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Report Preparation - College

On August 27, 2015, Dr. Vince Rodriguez, Vice President, Instruction, met with other campus leaders to propose a timeline to produce the Report. As much as possible, the individuals who represented the Standards in past reports were recommended. On September 14, the Accreditation Steering Committee reviewed the list of team members (COL 0.1 2015 Accreditation Timeline). The team (Table 1) included members who would provide updates on the self-identified action plans identified in the 2012-2013 Institutional Self Evaluation Report and the subsequent Recommendations expressed through Commission action letters (COL 0.2 ACCJC Action Letter 7-3-13; COL 0.3 ACCJC Action Letter 7-3-14; COL 0.4 ACCJC Action Letter 6-29-15). Academic Senate unanimously approved the team on September 15 (COL 0.5 Academic Senate Minutes 9-15-15).

Table 1: Recommendations / Self-Identified Action Plans and Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Recommendation</th>
<th>Team Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Developing Institutional Effectiveness Measures</td>
<td>Rick Lockwood, Professor, Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aeron Zentner, Dean, Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Systematic Review of Planning and Allocation</td>
<td>Wendy Sacket, Electronic Media Publishing Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheryl Stewart, Professor, Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann Holliday, Professor, Academic Senate President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aeron Zentner, Dean, Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vince Rodriguez, Vice President, Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Student Services and Administrative SLOs</td>
<td>Gayle Berggren, Professor, Psychology; SLO Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann French, Staff Assistant Senior, Office of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aeron Zentner, Dean, Research and Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Program Review Integrated into Planning Allocation</td>
<td>Dan Johnson, Professor, History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aeron Zentner, Dean, Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Darian Aistrich, Project Coordinator, Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Ensure a Sufficient Number of Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>Lori Adrian, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christine Nguyen, Vice President, Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vince Rodriguez, Vice President, Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann Holliday, Professor, Academic Senate President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Ensure Systematic Personnel Evaluation</td>
<td>Shaunick Barber, Staff Assistant, Senior, Personnel Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Ramirez, Administrative Assistant to the V.P. Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christine Nguyen, Vice President, Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Rothgeb, Director, Business Services, Fiscal &amp; Personnel Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Recommendations 1-4 and Commission</td>
<td>Ann Holliday, Professor, Academic Senate President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 1</td>
<td>Margaret Lovig, Professor, Paralegal Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andreea Serban, Vice Chancellor, Educational Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard(s) Associated with Self-Identified Action Plan(s)</td>
<td>Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.2.</td>
<td>Vince Rodriguez, Vice President, Instruction Ross Miyashiro, Vice President, Student Services Christine Nguyen, Vice President, Administrative Services Aeron Zentner, Dean, Institutional Effectiveness Planning, Institutional Effectiveness, and Accreditation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.3; I.B.6</td>
<td>Aeron Zentner, Dean, Institutional Effectiveness Planning, Institutional Effectiveness, and Accreditation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.f.</td>
<td>Gayle Berggren, Professor, Psychology; SLO Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.3.e.</td>
<td>Aeron Zentner, Dean, Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.e.</td>
<td>Aeron Zentner, Dean, Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.3.e.</td>
<td>Aeron Zentner, Dean, Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.1.</td>
<td>Cheryl Stewart, Professor, Librarian Daniel Pittaway, Instructor, Student Success Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.2.</td>
<td>Daniel Pittaway, Instructor, Student Success Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.1.b.</td>
<td>Vince Rodriguez, Vice President, Instruction Christine Nguyen, Vice President, Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.C.1.e.</td>
<td>Christine Nguyen, Vice President, Administrative Services Aeron Zentner, Dean, Institutional Effectiveness Planning, Institutional Effectiveness, and Accreditation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.B1.e.; IV. B.1.g.; IV.B.1.j.; IV.B.3.a.; IV.B.3.g.</td>
<td>Andreea Serban, Vice Chancellor, Educational Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A first draft was completed on October 15, 2015, and was emailed to the campus community for review and feedback. A revised draft was sent to constituency groups for review in late October and November, which included Classified Senate, Academic Senate, and Associated Student Government. The Academic Senate accepted the revised draft on December 1 (COL 0.6 Academic Senate Agenda [section 3.1] 12-1-15). The Classified Senate accepted it on January 21, 2016, and the Associated Student Government accepted it on January 22 (COL 0.7 Classified Senate Agenda 1-21-16; COL 0.8 Associated Student Government Agenda 1-22-16). The Coastline Management team approved the report electronically on February 2, and the Academic Senate gave final approval on the same date. The report received a first reading by the Board of Trustees on February 2 (COL 0.9 Board of Trustees Agenda [3.04] 2-3-16). The final report was approved by the Board of Trustees on February 17, 2016.
List of Evidence, Report Preparation - College

COL 0.1 2015 Accreditation Timeline
COL 0.2 ACCJC Action Letter 7-3-13
COL 0.3 ACCJC Action Letter 7-3-14
COL 0.4 ACCJC Action Letter 6-29-15
COL 0.5 Academic Senate Minutes 9-15-15
COL 0.6 Academic Senate Agenda [section 3.1] 12-1-15
COL 0.7 Classified Senate Agenda 1-21-16
COL 0.8 Associated Student Government Agenda 1-22-16
COL 0.9 Board of Trustees Agenda [3.04] 2-3-16
Report Preparation - District

Based on discussions at the Chancellor’s Cabinet, in order to provide continuity, it was determined that, to the extent possible, the same District-wide workgroup that had previously worked on developing the responses to the ACCJC District-level recommendations included in the letters sent to the colleges by ACCJC in July 2013 and July 2014 develop the responses to the District Recommendations and Commission Recommendation 1 for the midterm reports due to ACCJC by March 15, 2016.

The initial 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, the three Vice Chancellors, the District Director of Public Information and Governmental Affairs, and the District Director of Board Operations/Secretary of the Board of Trustees.

The members of the workgroup are listed below:

Coastline Community College
Ann Holliday, Professor, Special Education; President, Academic Senate
Margaret Lovig, Professor, Paralegal Studies; Past President, Academic Senate

Golden West College
Wes Bryan, President
Gregg Carr, Past President, Academic Senate; Past President, Coast Federation of Educators
Ron Lowenberg, Dean, Criminal Justice
Kay Nguyen, Administrative Director; Accreditation Liaison Officer

Orange Coast College
Georgie Monahan, Faculty, Communication
Sheri Sterner, Administrative Director; Accreditation Liaison Officer

District Office
Dr. Andreea Serban, Vice Chancellor, Educational Services and Technology

The reconstituted committee prepared a first draft in early October 2015, which was provided to the respective college Accreditation Liaison Officers for circulation to their respective Accreditation committees for review. Input from these reviews was taken into consideration in preparing a second draft, which was then transmitted to the respective colleges for inclusion in their final report. The colleges have the final authority for the preparation of their final report.
Response to Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letters

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)*

This Recommendation was fully addressed and acknowledged in the July 3, 2014, Action Letter from ACCJC (COL 1.1 ACCJC Action Letter 7-3-14).

In 2011-2012, the College developed key performance indicators (KPIs) to measure the degree to which College goals are achieved (COL 1.2 PIEAC Minutes 5-16-12). The final College Scorecard with institutional effectiveness measures for each of the six College goals was completed at the end of December 2013 and finalized in February 2014. The College also developed clearly defined goals as well as standards for each Scorecard measure.

During fall 2013, the College developed institutional set standards 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.

KPI results are presented regularly at PIEAC, and performance is reviewed annually to determine progress toward achieving the set target for each indicator/goal (COL 1.3 PIEAC Minutes [4.1] 4-15-15; COL 1.4 2015-2016 KPI Scorecard).

In fall 2015, a planning map document was developed by the Department of Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Planning in order to clearly display how KPIs link to all major planning documents at the College (COL 1.5 KPI Assessment Methodology and Planning Map). These indicators facilitate College-wide discussion and are present in multiple planning documents that are vetted by various committees and groups to ensure continuous quality improvement throughout the institution. KPI assessment encompasses academic and service area-related metrics that are a mixture of quantitative and qualitative data that inform discussion and observation of whether targets are being met. Benchmark targets are set annually based upon previous trends and patterns. To ensure relevancy, the KPI metrics are reviewed and refined to best reflect the institutional climate and emergence of new college areas of focus. In this way, the College engages in an ongoing practice of College goal assessment through integrated planning.
Additionally, beginning in fall 2015, gainful employment is being utilized to assess job placement rate as a component of the College goal to enhance student success (COL 1.6 Job Placement Data; COL 1.7 Job Placement Set Standard). This employment-related KPI allows the College to set goals to improve employment and job placement outcomes in an ongoing manner (COL 1.8 ACCJC Response Letter 10-7-15).

With the establishment of institutional effectiveness measures to clearly identify and assess the degree to which College goals are attained, combined with integration across all College planning documents, supported by College-wide dialog and discussion within various committees and groups connected to those plans, this Recommendation is met.

The Recommendation was fully addressed, and the College meets the Standard.

**List of Evidence, Recommendation 1**

| COL 1.1 | ACCJC Action Letter 7-3-14 |
| COL 1.2 | PIEAC Minutes 5-16-12 |
| COL 1.3 | PIEAC Minutes [4.1] 4-15-15 |
| COL 1.4 | 2015-2016 KPI Scorecard |
| COL 1.5 | KPI Assessment Methodology and Planning Map |
| COL 1.6 | Job Placement Data |
| COL 1.7 | Job Placement Set Standard |
| COL 1.8 | ACCJC Response Letter 10-7-15 |
**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)*

This Recommendation was fully addressed and acknowledged in the July 3, 2014, Action Letter from ACCJC.

The role of the Wing Planning Councils (Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, and President), which collectively represent all programs and departments (*COL 2.1 2015-2016 Wing Planning Council Directives and Member List*), was discussed in the *2014 Follow-Up Report* (pp. 8-12).

The College routinely reviews the planning and budget allocation processes as outlined in the 2012 Integrated Planning Guide. An internal evaluation of the planning and budget allocation processes revealed a degree of cumbersome routines that lacked cohesion. To increase effectiveness, planning and budgeting processes were clarified and streamlined through program and department review to define an evidence-based approach for resource requests. To this end, new templates for annual and comprehensive program and department review were subsequently approved (*COL 2.2 Academic Senate Minutes [Action Items, p. 2] 5-5-15*). The 2012 Planning Guide was also revised in fall 2015 to reflect a focus on integrated planning for institutional effectiveness (*COL 2.3 PIEAC Minutes 9-16-15; COL 2.4 2015 Planning Guide*).

Following annual program and department review, prioritization of resource requests is established by the appropriate Wing Planning Council (i.e., Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, and President’s Wing) and ultimately sent to PIEAC for College-wide prioritization based on evidence and dialog (*COL 2.5 2015-2016 Priority Ranking*).

A systematic review of all parts of the planning and resource allocation cycle has been completed and documented, as outlined in College planning documents.

The Recommendation was fully addressed, and the College meets the Standard.
List of Evidence, Recommendation 2

COL 2.1 2014-2015 Wing Planning Council Directives and Member List
COL 2.2 Academic Senate Minutes [Action Items, p. 2] 5-5-15
COL 2.3 PIEAC Minutes 9-16-15
COL 2.4 2015 Planning Guide
COL 2.5 2015-2016 Priority Ranking
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)

This Recommendation was fully addressed and acknowledged in the July 3, 2014, Action Letter from ACCJC.

Annually, the College KPI Scorecard presents an aggregated view of the institutional student learning outcome (ISLO) findings from the previous year and establishes benchmarks for the following year (COL 3.1 2015-2016 KPI Scorecard). A three-year analysis of ISLO findings were reported in the 2014-2015 ISLO Report and discussed at PIEAC for potential areas of focus for all units to consider when completing program or department review (COL 3.2 2014-2015 ISLO Report; COL 3.3 PIEAC Minutes 5-6-15).

Additionally, institutional, program, and course-level student learning outcomes (SLOs) are discussed once a year at the All-College convocation meetings at the beginning of spring terms (COL 3.4 2014 Spring All-College Meeting Agenda; COL 3.5 2015 Spring All-College Meeting Agenda). This facilitates faculty coming together and planning based on student learning outcome data. SLO achievement data and interpretation is also recorded within the annual and comprehensive program review process. In this way, academic programs have effectively integrated SLO review and discussion into a centralized planning document that supports the development of future programmatic plans and resource requests.

Service area outcomes (SAOs) were developed across all departments in 2012-2013 to support College-wide data collection (COL 3.6 2012-2015 Service Outcome Assessment Results). The initial outcomes were measured via survey. In 2014-2015, an internal initiative was convened to review, modify, and update all service area outcomes to ensure alignment with the intended purpose and operational function of each non-instructional department.
The newly revised SAOs are assessed via a triangulation of quantitative and qualitative data. Like program and course-level SLOs, SAO analysis is factored into the program and department review process (COL 3.7 2015 Program and Department Review Handbook; COL 3.8 2015 Annual Program Review Template; COL 3.9 2015 Annual Department Review Template; COL 3.10 2015 Comprehensive Program Review Template; COL 3.11 2015 Comprehensive Department Review Template). In this way, non-instructional departments use outcome data to support resource requests for future planning. Furthermore, instructional and service outcomes are one of many evidence-based components in support of continuous improvement through the annual planning and resource allocation process, which is mediated by program and department review.

This Recommendation was fully addressed, and the College meets the Standard.

List of Evidence, Recommendation 3

| COL 3.1 | 2015-2016 KPI Scorecard |
| COL 3.2 | 2014-2015 ISLO Report |
| COL 3.3 | PIEAC Minutes 5-6-15 |
| COL 3.4 | 2014 Spring All-College Meeting Agenda |
| COL 3.5 | 2015 Spring All-College Meeting Agenda |
| COL 3.6 | 2012-2015 Service Outcome Assessment Results |
| COL 3.7 | 2015 Program and Department Review Handbook |
| COL 3.8 | 2015 Annual Program Review Template |
| COL 3.9 | 2015 Annual Department Review Template |
| COL 3.10 | 2015 Comprehensive Program Review Template |
| COL 3.11 | 2015 Comprehensive Department Review Template |
College Recommendation 4: Program Review Integrated into Planning Allocation

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

Commission Concern: Recommendation 4 required the College to “ensure that the program review cycle for all student services, learning resources, and administrative resources is systematic and integrated into the college planning and resource allocation processes.” While the College has established a cycle and a calendar that ensures inclusion of all units that had not completed a prior program review, many of the programs are not required to undergo their first program review until 2016, 2019, or 2020.

This Recommendation and Commission Concern were fully addressed and acknowledged in the June 29, 2015, Action Letter from ACCJC (COL 4.1 ACCJC Action Letter 6-29-15).

In fall 2014, the Program and Department Review Committee conducted a careful audit and engaged in a sustained dialog to ensure that all units were included (COL 4.2 Program and Department Review Minutes 9-8-14; COL 4.3 Program and Department Review Minutes 9-22-14) in the review calendar. The calendar was subsequently revised to include nine administrative and student service units that had not completed a prior program review.

In spring 2015, Academic Senate approved the Program and Department Review Handbook, which establishes periodic deadlines and milestones to clarify and streamline the review process (COL 4.4 2015 Program and Department Review Handbook; COL 4.5 Academic Senate Minutes [Action Items] 5-5-15).

With the completion of comprehensive review of all areas previously identified as not having completed a comprehensive review, the development of a revised review calendar, and the adoption of a Program and Department Review Handbook, the deficiency identified in the Commission Action Letter has been resolved.

The Recommendation and the Commission Concern were fully addressed, and the College meets the Standard.
List of Evidence, Recommendation 4

COL 4.1 ACCJC Action Letter 6-29-15
COL 4.2 Program and Department Review Minutes 9-8-14
COL 4.3 Program and Department Review Minutes 9-22-14
COL 4.4 2015 Program and Department Review Handbook
COL 4.5 Academic Senate Minutes [Action Items] 5-15-15
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, IIA.2.a, IIB.3.c, IIC.1.a, IIIA.2, IIIA.6, IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3)

This Recommendation was fully addressed in the 2014 Follow-Up Report (pp. 24-27) and acknowledged in the July 3, 2014, Action Letter from ACCJC.

The College and the District continue to work together to meet the Standard(s). 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.

In fall 2014, the Instructional Wing Planning Council recommended a plan for the College to hire eight new full-time faculty members over the next 5 years (COL 5.1 Full-time Faculty Hiring Plan 10-1-14). These new faculty positions did not include faculty positions that were already in the recruitment process nor those selected to fill vacancies due to retirements or other reasons (COL 5.2 Faculty Hiring Letter 12-8-14). To reach the College goal of hiring eight new full-time faculty members by 2019-20, the Instructional Wing Planning Council developed a strategic hiring plan that outlines the number of new hires per year (COL 5.3 Instructional Wing Planning Council Minutes 9-29-14). Based on support from both the President and the District, fortunately, the projections outlined in the plan have been exceeded.

In fall 2015, Academic Senate convened on October 20 to prioritize seven new full-time faculty hires (COL 5.4 Academic Senate Agenda 10-20-15). Presentations were delivered at that meeting by various departments (COL 5.5 Academic Senate Minutes 10-20-15; COL 5.6 Faculty Hiring Letter 1-13-16), and the presentations were ranked by senators on the basis of data demonstrating need and adherence to the College mission (COL 5.7 Voting Process for Prioritization of Full-time Faculty).

With a pattern of full-time faculty hiring that far exceeds the original five-year hiring projection plan (2014-2019), coupled with ongoing new hiring to meet College needs and goals, and a voting/selection process based on criteria of need and adherence to the Mission, the College continues to meet the Standard.

The Recommendation was fully addressed, and the College meets the Standard.
List of Evidence, Recommendation 5

COL 5.1  Full-time Faculty Hiring Plan 10-1-14
COL 5.2  Faculty Hiring Letter 12-8-14
COL 5.3  Instructional Wing Planning Council Minutes 9-29-14
COL 5.4  Academic Senate Agenda 10-20-15
COL 5.5  Academic Senate Minutes 10-20-15
COL 5.6  Faculty Hiring Letter 1-13-16
COL 5.7  Voting Process for Prioritization of Full-time Faculty
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)

This Recommendation was fully addressed in the 2014 Follow-Up Report (pp. 27-29) and acknowledged in the July 3, 2014, Action Letter from ACCJC.

District Human Resources has assigned additional resources (e.g., dedicated staffing and technology for operationalizing the NEOGOV system) to provide timely data entry and filing of employee evaluations into Banner. In fall 2015, an interim agreement was established between the College and District Human Resources to provide a list of all active part-time faculty employees and their most recent evaluation dates. The College will manage the tracking of this employee group through the end of spring 2016. Afterwards, part-time faculty will be integrated into NEOGOV.

The District and the College are implementing an online evaluation tracking tool, NEOGOV-Perform, that will continue to increase the efficiency of systematic and regular employee evaluation (COL 6.1 Board of Trustees Regular Meeting Agenda 9-2-15 [section 10.02]; COL 6.2 Board of Trustees Regular Meeting Minutes [section 4.00 - Consent Calendar]). The system is scheduled for implementation and use in summer 2016, with a plan for full tracking of contract and tenured faculty by spring 2017 (COL 6.3 HR and Payroll Managers Meeting Agenda [NEOGOV Timeline] 1-19-16).

In collaboration with the District, the College has resolved discrepancies in the employee evaluation process. The College meets the standard of ensuring a systematic evaluation process for all employees.

The Recommendation was fully addressed, and the College meets the Standard.

List of Evidence, Recommendation 6

COL 6.1 Board of Trustees Regular Meeting Agenda 9-2-15 [section 10.02]
COL 6.2 Board of Trustees Regular Meeting Minutes 9-2-15 [section 4.00 - Consent Calendar]
COL 6.3 HR and Payroll Managers Meeting Agenda [NEOGOV Timeline] 1-19-16
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)

This Recommendation has been met (see ACCJC Action Letter 7-3-14).

Summary of actions and accomplishments to address the recommendation

The District and its employee groups have integrated SLOs in the employee evaluations. In the full-time faculty, part-time faculty 7.5 Load Hour Equivalent (LHE) and above, 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 went into effect in spring 2014 until a full successor agreement has been approved (DIS 1.1 Joint SLO Letter CFE and District 11-13-13; DIS 1.2 Form CFE Agreement Appendix B - page 94). The District has also directed evaluators of part-time faculty below 7.5 LHE to use the present evaluation process and forms to specifically address the use of SLOs (DIS 1.3 CCA Part-time Evaluation Form). These directions have been implemented during the spring 2014 semester, and will continue to be until successor agreements are realized.

Summary of comments from accreditation follow up visiting team regarding this recommendation

The Accreditation Visiting Teams who visited the three colleges in April 2014 concluded in each of the three evaluation reports that “The District has fully addressed the recommendation and meets the Standards.” The 2014 Accreditation Visiting Teams also noted in their conclusion the following: “Employee groups and the District have engaged in serious discussions regarding the inclusion of SLOs as a component of evaluation processes. The team had access to evaluations and was able to validate that SLOs are being used as part of evaluation processes.”
**Continuous sustainment of changes/improvements**

Since the last accreditation follow-up visit in April 2015, the District and the Coast Community College Association (CCA), which represents part-time faculty below 7.5 LHE, have reached agreement on a new contract, which was brought to the Board of Trustees to the January 20, 2016, Board meeting for ratification ([DIS 1.4 Board Agenda Item Ratification of Agreement with CCA 1-20-16](#)). This contract puts into effect the directions implemented in spring 2014.

The District and the Coast Federation of Educators, which represents full-time faculty and part-time faculty above 7.5 LHE, have continued negotiations on a new contract. During these negotiations, five tentative agreements have been signed by the District and the Coast Federation of Educators that relate to changing the faculty evaluation forms to integrate student learning outcomes ([DIS 1.5 TA - Faculty Observation Report 10-16-15; DIS 1.6 TA - Faculty Self Evaluation Form 10-23-15; DIS 1.7 TA - Distance Learning Faculty Evaluation Report 10-16-15; DIS 1.8 TA - Administrative Feedback and Evaluation Form 9-25-15; DIS 1.9 TA - Regular-Temporary-Categorical Faculty Eval Summary Report 10-23-15](#)). These tentative agreements will be incorporated in the new contract once negotiations conclude.

**List of Evidence, District Recommendation 1**

- DIS 1.1 Joint SLO Letter CFE and District 11-13-13
- DIS 1.2 Form CFE Agreement Appendix B - page 94
- DIS 1.3 CCA Part-time Evaluation Form
- DIS 1.4 Board Agenda Item Ratification of Agreement with CCA 1-20-16
- DIS 1.5 TA - Faculty Observation Report 10-16-15
- DIS 1.6 TA - Faculty Self Evaluation Form 10-23-15
- DIS 1.7 TA - Distance Learning Faculty Evaluation Report 10-16-15
- DIS 1.8 TA - Administrative Feedback and Evaluation Form 9-25-15
- DIS 1.9 TA - Regular-Temporary-Categorical Faculty Eval Summary Report 10-23-15
Coastline Community College 2016 Midterm Report

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)

This Recommendation has been met (see ACCJC Action Letter 6-29-15).

Summary of actions and accomplishments to address the recommendation

Since the last comprehensive evaluation visit in March 2013, 17 board policies and administrative procedures related to delegation of authority to the Chancellor and the Presidents were revised or created spanning all key areas of the District and the colleges. Some of these Board policies and administrative procedures were revised multiple times during this period to further clarify or add to the delegation of authority. These Board policies and administrative procedures include the following:

BP 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO – revision (DIS 2.1)
AP 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO – new (DIS 2.2)
BP 2200 Board Duties and Responsibilities – revision (DIS 2.3)
BP 2320 Special and Emergency Meetings – new (DIS 2.4)
BP 2905 General Counsel – revision (DIS 2.5)
BP 6100 Delegation of Authority – revision (DIS 2.6)
AP 6100 Delegation of Authority – new (DIS 2.7)
BP 6150 Designation of Authorized Signatures – revision (DIS 2.8)
AP 6150 Designation of Authorized Signatures – new (DIS 2.9)
BP 6340 Bids and Contracts – revision (DIS 2.10)
AP 6340 Bids and Contracts – new (DIS 2.11)
BP 6350 Contracts Relating to Construction – new (DIS 2.12)
AP 6350 Contracts Relating to Construction – new (DIS 2.13)
BP 6370 Contract for Independent Contractor or Professional Experts – new (DIS 2.14)
AP 6370 Contract for Independent Contractor or Professional Experts – new (DIS 2.15)
BP 7110 Delegation of Authority Human Resources – new (DIS 2.16)
AP 7110 Delegation of Authority Human Resources – new (DIS 2.17)
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 2.18 Memorandum to District Managers Support Staff Re Delegation Authority 1/23/2014; DIS 2.19 Contract Submission and Review Procedures 1/22/2014). Subsequently, additional revisions and clarifications were provided to managers and staff relative to the implementation of these Board policies and administrative procedures (DIS 2.20 Email from Risk Services Revision of Procedures for Submission and Review of Contracts Sep 2014; DIS 2.21 CCCD Contract Submission and Review Procedures Sep 2014).

**Summary of comments from accreditation follow up visiting team regarding this recommendation**

The Accreditation Visiting Teams who visited the three colleges in April 2014 concluded in each of the three evaluation reports that “*The District has fully addressed the recommendation and meets the Standards.*” The 2014 Accreditation Visiting Teams also noted in their conclusion the following: “*Tremendous improvement in the operationalization of the policies was evidenced. Since the operationalization of these policies is relatively new, close monitoring is needed to ensure smooth transition of the changes and to ensure college personnel understand the changes and work within agreed upon policies and procedures.*”

The Accreditation Visiting Teams who visited two of the three colleges in the District in April 2015 concluded in each of the two evaluation reports that “*The District has satisfied this recommendation and now meets the Standards.*” The 2015 Accreditation Visiting Teams noted in their follow up evaluation report:

“*The team was able to verify that the newly created and revised board policies and corresponding administrative procedures relating to the delegation of authority are being implemented. Interviews with the Interim Chancellor, Coastline’s President, the Board of Trustees, Board Secretary and District General Counsel, as well as the review of several months of Board minutes indicate that board policies are being followed.*”

“*There has been an incredible transformation in regards to the Board of Trustees adhering to the board policies regarding the delegation of authority to the chancellor. The board fully recognizes that its role is to delegate authority to the chancellor and then hold him/her accountable in the operation of the district. Additionally it is clear that the chancellor effectively delegates authority to the presidents and then holds them accountable in the operation of the campuses.*”

**Continuous sustainment of changes/improvements**

Since the last Accreditation follow-up reports submitted in March 2015, the Board policies and administrative procedures related to delegation of authority have continued to be followed. In
addition, in order to further clarify the delegation of authority, additional revisions to relevant Board policies and administrative procedures have been approved through the District Consultation Council and brought to the Board for first reading and then for approval/ratification as follows:

- AP 6200 Budget Preparation – revision ratified at the June 17, 2015 Board meeting (DIS 2.22)
- BP 3300 (DIS 2.23) and AP 3300 Inspection and Copying of Public Records (DIS 2.24) – revisions approval/ratification at the October 20, 2015 Board meeting
- BP 7110 Delegation of Authority Human Resources - revision first reading at the December 9, 2015 Board meeting/approval at the January 20, 2016 Board meeting (DIS 2.25)

For the first time, through the work of the District Consultation Council, the District has developed the District Level Decision Making and Participatory Governance Document. The document further clarifies the delegation of authority to the Chancellor and College Presidents and their role in leading the District and its three Colleges (DIS 2.26 CCCD Decision Making 10-7-2015).
List of Evidence, District Recommendation 2

DIS 2.1 BP 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO
DIS 2.2 AP 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO
DIS 2.3 BP 2200 Board Duties and Responsibilities
DIS 2.4 BP 2320 Special and Emergency Meetings
DIS 2.5 BP 2905 General Counsel
DIS 2.6 BP 6100 Delegation of Authority
DIS 2.7 AP 6100 Delegation of Authority
DIS 2.8 BP 6150 Designation of Authorized Signatures
DIS 2.9 AP 6150 Designation of Authorized Signatures
DIS 2.10 BP 6340 Bids and Contracts
DIS 2.11 AP 6340 Bids and Contracts
DIS 2.12 BP 6350 Contracts Relating to Construction
DIS 2.13 AP 6350 Contracts Relating to Construction
DIS 2.14 BP 6370 Contracts for Independent Contractor or Professional Expert Services
DIS 2.15 AP 6370 Contract for Independent Contractor or Professional Expert Services
DIS 2.16 BP 7110 Delegation of Authority HR
DIS 2.17 AP 7110 Delegation of Authority
DIS 2.18 Memorandum to District Managers Support Staff Delegation Authority
DIS 2.19 Contract Submission and Review Procedures
DIS 2.20 Email from Risk Services Revision of Procedures for Submission and Review of Contracts Sep 2014
DIS 2.21 CCCD Contract Submission and Review Procedures Sep 2014
DIS 2.22 AP 6200 Budget Preparation
DIS 2.23 BP 3300 Inspection and Copying of Public Records
DIS 2.24 AP 3300 Inspection and Copying of Public Records
DIS 2.25 BP 7110 Delegation of Authority Human Resources 11-11-15
DIS 2.26 CCCD Decision Making 10-7-2015
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)

This Recommendation has been met (ACCJC Action Letter 7-3-14).

Summary of actions and accomplishments to address the recommendation
In August 2012, the Board of Trustees revised Board Policy 2745 Board Self Evaluation (DIS 3.1) and developed a new process for its evaluation, which was implemented in fall 2013. The revised process included, in addition to a self-evaluation by the Board members, a 360-degree evaluation of the Board through a survey sent to all District employees, development of Board goals, and development of action plans relative to the Board goals.

Summary of comments from accreditation follow-up visiting team regarding this recommendation
The Accreditation Visiting Teams who visited the three colleges in April 2014 concluded in each of the three evaluation reports that “The District has satisfied this recommendation and now meets the standard.”

The 2014 Accreditation Visiting Teams noted:

“The Board is to be commended for taking the extra step of making public the results of both its own self-evaluation and the employee survey, including all written comments, in an effort to be transparent. It is evident that the Board has taken the self-evaluation process very seriously and has devoted a great deal of time and effort to improving its performance.”

“The revised Board Policy 2745 regarding Board Self-Evaluation is posted, along with all other board policies, on the district website. The Board has followed the new board policy and recently conducted a self-evaluation that included input from all district employees. The Board developed 2013 Board Goals and Action Plans based on the self-evaluation.”
Continuous sustainment of changes/improvements

Consistent with BP 2745, the Board of Trustees conducted a comprehensive self-evaluation again in fall 2015. The survey sent to all employees in fall 2013 was administered again in fall 2015 with a deadline to respond of October 19, 2015 (DIS 3.2 Email from Board President to All District Employees 9-30-15; DIS 3.3 Email from Board President to All District Employees 10-13-15). The Board discussed its evaluation at the November 4, 2015 Board meeting as well as its previous goals (DIS 3.4 11-4-2015 Board Agenda Item on Board Evaluation; DIS 3.5 BOT Self-Eval Report 2013-2015; DIS 3.6 Survey of District Employees Regarding Board; DIS 3.7 2013-2014 Board Goals + Added Goals). At the November 18, 2015 Board meeting, new Board goals for 2015-17 were discussed (DIS 3.8 11-18-2015 Board Agenda Item on Adoption of Board Goals and Plans; DIS 3.9 2015-2017 Board Goals 11-18-2015).

List of Evidence, District Recommendation 3

DIS 3.1 BP 2745 Board Self Evaluation
DIS 3.2 Email to All Employee Re Board Evaluation 9-30-15
DIS 3.3 Email to All Employee Re Board Evaluation 10-13-15
DIS 3.4 11-4-2015 Board Agenda Item on Board Evaluation
DIS 3.5 BOT Self-Eval Report 2013-2015
DIS 3.6 Survey of District Employees Regarding Board
DIS 3.7 2013-2014 Board Goals + Added Goals
DIS 3.8 11-18-2015 Board Agenda Item on Adoption of Board Goals and Plans
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)

This Recommendation has been met (ACCJC Action Letter 7-3-14).

Summary of actions and accomplishments to address the recommendation

The development and implementation of BP 2410 (DIS 4.1) and AP 2410 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures (DIS 4.2) in March 2012 helped to clarify the process and responsibilities for revision and/or creation of policies and procedures. AP 2410 has been followed consistently since its ratification and has ensured that, with an established schedule that calls for reviewing and updating all existing Board policies and administrative procedures on a four-year cycle, those responsible, and the District overall, stay on track.

In spring 2012, the Board of Trustees approved and directed staff to work on realigning the board policies and administrative procedures to conform to the chapter and numbering structure recommended by the Community College League of California (CCLC) (DIS 4.3 Board Meeting Minutes 3-21-12). 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. The Board of Trustees approved the implementation of the proposed recommendations at the August 1, 2012, meeting.

The Vice Chancellor of Educational Services and Technology has continued to provide overall coordination for this process.

Since the last Accreditation follow-up visit in April 2015, the review and revision of Board policies and administrative procedures have continued as scheduled at a steady pace. Between April 15, 2015, and January 20, 2016, 16 Board Policies and 17 Administrative Procedures were revised or created.

Summary of comments from accreditation follow up visiting team regarding this recommendation

The Accreditation Visiting Teams who visited the three colleges in April 2014 concluded in each of the three evaluation reports that “The District has satisfied this recommendation and now meets the standard.”
The 2014 Accreditation Visiting Teams noted:

“All board policies and administrative procedures have now been reviewed, revised, or newly created except for a small number of Human Resources policies and procedures that must go through collective bargaining processes.”

“A four-year review cycle has been established so that, during each year, a group of the board policies and administrative procedures will be updated, reviewed, and revised as needed by the Board of Trustees after going through the consultation process. At the completion of each four-year cycle, all board policies and administrative procedures will have been reviewed. During the interim years, the Vice Chancellor of Educational Services and Technology is responsible for reviewing any CCLC recommendations for change and bringing them to the attention of the appropriate district or college administrators who will then develop recommendations. Any resulting new policies and procedures will then go through the consultation process and be submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval.”

**Continuous sustainment of changes/improvements**

The District has continued to follow the process defined in BP 2410 and AP 2410 for revision of existing Board policies and administrative procedures and creation of new ones, as needed. A schedule for continued review and updating of all Board policies and administrative procedures within a four-year cycle has been established, followed, and continuously updated.

As of January 2016, of the total 177 board policies currently in place, only 13 have not had their revision finalized. These 13 Board policies are in various stages in the revision process. These Board policies have required discussions with the District Collective Bargaining Units and thus have taken longer to complete. It is expected that the revision of these 13 Board policies will be completed by May 2016. In addition, 95 Administrative Procedures have been revised or created since January 2012.

**List of Evidence, District Recommendation 4**

DIS 4.1 BP 2410 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures
DIS 4.2 AP 2410 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures
DIS 4.3 Board Meeting Minutes 3-21-12
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)

This Recommendation has been met (ACCJC Action Letter 7-3-14).

Summary of actions and accomplishments to address the recommendation
BP 2200 Board Duties and Responsibilities (COM 1.1) was revised and changed 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, which previously was done exclusively by the Board of Trustees.

The job description for the Board Secretary was revised to remove responsibilities that overlap with the delegation of authority to the Chancellor and College Presidents and to reflect the support role that this position has relative to the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor. The title of the position was changed to District Director of Board Operations/Secretary of the Board of Trustees (COM 1.2 Job Description of the Board Secretary revised 1-27-2014).

Summary of comments from Accreditation follow-up visiting team regarding this recommendation
The Accreditation Visiting Teams who visited the three colleges in April 2014 concluded in each of the three evaluation reports that “The District has substantively addressed this recommendation and now meets the standards.”

The 2014 Accreditation Visiting Teams noted:

“As part of the Chancellor’s commitment to work with the Board of Trustees to address issues surrounding the delegation of authority, the role of the Board Secretary was thoroughly examined. (The other three employees referenced in this recommendation report to the Board Secretary, not directly to the Board of Trustees or the Chancellor.) The most concrete changes resulting from this review occurred through a substantial revision to the job description for this position. The reporting relationship has been changed from reporting exclusively to the Board of Trustees to a dual reporting relationship to the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor, with the assumption that the Chancellor and the Board will jointly hire and evaluate the employee in this position. Also, a number of job functions that would more appropriately be among the responsibilities of the Chancellor (for example, “serve as a representative of the Board on strategic committees and task forces to advance the District mission, goals, and objectives,” “direct the preparation and maintenance of Board Policies and Administrative Procedures,”
etc.) were either eliminated from the job description or revised to reflect a supporting role. All relevant board policies and administrative procedures have also been revised to reflect these changes.”

“The District has responded substantively to this recommendation, but there has not yet been enough experience with the changes in the reporting relationship and the functions of this position to evaluate their effectiveness in addressing concerns regarding delegation of authority to the Chancellor.”

**Continuous sustainment of changes/improvements**

The changes in the reporting relationship and job responsibilities for the District Director of Board Operations/Secretary of the Board of Trustees have continued to be implemented and clarified. Consistent with the dual reporting, the District Director of Board Operations/Secretary of the Board of Trustees meets regularly with the Chancellor. The District Director of Board Operations/Secretary of the Board of Trustees meets regularly with the Chancellor’s Cabinet to review the Board Agenda, prior to publication. The Chancellor participates in the evaluation of the person holding this position. The most recent regularly scheduled performance evaluation was conducted on September 16, 2015 (COM 1.3 Board Meeting Evaluation of District Director - Secretary of the Board 9-16-2015). The Interim Chancellor contributed to and participated in this evaluation.

**List of Evidence, Commission Concern**

- COM 1.1 BP 2200 Board Duties and Responsibilities
- COM 1.2 Job Description of the Board Secretary revised 1-27-2014
- COM 1.3 Board Meeting Evaluation of District Director - Secretary of the Board 9-16-2015
Response to Self-Identified Issues

The self-identified improvement plans from the 2012-2013 Institutional Self Evaluation Report were reviewed at PIEAC on May 7, 2014, were subsequently updated and are included in this report for reference (COL AIP 0.1 PIEAC Minutes 5-7-14; COL AIP 0.2 Summary of AIPs with Accreditation Standards). A synopsis and update for each action improvement plan follows. Evidence in this section is labeled with “AIP” to denote actionable improvement plans.

List of Evidence, Response to Self-Identified Issues

COL AIP 0.1 PIEAC Minutes 5-7-14
COL AIP 0.2 Summary of AIPs with Accreditation Standards

Standard I.B.2: The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.

Improvement Plan I.B.2: Wing Action Plans

Develop measurable Wing Action Plans used to implement the college goals and present to the PIEAC and Budget Committee (BC) in the spring 2013 semester for prioritization and funding. Evaluate Wing Action Plans once they have completed a full planning and budget cycle.

In spring 2013, a meeting schedule for four new wing planning councils (Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, and President) was established, and the wings started to meet (COL AIP 1.1 College Council Minutes [section 2.1] 5-14-13). The purpose for the establishment of the wing planning councils was to streamline the planning and budgeting process so that all programs and services within the college fit within an integrated planning framework. In fall 2013, PIEAC established a meeting schedule and planning process for the Wing Councils that is now codified in the 2015 Planning Guide. These shared governance committees first convened in spring 2013 and meet on a monthly basis to facilitate College-wide planning initiatives (COL AIP 1.2 2014-2015 Wing Planning Council Directives and Member List).
To ensure that educational master planning initiatives are being addressed, the Councils were provided the opportunity to provide status updates in fall 2014 and spring 2015 (COL AIP 1.3 2014-2015 Educational Master Plan Progress; COL AIP 1.4 2015-2016 Educational Master Plan Progress). The review of the Educational Master Plan initiatives allowed the Councils to provide an assessment of relevance toward future planning.

Evaluation of Wing Action Plans occurs through the program and department review process on an annual basis. Departments or programs that receive or do not receive resources requested to support initiatives and College goals through the Wing Action Planning process must report on the effects of having received or not received a request.

Each department and program at the College evaluates the impact of receiving or not receiving resources requested through a Wing Action Plan. Each comprehensive and annual review by each program and department experiences a validation process to ensure that resource requests are evidence driven (e.g., internal/external research, learning outcome data), support the College goals, and align with the Mission (COL AIP 1.5 2014-2015 Annual Program Review Validation Summary; COL AIP 1.6 2014-2015 Annual Department Review Validation Summary).

In support of a cohesive planning process, wing-associated initiatives and resource requests from the program and department review process are prioritized by the associated wing councils based on broad discussion of initiatives and evidence in support of the College goals and Mission. Progress evaluations of program and department level wing-associated initiatives occur annually via the program and department review process. This information feeds into the ongoing evaluation cycle to support future plan development.

With the inclusion of the Wing Planning Councils to prioritize resource requests that come up through the program and department review process, the alignment of resource requests to College goals and Mission, and the evaluation of Wing Action Plans through the program and department review process, this action improvement plan has been fully addressed.

The Improvement Plan has been completed and the College meets the Standard.

**List of Evidence, Wing Action Plans**

COL AIP 1.1 College Council Minutes [section 2.1] 5-14-13
COL AIP 1.2 2014-2015 Wing Planning Council Directives and Member List
COL AIP 1.3 2014-2015 Educational Master Plan Progress
COL AIP 1.4 2015-2016 Educational Master Plan Progress
COL AIP 1.5 2014-2015 Annual Program Review Validation Summary
COL AIP 1.6 2014-2015 Annual Department Review Validation Summary
Improvement Plan I.B.2 and I.B.3: Key Performance Indicator Evaluation

Standard I.B.2: The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.

Standard I.B.3: The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.

Utilize the Key Performance Indicators to assess EMP outcomes and determine a cycle for comparison of achievement results. Evaluate KPI’s effectiveness as assessment measures.

The development of the 2011-2016 Educational Master Plan (EMP) led directly to the establishment of College goals (COL AIP 2.1 2011-2016 Educational Master Plan [p. 12]). In 2012-2013, the College developed key performance indicators (KPIs) to measure the degree to which College goals are achieved. These indicators facilitate College-wide discussion through multiple planning documents that are vetted by various committees and groups to ensure continuous quality improvement throughout the institution (COL AIP 2.2 2015-2016 KPI Scorecard). This benchmark assessment tool encompasses academic and service area-related metrics that provide a mixture of quantitative and qualitative data that informs discussion and observation of whether targets are being met. Benchmark targets are set annually based upon previous trends and patterns (COL AIP 2.3 KPI Assessment Methodology and Planning Map).

KPI results are presented regularly at PIEAC, and performance is evaluated annually to determine progress toward achieving the set target for each goal. As discussed in the response to Recommendation 1, in fall 2015 a planning map document was developed by the Department of Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Planning in order to clearly display how KPIs link to all major planning documents at the College (COL AIP 2.3 KPI Assessment Methodology and Planning Map). In this way, the College engages in an ongoing practice of College goal assessment through integrated planning. The alignment of College goals to KPIs allows for KPI outcomes to serve as evidence of progress on College goals.
The KPI planning map outlines the associations of KPIs across planning documents in support of evidence-driven planning. Additionally, the program and department review process requires that all unitary planning and budget allocation requests are aligned with College goals and support the College Mission. Evaluation of unitary plans are conducted and recorded annually through the program and department review process to ensure continuous quality improvement occurs throughout college planning (COL AIP 2.4 2015 Program and Department Review Handbook; COL AIP 2.5 2015 Annual Program Review Template; COL AIP 2.6 2015 Annual Department Review Template; COL AIP 2.7 2015 Comprehensive Program Review Template; COL AIP 2.8 2015 Comprehensive Department Review Template).

With the setting of institutional standards, regular assessment of College goals through analysis of key performance indicators, and a revised program/department review process with a focus on integration and linkage to College goals, the College has improved its effectiveness.

The Improvement Plan has been completed, and the College meets the Standards.

**List of Evidence, Key Performance Indicator Evaluation**

COL AIP 2.1 2011-2016 Educational Master Plan [p. 12]

COL AIP 2.2 2015-2016 KPI Scorecard

COL AIP 2.3 KPI Assessment Methodology and Planning Map

COL AIP 2.4 2015 Program and Department Review Handbook

COL AIP 2.5 2015 Annual Program Review Template

COL AIP 2.6 2015 Annual Department Review Template

COL AIP 2.7 2015 Comprehensive Program Review Template

COL AIP 2.8 2015 Comprehensive Department Review Template
Standard I.B.6: The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

Improvement Plan I.B.6: Institutional Planning and Resource Allocation

Evaluate and modify, if needed, the effectiveness of the revised Institutional Planning Framework, including the resource allocation processes.

The College routinely reviews the planning and budget allocation processes as outlined in the 2012 Integrated Planning Guide. An internal evaluation of the planning and budget allocation processes revealed a degree of cumbersome routines that lacked cohesion. To increase effectiveness, planning and budgeting processes were clarified and streamlined through program and department review to define an evidence-based approach for resource requests. To this end, new templates for annual and comprehensive program and department review were subsequently approved (COL AIP 3.1 Academic Senate Minutes [Action Items, p. 2] 5-5-15). The 2012 Planning Guide was also revised in fall 2015 to reflect a focus on integrated planning for institutional effectiveness (COL AIP 3.2 PIEAC Minutes 9-16-15; COL AIP 3.3 2015 Planning Guide).

Following annual program and department review, prioritization of resource requests is established by the appropriate Wing Planning Council (i.e., Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, and President’s Wing), and ultimately sent to PIEAC for College-wide prioritization based on evidence and dialog (COL AIP 3.4 2015-2016 Priority Ranking).

The Improvement Plan has been completed, and the College meets the Standard.

List of Evidence, Institutional Planning and Resource Allocation

COL AIP 3.1 Academic Senate Minutes [Action Items, p. 2] 5-5-15
COL AIP 3.2 PIEAC Minutes 9-16-15
COL AIP 3.3 2015 Planning Guide
COL AIP 3.4 2015-2016 Priority Ranking
Standard II.A.2.f: The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies.

Improvement Plan II.A.2.f: Student Learning Outcome Data Collection

In Spring 2013 evaluate the efficacy of Seaport\textsuperscript{3} SLO technical applications and related procedures to collect useful student achievement data and to effect improvements in student outcomes.

Program and course-level SLO achievement are discussed twice a year at the All College convocation meetings at the beginning of fall and spring terms (COL AIP 4.1 2014 Spring All-College Meeting Agenda; COL AIP 4.2 2015 Spring All-College Meeting Agenda). This facilitates faculty coming together and planning based on course- and program-level student learning outcome data. Subsequently, this information is also recorded within the annual and comprehensive program review process (COL AIP 4.3 2015 Program and Department Review Handbook; COL AIP 4.4 2015 Annual Program Review Template; COL AIP 4.5 2015 Annual Department Review Template; COL AIP 4.6 2015 Comprehensive Program Review Template; COL AIP 4.7 2015 Comprehensive Department Review Template). In this way, academic programs have effectively integrated SLO review and discussion into a centralized planning document that support the development of future programmatic plans and resource requests.

The Improvement Plan has been completed, and the College meets the Standard.

List of Evidence, Student Learning Outcome Data Collection
COL AIP 4.1 2014 Spring All-College Meeting Agenda
COL AIP 4.2 2015 Spring All-College Meeting Agenda
COL AIP 4.3 2015 Program and Department Review Handbook
COL AIP 4.4 2015 Annual Program Review Template
COL AIP 4.5 2015 Annual Department Review Template
COL AIP 4.6 2015 Comprehensive Program Review Template
COL AIP 4.7 2015 Comprehensive Department Review Template
Standard II.B.3.e: The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.

**Improvement Plan II.B.3.e: Placement Exams for International Programs**

Evaluate the effectiveness and fairness of placement exams and practices used with students in international programs.

The Education Bound United States (EBUS) program was the only active international program at the time of the 2012-2013 Institutional Self Evaluation Report. The program was created by the College’s contract education division and was designed to offer English language instruction and Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) courses leading to an associate’s degree for high-school-aged non-U.S. nationals living in China. However, the program has no active student enrollment and has been inactive since spring 2014, therefore there is no test currently in place. The improvement plan is on hold until the College determines the viability of supporting an international program. When the program is reinitiated, an appropriate test will be created and its results validated.

The Improvement Plan is on hold, but the College meets the Standard.

**(EBUS) Standard II.A.2.e:** The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an ongoing systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.

**Improvement Plan II.A.2.e: EBUS Program Review**

*Complete a program review for EBUS in 2012.*

Although a program review for EBUS was completed in 2012-2013, the EBUS program is currently inactive ([COL AIP 5.1 Program & Department Review Minutes 12-10-12](COL_AIP_5.1_Program_Department_Review_Minutes_12-10-12); [COL AIP 5.2 2012-2013 EBUS Program Review Validation Report](COL_AIP_5.2_2012-2013_EBUS_Program_Review_V). The program has been inactive since spring 2014 due to no enrollment. There were challenges related to number of participants and expectations between the College’s international high school partner and the College. The validation report highlighted several challenges facing the pilot project. Therefore, the viability of offering an international program is currently being analyzed by the College.

The Improvement Plan has been completed, and the College meets the Standard.

**List of Evidence, EBUS Program Review**

[COL AIP 5.1 Program & Department Review Minutes 12-10-12](COL_AIP_5.1_Program_Department_Review_Minutes_12-10-12)

[COL AIP 5.2 2012-2013 EBUS Program Review Validation Report](COL_AIP_5.2_2012-2013_EBUS_Program_Review_V)
Standard II.C.1: The institution supports the quality of its instructional programs by providing library and other learning support services that are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to facilitate educational offerings, regardless of location or means of delivery.

Improvement Plan II.C.1: Library and Learning Support Resources

Coastline will develop strategies to increase student and faculty awareness and use of library and learning support resources and services to promote student success.

The College’s Virtual Library provides instant access to electronic resources such as ebooks, peer-reviewed journals, primary and secondary source material, and a wide variety of learning support materials for all disciplines and programs at the College. The full-time librarian regularly makes announcements in meetings, campus gatherings, and class sessions to communicate availability to assist students, staff, and faculty in accessing library materials. She also conducts library orientations and in-class presentations, and maintains the development of the library website (COL AIP 6.1 2015-2016 Library Annual Department Review).

The Library webpage provides access to video and print tutorials on relevant information competency skills. The Library is also promoting open educational resource (OER) material to provide economical options to faculty and students. Library Science C110, the 2-unit credit information competency course, is seeking an OER textbook as its primary text. The librarian regularly disseminates information about OER resources within various groups and committees. Prior to launching a marketing campaign, it was necessary to stabilize and improve the webpage, library resource collection, and learning support materials. The marketing campaign is planned for launch in spring 2016. The campaign will feature both online, onsite, and print components. Data collected before and after the campaign will be collected and analyzed to determine which approach is most effective in increasing student and faculty awareness of the library’s educational offerings.
The Student Success Center has expanded to offer learning assistance (tutoring) to all students across all disciplines and serves more than 2,000 students annually via drop-in tutoring at one of the Student Success Centers, course-embedded tutoring in specific course sections, supplemental instruction, and online tutoring via Skype or email (COL AIP 6.2 2014-2015 Student Success Center Fact Sheet; COL AIP 6.3 Fall 2015 Course Embedded Tutoring and Supplemental Instruction List). Located at each of Coastline’s four learning centers, the Student Success Center provides drop-in tutoring for all major subject areas with an emphasis on self-efficacy and study skills. The Centers employ tutors who are hourly employees who undergo training through EDUC C101: Tutor Training, a 0.5 unit course that focuses on andragogy and current student success frameworks and initiatives such as Reading Apprenticeship and Growth Mindset.

The Student Success Center maintains a website (coastline.edu/ssc) to promote its services, and regularly features scrolling banners on the homepage of the College. Each Success Center is staffed by tutors who specialize in writing, math, science, or accounting. In this way, tutors are equipped to provide assistance to any student in any class. Advertising occurs through posters, flyers, schedules, class visitations, and announcements at various committee and group meetings (COL AIP 6.4 Spring 2016 Student Success Centers Schedule). Success Center tutors also operate in other programs and departments, such as EOPS and the Transfer Center at the Garden Grove Learning Center. In this way, the spread and reach of learning assistance continues to blend with all major programs and services at the College.

The increased advertising and integration of the Success Center locations as study hubs for student gathering, combined with the expansion of course-embedded tutoring and supplemental instruction, have led to the rapid growth of the Student Success Centers as central to the Mission of the College to support and foster student success, as evidenced by student learning outcome achievement data featured in the annual department review for the Student Success Centers (COL AIP 6.5 2015-2016 Student Success Centers Annual Department Review).

The Improvement Plan has been completed, and the College meets the Standard.

**List of Evidence, Library and Learning Support Resources**

- COL AIP 6.1 2015-2016 Library Annual Department Review
- COL AIP 6.2 2014-2015 Student Success Center Fact Sheet
- COL AIP 6.3 Fall 2015 Course Embedded Tutoring and Supplemental Instruction List
- COL AIP 6.4 Spring 2016 Student Success Centers Schedule
- COL AIP 6.5 2015-2016 Student Success Centers Annual Department Review
Standard II.C.2: The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

Improvement Plan II.C.2: Learning Support Center Outcomes for the Information Commons

Develop and assess Student Learning Outcomes and goals for the Information Commons as a Learning Support Center.

In fall 2013 service auxiliary outcomes (student learning outcomes) were developed for the Information Commons as a learning support center (COL AIP 7.1 Information Commons Service Auxiliary Outcomes). The outcomes were assessed via College-wide student survey in spring 2014, and the results published as an addendum to the department review document (COL AIP 7.2 2013-2014 Information Commons Annual Department Review Addendum).

The outcomes were focused on awareness of the center, its services, and whether students believed their grades and computer application skills had improved as a result of using the Information Commons. Additionally, the Student Success Center, originally located at the Le-Jao Center in Westminster, expanded to the Garden Grove Center by placing tutors in the Information Commons in spring 2013 (COL AIP 7.3 2013 Student Success Center Comprehensive Department Review [Part 3]). In 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, the tutoring service at the Information Commons has continued to grow, and the service auxiliary outcomes established for the Student Success Centers now apply to the learning support services in the Information Commons (COL AIP 7.4 2015-2016 Student Success Centers Annual Department Review).

Through the annual department review process, both the Garden Grove Center and the Student Success Centers find ways to continue to support the Information Commons as a learning support center through common initiatives and goals (COL AIP 7.5 2015-2016 Educational Centers Annual Review [Garden Grove Center, Progress on Forward Strategy Initiative(s)])

With the establishment of learning outcomes for the Information Commons as a Learning Support Center, the operation of tutoring through the Student Success Center, and the regular assessment of these services and outcomes, the self-identified improvement plan has been achieved.

The Improvement Plan has been completed and the College meets the Standard.
List of Evidence, Learning Support Center Outcomes for the Information Commons

COL AIP 7.1 Information Commons Service Auxiliary Outcomes
COL AIP 7.2 2013-2014 Information Commons Annual Department Review Addendum
COL AIP 7.3 2013 Student Success Center Comprehensive Department Review [Part 3]
COL AIP 7.4 2015-2016 Student Success Centers Annual Department Review
COL AIP 7.5 2015-2016 Educational Centers Annual Review [Garden Grove Center, Progress on Forward Strategy Initiative(s)]
Standard III.A.1.b: The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

Improvement Plan III.A.1.b: Completion of Certificated Evaluations

Work with the District to develop a plan to ensure that certificated evaluations are completed in a timely manner.

District Human Resources has assigned additional resources to provide timely data entry and filing of employee evaluations into Banner. As discussed in College Recommendation 6 in this report, an interim agreement has been established between the College and District Human Resources to provide a list of all active part-time faculty employees and their most recent evaluation dates. The College will manage the tracking of this employee group through the end of spring 2016. Afterwards, part-time faculty will be integrated into NEOGOV.

As discussed in the response to Recommendation 6, the District and the College are putting into place an online evaluation tracking tool, NEOGOV-Perform, that will continue to increase the efficiency of systematic and regular employee evaluation. The system is scheduled for implementation and use in summer 2016.

The Improvement Plan has been completed, and the College meets the Standard.
Standard III.C.1.c: The institution systematically plans, acquires, maintains, and upgrades or replaces technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs.

Improvement Plan III.C.1.c: Fund Predictable Financial Obligations

Assess and refine the planning and budgeting process in order to fund predictable financial obligations, such as instructional (e.g., computer labs) and non-instructional equipment replacement, including technology equipment (e.g., College network upgrades), that will predetermine the allocation of funds.

The 2015 Planning Guide outlines the College practices regarding budgeting and planning specifically with long and short term replacement of technology and equipment (COL AIP 8.1 2015 Planning Guide). In 2013-2014 the District received Measure M bond funds that provided a refresh to all entities within the District for computers, classroom technology, infrastructure, and building upgrades. The Distance Learning and Technology Committee meets on a regular basis to provide recommendations to the program/department, College planning committees, and District technology planning on emerging needs. The Administrative Services Wing developed an equipment replacement plan for vehicles outlined with the program review and Wing Planning process to ensure that vehicles and equipment are being replaced in a timely manner to increase operational efficiency.

Since 2013-2014 the College has used an evidence-based priority budget allocation rubric, contained in the 2015 Planning Guide, that utilizes findings from the program and department review process to develop a prioritization process for the Wing Planning Councils. The program and department review templates utilize an evidence-driven method that attempts to connect initiatives and budget allocation requests to the College Mission. This is performed through the assessment of learning/service outcomes, internal and external research, and alignment with College goals. The prioritization and supporting documentation is incorporated into a program or department planning prioritization map, which is featured in section 6 of the annual department and program review templates (see COL 3.8 and 3.9).

After undergoing validation review by the Program and Department Review Committee, the documents are sent to their respective wing planning council for discussion, and resource requests are prioritized by the appropriate wing. Wing prioritization requests are then forwarded to PIEAC for discussion and final prioritization/recommendation.

The Improvement Plan has been completed, and the College meets the Standard.

List of Evidence, Fund Predictable Financial Obligations

COL AIP 8.1 2015 Planning Guide
Standard IV.B.1.e: The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.

Improvement Plan IV.B.1.e: Complete Review of All Existing Board Policies

The District will complete the review of all existing Board policies by the end of Spring 2013.

The development and implementation of BP 2410 (DIS AIP 1.1) and AP 2410 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures (DIS AIP 1.2) in March 2012 helped to clarify the process and responsibilities for revision and/or creation of policies and procedures. AP 2410 has been followed consistently since its ratification and has ensured that, with an established schedule that calls for reviewing and updating all existing board policies and administrative procedures on a four-year cycle, those responsible, and the District overall, stay on track.

In spring 2012, the Board of Trustees approved and directed staff to work on realigning the board policies and administrative procedures to conform to the chapter and numbering structure recommended by the Community College League of California (CCLC) (DIS AIP 1.3 Board Meeting Minutes 3-21-12). 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. The Board of Trustees approved the implementation of the proposed recommendations at the August 1, 2012, meeting.

The Vice Chancellor of Educational Services and Technology has continued to provide overall coordination for this process.

The District has continued to follow the process defined in BP 2410 and AP 2410 for revision of existing board policies and administrative procedures and creation of new ones, as needed. A schedule for continued review and updating of all board policies and administrative procedures within a four-year cycle has been established, followed, and continuously updated.

As of January 2016, of the total 177 board policies currently in place only 13 have not had their revision finalized. These 13 board policies are in various stages in the revision process. These board policies have required discussions with the District Collective Bargaining Units and thus have taken longer to complete. It is expected that the revision of these 13 board policies will be completed by May 2016. In addition, 95 Administrative Procedures have been revised or created since January 2012.
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 but 13 of its existing board policies and administrative procedures and created new ones, as needed. A schedule for continued review and updating of all board policies and administrative procedures within a four-year cycle has been established and has been followed.

The Improvement Plan has been completed, and the College meets the Standard.

**List of Evidence, Complete Review of All Existing Board Policies**

- DIS AIP 1.1  BP 2410 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures
- DIS AIP 1.2  AP 2410 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures
- DIS AIP 1.3  Board Meeting Minutes 3-21-12
Standard IV.B.1.g: The governing board’s self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.

Improvement Plan IV.B.1.g: Completion of Evaluation Process

The Board will model best practices of continuous improvement by completing its evaluation process, taking appropriate action in response to the evaluation summary.

In August 2012, the Board of Trustees revised Board Policy 2745 Board Self Evaluation (DIS AIP 2.1) and developed a new process for its evaluation, which was implemented in fall 2013. The revised process included, in addition to a self-evaluation by the Board members, a 360-degree evaluation of the Board through a survey sent to all District employees, development of Board goals, and development of action plans relative to the Board goals.

In fall 2013, the Board of Trustees conducted its evaluation consistent with the revised Board Policy 2745. On October 16, 2013, the Board discussed the evaluation results during a study session for this purpose (DIS AIP 2.2 Board of Trustees Meeting Agenda and Minutes 10-16-2013; DIS AIP 2.3 Board of Trustees Self Evaluation; DIS AIP 2.4 Survey Results of District Employees Regarding the Board of Trustees).

Actions taken as a result of the evaluation were determined at the public meetings held on 10/16/2013 and 11/6/2013. This resulted in identifying goals and action plans for the Board of Trustees (DIS AIP 2.5 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.

Consistent with BP 2745, the Board of Trustees conducted a comprehensive self-evaluation again in fall 2015. The survey sent to all employees in fall 2013 was administered again in fall 2015 with a deadline to respond of October 19, 2015 (DIS AIP 2.6 Email from Board President to All District Employees 9-30-15; DIS AIP 2.7 Email from Board President to All District Employees 10-13-15). The Board discussed its evaluation at the November 4, 2015 Board meeting as well as its previous goals (DIS AIP 2.8 11-4-2015 Board Agenda Item on Board Evaluation; DIS AIP 2.9 BOT Self-Eval Report 2013-2015; DIS AIP 2.10 Survey of District Employees Regarding Board; DIS AIP 2.11 2013-2014 Board Goals + Added Goals). At the November 18, 2015 Board meeting, new Board goals for 2015-17 were discussed (DIS AIP 2.12 11-18-2015 Board Agenda Item on Adoption of Board Goals and Plans; DIS AIP 2.13 2015-2017 Board Goals 11-18-2015).

The Improvement Plan has been completed, and the College meets the Standard.
List of Evidence, Completion of Evaluation Process

DIS AIP 2.1 BP 2745 Board Self Evaluation
DIS AIP 2.2 Board of Trustees Meeting Agenda and Minutes 10-16-2013
DIS AIP 2.3 Board of Trustees Self Evaluation
DIS AIP 2.4 Survey Results of District Employees Regarding the Board of Trustees
DIS AIP 2.5 Goals and Action Plans Adopted at the November 6, 2013 Board Meeting
DIS AIP 2.6 Email from Board President to All District Employees 9-30-15
DIS AIP 2.7 Email from Board President to All District Employees 10-13-15
DIS AIP 2.8 11-4-2015 Board Agenda Item on Board Evaluation
DIS AIP 2.10 Survey of District Employees Regarding Board
DIS AIP 2.11 2013-2014 Board Goals + Added Goals
DIS AIP 2.12 11-18-2015 Board Agenda Item on Adoption of Board Goals and Plans
Standard IV.B.1.j: The governing board has the responsibility for selecting & evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively. In multi-college districts/systems, the governing board establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting & evaluating the presidents of the colleges.

Improvement Plan IV.B.1.j: Delegation of Authority

The College encourages the Board to continue to work on clarifying the delegation of authority through the development of an administrative procedure related to BP 2201 Board of Trustees’ Standards for Administration.

Board Policy 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO was revised in December 2013 to more specifically define the delegation of authority to the Chancellor and the College Presidents and combined two different board policies which were overlapping (former BP 2201 Standards of Administration and BP 2430 Delegation of Authority). A new administrative procedure was created and ratified by the Board in December 2013 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 (DIS AIP 3.1, BP and AP 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO). The delegation of authority to the CEO and College Presidents as stated in BP and AP 2430 has been followed consistently since December 2013.

The Improvement Plan has been completed and the College meets the Standard.

List of Evidence, Delegation of Authority

DIS AIP 3.1 BP and AP 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO
Standard IV.B.3.g: The district/system regularly evaluates district/system role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Improvement Plan IV.B.3.g: Development of an Administrative Review Process

The College recommends that the District Office develop and implement an administrative program review process for self-improvement of its services to the colleges.

The District Office developed an approach and process for conducting administrative program reviews for the District Office departments in spring 2013 (DIS AIP 4.1. Coast Community College District Program Review for District Office Units). The first ever program review for District Office departments was conducted in fall 2013. The results from this first program review supported staff augmentations for the District Human Resources Offices and changes in the Risk Services Department. The process called for an annual program review cycle. As a result of the changes in the Chancellor position starting in August 2014, the process has been suspended pending the hiring of a permanent Chancellor. Pending the hiring of a permanent Chancellor, the program review process for District Office departments will need to be revisited.

The Improvement Plan has been partially addressed, but the District meets the Standard.

List of Evidence, Development of an Administrative Review Process
DIS AIP 4.1 Coast Community College District Program Review for District Office Units
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