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Statement of Report Preparation - College Recommendations

In September 2013 the Accreditation Liaison/Vice President of Instruction and the Faculty Accreditation Co-Chair called together a group of 2011-2012 Accreditation Steering Committee members. Only the members who worked on the Standards related to the June 2013 Commission Recommendations were asked to work on the Follow-Up Report. Additional College staff and faculty with expertise in the recommendation areas were identified to assist in responding. The following table identifies individuals who worked on each recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Members on Writing Team/Job Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Developing Institutional Effectiveness Measures</td>
<td><em>Rick Lockwood,</em> Professor, Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Jorge Sanchez,</em> Associate Dean, Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Systematic Review of Planning and Allocation</td>
<td><em>Wendy Sacket,</em> Electronic Media Publishing Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Cheryl Stewart,</em> Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Vince Rodriguez,</em> Vice President of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Student Services and Administrative SLOs</td>
<td><em>Gayle Berggren,</em> Professor, Psychology; SLO Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ann French,</em> Staff Assistant Senior, Office of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Vinicio Lopez,</em> Dean, Instruction, Le Jao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Program Review Integrated into Planning Allocation</td>
<td><em>Dan Johnson,</em> Professor, History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Nancy Jones,</em> Dean, Instruction, Garden Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Helen Ward,</em> Staff Assistant, Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Ensure a Sufficient Number of Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td><em>Lori Adrian,</em> President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Pedro Gutierrez,</em> Professor, Biology; Senate President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Christine Nguyen,</em> Vice President, Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Vince Rodriguez,</em> Vice President of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Ensure Systematic Personnel Evaluation</td>
<td><em>Shaunick Barber,</em> Staff Assistant, Senior, Personnel Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mary Halvorson,</em> Interim Dean, Newport Beach Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Nancy Ramirez,</em> Administrative Assistant to the V.P. Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Helen Rothgeb,</em> Director, Business Services, Fiscal Services, &amp; Personnel Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Developing Response to District Recommendations</td>
<td><em>Pedro Gutierrez,</em> Professor, Biology; Senate President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ann Holliday,</em> Professor, Special Education; Senate Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Margaret Lovig,</em> Professor, Paralegal; Past Senate President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided Assistance with Report Preparation</td>
<td><em>Daniel Pittaway,</em> Faculty, English; Coordinator, Student Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Dave Thompson,</em> Director, eLearning, Application &amp; Web Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To discuss division of work and progress in work completion, the Accreditation Steering Committee met on September 4 and October 22, 2013 (COL 0.1 Accreditation Steering)
Committee Meeting 9-4-13.docx; Accreditation Steering Committee Meeting 10-22-13.docx). Draft responses for each College Recommendation were due September 27 and October 11. The deadline for the College’s draft section was November 1. A meeting originally scheduled for November 13 was cancelled since the first draft of the report was completed before this date. The District’s draft section was incorporated in the third week in November. Various drafts of the report were reviewed by the faculty Accreditation Co-Chair, the Interim Dean, Newport Beach Center, and the Vice President of Instruction. At the Fall 2013 All-College Meeting on September 6, an overview of the accreditation recommendations and the initial plan for addressing each recommendation was discussed.

The complete first draft was sent to all employees for review and comment on November 21, 2013. After receiving feedback, changes were incorporated as appropriate. Regular progress reports were provided to the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness, and Accreditation Committee (PIEAC) (COL 0.2 PIEAC 9-4-13 Minutes.doc; PIEAC 9-18-13 Minutes.pdf; PIEAC 10-02-13 Minutes.pdf; PIEAC 11-20-13.doc), Academic Senate (COL 0.3 2013-09-03AcadSenateMinutes.pdf; 2013-09-17AcadSenateMinutes.pdf; 2013-10-01AcadSenateMinutes.pdf), Blue Ribbon Management/Coastline Management Team (COL 0.4 2013-05-07 BRMT Mtg. Summary DRAFT.doc; 2013-06-04 BRMT Mtg. Summary DRAFT.doc; 2013-09-03 BRMT Meeting Minutes.pdf; 2013-11-05 CMT Meeting Minutes.pdf; 2013-12-03 CMT Meeting Minutes.pdf; 2014-01-07 CMT Meeting Minutes DRAFT.doc), Board of Trustees (COL 0.5 Board Accreditation Committee Minutes 7-30-2013.pdf; 2013-09-25 CMT Meeting Minutes 7-30-2013.pdf; Board Accreditation Committee Minutes 9-10-2013.pdf; BOT Accreditation Committee Web Page), Associated Student Government (ASG), College Council (COL 0.6 College Council Summary 2013-07-23 p. 1, 2, 5.pdf; College Council Summary 2013-08-13 p. 2, 3, 5.pdf; College Council Summary 2013-09-10 p. 1, 4.pdf; College Council Summary 2013-09-24 p. 2.pdf; College Council Summary 2013-10-08 p. 3, 4.pdf; College Council Summary 2013-10-22 p. 3, 4, 5, 7.pdf; College Council Summary 2013-11-26 p. 2, 4.pdf; College Council Summary 2013-12-10 p. 1, 2, 4, 5.pdf) and other constituent groups. In January 2014 a revised draft of the Follow-Up Report was sent to all employees for review and comment. A faculty member edited drafts during the revision process. The final draft was formally accepted by Academic Senate on February 4. Further, the report was reviewed and discussed at a Board Study Session on February 5. The final report was sent to the Board of Trustees on February 7.

For uniformity in the reports, the Vice Presidents from the three colleges agreed to label the evidence “COL” for College Recommendations and “DIS” for District Recommendations. The number of the recommendation, then the serial number of the evidence would follow these abbreviations.

The following individuals were involved in developing responses to District Recommendations 1-4 and Commission Recommendation 1:

Coastline:
Ann Holliday, Professor, Special Education; Senate Treasurer
Margaret Lovig, Professor, Paralegal; Past Senate President
Dr. Pedro Gutierrez, Professor, Biology; President, Academic Senate
Golden West College:
Wes Bryan, President
Gregg Carr, President, Academic Senate
Ron Lowenberg, Dean
Kay Nguyen, Administrative Director; Accreditation Liaison Officer

Orange Coast College:
Georgie Monahan, Faculty, Communication; Program Review Coordinator; Co-Chair, Accreditation Coordinating Committee
Denise Cabanel-Bleuer, Faculty, Spanish; President, Academic Senate
Dr. Robert Mendoza, Dean, Math & Sciences

Coast Community College District Office:
Dr. Andreea Serban, Vice Chancellor, Educational Services and Technology
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Statement of Report Preparation - District Recommendations

In September 2013, a workgroup with representation from the three colleges and the District Office was formed to draft responses to the ACCJC District-level recommendations included in the letters sent to the colleges by ACCJC in July 2013 (District-wide Workgroup for Responding to ACCJC 2013 District Recommendations Agendas for Meetings: DIS 0.1 9/27/2013; DIS 0.2 10/11/2013; DIS 0.3 11/4/2013; DIS 0.4 12/2/2014). The workgroup was constituted based on the recommendation of the Chancellor’s Cabinet, which is chaired by the Chancellor and is composed of the three College Presidents and the three Vice Chancellors. The creation of the workgroup was discussed with and endorsed by the Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee at its meeting on September 10.

The workgroup membership was designed to provide continuity by including, to the extent possible, the same individuals who were part of the College and District-wide workgroups tasked with preparing the sections in the 2013 College institutional self-evaluation reports dealing with Standard IV.B.2.

The members of the workgroup are listed in the previous section.

At the meeting of the Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee held on September 10, 2013, the following timeline was discussed and agreed upon in terms of preparation of draft responses to the ACCJC District Recommendations and overall follow-up college reports for review and discussion with the Board Accreditation Committee and the full Board of Trustees and due to ACCJC on March 15, 2014.

a. Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee Review of Progress Reports: November 12, 2013 and January 14, 2014
b. Board of Trustees Meeting Review and Discussion of Draft Follow-Up College Reports: February 5, 2014 (DIS 0.7 Board Agenda Regular Meeting 2-5-14.pdf)
c. Board of Trustees Final Adoption of College Follow-Up Reports: February 19, 2014 (DIS 0.8 Board Agenda Regular Meeting 2-19-14.pdf)
d. College Presidents/ALOs Submission of Follow-Up Reports to ACCJC: By March 15, 2014

At its September 27 and October 11, 2013 meetings, the workgroup developed and further refined the division of responsibilities in terms of developing draft responses, the template to use for writing the draft responses, and the evidence to be collected and analyzed in support of the responses to the ACCJC District Recommendations (DIS 5. ACCJC 2013 District Recommendations Assignments Timeline Evidence 10/11/2013). At its November 4, 2013 meeting, the workgroup discussed its first and preliminary draft response, status of evidence and references gathered and reviewed and work that needed to be completed by the Board of Trustees, District Office, District Consultation Council and/or the colleges in order to fully meet the five District Recommendations.
Details of the approach taken by the workgroup were discussed with the full Board of Trustees at its October 30, 2013 special meeting (DIS 0.6 Agenda, attachments and minutes Board Special Meeting October 30, 2013).

List of Evidence, District Report Preparation
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College Recommendation 1 - Developing Institutional Effectiveness Measures

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)

In March 2013, at the time of the external team evaluation visit, the College Scorecard featured quantifiable outcomes for several, but not all, Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) or goal areas. The indicators with quantifiable outcomes included Student Success; Access, Persistence and Retention, and Growth and Efficiency. These were widely disseminated and discussed in various College venues, including the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness, and Accreditation Committee (PIEAC) and All-College meetings (COL 1.1 2013 FALL All-College Scorecard Presentation FINAL.pdf; COL1.2 2013 SPRING All-College Data Final.pdf).

On February 1, 2013, faculty, staff, and managers gathered at the Spring 2013 All-College Meeting to engage in establishing specific, quantitative goals for Student Success, Access, Persistence and Retention. A presentation provided data from the previous three years about prior student success measures at the College (COL 1.2 2013 SPRING All-College Data Final.pdf). Data included College trends and averages as well as statewide averages for Key Performance Indicators (KPI) in fifteen areas related to Student Success and Access, Persistence and Retention. Participants worked in groups to suggest goals for the remainder of the 2012-2013 academic year (Data required to set KPI goals for the 2012-2013 academic year became available after the Fall 2012 semester had commenced.). Each group agreed on various annual goals for the College for each KPI. The worksheets were collected from each
group and each KPI goal was averaged to produce a College goal for 2012-13. However, some KPIs in 2012-2013 did not yet have quantifiable outcomes: Innovation; Partnerships; and a Culture of Planning, Evidence, and Inquiry (COL 1.3 2012-13 Unfinished Scorecard 10-25-13.pdf).

PIEAC reviewed the KPI worksheets that were collected at the Spring 2013 All-College Meeting, and after analyzing the worksheets, past trends, and other data, the committee made recommendations for goals for these KPIs (COL 1.4 PIEAC 2-6-13 Minutes). The College Scorecard with goals was then presented to the College’s governance committees, including PIEAC, College Council, Academic Senate, Budget Committee, and Blue Ribbon Management Team for discussion and agreement on the goals established for 2012-13.

In July 2013, updates to the 2012-13 College Scorecard occurred as data became available from: the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s MIS Data Mart, Banner Data Cubes, Banner ODS data extracts, and department reports. Progress was checked against each KPI goal to determine if the College’s 2012-13 actual outcome performance met or exceeded the established College goal for each KPI. A check-off system was deployed to note the degree to which outcomes met or missed the target KPI goals for the College. The ratings available were: fully met or exceeded the goal (100% or higher), partially met the goal (80-90%), and did not meet the goal (less than 80%).

In September 2013, PIEAC resumed discussion of Strategic Initiatives (COL 1.5 PIEAC 9-18-13 Minutes.pdf p. 3; COL 1.6 PIEAC 10-02-13 Minutes.pdf p. 4-5).

In October 2013, PIEAC established the following committee goals for 2013-2014:

1. Prioritize strategic initiatives that support the goals of the Coastline Education Master Plan 2011-2016 (COL 1.7 PIEAC 12-4-13 Draft Minutes.pdf).
2. Update and complete College Scorecard Measures (COL 1.8 College Score Card w Definitions 2013.pdf).
3. Evaluate and refine Integrated Planning Guide by December 1 (COL 1.6 PIEAC 10-02-13 Minutes.pdf p. 4-5).

On October 16, 2013, the Associate Dean of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness sent an email to PIEAC members requesting suggestions for specific activities that support and align with KPIs on the existing College Scorecard (COL 1.9 GoogleDocs Scorecard Measures 10-16-13.pdf; COL 1.10 Email to PIEAC Members re Activities for Scorecard 10-16-13.docx). The updated Scorecard was discussed at PIEAC on November 20 and December 4. Because the College strategic initiatives were scheduled for prioritization by PIEAC on December 4, it was decided that additional KPIs could be added to a 2013-2014 Scorecard but that the 2012-2013 Scorecard was now complete (COL 1.11 PIEAC 11-20-13.doc; COL 1.7 PIEAC 12-4-13 Minutes.pdf).

The final College Scorecard with institutional effectiveness measures for each of the six College goals was completed at the end of December 2013 (COL 1.8 College Scorecard w Definitions 2013.pdf) and finalized in February. On February 7, 2014, at the Spring 2014 All-
College Meeting, a presentation was made and information with SLO data (including SS-SLO, SAO, and academic SLOs) was distributed to participants (COL 1.12 2012-13 KPI Contract Ed Scorecard with Standards Performance.pdf; COL 1.13 2012-13 KPI College Scorecard.pdf; COL 1.14 2013-14 KPI College Scorecard Phase 1.pdf; COL 1.15 2012-13 KPI Scorecard Definitions.pdf; COL 1.16 2012-13 KPI Scorecard Data Sources.pdf; COL 1.17 President's Bulletin February 13 2014 web link).

The Commission was also concerned that the College did not distinguish between goals and standards. In response, the College developed clearly defined goals as well as standards for each Scorecard measure. During fall 2013, a College minimal performance standard was established for each KPI. This standard was derived from a normal distribution model using the individual performance of each college statewide on student success, access, persistence and retention measures. A threshold of 85% performance for the College was derived as a reasonable expectation standard to reflect that the College would, at minimum, perform at 85% of its previous year’s outcome for each KPI.

The establishment of the 85% factor for each standard provides the College with a measure for identifying satisfactory performance levels while also allowing for nominal increases and decreases in each measure from one year to the next. The 85% satisfactory performance measure was determined after analysis of past performance and adopted by PIEAC on February 5, 2014 (COL 1.13 PIEAC 02-05-14 Draft Minutes.pdf). The goals will serve as measures for continuous improvement. The standards will be the minimum thresholds for each measure, serving to alert the College when any KPIs fall below acceptable levels.

Conclusion

With meaningful institutional effectiveness measures determined and clearly identified on the newly-revised College Scorecard, along with outcome data demonstrating the degree to which goals are achieved, accompanied by an institutionalized mechanism for All-College discussion of goal achievement, this recommendation is met.

This recommendation was fully addressed and the College meets the standard.
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College Recommendation 2 - Systematic Review of Planning and Allocation

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 1.B, 1.B.6)

On April 17, 2013, the College began a systematic review of all parts of its revised planning and resource allocation cycle following completion of 2012-2013 institutional planning activities and development of budget allocation recommendations. At the April 17 and May 1 meetings, the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness, and Accreditation Committee (PIEAC) discussed the formation of a task force to conduct the review and evaluation process. Membership of the task force would be representative of College constituency groups and would include active participants of PIEAC (COL 2.1 PIEAC 4-17-13.pdf p.3; COL 2.2 PIEAC 5-1-13.pdf p. 5-6).

Volunteers to serve on the Planning & Budget Process Evaluation Task Force (PBPE Task Force) were recruited at the May 1 PIEAC meeting. The Vice President of Instruction was designated the chair for the new Task Force. Eleven PIEAC members volunteered to join, and it was suggested that a non-PIEAC faculty member be included along with two classified staff members – one from the Program Review Committee and one from the Budget Committee (COL 2.2 PIEAC 5-1-13.pdf p. 5-6).

The PBPE Task Force convened on May 8, 2013, to identify those elements of the planning process that were functioning well and those parts of the process that needed to be changed to assure the effectiveness of ongoing planning and resource allocation. The report from this meeting was submitted to PIEAC on May 15 (COL 2.3 Planning Process Task Force Notes May 8, 2013.docx; COL 2.4 PIEAC 5-15-13 Minutes.pdf p. 4-5). In addition, the Associate Dean of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness conducted a survey of PIEAC members about the effectiveness and the functioning of PIEAC as a committee (COL 2.5 PIEAC 2012-2013 Evaluation Survey; COL 2.6 Email Re PIEAC Evaluation Survey 5-17-13.docx).

At the May 8 Task Force meeting, the positive outcomes identified as contributing to the effectiveness of the planning and resource allocation process were the following:
• The inclusive, collegial, collaborative Wing Planning Councils enable broader input and participation in the development of Wing Plans.
• The Annual Planning Reports allow for up-to-date planning and resource allocation data and for follow-up on progress toward institutional and program-level goals.
• The bifurcation of the Planning and Budget Committee into two entities allows greater focus on planning; more structured discussions of issues in both committees; and a clearer connection between planning, prioritization, and resource allocation.

At the May 8 Task Force meeting, areas identified for improvement were the following:

• The Wing Planning Process needs to have more clearly stated goals and priorities, feedback to unit members, and broader unit representation. Wing presentations to PIEAC should be brief, and the format of the final Wing Report should be uniform for all Wings. The President’s Wing should convene a Planning Council. Finally, the Wing planning process should begin much earlier in the year to allow more time for discussion and planning.
• The Planning Prioritization Allocation Rubric should be revised to include items essential in administrative services. The Rubric should be embedded into the scoring document (COL 2.7 PIEAC Prioritization Allocation Rubric as of 2-4-14.pdf; COL 2.8 Resource Allocation Proposal 2014-15.docx).
• The Program Review process, which is the starting point for institutional and program planning, needs additional improvements. Stronger links between Program Review and other plans need to be made. [See Recommendation 4]
• The Integrated Planning Guide needs to be reviewed and revised, and planning timelines need to be established that meet the planning and the budget deadlines (COL 2.9 Integrated Planning Guide Revised 2014).
• The Resource Allocation Process will work more smoothly with revised forms, consistent presentation formats, and a clearer understanding of what is expected from the Budget Committee (COL 2.8 Resource Allocation Proposal 2014-15.docx).

After the PIEAC meeting presentation on May 15, 2013, and, as a result of the comprehensive evaluation of the planning and budget processes, committee members worked during the summer and presented recommendations to PIEAC at the start of the fall semester pertaining to the Integrated Planning Guide, timelines, Program Review activities, and Wing Planning Councils. The timeline was further refined at PIEAC meetings in fall 2013 (COL 2.10 PIEAC 9-4-13 Minutes.docx p. 6; COL 2.11 PIEAC 10-02-13 Minutes.pdf p. 5-6; COL 2.12 PIEAC 11-6-13 Minutes.pdf p. 6; COL 2.13 PIEAC 12-4-13 Minutes.pdf; COL 2.14 Timeline).

Planning and Resource Allocation Achievements Spring 2013 through Fall 2013

2. Completed (November-December 2013) the first year of program submissions of Annual Institutional Planning forms (instructional and non-instructional) [See Recommendation 4]. Features of the new report include the following:

   a. SLO assessment  
   b. Statistics (demographics, student success, retention, etc.)  
   c. Activity based on objectives & goals  
   d. Budget  
   e. Needs


4. Completed one entire planning and resource allocation cycle with the new planning guidelines and processes (2012-2013). This included the following:
   a. Review of planning objectives and goals (COL 2.11 PIEAC 10-02-13 Minutes.pdf p. 4-5).
b. Review of SLO outcomes, including activities undertaken as a result of analysis in order to improve student achievement. [See Recommendation 3]

c. Assessment of Key Performance Indicators (to occur each October; added to Planning Timeline) (COL 2.19 PIEAC 11-20-13.doc; COL 2.13 PIEAC 12-4-13 Minutes.pdf)

d. Prioritization of budget and allocation based on an agreed-upon rubric and linked to the goals of the Education Master Plan 2011-2016 and other appropriate plans (COL 2.7 PIEAC Prioritization Allocation Rubric as of 2-4-14.pdf; COL 2.8 Resource Allocation Proposal 2014-15.docx).

e. Evaluation of the planning process (COL 2.3 Planning Process Task Force Notes May 8, 2013.docx).

5. The Planning Prioritization Allocation Rubric was revised to include items essential in administrative services; it was embedded into the scoring document (COL 2.7 PIEAC Prioritization Allocation Rubric as of 2-4-14.pdf).

6. Established Planning Councils for Instruction, Student Services, and Administrative Services (President’s Planning Council is pending; the new Administrative Director for Institutional Effectiveness will establish this Council upon hiring [See Recommendation 3]. The President believes it would not be appropriate for her to chair the President's Planning Council since ultimately all funding recommendations will come to her for final approval.) (COL 2.12 PIEAC 11-6-13 Minutes.pdf p. 7; COL 2.20 Planning Council, Instructional 2013.docx; COL 2.21 Planning Council 2013, Administrative Services.docx; COL 2.22 Planning Council 2014, President's Wing.docx; COL 2.23 Planning Council 2013, Student Services.docx).

The Wing Planning Process was informed by clearly-stated goals and priorities, the focus being on the college Mission, the Education Master Plan 2011-2016, strategic initiatives, and mandated targets. Broad representation and involvement in the process was achieved by formation of Wing Planning Councils, which were comprised of representatives from all constituencies within the Wing. It was determined by the Wing Leaders that feedback, input, and concerns from the field would come to the body through the constituency representatives.

7. A Wing Plan Report template was developed by the three vice presidents (COL 2.24 Wing Plan Report Template 2014-2015). The template was designed to simplify the process and uniformly document the relationship between planning, resource allocation, and budget development. The reports were submitted to PIEAC on February 19, 2013 and included wing goals, initiatives, and a summary of all resource allocation requests from each wing. (COL 2.25 Wing Plan Administrative Services 2014-15.docx; Instruction Wing Plan 2014.docx; Wing Plan 2014-2015 Student Services (1).docx).
Conclusion:

A systematic review of all parts of the planning and resource allocation cycle has been completed and documented, as outlined in the Education Master Plan 2011-2016 and the Integrated Planning Guide.

This recommendation was fully addressed and the College meets the standard.
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College Recommendation 3 - Student Services and Administrative SLOs

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)

Academic Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

In its External Evaluation Report (July 3, 2013), the visiting team commended “the College for integrating the storage of [academic] Student Learning Outcomes assessment data into its Seaport3 learning management system” (p. 9). The team commented: “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” (COL 3.1 ACCJC Report July 3, 2013.pdf, p. 29). It was further noted that “SLO results and analysis are included in the program reviews that occur every five years for all instructional and non-instructional programs. These results are used by programs to identify progress and problem areas and to make changes to ensure student success. In addition, annual reviews provide updates of specific activities taking place to accomplish program objectives. These annual program plans also use CSLO, PSLO, and ISLO [Course Student Learning Outcomes, Program Student Learning Outcomes, and Institutional Learning Outcomes] data in their planning” (COL 3.1 ACCJC Report July 3, 2013.pdf).

Dialog about outcomes occurs at each Spring Faculty Meeting, which coincides with the All-College Meeting. Although Seaport3 enables all SLO data to be collected continuously, the College formally collects SLOs in the fall for dialog/assessment in the spring. The SLO coordinator prints the Seaport reports, aggregated by discipline, and delivers them to each program at the Spring Faculty Meeting. Then the dialog and formal assessment of SLO results takes place, when the faculty can review the printed reports together and discuss the SLO outcomes for their programs at the course, program, and institutional level.
A Closing the Loop Survey (COL 3.2 CTLSpring2013DialogPrintable.pdf; COL 3.3 CTL
Spring 2014 Printable.pdf) was developed in order to gather summative data and feedback from
faculty within each major, program, and/or certificate immediately after the Spring Faculty
Meeting dialog. The survey requests that the faculty provide a summary of their dialog,
including 1) why SLOs may not have been met and what strategies the faculty might use to
improve SLO implementation (technical or implementation aspects); 2) why students may not
have achieved SLOs; and 3) what solutions or implementation strategies the faculty might
undertake to improve SLO achievement in their programs (student-related aspects).

In addition, the survey asks faculty to identify instructional or other needs as related to key
Education Master Plan 2011-2016 goals. In this way the dialog is summarized, and feedback is
linked directly to the Education Master Plan. The results are compiled by Survey Monkey, and
the data is displayed on the College Web site, where the data is then available for review by
programs, for later use in Program Review and for use by the Planning, Institutional
Effectiveness, and Accreditation Committee (PIEAC) and the Budget Committee. The SLO
coordinator makes reports about implementation and the summative survey results to the PIEAC,
Senate, and other governance groups (COL 3.4 CTLSpr2013 DialogCharts.docx; COL 3.5
CTLSurvSummfall12dataDialogspr2013.pdf; COL 3.6 2013-03-05AcadSenateMinutes.pdf p.
7-8; COL 3.7 PIEAC 3-6-13 Minutes.pdf).

In preparation for the faculty discipline meetings that occurred during the Spring 2014 All-
College Meeting on February 7, 2014, electronic SLO reports for each discipline were sent to
department chairs one month beforehand. Instructions were included for accessing the reports
online in order to allow chairs to study the source of low SLO achievement rates (individual
faculty SLO achievement rates can be viewed, by course, program, and ISLO levels).
Department chairs were asked to complete a narrative form to take to the department dialog
meetings. They were asked to analyze SLO achievement rates by considering and evaluating the
effectiveness of current interventions, whether new interventions are warranted, and what
resources might be needed. The purpose of the narrative was to encourage greater investigation
of available SLO statistics, deeper dialog about SLO achievement, and motivation to improve
(COL 3.8 Narrative Form Spring 2014.docx).

In October 2013 the Annual Institutional Planning Report form was updated to include
information about PSLOs from the previous semester (information about CSLOs and ISLOs
were not included because they would be too hard to summarize). Information requested
included “Total Number of PSLOs/Sections,” “Percentage of PSLOs that were Fully Achieved,”
and “Department Discussions Regarding PSLOs (Closing the Loop).” This information served
to remind the department chairs of the importance of following up with individual faculty whose
courses did not achieve PSLOs. It was also an efficient way to document needs in the
development of the February budget requests (COL 3.9 Annual Institutional Planning Report
Form-Instructional 2013-14). Twelve department chairs who completed their Annual Planning
Report on the wrong form were asked to complete Addendum Reports (see Recommendation 4
for a discussion of this issue) (COL 3.10 Accounting1.docx; Business1.docx; CST
PSLOs1.docx; DGA PSLOs1.docx; Education1.docx; EmergMgt1.pdf; Humanities1.docx;
International Languages1.docx; Library1.docx; Math1.docx; Science1.docx; Social
Science1.docx; Special Education1.docx).
The Annual Institutional Planning Report, when used with District data set information, CSLO, PSLO, and ISLO (including degree/certificate-level and general education learning outcomes) data results and dialog, enable each program to document how the results of these assessments were used at the program level for institutional improvement. Further, the Close the Loop Survey documents the programs’ efforts to improve teaching and/or requests for support to improve teaching and student learning. Programs requesting funding allocations can also use all of this data in the spring budget allocation process. These are all ways assessment documentation reaches the PIEAC/planning committee and has an effect on institutional improvement. Other ways documentation reaches the planning committee is through formal reports from the Program Review Committee and the SLO coordinator at the first meeting in spring (the SLO coordinator summarizes key findings from the Close the Loop Survey from dialog at the Spring Faculty Meeting) (COL 3.11 Productivity Report District Data Cube 2012-13.pdf; COL 3.12 Subject Reports 2013 AIR-Business.pdf; COL 3.13 Success Retention Report District Data Cube 2012-13.pdf; COL 3.14 Success Retention Report w Modality 2012-13.pdf).

This document (COL 3.15 SLO Implementation Timeline Table.docx) provides a summary timeline of the College’s implementation of Course, Program, and Degree SLOs according to ACCJC’s Institutional Effectiveness Rubric.

**Learning Outcomes in Student Support Services, Learning Resources, and Administrative Units**

In its External Evaluation Report (July 3, 2013), the visiting team noted that the College “is not nearly as far along in the outcomes assessment cycles for student services, learning resources, and administrative programs [compared to academic SLOs]” (p. 29). The team noted “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 Review reports 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” (COL 3.16 ACCJC Report July 3, 2013.pdf, p. 35

The previous SLO coordinator did train and assist departments in identifying SLOs in 2006, and SLO data was collected on a regular basis (COL 3.17 Service Area Outcomes Instructions 2006.pdf). The former coordinator’s retirement in 2009 reduced the College’s ability to collect annual quantitative student survey data for Program Review reporting regularly and efficiently. However, most departments were able to locate at least some data from other sources such as from departments that had conducted surveys as part of their Program Review or the Accreditation Self-Study Survey in 2011.
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In May 2013, the SLO coordinator met with the College Learning Management System (LMS) Seaport programmers to discuss the feasibility of deploying short surveys to students immediately after they received a service from the College (e.g., counseling or orientation). The SLO coordinator subsequently held discussions with the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, and the PIEAC committees in May 2013, about the need for the College to develop student services and administrative service outcomes, in order to address and implement the Accreditation Recommendation. The idea of employing point-of-service surveys was suggested as one possible means of collecting student data (COL 3.18 Academic Senate Minutes 5-7-13 p. 6; COL 3.19 PIEAC 5-15-13 Minutes.docx; COL 3.20 Classified Senate Minutes 5-16-13.pdf p. 2-3).

Over summer 2013, the SLO coordinator reviewed the existing College service area and administrative unit SLOs, and studied those types of SLOs and the data collection processes in use by accredited California community colleges. In consultation with the interim Dean of Counseling, it was decided that a single survey would be the most efficient way to engage the largest number of students about their experiences at the College.

To prepare for training non-instructional staff, the SLO coordinator developed 1) a handbook that included definitions and procedures related to service area outcomes (COL 3.21 Service Area Handbook Fall 2013); 2) a handout that included sample SLOs either in use by other colleges or suggested SLOs for unique College departments (COL 3.22 AUO & SS-SLO Table TRAINING.docx); and 3) a draft Student Service Area Outcomes survey in Survey Monkey annotated by department. Training for staff from key departments was held on two occasions in early September 2013 (COL 3.23 MinutesSAOTraining9-3-13.docx). Participants reviewed the materials with their own department and provided feedback to the SLO coordinator. In this way SLOs were developed by student services, key administrative units, and learning resources. Survey questions were then developed to address the SLOs. The primary document was then finalized so that each department SLO was linked to a responsible individual and mission or strategic initiative and survey item(s) (COL 3.24 Student Services SLOs wSurvey Items 10-8-13.docx).

The Student SS-SLO Survey Monkey survey was developed by the SLO coordinator with participation and feedback from each department; editing and reviewing was performed by the members of the Accreditation subcommittee responsible for writing the section of this report related to this recommendation (COL 3.25 SS-SLO STUDENT SURVEY10-4-13.pdf).

The Associate Dean of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness prepared a random sample of 25% of the College’s currently (fall 2013) enrolled students to receive the SLO survey; this equated to 6,791 students. The survey was deployed online to students’ home email addresses on October 7, 2013; students had three weeks to respond. A total of 961 students responded to the survey – a response rate of 14%. Survey data results were cached on the Institutional Effectiveness Web page for use in cyclical Program Review and annual reports (COL 3.26 AUO SLO Student Survey Summary 10-29-13.pdf Web Link). Survey data was distributed to departments at the end of October 2013 (COL 3.27 AUO SLO Survey Summary_10-29-2013.pdf).
Starting fall 2014, the SLO survey will be deployed yearly to students at the end of the fourth week of instruction in the fall semester (i.e., the last week in September) to allow sufficient time for the departments to analyze the survey data for their annual planning reports due at the end of October.

Fall 2013 survey data results were included in the department Annual Institutional Planning Reports that were submitted to PIEAC at the end of October. These forms had been updated in early October to require the inclusion of department “Student Learning/Service Area Outcomes Statements,” “Strategies to Achieve or Improve SLO/SAOs,” and “Outcome Data OR Other Assessment Results (i.e., Data from Student SLO Survey)” (COL 3.28 Annual Institutional Planning Report Form-Non Instructional 2013-14.docx, see item 4). Inclusion of this data on the Annual Institutional Planning Reports provided a mechanism for the departments/units to engage in dialog at the Spring 2014 All-College Meeting as well as an efficient way to document needs in the development of the February budget requests (COL 3.29 Annual Institutional Planning Reports, Non-Instructional: A & R 2013-2014.docx; Assessment Center 2013-2014.docx; CalWORKS 2013-2014.docx; Counseling Services 2013-14 REV.docx; Distance Learning 2013-2014.docx; EOPS_CARE 2013-14.docx; Financial Aid 2013-2014.docx; Fiscal Services 2013-2014.docx; Garden Grove 2013-2014.docx; Grant Development 2013-2014.docx; Institutional Research 2013-2014.docx; Le-Jao Center, 2013-2014.docx; M&O 2013-2014.docx; Marketing PR 2013-2014.docx; Newport Beach Cntr 2013-14.docx; OLIT 2013-2014.docx; Security 2013-14.docx; STAR 2013-2014.docx; Student Success Center 2013-2014.docx; Transfer Center 2013-2014.docx). Departments that did not initially include student survey results data in their analysis were asked to complete addendums that included this data (COL 3.30 Addendums: Assessment Center 2013-14 Addendum.docx; CalWORKS 2013-14 Addendum.docx; Counseling Services 2013-14 Addendum.docx; EOPS_CARE 2013-14 Addendum.docx; Financial Aid 2013-14 Addendum.docx; Infor Commons 2013-14 Addendum.docx; Library 2013-14 Addendum.docx; Transfer Center 2013-14 Addendum.docx).

A workshop was held on January 15, 2014, for managers and staff in Student Services, Administrative Services, and Learning Service areas, which covered the importance of collecting student learning outcomes and engaging in regular dialog to improve our services and student outcomes. Attendees studied the AUO SLO Student Survey summary results for their departments and the “SS-SLO and AUOs by Department” document that linked SLOs to the Student Survey (COL 3.24 Student Services SLOs wSurvey Items 10-8-13.docx; COL 3.27 AUO SLO Survey Summary_10-29-2013.pdf). Laptops available on each table enabled participants to answer questions about how they could improve the implementation of each SLO (COL 3.31 2014 Spring SLO Workshop for Support Services.docx; COL 3.32 Email re Spring 2014 SLO Workshop.docx; COL 3.33 Spreadsheet of 1-15-14 SAO Workshop Responses.xlsx).

A similar dialog activity was completed by departments at the Spring 2014 All-College Meeting on February 7, 2014. The Vice-Presidents each met with staff and managers from their respective areas. Each area reviewed the overall process and reason for SLOs, analyzed current assessment measures and performance outcomes, reviewed current intervention strategies, and developed plans for future interventions and assessment.
A single document was created to provide a summary timeline of the College’s implementation of Course, Program, and Degree SLOs as well as SLOs in Student Services, Learning Resources, and Administrative Unit Outcomes, according to ACCJC’s Institutional Effectiveness Rubric (COL 3.34 SS-SLO & AUO Implementation Timeline Table.docx).

Additionally, in fall 2013, the College demonstrated its commitment to SLOs and the planning process through the restructuring of the College from two to three vice presidents, enabling the offices of Instruction and Student Services to each have their own vice president and planning council. At the same time, the College announced a position for Administrative Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning to assist in coordinating and improving all planning and budgeting processes. This Director will provide assistance to the Program Review Committee and will provide leadership with the Student Learning Outcomes functions (COL 3.35 PIEAC 9-4-13 Minutes.docx p. 4; COL 3.36 Job Description Institutional Effectiveness Director.docx).

**Conclusion:**

The College fully completed the cycle of SS-SLO/SAO assessment. The documentation of how the results of these assessments are used for institutional improvement is demonstrated in the following ways: 1) Annual Institutional Planning Reports incorporating Annual Fall Student SLO Survey data; 2) dialog at annual Spring All-College Meeting (summary of dialog collected on Close the Loop Survey); 3) Program Review Coordinator and SLO Coordinator summary reports to PIEAC in early February; and 4) February budget allocation requests incorporating SLO outcomes into requests. Furthermore, SS-SLO/SAO assessment is now part of our continuous improvement integrated into annual planning and resource allocation processes.

This recommendation was fully addressed and the College meets the standard.

**List of Evidence, Recommendation 3**
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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, I.IA, I.IA.2, I.IA.2.a., I.IA.2.e, I.IA.2.f, I.IA.6.b, I.IB, I.IB.3.c, I.IB.4, I.IC, I.IC.2)

At the time of the external team visit in March 2013, the College was in the process of updating its planning and budgeting processes, including Program Review. The Program Review
Committee has since been refining processes to ensure that all programs and services are regularly reviewed and that information from these reviews is conveyed in a timely manner to the committees and individuals responsible for planning and budgeting. The Committee worked with the College President; the Vice President of Instruction; the Associate Dean of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness; the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness, and Accreditation Committee (PIEAC); and the Budget Committee.

One area in need of improvement was ensuring that all relevant programs and services were being included in the review cycle. Although the Program Review Committee has been responsible for ensuring reporting from instructional and student support programs, some departments with less frequent student contact were not under its purview. During the December 9 meeting, additional departments/programs were identified and formally incorporated into the review calendar (COL 4.1 Program Review Draft Minutes 12-9-13.doc). Specific changes included the following:

- EOPS will be bundled with CalWorks and CARE and report in 2016
- Matriculation will be referred to as Student Success & Support Program (SSSP)
- Assessment Center, Transfer Center, Outreach, and Career Center will be bundled together
- Financial Aid will report as a separate department
- Office of Instruction will report in 2015
- Marketing/PR/Graphics will report in 2016
- Administrative Services will report in 2016


The Program Review Committee has also been refining the review process to ensure that it occurs in an efficient and systematic manner. The entire review cycle was changed during the 2012-13 school year to make it more relevant to the planning and budgeting process. Programs will continue to submit a five-year comprehensive report every five years but will now assemble their teams, collect data, and perform curriculum review in the spring prior to the scheduled reporting date. Programs will then report to the Program Review Committee during the fall term (previously they reported in the spring).

The Associate Dean of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness, working collaboratively with the researchers at the other two colleges and the District, developed a sustainable set of indicators common to the three colleges that can be routinely drawn from an
automated District database to support data needs for instructional Program Review. This data set, which contains five years of comparison data, was first implemented November 2012 for annual instructional program review reports. For each instructional program, the report includes, among other data, enrollment at census, the total FTES, WSCH, FTEF30 (estimate), FTES/FTEF (estimate), fill rate (percent), success and retention, and persistence (COL 4.11 Glossary of Data Terms.docx). A data access process allows users to create a variety of reports based on the dimensions and data needed (COL 4.12 Research & Planning Web Site (Click Program Review). This sustainable set of data provides department chairs and managers with access to consistent data, which aids systematic planning that is integrated into budget allocation.

In fall 2013 the College announced a position for Administrative Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning to assist in coordinating and improving all planning and budgeting processes. This Director will provide invaluable assistance to the Program Review Committee in fulfilling its mandate (COL 4.13 Job Description Institutional Effectiveness Director.docx).

Also in fall 2013, a separate Planning Council for the Student Services Wing was developed. In addition, the Planning Councils for Instructional and Administrative Services wings that were developed in fall 2012 were expanded and membership was formalized. Lastly, in spring 2014 the Planning Council for the President’s wing was initiated. These Planning Councils serve as an advisory group for the appropriate administrator and assist with the review and vetting of annual wing plans prior to Wing Plans being presented to PIEAC (COL 4.14 PIEAC 10-30-13 Minutes.pdf p. 2; COL 4.15 PIEAC 11-6-13 Minutes.pdf p. 7; The Administrative Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning will assist in developing and chairing the President’s Wing Planning Council.

In the past year, the Program Review Committee has accomplished the following:

- Reviewed and updated all forms and manuals to ensure that they are easily understandable and useful (COL 4.16 Program Review Handbook 2012-2014.pdf).
- Created a Web page on the College Web site to house documents, reports, and reference materials. This not only assists programs in working on their reports but also provides a database of Annual Reports, Validation Reports, and Program Review Five-Year Self-Studies to facilitate the planning and budgeting process (COL 4.17 Program Review Web Site).
- Implemented systematic training for programs/departments scheduled for review. This training will occur every fall to enable programs to begin collecting data and (where relevant) conducting curriculum review during the spring term. The orientation training for Program Review was conducted on November 4, 2013 (COL 4.18 Program Review Training Flyer Nov. 2013.jpg; COL 4.19 Program Review Training 2013.pdf).
- Worked with the Associate Dean of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness and the Vice President of Instruction to ensure that programs are receiving data in a timely manner (COL 4.12 Research & Planning Web Site (Click Program Review).
- Assigned a staff person to provide consistent clerical and scheduling support for the committee.
Conclusion:

The College has developed a Program Review cycle for all student services, learning resources, and administrative services that is systematic and integrated into college planning and resource allocation processes.

This recommendation was fully addressed and the College meets the standard.

List of Evidence, Recommendation 4

4.2 Program Review Schedule (new) Draft 2011-15.xlsx
4.3 Annual Institutional Planning Report Form-Non Instructional 2013-14.docx
4.4 Annual Institutional Planning Report Form-Instructional
4.7 Program Review Process Chart.docx
4.8 Wing Plan Report Template
4.9 Addendums, Non-Instructional: Assessment Center 2013-14 Addendum.docx; CalWORKS 2013-14 Addendum.docx; Counseling Services 2013-14 Addendum.docx; EOPS CARE 2013-14 Addendum.docx; Financial Aid 2013-14 Addendum.docx; Infor Commons 2013-14 Addendum.docx; Library 2013-14 Addendum.docx; Transfer Center 2013-14 Addendum.docx
4.10 Addendums, Instructional: Accounting1.docx; Business1.docx; CST PSLOs1.docx; DGA PSLOs1.docx; Education1.docx; EmergMgt1.pdf; Humanities1.docx; International
College Recommendation 5 - Ensure a Sufficient Number of Full-Time Faculty

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)

The College and the District have been working together to address this recommendation. It is critical that the College and District establish plans for identifying the number of faculty members needed to support the College’s students and programs. As a result, there have been discussions throughout the District related to the role of full-time faculty, support for instructional programs, current faculty hiring prioritization processes, and fiscal impact and financial resources available to support instructional programs. There have also been discussions about current budget allocation processes and possible models for consideration in the future.

The Board of Trustees keeps current on the number of full-time faculty employed in the District, full-time faculty hiring and other matters related to the number of full-time faculty. For example, recent agendas for the Board of Trustees Personnel Committee meeting include updates on faculty hiring, discussions of Full-Time Obligation Numbers (FON) required by the California Community College Board of Governors, and reports on faculty hiring (COL 5.1 Personnel Committee Minutes 2-26-13; Personnel Committee Minutes 4-4-13; Personnel Committee Minutes 5-2-13; Personnel Committee Minutes 8-26-13). In addition, during regular meetings of the Board of Trustees, there have been discussions and public comment about the current number of full-time faculty members in the District. A Special Board Study Session was held on February 12, 2014, to discuss full-time faculty hiring (COL 5.2 Board Agenda Special Study Session 2-12-14.pdf).

In a variety of settings, the Coast District Chancellor has led discussions about the hiring of full-time faculty. On September 17, 2013, the Chancellor attended the College’s Academic Senate meeting and provided updates and reports. Included in his report were comments related to the District’s commitment to address all of the Accreditation Recommendations required in the
colleges’ Follow-Up Reports for March 2014 (COL 5.3 2013-09-17 Academic Senate Minutes.pdf). In addition, there was considerable dialog about the number of full-time faculty members assigned to the College and about how many full-time faculty members may be needed in the future. The Chancellor encouraged the faculty to consider new and innovative ways to address the need for faculty. He also suggested that discussion occur about which programs should be encouraged to grow and which programs may need to be sunset. The Chancellor suggested that the District should look at each College to strategically address the need for faculty. Lastly, he agreed that faculty will play a critical role in the discussion of full-time faculty numbers.

Chancellor Jones led a three-hour District Consultation Council Meeting on October 7, 2013 to focus on the single topic of full-time faculty hiring (COL 5.4 10-07-13 District Governance Council Minutes.pdf; COL 5.5 10-07-13 DGC Faculty Hiring Coast Colleges Background Info 2013 Draft)

The Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services and the Vice Presidents of Administrative Services have been gathering examples of allocation models in use at other multi-college districts to identify an effective budget allocation model to support the missions of the District and the Colleges. All vice presidents were invited to the October 14, 2013, Chancellor’s Cabinet meeting to see a preliminary presentation of multi-college resource allocations (COL 5.6 Stutzman Presentation to Chancellors Cabinet 10-14-13.pptx; COL 5.7 Stutzman White Paper Allocation Model in Multi-College Districts). At a follow-up meeting on January 13, 2014, the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services and the Vice Presidents of Administrative Services presented a proposal for an adjustment to the current allocation model that would increase the College’s annual allocation by approximately $500,000 annually. While the proposed allocation model does not specifically include a plan for hiring additional faculty members, the additional funds may possibly provide financial resources for hiring additional new full-time faculty.

At the College there continues to be regular dialog, planning, and actions related to full-time faculty numbers and hiring. The College is committed to finding ways to expand the number of full-time faculty assigned to the College. In addition, the College has also begun working more closely with the sister colleges to utilize and leverage full-time faculty across the District (COL 5.8 Academic Senate Minutes 2013-10-01 p. 6-7; Academic Senate Minutes 2013-10-15). The College often utilizes faculty from other colleges to ensure we have adequate support and expertise in each of our disciplines. When the College does not have an appropriate number of full-time faculty members to serve on hiring committees, faculty from Orange Coast College and/or Golden West College serve in these bodies. The College employs a similar strategy for tenure review committees since the tenure review process requires that discipline experts from the same field as the tenure-track faculty member.

In spring 2013 the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness, and Accreditation Committee (PIEAC) discussed the need for hiring additional full-time faculty (COL 5.9 PIEAC 4-10-13.pdf; PIEAC 4-17-13.pdf). In addition, support was expressed by the College President and vice presidents. However, in April and May 2013, the Budget Committee reviewed the financial situation of the College and made Recommendations to PIEAC and the President that the College not increase the amount of on-going dedicated expenses for the 2013-14 fiscal year, since there was no
guarantee of any increases in ongoing revenue. As a result, the preliminary 2013-2014 budget was developed without any increased ongoing costs and no additional full-time faculty.

During the recent Academic Senate faculty prioritization process, there were many presentations that highlighted the need for additional full-time faculty. For example, departments described the need to hire full-time faculty to design new courses, establish transfer degrees, develop articulation agreements, provide leadership and outreach, teach specialized classes, mentor part-time faculty, increase counseling opportunities, and explore innovative teaching strategies. In addition, these presentations provided connections between the activities the new faculty members would undertake and the mission of the College and the Education Master Plan 2011-2016 (COL 5.10 2013-14 Academic Senate Full-Time Faculty Request Presentations.pdf). In addition, the topic of full-time faculty hiring is a regular agenda item at College Council meetings (COL 5.11 College Council Summaries: 2013-05-14 CC Summary.pdf 2013-09-10 CC Summary.pdf; 2013-10-22 CC Summary.pdf; 2013-11-26 CC Summary.pdf; 2014-01-14 CC Summary.pdf).

In recent years, funding from the State and the District made it challenging for the College to commit to increase ongoing expenses and the hiring of additional permanent full-time faculty members. However, through ongoing dialog there is now a commitment within the District to support the increase in full-time faculty at Coastline and in the District. During the February 12, 2014 Board of Trustees Study session, Board members expressed their desire for the District to develop a plan for hiring additional new faculty in the District for the 2014-15 academic year. Through a memorandum to the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor outlined a plan for adding eight additional new faculty to the District for the 2014-15 academic year (COL 5.12 Chancellor's Memo to Board re: Faculty Hiring, Feb14.pdf).

The College is doing its utmost to ensure that students and programs have appropriate faculty resources. The President provided additional information about the 2014-15 faculty hiring plan in a letter to the Academic Senate President and Vice President of Instruction (COL 5.13 2013-14 Faculty Prioritization.pdf). In the letter the President provided a detailed plan for replacing a recent full-time faculty retirement, institutionalizing a grant-funded faculty position by funding the position with general funds (COL 5.14 PIEAC 11-6-13 Minutes.pdf; PIEAC 11-20-13.pdf; COL 5.15 Budget Committee Minutes 12-11-13.pdf), hiring a one year temporary full-time counselor, hiring the two new full-time faculty positions identified by the Chancellor, and using College funds to hire an additional new permanent full-time faculty member. Furthermore, The Vice President of Instruction, academic managers, department chairs, and Academic Senate are working together to provide additional release time and special faculty assignments to address other needs identified in the faculty prioritization presentations.

As a result, in the 2013-14 year the College increased the number of full-time general fund faculty positions by one. By the start of fall 2014 the College will add one temporary full-time counselor and three full-time permanent faculty members along with the two full-time faculty that began working for the College in fall 2013. Therefore, by September 2014, the College will have six more full-time faculty positions than at the time of the external team evaluation visit in March 2013.
Conclusion:

The College and District have been working together to develop a plan for hiring sufficient numbers of full-time faculty to support the District and College mission. In addition, the College has been able to use alternative strategies and collaboration with the sister colleges to address some deficiencies in full-time faculty numbers. The College has engaged in the development of a multi-year faculty hiring plan beginning in spring 2014. The College has worked with the District to develop a plan to significantly increase the number of full-time faculty available to support our students and programs.

This recommendation was fully addressed and the College meets the standard.
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5.3 2013-09-17 Academic Senate Minutes.pdf
5.4 10-07-13 District Governance Council Minutes.pdf
5.5 10-07-13 DGC Faculty Hiring Coast Colleges Background Info 2013 Draft
5.6 Stutzman Presentation to Chancellors Cabinet 10-14-13.pptx
5.7 Stutzman White Paper Allocation Model in Multi-College Districts
5.8 Academic Senate Minutes 2013-10-01 p. 6-7; Academic Senate Minutes 2013-10-15
5.9 PIEAC 4-10-13.pdf; PIEAC 4-17-13.pdf
5.10 2013-14 Academic Senate Full-Time Faculty Request Presentations.pdf
5.12 Chancellor's Memo to Board re: Faculty Hiring, Feb14.pdf
5.13 2013-14 Faculty Prioritization.pdf
5.14 PIEAC 11-6-13 Minutes.pdf; PIEAC 11-20-13.pdf
5.15 Budget Committee Minutes 12-11-13.pdf

College Recommendation 6 - Ensure Systematic Personnel Evaluation

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)

Annually, the College receives a list from District Human Resources informing every supervisor which employees under his or her supervision are due for evaluation. The list includes managers, classified personnel, and faculty. The intervals of evaluation are taken into account according to Board Policy and faculty/classified contracts (COL 6.1 Appraisals Due - 12-4-13.xlsx). The process for completion is as follows:
1. The supervising manager receives reminder prompts whenever he/she signs in to MyCCC to submit an evaluation for a current employee (COL 6.2 MyCCC Manager Screen-Appraisals Due.docx).

2. The evaluation is completed, and the form is signed by the manager and the employee.

3. The evaluation form is submitted to Coastline Human Resources (HR).

4. Coastline HR submits the evaluation form to District HR. District HR receives the evaluation and enters the date the evaluation was completed, enters the new date for the next evaluation into Banner (the new date will vary depending on the status of the employee, e.g., new employee, part-time), and checks off that it was completed.

5. The evaluation is filed in the employee’s file in the District HR file room.

If there is a manager change for any employee, Coastline HR initiates the tracking process. Coastline HR submits one request to District Payroll and a second request to the District Budget Department to make the change in Banner.

In working with the District to improve the employee evaluation process, Coastline HR noted several problems in the process that decreased the College’s overall evaluation completion rates. The College’s evaluations had been completed on time and sent to District Human Resources via Coastline HR. However, for the past few years, the annual list sent to all supervisors by District Human Resources has not been accurate. For example, the 2012-2013 list included employees whose evaluations had been completed the year prior. Coastline HR discovered that in some cases, completed evaluations were not triggering new evaluation dates for employees. In other cases, no date was listed for evaluation because there was no tracking mechanism to monitor the six-semester evaluation date for adjunct faculty. Because there are specific fields in Banner that must be updated and/or corrected, District Human Resources is retraining its staff as well as allowing designated College staff update access for full-time and part-time faculty. This will significantly improve the accuracy of provided information as well completion rates.

There was also a problem in the Banner fields that District HR used to input completion of the evaluation. When the data was initially converted from the old system to Banner, certain records did not populate into correct fields. That problem has since been corrected, and the list is now accurate. If a supervisor has a question related to the accuracy of the list, Coastline HR can be contacted.

To improve timeliness and accuracy, Coastline HR has created a tracking report to ensure that all evaluations are completed in a timely manner. This report tracks by employee, by manager for data completed, and by what has been sent to District HR. Coastline HR also sends reports of evaluations due to managers on a monthly basis. Past-due evaluations are discussed at the Coastline management monthly meetings or with the individual manager. Any discrepancies are reconciled with District HR. College managers have been asked to send all completed evaluations to Coastline HR, not to District HR, so they can be tracked at the college level. Coastline HR will forward all completed evaluations to District HR after they have been logged into the tracking report (COL 6.3 Appraisals Due w Tracking Columns.xlsx).
Conclusion:
The College has worked with the District to resolve discrepancies in the employee evaluation process and has developed a backup tracking report with reminder mechanisms to ensure that all personnel are evaluated systematically at stated intervals.

This recommendation was fully addressed and the College meets the standard.

List of Evidence, Recommendation 6
6.1  Appraisals Due - 2-3-14.xlsx
6.2  MyCCC Manager Screen-Appraisals Due.docx
6.3  Appraisals Due w Tracking Columns.xlsx
Response to District Recommendations #1, #2, #3, #4 and COMMISION
RECOMMENDATION #1

District Recommendation 1 - SLO Achievement a Component of Evaluation

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

Analysis and Findings
There were a variety of means of assessment used to gather the data related to this recommendation and to determine a final finding. For organizational purposes, the assessment was divided among four groups. These groups were full-time faculty, part-time faculty, classified employees, and managers. The means of assessment covered contract language, Memoranda of Understanding (MOU), notes from district meetings, letters or emails describing the SLO evaluation process and training opportunities, and evaluation forms to be used and SLO evaluation questions identified.

Full-Time Faculty
The Coast Federation of Educators (CFE) represents full-time and part-time faculty with 7.5 Lecture Hour Equivalents (LHE) or above. In a joint letter between CFE and the District (DIS 1.1 Joint Letter from District and CFE signed 11/13/2013), CFE and the District described that they had been engaged in negotiations for the successor collective bargaining agreement since fall 2012. Recognizing and agreeing on the need to include the use of SLOs as a component to faculty evaluations, both parties conceptually agreed to new contract language to address this on August 6, 2012. Both parties conceptually agreed that this new language would be a component of evaluations for all categories of faculty represented by CFE.

Until the successor agreement negotiations can be finalized and a new contract ratified, the District has directed administrators who evaluate faculty to address the use of SLOs in the current Coast Community College District Administrator Evaluation of Faculty form (DIS 1.2 Form CFE Agreement Appendix B - pages 94 & 95) of the now expired Collective Bargaining Agreement. Specifically, administrators have been directed to comment on faculty use of SLOs under subparagraph D of the form, which is entitled "Participates in Department/Division Activities." This went into effect in fall 2013 (DIS 1.1 Joint Letter from District and CFE signed 11/13/2013; DIS 1.5 Full-time and Part-time Faculty Evaluation Instructions - email from Vice Chancellor of Human Resources 10/31/2013 and 11/1/2013).

Part-Time Faculty
The part-time faculty members are represented by two employee groups. Part-time faculty members with 7.5 LHEs or above are represented by the Coast Federation of Educators (CFE).
Faculty members with less than 7.5 LHEs are represented by the Coast Community College Association (CCA). These two groups have separate collective bargaining agreements with the District.

As mentioned previously, the District and CFE have been in contract negotiations since fall 2012. Until a successor agreement is reached, the District has directed deans and department chairs of part-time faculty in the CFE unit to use the Faculty (or Counselor) Evaluation Report forms found on pages 88-91 in Appendix B of the CFE bargaining agreement. They should indicate SLO usage by individual faculty members by answering two SLO-related questions under "Additional comments by evaluator(s)." The questions are 1) Are SLOs on your syllabus (syllabi)? and 2) Do your assignments contribute to SLO(s) achievement? (DIS 1.3 Forms Faculty/Counselor Evaluation Reports - CFE Agreement Appendix B - pages 88-91). This goes into effect in spring 2014 (DIS 1.1 Joint Letter from District and CFE signed 11/13/2013; DIS 1.6 Joint Letter from District and CFE signed 11/19/2013; DIS 1.5 Full-time and Part-time Faculty Evaluation Instructions - email from Vice Chancellor of Human Resources 10/31/2013 and 11/1/2013).

The District and the Coast Community College Association (CCA) have not entered contract negotiations for a successor agreement. The District has approached CCA to negotiate new definitive language for part-time faculty evaluations. Until a successor agreement is reached, the District has directed evaluators for part-time faculty members represented by CCA to specifically address the use of SLOs on the Part-Time Faculty Evaluation Form found on page 23 in Appendix C of the CCA bargaining agreement under the first paragraph entitled, "Evaluator's Description of Observation" (DIS 1.4 CCA Part-Time Evaluation Form). Since evaluators are required to consider all teaching materials, including the syllabus, in the evaluation of part-time faculty, this is the most appropriate place to discuss the evidence of the use of SLOs by part-time faculty (DIS 1.5 Full-time and Part-time Faculty Evaluation Instructions - email from Vice Chancellor of Human Resources 10/31/2013 and 11/1/2013).

**Classified Employees**

Although faculty have direct responsibility to address instructional SLOs, classified employees do encourage and support student progress towards achieving stated student learning outcomes when appropriate. Management will ensure that classified employees have knowledge and familiarity of student learning outcomes through departmental meetings, conferences, training opportunities, and various other means. Managers are encouraged to have ongoing discussions with employees to support student learning. Contract negotiations and discussions will continue to ensure that all classified employees have an understanding of the alignment of their work with the District mission to support student learning (DIS 1.8 Classified Employee Email between Coast Federation of Classified Employees (CFCE) and VC HR 11/23/2013).

**Management**

The District and the Coast District Management Association (CDMA) negotiated language for a rated item pertaining to SLOs on all management employee evaluations. The item is worded as follows: "This manager supports faculty and staff in implementation of Student Learning Outcomes as a measure of student success and of teaching excellence." The implementation of
this language started in the Fall 2013 semester in the management evaluation process (DIS 1.7 CDMA Manager Evaluation letter 10/28/2013).

**Conclusion:**
The Coast Community College District and its employee groups have integrated SLOs in employee evaluations and should be commended. For the full-time faculty, part-time faculty with 7.5 LHE and above, and the management groups, contract language has been approved by the negotiation teams. The full-time and part-time faculty above 7.5 LHE have also come to agreement on an interim plan that will immediately go into effect until a full successor agreement has been approved. The District has also directed evaluators of part-time faculty below 7.5 LHE to use the present evaluation process and forms to address the use of SLOs. These directions will be implemented during the Spring 2014 semester.

This recommendation was fully addressed, and the College meets the standard.

**List of Evidence, District Recommendation 1**
- DIS 1.1 Joint Letter from District and CFE signed 11/13/2013
- DIS 1.2 Form CFE Agreement Appendix B page 94
- DIS 1.3 Forms Faculty/Counselor Evaluation CFE Agreement Appendix B pages 88-91
- DIS 1.4 CCA Part-time Evaluation Form
- DIS 1.5 Full- and Part-time Faculty Evaluation Instructions VC HR 10/31/2013 and 11/1/2013
- DIS 1.6 Joint Letter from District and CFE signed 11/19/2013
- DIS 1.7 CDMA Manager Evaluation letter 10/28/2013
- DIS 1.8 Classified Employee Email between CFCE and VC HR 11/23/2013

**District Recommendation 2 - Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor**

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)

**Analysis and Findings**
As part of the process and schedule followed for the revision of all existing board policies and administrative procedures, and creation of new ones as needed, described in the response to District Recommendation 4, many existing board policies related to delegation of authority were revised, and several new ones were created. Associated administrative procedures were created to effectively operationalize these board policies.

Specifically, the following board policies and administrative procedures were revised or created:
BP 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO – revision (DIS 2.1)
AP 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO – new (DIS 2.2)
BP 2905 General Counsel - revision (DIS 2.3)
BP 6100 Delegation of Authority – revision (DIS 2.4)
AP 6100 Delegation of Authority – new (DIS 2.5)
BP 6150 Designation of Authorized Signatures – revision (DIS 2.6)
AP 6150 Designation of Authorized Signatures – new (DIS 2.7)
BP 6340 Bids and Contracts – revision (DIS 2.8)
AP 6340 Bids and Contracts – new (DIS 2.9)
BP 6350 Contracts Relating to Construction – new (DIS 2.10)
AP 6350 Contracts Relating to Construction – new (DIS 2.11)
BP 6370 Contract for Independent Contractor or Professional Experts – new (DIS 2.12)
AP 6370 Contract for Independent Contractor or Professional Experts – new (DIS 2.13)
BP 7110 Delegation of Authority – new (DIS 2.14)
AP 7110 Delegation of Authority– new (DIS 2.15)

Following the process outlined in AP 2410 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures, all these revisions or new board policies and administrative procedures, except for BP 2905, which did not require District Consultation Council (DCC – formerly the District Governance Council) approval, were brought to DCC for a first reading on September 30, 2013, and again for approval on October 28, 2013. (DCC Agenda items related to board policies and administrative procedures 9/30/2013 (DIS 2.16) and 10/28/2013 (DIS 2.17)). Subsequently, they were brought to the Board of Trustees for first reading at the Board meeting on 11/6/2013 and for approval or ratification, respectively, at the Board meeting on 11/20/2013 (Agenda and minutes Board meetings 11/6/2013 (DIS 2.18), 11/20/2013 (DIS 2.19), and 12/2/2013(DIS 2.20)). The approval or ratification took place at the December 2, 2013, Board meeting.

BP 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO was revised to more specifically define the delegation of authority to the Chancellor and the College Presidents and combined two different board policies that were overlapping (former BP 2201 Standards of Administration and BP 2430 Delegation of Authority). A new administrative procedure was created that indicates the specific areas for which the Chancellor and the College Presidents are responsible. The administrative procedure was created based on discussions with the Chancellor and the College Presidents.

BP 2905 General Counsel was revised to specifically define the working relationship and direction received from both the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor, whereas previously the General Counsel received direction and oversight exclusively from the Board of Trustees.

BP 6340 Bids and Contracts was revised to delegate the authority to the Chancellor to enter into contracts for work to be done; services to be performed; or for goods, equipment, or supplies to be furnished or sold to the District that do not exceed the amounts specified in Public Contract Code Section 20651, as amended annually under Public Contract Code Section 20651(d), without requiring prior approval by the Board but ratification by the Board. This is a significant change in actual delegation of authority to the Chancellor. Prior to this change, any contract, service, or purchase, regardless of dollar amount, required prior approval of the Board, which
had an impact on the ability of the District to operate efficiently. The associated AP 6340 defined the delegation of authority from the Chancellor to the Vice Chancellor of Fiscal and Administrative Services.

BP 7110, a new board policy related to the delegation of authority to the Chancellor related to personnel matters, combined a number of disparate policies and more clearly articulated the type of personnel actions that the Chancellor could undertake without prior approval, but rather ratification, by the Board, to effectively run the operations of the District. The associated AP 7110 defined the delegation of authority from the Chancellor to the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources.

At its November 6, 2013, Board meeting, the Board of Trustees approved the revision to the following Board Policies that recognize the role of the Chancellor as follows:

BP 2200 Board Duties and Responsibilities (DIS 2.21) – the board policy was revised to include the Chancellor in the hiring and evaluation of the Board Secretary and the appointment and oversight of the District General Counsel, District External Auditor, and District Lobbyist. Previous language in the policy had these functions being selected and overseen exclusively by the Board of Trustees.

BP 2320 (DIS 2.22) is a new board policy that provides the Chancellor the responsibility for ensuring that the media are informed of special or emergency meetings of the Board.

The operational implementation of the revised or new relevant board policies and administrative procedures was defined and communicated to all District managers on January 23, 2014, by the manager of the District Risk Services. The changes were implemented effective with the Board meeting on February 5, 2014 (DIS 2.23 Memorandum to District Managers Support Staff Re Delegation Authority Contracts Submission Review 1/23/2014, DIS 2.24 Contract Submission and Review Procedures 1/22/2014).

Conclusion:

The District and the Board of Trustees have revised existing board policies related to delegation of authority and created new board policies and administrative procedures that clearly define the delegation of authority to the Chancellor and College Presidents and operationalize this delegation of authority. The implementation of the changes made related to delegation of authority is evidenced in the changes made to the way items are submitted to Board of Trustees meetings (DIS 2.25 Agenda and minutes Board meeting 2/5/2014).

This recommendation was fully addressed, and the College meets the standard.

List of Evidence, District Recommendation 2
DIS 2.1 BP 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO – revision
DIS 2.2 AP 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO – new
DIS 2.3 BP 2905 General Counsel - revision
District Recommendation 3 - Board Self-Evaluation

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)

Analysis and Findings

Review of Evaluation Procedure

At the February 7, 2012, meeting of the Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee, members of the committee discussed with those present the status of the Board of Trustees Self Evaluation materials, including the Board Self Evaluation (DIS 3.1 Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee Meeting Minutes 2/7/2012).

At the April 17, 2012, meeting of the Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee, committee members discussed the Board of Trustees’ Self Evaluation materials and agreed that the Board President and the Board Secretary would get together to develop an action plan on self-evaluation dissemination and follow up on the action plan (DIS 3.2 Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee Meeting Minutes 4/17/2012).
At the June 27, 2012, meeting of the Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee, committee members discussed Board Policy 2745 Board Self Evaluation. One issue raised was that the Administrative Procedure was embedded in the policy itself. The Board Clerk (a member of the Board Accreditation Committee at the time) and the Vice Chancellor of Educational Services and Technology were asked to separate out the Administrative Procedure and take it to the Board Study Session. With this plan in place, the committee voted to approve the revised policy (absent a procedure) and to forward both to the full Board at the July 18 Board meeting. At this same meeting, committee members discussed the need for a plan to expand the Board of Trustees’ meeting minutes to provide elaboration on discussion topics to reflect important information, concerns raised, and possible impact to other programs and efforts (DIS 3.3 Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee Meeting Minutes 6/27/2012).

Approval of Revised Board Evaluation Policy (BP 2745)

At the August 1, 2012, Board meeting, the Board reviewed Board Policy 2745 for a first reading. One of the expressed concerns was that action minutes do not provide sufficient evidence regarding Board discussion and involvement in matters before the Board for the purpose of deliberation. This also applies to Board committees. Detailed meeting minutes for many District and college committees provide evidence for both the self-evaluation and subsequent reports to the Accreditation Commission and other State agencies. The details help document the topic and viewpoints of discussion, pertinent parts of the deliberation, outcomes they support, engagement, and important background on the decision-making process. Action minutes of Board of Trustees meetings do not serve this evidence function very well. The change being suggested is recommending a way to augment Board and Board Committee action minutes for this purpose. The Board of Trustees voted to refer Board Policy 2745 to the next regular meeting, with changes as modified in paragraph #7 (DIS 3.4 Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes 8/1/2012).

At the August 15 Board meeting, the Board adopted a revised Board Policy 2745, which included expanding the meeting minutes when the Board discusses findings of the self-evaluation. These minutes will be public and available before they are presented for approval (DIS 3.5 Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, 8/15/2012; DIS 3.6 Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee Meeting Minutes, 9/20/2012).

At the July 30, 2013, meeting of the Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee, the Board President provided the Committee with a progress report on District Recommendation 3. She shared that the Trustees were researching other tools being used for self-evaluation and that this item would be presented at the upcoming Study Session of the Board of Trustees. The Board President further shared that she would recommend a 360-degree review of the Board, with surveys being distributed in late August/early September and returned mid-September. Statistical results would be generated at the end of September 2013, and there would be discussion at a Board Meeting Study Session where the Board of Trustees would receive insight from employees regarding the evaluation. The Board also approved, as part of an effort to coordinate and prepare the follow up reports due to ACCJC March 15, 2014, the following approach for the District responses.
“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 and review by the appropriate groups at the District Office and the colleges” (DIS 3.7 Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee Meeting Minutes, 7/30/2013).

At the August 7, 2013, Board Study Session on Accreditation, the Board discussed its current self-evaluation process and proposed changes to the tool based on its review of other districts, and those suggested by the Community College League of California (CCLC) and the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT). This proposed self-evaluation would be brought to the August 21 Board agenda with the goal of sending out surveys by early September 2013 and sharing results in October 2013. Goals for the next two years would be formulated and a report based on the survey would be posted on the District website (DIS 3.8 Board of Trustees Study Session Minutes, 8/7/2013).

On August 21, 2013, the Board took action to approve the Board Self Evaluation Plan presented at the Board Accreditation Study Session of August 7, 2013 (DIS 3.9 Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, 8/21/2013).

Below a summary of the Board evaluation process as stated in BP 2745, as adopted at the August 15, 2012, Board of Trustees meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Review and approve procedures</td>
<td>September, odd number years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Review and approve evaluation instrument</td>
<td>September, odd number years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Board members complete and submit evaluation responses</td>
<td>10 days prior to evaluation meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Board Secretary tabulates responses and presents them to Board President</td>
<td>Prior to evaluation meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Board President presents evaluation results to Board in writing</td>
<td>Prior to evaluation meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Board President/designee presides over discussion of evaluation results</td>
<td>October study session (or special meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Public/District constituencies provide input during self-evaluation</td>
<td>Prior to evaluation meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Action(s) taken as result of evaluation summary in public meeting</td>
<td>Prior to date of next review cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Board Accreditation Committee develops of process/measures to address areas of improvement</td>
<td>Prior to date of next review cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Board Accreditation Committee reports back with results in public meeting</td>
<td>Prior to date of next review cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Evaluation identifies accomplishments, goals and plans (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action (1)**

On August 15, 2012, the Board approved BP 2745 ahead of the schedule (DIS 3.5 Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, 8/15/2012).
Action (2)
On August 21, 2013, the Board approved the evaluation instrument (DIS 3.9 Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, 8/21/2013, DIS 3.11 Board of Trustees Self Evaluation).

Action (3)
Board members completed a self-evaluation online. The Board Secretary prepared the report of the survey responses.

Action (7)
Board secretary sent an email communication on September 9, 2013 to all employees of the Coast Community College District with the URL for the Board evaluation survey.

Action (4)
Board secretary tabulated and presented them to the Board President on October 2, 2013.

Action (5)
The Board President presented the evaluation results to the Board in writing on October 16, 2013, which was part of the agenda of the Board Study Session (DIS 3.10 Board of Trustees Meeting Agenda 10/16/2013).

Action (6)
On October 16, 2013, the Board discussed the evaluation results during a study session for this purpose (DIS 3.10 Board of Trustees Meeting Agenda and Minutes, 10/16/2013; DIS 3.11 Board of Trustees Self Evaluation; DIS 3.12 Survey Results of District Employees Regarding the Board of Trustees; DIS 3.13 Survey Written Comments of District Employees).

Actions taken as a result of the evaluation were determined at the public meetings held on October 16, 2013, and November 6. This resulted in identifying goals and action plans for the Board of Trustees (DIS 3.14 Goals and Action Plans Adopted at the November 6, 2013, Board meeting).

The Board Accreditation Committee was charged to develop the process and measures to address areas of improvement.

Conclusion:

This recommendation was fully addressed and the College meets the standard.

List of Evidence, District Recommendation 3
DIS 3.1 Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee Meeting Minutes 2/7/2012
DIS 3.2 Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee Meeting Minutes 4/17/2012
DIS 3.3 Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee Meeting Minutes 6/27/2012
DIS 3.4 Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes 8/1/2012
DIS 3.5 Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes 8/15/2012
District Recommendation 4 - District Evaluation of Policies and Procedures

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)

Analysis and Findings
After discussions at the Chancellor’s Cabinet (formerly called Presidents’ Council) and District Consultation Council (formerly called Chancellor’s Cabinet and then District Governance Council), in order to clarify and formalize the process by which existing board policies and administrative procedures are revised and/or new ones are created, in February 2012, new Board Policy 2410 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures (DIS 4.1) and associated Administrative Procedure 2410 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures (DIS 4.2) were developed. The Board of Trustees adopted and ratified, respectively, the new BP 2410 and AP 2410 at its March 21, 2012, meeting (DIS 4.3 Minutes Board of Trustees Meeting 3/21/2012).

The development and implementation of AP 2410 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures in March 2012 has helped to clarify the process and responsibilities for revision and/or creation of policies and procedures. Since AP 2410 has been followed consistently since its ratification, the District and responsible individuals stay on track because there is an established schedule that calls for reviewing and updating all existing board policies and administrative procedures on a four-year cycle.

Between January 2012 and February 2013, 48 board policies were revised or created. This represented 15% of the total number of current board policies as of February 2013 (316 total) (DIS 4.4 List of board policies and administrative procedures revised or created from January 2012 to February 2013).

In spring 2012, the Board of Trustees approved and directed staff to work on re-aligning the board policies and administrative procedures to conform to the chapter and numbering structure recommended by the Community College League of California (CCLC). The Vice Chancellor of
Educational Services and Technology convened a working group with representation from the units of the District Office who have overall responsibility for each area to work on this realignment.

After further review and analysis of the current structure and numbering of existing board policies and administrative procedures, the Vice Chancellor of Educational Services and Technology also provided an extensive analysis with recommendations for changes in the current structure; numbering; and, in some cases, content of board policies in order to fully implement the CCLC structure and numbering format as well as consistency with CCLC in terms of the content of board policies and administrative procedures. The Board of Trustees approved the implementation of the proposed recommendations at the August 1, 2012, meeting (DIS 4.5 Minutes Board of Trustees Meeting 8/1/2012).

This work was completed, and the revised structure was implemented. During the review and realignment to conform to the CCLC recommended structure, overlapping board policies were identified, leading to the consolidation or elimination of some. Others that were suitable as administrative procedures, rather than as board policies, were revised and brought to the Board of Trustees for review and approval or ratification, as appropriate.

In addition, at its meetings on September 19, 2012; June 19, 2013; and August 21, respectively, the Board of Trustees approved contracts with CCLC for providing assistance to the District Human Resources and Administrative Services with revision of current board policies and administrative procedures, or creation of new ones, as needed (Minutes Board Meetings: DIS 4.6 9/19/2012; DIS 4.7 6/19/2013; DIS 4.8 8/21/2013). The Vice Chancellor of Educational Services and Technology has continued to provide overall coordination for this process.

At the July 30, 2013, meeting of the Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee, the approach and new schedule for completing by January 2014 the revision of all board policies and administrative procedures, and creation of new ones, as needed, was reviewed and discussed (DIS 4.9 Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee Agenda and Minutes 7/30/2013.)

The work has continued in earnest throughout the fall 2013 and spring 2014 semesters as follows:

Per BP 2410 and AP 2410, revised or new Board Policies and Administrative Procedures were brought for information only, first reading, or approval to the District Consultation Council (DCC) (DCC Agendas Items related to BPs and APs: DIS 4.10 9/9/2013; DIS 4.11 9/30/2013; DIS 4.12 10/21/2013; DIS 4.13 10/28/2013; DIS 4.14 11/18/2013; DIS 4.15 12/2/2013; DIS 4.16 1/13/2014).

After review and approval by the DCC, the revised or new Board Policies and Administrative Procedures were brought to the Board of Trustees for first reading and subsequently for approval or ratification, as follows (Board of Trustees Meetings Agendas Items and Minutes related to BPs and APs: DIS 4.17 10/16/2013; DIS 4.18; 11/6/2013; DIS 4.19 11/20/2013; DIS 4.20 12/2/2013; DIS 4.21 12/11/2013; DIS 4.22 1/15/2014).
### Board of Trustees Meeting Date | BPs and APs for First Reading | BPs and APs for Approval or Ratification, respectively
--- | --- | ---
10/16/2013 | 22 BPs and 3 APs | 1 BP
11/6/2013 | 72 BPs and 75 APs | 22 BPs and 2 APs
11/20/2013 | 1 BP | 62 BPs and 56 APs -on agenda but postponed to 12/2/2013 meeting)
12/2/2013 | 27 BPs and 22 APs | 71 BPs and 69 APs
12/11/2013 | 8 BPs and 2 APs | 26 BPs and 24 APs
1/15/2014 | 8 BPs and 5 APs | 6 BPs and 1 AP

In addition to the schedule for completing a full revision of existing BPs and APs, or creation of new ones as needed, a look-forward and schedule for the new four-year review cycle was developed and provided to the Board of Trustees at its February 5, 2014, meeting. This document covered board policies in Chapters 1 through 6 (DIS 4.23 Status and Revision Schedule of Board Policies and Administrative Procedures Chapters 1 to 6). The complete schedule which also includes Chapter 7 was provided to the Board of Trustees at its February 19 meeting (DIS 4.24 Status and Revision Schedule of Board Policies and Administrative Procedures Chapters 1 to 7).

### Conclusion:

The District has followed the process defined in BP 2410 and AP 2410 for revision of existing Board Policies and Administrative Procedures, as needed. The District and the Board of Trustees completed a full review and revision of all of its existing BPs and APs and created new ones, as needed. A schedule for continued review and revision for the next four-year cycle, fall 2014-spring 2018, has been established and will be followed.

This recommendation was fully addressed, and the College meets the standard.

### List of Evidence, District Recommendation 4

**DIS 4.1** Board Policy 2410 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures

**DIS 4.2** Administrative Procedure 2410 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures

**DIS 4.3** Minutes Board of Trustees Meeting 3/21/2012

**DIS 4.4** List of board policies and administrative procedures revised or created from January 2012 to February 2013

**DIS 4.5** Minutes Board of Trustees Meeting 8/1/2012

**DIS 4.6** Minutes Board of Trustees Meeting 9/19/2012

**DIS 4.7** Minutes Board of Trustees Meeting 6/19/2013

**DIS 4.8** Minutes Board of Trustees Meeting 8/21/2013

**DIS 4.9** Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee Agenda and Minutes 7/30/2013

**DIS 4.10** DCC Agenda Items related to BPs and APs 9/9/2013

**DIS 4.11** DCC Agenda Items related to BPs and APs 9/30/2013

**DIS 4.12** DCC Agenda Items related to BPs and APs 10/21/2013

**DIS 4.13** DCC Agenda Items related to BPs and APs 10/28/2013

**DIS 4.14** DCC Agenda Items related to BPs and APs 11/18/2013

**DIS 4.15** DCC Agenda Items related to BPs and APs 12/2/2013
Commission Recommendation 1 - District Examine the Role of Four Board Employees

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)

Analysis and Findings
Various documents including Board Policies, Administrative Procedures, and job descriptions were identified for the workgroup to review and analyze. Further, the workgroup members interviewed the Chancellor, the Board members, and the Board Secretary to understand the perception of and processes followed when it comes to working with the Board Secretary and the Chancellor.

Interviews were conducted with the following:
- the Chancellor on October 25, 2013,
- the Board President and the Board Secretary on November 1, and
- four Board members were interviewed individually on November 7-8.

The interview with the Chancellor affirmed the commitment of the Chancellor to work with the Board of Trustees to ensure that the issues surrounding the delegation of authority, including the role of the Board Secretary, are clarified and fully addressed.
The results of the interviews conducted with members of the Board of Trustees in November 2013 harkened back to the time of 2006-2010 in order to create a context and to have a better understanding as to why the Board has evolved in its mode of operations and authority. The mid 2000s were a time when the Coast Community College District’s Chancellor was not trusted by either the colleges or the Board of Trustees. This lack of trust as well as a perceived lack of transparency prompted the Board members at the time to set up safety measures for control and authority that included hiring a general counsel for both advice and the opportunity to make decisions faster based on trusted legal advice; an external auditor for greater objectivity; and a lobbyist to argue in Sacramento on behalf of the colleges. At that time, the majority of the Board members believed its office needed confidentiality above all. It appears that these measures did provide that confidentiality and supported the Board of Trustees to have authority and control to keep the administrative staff in a direct reporting relationship.

Since that time, it is now perceived that the District, with two new Board members first elected in 2008 and 2010, respectively, and a new Chancellor who started in his position in August 2011, in the current climate, has been “making leaps and bounds” forward, and the past measures have staunched much of the issues from the prior years. A majority of the Board members reported that it is appropriate for the Chancellor to have the delegation of authority. It is also apparent that with the current Board members and Chancellor, achieving trust and creating more transparency has been evolving in a healthy and successful way. The Board Secretary and the assistants that report to her have been successfully working with not only the Board, but also the Chancellor and appropriate Board and District committees.

On the other hand, two of the Board members are still reluctant to delegate authority. They recognize change has occurred, and they attribute that to the measures and control that they put into place prior to 2010. They feel removing those controls may move the District backwards rather than forward. One of these two Board members believes that ACCJC has gone too far in its authority and stated this in a letter he sent to the U.S. Department of Education (COM 1.1 Board of Trustees Special Meeting Agenda, Attachment and Minutes 8/21/2013). This letter was not supported or endorsed by the Board as a whole. The Board President sent a follow-up letter to the U.S. Department of Education and ACCJC to this effect (COM 1.2 Letter from Board President to the US Department of Education 8/26/2013).

The following Board Policies (BP) and Administrative Procedures (AP) were revised to reflect the delegation of authority. They were brought to the District Consultation Council before they were brought to the Board following the process outlined in AP 2410.

BP 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO (DIS 2.1)
AP 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO (DIS 2.2)
BP 2905 General Counsel (DIS 2.3)
BP 6100 Delegation of Authority (DIS 2.4)
AP 6100 Delegation of Authority (DIS 2.5)
BP 6150 Designation of Authorized Signatures (DIS 2.6)
AP 6150 Designation of Authorized Signatures (DIS 2.7)
BP 6340 Bids and Contracts (DIS 2.8)
AP 6340 Bids and Contracts (DIS 2.9)
Relevant Board Policies and Administrative Procedures related to Commission Recommendation 1 in which the Board Secretary is mentioned in terms of duties and responsibilities or relationship to the Board of Trustees and/or Chancellor which were revised include the following:

- **BP 2015 Student Member, Board of Trustees** (updated version approved at the 11/6/2013 Board of Trustees meeting) (COM 1.3)
- **BP 2105 Election of Student Member** (updated version approved at the 11/6/2013 Board of Trustees meeting) (COM 1.4)
- **BP 2200 Board Duties and Responsibilities** (updated version approved at the 11/6/2013 Board of Trustees meeting) (COM 1.5)
- **BP 2210 Officers** (updated version approved at the 11/6/2013 Board of Trustees meeting) (COM 1.6)
- **BP 2340 Agendas** (updated version approved at the 11/6/2013 Board of Trustees meeting) (COM 1.7)
- **BP 2345 Public Participation at Board Meetings** (updated version approved at the 11/6/2013 Board of Trustees meeting) (COM 1.8)
- **BP 2360 Minutes** (updated version first reading at the 3/5/2014 Board of Trustees meeting) (COM 1.9)
- **BP 2365 Recording** (updated version first reading at the 3/5/2014 Board of Trustees meeting) (COM 1.10)
- **BP 2740 Board Education and New Trustee Orientation** (updated version first reading at the 3/5/2014 Board of Trustees meeting) (COM 1.11)

BP 2200 Board Duties and Responsibilities was revised to change the reporting relationship of the Board Secretary from reporting exclusively to the Board of Trustees to a dual reporting relationship to both the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor. The Chancellor and the Board of Trustees work together to hire and evaluate the Board Secretary. This was previously the exclusive responsibility of the Board of Trustees.

The job description of the Board Secretary (COM 1.12) was revised to clarify the supporting role of this position to work with the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to prepare Board meeting agendas, take minutes, and to collect attachments. The revised job description was discussed at the February 5, 2014, Board meeting.

**Conclusion:**

This recommendation was fully addressed, and the College meets the standard.
List of Evidence, Commission Recommendation 1
COM 1.1 Board of Trustees Special Meeting Agenda, Attachment and Minutes 8/21/2013
COM 1.2 Letter from Board President to the US Department of Education 8/26/2013
COM 1.3 BP 2015 Student Member, Board of Trustees (updated version approved at the
  11/6/2013 Board of Trustees meeting)
COM 1.4 BP 2105 Election of Student Member (updated version approved at the
  11/6/2013 Board of Trustees meeting)
COM 1.5 BP 2200 Board Duties and Responsibilities (updated version approved at the
  11/6/2013 Board of Trustees meeting)
COM 1.6 BP 2210 Officers (updated version approved at the 11/6/2013 Board of Trustees
  meeting)
COM 1.7 BP 2340 Agendas (updated version approved at the 11/6/2013 Board of Trustees
  meeting)
COM 1.8 BP 2345 Public Participation at Board Meetings (updated version approved at the
  11/6/2013 Board of Trustees meeting)
COM 1.9 BP 2360 Minutes (updated version first reading at the 3/5/2014 Board of Trustees
  meeting)
COM 1.10 BP 2365 Recording (updated version first reading at the 3/5/2014 Board of Trustees
  meeting)
COM 1.11 BP 2740 Board Education and New Trustee Orientation (updated version first reading
  at the 3/5/2014 Board of Trustees meeting)
COM 1.12 Revised Job Description of the Board Secretary
DIS 2.1 BP 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO
DIS 2.2 AP 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO
DIS 2.3 BP 2905 General Counsel
DIS 2.4 BP 6100 Delegation of Authority
DIS 2.5 AP 6100 Delegation of Authority
DIS 2.6 BP 6150 Designation of Authorized Signatures
DIS 2.7 AP 6150 Designation of Authorized Signatures
DIS 2.8 BP 6340 Bids and Contracts
DIS 2.9 AP 6340 Bids and Contracts
DIS 2.10 BP 6350 Contracts Relating to Construction
DIS 2.11 AP 6350 Contracts Relating to Construction
DIS 2.12 BP 6370 Contract for Independent Contractor or Professional Experts
DIS 2.13 AP 6370 Contract for Independent Contractor or Professional Experts
DIS 2.14 BP 7110 Delegation of Authority
DIS 2.15 AP 7110 Delegation of Authority
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