathematics and communications, by ethnic, gender and age
      (Applicable only to Mathematics and English disciplines)
   d. Success rates of students as they progress through defined sequences of courses in the curriculum.
   e. Degrees or certificates completed compared to enrollments by ethnicity, gender and age
      (Applicable only to AS, AAS, BAS, PSAV and certificate programs)
   f. Student opinions of discipline/program by current students and graduates
   g. Stakeholders’ opinion of program
7. **Direct Measures of Student Learning**

   a. Evidence of attainment of general education competencies
   
   b. Evidence of student achievement in learning outcomes for the discipline/program
   
   c. Evidence of the number of AA graduates by ethnicity and gender
   
   d. Evidence of transfer rates by ethnicity and gender
      (Applicable only to transfer degree disciplines/programs)
   
   e. Evidence of performance of transfer students
      (Applicable only to transfer degree disciplines)
   
   f. Evidence of student retention and success
   
   g. Evidence of student engagement in learning
   
   h. Evidence of discipline/program quality from external sources such as advisory committees, agencies, employers, by other departments on campus where those departments are consumers of instruction provided by the discipline, and other stakeholders
   
   i. Evidence of student performance on licensure or certification examinations
      (Applicable only to AS, AAS, BAS, PSAV, and certificate programs)
   
   j. Evidence of employment of graduates
      (Applicable only to AS, AAS, BAS, PSAV and certificate programs)
   
   k. Evidence of employment of AA graduates
   
   l. Evidence of developmental education students’ performance in subsequent, related course work
      (Applicable only to Mathematics and English)
APPENDIX E: A BRIEF DESCRIPTIVE OUTLINE OF THE REVIEW PROCESS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES UNITS

The following is a brief descriptive outline of the process for review of these units.

Outline: Administrative/Educational Support Services Unit Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>The Unit/Program Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>The Mission/Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Role unit plays in the College’s mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Unit/program goals as they relate to the College’s mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>The Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Administrative and Professional Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Position description/duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Credentials (full and part-time, if any)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Accomplishments (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Service to Unit, College and community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Professional development activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Career Service and Other Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. List of names and positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. List of required credentials (if any)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>The Stakeholder/Client Served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Breakdown of students/faculty or staff by type or demographic information (thorough explanation of who is served)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Key internal and external stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2  | Definition of Services or Program |
a. Definition of day-to-day duties of the unit

b. Innovations, new projects, new initiatives, local, state-wide or national efforts

c. Required functions of unit (description and status of compliance)
   i. SACS core requirements and comprehensive standards
   ii. City/County/State mandates
   iii. Federal mandates
   iv. Other

### 3 Administrative Outcomes and Student Outcomes (where appropriate)

a. Outcomes (2-3 outcome objectives)

b. Outcomes (or status if incomplete) of innovations, new projects, new initiatives, local, state or national efforts

c. Assessment explanation (what was assessed, who, when, how many)

d. Results of Administrative Outcomes Based on Assessment

### 4 Need for Change

a. Strengths identified by external sources, faculty, staff and students

b. Weaknesses identified by external sources, faculty, staff and students

c. Recommendations by faculty, staff, external sources and students to improve the unit’s services and programs

d. Strategies for change (based on input from A, B & C above) – closing the loop

e. A one-year follow-up brief report to the Unit VP reporting on the progress of D above (due April 15, the year following review)

### 5 Future Issues – Resources needed for future efforts
a. Market trends within the broad service unit or program area (based on best-practices, the literature or training received)

b. Anticipated future changes and needs (based on market trends)

c. Resources, equipment, space, staffing and work load changes needs for future growth or continuation

d. Future plans of unit

Administrative/Educational Support Services Unit Review

Definition of a “Program”:

The term “Program” for the purpose of this review is defined as “a group of courses, services or activities designed and implemented by a specific group of people with a common purpose or core set of outcomes.”

No matter what type of program/service unit you represent, your review must address the following SACS-COC areas of concern:

1. Core Requirement 2.5 states

“The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality and (3) demonstrate that the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission (Institutional Effectiveness).”

2. Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1 states

“The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses whether it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas:
3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes,
3.3.1.2 administrative support services,
3.3.1.3 educational support services,
3.3.1.4 research within its educational mission, if appropriate,
3.3.1.5 community/public service within its educational mission, if appropriate.”
APPENDIX F: A DESCRIPTION OF THE REVIEW PROCESS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES UNITS

Description of the Process:

I. Program Profile

A. Mission/Purpose
   Each unit will have an opportunity to describe its program/service in some detail. All programs should fit nicely into SF’s Mission. If your unit has its own mission, use it here, if not, simply address how your unit’s goals fall in line with the College’s mission and goals. Goals must always lead back to the mission. If they do not, red flags go up in the minds of those reading your review. All units must link to the College’s mission.
   1. Role unit plays in the College’s mission
   2. Unit/program goals as they relate to the College’s mission

B. Staff
   1. Administrative and Professional
      This section will provide information on the quality of the staff and the leadership capabilities within the unit, including service to College and community and commitment to lifelong learning:
         a. Position description/duties
         b. The credentials of all full and part-time professional staff including degrees, special training, certificates, etc.
         c. The accomplishments of the professional staff including grants, recognition, awards and honors
      b. Service to the College, community and professional organizations.
         c. Professional Development activities of the faculty, courses taken, special training received, and conferences attended, etc.
2. **Career Service and Other Staff:**
   a. List of names and positions/job titles
   b. List of basic qualifications for the job

C. **The Stakeholder/Client Served**
   It is important to discuss the type of stakeholder/clients that your unit serves. Many units/programs serve only faculty/staff while other units serve students, the state system office and the community as well as faculty/staff. The important issue here is that external reviewers of your unit can understand your service population and how characteristics of those served impact programs and services.

II. **Unit Services and Function**

A. **Definition of day-to-day duties of the unit**
   Here units can define their “services or program.” Programs/services should explain themselves in terms of “function.” Most units have day-to-day functions that must be accomplished plus additional efforts they must support or champion. Those should be explained in the next section.

B. **Innovations, new projects, new initiatives, local, state or national efforts**
   Units may explain any initiative in which they are involved that is separate from the day-to-day function of their unit.

C. **Required functions of unit** (description and progress of compliance and community commitment)
   1. SACS-COC core requirements and comprehensive standards including compliance with substantive change policy
   2. City/County/State mandates including service area school districts
   3. Federal mandates
   4. Other - some units have additional requirements that come from sources other than those listed in 1-3 above.

Many units must comply with state, federal and SACS-COC requirements. Data and/or information should be provided in this
section as to the progress made toward compliance with these mandates.

III. Administrative Outcomes and Student Outcomes

Education has moved into the age of assessment. We can no longer evaluate the effectiveness of our programs by the numbers we serve. Our system office, accrediting agencies and government officials are interested in the outcomes our students see as a result of attending SF. **It is no longer good enough that we offer programs and services; we must show that we are continually seeking to improve – to better meet the changing needs of our students, faculty/staff and community.** “Outcomes” are benefits for people: changes in knowledge, values, position, skills, behavior or status. For administrative/educational support units, **Outcomes are benefits for students, the faculty/staff or the College as a whole.** **Things such as changes or improvements in efficiency, skill-level of faculty/staff, opportunities for the College, circumstances for students and potential for the future are examples of Outcomes.** **These should be things over which you have a certain amount of control.**

Examples:

- **Student Outcome:** 95% of students who apply and are qualified for monetary assistance will receive financial aid.
- **Administrative Outcome:** 100% of state and federal reports written by Planning and Research will be submitted on time.

Each unit must address the following in the area of administrative outcomes/student outcomes:

A. **Identify outcomes** (no more than 2-3 each).

B. **Identify outcomes of any innovations, new projects, and new initiatives, local, state or national efforts in which they participate.**

C. **Assess whether outcomes were met** (what was assessed, who, where, when, how many, etc.) **You must identify how you assessed** (e.g. survey).

Each unit should create a method of regularly assessing outcomes. An explanation of the assessment you will use to determine if outcomes were met needs to be explained here. Identify what constitutes success on the measure (e.g. 80% passing rate). These results will be used to
make suggested improvements in programs and services. Some typical methods to assess outcomes are as follows:

- Focus groups
- Archival data (in written records)
- Surveys and feedback from graduates/completers
- Surveys and feedback from faculty and staff
- Surveys and feedback from current students about services

D. Results of Outcomes Based on Assessment
Identify the results that were found through assessment. State whether outcomes were met or not met.

IV. Need for Change based on Student and Faculty/Staff Feedback

a. Strengths identified by external sources, faculty, staff and students

b. Weaknesses identified by external sources, faculty, staff and students

c. Recommendations by faculty, staff, external sources and students to improve the unit’s services and programs

d. Strategies for change (based on input from A, B & C above) – closing the loop

e. A one-year follow-up brief report to the Unit VP reporting on the progress of D above (due April 15, the year following review)

Using outcome assessment results to improve programs and services is the most important aspect of review. By assessing outcomes, programs often find that service recipients are not doing well in certain areas or that changes need to be made to keep up with trends in the field. Finding program weaknesses or need for change is a “good thing.” This gives a program direction for making changes and the ability to document the effort taken to make program improvements (true institutional effectiveness). Results from measuring outcomes should be used in this section.

Most programs in higher education feel strongly that they are offering effective services that are state-of-the-art in their field. Often this is not true and programs would benefit from taking a frequent inventory of program effectiveness,
strengths and weaknesses and making regular feedback part of their planning process. Students and faculty/staff are excellent sources of perceived program strengths and weaknesses. Five sections that must be included are:

1. Ways to better serve our service recipients
2. Strengths identified by students and/or faculty/staff
3. Weaknesses identified by students and/or faculty/staff
4. Recommendations and strategies for change
5. A one-year follow-up on progress toward strategies for change

Programs must document “on paper” how feedback informs programmatic changes as a required portion of the review process. Programs reviewed in a given year must submit a brief report in the spring of the following year identifying all the programmatic changes made as a result of assessing outcomes the previous year during their review.

V. Future Issues

This is an opportunity for programs to discuss what they will need for future growth, where their program/unit is going, or anticipated future changes. Resources needed for future efforts can be discussed here. Some other issues that can be discussed are:

A. Anticipated future program/unit changes and needs – this may include the development of new methods of delivery
B. Market trends within the program area
C. Resources, equipment, space and staff needs/changes for future growth or continuation
D. Future plan