

Institutional Strategic Planning Council
September 20, 2017
ST 107 (1:00-3:00pm)
Minutes

Members Present: Kris Anderson (Faculty Accreditation co-chair), Greg Aycock, Melissa Bader (Faculty Chair), Peggy Campo, Chis Castillo (ASNC Rep.), Leona Crawford, Mark DeAsis, Monica Esparza, Daniel Landin, Ruth Leal (Staff Chair), Samuel Lee, Mark Lewis, Barbara Moore, Chris Poole, Bryan Reece (Admin Chair) Jim Reeves, Mitzi Sloniger, Jim Thomas

Call to order: 1:05pm

Approval of Minutes:

Approval of Minutes for September 6, 2017

MSC (Thomas/Lewis) Approved. (2 abstentions)

Correction: Amend Professional Development section to illustrate that this was a ‘for example’ conversation. Remove the sentence about the dearth of goals.

I. Action Items:

1.6M Proposal (Bryan Reece)

MSC (Campo/Landin) Approved.

Background and Discussion:

We have a one-time allocation from the district from an excess in reserves. At the last ISPC meeting, we discussed how to spend it. The consensus leaned toward spending it on growth. Dr. Reece presented a proposal to spend the one time allocation on 1) Growth Initiatives and 2) Items that need immediate attention from the Program Review list. (Handout).

Questions/Comments:

- Does this plan include a staffing plan for admin assistants, A&R staff, and IDS’s for the short-term and long-term?
- IDS staffing is an issue right now.
- Will the positions be treated like grant-funded employees?
- Expect an annual report on the ROI for the programs, at that point we can make a decision regarding re-hiring.
- It is important to note when things are done well, this is a thoughtful approach to spending money.

Staffing Initiative includes year one costs for 3 FT directors and the equivalent of 3 FT administrative/classified support for the Next Phase/Prison Program, Dual Enrollment, and Veterans Services. The directors will be in charge of heading up initiatives that are currently being handled by existing staff. The support is there, we need to have the management person to take it to the next level.

Recommendations:

Detailed staffing plan for subsequent years as part of the proposal. Pursue grant and fund raising opportunities.

II. Committee Reports

None.

III. Information Items

A. Academic Reorganization (Bryan Reece)

Early in the year, Dr. Reece discussed transitioning from a small college model to a division dean model. Currently we have the Dean of Instruction doing all of the enrollment management leaving no time to grow programs. We cannot hire new deans but we can use our existing deans as division deans. The proposal is to ensure that we are moving toward thoughtful comprehensive growth and development of our instructional programs. Do we want to move in that direction?

Questions/Comments:

- Teaching experience is a requirement for Instructional Deans.
- It is important to develop a culture of valuing what happens in the classroom first, within Academic Affairs, creating a culture of understanding and support.
- If we move deans from roles into other who oversees those programs?
- IDS's are already overloaded; does this plan include a distribution of their workload?
- Can we increase Instructional Deans using grants? The work has to be tied to the grant.
- Why is the push towards administration, what do we get when we do that? We need to demonstrate there is a need to change.
- The IOI is an issue; faculty do not want to be evaluated by someone who has never taught before. On the flip side, if you are instructor and want to start something new you will need an administrative advocate.
- What if the Dean(s) of Instruction continue to facilitate the IOI's but division deans handle the administrative aspects of the department?
- Despite seeing a lot of faculty performing administrative work, involvement in this work (i.e. enrollment management), is something that many of the faculty want to take part in.

Recommendation:

Continue to discuss with faculty constitute groups the need and how to approach a transition to a division dean model at Norco College.

B. Institutional Set Standards Update (Greg Aycock)

At their [May 15, 2017](#) meeting, the Academic Senate voted to approve a change in the ISS Procedural Response. The Dean of Institutional Effectiveness identifies a “dip” below ISS for two consecutive years, as measured by ½ standard deviation from the 5-year norm. Currently, nothing needs a procedural response from the senate, we are below in success for fall, and below in one or two areas for employment; however this was not the case last year. Dr. Aycock will review again in March when the next report is completed.

C. Review Open Dialogue Minutes (Ruth Leal)

Ruth reviewed the minutes from the last open dialogue meeting noting items under ISPC purview:

- Parking and signage (wayfinding that is all inclusive): BFPC is taking on this topic.
- Hiring Strategy: Dr. Reece is addressing this issue.
- Shade outdoor table for the amphitheater: In progress.
- Shade for tables: In progress.
- CSS-217 Re-purpose into multi-purpose space: This will be brought to BFPC, Jim Reeves will report back.
- Non-smoking campus: A survey was completed and COTW minutes reflect a responsibility to JFK to make this college a non-smoking campus. Needs Action.

Action Item: Add to the next meeting to come up with a cessation plan for a non-smoking campus. Obtain minutes from the ASNC Senate Meeting.

D. Review Surveys of ISPC, IC, & Committees (Greg Aycock)

- ISPC Survey tabled for next meeting.

Dr. Aycock reviewed for the committee the Institutional Effectiveness Survey administered last spring rating the effectiveness of the strategic planning committees.

Items Tabled for Next Meeting

D. Review ISPC Survey (Greg Aycock)

E. Budget Planning Workshop Discussion (Melissa Bader)

F. COTW Discussion (Melissa Bader & Ruth Leal)

G. Prioritization Process Timeline Update (Bryan Reece)

IV. Good of the order

Peggy shared a concern about the President serving as the sitting tri-chair for the ISPC. This committee is a recommending body and the decision needs more campus-wide discussion.

Meeting adjourned at 2:59pm

Next meeting is Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Minutes submitted by Denise Terrazas

Strategic Initiatives	In Program Review	Anticipated Cost	Notes:	Offsets and Adjustments	Projected Costs
Staffing		\$ 641,000.00	Year one costs		\$ 641,000
Next Phase/ Prison Program			Not in PR but vetted through planning process		\$ -
Dual Enrollment	X				\$ -
Veterans	X				\$ -
Business Services					\$ -
Emergency Preparedness Budget	X	\$ 50,000			\$ 50,000
Facilities					\$ -
Parking Lot Paving/ Slurry	X	\$ 500,000	DTSC lot and some portion of Third St. Repairs		\$ 350,000
Campus Signage Design/ Implementation		\$ 50,000			\$ 50,000
Space Utilization (see schedule)	X	\$ 75,000	Accommodate additional faculty/staff		\$ 75,000
Key Card Access Program - Student Services	X	\$ 150,000			\$ -
Marquee Sign Gap Funding	X	\$ 250,000		\$ 150,000	\$ 100,000
Instructional/ Student Support Services					\$ -
Theatre Lighting	X	\$ 15,000	Carryover from 16/17		\$ 15,000
Library Lighting	X	\$ 20,000	Completes Initial Retrofit Program		\$ 20,000
Amphitheatre Shade Sys.	X	\$ 450,000	Anticipates ASNC contribution	\$ 150,000	\$ 300,000
Traffic Study		\$ 25,000			\$ 25,000
Traffic Control Lights		\$ 50,000			\$ 50,000
Total		\$ 2,276,000			\$ 1,676,000

Distribution from Reserves - Norco Share

\$ 1,674,750

Institutional Strategic Planning Council
Open Dialogue Session
May 17, 2017
2:30—3:30 CSS 217

Attendees:

Welcome

Dr. Diane Dieckmeyer: Open Dialogue came about from an accreditation that took place that suggested we didn't have enough opportunities for individuals to speak out. The purpose of open dialogue is an opportunity to talk about program review, planning procedures & we would use this and the minutes taken as an evaluation tool. Over the year, ISPC evaluated this and we learned it was effective as an evaluation tool and that it is something that is to the college benefit. Changes have happened from this dialogue. It's unique because there is no agenda and it's an opportunity to ask a question, voice a concern about anything college related that is on your mind, or even just sit quietly.

Parking & Signage

Daniela: we might need more help with exploring directing people to the lots according to the alphabet-signing (Parking lot d etc). BFPC have recognized the need. Summer project will take place to drive the campus as someone new to meet the needs of signage and locations of different parking lots.

Celia: When students don't know what to do or where to go they come to the library.

Communication of Training Opportunities

There is a training (pilot) taking place and an online training that's purpose is to help us better understand how to engage teach and understand our men of color. The training is 15 hours and right now, there is a pilot group going through it.

It was not an open invitation, the offer went to the Equity Work Group first then ISPC and there are still open seats. The hope is that as people go through this training we would then bring it into FLEX to have a base of people that had completed it then get it out to Faculty and Staff. The library bought ten copies of this book, which are available. The concern is that if things like this are happening even if we are not able to participate communication regarding things taking place around the campus are appreciated.

Response: Not having an admin for the equity workgroup is a stated challenge regarding communication.

Committees

Melissa: We need to simplify the process of who is doing minutes for different committees; we need to change the association of functions and roles as opposed to who used to do something versus who is doing it currently.

Beth: We have a worry of over saturation, but maybe if we direct people to websites that you could go to in order to find things that interest you specifically. Just current stuff of what's happening to ensure people can do the things that interest them.

Diane: we have to figure out a way to share information within the Norco employees not to the entire college community. As we grow, we must continue to be mindful of those who want to participate. ISPC decided to make the first topic of the first meeting of the fall is to review this meetings minutes.

Vaping, Smoke Free Campus

Sarah Burnett: signage to police e-vaping, what is taking the place with smoking we were going to go forward a cessation plan to get rid of smoking on the campus. This was voted on at COTW to remove the signs and stop smoking on campus, even though the governor did not sign the second legislation. Are we not allowed to just state that we are no longer a smoking campus? The fact that our spaces (smoking spaces specifically) are accessible to the JFK students leaves us at risk.

Response: Minutes from the COTW meeting will be reviewed.

Human Resources

Sarah Burnett: Within hiring communication process for internal applicants, we need more HR people and one who doesn't split their time with the District Office. This is the fourth summer in a row that we will have faculty-hiring committees taking place during the summer. The workload on the faculty at the end of the semester is not wise we should be able to stay locked into to completing the semester with our students.

Bryan Reece: we need to start the fall semester with a collective strategy to have everything done by the winter break. Then we can work with HR to make sure our candidates are being pushed through.

Kevin Fleming: Even with winter break, there is still a real concern with the structural process and timeline.

Diane: went through this for four months trying to get a temp for an assistant, maybe they need to hire more temps or more permanent staff

Beth: The last time the District assessed district services the finding was not shared. They are not exempt from the expectation of providing quality services to the colleges.

Jason Parks: Have we considered a professional resource team?

Dr. Reece: can we assess our services received from the District? We are writing a District Strategic Plan and there is a lot of language that says the District is a service to the colleges. So if the colleges routinely assess the District services provided that may be an easier way to go, being wrapped into the strategic plan.

Shaded outdoor tables, spaces to study

Staff Member, emailed in: has a lot of interaction with students that there is not enough tables with seating and shade to study and enjoy the outdoors. We found out about this need through another survey, our response was to purchase the red tables that are used frequently now.

Sarah Burnett: students would like more spaces for study groups to take place, what we currently have is not enough. Something like the STEM center with white boards they can utilize where they can log in reserve a block to have access to resources.

Jason Parks: the LRC is currently available to hold student groups that isn't used as much.

Kevin Fleming: In regards to hiring we've had some awesome job of hiring practices, let's not lose that momentum. We've done a great job.

CSS-217

Beth Gomez: we need to figure out what to do with this room (CSS 217) it needs to be a goal for next year, even using it as a classroom we have to get a pedagogy right. This is an under-utilized space.

Training

Melissa Bader: first Fridays with faculty is going great with our faculty but we should be doing something like this with staff and managers to help them acclimate to the culture of Norco understanding where they fit. To teach how decisions are made in this college, educate on the governance.

Ruth: we don't have the time available like faculty do when trying to conduct a training, or search committees, or everything else. There is no designated time where staff are available collectively to complete any activities.

Jenn: If we can't find the time to get employees all together to be trained at once maybe we can coordinate getting a mentorship program connecting each mentor with a new employee.

Shirley: The same thing with technology, we need to get into labs to complete updates to software while trying to coordinate a designated times in between the academic scheduling that currently is taking place. Each college handles this challenge differently. We need to do preventative maintenance, we need faculty to test software they are needing for their courses to ensure they are functioning at proper capacity. The majority of tech problems are called in by adjunct faculty that aren't available to meet to assess software. We need to make it a priority to be able to get into these lab spaces to provide the technology

Celia: the library is closed every Friday at 1:00 that is the only block of time we have available.

Jim Tomas: a master calendar that includes all events would be something that could overcome the issue of time blocks to meet.

Sarah Burnett: getting faculty to meet outside of college hour feel impossible, it's challenging to try to schedule something when you are unable to meet, I would like it if everyone would look at the master calendar prior to scheduling an event.

Sarah Burnett: can we improve our internet speed? The flow of teaching grinds to a halt when waiting to be able to connect to incorporate the internet into content.

Institutional Strategic Planning Council
Open Dialogue Session
June 1, 2016
1:00-2:00 CSS 217

Attendees:

- Dr. Carol Farrar –Dean of Instruction
- Ms. Barbara Moore – Associate Professor, Biology
- Dr. Koji Uesugi-Dean of Student Services
- Dr. Maureen Sinclair-CTE Project Supervisor
- Mr. Charles Henkels-Apprenticeship Director
- Ms. Ruth Leal – Staff
- Ms. Melissa Bader – Associate Professor, English
- Dr. Irving Hendrick – President
- Dr. Siobhan Freitas – Associate Professor, Chemistry
- Dr. Greg Aycock – Dean, Student Success
- Dr. Diane Dieckmeyer –Vice President, Academic Affairs
- Ms. Peggy Campo – Associate Professor, Anatomy and Physiology
- Dr. James Thomas-Professor, Construction
- Mr. Chris Poole-Staff
- Ms. Ana-Marie Olaerts – Associate Professor, Speech Communication
- Dr. Kevin Fleming – Dean of Instruction, Career and Technology
- Mr. Emile Bradshaw –Staff
- Dr. Monica Green – Vice President, Student Services
- Ms. Beth Gomez – Vice President, Business Services
- Ms. Tricia Hodawanus – Staff
- Mr. Mark DeAsis – Dean of Admissions and Records
- Ms. Natalie Aceves – Staff
- Dr. Sarah Burnett, Professor, Early Childhood Education
- Ms. Mitzi Sloniger – Associate Professor, Reading

Welcome Dr. Diane Dieckmeyer

- Dr. Dieckmeyer welcomed the group to the annual Open Dialogue session and reviewed the purpose of this meeting. A link was sent earlier so everyone had an opportunity to review the Open Dialogue minutes from our last meeting. The time that is currently scheduled for these meetings was discussed. We are open to alternative meeting times and welcome your input. Dr. Dieckmeyer reminded the group that there is never an agenda for this meeting. This forum is an opportunity to bring up any issue you would like to discuss. Discussion is open to the floor:

Dr. Kevin Fleming

- Welcome Charles Henkels-new Apprentice Director-We are currently working on the focus for Norco College. We are the only Community College hosting the Apprenticeship program. Charles is located in OC 116.

How do you feel the College is really doing?

- It feels shiny on the outside but rattily on the inside. Is it due to all the changes? What is the underlying reason for feeling rattily? Do other people feel we are not as strong on the inside?
- At the last Committee of The Whole (COTW) meeting the discussion was rushed and there was not enough time to properly discuss and vote. The minutes show we discussed and everything was fine?
- While we were going through the process of becoming an independent college lots of things changed. It could be the perception that things are not moving along as fast when compared to previous years.
- Rattily on the inside could come from not being able to find the time to meet, i.e. Program Review. We need something to happen or something might break. We *seem* to be moving along fine, but at what expense?
- COTW was an attempt to offer fewer meetings. The time is very compressed and we are still trying to balance getting the information out and the desire for fewer meeting.
- Don't throw out the Institutional Strategic Planning Council evaluation process; just bring forward the ideas from the Open Dialogue meeting in the fall. Refresh memories with a summary report.
- There is agreement that we are shiny on the outside-a general concept of pride and optimism.

How do we make these meetings more meaningful, encourage leadership and do analysis?

- Leadership positions need to be spread out. Why do people shy away from leadership positions? Are we undervaluing the positions which in turn makes fewer people step up? Should we do an anonymous analysis/survey of leadership?
- What is being said is really a mix; no one really wants to step up to leadership because they know what it means.
- Should COTW be a voting body or informal?
- Consider listening to stakeholders first.
- The various Councils represent the constituency. Maybe the constituencies aren't hearing all of the information.
- Leadership responsibilities change. The changes are tied to timelines. It takes time for a new leader to settle in.
- It is challenging to get information out to all the staff and we don't get as many staff in these meetings as we would like.
- Perhaps the Portal will help to notify staff of important issues? Is there a system within the system to create review topics?
- We need a wider input and a better way to communicate. Many people that come to the COTW meetings are hearing the topics being discussed for the first time even though the topics have gone through all of the Councils. Now is not the time to put it to a vote because really the decisions have already been made.
- Information should be disseminated, reviewed, thought through and *then* voted on.
- Perhaps the use of technology would help? There is a function in 25Live to post information and create your own committee calendar. Also consider the portal for posting.

- We are saturated with information. We can't keep up with the technology we have!
- Need to determine "want to know" vs "need to know" Nor-all is oversaturated.
- Could the rattily feeling be that we are experiencing a change of perspective. Moving from a small college to a large college means we have outgrown the luxury of knowing everything and everyone. We must explore new ways to communicate.
- The fact that we can have this open dialogue speaks to our strength as a college.
- Norco has lots of new people and we will continue to grow.
- The data reflects that we *are* shinny on the outside. Looking inside - objectively we look good; subjectively are we balanced and are our internal processes working? This may be a good starting point for a survey.
- Internal shinny is fine but are we doing something for our students? That should really be the focus of internal shinny. The pulse of the college, the passion for our students as demonstrated by A&R, Tutorial Services, the Corral, etc.
- The rattily feeling could be feeling tired at the end of the year.
- There needs to be a balance between our commitment to leadership vs our commitment to our students. We are seeing a disconnect in many faculty. They need to understand that their involvement in assessment *helps* our students, that their involvement in curriculum *helps* students.
- We need to change the language we put out there; that what we are doing is for accreditation (ACCJC). We are *doing* it for our student!
- There has been a huge shift over the last four years, in a positive way. Are we in this *together*? If not, *why* not?
- Great connections are made by attending state events and visiting other colleges. We could pull together a team. We have money available. Do we want a visit and what would we like the outside perspective to include?

Forum on Communication

- Write-Speak-Perform
- Received 1200 student responses.
- Data collected shows that we are awesome! Students are gaining knowledge.
- We are the only college that has done PLO assessment

Assessment and Student Impact

- How does Program Review (PR) and the Strategic Planning and decision making process connect with student?
- We have got to make sure, objectively that students are impacted by PR and the planning decisions that are made. If it is *already* connected, let show it. If it is not, let's make that connection.
- It is no secret how some faculty feel about assessment. What do you think we are doing in our classrooms? Assessment is becoming more important than what we are teaching in the classroom. The reports are laborious. Even people that don't necessarily agree with this thought are not stepping up. Others agree. There is less and less time to prep for classes. The onus is complexly on the faculty. When does the onus become shared with the student? Not all students want to *learn*. They want to *pass*! These variables are not accounted for. There is pressure for perfection. It should be OK to give an F to a student that has earned it. Assessment is defeating the reason we teach.

- Are we headed toward a common core system?
- All learning cannot be measured. There are some fields/disciplines where learning does not even show up until *years* later!
- The Administrative team is hearing your frustration. Assessment is measurable. It is demanding and difficult but it *still* needs to be done. There are ways we can help such as bringing in sources to support your efforts and identifying individuals who need support. This would be done in an effort to help the students.

Know that your messages were received in grace.

Institutional Effectiveness and Planning Survey

ISPC PRESENTATION

9/6/2017

Survey Information

Sent to college on May 23, 2017

105 respondents by end of June (91 viable)

- 49 Faculty, 43 Staff, 13 Managers
- Mostly full-time employees (74%)
- Instruction had highest representation (61%), followed by SSV (33%), then Business (6%)
- About 2/3 had five or less years of employment

Survey Areas

- College Mission
- Assessment & Program Review
- Use of Data
- Human/Physical Resources
- Campus Climate
- Resource Allocation Processes

College Mission

Rated level of impact from “Strong” to “No Impact”

Strong Impact	Faculty	Staff	Managers	Total
Providing Educational Opportunities	84.1%	80.0%	91.7%	83.5%
Celebrating Diversity	72.7%	65.7%	58.3%	68.1%
Promoting Collaboration	62.8%	75.8%	91.7%	69.2%
Encouraging Inclusive, Innovative Approach to Learning	84.1%	65.7%	75.0%	75.8%
Encouraging Creative Application of Emerging Technologies	38.6%	48.6%	75.0%	47.3%
Providing Foundational Skills and Pathways	77.3%	57.1%	83.3%	70.3%

Mission & Planning

Mission Guides Institutional Planning

- Overall 97% Agreement-lowest faculty (95.3%), highest managers (100%)

Norco Achieving Mission

- Overall 97% Agreement-lowest faculty (93.1%), highest managers/staff (100%)

Confident in Direction for Future

- Overall 96% Agreement- lowest staff (91.4%), highest managers (100%)

Program Review & Assessment

Rated level of agreement with statements: Agreement Score (Percentage of Strongly Agree + Agree)

Question	Faculty	Staff	Mngrs	Total
Frequently dialogue about SLO/SAO	79%	56%	83%	74%
Used to improve	88%	68%	82%	79%
Assessment meaningful	88%	74%	100%	84%
PR processes ongoing & used to improve students learning	88%	91%	100%	91%
PR is meaningful	81%	74%	92%	80%

Use of Data

Same agreement scale as other areas

Question	Faculty	Staff	Mngrs	Total
Use ISS	71%	73%	75%	72%
Use SP Goals	81%	76%	100%	82%
Planning is based on data	81%	91%	100%	87%
SP Goals are regularly assessed and shared	95%	85%	100%	92%

Hrs/Week to Shared Governance

Hours/Week	Faculty		Staff		Management		Overall Percent	Count
0	5	11.4%	4	11.4%	0	0.0%	9.9%	9
1-2	9	20.5%	24	68.6%	3	25.0%	39.6%	36
3-5	12	27.3%	14	11.4%	3	25.0%	20.9%	19
6-8	14	31.8%	1	2.9%	2	16.7%	18.7%	17
9-11	3	6.8%	1	2.9%	1	8.3%	5.5%	5
12 or more	1	2.3%	1	2.9%	3	25.0%	5.5%	5
TOTAL	44	100.0%	35	100.0%	12	100.0%	100.0%	91

Unfair Treatment at the College

Since the beginning of the current school year, I have experienced unfair treatment at the college.

Answer Options	Faculty		Staff		Managers		Percent	Count
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent		
Never (0 times)	30	68.2%	26	74.3%	11	91.7%	73.6%	67
Seldom (1-2 times)	12	27.3%	4	11.4%	1	8.3%	18.7%	17
Often (3-4 times)	1	2.3%	3	8.6%	0	0.0%	4.4%	4
Frequently (more than 4 times)	1	2.3%	2	5.7%	0	0.0%	3.3%	3
TOTAL	44	100%	35	100%	12	100%	100%	91

Follow Up Question – 25% of the unfair treatment respondents (6.6 % of all respondents) felt it was due to diversity-related characteristics

Human Resource Ratings

Question	Faculty	Staff	Managers	Total
Familiar with policies, procedures, & pub in area	93%	97%	100%	96%
Services/classes aligned with student needs/pathways	95%	94%	100%	96%
Newly hired employees are highly qualified for jobs	95%	75%	100%	89%
Sufficient number of administrators	81%	82%	58%	78%
Sufficient number of full-time faculty	25%	61%	67%	44%
Sufficient number of staff	50%	33%	33%	41%
Provides opportunities for professional development	80%	81%	92%	82%

Campus Climate

Question	Faculty	Staff	Managers	Total
I am treated fairly	98%	91%	100%	95%
I feel safe	95%	88%	100%	97%
I feel accepted as an individual by employees	98%	97%	100%	99%
I feel accepted as an individual by students	100%	97%	100%	99%

Planning & Resource Allocation

Question	Faculty	Staff	Managers	Total
Planning & resource allocation are well integrated	82%	70%	92%	82%
Resources have been allocated effectively to support student success	80%	70%	92%	79%
Prioritization processes are effective means of ensuring that resource allocation is based on needs in program review	83%	68%	100%	80%
Needs of my area are addressed through prioritization process	81%	67%	83%	76%
Aware of processes that ranks staffing and equipment needs identified in program review	86%	78%	100%	85%
Administrators give consideration to priority lists in making resource allocation decisions	87%	71%	100%	83%

Summary

All groups think they have a strong impact on mission

Mission is moving planning in the right direction

Assessment & program review are important—meaningful?

Data use high, awareness of ISS needs to increase

About 25% have experienced unfair treatment, but 95% think they are treated fairly by the college

Campus climate scores were some of the highest

Planning and resource allocation were effective for most part, but some concern about meeting needs of area and students.