

COAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT District Governance Council Meeting Summary

August 12, 2013

CALL TO ORDER

Cabinet members present were:

Wes Bryan, President, Golden West College
Denise Cabanel-Bleuer, President, Academic Senate, Orange Coast College
Gregg Carr, Academic Senate President, Golden West College
Ann French, Chair, Classified Senate, Coastline Community College
Rachel Gajardo, Student Representative, Orange Coast College
Trudie Giordano, Co-Chair, Classified Leadership, District
Pedro Gutierrez, Academic Senate President, Coastline Community College
Dennis Harkins, President, Orange Coast College
Deborah Hirsh, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
Andrew C. Jones, Chancellor
Dean Mancina, President, Coast Federation of Educators
Connie Marten, Chair, Classified Connection, Golden West College
Ann Nicholson, President, Coast Federation of Classified Employees
Vince Rodriguez, representing President, Coastline Community College
Joe Poshek, President, Coast District Management Association
Andreea Serban, Vice Chancellor, Educational Services & Technology
Daniela Thompson, representing Vice Chancellor, Finance & Administrative Services

Also in attendance was:

Nancy Sprague, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor

Chancellor Jones called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m. in Conference Room F at the District office.

District Governance Council Charge and Membership

Discussion:

- A draft document describing the Charge and Membership of the District Governance Council was reviewed. A partial description read, "The District Governance Council is a collegial consultative body designed to serve the good of the District. The group facilitates timely, factual, and clear communication between constituents and the Chancellor as a means to help make informed District-wide decisions. The Council does not address matters which are negotiable under the agreements with the collective bargaining units."
- Charge and Membership to serve as official document identifying governing process and delineation of authority that allows District/Colleges to function. Document developed in response to recent accreditation review in which ACCJC looked for historical document that identifies how we operate and how our constituents are involved, and we did not have one.
- DGC members to serve as liaison and conduit of accurate information back and forth between district/college on major operational and policy matters. Each member is expected to communicate information to their constituents.
- DGC will address constituent issues and not those subject to negotiations.
- Important items moving forward: updating/revising Vision 2020; policy review; program review; planning & budget.

- Membership to include Regular Members and Resource Members to articulate from a governance perspective our process on how things get done at the district level. Regular members having voting privileges; Resource members do not. Historically, group functions by consensus rather than vote.
- District Governance Council may hold more frequent meetings during 2013-14. Some may take place electronically.

Action:

- **Chancellor Jones** requested that Council members come to the next meeting with final recommendations to the draft Charge and Membership document. Needs to be finalized by September.

Approach and Timeline for District and Colleges Program Review, Planning, Budgeting and Accreditation Evaluations

Discussion:

- **Vice Chancellor Serban** distributed a draft handout of Coast District and Colleges' timeline of continuous improvement processes covering two six-year cycles.
- Draft handout emerged from Chancellor's Cabinet to better apply program review by developing a framework and timeline to coordinate planning and budget from both district-wide and college-wide perspectives.
- Will begin with District-wide strategic plan, to include review/revision of the Vision 2020 Master Plan.
- New in 2013 will be program review of district office units.

Action:

- After discussion, it was agreed that **Vice Chancellor Serban** will modify draft handout of Coast District and Colleges' timeline of continuous improvement processes covering two six-year cycles to incorporate college report writing each year, as it is ongoing annually for different departments.

Approach to Responding to ACCJC Recommendations and Preparing the Follow Up Reports due March 15, 2014

Discussion:

- **Chancellor Jones** distributed a handout that summarized the recommendations of the 2013 ACCJC site visit reports, which resulted in a "warning" sanction for all three colleges. A "warning" is the least severe sanction, and must be fully resolved by March 2014 for reaffirmation of ACCJC accreditation.
- **Chancellor Jones** reviewed the four District recommendations and one Commission recommendation made by ACCJC. Each college received college-specific recommendations.
 - District Recommendation 1 calls for inclusion of student learning outcomes as part of the faculty evaluation process. This is a negotiated item and is currently being discussed at the bargaining table. **Vice Chancellor Serban** advised that our report in response to ACCJC needs to be finalized by February 5.
 - District Recommendation 2 calls for development of administrative procedures to carry out delegation of authority to the Chancellor for effective operation of the district and to college presidents for effective operation of the colleges.
 - District Recommendation 3 addresses the process for self-evaluation of the Board of Trustees; a new self-evaluation process will be implemented.
 - District Recommendation 4 integrates with Recommendation 2, and calls for evaluation of policies and procedures according to an identified timeline.

- Commission Recommendation 1 relates to District Recommendation 2 and calls for examination of delegation of authority for Board Office staff.

Action:

- Expedite corrective action in all deficient areas cited by ACCJC and show evidence of compliance with all ACCJC District and College recommendations by March 2014.

Other

- **Chancellor Jones** informed that he would like the District Governance Council to help identify efficiencies, faculty strengths, and ways to create interaction among constituent groups. Promote what is working and get rid of what isn't working. Utilize an action-collab process throughout the district to bring uniformity among all three colleges for the benefit of students. Discuss regularly at future meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 10:20 a.m.

Next Meeting Date:

September 9, 2013, 8:30 a.m.

Coastline Community College, College Center

Fourth Floor Conference Room

Recorded by Nancy Sprague

**COAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
DISTRICT GOVERNANCE COUNCIL**

**CHARGE AND MEMBERSHIP
DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION
8-12-2013**

BASIS FOR THE DISTRICT GOVERNANCE COUNCIL

The Chancellor appoints a District Governance Council to serve as the District-wide communication, planning, and review forum on matters pertaining to major issues affecting the District.

CHARGE OF THE COUNCIL

The District Governance Council is a collegial consultative body designed to serve the good of the District. The group facilitates timely, factual, and clear communication between constituents and the Chancellor as a means to help make informed District-wide decisions. The Council does not address matters which are negotiable under the agreements with the collective bargaining units.

The Council serves in an advisory capacity to the Chancellor or his/her designee to promote effective communication and participatory governance throughout the District.

The District Governance Council

- Makes recommendations to the Chancellor on policy matters, district-wide planning, budgeting, the integration of planning and resource allocation, and other matters of the District;
- Promotes communication and fosters an awareness of District-wide perspectives among the students, faculty, staff and administration concerning the welfare, development and sustainable quality improvement within CCCD;
- Identifies common areas of concern that require further study;
- Annually reviews reports of progress on the District-wide Strategic Plans, Goals and Objectives and measures of institutional effectiveness;
- Oversees the development, evaluation and integration of the District-wide Strategic Plan with the college strategic plans; and
- Monitors compliance with accreditation standards.

DUTIES OF MEMBERS

Members of the Council fill a unique place in the District's structure. As members, they are the primary and most visible representatives of their constituent groups. They set the standard for civility, candor, and accuracy in collegial discussion, within Council meetings and in their interactions with others in the college communities. Members are conduits of information to and from their respective groups. They should strive to understand and accept diverse points of view while attempting to reach a consensus to best serve the District as a whole.

The goal of the District Governance Council is to provide accurate, factual information. When asked a specific question by a constituent, a Council member may respond with appropriate information if it is available. If the information is not available at that time, the Council member

should either inform the constituent that he or she will get the requested information or will direct the question to a more appropriate person, who will respond to the constituent.

The Council works cooperatively with other college/district standing councils/committees and such other groups to carry out its functions and fulfill its responsibilities.

The Consultation Council is a select group; invited guests are appropriate if they are relevant to an agenda item with the understanding that they may only contribute via their representative, not directly to the Council unless otherwise invited to do so.

MEMBERS

Chancellor (Chair)

Vice Chancellor Educational Services and Technology

Vice Chancellor Human Resources

Vice Chancellor Finance and Administration

Orange Coast College President

Golden West College President

Coastline Community College President

Orange Coast College Academic Senate President

Golden West College Academic Senate President

Coastline Community College Academic Senate President

Student Trustee

Coast District Management Association President

Orange Coast College Classified Senate President

Golden West College Classified Connections President

Coastline Community College Classified Senate President

District Office Classified Senate President

RESOURCE MEMBERS

District Director, Public Affairs, Marketing and Government Relations

College Student Associations Presidents (3)

Collective Bargaining Unit Presidents (3)

Secretary of the Board

Timeline of Continuous Improvement Processes - Two Six-Year Cycles

Task	2013-2019 Cycle						2019-2025 Cycle					
	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 6	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 6
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
District-wide Strategic Plan	Update/Develop new three-year plan			Update/Develop new three-year plan			Update/Develop new three-year plan			Update/Develop new three-year plan		
College Master/Strategic Plan		Update/Develop new three-year plan			Update/Develop new three-year plan			Update/Develop new three-year plan			Update/Develop new three-year plan	
Program Review Reports (Colleges)			Write Reports			Write Reports			Write Reports			Write Reports
Program Review Reports (District Office) *	Annual updates of performance indicators established by each unit and requests for new resources (if needed). Every three years comprehensive reports and revisions, as needed.											
Prioritize Resource Requests from Program Review (annual prioritizations may occur as well, see below)	**			Prioritize			Prioritize			Prioritize		
Accreditation Mid-Term Report			Write and Submit						Write and Submit			
Accreditation Institutional Self-Evaluation				Plan	Write	Submit				Plan	Write	Submit
Comprehensive Accreditation Team Visit						Visit in spring						Visit in spring
Other accreditation reports (some are required annually, others are based on determinations made by ACCJC) and accreditation follow up visits, if any, as determined by ACCJC	Annual regular reports and others as determined by ACCJC											
Annual: Program Review Update, Requests for new resources, Budget Development, and Resource Allocation	Submitted every year to inform next fiscal year's planning and budget											

Note: * District Office conducts first program review for its units in Fall 2013

** GWC to prioritize PR requests from previous cycle

Coordination and Preparation of Follow up Reports due to ACCJC March 15, 2014 and Follow up Visit

7/30/2013

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) met in early June 2013 to review and act upon the site team reports for those colleges that were visited in spring 2013, which included the three Coast Colleges.

The ACCJC decided to place all three Coast Colleges on "warning on the basis of a comprehensive evaluation." A "warning," the least severe of the four accreditation sanctions, is issued when ACCJC finds that an institution has pursued a course deviating from the Commission's eligibility requirements, standards, or policies to an extent that gives concern to the Commission. During the warning period, reaffirmation of accreditation is delayed but the colleges remain accredited while they work toward resolution of the deficiencies identified by the Commission. The accreditation will be reaffirmed for each Coast College when ACCJC determines that the issues giving rise to the warning are fully resolved and the colleges are moved from warning.

ACCJC requested all three Coast Colleges to each submit a follow-up report by March 15, 2014. The follow-up reports must each demonstrate that the respective college has fully addressed District Recommendations 1, 2, 3 and 4, Commission Recommendation 1 and the college specific recommendations (see below the list of recommendations). District Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4 and Commission Recommendation 1 apply district-wide. The college-specific recommendations relate to issue identified for the respective college, as noted below.

Coast Community College District recognizes the value of peer review accreditation and is committed to working collaboratively district-wide to fully address the recommendations identified.

Once the follow-up reports are received, there will be follow-up site visits at each of the three colleges and the District Office either in late March 2014 or April 2014. Follow up site visits are shorter than the comprehensive site visits that occurred in March 2013 and involve a smaller number of visiting team members. The site visits are usually a day long, maximum two days. The teams conducting follow-up site visits consist of two to three members of the respective teams who visited the colleges in March 2013. Usually, the chair of the March 2013 team will be the chair of the team conducting the follow-up visit in spring 2014 for each college. During the March 2013 comprehensive site visits, there was also a Chair for the District overall. Given that there are five specific recommendations related to the District rather than the Colleges, it is highly likely that the District Chair will be also involved in the follow-up site visits in spring 2014.

After the follow-up visits, each of the visiting teams will submit a report to ACCJC. At its June 2014, ACCJC will make a determination regarding the accreditation status of each of the Coast Colleges. If the visiting teams find that all recommendations have been fully addressed by the

time of the site visits, ACCJC can decide in June 2014 to remove all Coast Colleges from warning and reaffirm accreditation. The decision is made for each college separately. If the recommendations have not been fully addressed by the time of the site visits in spring 2014, ACCJC may decide to continue all or some of the Coast Colleges on warning or issue a higher level of sanction such as probation.

In order to address the recommendations, the District Office and the Colleges will be working together. The District Office will coordinate the recommendations related to the District, while the colleges will coordinate the college-specific recommendations. For all recommendations, there will be input from and review by the appropriate groups both at the District Office and the colleges. Below the key planning dates and a high-level chart identifying responsibilities for addressing the recommendations and writing the follow-up reports.

Key dates:

- Board Accreditation Committee Progress Report Review Dates November 12, 2013 and January 14, 2014
- Board Study Session Review and Discussion of Draft Follow-up Reports February 5, 2014
- Board Final Adoption Date February 19, 2014
- March 1, 2014 College Presidents/ALOs Submit Follow-up Reports to ACCJC
- Late March 2014 or April 2014 Follow-up ACCJC Visits – Colleges and District Office

Recommendations	Responsible for Coordination	District Office (DO) and College Groups/Representatives Involved in Writing and/or Review
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)	Chancellor Vice Chancellor of Human Resources (this is a negotiated item with the Faculty Unions)	DO Human Resources Chancellor’s Cabinet College Academic Senates Faculty Unions
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.	Board President Chancellor	Board of Trustees Board Accreditation Committee Chancellor’s Cabinet District Governance Council College Academic Senates College Primary Participatory Governance

Recommendations	Responsible for Coordination	District Office (DO) and College Groups/Representatives Involved in Writing and/or Review
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)		Committee/Group
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)	Board President	Board of Trustees Board Accreditation Committee
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)	Chancellor Board Clerk/Secretary Vice Chancellor Educational Services and Technology – overall coordination Vice Chancellor Human Resources Vice Chancellor Finance And Administration	Board of Trustees Board Accreditation Committee Chancellor’s Cabinet District Governance Council
Commission Recommendation 1 To meet the Standards, the District needs to examine the role of the four board employees who report directly to the Board of Trustees to ensure there is no conflict with the delegation of authority of the Chancellor and the college presidents. (Standard IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b)	Board President Chancellor	Board of Trustees
College-specific Recommendations (see below)	College Presidents and ALOs coordinating with Vice Chancellor of Educational Services and Technology	Appropriate groups and process aligned with internal college governance structures

ACCJC Recommendations to be Addressed in the Follow up Report Due March 15, 2014

Recommendations Related to the District

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)

Commission Recommendation 1: To meet the Standards, the District needs to examine the role of the four board employees who report directly to the Board of Trustees to ensure there is no conflict with the delegation of authority of the Chancellor and the college presidents. (Standard IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b)

College Specific Recommendations

Coastline Community College 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)

Golden West College Recommendations

College Recommendation 2: In order to fully meet the Standards and improve institutional planning, the College must implement a process to more specifically create and link objectives that lead to accomplishment of the institutional goals and improvement in Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). (I.A.I, I.A.4, I.B.1-7, III.B.2.b)

College Recommendation 3: In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that the College complete the process of mapping (aligning) course-level SLOs with program-level SLOs and general education SLOs and expedite the process of assessing all SLOs. Doing so will allow the College to ensure that it is awarding credit based on student achievement of a course's stated learning outcomes as well as awarding degrees and certificates based on student achievement of stated learning outcomes. (II.A.2.f, II.A.2.h, II.A.2.i, ER 10, ER 19)

College Recommendation 4: In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that the College ensure that all students receive a course syllabus containing course-level student learning outcomes, properly labeled, for all courses regardless of delivery modality. (II.A.6)

College Recommendation 5: In order to meet the Standards, the College must develop and implement a policy and/or procedure for measuring the program length and intended outcomes of degrees and certificates offered by the College. (II.A, II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.2.h, II.A.6.a-c)

College Recommendation 6: In order to meet the Standards, the College must develop financial planning processes that include the following:

- a. Consideration of its long-range financial priorities when making short-range financial plans
- b. Development of financial plans that are integrated with and supports all institutional plans
- c. Development of an enrollment management plan in order to maintain the financial viability of the organization, (as noted in 2000 and 2007). (Standard III.D.1.a, III.D.1.c)

Orange Coast College Recommendations

Commission Recommendation 2: While some online instructors have established regular and substantive contact with their students, these strategies are not being consistently applied in the online environment.