

EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

Coastline Community College
11460 Warner Avenue
Fountain Valley, CA 92708

A Confidential Report Prepared for the
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

This report represents the findings of the External Evaluation Team that visited
Coastline Community College on March 18, 2013 through March 21, 2013.

Randal Lawson, Chair

LIST OF TEAM MEMBERS

Mr. Randal Lawson (Chair)
Executive Vice President
Santa Monica College

Ms. Erica LeBlanc (Assistant)
Dean, Academic Affairs
Santa Monica College

Ms. Anita Black
Vice President, Instruction (Interim)
Merritt College

Ms. Mojdeh Mehdizadeh
Vice Chancellor, Educational Services and Technology
Contra Costa Community College District

Dr. Kevin Bontenbal
Instructional Technology Librarian
Cuesta College

Dr. Kimberly Perry
Superintendent/President
Butte College

Ms. Susan Kincade
Vice President of Instruction/ALO
Modesto Junior College

Ms. Meredith Plummer
Chief Business Officer
Copper Mountain College

Dr. Andrew LaManque
Executive Director, Institutional Research and Planning
Foothill-De Anza Community College District

Dr. Ryan Theule
Dean, Canyon Country Campus
College of the Canyons

Dr. Ian Walton
Mathematics Faculty Emeritus
Mission College

Dr. Kathryn Weiss
Dean, Arts and Sciences
San Bernardino Valley College

Summary of the Report

INSTITUTION: Coastline Community College
DATE OF VISIT: March 18, 2013 through March 21, 2013
TEAM CHAIR: Randal Lawson
Executive Vice President, Santa Monica College

A team of twelve professional educators visited Coastline Community College March 18 through March 21, 2013, for the purpose of reaffirmation of accreditation through evaluation of the College's performance relative to the Accreditation Standards and its compliance with Eligibility Requirements and Commission policies, to make recommendations for quality assurance and increasing institutional effectiveness, and to submit recommendations to the Accrediting Commission regarding the College's accredited status. The team members prepared for the visit in advance by reviewing the Institutional Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness and preparing a draft report of their conclusions regarding the College's response to the recommendations from the most recent educational quality and institutional effectiveness review, their initial impressions of assigned Standards, Eligibility Requirements, and policies, and their overall opinion of the Self Evaluation Report. Shortly before the visit, the College also provided the team with an update document outlining changes that had occurred since the Self Evaluation Report had been completed and published.

Since Coastline Community College is one of three colleges in the Coast Community College District, there was also a District accrediting team composed of representatives from the visiting teams for each of the three colleges. The District team focused on evaluating the performance of the Board of Trustees and the District Office relative to each of the three colleges in this multi-college district. The chair of the District team maintained contact with the team chairs of the three colleges throughout the visit to share findings, observations, and recommendations.

The Coastline Community College team found the College to be exceptionally well prepared for the visit, with widespread understanding of the accreditation process evident throughout the college community. The accommodations for the team worked very well, with a conference room at the hotel available for team meetings and equipped with a computer, printer, and Internet access and a secure team meeting room at the College Center, fully equipped with all accessories needed to complete work efficiently. Documentation to support the Self Evaluation Report was well organized in the team room at the College, and team members were given secure Internet access. The College provided transportation daily, including on-demand transportation between the College and the District Office, and among the College's four educational sites—the College Center in Fountain Valley and the learning centers in Garden Grove, Westminster, and Newport Beach.

The team began its work with a meeting held in the hotel team room the afternoon of Monday, March 18. Late that afternoon, the College hosted an informal reception for the team at the College Center. The team chair was given the opportunity to make some brief remarks and introduce the individual team members, and team members were able to interact with not only college administrators, faculty, and staff, but also the District Chancellor, other District administrators, and all five members of the Coast Community College District Board of Trustees. The team was warmly received by the college community, and the reception initiated a very positive tone that proved to be characteristic of the entire visit. Both prior to and during the visit, college staff—in particular, the Accreditation Liaison Officer and his administrative assistant—responded quickly and efficiently to all requests made by team members through the team chair to arrange interviews and provide additional documentation.

The team conducted its work from the morning of Tuesday, March 19 through noon on Thursday, March 21. During this time, team members toured the four college sites; conducted more than 75 interviews with college faculty, administrators, staff, and students and with District administrators and members of the Board of Trustees; observed classes held at college sites, as well as classes offered through each of the College's various distance learning modalities; held two open forums; and attended meetings of the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee, the Academic Senate, the Curriculum Committee, and the Board of Trustees. Frequent team meetings were held throughout the visit. The team (including the District Team Chair) met at length in the hotel team room the evening of Wednesday, March 20 to review findings and evidence, and to focus on potential commendations and recommendations. The team met again in the late morning of Thursday, March 21 to incorporate any new information from the morning's interviews and finalize the summary to be shared with the college community. The Exit Report, which occurred at 1:00 p.m. on Thursday, March 21 at the College's Garden Grove Center, was exceptionally well attended.

The Institutional Self Evaluation Report for Coastline Community College was a well written, comprehensive document that detailed the processes used by the institution to address the Recommendations of the Previous Accrediting Team, the Eligibility Requirements, the Commission Standards, and relevant Commission Policies. The report summarized the College's evolution from its original intent to serve the community as a "college without walls" to the College as it currently exists, with an expanding base of "on-ground" students to complement the majority of students who attend the College through a variety of distance learning modalities. The report included internet links to evidence, and this approach, when functional, served to facilitate the work of the team in evaluating the College's performance relative to the Standards, Eligibility Requirements, policies, and previous team recommendations. The team found that, overall, the Self Evaluation Report provided the team with a fair and accurate depiction of the College and its work.

Throughout the visit, team interactions with faculty, staff, administrators, and students consistently confirmed what was portrayed in the report: that Coastline Community College is a unique, vital, and innovative institution that is deeply committed to student learning and to the communities it serves. The College exemplifies a "can do" team spirit

and a willingness to adapt to myriad changes (technological, human, and fiscal) thoughtfully and creatively. Innovative approaches to delivering educational services have merited many, well deserved accolades, and team members found many of the College's programs, services, and processes to be worthy of commendation.

The team found Coastline Community College to be in compliance with all Eligibility Requirements and with the two Commission policies addressed in the Self Evaluation Report—*Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations* and *Principles of Good Practice in Overseas International Education Programs for Non-U.S. Nationals*. Through a review of not only the Self Evaluation Report, but also the two reports resulting from progress report visits and the College's Midterm Report, the team found that the College has responded satisfactorily to the Recommendations from the Most Recent Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness Review. The District Team found that the District has not responded completely to the previous team's recommendations, and this is reflected in four 2013 team recommendations (District Recommendations 1, 2, 3, and 4) relative to District and Board of Trustees operations.

Relative to the Standards, the team found that the College has done much good work, some of it exemplary, in the important areas of learning outcomes assessment, program review, and institutional planning. Some of this work involved making changes over the last two years in the institutional planning process and its various components. These changes are, in part, responsible for the fact that the College still needs to complete the cycles of the overall institutional planning process and its key components and to ensure that all areas of the College are included in the planning and evaluation cycles. This theme of completion is featured in four of the team's recommendations—College Recommendations 1, 2, 3, and 4. Another theme that emerged across all four standards through the team's evaluation resulted in College Recommendation 5. The team found the College to be currently in compliance with Eligibility Requirement 13 *Faculty*. However, team members were concerned about the College's ability to continue meeting this requirement, to address the team's recommendations regarding the College's planning and evaluation agenda, and to sustain a level of continuous quality improvement in planning and evaluation, unless the College and District work together to review the resource allocation model and make changes, as appropriate, to ensure "a substantial core of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution."

Introduction

In 1976, Coastline Community College was founded to become the third college in the Coast Community College District, joining Orange Coast College and Golden West College. Coastline was envisioned as a “college without walls” that would not have a campus, but would instead offer classes at community-based locations, where its targeted nontraditional student population worked and lived, and electronically through various distance education modalities, including courses broadcast over KOCE, the District’s public television station. This concept proved to be a successful one. Coastline Community College still holds the record for the largest opening day population (more than 20,000 students) in the history of community colleges.

In response to its charge to explore alternative instructional modalities, the College formed an instructional design staff, and, over time, new distance learning technologies evolved. Eventually, Coastline built facilities in distributed locations within the college district. Starting in 1983 with the College Center, an administrative and student services headquarters in Fountain Valley, the College has added learning centers in Garden Grove (a 45,000-square-foot facility opened in 1997), Westminster (the 33,000-square-foot Le-Jao Center opened in 2005), and Newport Beach (a 68,000-square-foot facility opened in Spring 2013).

Today, Coastline enjoys a national reputation as an innovator through its unique combination of distance learning and distributed education. The College has earned many awards, including 19 Emmy Awards, as a developer of distance learning courseware, and more than 350 colleges in the United States and Canada either license or have purchased instructional courseware, audiovisuals, and/or textbooks produced at Coastline.

In Fall 2011, Coastline Community College served a headcount of 10,159 students. (This represents a 33 percent decrease from the 15,247 students served in Fall 2007, a direct result of course offering reductions dictated by lower state funding). Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) for 2011-2012 totaled 5,947. Distance learning courses were responsible for 64 percent of credit FTES. The College serves a diverse student body, the most represented ethnicities being White Non-Hispanic (33.9 percent), Asian (30.2 percent), and Hispanic/Latino (17.0 percent). In Fall 2011, approximately 85 percent of students were part-time; 38 percent of students were enrolled in fewer than six units at Coastline. (Significant numbers of Coastline students are concurrently enrolled at Orange Coast College, Golden West College, or other institutions and do not consider Coastline their “home” college.) Coastline currently offers courses in approximately 58 disciplines, leading to 60 associate degrees and 66 types of certificates.

In addition to its regular site-based and distance learning course offerings, Coastline operates, through contract education, a variety of unusual programs for special populations, including the Military Education Program, which enables active military personnel to continue their education through distance learning, and an international education program for foreign nationals that prepares Chinese high school students for transfer to United States colleges and universities. Coastline is one of a few California community colleges to provide instruction to incarcerated students, primarily through telecourse offer-

ings. The College also operates the Orange County One-Stop Centers funded by the Orange Coast Workforce Investment Board. These centers serve more than 3,000 clients per month, including many dislocated workers, disabled persons, veterans, and seniors.

Throughout its history, Coastline Community College has proudly remained true to its founders' motto: "The community is our campus; its citizens are our students." The College celebrates its unique characteristics and maintains a commitment to change as an institutional dynamic.

Team members found the Institutional Self Evaluation Report visually appealing, well written, and reasonably complete. Overall, the report presents a fair and accurate portrait of the institution. The report includes all required sections, including college history, demographic information, achievement data, overview of the self evaluation process, educational programs and delivery modes, and compliance with Eligibility Requirements, policies, and practices. However, the choice to present some of the required information (particularly some student achievement data) through links to the website rather than in the report itself made the printed report more challenging for team members to review since it is not self contained. The Responses to the Recommendations of the Previous Accrediting Team are somewhat abbreviated in the Self Evaluation Report itself, making it necessary for team members to review the two progress reports and the midterm report to evaluate the true depth and breadth of the College's responses.

Descriptive sections of the report are thorough, and the self evaluation sections are generally thoughtful, candid, and reflective, with the exception of those self evaluation sections related to District and Board functions. These tend to be more guarded. While the team appreciated the College's clear intention not to repeat what seemed to be an overabundance of plans in its 2007 self study, team members found in this 2013 Self Evaluation Report a number of instances in which evaluation sections seem to lead to actionable improvement plans that are missing. Throughout the document, there is a tendency toward sweeping statements that are not backed up by evidence. These contribute to the length of the document without providing information useful for evaluation, as does the consistent inclusion of satisfaction survey data absent any in-depth or focused analysis. While team members appreciated the intent of including a separate Standard II section for the College's new Education Bound United States (EBUS) Program (for high school students in China), they found that this served to complicate, rather than facilitate, review of the Self Evaluation Report.

Prior to the visit, team members greatly appreciated the availability of most evidence online, via a flash drive and direct web links embedded in the electronic version of the document and found this invaluable in preparing for the visit. However, there were several instances in which the links did not work because of changes to the college website made after the document had been produced and distributed. Evidence in the team room was well organized, and team members were eventually able to locate needed data through a combination of the team room collection, the flash drive and web links, and requests to college staff.

Shortly before the accreditation visit, the College provided the team with a very useful addendum to the Self Evaluation Report, which included not only general information

regarding changes that had occurred since the publication of the Self Evaluation Report, but also a significant development in the College's work on institutional achievement measures in regard to the relationship between benchmarks and institution-set standards. The College also forwarded the Student Learning Outcomes Implementation Report it submitted to the Accrediting Commission. Both documents were timely and valuable in facilitating the team's preparation for the visit.

Coastline Community College was exceptionally well prepared for the team visit. Strategies such as the "Countdown of Days" banner prominently posted at the College Center and the "Jeopardy" game featuring accreditation facts effectively addressed the communication challenges inherent in the College's unique distributed education structure. Both the informal opening reception and the exit report were especially well attended, and team members found faculty, staff, and students who were interviewed or whose classes, sites, or offices were visited to be knowledgeable about the accreditation process. The visiting team was warmly received by the College, and college faculty and staff responded graciously and efficiently to requests for interviews, additional data, and transportation among college sites. Throughout the visit, the team encountered in the college community a sense of "Coastliner Pride" regarding the College's unique history, ongoing commitment to innovation, and educational programs and services.

As a result of a comprehensive accreditation visit in March 2007, the accreditation of Coastline Community College was reaffirmed with the requirement that the College submit a progress report (focused on Recommendations 2, 3, 7, and 10) in March 2008 to be followed by a visit by Accrediting Commission representatives. After reviewing the College's progress report and the evaluation report of the progress report team, the Commission took action in June 2008 to require that the College submit another progress report (focused on the same four recommendations) in March 2009 to be followed by a visit by Commission representatives. After reviewing the College's progress report and the evaluation report of the progress report team in June 2009, the Commission took no further action. In April 2010, the Commission notified the College that it was taking no action regarding its substantive change request (originally submitted in 2009) for "Change in Geographical Area Served" related to the Education Bound United States program. The College was commended for "managing the overseas activities as responsible stewards" and was informed that a substantive change review would be required at such time that the Education Bound United States program becomes a full program in terms of awarding a certificate or degree. Coastline's Midterm Report was received by the Commission in June 2010.

Commendations/Recommendations

Commendations

The team commends the College for promulgating an institutional culture of collegiality, collaboration, and innovation which the team came to recognize as “Coastliner Pride”—a “can do” attitude that was consistently displayed by Coastline staff, faculty, and administrators during the visit.

The team commends the College and its Academic Senate for developing the Academic Quality Rubric. The team found the rubric to be an effective tool for ensuring the rigor and comprehensiveness of the instructional programs, regardless of the modality in which they are delivered.

The team commends the College for its many innovative programs, including the “PocketEd” PDA program designed for sailors deployed on military ships; the STAR Fast-Track program which is designed to help students finish their lower division study in 3.5 semesters; and the Education Bound United States program for high school students in China.

The team commends the College for the forward-thinking design of the Newport Beach Learning Center which, in addition to achieving a LEED Gold designation, provides students with gathering spaces that incorporate an element of student life into the facility to imbue students with a sense of belonging to and identification with the College.

The team commends the College for developing unique student support strategies, including the volunteer-based “guide-U” student mentor program.

The team commends the College for providing innovative learning resources to meet the unique needs of its students through the College’s virtual library and the services provided by the Library, including the “Ask-a-Librarian” e-reference service and the library/information competency components that faculty can import into online classes.

The team commends the College for integrating the storage of Student Learning Outcomes assessment data into its Seaport³ learning management system.

The team commends the College for the Summer Technology Institute, a professional development effort which attracted faculty and staff not only from Coastline, but also from its sister colleges (Golden West College and Orange Coast College) in the Coast Community College District.

Recommendations

College Recommendation 1: To meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College complete the process of developing institutional effectiveness measures so that the degree to which college goals are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. (Standards I.B, I.B.2, I.B.3)

College Recommendation 2: To increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College assure the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by completing a systematic review of all parts of the cycle in a purposeful and well documented manner as outlined in the 2011 *Educational Master Plan* and the 2012 *Planning Guide*. (Standards I.B, I.B.6)

College Recommendation 3: To meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College fully complete the cycle of assessment and the documentation of how the results of these assessments are used for institutional improvement for course-level and degree/certificate-level student learning outcomes, general education and institutional learning outcomes, student support services outcomes, learning resources outcomes, and administrative services outcomes. (Standards I.B, I.B.1, II, II.A, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.6.a, II.B, II.B.4, II.C, II.C.2)

College Recommendation 4: To meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College ensure that the program review cycle for all student services, learning resources, and administrative services is systematic and integrated into college planning and resource allocation processes. (Standards I.B, I.B.1, I.B.3, I.B.6, II.A, II.A.2, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.6.b, II.B, II.B.3.c, II.B.4, II.C, II.C.2)

College Recommendation 5: To increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College work with the District to ensure a sufficient number of full-time faculty to support the College's future student population as projected in the *Educational Master Plan* in support of the institutional mission. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.4, II.A.2.a, II.B.3.c, II.C.1.a, III.A.2, III.A.6, IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3)

College Recommendation 6: To meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College work with the District to ensure that all personnel are evaluated systematically at stated intervals. (Standard III.A.1.b)

District Recommendation 1: To meet the Standard, and as recommended by the 2007 team, the team recommends that faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.1.c)

District Recommendation 2: To meet the Standards, and as recommended by the 2007 team, the team recommends that the Board and district follow their policies regarding the delegation of authority to the Chancellor for effective operation of the district and to the college presidents for the effective operation of the colleges. Further, the team recommends that the district develop administrative procedures that effectively carry out delegation of authority to the Chancellor and the college presidents. (Standards IV.B.1.j, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.g)

District Recommendation 3: To meet the Standard, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees follow its established process for self-evaluation of Board performance as published in its board policy. (Standard IV.B.1.g)

District Recommendation 4: To meet the Standards, and as recommended by the 2007 team, the team recommends that the Board implement a process for the evaluation of its policies and procedures according to an identified timeline and revise the policies as necessary. (Standard IV.B.1.e)

District Recommendation 5: To increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District fully utilize systematic participative processes in District governance to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation and to create the same environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence that already exists at the College. (Standards IV.A.1, IV.B.1.a, IV.B.1.b, IV.B.1.c, IV.B.1.g) [This recommendation is unique to Coastline Community College and is not included in the external evaluation reports for the other two colleges.]

Evaluation of Institutional Responses to Previous Recommendations

Recommendation 1

The team recommends that in the College's next review of its mission statement, it clarify the College's intended student population. (Standard I.A.1, I.A.4)

The team found that the College has satisfactorily addressed Recommendation 1. In the Self Evaluation Report, the College detailed the process taken to revise its mission statement. The completeness of the process was documented in participatory governance meeting minutes which included evidence that thoughtful college-wide dialogue had taken place and that consensus had been reached. The District Board of Trustees discussed and affirmed the new mission statement on May 4, 2012.

Recommendation 2

The team recommends that the College provide library and other learning support services that are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to facilitate its educational offerings to all student constituents, including distance learning, on campus, contract military, and incarcerated students, through the establishment of a permanent budget for these services, and by generating new processes to address the needs of students who are currently unable to receive service(s). (Standard II.C.1)

The College has responded to the funding piece of this recommendation by increasing the General Fund line item for the Library by \$5,000 a year for five years to a total of \$37,000. However, this amount continues to be insufficient to adequately cover the total annual cost of library databases, eBook subscriptions, and other library resources. Coastline Community College Lottery and Telecommunication and Technology Infrastructure Program (TTIP) funds supplement the General Fund allocation to ensure that the College provides "library and other learning support services that are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety." The full-time librarian has responded to the second part of this recommendation, "generating new processes to address the needs of students who are currently unable to receive services," by working with various instructors to augment their course materials and assignments to introduce students to library resources and aspects of information competency. The team found that the College has satisfactorily addressed this recommendation.

Recommendation 3

The team affirms the 2001 team's recommendation that the College develop a long-term staffing plan. (Standard III.A.2)

Recommendation 3 reaffirmed Recommendation 5 of the 2001 team that the College develop a long-term staffing plan "based upon goals and enrollment projections." The College developed an initial plan, with the assistance of external consultants, in 2007 and revised the plan in 2012. The initial plan included employee demographics, enrollment forecasts, "an agenda that creates the groundwork for the College to add a Staffing Initia-

tive to the Master Plan,” and a stated goal of “strategic growth.” It further added goals of creating faculty and staff orientation programs and a technology training program. Military and General Fund enrollment data were disaggregated. The planning process included dialogue, surveys, and a two-day workshop with consultant facilitation. The plan has been incorporated into the *Educational Master Plan* and Program Review processes. The revised plan, dated 2013-2019, was adopted in July 2012. The College plans to update it as part of its six-year planning and assessment cycle. This plan provides employment trends and references Board policy for recruitment and hiring.

In the 2009 Progress Report Evaluation, the previous team chair stated, “While there is an improvement in the number of full-time faculty since the original team visit in 2007, (and while continuing to acknowledge that Coastline was originally conceived as a college that would rely primarily on hourly faculty), the number of students served by the College has also grown, outpacing the relatively small growth in full-time faculty positions. As the number of full-time faculty employed at the College was already unusually low, the ability of Coastline to meet the accreditation requirement to maintain a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution remains a concern.”

The College has satisfactorily addressed the recommendation to develop a staffing plan. However, it should be noted that the plan does not include mechanisms that would trigger action to either increase or decrease staffing, and there is no discussion of optimum or minimum staffing levels required. The plan identifies processes for requisitioning and hiring staff, but does not provide an evaluation of staff resources required to “provide the services necessary to support the institution’s mission and purpose” or a source of funding for these resources.

Recommendation 4

The team recommends that the District, in collaboration with the appropriate bargaining units, revise evaluation processes, including methods and instruments for surveying student opinions, to align with a wider variety of instructional delivery methods and to facilitate meaningful feedback from distance education students. (Standards II.A.1.b, III.A.1.c)

In Recommendation 4, the previous team recommended that the College revise evaluation processes to provide for collection of student opinions and to align with the variety of instructional delivery methods present within the College. The District and the faculty collective bargaining unit signed a Memorandum of Understanding on March 4, 2010 which included separate evaluation for faculty teaching classes through distance learning. The current part-time and full-time faculty contracts include provisions for evaluation of faculty teaching online courses. Student surveys are requested in evaluation of faculty teaching online courses. However, few students participate in this process.

The team found that the College has satisfactorily addressed this recommendation, but should still take steps to increase student participation in online faculty evaluations.

Recommendation 5

The team recommends that the cost of regularly replacing outdated computers and related technology be institutionalized in the College's budget process rather than relying on one-time funding. (Standards III.C.1.c, III.C.2)

The College has provided a clear response to this recommendation by initially establishing a line item budget of \$39,000 in 2007-2008 and increasing it, over time, to \$100,000 as of 2012-2013. An additional \$300,000 in one-time funding was provided to meet the needs of the *Strategic Technology Plan* in 2011-2012.

As evidenced by the equipment replacement plan, the College should budget \$1.1 million for hardware replacement annually (\$473,300 in desktop/laptop replacements alone). Funds from Measure M, a general obligation bond passed in November 2012 by voters, are being directed toward filling the gap.

The team found that the College has satisfactorily addressed this recommendation.

Recommendation 6

The team recommends that the Board develop a clearly defined procedure for addressing board member behavior that violates its Code of Ethics. Additionally, it is recommended that the district develop a written code of professional ethics for all its personnel. (Standards III.A.1.d, IV.B.1, IV.B.1.g, IV.B.1.h)

The Coast Community College District *Code of Ethics for Members of the Board of Trustees*, revised in July 2012 as Board Policy 2715, sets forth both the policy and process for ethics standards and the review and response to potential violations. Reviews of the Board of Trustees minutes of meetings and interviews with both members of the Board and of constituent groups affirmed that the process is understood and followed.

The District has developed a *Code of Professional Ethics* for all employees, adopted by the Board of Trustees in August 2012 as Board Policy 3050. Interviews with constituent leaders affirmed that the policy is in place although no procedure for implementation has yet been developed.

The team found that the District has responded effectively to this recommendation and now meets the Standards.

Recommendation 7

The team recommends that the Board adopt a formal written process for the selection of chancellor, vice chancellors, and college presidents. In addition, the Board should develop a policy that clearly delegates authority from the Chancellor to the college presidents for the effective operation of the colleges. (Standards IV.B.1.j, IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a)

The District has responded effectively to the recommendation for a formal written process to select the senior administrators in the District by revising Board Policy 7909, most recently in May 2012. Thus, the District meets the initial statement in Standard

IV.B.1.j. The District provides effective leadership to and liaison with the colleges and appropriately has defined and implemented clear roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district, thus meeting Standard IV.B.3. The District has partially responded to the recommendation regarding delegation of authority by developing such a policy although that policy is not consistently followed. Consequently, the District does not fully meet Standards IV.B.1.j and IV.B.3.a.

The Board of Trustees adopted revised hiring policies in January 2012. Interviews with district and college personnel affirmed that policies are followed with the occasional exceptions corrected expeditiously.

The Board of Trustees delegates district operational responsibility to the Chancellor as stated in Board Policy 2201. The District has also defined such responsibilities in a Delineation of Functions Map. Review of minutes of board committees and of minutes of board meetings plus interviews with members of the Board of Trustees and constituent group leaders demonstrate that the Board is still in the process of clarifying its role regarding the distinction between policies to govern the District and procedures to operate the District and its colleges. Of particular concern are board initiation of academic plans such as changes in the manner in which the colleges offer English as a Second Language, board involvement in proposing changes to the colleges' Self Evaluation Reports, and board incursion in the authority delegated to the Chancellor such as evaluation of the vice chancellors. (See 2013 District Recommendation 2)

Recommendation 8

The team recommends that the Board implement a process for the evaluation of its policies and procedures according to an identified timeline and revise the policies as necessary. (Standard IV.B.1.e)

The District has begun the process of reviewing and revising its policies and procedures as recommended by the last accreditation team. In February 2012, the District created Administrative Procedure 2410 to clarify and formalize the process by which existing board policies and administrative procedures are revised or created. This process was started just within the last two years and is not yet complete. The District does not yet meet the Standard. (See 2013 District Recommendation 4)

Recommendation 9

The team recommends that the Board establish a process and specific timeline for updating the District's Vision 2020 plan. (Standard IV.B.3)

The team found that the College has sufficiently met requirements identified in Recommendation 9 and meets the Standard. During the Fall 2009 semester, the Coast Community College District's *Vision 2020* plan was reviewed to assess the District's accomplishments compared with the established goals stated in the plan as well as to identify gaps. In October 2009, the Board of Trustees held a special study session to review the District's master planning process and to recommend a timetable. The Board determined that the District would establish a ten-year cycle (through 2020) and complete a five-year

master strategic plan with three-year review cycles. The District *Vision 2020 Educational Master Plan* was accepted by the Board on June 15, 2011.

Recommendation 10

The team recommends that the College and District adhere to the Commission policy for the evaluation of institutions in multi-college districts by immediately delineating specific district functions as distinct from those of the Colleges' functions, and communicate these delineated functions to all college and district constituencies, so there is a clear understanding of their respective organizational roles, authority and responsibilities for the effective operations of the colleges, and in meeting the Accreditation Standards. (Standards IV.B, IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.g and Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems, January 2004)

The District has partially addressed this recommendation by developing a Functional Map of district and college responsibilities related to the Commission's standards. The map displays both the affected and responsible parties for the major activities of the district and college, as they align with the Accreditation Standards. The Board and staff do not display clear understanding of this delineation of functions, and so the District does not meet the Standards.

Review of minutes of board committees and of minutes of Board of Trustee meetings plus interviews with members of the Board of Trustees and constituent group leaders demonstrate that the Board is still in the process of clarifying its role regarding the distinction between policies to govern the District and procedures to operate the district and its colleges. Of particular concern are Board initiation of academic plans such as changes in the manner in which the colleges offer English as a Second Language; Board involvement in proposing changes to the colleges' self studies; and Board incursion in the authority delegated to the Chancellor such as evaluation of the vice chancellors. (See 2013 District Recommendation 2)

Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority

The evaluation team confirmed that Coastline Community College is a public, two-year community college operating under the authority of the State of California, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the Board of Trustees of the Coast Community College District. Coastline Community College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

2. Mission

The evaluation team confirmed that Coastline Community College's updated mission statement was adopted by the Board of Trustees on May 5, 2012. The mission statement includes a focus appropriate for a community college. It is published widely throughout the College, including the College's web page and the college catalog.

3. Governing Board

The evaluation team confirmed that the Coast Community College District is governed by a five-member Board of Trustees elected at large by voters from the cities of Seal Beach, Garden Grove, Huntington Beach, Westminster, Stanton, Fountain Valley, Costa Mesa, Newport Beach, and portions of surrounding communities. Each Board member serves a term of four years with elections held in even-numbered years, and the terms are staggered. There is also a student trustee who is elected annually by the District Student Council. The majority of the Board members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution.

The team confirmed that the Board makes policy for the District. Each Board member serves on at least two of the six Board committees—Accreditation, Audit and Budget, Career Technical Education, Land Development, Legislative Affairs, and Personnel Commission. This involvement by the Board ensures that policies are established, maintained, and revised to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of student learning programs and services, and financial stability. Additionally, Board members' participation with accreditation demonstrates the Board's commitment to and understanding of the accreditation process.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The evaluation team confirmed that the Coastline Community College President serves as the chief executive officer who has primary authority and responsibility for leadership and management of all programs and services provided by the College.

5. Administrative Capacity

The evaluation team confirmed that the College has sufficient administrative staff with appropriate preparation and experience to operate the College.

6. Operating Status

The evaluation team confirmed that Coastline Community College is operational and actively serves students seeking certificate and degree completion.

7. Degrees

The evaluation team confirmed that Coastline Community College offers a total of 60 Associate in Arts and Associate in Science degrees, three of which are Associate in Arts-Transfer (AA-T) degrees. Thirty-eight percent of the College's students have declared educational goals leading to a degree.

8. Educational Programs

The evaluation team confirmed that Coastline Community College degree programs align with the College's mission and that fields of study are aligned with generally accepted practices in degree-granting institutions of higher education. The team also confirmed that programs are of sufficient content and length, are taught at appropriate levels of quality and rigor, and culminate in identified student learning outcomes.

9. Academic Credit

The evaluation team confirmed that Coastline Community College awards academic credit in a manner consistent with generally accepted higher education practices. The College uses the Carnegie formula and clearly distinguishes between degree applicable and non-degree applicable courses.

10. Student Learning and Achievement

The evaluation team confirmed that Coastline Community College defines course, program/degree, and institutional learning outcomes, assesses these student learning outcomes, and engages in meaningful dialogue leading to continuous quality improvement.

11. General Education

The evaluation team confirmed that Coastline Community College incorporates general education into its degree programs, with a significant emphasis on demonstrated competencies in writing, computation, and other major areas of knowledge. There are comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete the general education component, and degree credit is reflective of the quality and rigor appropriate for higher education.

12. Academic Freedom

The evaluation team confirmed that Coastline Community College has adopted an Academic Freedom Statement (Board Policy 4030) to ensure that faculty and students are free to examine and test knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as judged by the general academic/educational community. Both the full-time and part-time faculty contracts also address issues of academic freedom and responsibility.

13. Faculty

The evaluation team confirmed that Coastline Community College has a sufficient core of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution to meet current needs. (The College currently has 40 full-time faculty members and 252 part-time faculty members.) The team also confirmed that faculty members are responsible for curriculum processes and for the assessment of student learning. However, team members were concerned that simply maintaining the current level of full-time faculty (relative to the number of part-time faculty) will not be sufficient to enable the College to serve future student populations as projected in the College's *Educational Master Plan* and to support the College in sustaining a planning and evaluation cycle for continuous quality improvement.

14. Student Services

The evaluation team confirmed that a wide variety of student services to support student learning are offered through multiple formats in order to serve the College's many student populations.

15. Admissions

The evaluation team confirmed that clear, accessible, and consistent admissions policies are publicized online, in the College catalog, in the schedule of classes, and in Board policies.

16. Information and Learning Resources

The evaluation team confirmed that Coastline Community College provides students and staff with access to adequate information and learning resources and services to support its mission and all educational programs. Through its virtual library, students and staff have 24/7 access to library resources. In addition, the Student Success Center provides a range of tutorial services, including virtual tutoring options for distance education students and delivery of basic skills math, English, and study skills courses.

17. Financial Resources

The evaluation team confirmed that the College's funding base is documented in the Budget Allocation Model developed by the District. Management of financial aid,

grants, programs, and contracts are handled by the College. External and internal audit results attest to the financial integrity of the College.

A review of the Coast District 2011-2012 Budget Summary, 2012-2013 Tentative Budget Presentation and audit reports confirm that the District and College document financial resources and assure financial stability.

18. Financial Accountability

The evaluation team confirmed that the District undergoes annual independent external audits and the College is reviewed by the Internal Auditor on a regular basis throughout the year. The past five audits for the District were certified without exception. The Coast Community College District 2011-2012 Budget Summary confirms that the District's overall budget is being well managed.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation

The evaluation team confirmed that the College uses data about student achievement and learning in its planning and resource allocation processes. Data, descriptive and longitudinal, is presented and discussed at all-college and other participatory governance committee meetings. The *Educational Master Plan* outlines college goals and initiatives in alignment with District goals. College planning processes are integrated, open, and collaborative and allow for a dialogue about college issues based upon information.

20. Public Information

The evaluation team confirmed that the mission, purposes, and objectives of the College; course, program, and degree offerings; admissions requirements; fees and refund policies; requirements for degrees, certificates, graduation, and transfer; academic credentials of faculty and administrators; names of Board members; major policies affecting students; and related items are published in the catalog, the class schedule, and other appropriate documents and are also posted on the college website.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission

The evaluation team confirmed that Coastline Community College adheres to the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and policies of the Accrediting Commission and describes itself in identical terms to all of its external accrediting agencies. The College publishes accurate information regarding its accreditation status both in printed documents and on its website.

Standard I – Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Standard IA – Mission

General Observations

The mission statement for Coastline Community College defines the College's broad educational purposes: "...academic excellence and student success through accessible, flexible, innovative education that leads to the attainment of associate degrees, transfers, certificates, basic skills readiness for college, and career and technical education."

Until 2011, Coastline's mission statement was reviewed and discussed annually. As a result of the recent changes to the institutional planning process, the mission statement will now be reviewed every three years as part of the planning cycle.

Findings and Evidence

Coastline Community College's statement of mission defines broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning. The college mission and vision statements parallel those of the Coast Community College District in stressing innovation, global community, excellence, and success. (Standard I.A)

The College has determined its intended population to be "today's global students," including non-US national students, international students, distance learning students from locations across the globe, and the students of many ethnicities taking classes at the College's learning centers. The student population is reasonably matched for the institution's location, resources, and role in higher education and expresses the College's commitment to student learning. (Standard I.A)

Coastline Community College has established student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population. The college motto, "Tomorrow's College Today" represents the innovative programs and services via their "niche" markets and underserved student populations. Founded as a "college without walls," Coastline Community College is unique, with programs and services that include Distance Learning (comprising 64 percent of credit FTES in Fall 2011), Military Programs (serving more than 4,000 active military personnel and veterans each semester), Office of Learning and Information Technologies (produces and distributes high-quality courses and courseware), STAR (a fast track Associate degree program), Education Bound United States (prepares Chinese high school students for transfer to United States colleges and universities), Acquired Brain Injury (provides cognitive retraining for adults who have sustained a brain injury), Early College High School (facilitates attainment of both a high school diploma and an associate degree in five years), Work-Based Learning (college credit for on-the-job experience), the Orange County One-Stop Centers (meet the needs of employers and job seekers throughout the region), the Virtual Library, and online counseling. Coastline has developed these programs and services in innovative and creative ways. (Standard I.A.1)

Members of key constituent groups contributed to the College's current mission statement which maintains student learning as its central core. The review process focused on student success, educational excellence, innovation, and globalization and the impact of current goals and initiatives on the relevance of the mission statement to the College. The mission statement both recognizes the institution's "college without walls" origins and addresses the new global focus. There was definite consensus for including this new global focus in light of the new Education Bound United States program and its planned expansion. (Standard I.A.1)

The current mission statement was approved by the Board of Trustees on May 5, 2012 and has been published. It appears in all major college publications, including the college catalog, the website, and all college brochures. Additionally, it is included at the top of every Academic Senate agenda and at the bottom of the agendas for all major committees. It is also posted in college classrooms. (Standard I.A.2)

Coastline's governance and decision-making processes are reviewed annually. The institution's process for periodic review of the mission statement is effective and incorporates the interests of college stakeholders. (Standard I.A.3)

Coastline uses its participatory governance structure to address and vet the college mission and vision statements. Once approved by each governance committee, recommendations are forwarded to the College Council, which, in turn, makes recommendations to the President. As a component of the College's recently revised planning process, the mission statement will be reviewed every three years as part of the planning cycle. (Standard I.A.3)

The College's mission is central to institutional planning and decision making. The Planning, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee ensures that Coastline integrates the mission statement into the planning and decision-making cycles. This is illustrated by the requirement that proposals for new initiatives must include documentation of how project outcomes will align with the mission of the College. All members of key governance structure committees know and understand the mission thoroughly because of broad institutional dialogue. (Standard I.A.4)

Conclusion

The mission statement is approved by the governing board and published. The College reviews its mission statement regularly and revises it as necessary.

The College meets the Standard.

Recommendations

None

Standard I – Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Standard IB – Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The positive “Coastliner” attitude is evident as individuals describe the institution’s goals and plans. Employees seem to be genuinely willing to try new things in an attempt to improve processes and positively impact student success. The College is committed to serving students who need alternative avenues to pursue their educational goals, whether by picking up additional units in addition to those being earned at a nearby district college or via various distance education formats. As external pressures force changes on the College, faculty, staff, and administrators seem willing to consider various alternatives and reach consensus on the best way to adapt to meet new college goals.

The limitations created by the combination of a relatively small cadre of full-time faculty and recent budget reductions and their impact upon staffing have put a strain on the planning and budgeting process. The limited human resources have resulted in a delay in completing the implementation of the revised planning process and its evaluation. Despite this, the College is clearly committed to the idea of continuous quality improvement.

Findings and Evidence

The Coastline *Educational Master Plan* 2011–2016 was developed in 2011. In this new plan, the strategic themes (goals) from the Coast Community College District *District Vision 2020* and *Educational Master Plan* were used as a framework for developing the College’s goals and initiatives. (Standard I.B.2)

In the summer of 2011, the College Council recommended that the Mission, Plan, and Budget Committee (MPB) be split into two separate committees: the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee (PIEAC) and the Budget Committee. The mandate of the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee is:

“To provide oversight and leadership in support of institutional effectiveness and, through ongoing intentional college-wide evaluation, dialogue, planning, and coordination, ensure that the College fulfills its mission and meets or exceeds institutional and accreditation standards.”

Reports to the College Council, the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee, and the Budget Committee have included research related to institutional effectiveness. The Office of Research and Planning is an important college component in the ongoing assessment and dialogue related to institutional effectiveness. The Institutional Research Office maintains a visible presence on campus by making regular research presentations to college committees. Research data and reports can be found on the college website.

Resources have been allocated to support the Student Learning Outcomes process, including the assignment of a full-time faculty member as the Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator; development of a technology-assisted process for assessment and tracking of learning outcomes using Seaport³ (the College's proprietary course management system); and training and learning aids for faculty to identify and assess these learning outcomes in their electronic Seaport grade books. Student learning outcomes are collected electronically at the course, program, and institutional levels through the online system. Reports are generated to indicate how many students fully achieved, partially achieved, or failed to achieve the stated learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels. Both quantitative and qualitative data are components of the program review process at the College.

The grant development process is linked to institutional planning, and grant activities are informed by data. The College has been able to leverage Title III funds to promote innovation. In Spring 2013, Title III staff presented future staffing needs to the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee so that the College can begin planning for the future institutionalization of grant initiatives. (Standards IB, I.B.1, I.B.2)

The Education Bound United States program currently offers English Language instruction and credit courses that meet Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) requirements to students at a private high school in China. The credit courses are the same courses taught at Coastline College. The program has completed its first program review and has identified plans to expand into other countries, including South Korea, Turkey, and Vietnam. Some concerns exist as to the College's ability to support those students who achieve the stated goal of transfer to the United States to complete their degrees. Faculty at Coastline express their commitment to ensuring the quality and rigor of the program, and evaluation of the program indicates a need to establish staffing practices that can support the program over the long term. (Standards I.A, I.B)

Conclusion

Based on a review of the evidence and interviews, the team found that the College uses data about student achievement and learning in its planning and resource allocation processes. There was evidence (meeting minutes, research reports, presentation materials, etc.) that the institution is continually discussing ways to improve student learning and institutional processes. (Standard I.B.1)

The *Educational Master Plan* outlines college goals and initiatives in alignment with District goals. (Standard I.B.2) Assessment of progress toward institutional goals outlined in the *Educational Master Plan* is planned for Spring 2013 with the implementation of the College Scorecard Report. The College engaged in a process of setting "benchmarks" for attainment of institutional metrics to measure progress on the goals in February 2013 at a Planning, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee meeting. (Standards I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.6) Trend data and faculty input were used to set reasonable benchmarks. There is some confusion among college personnel as to whether these benchmarks are aspirational or constitute institution-set standards, since some of the benchmarks are set above current levels of achievement. Not all of the benchmarks have been set, and the College has yet to engage in a cycle of feedback and assessment of progress.

College planning processes are integrated, open, and collaborative and allow for a dialogue about college decisions based on information. (Standard I.B.4) Data, both descriptive and longitudinal, is presented and discussed at all-college and other participatory governance committee meetings. (Standard I.B.5)

The college program review process includes both comprehensive reports and annual updates. Program review information is integrated into planning and budgeting processes. The program review reports (both comprehensive and annual) include analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data. Student learning outcomes assessment information is also included. Comprehensive program reviews for student services programs include some survey information as a form of assessment. The College is moving to a self-service model for future program surveys with some assistance on question development from the Institutional Research Office, but survey implementation will need to be done by the departments. (Standard I.B.6)

Over the last two years, the College has sought to improve on a planning process that was given positive feedback by the last accreditation evaluation team. (Standard I.B.7) The main change in the process was to separate the planning and budgeting committees. Several college employees, including faculty and administrators, indicated that the goal was to disentangle planning discussions from discussions focused on budget allocations. The College has not yet completed a full cycle under the revised model. Evaluation of the planning process leading to the change was not well documented. However, based on interviews, individuals involved in the process are supportive of the change which they believe allows for a more institutional lens in which to view proposals, rather than just an individual program budgetary need. Evaluation of the revised process, including a survey of participants, has not yet taken place, but is planned for Spring 2013. (Standard I.B.7)

Institutional Learning Outcomes are linked to course Student Learning Outcomes, and the faculty has agreed to a goal of 80 percent proficiency. Assessment results are being collected in the Seaport³ online system. Assessment data, aggregated to the departmental and institutional levels, were disseminated for the first time in Spring 2012. The campus has yet to engage in a full cycle of dialogue around the institutional learning outcome assessment results. Although some reports on outcomes for administrative service units exist, the administrative program review process is still in the development phase. (Standard I.B.1)

Data and analysis used to inform the tradeoffs between the *Educational Master Plan* goals such as Student Success, Access, and Growth and Efficiency might be helpful to inform the planning and resource allocation processes, including the allocation of new and/or replacement full-time faculty positions and the allocation of weekly assigned hours in the class scheduling process. For example, information on the ethnicity, languages, residence, and goals of English as a Second Language students might assist the College in designing new curriculum and in planning course offerings that simultaneously improve access, success, and efficiency in English as a Second Language offerings and the progression of students to college-level programs. Continued integration and alignment of the federal Title III grant goals with college plans might provide the initial funding to support such improvements and help the College attain the English as a Second Language scorecard benchmark. Relative to the Accountability Report for Community

Colleges (ARCC) Performance Indicators, the College scored lowest on the English as a Second Language Improvement Rate. (Standard I.B.2)

The *Educational Master Plan* pre-dates the most recent revision of the mission statement which identified the College's intended student population as "today's global students" which was meant to include: non-US national students, international students from locations across the globe accessing instruction through distance education, and the students of many ethnicities taking classes at the College's learning centers. While the Partnerships Goal includes one initiative related to students in international locations, the College might consider reviewing the *Educational Master Plan* goals in light of the revised mission statement. (Standard I.B.6)

The College does not fully meet the Standard.

Recommendations

College Recommendation 1: To meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College complete the process of developing institutional effectiveness measures so that the degree to which college goals are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. (Standards I.B, I.B.2, I.B.3)

College Recommendation 2: To increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College assure the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by completing a systematic review of all parts of the cycle in a purposeful and well documented manner as outlined in the 2011 *Educational Master Plan* and the 2012 *Planning Guide*. (Standards I.B, I.B.6)

College Recommendation 3: To meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College fully complete the cycle of assessment and the documentation of how the results of these assessments are used for institutional improvement for course-level and degree/certificate-level student learning outcomes, general education and institutional learning outcomes, student support services outcomes, learning resources outcomes, and administrative services outcomes. (Standards I.B, I.B.1, II, II.A, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.6.a, II.B, II.B.4, II.C, II.C.2)

College Recommendation 4: To meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College ensure that the program review cycle for all student services, learning resources, and administrative services is systematic and integrated into college planning and resource allocation processes. (Standards I.B, I.B.1, I.B.3, I.B.6, II.A, II.A.2, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.6.b, II.B, II.B.3.c, II.B.4, II.C, II.C.2)

College Recommendation 5: To increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College work with the District to ensure a sufficient number of full-time faculty to support the College's future student population as projected in the *Educational Master Plan*

in support of the institutional mission. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.4, II.A.2.a, II.B.3.c, II.C.1.a, III.A.2, III.A.6, IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3)

Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services

Standard IIA – Instructional Programs

General Observations

Coastline Community College opened in 1976 as a “college without walls” that would not have a campus, but would instead offer classes at community-based locations and electronically through various distance education modalities. Eventually, Coastline built facilities in distributed locations within the college district. There are now three learning centers where Coastline students receive face-to-face instruction, and the College continues to excel at offering instruction through a variety of distance learning modalities. In 2009, the College added an overseas component, Education Bound United States, which offers on-site English as a Foreign Language instruction and credit general education classes, through a combination of distance education and on-site instruction, to high school students in China.

Coastline Community College offers degree and certificate programs that are in alignment with its mission. The College currently offers 57 Associate in Arts (AA) and Associate in Science (AS) degrees and three Associate in Arts-Transfer (AA-T) degrees, as well as certificates of achievement, accomplishment, and specialization in a variety of disciplines, including career technical education fields. The College also offers instruction in basic skills English and mathematics and has a large English as a Second Language program. A significant contract education component of the College is the Military Education Program. Coastline Community College is a military-friendly college and a subcontractor of Central Texas College in the delivery of online, video-based, and correspondence (CD-ROM, PocketEd) education. In addition, the College offers two Associate in Arts degrees and a Certificate of Achievement in Business for incarcerated populations through its Incarcerated Student Education Program (ISEP).

Findings and Evidence

The College’s *Educational Master Plan 2011-2016* identifies its student population, enrollment trends, and local labor market trends. The College serves a diverse student body, the most represented ethnicities being White Non-Hispanic (33.9 percent), Asian (30.2 percent), and Hispanic/Latino (17.0 percent). There is a disproportionate increase in the Asian student population being served by the College than is represented by the surrounding community while there is a disproportionate decrease in the Hispanic student population being served by the College than is represented by the surrounding community. The College is aggressive in trying to meet the varied educational needs of its students. (Standard II.A.1.a.)

The College seeks to serve students who are looking for innovative technology and flexible delivery methods to achieve their educational goals. Modalities of instruction at Coastline include online courses through a proprietary learning management system

(Seaport³); television broadcast and video-based courses; telecourse/CD-ROM/independent study, cable, and satellite broadcasts; Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) courses for military students (Pocket-ED Program); and traditional site-based courses. The delivery systems and modes of instruction are compatible with curriculum objectives and meet the needs of the student population. The Incarcerated Student Education Program (ISEP) utilizes a combination of low-technology solutions, including video-based telecourses, CD-ROM/independent study, and United States Postal Service correspondence with instructors, to reach the intended student population. Online students are provided instruction through the easy-to-use and highly interactive proprietary learning management system Seaport³. The Military Education Programs and Services students are provided instruction through online delivery and, when Internet is unavailable, through Personal Digital Assistants (PocketEd Program). Instructional modality is appropriately determined by student need and guided by curricular objectives. The College complies with the verification of students at remote locations as outlined in the "Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education." (Standards II.A.1.b, II.A.2.d)

The College has invested significant time and effort in the self-assessment of its instructional programs. Student learning outcomes have been developed at the course, program, and institutional levels and have been integrated into the program review process. Coastline is currently completing its first full cycle of program and institutional student learning outcomes assessment and will be implementing improvements based on those assessments in 2013-2014. The College began implementation of its unique process for storage of learning outcomes assessment data in October 2009, using "progress notes" within its proprietary learning management system to provide electronic reports of student learning outcomes assessments. With the recent release of Seaport³, the new version of the learning management system, came the ability to link student learning outcomes directly to specific class assignments, projects, and examinations. The College began to identify, measure, and collect degree-level student learning outcomes (called Institutional Student Learning Outcomes, or ISLOs) in Fall 2010. This was followed by a faculty-wide training session on identification and measurement of ISLOs in Fall 2011 and a follow-up for faculty-wide assessment and dialogue scheduled first in Spring 2012 and to occur in all subsequent spring semesters. The College's accomplishments in these fine self-assessment efforts are particularly commendable in light of the very small number of full-time faculty members it has to provide leadership in doing this important work. While the College is close to completing the cycle of learning outcomes development, assessment, and implementation of assessment results for its instructional programs, it is not nearly as far along in the outcomes assessment cycles for student services, learning resources, and administrative programs. (Standards II.A.1.c, II.A.2.f)

Program Review at Coastline Community College has been active since 1987 and was formalized in 1992. Team members examined program reviews for instructional programs and found them to be thorough, engaging, and self-reflective. The team confirmed that research data, interdepartmental dialogue, and student surveys are integral to the College's program review process. To better integrate program review within the institutional budget and planning processes, data collection takes place in fall semesters, with assessment and reporting occurring in spring semesters. The team was able to verify that the program review process is indeed used to inform the College's budget and planning

processes. The College has recently added an annual update process to feed into the five-year program review cycle and to ensure inclusion of the most current data and information for each program in the annual institutional planning and resource allocation processes.

Developed with a specific focus on instructional programs, the program review process has been expanded in recent years, first to incorporate programs with significant student services and support operation components (Military Education, Counseling, Distance Learning, etc.), and eventually to include all student services, learning resources, and administrative programs. Additionally, based upon an Academic Senate discussion, interdisciplinary programs (e.g., STAR Fast Track, Early College High School, Education Bound United States) have recently been included. The five-year schedule has been revised to include these programs, so some of the programs have not yet completed their initial program review efforts. Also, a few of the programs did not complete the process when scheduled. (Standards II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e)

The team reviewed advisory committee agendas and minutes for several career technical programs and found faculty members and advisory committees to be actively engaged in assessing student achievement in degree and certificate programs. Board Policy 4107 *Program Advisory Committees*, approved in 2010, has a provision to establish administrative procedures for the operation of program advisory committees. To date, administrative procedures have not been developed. (Standard II.A.2.b)

The Academic Quality Project (AQP) was developed by the Academic Standards subcommittee of the Academic Senate. It provides faculty with quality standards and rubrics for teaching and learning for face-to-face, telecourse, and online classes in one easy-to-use document. The team found this document to be exemplary. (Standard II.A.2.c)

Coastline Community College does not use departmental or program examinations to measure student learning. Students are awarded credit based on achievement of course learning outcomes with embedded assessments in assignments to verify that course, program, and institutional learning outcomes are achieved. All course outlines are reviewed by the Curriculum Committee to verify that hours of instruction, course objectives, and content meet standards in alignment with other institutions of higher education. Course outlines are available online through the college website. (Standards II.A.2.g, II.A.2.h, II.A.2.i)

Coastline Community College awards credit according to the Carnegie Unit. The team reviewed ten courses randomly selected from the Spring 2013 schedule of classes, as well as a number of other online, televised, and face-to-face courses, and verified that the College is in compliance with commonly accepted practices for hours of instruction and content. There are no clock hour programs. (Standard II.A.2.h)

The College's general education student learning outcomes are synonymous with institutional student learning outcomes (ISLOs) and include the major areas of arts and humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences. The College has a general education philosophy that includes core degree learning outcomes incorporating lifelong learning, communication skills, reasoning, information and computer competencies, and critical thinking.

This philosophy guides the evaluation and decision-making process of the Curriculum Committee for general education. In addition, the general education philosophy serves as the vehicle for student engagement in recognition of ethics, citizenship, respect, and social responsibility. The College's general education philosophy went through a review, update, and approval process by college constituencies in 2006. (Standards II.A.3.a, II.A.3.b, II.A.3.c)

Coastline Community College offers Associate in Arts and Associate in Science degrees that have an established disciplinary core with a minimum of 18 units in a major or area of emphasis. The College's career technical education certificates meet employment and licensure certifications. (Standards II.A.4; II.A.5)

Using the college catalog, college website, and multiple media resources, Coastline provides students with the clear and accurate information on degrees and certificates necessary for them to make decisions regarding educational goals. Through a review of online, television, and face-to-face course syllabi, the team found that most included objectives and expected student learning outcomes. Transfer policies and articulation agreements are shared with students, and the College represents itself clearly and accurately in multiple forms of media. The catalog is updated and published annually, both in print and online. (Standards II.A.6.a, II.A.6.b, II.A.6.c)

Coastline Community College endeavors to ensure academic integrity through a variety of Board of Trustees policies, including Board Policy 3902 *Student Code of Conduct and Discipline*. The faculty are aware, through Board Policy 4030 *Academic Freedom*, that they "...shall attempt to be accurate, objective, and show respect for the opinions of others." A document entitled "Policies and Recommendations: Academic Honesty" updates the Academic Conduct Policy to address online materials and exams, as well as use of computers and electronic resources. Academic integrity is also addressed through staff development sessions on plagiarism and prevention of cheating. Turnitin.com plagiarism software is available, and training is provided upon request. (Standards II.A.7.a, II.A.7.b, II.A.7.c)

Coastline's Education Bound United States (EBUS) program currently offers on-site English as a Foreign Language instruction, and, through a combination of distance learning and on-site instruction, credit courses that meet Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) requirements to students at a private high school in China. The credit courses are the same courses taught at Coastline Community College. The program has completed its first program review, and has identified plans to expand into other countries, including South Korea, Turkey, and Vietnam, as well as to a second high school in China.

The team found this program to be in compliance with the Accrediting Commission's *Policy on Principles of Good Practice in Overseas International Education Programs for Non-U.S. Nationals*. The College has specified the population and the educational needs to be met. The target students have, as a goal, transfer to United States colleges and universities. The College provides courses and services designed to help students achieve this goal. College personnel regularly visit the host site for the purpose of review and evaluation, and communications between college staff and the host institution occur regu-

larly. Faculty are hired according to college minimum qualifications, and standards of achievement for credit courses are identical to those at the College. Faculty are responsible for educational quality and rigor. (Standard II.A.8)

Conclusion

The *Educational Master Plan 2011-2016* identifies the College's student population, enrollment trends, and local labor market trends. The College seeks to serve students who are looking for innovative technology and flexible delivery methods in order to achieve their educational goals. Instructional modality is appropriately determined by student need and guided by curricular objectives. The College complies with the verification of student identity at remote locations as outlined in the *Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education*. (Standards II.A.1.a, II.A.1.b, II.A.2.d)

The team found faculty members and advisory committees to be actively engaged in assessing student achievement in degree and certificate career technical programs. The Academic Quality Project, developed by the Academic Standards subcommittee of the Academic Senate, is an exemplary, easy-to-use document outlining for faculty members in-class, telecourse, and online quality standards and rubrics for teaching and learning. All course outlines are reviewed by the Curriculum Committee to verify that hours of instruction, course objectives, and content meet standards in alignment with other institutions of higher education. Coastline Community College awards credit according to the Carnegie Unit, and the College is in compliance with commonly accepted practices for hours of instruction and content. (Standards II.A.1.c, II.A.2, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.c, II.A.2.h)

The College has a general education philosophy that includes core degree learning outcomes incorporating lifelong learning, communication skills, reasoning, information and computer competencies, and critical thinking. Coastline Community College offers Associate degrees that have an established disciplinary core with a minimum of 18 units in a major or area of emphasis. Using the college catalog, college website, and multiple media resources, Coastline provides students with clear and accurate information on degrees and certificates necessary for them to make decisions regarding educational goals. (Standards II.A.3, II.A.3.a, II.A.3.b, II.A.3.c, II.A.4, II.A.6)

Coastline Community College endeavors to ensure academic integrity through a variety of Board of Trustees policies, including Board Policy 3902 *Student Code of Conduct and Discipline*. The faculty are aware, through Board Policy 4030 *Academic Freedom*, that they "...shall attempt to be accurate, objective, and show respect for the opinions of others." The team found the College's Education Bound United States program to be in compliance with the Accrediting Commission's *Policy on Principles of Good Practice in Overseas International Education Programs for Non-U.S. Nationals*. (Standards II.A.7, II.A.7.a, II.A.7.b, II.A.8)

The College has invested significant time and effort into self-assessment, and, despite the small number of full-time faculty members to provide leadership in this area, much has been accomplished. Student learning outcomes have been developed at the course, program, and institutional levels and have been integrated into the program review process. Coastline is currently completing its first full cycle of program and institutional student

learning outcomes assessment and will be implementing improvements based on those assessments in 2013-2014. While the College is close to completing the cycle of learning outcomes development, assessment, and implementation of assessment results for its instructional programs, it is not nearly as far along in the outcomes assessment cycles for student services, learning resources, and administrative programs. (Standards II, II.A, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.6.a)

Team members examined program reviews for instructional programs and found them to be thorough, engaging, and self-reflective. The team confirmed that research data, inter-departmental dialogue, and student surveys are integral to the College's program review process. The team was able to verify that the program review process is indeed used to inform the College's budget and planning processes. The College has recently added an annual update process to feed into the five-year program review cycle and to ensure inclusion of the most current data and information for each program in the institutional planning and resource allocation processes. Developed with a specific focus on instructional programs, the program review process has been expanded in recent years, first to incorporate programs with significant student services and support operation programs, and eventually to include all student services, learning resources, and administrative programs. Additionally, based upon an Academic Senate discussion, interdisciplinary programs have recently been included. The five-year schedule has been revised to include these programs, so some of the programs have not yet completed their initial program review efforts. Also, a few of the programs did not complete the process when scheduled. (Standards II.A, II.A.2, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.6.b)

Coastline Community College has devoted extensive time, effort, and care to self-assessment efforts, and the results of this work have been good, and sometimes even exemplary, in the areas of outcomes assessment and program review. However, this work has also involved a number of recent changes in the institutional planning process and especially in its outcomes assessment and program review components. The team found all of these changes to be positive in enhancing the various components of the institutional planning process. However, largely because of these changes, not all assessment and review cycles have been completed for all programs at this time. It is this completion issue that prevents the College from meeting all components of the Standard.

The College does not fully meet the Standard.

Recommendations

See College Recommendations 3, 4, and 5.

Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services

Standard IIB – Student Support Services

General Observations

Coastline Community College offers a wide variety of student services including: admissions; registration; records and transcripts; counseling; financial aid; international students; matriculation; special programs such as Educational Opportunities Programs and Services (EOPS) and Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS); Associated Student Government (ASG); career services; and transfer center. Several of these programs are specialized to support specific student populations, such as disabled students, while others provide generalized support for Coastline's entire student population. Information about student services is available in the 2012-2013 Coastline Community College Catalog, as well as through the college website and assorted publications.

Findings and Evidence

As detailed in Board Policy 5010, the College has established admissions criteria that provide detail about student populations identified as able to benefit from instruction. Student learning outcomes dialogue demonstrates college-wide discussion about student support and service improvement. Coastline also conducts specific outreach to local high schools, special populations, and diverse student populations including the FUTURO outreach project to Hispanic high school students. (Standard II.B)

Coastline Community College provided a number of sources as evidence that student services offered by the College support student learning, including the *Educational Master Plan*, departmental and division meeting minutes, program review documentation, and service outcomes. With the diverse instructional formats offered at Coastline and its varied geographic locations, the College is endeavoring to be similarly diverse in its efforts to support students.

The MyCCC electronic student portal implemented by the College allows students to complete many common student services transactions online, including application, registration, transcript orders, and communication with faculty. In addition to the web-based MyCCC, the College also supports a free mobile application, online counseling chat sessions, and educational planning. These services demonstrate a commitment to extending information and providing student services support through multiple methods to meet the challenges presented by the College's distributed education structure and varied means of instructional delivery. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.3, II.B.3.a)

While the many support services are available to students in a simplified and easy-to-access manner, the College's multiple locations add some challenges to supporting student learning, as do its varied student populations and instructional delivery methods. There are some notable differences between the services offered (including type, hours, and staffing levels) at the various campus centers, as well as variations in the ways in which online or off-site students are supported.

There has been little evaluation of the effect of student support services on student learning and limited use of disaggregated student data to inform college planning and decision making about student services. The College might consider, for example, whether Educational Opportunities Programs and Services support services impact success rates in comparison to students in other cohorts, or whether the online orientation and in-person orientation processes have equivalent or disparate impacts. (Standard II.B.3.a)

Coastline has a planning process in place to assess and review the appropriateness of services provided to students, and, despite the challenges presented by its very limited student services staffing, the College does examine whether services are sufficiently comprehensive and appropriately available to students across multiple methods of access. Unfortunately, some of the student services program reviews provided as evidence for the Self Evaluation Report are somewhat dated. Although more recent annual updates have been completed for many student services departments, more evidence is needed to support the College's claim that it assures quality of services and demonstrates that they support student learning. For those departments that did complete a recent annual update or service outcome assessment, the College should encourage the use of more recent and reflective data to inform these important planning documents. For example, the Counseling Department's most recent program review update from 2011-2012 relied heavily upon student survey data from 2009 and 2010. This pattern was also found for several other student services, with the exception of Educational Opportunities Programs and Services which used a regular, semester-based survey. (Standards II.B.3.c, II.B.4)

Service Area Outcome (SAO) assessments for Student Services departments are conducted annually. However, it was noted that some of these SAOs used assessment data that was not current. Many student services departments relied upon data from dated surveys of students. The College's *Educational Master Plan* aptly notes that student learning and student success are "paramount," but it also notes that "more research and assessment on student learning outcomes, as well as study of best practices, and dialogue among instructional faculty and student services support practitioners, is needed in order to improve student learning outcomes." This observation, accompanied by evidence of less than regular comprehensive program review, makes it clear that that more systematic and timely assessment to support ongoing improvement of effectiveness of services is needed. (Standard II.B.1)

Information for college constituencies is provided in Coastline's catalog and schedule of classes and on the website. This includes the name and address of the institution, the mission statement, course/program offerings, academic calendar, information about financial aid and learning resources, and information on Board members and administrators, academic freedom, and available student learning resources. Coastline also provides information in a variety of languages to support the demographics of its service area. (Standard II.B.2.a) Admissions criteria, information about matriculation, fees, and requirements needed to complete a degree/certificate/transfer pattern are also provided to College constituents and clearly identified in institutional publications. (Standard II.B.2.b)

Major policies affecting students are provided online and in the printed schedule of classes, which includes a helpful, color-coded section that details policies on student conduct, discipline, the Family Educational Rights Privacy Act (FERPA), academic renewal, aca-

democratic honesty, refunds, and more. The college catalog includes a list of policies affecting students. (Standard II.B.2.c) The student-oriented publications produced by Coastline are well-organized, easy to use, and informative. The College is to be commended for providing clear and accurate information to its constituents. The College has discontinued the print production of the schedule of classes, which is now available exclusively online or in limited hard copies available at service counters at the College Center location.

Coastline provided evidence of several surveys used to study the learning support needs of students. The Close the Loop Survey, feedback from the Associated Student Government, and the work of college committees and organizations, such as the Academic Senate and Student Success Committee, contributed to the institutional examination of student learning support needs. The *Educational Master Plan* includes demographic data, college trends, labor market insights, and an analysis of college support programs. Service outcomes for discrete student services departments also detail methods used to assess the impact of student services and the needs of students. Coastline provides numerous survey results as evidence that student learning support needs are addressed, but there is a lack of evidence that there was analysis of these data to inform institutional improvement.

The College noted in its institutional Self Evaluation Report that “as a result of the combination of loss of staffing through retirements, voluntary separations, and a District-wide hiring freeze, between 2009 and 2012, a number of key administrative positions were either left vacant or filled with interim/acting personnel. . . . Most notably, it went from a three-vice president organizational model to a two-vice president model, combining the duties of the Vice President of Instruction with the Vice President of Student Services.” Onsite interviews and program review comments have suggested that this leadership transition may have impacted operational effectiveness of student support services due to the increased responsibilities now resting with the single Vice President. The College should continue to evaluate the effectiveness of the organizational responsibilities for student services staff and ensure that the quality of student support services is not diminished.

When the services division was reorganized under the singular Vice President of Instruction and Student Services, the maintenance and address of student complaints and grievances was consolidated into a single office. However, the appeal process for these records must now be reviewed, since the singular Vice President is now both the first reviewer and appellate reviewer for student complaints. The institution should also review and clarify its policy about what records are maintained and for what duration. (Standard II.B.2.d)

The College should consider specific examination of student support programs to determine the impact from perspectives of equity, ethnicity, and other forms of disaggregation. The College’s *Educational Master Plan* notes current and projected demographic changes in the College’s service area that can inform disaggregation studies to help ensure that constituent student populations receive services to support success. The College is encouraged to build upon existing planning processes and demonstrate that robust and au-

thentic assessment is used to identify the learning support needs of students. (Standard II.B.3)

Among the College's comprehensive student services are several that are quite innovative, including the guideU student-mentor connection, accessible online options for students to access services, and a legal aid clinic. Others are notable for their size (military contract education) or for their increasing impact (the rising percentage of students using financial aid services). The dedicated Distance Learning Support Office is very much in keeping with the institution's extensive reliance upon distance learning and demonstrates that Coastline is clearly seeking to extend student support services to students in as comprehensive and reliable a manner possible.

The College also offers for high school students in China the Education Bound United States program of English as a Foreign Language instruction on site and several credit courses, which meet the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) requirements, through a combination of distance learning and face-to-face instruction. The College has striven to provide quality services to its population in China. Students are placed into courses based on assessment data, and materials are provided in their native language. Student Support Services include counseling online and via e-mail, academic advising on site, library access via both the college online databases and the high school library, and English as a Foreign Language faculty support within the context of general education courses. (Standard II.B).

Coastline also provides extensive services to military students via the Military Education Program. Military students, who pay for courses through contract fees, receive student services assistance (registration, counseling, and orientation). The College has also endeavored to offer appropriate student services to incarcerated students. The Incarcerated Student Program Office coordinates counseling, orientation, assessment, proctoring, and student information services to support two Associate in Arts degree programs and a certificate program offered at California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation facilities.

While the College maintains that it provides student services to equitably serve students at onsite, offsite, distance, military, and correctional facility learning sites, interviews and program review comments have revealed some concerns about the comparable quality of these services. Students at one center are often obligated to travel to another location in order to access a particular support service. While counselors are available at the Garden Grove, Westminster, and Newport Beach locations, other services such as Admissions and Records, Financial Aid, and Educational Opportunities Programs and Services (to name a few) are available only at the College Center. Although some students may not notice the absence of services at a particular site, others may experience this as a hardship. Overall, institutional planning documents provided incomplete data analysis of the student enrollment patterns at the various college locations, and onsite interviews corroborated that the institution has an incomplete understanding of how students are using services at the various facilities. As the College has described its desire to increase the percentage of on-site students at its learning centers, including the recently opened Newport Beach Learning Center, the research and planning process used to determine which student support services should be included or excluded at any given college site is unclear.

The College is encouraged to provide detailed evidence of institutional assessment and planning used to determine that student support services are comprehensive and equitably offered to all student populations, including justification of services offered, staff available, and hours of operation at the various college facilities. (Standard II.B.3.a)

The Associated Student Government (ASG), student clubs, and college efforts have provided for an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility. While challenged by a student body that includes many non-traditional students, the ASG has engaged student participation in a number of organized activities, including providing assistance with the remodel of the Veterans Resource Center and planning outreach events and other student celebrations. Core degree-level learning outcomes focus on student growth and the creation and maintenance of a successful learning environment. As the College pursues the growth of on-site student enrollment at its learning centers, it should continue to develop student life and opportunities for a robust intellectual and personal learning environment

Coastline's Counseling Department provides multiple methods for students to contact a counselor, including email, web chat, online advising, phone, fax, and correspondence by mail. Orientation, including an online orientation module, provides important information upon student entry and is part of the advising that supports student development. The College's *Educational Master Plan* supports the use of degree audit software, DegreeWorks, which, when implemented in Summer 2013, promises to facilitate enhanced analysis of student data. In the meantime, the Counseling Department continues to analyze existing degree plan data. At its regular department meetings, the Counseling Department addresses how its services enhance student development and success. Ongoing professional development training ensures that counselors are well-trained and able to provide services to students in person and across distance-mediated methods.

The College has implemented several initiatives to support and enhance diversity as part of its commitment to a "college open to all" approach. These include specific outreach and support to student populations through services such as CalWORKs, the Disability Program Navigator, and outreach to local non-English speaking populations and incarcerated students. The Latino Youth Leadership Academy is another example of a program used to support underrepresented student populations. (Standard II.B.3.d)

Coastline has evaluated assessment instruments, including Accuplacer and institutionally devised tests, every three years. Although the English as a Second Language and Mathematics placement tests have not yet been validated for scores and biases for the Educational Bound United States Program, the College identified, in its Self Evaluation Report, an actionable improvement plan to evaluate the effectiveness and fairness of placement exams and practices for students in international programs. (Standard II.B.3.e)

The College maintains electronic, scanned versions of student records within a document management system—Banner Document Management System. Scanned documents are backed up daily and also backed up off site. Student records received by the College prior to the implementation of the current document management system have also been digitized and are available in an electronic format. The College follows appropriate regulations (such as Title 5) to ensure that records are maintained permanently, securely, and

confidentially. A limited number of student records that are currently being converted to electronic formats are stored securely in a fire-safe location at the College Center location. The Family Educational Rights Privacy Act (FERPA) is followed with regard to the release of student records. (Standard II.B.3.f)

Conclusion

Coastline Community College provides a wide variety of student support services and, overall, rises admirably to the challenges presented by its multiple locations and varied student populations and instructional delivery methods in making these services easily accessible to students. However, given the notable differences between the type and level of services offered at the College's different sites and variations in the way online and off-site student populations are supported, there has been relatively little use of disaggregated student data to evaluate whether these services are effective for the populations served and to inform general institutional planning about student services. While the College provides numerous survey results as evidence that student learning support needs are addressed, there is a lack of evidence of analysis of these data to inform institutional improvement. (Standards II.B, II.B.1, II.B.3, II.B.3.a, II.B.4)

The College provides students with clear and accurate information through the college catalog and other student-oriented publications, as well as through the College's website. Major policies affecting students are provided online and in the catalog and schedule of classes. Despite the challenges presented by a large non-traditional student population, the College has made efforts to introduce a more active student life program. These efforts will need to continue, given the plans to increase on-site enrollments. The College has also implemented a number of efforts to support and enhance student diversity. (Standards II.B.2, II.B.2.1, II.B.2.b, II.B.2.c, II.B.2.d, II.B.3, II.B.3.a)

Coastline evaluates assessment instruments every three years. It has not yet validated assessment instruments relative to the Chinese high school students served through the Educational Bound United States Program, but has established an actionable improvement plan to do so. Student records are securely stored, primarily through digital means. Orientation, including an online orientation module, provides important information upon student entry and is part of the advising that supports student development. (Standards II.B.3.b, II.B.3.c, II.B.3.e, II.B.3.f)

Program review and assessment of Service Area Outcomes were the issues of greatest concern for visiting team members. While there have clearly been evaluation efforts, some of them commendable in light of the College's very limited student services staffing, the program review process needs to be regular and systematic across all student services, so that the results of this process can inform institutional planning. Team members were also concerned about both the currency and relevance of the some of the data being used to assess Service Area Outcomes. (Standard II.B.4)

The College does not fully meet the Standard.

Recommendations

See College Recommendations 3, 4, and 5.

Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services

Standard IIC – Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

Coastline’s Library and Learning Resources support student learning and contribute to student success. The Learning Resources Unit at Coastline Community College is composed of a Virtual Library, Paralegal Studies Law Library, Student Success Center, Assessment Center, Information Commons, Office of Learning and Information Technologies, and a Distance Learning Department. Within the Student Success Center, tutoring is provided for students both in person and virtually. Tutoring is also provided in the Information Commons at the Garden Grove Center, which also provides access to both Windows and Macintosh computers. A small Reserve Textbook Library where students can access and use textbooks on site is also housed in the Information Commons. The Paralegal Studies Law Library is a specialized library located at the Newport Beach Learning Center. It consists of donated books and online access to legal research for paralegal students. The Office of Learning and Information Technologies is dedicated to ensuring faculty success via technology-mediated and online instruction. The Distance Learning Department makes available on its website access to various resources and information to assist and support all distance education students at Coastline. All these Library and Learning Support Services provide students with assistance and support that promotes their academic success. Library instruction occurs through the offering of course-specific orientations and interacting one-on-one with students either virtually or in person. Coastline Community College includes information competency as one of its core institutional outcomes.

Findings and Evidence

Coastline has continued to be innovative in supporting the learning resources needs of all of its students, including its large percentage of distance education students, by establishing and maintaining a Virtual Library, implementing an Ask-A-Librarian e-reference service, and developing library and information competency components that faculty can import into their online courses. (Standards II.C.1, II.C.1.b, II.C.1.c)

The College has increased the General Fund line item for the Library by \$5,000 a year for five years to a total of \$37,000. Since this amount is insufficient to cover the approximate \$60,000 total annual cost of library databases, eBook subscriptions, and other library resources, Coastline depends on Lottery and Telecommunication and Technology Infrastructure Program (TTIP) funds to adequately fund sufficient quantity, currency, depth, and variety of library resources. (Standards II.C.1, II.C.1.a)

The Library currently has only one full-time librarian, no part-time librarians, and no support staff. The librarian has been instrumental in selecting and maintaining materials to support student learning by identifying library service and information resource needs through review of instructional program reviews and new and updated curriculum. (Standard II.C.1.a) The librarian has also been successful in providing library instruction

through the offering of course-specific orientations, working one-on-one with students, and through the online information competency skills course. In addition, the librarian works with instructors in developing class assignments that incorporate aspects of information competency and use of library resources, and has created library and information competency components that faculty can import into their Seaport³ courses. Demand by faculty for course-specific orientations in the use of library resources and information competency has risen between 2007 and 2011. The librarian also assists students in developing their information competency skills virtually through the “Ask-a-Librarian” e-reference service. (Standard II.C.1.b) In conjunction with the Virtual Library, Coastline Community College students are welcome to use the physical libraries at Coastline’s sister campuses (Golden West College and Orange Coast College) and local public libraries. (Standard II.C.1.e)

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the Library have been identified and are listed in the Library’s program review. At this point, no formal assessment plan of the Library’s SLOs has been developed, and none of the Library’s SLOs have been assessed. There has been no program review completed for the Information Commons, and SLOs have not yet been developed. The program review for the Distance Learning Department, which is part of the Learning Resources Unit, was postponed one year due to limited staffing. (Standard II.C.2)

Conclusion

Coastline Community College’s Library and Learning Support Services support student learning and contribute to student success. Coastline has continued to be innovative in supporting the learning resources needs of all of its students, including its large percentage of distance education students, by establishing and maintaining a Virtual Library, implementing an Ask-A-Librarian e-reference service, and developing library and information competency components that faculty can import into their online courses. Permanent funding for sufficient library and learning support resources and services remains an issue for the College. In order for Coastline Community College to continue to increase effectiveness and ensure that comparable and universal access to library resources and learning support services remains sufficient in quantity, currency, and depth, and to facilitate its educational offerings for all students regardless of location or means of delivery, the College must continue its efforts to establish permanent and sustainable funding, including funding for human resources, for the Learning Resources Unit. (Standards II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.c, II.C.2, III.A.2)

Team members were concerned with the status of self-assessment for the Library and Learning Resources. Although the Library has identified Student Learning Outcomes, these outcomes have not been assessed, and there is no formal assessment plan. The Information Commons has neither developed SLOs nor completed a program review, and the program review for the Distance Learning Department was postponed because of limited staffing. (Standard II.C.2)

The College does not fully meet the Standard.

Recommendations

See College Recommendations 3, 4, and 5.

Standard III – Resources

Standard IIIA – Human Resources

General Observations

Coastline Community College has standardized hiring practices in place, per Board Policies 7121, 7838, 7856, 7859, and 7888 (revised January 2012) and has worked to improve its evaluation processes. New faculty evaluation tools have been developed to provide for student evaluations of online instructors, but do not appear to have been fully implemented.

The Board has recently adopted a *Code of Professional Ethics* for all faculty, classified staff, and managers. Personnel records are protected, while still providing access for employees who wish to review their own personnel files. The College has made some progress in regard to employing faculty and staff who reflect the diversity of its students. Employees express a great deal of satisfaction regarding their employment, indicating that they are treated fairly.

Professional development opportunities are provided in the form of funding for conferences, workshops, and further education, and for faculty sabbatical leaves. There are also regular workshops that provide for training in emerging technologies. An annual summer technology institute is well orchestrated and attended, with sessions focused on new and emerging technologies and their uses within the educational environment. The office of the Vice President of Instruction and Student Services coordinates a new faculty orientation held prior to the start of the fall semester. New faculty members also participate in training to develop materials within the Seaport³ system. Planning for human resources has been integrated with the College's *Educational Master Plan* and strategic plans and occurs through the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee, as well as the Academic Senate and College Council. Although the District has maintained compliance with state mandates regarding the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty numbers, the College continues to operate with a very small number of full-time faculty members in comparison to the number of part-time faculty numbers. The College has recently had a large decrease in employees based on attrition following early retirement incentives.

Findings and Evidence

The College provides evidence through its catalog, board policies, job descriptions, and recruitment strategies that it employs qualified personnel. Job descriptions relate to the college mission and goals, and appropriate board policies support fair hiring practices. Position responsibilities are reviewed by constituency groups, and job specifications are periodically reviewed and updated to ensure that they match job expectations. Faculty hiring processes include extensive involvement of faculty members in the selection of new faculty, and policy provides for demonstration of expertise within the interview process. The College ensures that minimum qualifications are reviewed and that announcements and performance measures are appropriately appraised. All search committee

members attend training regarding fair hiring practices, and an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) recruitment coordinator facilitates the work of these committees to ensure that processes are appropriately followed. (Standard III.A.1.a)

Regular performance review is addressed in board policy and in the contracts with all bargaining units. Documentation of management evaluation focuses on goals and achievements, as well as job skills including leadership, communication, and decision making. Faculty evaluation includes evidence of teaching skills and strategies, division and department activity, and professional growth activity. College-wide participation is not specifically addressed, although it can be included in narrative sections. Student surveys are completed in a minimum of two classes for full-time faculty. The evaluation process includes opportunities for professional development to improve instruction. Part-time faculty evaluation may include peer observation, if requested. In Spring 2012, a draft of new templates to be used in performance review and a proposed revision to the tenure review process were developed through the bargaining process, but these have not yet been approved.

The College has fallen behind in its performance reviews and indicates some difficulty getting accurate, timely reports from the District. Data provided by the College indicate that 55 percent of management evaluations, 62 percent of classified evaluations and 58 percent of full-time faculty evaluations are current. The College has included, within its planning agenda, the need to work with the District to develop a plan to ensure that evaluations for academic employees are completed in a timely manner. New faculty members interviewed stated that evaluation processes were followed, that they have met with the tenure committee members both individually and collectively, and that student surveys were collected both in face-to-face and online courses. (Standard III.A.1.b)

Full-time and part-time faculty are engaged in the development and assessment of student learning outcomes as described in the Self Evaluation Report. Per the collective bargaining agreement, part-time faculty members are provided a stipend for work in Student Learning Outcomes development. Faculty members use the Seaport³ learning management system to record assessment of student learning outcomes, and course outcomes are mapped to program and institutional outcomes. Processes are in place for analysis and dialogue related to student learning. The full-time faculty evaluation process includes a self evaluation which asks full-time faculty to discuss assignment objectives and strategies used to evaluate student progress. This is not evident for part-time faculty or others responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes. Additionally, students rate instructors based on whether faculty have made clear what is expected in the course, but this is not clearly related to student learning outcomes.

In 2007, Orange Coast College received the following recommendation from the visiting team:

The team recommends that the district and College enhance faculty professional development activities and revise faculty and management performance evaluation procedures to focus on identifying, measuring, and achieving student learning outcomes. (Standards II.A.1, II.A.6, III.A.1.b, III.A.1.c, III.A.5, III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b)

However, the District does not currently include the results of assessment of student learning outcomes in the evaluation of faculty or others with direct responsibility for student achievement. A revision to the tenure review process does include student learning outcomes assessment results, but it has yet to be approved through the collective bargaining process. (Standard III.A.1.c)

The Board adopted a resolution (010-04) specifying a *Code of Professional Ethics* in 2010. This was followed by a new board policy approved in August 2012. The policy includes a provision for addressing violations by stating that “disciplinary action shall be in accordance with applicable law and collective bargaining agreements.” The faculty bargaining agreement discusses academic freedom and responsibility, requiring faculty to balance ethical responsibilities with academic freedom. Recently, the Academic Senate adopted the 2009 *American Association of University Professors Statement on Professional Ethics*. (Standard III.A.1.d)

The College currently employs approximately 40 full-time faculty, 28 managers, 155 classified staff members, and one confidential employee. The District adheres to state requirements regarding staffing, but the College operates with a very low number of full-time faculty members. To some degree, this may be the result of Coastline’s unique program offerings and extensive use of distance education programming. The College states in the Self Evaluation Report that “numbers are sufficient though not perhaps optimum, given increasing demands on decreasing personnel.” Due to recent state budget reductions, the College has evaluated the replacement of every vacant position, making strategic new hiring decisions based on student demand and operational effectiveness.

The College has developed a long-term staffing plan and recognizes a critical concern that many faculty are approaching retirement age. The College has a low full-time to part-time faculty ratio and includes in its *Educational Master Plan* a variety of goals related to programmatic growth. When positions are allocated, the College considers the priorities documented in the *Educational Master Plan*, its program review process, and the institutional planning process in assessing human resources needs. Staffing needs are prioritized annually. (Standard III.A.6)

The College has had a large number of administrators and support staff in interim and multiple roles, but the Human Resources Office indicates that most of these positions are now permanently staffed. Numerous college personnel expressed concern that there are not sufficient full-time faculty to serve on screening committees, tenure review committees, and other operational campus committees. Part-time faculty are active in participatory governance processes. The College states that ongoing discussions occur regarding staffing needs in all areas, and it recently prioritized five replacement faculty positions through the Academic Senate and the deans, making use of program review data and departmental presentations. (Standard III.A.2)

The College has 140 policies that address human resources. Policies and their review are initiated through Board request, changes in legal requirements or by the constituent groups. Interviews with Human Resources and bargaining unit representatives revealed that policies are reviewed by General Counsel and vetted by the Chancellor’s Cabinet and returned to constituent groups with recommended changes. The Board uses a first and

second reading process, enabling review during public meetings. Many policies are out of date, with some dating to the 1980s. A newly established cycle of review has been developed, and progress is being made on bringing the policies up to date. The Board has approved many of these policies over the past several months, including hiring policies for faculty, managers, and classified employees, a recruitment policy, and an anti-nepotism policy. Policies are posted on the District website. (Standard III.A.3)

Employee personnel records are secured in the Human Resources office. Education and Labor Codes are followed regarding access and inspection of records by the employees. Employees may review and copy contents of their own personnel files by appointment. (Standard III.A.3.b)

The College has policies (Board Policy 3420 and Board Policy 3421) that support and promote diversity in hiring. Positions are advertised in a variety of formats and locations in order to attract diversity within pools of qualified applicants. The College states in its Self Evaluation Report that, while policies are in place, they have not yielded diversity in the employee population that closely mirrors the student population. Fall 2010 data indicate that this gap may be closing in some employee classifications, with classified employment numbers showing the most improvement. Programs that support international students and international education represent efforts to enhance student diversity. (Standard III.A.4)

The District *EEO/Staff Diversity Plan* includes goals and hiring procedures, and the non-discrimination statement appears in all publications. The College participates in diversity job fairs and a wide variety of listservs and community organizations to assist with marketing its positions. (Standard III.A.4.b) The College's Diversity, International, and Intercultural Committee is charged with promoting understanding and competence as both local and global citizens. This committee has not held documented meetings since March 2011 and currently has a large number of vacancies, based upon minutes and membership lists provided. Other activities that support the diverse population have been initiatives of the Foundation, the President's Office, and the Title III grant program. There is no evidence of needs assessment processes to determine professional development programs and services that might support diverse personnel. (Standard III.A.4.a)

The District has a variety of policies that address issues of integrity and fair treatment, including Board Policy 7803 (Sexual Harassment), Board Policy 3720 (Computer and Electronic Resources Systems Acceptable Use), Board Policy 3510 (Workplace Violence Plan), and Board Policy 3050 (Professional Ethics). Although the College addresses policy, the Self Evaluation report states that "with diminishing resources, staff have described feelings of isolation and declining empowerment." The college President has provided for regular meetings to keep abreast of problems within the constituency groups and to identify resolution strategies. The commitment and dedication of the staff and faculty, including part-time faculty, is evident based upon participation rates in college initiatives and committee involvement. (Standard III.A.4.c)

The faculty and classified staff are represented by three separate unions. Each of the bargaining unit agreements provides for support of professional development. Funding is made available for conference attendance for all employee groups and for sabbatical

leaves for faculty. Classified employees may be funded for continuing academic programs. Managers are also encouraged to participate in Liebert, Cassidy, and Whitmore statewide training on a variety of management topics. New faculty are provided a formal orientation, prior to the start of their first semester, and are given training on the Seaport³ learning management system. There is also substantial opportunity for participation at college workshops, brown bags, and informal meetings with mentors. (Standard III.A.5)

A variety of sources are available for professional development. The District offers training for managers related to effective management and provides training on emerging technologies to all employees in a variety of modalities, including desktop training, online training and face-to-face training. Additionally, the College offers a spring workshop focused on current topics of interest to faculty, and a leadership academy is offered annually. Of note, the College holds an annual Summer Technology Institute which is very well attended and assists faculty in preparing courses and materials through new and emerging technologies. These activities are planned and supported by the Professional Development and Leadership Committee. The College also provides for online faculty/staff support. Survey data indicate that most faculty and staff participate in professional development. (Standard III.A.5.a)

Professional development activity is evaluated through online survey technology. Additionally, the College utilizes a system of tracking help ticket items to identify areas of need. A 2012 Needs Assessment Survey was conducted and serves as information to the Professional Development and Leadership Committee for planning purposes. Programming is available online, by telephone, and in person at the Office of Learning and Information Technologies. (Standard III.A.5.b)

Conclusion

The College employs qualified personnel through established hiring processes that are in compliance with fair employment and equal opportunity requirements and appropriately evaluate the qualifications and experience of candidates relative to job descriptions that realistically match performance expectations. (Standard III.A.1.a) Although established policies that promote diversity are followed, this has not produced the desired results, although there has been some improvement with regard to classified employees. (Standard III.A.4) The College has an active professional development program, and most employees participate in professional development activities. (Standard III.A.5.a) Employee personnel records are appropriately secured, and the College follows policies and contractual requirements for allowing employees to review their personnel files. (Standard III.A.3.b)

Although the Board has made progress in updating policies, including those related to Human Resources, it has not fully satisfied a 2007 accreditation team recommendation to review and update all policies, and there are still many policies that are out of date. (Standard III.A.3) The College has fallen behind in the evaluation of employees on regular cycles and indicates that there is difficulty in obtaining timely and accurate reports from the District. The District does not yet incorporate effectiveness in producing learning outcomes into its evaluation processes for faculty and others directly responsible for student achievement. (Standards III.A.1.b, III.A.1.c)

Although Coastline has satisfactorily addressed the recommendations of both the 2001 and 2007 accreditation teams to develop staffing plans, it continues to operate with a very low number of full-time faculty members and to rely heavily on part-time faculty, partly because the resulting flexibility has been historically desirable in terms of the College's unique focus on targeting nontraditional students through distributed education and alternative delivery modes. However, with the establishment of its three learning centers, the focus of the College has changed over time to include providing instruction and services to a larger number of full-time students who are preparing for transfer or pursuing degrees or certificates. There is a growing concern that the low number of full-time faculty members is impacting the College's ability to operate effectively, and the new *Educational Master Plan* projects continued growth in this student population. The team therefore feels strongly that the College will be unable to implement the staffing plans it has developed unless it can work with the District to adjust human resource allocation mechanisms to appropriately address the College's new reality, particularly in regard to full-time faculty needs. (Standards III.A.2, III.A.6)

The College does not fully meet the Standard.

Recommendations

See College Recommendation 5

College Recommendation 6: To meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College work with the District to ensure that all personnel are evaluated systematically at stated intervals. (Standard III.A.1.b)

District Recommendation 1: To meet the Standard, and as recommended by the 2007 team, the team recommends that faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.1.c)

District Recommendation 4: To meet the Standards, and as recommended by the 2007 team, the team recommends that the Board implement a process for the evaluation of its policies and procedures according to an identified timeline and revise the policies as necessary. (Standard IV.B.1.e)

Standard III – Resources

Standard IIIB – Physical Resources

General Observations

Coastline Community College’s physical facilities have evolved since the College’s initial inception as a “college without walls.” Four main facilities are distributed throughout the college district. Starting in 1983 with the College Center, an administrative and student services headquarters in Fountain Valley, the College has added learning centers in Garden Grove (a 45,000-square-foot facility opened in 1997), Westminster (the 33,000-square-foot Le-Jao Center opened in 2005), and Newport Beach (a 68,000-square-foot facility opened in Spring 2013). Team members who visited these relatively new facilities observed them to be very well maintained and well designed. The latest building to open, the Newport Beach Learning Center, is of note for its design, which garnered LEED Gold certification, and it provides for the future growth projected in the *Educational Master Plan*.

The College uses the District *Vision 2020 Facilities Master Plan* for long-range planning and implementation. Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals, but do not always project the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment. The administrative services areas for the College and District support the College in physical resource planning and assist the College in obtaining available state funding for repairs, renovations, land acquisition, and building projects. In terms of its facilities inventory, the College acknowledges that it will eventually have space deficiencies in the areas of library and learning resources. However, the current and planned “teaching space,” including both lecture and laboratory space, will be sufficient to meet institutional needs through 2020.

The College uses a technologically driven security camera and electronic key swipe system to provide safe and sufficient support and to assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services. The College appears to maintain, upgrade or replace its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continued quality needed to support its programs and services. The process assures access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment.

Findings and Evidence

Coastline Community College provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery. This is accomplished largely through the Coast Community College District’s *Vision 2020 Facilities Master Plan*. (Standard III.B.1)

As part of a multi-college district, the College organizes and allocates its resources within a centralized structure. Therefore, physical resources, which include facilities, equip-

ment, land, and other assets, are determined through a structure that may not always support specific student learning programs and services desired to improve institutional effectiveness at each college. The College's Facilities Planning Committee must ensure alignment of resources as related to student learning programs and services.

Coastline uses the District's *Vision 2020 Facilities Master Plan* to assure effective utilization and the continuing quality of physical resources necessary to support its programs and services. The institution considers the needs of programs and services when planning new buildings, maintenance, and upgrades. The facilities planning processes ensure that program and service needs determine equipment replacement and maintenance. Through the Accreditation Self Evaluation Survey, Coastline assessed the effectiveness of facilities and equipment in meeting the needs of programs and services. Responses were favorable that the institution uses its physical resources effectively. (Standard III.B.1.a)

The College provides a healthy environment for students, faculty, and staff. Coastline has a monitoring system for college premises for factors such as Americans with Disabilities Act compliance, environmental health and safety, security and disaster preparedness. Its sites are maintained by ten full-time staff: three maintenance personnel, two groundskeepers, and five custodians. The institution assures that physical resources at all locations are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment. The institution uses card-access doors to effectively secure the campuses. (Standards III.B.1, III.B.1.b, III.B.2)

Coastline aligns its resource planning processes, using the District *Vision 2020 Facilities Master Plan* as a guide, and ensures regular assessment of facilities use conducted by the instructional deans and the Associate Dean, Institutional Research and Planning. The Maintenance and Operations Department regularly evaluates the condition of facilities and non-instructional equipment. (Standard III.B.2.b)

Long-range capital planning is initiated by the District Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services, and capital projects are linked to institutional planning through the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee, the Academic Senate, college departments, the *Educational Master Plan*, the *Vision 2020 Facilities Master Plan*, and the Facilities and Sustainability Committee. As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, the District has not formally adopted a "total cost of ownership" model in facilities planning. (Standards III.B.2, III.B.2.a)

Conclusion

The College's physical resources are designed to support student learning programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery. The College considers the needs of programs and services when planning new buildings, maintenance, and upgrades. For example, the College recently completed the Newport Beach Learning Center, the design of which achieved LEED Gold designation. The Newport Beach Learning Center also addresses the need for student gathering places. (Standard III.B.1)

The facilities planning processes ensure that program and service needs determine equipment replacement and maintenance, thus ensuring effective utilization and continu-

ing quality of those programs and services. Capital projects are linked to institutional planning through the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee, the Academic Senate, college departments, the *Educational Master Plan*, the *Vision 2020 Facilities Master Plan*, and the Facilities and Sustainability Committee. Physical resources are also maintained in a manner that assures the safety and security of college personnel and students. Long-range capital plans, documented in the District *Vision 2020 Facilities Master Plan*, support institutional improvement goals. (Standards III.B.1.a, III.B.1.b, III.B.2, III.B.2.a)

The College meets the Standard.

Recommendations

None

Standard III – Resources

Standard III.C – Technology Resources

General Observations

Coastline Community College was founded as a “college without walls.” Consistent with this tradition, there is great emphasis placed on ensuring that distance learning, including the learning management system itself and faculty course development, telemedia, and student support services are delivered with a focus on student success. Sixty-four percent of the College’s credit Full-time Equivalent Students (FTES) is in distance education courses, and all courses, including face-to-face and hybrid, utilize Coastline’s home-grown learning management system, Seaport³. The College has been evolving and updating the structure of the technology unit. In 2007, the College developed the Center for Instructional Systems Development. Although this structure was deemed effective by the College, the budget reductions over the years forced the College to re-examine all staffing and organizational units. In response to this evaluation, additional merging of Information Technology areas took effect in 2012, resulting in the development of the Office of Learning and Information Technologies. The goal of this consolidation effort was to leverage existing staff in locations where contributions would be most beneficial. The reorganization retained all prior roles and responsibilities of the Center for Instructional Systems Development and added those of the Computer Services Department.

The College has several committees engaged in the discussion and planning of Information Technologies. These include the Technology and Distance Learning Committee, which focuses on planning at the strategic level; the Distance Learning Subcommittee, which focuses on more tactical elements of online teaching and technologies; and the Voyager Planning and Implementation Task Force, which concentrates on operational and technical issues around Enterprise Resource Planning, portal, and web services.

The process outlined for providing input into the technology planning process is comprehensive. Considerable opportunity is provided to stakeholders to provide input and vet all alternatives.

Findings and Evidence

The College continuously evaluates its technology staffing and structure to align its resources with the strategic goals of the College. The changes and merging of operational units and the integration of the planning processes with resource allocation provide evidence of the College’s focus in this area. However, approximately half of the Office of Learning and Information Technologies staff is funded through the College’s Enterprise Fund which has been declining over time. It would be wise for the College to develop a plan to address information technology positions currently funded through the Enterprise Fund, given the steady decline in this source of revenue. (Standard III.C.1.d)

The College has invested in a homegrown Learning Management System, referred to as Seaport. It appears that the College has continued to invest in the added functionality as the latest release, Seaport³, also includes the integration of Student Learning Outcomes

and the results of their assessment within the Learning Management System structure. The College has also made decisions to outsource mission-critical servers and operations to the District's server room or to a cloud provider. The College provides professional support in the areas of telemedia, distance learning, and Enterprise Resource Planning. (Standard III.C.1.a)

Technology training is provided to students via the vast array of technical course offerings. Additionally, the Information Commons, a student computer lab located at the Garden Grove Center and staffed by a lab technician, is available during scheduled hours to assist with common user applications, such as those from Microsoft and Adobe. Computer labs and other instructional labs are also available.

Training is available for staff through a variety of venues. Training on the District's Enterprise Resource Planning system is available on an as-needed basis. Online procedure manuals are available on the District's portal site. The College also hosts an exemplary Summer Technology Institute with sessions offered on a range of technical topics to enhance both the learning and administrative environments. The College accomplished a major migration from Seaport² to Seaport³ beginning in summer 2011. Considerable training and support were provided to manage the migration. Finally, Coastline Community College provides training to staff responsible for maintaining the college website and subscribes to online training via professional development sites such as @ONE. (Standard III.C.1.b)

Although Coastline Community College maintains an up-to-date inventory of college hardware and software with appropriate lifecycle and replacement standards, the College struggles with allocating the necessary budget to fund the obligation. The College has identified an ongoing investment of \$100,000 to fund upgrades and replacements. Additionally, one-time funds are allocated when available. Based on interviews and a study of fund balance data, it is evident that technology upgrade cycles are generally maintained with some combination of ongoing and one-time funds. (Standards III.C.1.c, III.C.1.d)

The College's 2012-2017 comprehensive *Strategic Technology Plan* documents outline five strategic areas, 71 initiatives, and 521 objectives. Constituents appear to have had considerable opportunity to provide feedback into the planning process by way of responses to surveys, articulation of technology needs in department program reviews, and representation on technology committees and subcommittees. However, the College should document more clearly the relationships among the strategies, initiatives, and objectives in the various *Strategic Technology Plan* documents and their alignment with the *Educational Master Plan* and the *District Technology Plan*. The *Technology Plan* abstract, developed as a companion piece to the comprehensive plan, identifies eight achievable strategic objectives to be funded immediately through Measure M. (Standard III.C.2)

Conclusion

It is evident that the College retains focus on ensuring that technology resources support student learning programs and services and improving institutional effectiveness. The consistent review and evaluations undertaken by the College show its continuous focus

on serving the community through nontraditional means. Technology remains central to the delivery of educational content in varying modalities.

The College shows strength in staff development and should be commended for its efforts on the very successful and well attended Summer Technology Institute. (Standard III.C.1.b) The College should also be commended for its ability to continuously evaluate its structure and make modifications to align with resources and the changing needs of its constituents, as exemplified by its recent consolidation of services into the Office of Learning and Information Technologies. (Standard III.C.1)

The process for creating the College's 2012-2017 *Strategic Technology Plan* documents provided considerable opportunity for constituents to provide feedback through surveys, program reviews, and technology committees and subcommittees, and the Technology Plan Abstract identifies eight achievable strategic objectives to be funded immediately through Measure M. (Standard III.C.2)

The College meets the Standard.

Recommendations

None

Standard III – Resources

Standard IIID – Financial Resources

General Observations

The District and College take a conservative approach to budgeting and management of financial resources. Control of expenditures is strong and well managed. The finance teams at the College and District are professional, competent, and experienced.

Findings and Evidence

A review of the audit statements confirms that the District's overall budget is being well managed. In spite of the difficult economic times, the conservative approach to budgeting has ensured positive general fund ending balances for the last five years. Review of the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee minutes, and ranking of requests revealed an effective means of setting priorities for funding institutional improvements. The strong fund balance demonstrates the District's ability to fund institutional improvements and simultaneously protect the District from potential future state reductions. Financial resources appear sufficient to ensure fiscal solvency. (Standard III.D)

Review of the *Integrated Planning Guide* (Spring 2012) indicates that financial planning is linked to and supported by the *Educational Master Plan* and the *Vision and Mission* statements. The College began implementation of the Integrated Planning Framework in 2012-2013. The District Budget Advisory Committee, a district-level participatory governance committee, was formed in 2009 to ensure that the college institutional planning processes are aligned with the District's *Educational Master Plan*. A Budget Development Worksheet is provided to college department managers and is used to request additional resources. An examination of an administrative review process confirmed that the unit completed its first annual review in 2012-2013. From the annual review, a 2013-2014 Resource Allocation Proposal and a Planning Request ranked by Institutional Planning Goals were created. These documents show that resource requests are linked to program review, planning documents, and institutional goals. The College still needs to document that administrative unit plans are clearly linked to institutional planning. (Standard III.D.1.a)

At the District level, the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services develops budget assumptions based on projected enrollment data, full-time faculty obligations, cost of living adjustments (COLA), and growth and deficit factors. The budget plan presented to the colleges first shows the District budget allocation followed by a detailed description of District-wide costs and fixed costs that are taken off the top. Next, the target percentage of Full Time Equivalent Student (FTES) funding allocated to each College is indicated. The target allocation for Coastline Community College is 17.38 percent. Coastline strives to stay near that percentage because any FTES earned over the target are not funded. The goal of the College is to remain within the allocated budget and depend only on the General Fund allocation for regular operations. While the College has had positive

general fund ending balances for each of the past five years, 2012-2013 furloughs were imposed for classified staff and managers to achieve a balanced budget for the District. (Standard III.D.1.b)

The District develops multiple year projections to assist in long-range planning. The long-term obligations are presented to the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation and Budget committees. The District budgets for long-term liabilities. Review of the 2012-2013 Budget shows amounts set aside for District obligations for employee benefits, retiree benefits, and capital leases. Evidence of payment schedules are in the 2011-2012 Audit Report. The District provided a cash flow projection for a portion of the Series A issuance from the passing of the general obligation bond Measure M. The projection includes a line item of \$20 million to repay the debt on the Newport Beach Learning Center. The Self Evaluation Report states that the Le and Jao family endowment fund “provides the interest income for the future maintenance” of the Le-Jao Center. There is a budget line item for maintenance of all the Coastline facilities. (Standard III.D.1.c)

Financial planning for the institution is coordinated by the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee (PIEAC) and the Budget Committee, and at the District level. Members from all college constituencies make up the PIEAC and Budget committees, and these committees define participatory governance relative to the budget. Meetings of PIEAC and the Budget Committee are open to the college community, and proceedings are reported out to College Council and via college-wide e-mail. All staff (classified, management, and faculty) receive invitations to present their ideas at the annual town hall meeting. Students have the opportunity to make recommendations through their representative on PIEAC or through the Associated Student Government. (Standard III.D.1.d)

Policies govern approval processes for internal audits and fiscal management. Banner software supports the approval and reporting system. The 2010-2011 audit report revealed only minimal findings, two of which were repeated in 2011-2012. The findings revolved around the calculation and timing of Return to Title IV (R2T4) funds. Per discussion with Financial Aid staff, the problems have been corrected at the District level. Per review of the College’s last three years of budgeting compared to actual expenditures, the budget accurately reflects institutional spending. (Standards III.D.2.a, III.D.2.b)

With the implementation of the Banner system in 2006, end users have access to the system to make financial inquiries online. The Banner financials module provides end users the ability to track departmental budget and expenditures and make online inquiries regarding their financial needs. Monthly financial reports are provided by the Fiscal Services Department. Quarterly financial updates are presented to the Board of Trustees. A review of minutes from College Council meetings confirms that budget updates are taking place. (Standard III.D.2.c)

The external audits verify that federal and state programs are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purposes. The College bookstore is now operated under contract with an outside vendor (Follett) and is no longer an auxiliary organization. The two College auxiliaries are the Foundation and Associated Student Government. Coastline has the largest contract education program in the District and provides student

support services, contract development and management, data management, marketing, outreach, and instructional services. The department is an ancillary unit of the College and receives no state apportionment. Serving the military community for thirty years, Coastline offers military education programs for active-duty military personnel, their dependents, and veterans located all over the world. The Director of this program is actively working on creating new contract education programs for the military through partnerships with major automobile companies (such as Ford) and major food distributors (such as Taco Bell and Pizza Hut). This program has been profitable, but with the recent sequestering of tuition assistance, a ten to fifteen percent reduction in revenues is expected. Coastline's Education Bound United States (EBUS) Program enables high school students in China to improve their English language skills and take college-level courses. Coastline also manages workforce training grants through Orange County. Coast Learning Systems is an operation of Coastline charged with designing, developing, and distributing learning systems. Due to the shift in technology demands from broadcast and video rentals to online, telecourse, classroom, and hybrid delivery, Coast Learning Systems is undergoing a transition and is not currently profitable. The District employs a full-time internal auditor who regularly reviews the financial practices of the District and ancillary accounts. The Citizen's Oversight Committee has reviewed expenditures from the Measure C Bond to ensure that they are consistent with regulatory and legal restrictions. Recent audits reveal no problems in managing these auxiliary and contract programs. (Standards III.D.2.d, III.D.2.e)

The District adheres to Board Policies 6200 and 6300 regarding financial solvency and budget preparation criteria. The criteria and standards dictate the unrestricted general reserves shall be between three and five percent, with a proposal to change the minimum level to seven percent. Coastline is responsible for preparing its own budget, but the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services ensures financial stability and compliance with District policy and procedures. In response to recent tough economic times, the District reduced spending through a hiring freeze, keeping vacancies open as long as possible, and lowering health care costs. In 2012-2013, the College set aside a 5.5 percent reserve for contingency. The District belongs to a Joint Powers Authority to manage risk. A review of Coastline's recent financial reports reveals that the College has ended the most recent fiscal year without deficit spending. The Vice President of Administrative Services, with agreement from constituency groups, is building a reserve or "rainy day fund" as a contingency for future needs. (Standard III.D.3, III.D.3.a)

The College uses the Banner system for all general fund expenditures. All transactions in the system are subject to electronic approval queues with the final review by the Fiscal Services Department. District legal counsel reviews all contracts for auxiliary operations prior to submission for approval by the Board of Trustees. The College uses the results of the external audits of General Funds, Bond Funds, and compliance with Title IV regulations under Financial Aid to ensure compliance and make improvements. (Standard III.D.3.b)

The District has a plan to fully fund the Other Post Employment Benefits liability by 2024-2025. Nearly half of the total obligation (\$44 million) has already been set aside in an irrevocable trust with the Community College League of California. An additional

\$9.5 million has been set aside locally in the County Treasury. A copy of the latest actuarial study on Other Post Employment Benefits liabilities was received and has been presented to the Board. (Standards III.D.3.c, III.D.3.d)

Two local debts were incurred by the College, one for the completion of the Newport Beach Center and the other for the upgrading of technology infrastructure for the College and its centers. The Newport Beach Center was financed through a \$20 million lease revenue bond with an annual debt payment of \$1.36 million. The \$750,000 technology upgrade was financed through Bank of America for five years, and the payments for this obligation have been budgeted. A new General Obligation Bond, Measure M, was passed in the November 2012 general election, and \$20 million of the proceeds from this bond will be used to retire the Newport Beach Center debt. This will take place in July of 2013 when the first Series A is issued. A review of the last three audit statements and the budget documents shows that the institution allocates resources for the repayment of any locally incurred debt instruments. (Standard III.D.3.e) The student loan default rates for the past three years are within federal guidelines. The College is not under any sanction at this time. (Standard III.D.3.f)

The mission and strategic goals of the College support a strong focus on entrepreneurial activities and partnerships outside of the standard apportionment stream, so the College has several contracts and is seeking additional ones. Currently, the College contracts with the United States Military for educational programs and services, with the County of Orange to operate One-Stop Centers, with the Newport-Mesa Unified School District for the Early College High School, with Follett Bookstore, and with Memorial Prompt Care for student health services. The contracts for the Education Bound United States (EBUS) Program to deliver education in China fall under the Commission policy entitled "Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations." The EBUS Program delivers fee-based credit courses. All contracts for the College go through District Risk Services, District General Counsel, and Board approval. Only the Board President, as designated by Board action, is authorized to sign contracts. (Standard III.D.3.g)

The College relies on the annual external audit report findings and reviews by the internal auditor to provide feedback on operations. External and internal audits provide information that is included when considering how to improve financial management and planning. (Standard III.D.3.h)

The College identifies four main processes used to evaluate the allocation and use of resources. These include the Budget Allocation Model, bi-annual progress reports for the College's *Educational Master Plan*, review of ancillary operations (i.e., Contract Education), and a review of college expenditures and ending balances. PIEAC reviews and validates the annual budget allocation by College wing (division). Through the PIEAC and Budget committees, all College constituencies are included in the process. Assessment/evaluation of the new integrated planning process that was implemented during the 2012-2013 year has not completed a full cycle. There was a lack of evidence that financial decisions are developed from program review results for administrative units.

Conclusion

Overall, fiscal management of the District, and hence Coastline Community College, is conservative as evidenced by adequate reserves in troubling economic times. This approach to fiscal management of the District and College protects the College's programs and services and therefore supports student learning.

The College meets the Standard.

Recommendations

None

Standard IV – Leadership and Governance

Standard IVA – Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

The College has both a structure and a culture that encourages participation of all constituencies. Official participants include the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, the Associated Student Government, and the Coast District Management Association. The college committee structure ensures broad input from these constituencies and from all levels of the College’s organizational structure. The College Council uses this broad base of input to prepare recommendations to the President.

The constituency organizations hold regular meetings, post agendas, and make minutes available to the college community. In addition, the President uses a variety of more direct methods to ensure participation and input including open office hours, open forums, and e-mail communications. The *College Participatory Governance Philosophy and Procedures* summarizes the entire participatory governance concept and the operational details. Although all constituents feel welcome to participate, part-time faculty, classified staff, and especially students find widespread participation to be challenging. While the college governance process appears to work well for all concerned, participants seem much less certain about both their input and the results of District-level governance.

Findings and Evidence

The College has an open leadership structure in which the college President encourages all constituency groups to “participate in the pursuit of institutional excellence.” A 2011 reorganization resulted in two main committees (Planning, Institutional Effectiveness, and Accreditation and Budget) that work with institutional goals, assessment results and input from governance groups. Governance group documents relate to the College’s mission and goals, student success and educational excellence. (Standard IV.A)

In addition to the official constituency governance participation structure, the college President empowers innovation and institutional excellence through availability: walk-in office opportunities and a variety of well-documented open forums. In the participatory governance diagram, these two modes are described as the formal pathway and the organic pathway. This dual approach seems to be reasonably effective at reaching staff, and both full- and part-time faculty, but in the Accreditation Self Evaluation Survey, only 34 percent of students felt that they were a “valued part of the decision making process at this campus.” The College should consider strategies to improve the participation rate, but this may simply be inherent to the College, given the large number of distance education and military students. Conversations with Associated Student Government officers suggested that giving them access to student e-mail might enhance both participation in and awareness of student governance activities. The Accreditation Self Evaluation Survey is also used to communicate perceptions of the governance process to all staff and to allow for assessment and improvement. The Self Evaluation did not elaborate on how governance is used to enhance student learning. In several interviews, dissatisfaction was

expressed with the effectiveness of participation in District-level governance processes—in contrast to widespread satisfaction with college processes. Constituent representatives felt that district processes failed to create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. This viewpoint was also evident in the results of the Accreditation Self Evaluation Survey. (Standard IV.A.1)

The College has an exemplary participatory governance document—*College Participatory Governance Philosophy and Procedures*—that thoughtfully describes both the philosophy and the structure of participation for each of the constituent groups. It identifies decision-making groups as the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Management Team, and Associated Student Government. These groups use the College Council as a forum for preparing recommendations to the President. The described processes appear to function well. (Standard IV.A.2)

The Program and Department Review Committee includes faculty, management, classified, and student representatives. Using data from the program review process, the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness, and Accreditation Committee, a large group with multiple representatives of all constituencies, creates college planning recommendations. The Budget Committee also has representatives of all constituencies, thereby ensuring administrator, faculty, staff, and student input into the funding and implementation of institutional decisions that emerge from the governance and planning process. The College Council includes representatives from the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Management Team, and Associated Student Government. (Standard IV.A.2.a)

Board Policy 7837 specifies the role of the three college Academic Senates, including Coastline Community College's, in the governance process. It also specifies which issues are subject to mutual agreement or primary recommendation from the Academic Senate. The College's Curriculum Committee is a subcommittee of the Academic Senate which reviews all course outlines, including student learning outcomes. Development of programs and services originates with program faculty and discipline deans. Evidence clearly describes the responsibilities and authority of faculty and academic administrators in curricular and other educational matters. (Standard IV.A.2.b)

Starting with the District's *Educational Master Plan* which advocates "proactive cooperation and collaboration," the College has processes that promote communication among constituencies to effect student success. The College relies on faculty, the Academic Senate, the Curriculum Committee, and academic administrators via written policies that define their roles in educational programs and services. The Self Evaluation Report states that part-time faculty go beyond their contractual obligations, and this is perhaps reflected in survey responses that show similar rates of agreement for full- and part-time faculty in response to questions about participation and representation by the Academic Senate. Given the issues relative to the small number of full-time faculty, this satisfaction regarding participation and representation is especially significant. On the other hand, according to the Accreditation Self Evaluation Survey, only 33 percent of students feel that they are effectively represented by the Associated Student Government. The large number of distance education students is suggested as a reason. (Standard IV.A.3)

The College satisfies expectations for its relationships with the Accrediting Commission. It documents past accreditation history on the college web site and has responded to previous recommendations. (Standard IV.A.4)

The College uses review of the *Participatory Governance Philosophy and Procedures* document as its mechanism for evaluation of governance processes. A review was completed in Spring 2012, resulting in some changes in committee structure. It also uses the Accreditation Self Evaluation Survey. (Standard IV.A.5)

Conclusion

The College has both a structure and a culture that encourages participation of all constituencies. Its exemplary participatory governance document—*College Participatory Governance Philosophy and Procedures*—thoughtfully describes both the philosophy and the structure of participation for each of the constituent groups. This document is used as the College’s mechanism for evaluation of governance processes. The College should make an effort to increase the participation and satisfaction of part-time faculty and students, recognizing that involvement for these constituencies can be logistically difficult. (Standards IV.A.1, IV.A. 2, IV.A.4) District-level governance processes need to be improved to mirror the open, participatory environment created by the College. (Standard IV.A.1)

The College meets the Standard.

Recommendations

See College Recommendation 5

District Recommendation 5: To increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District fully utilize systematic participative processes in District governance to assure effective discussion, planning and implementation and to create the same environment for empowerment, innovation and institutional excellence that already exists at the College. (Standards IV.A.1, IV.B.1.a, IV.B.1.b, IV.B.1.c, IV.B.1.g) [This recommendation is specific to Coastline Community College and is not included in the external evaluation reports for the other two colleges.]

Standard IV – Leadership and Governance

Standard IVB – Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations

The Board of Trustees for the Coast Community College District consists of five trustees who are elected at large, with each member representing a defined segment of the District. Board members are elected to four-year staggered terms. There is also a student trustee who is elected annually by the District Student Council. The majority of the Board has served at least two terms of office. Each Board member serves on at least two of the six Board committees, which are Accreditation, Audit and Budget, Career Technical Education, Land Development, Legislative Affairs, and Personnel Commission. This involvement by the Board ensures that policies are established, maintained, and revised to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services, and financial stability. Additionally, Board members' participation in accreditation demonstrates the Board's commitment to and understanding of the accreditation process. (Standards IV.B.1.a, IV.B.1.c)

The current college President was hired in 2010 and, in a relatively short period of time, facilitated the combining of several existing committees, split the Mission, Plan, and Budget Committee into the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness, and Accreditation Committee and the Budget Committee, was instrumental in the development of a new Integrated Planning Guide, and converted the College from a three-vice president model to a two-vice president model. She accomplished this using the College's participatory governance processes and by writing articles for the *Coastliner* newsletter, sending a regular President's Message e-mail, holding open office hours monthly, conducting forums at the different campus sites, and holding community meetings. (Standards IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.b, IV.B.2.e)

Findings and Evidence

The Coast Community College District Board of Trustees members seem to understand that, as a whole, they represent the public interest and that they are ultimately responsible for the educational quality, legal matters and financial integrity of the colleges. The Board Policies are included on the District's website, as are the Board meeting agendas and minutes. At the August 1, 2012 Board meeting, the Board voted to have more detailed minutes for topics related to student success, instructional programs, student services, budget and fiscal stability, plans, Student Learning Outcomes, and other topics of interest. The Board approved a District Vision Statement, Mission Statement, Values, Principles, and Goals that were last updated in August 2010 (Board Policy 1200). (Standards IV.B.1.a, IV.B.1.b)

Board Policies are published on the Coast Community College District website. The policies are organized into five major sections: The District, Board of Trustees, Educational Programs and Student Relationships, Business Operations, and Personnel Policies and Human Resources. In February 2012, the District created Administrative Procedure 2410

to clarify and formalize the process by which existing Board policies and administrative procedures are revised or created. The structure, numbering, and content of Board policies and administrative procedures are currently being changed and, as necessary, revised with an anticipated completion date of April 2013. In all, the Board has established 316 policies, 48 of which have been revised or created between January 2012 and February 2013. (Standards IV.B.1.b, IV.B.1.d, IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.f, IV.B.1.g, IV.B.1.h, IV.B.1.j)

The Board acts independently in a collaborative manner in the approval of educational programs, annual budget, and construction of all facilities. The Board approved the *District Educational Master Plan, Vision 2020* on June 15, 2011, and this document provides the context for policy and funding decisions. The Board has adopted budget guidelines that include a requirement for a minimum contingency reserve to guide the development of both long- and short-term budget strategies. These are vetted at District Budget Advisory Committee meetings. (Standards IV.B.1.b, IV.B.1.c)

All Board members are supported to attend state and national board development activities. New Board members are encouraged to participate in the Effective Trustee Workshop and Trustee Orientation offered annually by the California Community College Trustees (CCCT) and Community College League of California (CCLC) organizations. In the past five years, two of the trustees have served on the CCCT Board and CCLC's Advisory Committee on Education Services. The Board conducts study sessions and retreats to gain a greater understanding of topics and issues facing the District. Additionally, Board members are invited to attend college functions and, in fact, they do. (Standard IV.B.1.f)

The Board of Trustees has established Board Policy 2745 as its process for self evaluation. The policy was last updated in August 2012. The self evaluation is performed "in order to identify strengths and areas in which it may improve its functioning." The Board conducted its most recent self evaluation at the meeting of October 17, 2011 and discussed the results of the self evaluation at following meetings. (Standard IV.B.1.g)

The Board has a code of ethics detailing ethical responsibilities and trustee standards of practice. It was noted in the March 2007 Evaluation Report that "the code of ethics does not include a clearly defined policy for dealing with board member behavior that violates its policy." Board Policy 2715 *Code of Ethics for Members of the Board of Trustees* was most recently revised in July 2012 and now includes a "Steps in Addressing Ethical Violations" section. (Standard IV.B.1.h)

The Board has been kept informed of general accreditation timelines and processes, the functional map delineating roles and responsibilities between the District and the College, and the status of the 2007 District-related recommendations by the Vice Chancellor of Educational Services and Technology. The college President kept the Board informed of the status of the College's institutional self evaluation. The Board created an Accreditation Committee in January 2009. This was codified in Board Policy 2223 which includes the committee's purpose, goals and objectives, composition, responsibilities, ethical conduct, meetings, and reporting. The key responsibilities of this committee are to monitor the accreditation status of the three colleges within the district, assure compliance with the requirements of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,

Western Association of Schools and Colleges, and, in consultation with the Chancellor, recommend to the Board the approval of accreditation-related reports. (Standard IV.B.1.i)

There are clearly defined policies that delegate authority to the Chancellor and the college presidents; however, the Board's practice of employing four board staff (secretary, staff aide, senior staff assistant, and board office assistant) who do not report to the Chancellor, may actually violate Standard IV.B.1.j. There are clearly defined policies for selecting and evaluating the college presidents. The process for hiring the current president was adhered to when she was hired in 2010. (Standard IV.B.1.j)

The President of Coastline Community College has been in her position since July 1, 2010. She directly supervises the Vice President, Administrative Services; Vice President, Instruction and Student Services; Associate Dean, Institutional Research; Executive Director, Foundation; and Director, Public Relations and Marketing. The remaining administrative structure consists of one executive dean, five deans, and three directors. The President leads the College Council, the committee that acts on college committee and constituency recommendations, fosters communication and reviews overall college operations. The President chairs the Blue Ribbon Management Team which provides the management perspective to the College Council. The Council's recommendations, as well as those from the senior cabinet, assist the President in making decisions. (Standard IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.b)

The President guides institutional improvement by valuing and instilling in the College and the community the importance that there is a reliable, accurate, and ongoing culture of evidence that supports planning and informed decision making. As a result of the President's effective use of collegial processes, an *Educational Master Plan* was created; the Mission, Plan and Budget Committee was split into the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee and the Budget Committee; a new Integrated Planning Guide was created; and the Program and Department Review Committee revised its review cycle and includes data provided from Institutional Research, Student Learning Outcomes, and Student Services and Administrative Services Outcomes. (Standards IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.b)

The President attends the District Presidents' Cabinet and the District Chancellor's Cabinet, where statutes, regulations, and governing board policies are discussed. The President then delegates the policies to the appropriate administrator to ensure implementation in the area of responsibility of each. The President is responsible for the College's budget and utilizes the College's procedures, as delineated in the Integrated Planning Guide, to control expenditures. The President is involved with the local, state, national, and international communities that the College serves. The College publishes a regular newsletter, the *Coastliner*, and an annual report to keep the public informed about the College. (Standards IV.B.2.c, IV.B.2.d, IV.B.2.e)

The District Functional Map was finalized on February 4, 2013 and is organized by district division areas of responsibilities—Chancellor's Office, Educational Services and Technology, Human Resources, and Administrative Services—and contains evaluation/measurement of service outcomes. The effectiveness of the functional map is discussed in Chancellor's Cabinet and other District advisory committees. The District in-

formally evaluates the District's role delineation, governance, and decision-making processes as they relate to assisting colleges in meeting educational goals. Any changes to district and/or college responsibilities are shared with the constituency groups within the District. In addition, the Chancellor's Cabinet consists of the three college presidents, presidents of the academic senates, representatives from faculty and classified unions, and representatives from the student associations, who communicate with their respective groups the functions of the District and the responsibilities of the colleges. It appears that the roles and responsibilities of the District and those of the College are not widely understood at Coastline Community College. District-level governance should be improved to create the same environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence that already exists at the College. (Standards IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.g)

The District's *Vision 2020 Educational Master Plan* and mission and vision statements serve as the basis for the planning and budgeting processes. The District allocates funds following Board Policy 6200 and by using the District's designed budget principles, formulas, and priorities. These are reviewed regularly by the District Budget Advisory Committee, the Presidents' Council, and the governing councils of the three colleges. The district allocation model appears to allocate funds to the colleges based on a full-time equivalent student (FTES)-based formula, although no evidence was provided to confirm this statement. It appears that a large percentage of employees are not familiar with the District's allocation process to the colleges. In fact, nearly 30 percent of full-time faculty believe that the District does not treat each college fairly. Each college is responsible for its respective budget, and the District ensures that both college and District services stay within allocated budgets. The Board approves the budget and any change to the assumptions on which the budget was developed is communicated to the Board. The Measure C Citizen's Bond Oversight Committee oversees the administration of Measure C funds, and quarterly reports are posted on the District website. (Standards IV.B.3.c, IV.B.3.d)

The Chancellor delegates full responsibility for the successful operation of the colleges to the respective presidents. He meets regularly with the presidents, and the presidents are active on the Chancellor's Cabinet. The Chancellor holds the presidents accountable for college operations through formal evaluation, reports to the Board, state-of-the college reports, and through informal observations. The Chancellor regularly communicates to all employees through the Chancellor's Weekly News Brief and fosters inter-college collaboration beyond the Chancellor's Cabinet and President's Council to better serve students and increase their success. (Standards IV.B.3.e, IV.B.3.f)

Conclusion

Reviews of the minutes from Board of Trustee meetings and board committee meetings, plus interviews with several Trustees and constituent group leaders, demonstrate that the Board is still in the process of clarifying its role regarding the distinction between policies to govern the District and procedures to operate the District and its colleges. Of particular concern are the Board's initiation of academic plans (for example, plans to change the manner in which the colleges offer English as a Second Language), the Board's involvement in proposing changes to the colleges' accreditation self evaluations, and the Board's incursion in the authority delegated to the Chancellor such as evaluation of the

vice chancellors. (Standards IV.B.1.j, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.g and *Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems*, January 2004)

The District has begun the process of reviewing and revising its policies and procedures as recommended. In February 2012, the District created Administrative Procedure 2410 in order to clarify and formalize the process by which existing board policies and administrative procedures are revised or created. This process was started just within the last two years and is not yet complete. (Standard IV.B.1.e)

The Board has a well-defined and published self evaluation process formally established in board policy. Most recently, the Board delayed the evaluation from September to October 2011, deviating from the policy. The Board did not discuss the self evaluations until meetings on March 21, 2012 and May 16, 2012 rather than at the following meeting as stated in the policy. In addition, the Board did not adopt any action plans to improve its functioning as stated in the policy. (Standard IV.1.g)

The new college President has accomplished much during her brief tenure at Coastline Community College by instilling in the College and the community the importance of a reliable, accurate, and ongoing culture of evidence that supports planning and informed decision making. The administrative structure of the institution operates accordingly and is effective. However, the above issues relative to Board of Trustees and District operations prevent the College from meeting some components of the Standard.

The College does not fully meet the Standard.

Recommendations

See District Recommendations 4 and 5

District Recommendation 2: To meet the Standards, and as recommended by the 2007 team, the team recommends that the Board and district follow their policies regarding the delegation of authority to the Chancellor for effective operation of the district and to the college presidents for the effective operation of the colleges. Further, the team recommends that the district develop administrative procedures that effectively carry out delegation of authority to the Chancellor and the college presidents. (Standards IV.B.1.j, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.g)

District Recommendation 3: To meet the Standard, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees follow its established process for self-evaluation of Board performance as published in its board policy. (Standard IV.B.1.g)