

EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

Coastline College
11460 Warner Avenue
Fountain Valley, CA 92708

This report represents the findings of the peer review team that visited
Coastline Community College from February 25, 2019 to February 28, 2019.

Donald G. Wallace, Ph.D.
Team Chair

Contents

Summary of Evaluation Report	4
Introduction.....	7
Eligibility Requirements	8
Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies.....	9
Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment.....	9
Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement	10
Credits, Program Length, and Tuition	11
Transfer Policies	12
Distance Education and Correspondence Education	13
Student Complaints.....	14
Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials.....	15
Standard I.....	17
I.A. Mission	17
I.B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness	18
I.C. Institutional Integrity	21
Standard II.....	24
II.A. Instructional Programs	24
II.B. Library and Learning Support Services.....	29
II.C. Student Support Services.....	31
Standard III	34
III.A. Human Resources	34
III.B. Physical Resources	37
III.C. Technology Resources	38
General Observations:.....	38
III.D. Financial Resources	39
Standard IV	42
IV.A. Decision-Making Roles & Processes.....	42
IV.B. Chief Executive Officer	44
IV.C. Governing Board.....	46
IV.D. Multi-College Districts or Systems.....	50
Quality Focus Essay.....	54

**Coastline College
Comprehensive Evaluation Visit**

Team Roster

TEAM CHAIR

Dr. Donald G. Wallace
Palo Verde College
Superintendent/President

TEAM ASSISTANT

Mr. Brian Thieboux
Palo Verde College
Instructor, English and Business

ACADEMIC MEMBERS

Dr. Bernadette Anayah
Folsom Lake College
Professor of English as a Second Language

Dr. Janet Fulks
Bakersfield College
Professor of Biology

Dr. Kathryn Nette
Cuyamaca College
Professor of Biology

Dr. Alicia Virtue
Santa Rosa Junior College
Sr. Dean, Learning Resources and
Educational Technology

ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS

Dr. Dyrell Foster
Moreno Valley College
Vice President of Student Services

Mr. Mario Rodriguez
Los Rios Community College District
Associate Vice Chancellor of Finance

Dr. Bobbi Villalobos
Los Angeles Harbor College
Vice President of Academic Affairs

Dr. Ryan Carnal
Cuesta College
Director of Institutional Research and
Assessment

ACCJC STAFF LIAISON

Dr. Stephanie Droker
ACCJC
Senior Vice President

Summary of Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION: Coastline College

DATES OF VISIT: February 25 to February 28, 2019

TEAM CHAIR: Donald G. Wallace, Ph.D.

Preparations for the peer review team visit began many months prior to the team's arrival at Coastline College. Palo Verde College Superintendent/President Dr. Donald Wallace was selected by ACCJC in July 2018 to serve as team chair. Dr. Wallace subsequently asked Palo Verde College English and Business Instructor Brian Thiebaut to serve as his team assistant. By the end of 2018, ACCJC had organized the full visiting team, consisting of eight community college administrators and faculty from throughout California. Also serving on the team was ACCJC Senior Vice President Stephanie Droker, whose role was to provide advice and consultation to the team, but not to serve in a reviewer or evaluator capacity.

Dr. Wallace attended Team Leader training on December 5, 2018. Subsequently, Dr. Wallace and Mr. Thiebaut travelled to Coastline College January 23, 2019, to meet, on a pre-visit basis, with President Loretta Adrian and Vice President of Administrative Services Christine Nguyen to tour the distributed campus sites and to discuss plans and preparations in detail for the upcoming visit.

The full Coastline peer review team met February 5, 2019, for a required one-day training session presented by ACCJC. By that time, the team had the opportunity to read Coastline's ISER and to prepare the first of two written reports on their preliminary observations and findings. Team members were assigned by Dr. Wallace to specific standards on which they were to work during the visit. Because Coastline is part of a multi-college district, three members of the Coastline team—Dr. Wallace, Mr. Mario Rodriguez and Dr. Bernadette Anayah—also served on the district-level team consisting of representatives from the Orange Coast College and Golden West College visiting teams. Their responsibility was to evaluate the district on the basis of Standards IV.C and IV.D. Coastline team findings for two standards, I.C.7 and III.D.7, apply to the district-level report, as well.

The peer review team was provided a comfortable and private team room in which to work in the Fountain Valley College Center site. Coastline ALO Dr. Vince Rodriguez provided invaluable assistance in helping make the visit productive and enjoyable. Dr. Rodriguez responded promptly to the team's request for documents, for meetings with college personnel, for logistics arrangements where travel between sites was required and for advice on finding the right person to talk to in order to address the team's questions. He prepared a daily meeting schedule, often updating it several times throughout the day. The schedule quickly became an important tool that helped organize the team's time efficiently and productively.

Because the peer review team had studied the ISER and supporting documents well in advance of the visit, members focused on meetings and interviews with college personnel to help clarify and amplify what they had read in the college's materials. Not counting interviews at the district

office in Costa Mesa, the Coastline team conducted 25 interviews, including two open forums—one at the Newport Beach site, the other the College Center in Fountain Valley. Most of the interviews were conducted at the College Center facility and consisted of meetings with faculty, administrators, and staff who played a role in one or more areas covered by the various standards. Both of the open forums lasted about an hour in length, and both were attended by faculty, staff and students. The Newport Beach forum was attended by ten persons; the College Center forum was attended by over fifty.

Having prepared portions of the evaluation report in the days and weeks leading up to the visit, peer review team members devoted much of their time in the team room—after completing scheduled meetings and interviews—discussing findings with team colleagues and revising, correcting, and expanding upon their preliminary write-ups. As the evaluation report evolved over the four days of the visit, drafts were posted each day to a Google Docs site for team members to review, reflect upon, and discuss.

The final result of all these efforts is presented in this External Evaluation Report. Each standard and subsection was carefully reviewed by one or more team members for accuracy and consistency with other portions of the report.

The commendations and recommendations for the college were developed in a highly collaborative spirit with the objective to convey to the college areas the team identified as exhibiting exemplary strength, as well as areas needing improvement. The Coastline team identified one commendation and one recommendation to improve effectiveness, and these are described elsewhere in the report. The district-level team identified one commendation and two recommendations to improve effectiveness. These are described elsewhere in the report, as well.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2019 External Evaluation Team

COMMENDATIONS

Team Commendation 1 for Coastline College:

The peer review team commends the college for its robust and effective pedagogical approaches, delivery, and specialized student support and library services to its military and incarcerated student populations. These exemplary programs demonstrate the college's mission to support equity, access and success. (II.A.7, II.B.1)

Team Commendation 1 for the District:

The chancellor is commended for his ability to promote a calming leadership style and to communicate effectively about college and district governance roles, resulting in a climate that emphasizes a strong sense of confidence about college and district operations. (IV.D.2, IV.D.4)

RECOMMENDATIONS

Team Recommendation 1 for Coastline College to Improve Effectiveness:

In order to improve effectiveness, the peer review team recommends the college engage in continuous sustainable documented assessment processes across the entire institution, for all delivery modes, and assure that in every class section students receive a syllabus that includes SLOs consistent with the institution's officially approved course outlines or record. (I.B.4, I.C.3, II.A.3)

Team Recommendation 1 for the District to Improve Effectiveness:

In order to improve effectiveness, the peer review team recommends that governing board policy be revised to reflect the district's commitment to academic freedom for all constituencies, including students. (I.C.7)

Team Recommendation 2 for the District to Improve Effectiveness:

In order to improve effectiveness, the peer review team recommends that the district should ensure audit findings are responded to and resolved in a timely manner. (III.D.7)

Introduction

Coastline College is one of three accredited institutions in the Coast Community College District, with distributed sites in Garden Grove, Newport Beach, and Westminster. Student services and administrative offices are located at the Fountain Valley facility. The college also provides educational opportunities online for students within and outside the district.

The college serves a diverse student population: 30.8 percent White, 20.7 percent Asian-Pacific Islander, 17.4 percent Hispanic, 13.6 percent Multi-Ethnicity, 12.5 percent African-American, 4.4 percent Unknown, and 0.7 percent American Indian-AK Native. Coastline is a federally designated Asian-American and Native-American Pacific Islander-Serving Institution and a Hispanic-Serving Institution. The majority of Coastline students are part-time (91.6 percent). The median age is thirty.

Coastline offers ten associate degrees for transfer, 40 associate of arts degrees, 14 associate of science degrees, and 61 certificates. The college offers 42 degrees and 32 certificate programs that are entirely online. Currently, 83 percent of students complete classes through distance and hybrid education. Specifically, the college serves 51.9 percent of students online and also provides education to an incarcerated population via correspondence courses.

Last year, the college enrolled 26,434 students, unduplicated count, consisting of 20,288 (76.7 percent) state apportionment-funded credit students, 1,934 (7.3 percent) state apportionment-funded non-credit students, and 4,212 (15.9 percent) non-apportionment credit students through the Extended Learning program.

In view of the high proportion of Coastline's online enrollment and the variety of instructional programs, some departments operate differently from what might be found at other California community colleges. The Extended Learning program, for example, is an ancillary operation of the college and provides courses, training and services to clients in industry, the business community, and government agencies. The largest program is the Military Distance Education Program, serving thousands of active duty personnel, veterans, and military dependents worldwide. For nearly 40 years, the college has served the military community by offering instructional programs and services developed specifically to meet the needs of this population. Extended Learning provides both instructional and student services support for students through a case management approach. Processes and procedures are customized to meet the needs of the clients and their students.

The college is currently undertaking transformation efforts to align with the national *guided pathways* movement. Coastline's *guided pathways* program seeks to adapt institutional policies and practices to better support all students in achieving their goals. The college is committed to improving the student experience, reducing students' time to completion, minimizing the required units students earn to graduate and reducing equity gaps. The college is exploring the development of a unified approach to college-wide professional development, the ongoing improvement of internal and external communication and the utilization of student learning outcomes data to make informed decisions to improve course quality

Eligibility Requirements

Eligibility Requirement 1: Authority

The peer review team confirms that Coastline College is authorized by the State of California, the Board of Governors of the California Community College System, and the Board of Trustees of the college to operate as a degree-granting educational system in California. Coastline College is authorized by federal and state agencies to deliver programs and services outside the State of California. Coastline College meets ER 1.

Eligibility Requirement 2: Operational Status

The peer review team confirms the college enrolls approximately 26,000 students who are actively pursuing degree and certificate programs or transfer preparation for eventual enrollment in a four-year college or university. Coastline College meets ER 2.

Eligibility Requirement 3: Degrees

The peer review team confirms that the college offers approximately 54 associate degrees and 61 certificates in a wide range of disciplines. All of the college's degree programs are two academic years in length while certificate program length varies. Coastline College meets ER 3.

Eligibility Requirement 4: Chief Executive Officer

The peer review team confirms that the Coastline College Board of Trustees appoints a president whose full-time responsibility is to Coastline College and who possesses the requisite authority to administer board policies. The president of Coastline College does not serve as the chair of the Board of Trustees. Because the current president, Dr. Loretta Adrian, has served as president continuously since the last comprehensive site visit, there have been no staffing changes requiring communication to the commission. Coastline College meets ER 4.

Eligibility Requirement 5: Financial Accountability

The peer review team confirms that Coastline College annually undergoes and makes available an external financial audit by a certified public accountant. The college monitors and manages student loan default rates, revenue streams, and assets to ensure compliance with federal requirements, including Title IV of the Higher Education Act, and comes into compliance when the federal government identifies deficiencies. Coastline College meets ER 5.

Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies

The evaluation items detailed in this Checklist are those which fall specifically under federal regulations and related Commission policies, beyond what is articulated in the Accreditation Standards; other evaluation items under ACCJC standards may address the same or similar subject matter. The peer review team evaluated the institution’s compliance with Standards as well as the specific Checklist elements from federal regulations and related Commission policies noted here.

Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment

Evaluation

Items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive evaluation visit.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution cooperates with the evaluation team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution demonstrates compliance with the <i>Commission Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions</i> as to third party comment.

[Regulation citation: 602.23(b).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative: The team confirmed that the college sought third-party comment in advance of the evaluation visit and received no third-party comment.

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

Evaluation Items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. Course completion is included as one of these elements of student achievement. Other elements of student achievement performance for measurement have been determined as appropriate to the institution's mission. (Standard I.B.3 and Section B. Presentation of Student Achievement Data and Institution-set Standards)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance within each instructional program, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. The defined elements include, but are not limited to, job placement rates for program completers, and for programs in fields where licensure is required, the licensure examination passage rates for program completers. (Standard I.B.3 and Section B. Presentation of Student Achievement Data and Institution-set Standards)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution-set standards for programs and across the institution are relevant to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement; the defined elements and expected performance levels are appropriate within higher education; the results are reported regularly across the campus; and the definition of elements and results are used in program-level and institution-wide planning to evaluate how well the institution fulfills its mission, to determine needed changes, to allocating resources, and to make improvements. (Standard I.B.3, Standard I.B.9)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level. (Standard I.B.4)

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(i); 602.17(f); 602.19 (a-e).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative: The peer review team recommends follow-up to ensure the college maintains continuous assessment of all student learning and achievement results and that improvement actions are implemented where results do not achieve stated goals. See Team Recommendation 1 for Coastline College to Improve Effectiveness and findings for Standards I.B.4, I.C.3, and II.A.3.

Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Evaluation Items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education (in policy and procedure). (Standard II.A.9)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The assignment of credit hours and degree program lengths is verified by the institution, and is reliable and accurate across classroom based courses, laboratory classes, distance education classes, and for courses that involve clinical practice (if applicable to the institution). (Standard II.A.9)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tuition is consistent across degree programs (or there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition). (Standard I.C.2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Any clock hour conversions to credit hours adhere to the Department of Education’s conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice. (Standard II.A.9)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission <i>Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits</i> .

[Regulation citations: 600.2 (definition of credit hour); 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.24(e), (f); 668.2; 668.9.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative: The team confirmed that the college’s credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education in policy and procedure.

Transfer Policies

Evaluation Items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public. (Standard II.A.10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer. (Standard II.A.10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution complies with the Commission <i>Policy on Transfer of Credit</i> .

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.17(a)(3); 602.24(e); 668.43(a)(ii).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative: The team confirms that the college's transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public and contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer.

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

Evaluation Items:

For Distance Education:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution demonstrates regular and substantive interaction between students and the instructor.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution demonstrates comparable learning support services and student support services for distance education students. (Standards II.B.1, II.C.1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution verifies that the student who registers in a distance education program is the same person who participates every time and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit.
For Correspondence Education:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution demonstrates comparable learning support services and student support services for correspondence education students. (Standards II.B.1, II.C.1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution verifies that the student who registers in a correspondence education program is the same person who participates every time and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit.
Overall:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offerings. (Standard III.C.1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission <i>Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education</i> .

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi); 602.17(g); 668.38.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the Institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The college does not offer Distance Education or Correspondence Education.

Narrative: The team confirms that for distance education courses the college demonstrates regular and substantive interaction between students and the instructor. The team confirms that for distance education and correspondence education courses the college demonstrates comparable learning support services and student support services as for students enrolled in

face-to-face courses. The team confirms that the college verifies that the student who registers in a distance education program or correspondence program is the same person who participates every time and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit.

Student Complaints

Evaluation Items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The student complaint files for the previous seven years (since the last comprehensive evaluation) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint policies and procedures.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The team analysis of the student complaint files identifies any issues that may be indicative of the institution’s noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution posts on its website the names of associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities. (Standard I.C.1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission <i>Policy on Representation of Accredited Status</i> and the <i>Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions</i> .

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(ix); 668.43.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative: The team confirms that the college’s policies and practices are consistent with applicable regulations dealing with student complaints.

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

Evaluation Items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution provides accurate, timely (current), and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies. (Standard I.C.2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution complies with the Commission <i>Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Policy on Representation of Accredited Status</i> .
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution provides required information concerning its accredited status.(Standard I.C.12)

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(vii); 668.6.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative: The team confirms that the college provides accurate, timely, and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies.

Title IV Compliance
Evaluation Items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program, including findings from any audits and program or other review activities by the USDE. (Standard III.D.15)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If applicable, the institution has addressed any issues raised by the USDE as to financial responsibility requirements, program record-keeping, etc. If issues were not timely addressed, the institution demonstrates it has the fiscal and administrative capacity to timely address issues in the future and to retain compliance with Title IV program requirements. (Standard III.D.15)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If applicable, the institution’s student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by the USDE. Remedial efforts have been undertaken when default rates near or meet a level outside the acceptable range. (Standard III.D.15)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If applicable, contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive educational, library, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required. (Standard III.D.16)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission <i>Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations</i> and the <i>Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV</i> .

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(v); 602.16(a)(1)(x); 602.19(b); 668.5; 668.15; 668.16; 668.71 et seq.]

Conclusion Check-Off:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative: The team confirms that the college complies with Federal Title IV regulations and USDE requirements.

Standard I

Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

I.A. Mission

General Observations:

Coastline College's vision and mission statements describe the institution's educational purposes, intended student population, and commitment to learning and student achievement. The mission is expressed in related college documents that mention the types of degrees and credentials offered by the college as well as their commitment to provide access for a wide range of student populations. The mission statement is reviewed bi-annually, and its elements are aligned with college goals. Data are used to determine how well the college is accomplishing its mission and the planning goals that spring from it. The college's overall integrated planning process including the institution's programs and services are aligned with its mission and the mission clearly guides institutional decision-making, planning and resource allocation.

Findings and Evidence:

The college's vision and mission statements describe in specific terms its overall educational purposes, intended student population, and commitment to student achievement. In meeting with members of the College Council, it is evident that institutional leaders, faculty members, classified professionals, and students maintain a sustained focus on student learning and achievement through dialog, decision making, and the development of policies, procedures, and practices of the college. (I.A.1)

The college provided clear evidence that substantiates the college's use of a set of key performance indicators (KPIs) to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission. The data is grouped according to each of the 2016-2020 college goals, including the following: student success, completion, and achievement; instructional and programmatic excellence; access and student support; and student retention and persistence. The 2016-2020 Educational Master Plan is grounded by the mission. PIEAC and other college committees discuss and review annual KPI performance results which informs dialog about institutional priorities in meeting the educational needs of students. (I.A.2)

The college's programs and services are aligned with the mission. The mission is central to guiding institutional decision-making, planning, and resource allocation as evidenced in the college's Integrated Planning Handbook and the Program and Department Review Handbook in which the planning and resource allocation process require demonstrating alignment with the college mission, college goals, and corroborated data. Furthermore, the process provides clarity with planning and decision-making and promotes an integration of primary and secondary plans, their alignment to mission and college goals, an analysis of KPI data, which informs planning and the resource allocation process. The process ensures alignment among the various college plans and Program/Department Review so that all major wings of the college (i.e., Instruction,

Student Services, Administrative Services, and President's Office) operate in clear support of the mission. (I.A.3)

The college's mission is widely published, it appears on the college website, is found on all major published documents of the college, and it is posted throughout the campuses. Board of Trustees' minutes show that the mission statement was approved by the board in spring 2017. The college mission is reviewed bi-annually and is updated as necessary. The college has a clear planning timeline within the college's Integrated Planning Handbook in which the mission is scheduled be reviewed through the college governance process in 2020-2021. (I.A.4)

Conclusion:

The college meets the standard.

I.B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations:

Coastline College has organized planning and governance structures that support sustained, substantive, and collegial dialog about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. The team observed that dialog about student outcomes and achievement, while evident for some departments, is not consistently in evidence in all programs and departments. The college has demonstrated its commitment to continuous improvement by evaluating the effectiveness of internal processes, and making changes, as necessary, to improve student support and success.

Findings and Evidence:

The college's planning process is clearly tied to the mission and goals of the college as evidenced in the Integrated Planning Handbook. Initiatives from departments and programs are initially requested through program review and are based on data derived from SLO analysis and other student success and demographic data provided in the basic Program Review report. The Program Review process is clearly delineated in the Program Review Handbook, and all departments or programs are provided with a template populated with a broad spectrum of student success and demographic data for each. In team discussions with faculty, the team found evidence that discussions occur within and across departments to both provide support for existing programs and to support development of new ones. Deans appear to be a part of these discussions and work closely with faculty to help devise new and unique programs for the college. (I.B.1)

Academic quality is assessed using the Academic Quality Rubric developed by the Academic Senate, and through Online Instruction Guidelines for Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI). Most recently, the Academic Senate approved a RSI Review Plan that requires all online courses to be assessed for RSI at a minimum of one time per year which ensures appropriate interaction

between faculty and students. Regular discussion of student achievement data as part of KPIs is used in annual planning and is tied to the college mission and goals. (I.B.1)

Student equity is addressed through a Student Equity Research Report which informs the development of the SSSP Equity BSI Integrated Plan, and which is discussed and vetted throughout the shared governance groups. A variety of initiatives have been funded and carried out based upon recommendations from these reports. (I.B.1)

The Faculty Success Center for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching has recently been relocated and now provides additional space for workshops, faculty gathering, and increased technology for faculty. A full-time faculty coordinator is leading to enhanced faculty development activities, all focused on increasing academic quality. (I.B.1)

Instructions in handbooks define how SLOs should be developed, reviewed and results reported in Program Review. The Program and Department Review Handbook describes how section one of the report should include outcomes assessment data. So, it appears that the intent is to use SLO data to improve student success and learning. Team review of evidence showed that all instructional programs and student and learning support services have defined SLOs or SAOs. (I.B.2)

The college produces and publishes a variety of data in response to KPIs that have been developed to monitor the college's alignment with its mission, goals and Educational Master Plan. The team found evidence that the college has a set of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that are aligned with the college's mission. The baseline is set each year at 85 percent of the previous year's result, and the goal is for each KPI to improve by 1 percent from the previous year's result. The KPI Scorecard is published on the Institutional Effectiveness web page and appropriate KPIs are included in Program and Department Program Review reports which are broadly discussed through the participatory governance processes. (I.B.3)

Prior to 2017, SLO assessment data was maintained in a report generator called Seaport that was developed internally at the college. The team viewed reports of assessment data that was generated prior to 2017 and found that SLOs were assessed on a regular basis across the college.

The conversion to Canvas in 2017 forced a change in the way that SLOs were being managed. This, in combination with faculty discussions about ways to improve the usefulness of SLO assessment, led to a change in the SLO assessment, reporting and management system. The college developed an IEPI improvement plan that addressed the systematic change from the Seaport based system to the Canvas system. The system includes an SLO Reporting Schedule Dashboard, an SLO "cloud" where SLO data is entered by individual instructors for each student in a class where a SLO is assessed, and where the data is also stored; these can be reached from the Coastline SLO webpage. Templates for Department and Program review reports include pre-loaded student demographic and productivity data to facilitate program and department dialog.

At the department or program level, SLOs are scheduled for assessment on a five-year rotating schedule that is accessible from the SLO website. The goal is to have the SLOs of a single course (or a small number of courses) assessed each semester to better focus discussion of SLO

assessment results in the department rather than spreading SLO assessment over many semesters for multiple courses. Interventions and new initiatives can be designed from the discussions if necessary, and then assessed again within the five-year period creating a cycle of continuous improvement.

The team examined evidence supporting the conversion from the old system to the new system. A very complete and systematic plan has been put in place that describes how SLOs should be developed, assessed and reported.

The team specifically evaluated Program Student Learning Outcome Reports and Service Area Outcome Reports. The team found that Service Area Program Review reports consistently addressed evaluation of SAOs and reported on results.

However, evaluation of the instructional Program Student Learning Outcome Reports and Program Review reports showed that there is less consistency in the way that SLO data is used to support student learning and achievement. For example, discussions with some departments, including math, health science, and biology provided evidence that there are regular and significant conversations about data that have led to the acquisition of equipment that was directly used to support students in classes. In other cases, however, there was little evidence of these types of robust discussions in other departments or programs.

The processes for program and institutional level outcomes were also revamped in 2017. The team found that although a post-graduate survey was administered as the assessment vehicle, most departments had low response rates which made it difficult to draw conclusions based on the data. Team discussions with college staff indicated that for programs with low response rates, data will be collected over a number of years and then analyzed in total. The team believes the college should consider whether data collection over such a long period would lead to an effective process for consistent improvement.

The plan for moving to the new SLO assessment and management system called for a three-step phase-in to get the new process to scale. The initial pilot stage in Fall 2017 had a target of assessing 25 courses (73 sections) and achieved seven courses (ten sections); the second stage in Spring 2018 had a goal of 55 courses (140 sections) and achieved 20 courses and 29 sections, while the first stage scale-up goal for Fall 2018 was 90 courses across 221 sections. As of February 25, 2019, a total of 48 courses and 86 sections have outcomes reported. (I.B.4)

The program and department review processes are designed to align new initiatives to the mission and goals of the college. The data used in the program review process is disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery. Analysis of disaggregated department level student success data and college level KPI data through the participatory governance structure allows alignment with the mission and goals of the college. (I.B.5)

The team reviewed the Student Equity Research Report and data from multiple Program and Department Review Reports which presented disaggregated data for the college's subpopulations of students based on instructional modality. Analysis of the data is used to direct the development of interventions to close performance gaps. (I.B.6)

The college regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management and governance structures to support academic quality and accomplishment of the college's mission. Program review is used to assess all units of the college. Planning and governance organizations prepare a variety of reports that summarize college planning initiatives. A number of surveys are also regularly used to evaluate key areas of the college, and the data are used in planning of initiatives. The college mission and planning processes are reviewed on a recurring cycle that drives resource allocation for the college. (I.B.7)

The college broadly disseminates its assessment and evaluation activities through a wide variety of reports including Program and Department Review, Program and Department Review Summary, college KPI reports, and Data Dashboards that report disaggregated college success data by term. The reports are available through the college web site, and are also disseminated throughout councils, committees and other groups.

The college hosts a Planning Summit annually during the spring semester that is open to all college employees and ASG representatives. The event is designed to disseminate planning activities and outcomes, and also to build engagement and involvement of the college community. (I.B.8)

Evidence reviewed supports that Coastline College has a broad-based, cyclic, integrated evaluation and planning process that supports the college mission and institutional effectiveness. This process supports the needs for educational programs and services by informing resource allocation for human, physical, technical and financial needs, thus supporting academic quality and institutional effectiveness. (I.B.9)

Conclusion:

The college meets the standard.

Recommendation to Improve Effectiveness:

In order to improve effectiveness, the peer review team recommends the college engage in continuous sustainable documented assessment processes across the entire institution, for all delivery modes, and assure that in every class section students receive a syllabus that includes SLOs consistent with the institution's officially approved course outlines or record. (I.B.4, I.C.3, II.A.3)

I.C. Institutional Integrity

General Observations

Coastline College assures clear and accurate information is shared with the public, students and employees regarding the institution's mission, strategic goals, institutional learning outcomes (ILOs), programs and support services. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are available for

students and most educational programs on the Institutional Research website, and other forms of public information. Program review is publicly posted and occurs annually and comprehensively every five years providing thorough public information about the programs.

Coastline College has an accreditation website and properly posts its accreditation status and all required documents. Policies and processes are in place and regularly updated as evidenced in integrated planning documents, on agendas, and in minutes for meetings. These documents, as well as the governance organization, were reviewed by the team. The college conducts numerous surveys to monitor employee satisfaction and assess governance processes. The college has the means and policies in place to guarantee integrity of its information as related to its mission.

Findings and Evidence:

The team examined both printed and digital documents and concluded that the college clearly and accurately represents information related to its mission, goals, support services, programs and learning outcomes. (I.C.1)

The team examined print and online catalogs as well as class schedules for two terms, confirming all required components on the checklist were present. All requirements, policies and procedures were verified. (I.C.2)

The college has a plan and processes in place to document assessment of SLOs and student achievement reports to communicate academic quality. However, there is room for improvement regarding analysis and discussion about the data that is presented. The narrative associated with the data often describes the numbers but does not document associated dialog and analysis to communicate academic quality to appropriate constituencies. (I.C.3)

The institution has thorough descriptions of the certificates and degrees in the catalog, online and at each department website. However, the program outcomes are inconsistent within individual department websites. The career information and costs are reported under each program link for gainful employment and the information is accurately reported for all appropriate programs. (I.C.4)

Handbooks, meeting agendas and board reports indicate that institutional policies and practices are reviewed and approved regularly. (I.C.5)

Information about tuition and total course costs are clearly accessible on the college website. The college accurately informs the public about the total cost of education such as Health Fees, College Service Fees, Parking Fees and others. The team noted that faculty are making a concerted effort to decrease costs to students by using Open Educational Resources (OER) and homegrown materials. (I.C.6)

The team reviewed institutional and board policies, employee contracts and senate documents. The team reviewed Board Policy 4030 which details the college's commitment to academic freedom, as well the responsibilities associated with that freedom. This policy clearly and effectively articulates the district's commitment to faculty free pursuit of knowledge but makes

no mention of this freedom extending to students and other constituencies as required by the standard. The board policy on academic freedom appears in the faculty contract and college catalog. (I.C.7)

Academic honesty and student responsibilities are covered thoroughly in each of the student handbooks reviewed (General, Digital, Telecourse/Correspondence and Military). (I.C.8)

The team reviewed board policy, catalog and contract information as well as the faculty training information and found that students and staff codes are clearly defined, and policies are widely published and consistent with recognized best practices. Conformity to codes of Academic Freedom are clearly differentiated from opinion and conviction. There are no additional codes of conduct specified. (I.C. 9 and 10)

The college does not operate in any foreign locations. (I.C.11)

Based upon information provided and documents posted on the webpage, the college complies with eligibility requirements, ACCJC standards, commission policies, guidelines, public disclosure and reporting. The college demonstrates public integrity through its web and print publications. Documents indicate that the college relates honestly to all relevant external agencies and with the commission and the visiting team (I.C.12, 13).

The institutional policies and practices provide evidence of high-quality education and integrity driven by board policy. The college has no external investors and therefore no additional reporting. (I.C.14)

Conclusion:

The college meets the standard.

Recommendations to Improve Effectiveness:

In order to improve effectiveness, the peer review team recommends that governing board policy be revised to reflect the district's commitment to academic freedom for all constituencies, including students. (I.C.7)

In order to improve effectiveness, the peer review team recommends the college engage in continuous sustainable documented assessment processes across the entire institution, for all delivery modes, and assure that in every class section students receive a syllabus that includes SLOs consistent with the institution's officially approved course outlines or record. (I.B.4, I.C.3, II.A.3)

Standard II

Student Learning Programs and Support Services

II.A. Instructional Programs

General Observations:

Coastline College instructional programs are distinctive in the breadth of delivery and scope of student populations served. Overall commitment to innovation and quality are evidenced by rigorous design processes and robust academic support services, regardless of location or mode of delivery.

The college offers diverse higher education programs at the appropriate level. All instructional programs, whether delivered via Distance Education, Face-to-face, Hybrid, Correspondence or Telecourse, are consistent with the college's mission to focus on access, support, innovation and diversity.

Programs are consistent with the mission and many culminate in well-defined and assessed outcomes, but not all. Program review occurs annually with scheduled comprehensive reviews every five years. Although program review includes student learning outcomes assessment, the integration has not fully matured to systematic evaluation in all areas. While many course-level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and some Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Institution Learning Outcomes (ILOs), are assessed, the process is not systematic. The data has gaps and in many cases the response rate provides data that is not actionable. There is room for improvement regarding outcomes analysis and dialog to inform decision-making and improvement.

Findings and Evidence:

Coastline College's unique structure aligns with the college mission to provide educational programs by several delivery methods through a distributed campus organization. Approximately 52 percent of Coastline's enrollment is in online distance education, 30 percent in correspondence or telecourse delivery and only 18 percent in face to face and hybrid courses. The college offers 54 Associate Degrees, nine Associate Degrees for Transfer, 61 CTE certificates with many programs available online (70 programs). In addition to the documentation and evidence provided, the team interviewed employees, visited facilities and concluded that the instructional programs align with the college mission and are appropriate for higher education. (II.A.1)

Coastline College has 57 full-time faculty and over 168 part-time faculty. Because the majority of the college's courses are online, the team reviewed 40 randomly selected online course sections to determine alignment with the ACCJC Policy on Distance Education and overall currency. A variety of inmate and military courses delivered via correspondence and online were

also examined. Discussions with administrative, classified and faculty leaders from all delivery strategies and numerous disciplines confirmed practice and policy were consistent. Additional onsite evidence, provided by the college included training materials, handbooks, and syllabi checklists. The team concluded that a vigorous curriculum review process provides systematic curriculum and program evaluation that assures currency and high standards.

Coastline College provides opportunities for professional development to improve teaching and learning strategies. The professional development opportunities for all employees include virtual and face-to-face training as well as opportunities to go to conferences and to bring experts to the college for local training.

Coastline policies and practices address continuous improvement of instructional courses and programs through systemic evaluation and professional development. (II.A.2)

Recently, the college changed its processes for SLO development and assessment in conjunction with an institution-wide shift from a homegrown Learning Management System (LMS), called Seaport. The LMS housed SLOs, recorded assessment data and worked to align SLOs, PLOs and ILOs. Coastline adopted Canvas as the new LMS and, with monumental effort and professional development, converted all courses and programs to Canvas within one year.

The college received an Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) grant and Partnership Resource Teams (PRTs) support to develop a new system aligned with Canvas. The teams initially gathered information, helped the institution develop improvement strategies and timelines and provided follow-up support. According to the plan the conversion to the SLO cloud and many other key SLO and assessment functions were to be completed by April 2018. There was a phased in approach adopted but none of the phases have been completed to scale. Currently, only about 55 percent of the data is in the cloud, and additional issues exist. PLOs are listed on the degree and certificate pages in the catalog, but they are not consistently reported on the webpages. The PLO dashboard documents some results from assessments, but the team found the post-graduate response numbers too small to permit meaningful assessment to achieve program improvement.

The SLO Tableau dashboard was examined and seven of the 21 programs had no data. In general, many programs are aligned to the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) but there are gaps. Although program review documents provide opportunity to connect outcomes assessment to the review, the numerous program reviews examined had little or no reference to learning outcomes for courses or programs. There are areas where there is significant outcomes assessment, dialog and improvement occurring. Discussions with faculty from various departments revealed some unique methods of dialog using Canvas shells as well as person-to-person dialog. Effective improvements have been implemented as a result of outcomes assessment and program review through local methods, but the process is not systemic.

Coastline College has officially approved course outlines and a curriculum process that ensures SLOs are included for each course. The college informed the team that the SLO Cloud represented information drawn directly from CurricUNET, the official document of record. Course syllabi may include additional SLOs but must include the official core of outcomes because articulation and transfer agreements depend upon agreement that outcomes are the same

for each course regardless of location, delivery or modality. To meet the standard students in every class section must receive a course syllabus that includes outcomes from the institution's officially approved course outlines of record. The team found that randomly selected online and correspondence courses did not match the posted SLOs.

The team recognizes the value of training, such as "SLO and GO" and presentations through the Faculty Success Center. Online teaching and "just-in-time" web training are available for faculty training, as well. These plans provide opportunities for institution-wide collaboration and training to effectively implement established institutional practices. (II.A.3)

The college is undergoing an extensive re-evaluation and re-structuring of its pre-collegiate coursework. Courses that are pre-collegiate are clearly distinguished by course numbers, and catalog information. The math and English departments are placing students directly into transfer level courses and the assessment center website and support helps clarify the role of pre-collegiate courses. (II.A.4)

The college's degrees and programs align with the standard set by American higher education institutions including length, breadth, depth, rigor, course sequencing and synthesis of learning according to the information provided and a review of the catalog, website, Board Policies and curriculum processes. The institution ensures that degree requirements are a minimum of 60 semester units. (II.A.5)

Schedules at Coastline include a variety of time-periods and scheduling innovations that work well with online courses. The college makes great efforts to assess and serve their student populations by allowing flexible registration and creating personalized service for students with irregular and uncontrolled schedules. As one employee shared, "Our military may not know where they will be in 4 months, but they know the next 2 months usually, so we schedule 8-week courses to accommodate them." The college has examined extensive data concerning scheduling, enrollment and FTES. Coastline College produces an Enrollment Management Plan every three years which takes into account student ability to complete degree and certificates in a timely manner. In addition, Coastline College coursework, due to the online nature and compliance with the Online Education Initiative (OEI) and adoption of the Quality Rubric, supports and helps colleges and programs across the state that are unable to access courses to complete programs at their home colleges. (II.A.6)

The college has diverse delivery modes and teaching methodologies, aligning with the college mission and strategic goals. The effort and professionalism used to address various student populations, with a specific focus on equity, includes correspondence/telecourses for incarcerated and military students and online designed for military students.

Thirteen percent of Coastline College's enrollment is in Extended Learning which provides telecourse, correspondence, and online courses through asynchronous, on-demand educational access for military and corporate students. The Extended Learning Military component of Coastline serves students who are stationed or deployed in locations throughout the world. Telecourses are typically delivered through video-taped lectures and workbooks that can be used in distant and isolated locations where deployment restricts internet access. In addition, the

program serves students beyond their own offerings to connect with eight other partner colleges that can deliver additional courses towards completion of associate and bachelor's degrees.

The college's incarcerated student program is offered through the Distance Learning Department. The challenges and limitations of pen and paper interactions with incarcerated students creates numerous challenges and intensive work that relies on institutional cooperation as well as reliance on U.S. mail for communication.

The team was impressed with the student handbooks that provide information about support, expectations, quizzes and assignments. These programs contribute to higher education access consistent with Coastline's mission regardless of location or means of delivery. The telecourse/correspondence delivery lead to certificates and degrees and, through new legislation, course completion represents a vehicle to reduce an inmate's sentence.

Students are typically directed to adequate support services in the faculty syllabi in online courses and in the military and corporate course introductions. However, the quality of support service information varies among faculty within the online courses. The Student Success Center data displays growing use by students and higher success rates among attendees. The college addresses equity data for all its programs and services. (II.A.7)

The institution previously used a national placement exam that had internal testing on bias and reliability and college-wide analysis. The college does not use any department-wide course examinations. Coastline's military program operated under the Department of Defense (DOD) Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges (SOC) agreement and criteria. The SOC agreement awards credit for prior learning and military training. This program is sunsetting March 29, 2019 and is being replaced by a DOD memorandum to assure transferability of credit. Coastline is a lead college in dealing with prior learning credits. (II.A.8)

The institution awards credit, degrees and certificates based upon the completion of courses, most of which have clear and comprehensive course level outcomes. As previously stated, the program level outcomes reveal gaps. The unit of credit based upon time for face-to-face courses is clear and follows federal standards. The curriculum processes and committee work guarantee accepted norms for higher education coursework. Evidence for compliance with this standard is given as the alignment of CSLO to PLO to ILOs and assessment through the annual survey. As stated previously, this methodology and the gaps in the analysis create areas where the college can improve the understanding and communication about learning outcomes. The team found no courses dependent on clock-to-credit-hour conversions. (II.A.9)

The team examined Board policies, catalogs, ASSIST data, student handbooks and webpages to verify that articulation; acceptance and transfer-of-credit policies are clear and available to students. Because of the college's important role in military and online education, Coastline has policy in place to facilitate student transfer of units without penalty. (II.A.10)

The college requires all degree programs to include a component of general education (local, CSU Breadth, or IGETC) called Options 1, 2 and 3. As evidenced in the catalog and webpages, programs are designed to include courses that cover each of the key general education areas

(communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry, ethical reasoning, and diverse perspectives). The student outcomes within the general education areas are among the best documented and integrated by courses in the SLO cloud. As previously stated there are gaps in program and institutional outcomes across the college and although assessment is occurring, and improvements are in progress, there is room for the college to improve. (II.A.11, 12)

All degree programs at the college are structured to include specialized courses and where appropriate, an interdisciplinary core. Programs with documented PLOs appear to address key theories and practices within a field of study. Interviews with faculty revealed that some programs have substantive program level outcomes discussion, analysis and decision-making associated with that information. Math described the use of assessment to justify and acquire necessary technology and to change instructional support and teaching strategies. Math and biology use a unique format for SLO discussion that are based in a Canvas shell and used to adapt and improve coursework as well as discuss resource needs. The Health Sciences area reported the usefulness of SLOs and Program review in the creation of new programs, courses and alignment of courses with career and transfer expectations. However, some programs are missing PLOs and overall the substantive connection to SLOs is not documented broadly enough to assure the core is based upon competencies and learning outcomes. (II.A.13)

Coastline College has 12 CE departments and 61 certificate programs that participate in two advisory committee meetings each year. Data on graduates completing CE certificates and degrees are readily accessible. The CCCCO data indicate that CE completion rates are increasing in the last three years. Courses were reviewed online, through the web, catalog and department program reviews, address common employment standards and expectations. The EMGT Advisory Committee minutes indicated a thorough history and review of the program including weaknesses and strengths and areas for improvement. The team reviewed samples of all the CTE advisory group minutes that indicate a clear connection between employment and other applicable standards through collaboration with partners. (II.A.14)

The college's Program Review Handbook indicates a policy to guarantee changes and elimination of programs ensure appropriate arrangements for students to minimize disruption (p.10). The college utilizes its sister colleges as alternative sources for necessary coursework if programs are discontinued. The policy does not indicate how programs are identified or reviewed for program vitality/elimination, but the process includes protection for student's ability to complete in a timely manner. (II.A.15)

The team reviewed the SLO, Curriculum, Program Review and Distance Education web supports, program review policies, board policies, associated websites, professional development opportunities, and minutes of meetings to determine whether processes are in place to systematically improve the quality and currency of the instructional programs offered. The fundamental documents and resources are accessible and well-organized but institution-wide coherence on SLO documentation and assessment are not clear.

The college provided many Program Review reports that had large amounts of data and some analysis and discussion of improvements. Coastline has invested in diversified professional

development for all employees. A new dean is overseeing the many professional development initiatives and aligning goals and efforts to meet institutional needs. The Faculty Success Center Faculty Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning has become a resource for effective training. The college uses online opportunities in a variety of modalities to create “just-in-time” training for the rapidly evolving needs. The posted resources are useful and practical, creating opportunities to systematically improve programs and courses. (II.A.16)

Conclusion:

The college meets the standard.

Commendation:

The peer review team commends the college for its robust and effective pedagogical approaches, delivery, and specialized student support and library services to its military and incarcerated student populations. These exemplary programs demonstrate the college’s mission to support equity, access, and success. (II.A.7, II.B.1)

Recommendation to Improve Effectiveness:

In order to improve effectiveness, the peer review team recommends the college engage in continuous sustainable documented assessment processes across the entire institution, for all delivery modes, and assure that in every class section students receive a syllabus that includes SLOs consistent with the institution’s officially approved course outlines or record. (I.B.4, I.C.3, II.A.3)

II.B. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations:

Library and learning support services are offered through a combination of electronic resources and physical facilities that are well designed to support a student body that is predominantly enrolled in distance education and other alternative instructional modalities, including those for incarcerated students. The Coastline Library offers access to academic resources available online, including databases, journals, media, and e-books to support the curriculum of the college. The library has also developed information literacy instructional content that faculty may integrate into their online courses. In addition to the virtual library, there are Student Success Centers strategically located at college centers that offer student access to computer labs, study spaces and a collection of textbooks associated with high demand courses. The Student Success Centers are well publicized, and their effectiveness is supported by their dramatic growth in usage.

Findings and Evidence:

The library offers research databases, e-books and other web-based materials to create a current, diverse, and balanced collection in support of the educational programs taught at the college, regardless of location or means of delivery. Students are able to access electronic resources through remote authentication. In addition, students have access to reference services, both virtual and physical, which support all student populations. Evidence shows librarian involvement in active curation of library materials through faculty interaction, usage statistics analysis, and active participation in formal curriculum review to ensure library collection relevance to instructional programs. Increased staffing of librarians in recent years is evidence of the institution's commitment to support student learning and achievement by providing personnel responsible for creating this vital infrastructure of academic support. Planning documents show evidence of further college commitment to support growth, as it is likely that the college library will require additional personnel as it continues to meet demand for information competency support, collection access and development, and growing student awareness and usage of academic library materials and services. (II.B.1, II.B.2)

The Student Success Center provides critical academic support for students in English and Writing, Mathematics, Accounting, and the Sciences. Evidence shows a robust tutoring schedule offered each semester to students, coupled with equally robust usage statistics, indicating the popularity and need for these services. The Centers offer peer tutoring, embedded tutoring, and supplemental instruction to all students, including those taking courses online and via correspondence. Students may meet with a tutor through multiple modalities besides face-to-face sessions, including Skype, e-mail appointments and by using 3rd party tutoring service, SmarThinking and NetTutor. The Student Success Coordinator seeks active input from faculty colleagues to ensure that services align with instructional need. Evidence indicates that a feedback mechanism between the Student Success Centers and academic units exists and fosters the ongoing selection of instructional materials and relevant learning technology and equipment necessary to support student learning in support of the educational programs of the college. (II.B.1, II.B.2)

The team recognizes the Student Success Centers for delivery of robust, accessible, and varied modalities of academic support to students. The team was also impressed with the college library for its focused commitment to student learning by calibrating and curating online materials to best serve instruction needs, its growing outreach to students, and its efforts to find creative ways to address the research support needs of special populations. The collaboration between these two pillars of academic learning support services directly aligns with the mission of the college and provides holistic learning support services to students. (II.B.1, II.B.2)

Coastline's library engages in regular program review and has established program outcomes which it assesses annually through both quantitative and qualitative metrics. As a result of an analysis of usage statistics and student survey responses, the library made adjustments to its electronic collections and increased its outreach to students for improved visibility and awareness of services. The Student Success Centers also participate in regular program review and have Service Area Outcomes that are assessed through student survey data and analysis of

tutoring activity. Evidence published in annual department reviews indicate that the Centers provide strong support for student learning and course completion through skills learned and knowledge gained by students who use the Student Success Centers. (II.B.3)

The college relies on outside vendors and institutions for a number of services, including the Community College League of California, for the purchase of subscription databases and e-book collections, and the Council of Chief Librarians and the California Community Colleges Technology Center for procurement of the new Library Services Platform. Similarly, the college contracts with third-party student support services through its engagement in the Online Education Initiative as well as through direct district contracts. The effectiveness of these services are evaluated through usage reports, analysis of current needs and consideration of alternative options. The college ensures that equipment is maintained through maintenance contracts and support from centralized district IT services. (II.B.4)

Conclusion:

The college meets the standard.

Commendation:

The peer review team commends the college for its robust and effective pedagogical approaches, delivery, and specialized student support and library services to its military and incarcerated student populations. These exemplary programs demonstrate the college's mission to support equity, access, and success. (II.A.7, II.B.1)

II.C. Student Support Services

General Observations:

The college regularly evaluates the quality of student support services through an annual program and department review process and uses data to continuously improve student support programs and services. The college provides quality support services for all students to assist students with achieving their learning outcomes. The college ensures equitable access to appropriate and comprehensive services to students at each of the site-based campuses and for distance learning students. The college provides counseling and academic advising to support student development and success.

Findings and Evidence:

The college demonstrates regular evaluation of the quality of student support services through an annual program and department review process, which includes a comprehensive review in five-year cycles. The annual program and department review process, which is detailed in the Program and Department Review Handbook, includes both quantitative and qualitative data as part of the assessment process. To demonstrate that these services support student learning, the Student Services Wing Planning Council reviews and discusses the responsiveness and

effectiveness of student support services to ensure departments are meeting departmental goals and service area outcomes. (II.C.1)

There is significant evidence that the college identifies and assesses service area outcomes (SAOs) for all service-oriented units at the college. The college includes specific metrics in the College Scorecard to identify student support outcomes and goals. As indicated in the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER), SAOs are assessed annually and a comprehensive assessment occurs every five years. The team recognizes the quality of the assessment of SAOs and the use of its data to continuously improve student support programs and services. The program review process also assesses human capital to ensure that appropriate student support services and programs are planned for and provided to achieve area outcomes for each unit. Through the program review process, the institution uses assessment data to continuously improve student support programs and services to meet the needs of students. (II.C.2)

Through interviews with college personnel and observations, it is evident that site-based students have direct access to counselors, advisors, faculty, program specific staff, and academic success coaches. The committee recognizes the appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services and resources available in student support services which demonstrates the college's commitment to provide quality support to assist students in achieving their educational goals. Students also have equitable access to student support services through various modalities, including email, chat, virtual and off-site workshops, and live video chat. (II.C.3)

The college's Student Life Office offers co-curricular programs suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the social and cultural dimensions of the educational experience of its students. Student life programs focus on leadership, student equity, social justice, and student identities, and club meetings are offered online and in-person. The Associated Student Government (ASG) have clearly articulated guiding documents to ensure sound educational policy and standards of integrity. It is evident that ASG student members' voices are valued through their participation in governance committees; student leaders also regularly attend board meetings. (II.C.4)

All new students complete orientation and assessment and meet with a counselor to develop an educational plan, based on their goals. Counseling services are available to students in several modalities. Counselors also teach student success and career and life planning courses. Through student support programs and services, there are also dedicated and trained counselors and advisors for special student populations such as military/veterans, EOPS, and DSPS. The college uses a web-based academic planning tool, DegreeWorks, which provides students with online access to relevant and timely academic requirements. (II.C.5)

The college has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission. The institution defines and advises students on clear pathways to complete degrees, certificates and transfer goals. The college utilizes DegreeWorks as an electronic educational planning tool, provides an online student orientation, and produces a student handbook to advise students about college policies, procedures, support services and counseling services. (II.C.6)

As evidence demonstrates, every three years the Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Planning Department evaluates the college placement instruments and practices to validate

effectiveness and minimize bias. As a result, adjustments are made to cut scores and placement recommendations. However, in spring 2017, the Academic Senate approved the use of multiple measure assessment as a pilot for 2017-18 and as a result of Assembly Bill 705, in spring 2018, the college has developed alternative methods to determining placement into English and math. (II.C.7)

Based on the documentation provided, the college has established that it maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially. The college has a provision for secure backup of all files and the college publishes and follows established policies for release of student records. (II.C.8)

Conclusion:

The college meets the standard.

Standard III

Resources

III.A. Human Resources

General Observations:

The college provided evidence that it equitably follows detailed policies and procedures from the start of the hire process for employees and throughout the employment period for each employee. The position announcement and the hiring procedures ensure that employees are qualified for their positions in order for the college to achieve its mission: improve academic quality and institutional effectiveness. Board and administrative policies exist and are followed to ensure the college is in alignment with its EEO and diversity plans. Employees are provided professional development opportunities on a regular basis

Findings and Evidence:

Evidence examined by the team indicates that the college ensures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing administrators, faculty and staff who are qualified by appropriate education, training and experience to support the college's programs and services. A single Board Policy supported by multiple administrative procedures ensures compliance with all applicable state and federal laws and regulations, including equal opportunity regulations. Information for participation on hiring committees is described in *Administrators and Managers Toolkit to the Hiring Process*. (III.A.1)

Job descriptions are related to the college's goals and were recently reviewed (in 2015) for key job factors, which were then incorporated into updated job descriptions that are currently being reviewed for any needed revisions. Job description and application data are securely housed in the NEOGOV, an online human capital tracking system. When filling positions, a hiring committee comprised of diverse constituents, including ones with specific discipline content knowledge, is assembled at the onset of the recruitment process and then follows the process described in the *Administrators and Managers Toolkit to the Hiring Process*. (III.A.1)

Criteria, qualifications and procedures for selection of personnel align with commonly accepted practices within the California Community Colleges and are codified by local Board policies. Candidates applying for a faculty position must possess the minimum qualifications for their discipline as outlined in the state chancellor's office publication and must ultimately provide documentation that they meet these qualifications. Equivalency may be granted if a candidate provides evidence of equivalency to the published minimum qualifications. (III.A.2)

Adhering to Board Policy 7120, administrators and other employees responsible for educational support and services also possess qualifications necessary to adequately support educational

programs and services. Hiring committees adhere to board policies and human resources documents that clearly state the required steps in the hiring process. (III.A.3)

Required degrees must be from institutions accredited by U.S. accrediting agencies. Any foreign transcripts must be accompanied by a U.S. evaluation and translation from a National Association of Credential Evaluation Services member organization. (III.A.4)

All college employees are evaluated on a regular basis according to board policies and Administrative procedures, and where applicable, collective bargaining agreements. Completed evaluations are documented and tracked in the institution's human resources management system. (III.A.5)

Standard III.A.6 has been eliminated by the commission.

There is evidence that the board, district and colleges have made a commitment to continuing to replace full-time faculty who retire and to increase the number of full-time faculty. A full-time faculty hiring plan was put in place in 2014 and has been implemented since then. In addition, the college maintains a staffing plan and since Fall 2014 through Fall 2017, the number of full-time faculty has been increased from 42 to 55. (III.A.7)

The college adheres to board policies and administrative procedures that require regular evaluation of all employees, and the evaluation process for part-time faculty is outlined in the part-time faculty union contract. The college provides part-time faculty orientations during the fall and spring terms, and all new faculty are required to receive training in the college's learning management system, Canvas. A Faculty Handbook is available to all new hires, which outlines basic information for all faculty, and a series of professional development days including fall and spring FLEX days, an annual spring workshop and BBQ, a leadership development program, faculty success career workshops, \$1,000 per year for all faculty to attend professional development activities, and an Annual Summer Institute. Faculty participation in these events provides significant opportunities for integration of full and part-time faculty into the college. (III.A.8)

The college maintains a staffing plan for hiring which is tied to the program and department program review processes. The college views long-term staff planning as an extension in refinement and comprehensiveness to its Master Planning and Budgeting processes. The number of full- and part-time faculty has increased since Fall 2013, as has the number of classified professional staff, from 134 in 2013 to 163 in 2017. Coastline maintains a strong commitment to professional development for all staff in line with the college's established mission, goals and initiatives. (III.A.9)

The college maintains a staffing plan that includes the needs for administrators and as a result, has sufficient administrators to maintain continuity and effective administrative leadership and services to support the college mission and purposes. As a result of the staffing plan, the college has increased the number of administrators from 26 in 2013 to 31 in 2017. (III.A.10)

The team found evidence that the district has adopted approximately 150 Board Policies and 130 corresponding Administrative Procedures; 47 of the board policies specifically address personnel matters. Board policies are kept current, or new ones are added as necessary to comply with state and federal regulations, statutes and accreditation standards. The district has an established schedule for reviewing and updating district policies. Policies that are newly developed or revised are placed on a Board agenda for review during public meetings allowing broad-based exposure prior to adoption. Policies are available on the district's website for public access. Evidence throughout the ISER indicates that the policies are adhered to and administered equitably and consistently. (III.A.11)

The team recognizes that the college adheres to specific board policies and administrative procedures to demonstrate its commitment to equity and diversity in all of its practices. The 7 board policies and 6 associated administrative procedures support an equity-minded culture that enhances respect, fosters learning, and promotes inclusion for the college's students, employees and community members. The college regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission. Plans are updated as necessary to support diversity practices. (III.A.12)

The college adheres to Board Policy 3050 which promotes an ethical work environment worthy of public trust for all of its employees. Its corresponding administrative policy provides a procedure by which employees can report violations of the Code of Professional Ethics. The policy also informs employees of their responsibilities with respect to students. A series of other policies also address conflict of interest, personal use of district resources and whistleblower protection. The Academic Senate has also adopted the AAUP statement on professional ethics and the full-time faculty collective bargaining agreement contains an article on academic freedom and responsibility. (III.A.13)

The college's Education Master Plan states that "faculty and staff will be inspired through ongoing professional learning and evidence-informed collaboration to develop initiatives to actualize the mission..." The college plans for and provides all personnel with a variety of appropriate opportunities for continued professional development consistent with the mission of the college and based on current pedagogy, technology and learning needs. Since 2015, a portion of professional development funds have been allocated toward sustaining a Faculty Success Center (recently renamed as Faculty Center for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching). The center was recently relocated to a larger center with more resources, and a full-time faculty coordinator has been added to increase the number of professional development activities. (III.A.14)

The college systematically evaluates professional development programs and activities using surveys and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis of program improvements. As well, the participatory governance survey captures feedback from members of committees who are tasked with professional development related mandates to implement resources in directions that contribute to the ongoing quality of the institution. (III.A.14)

The team found that each employee of the district has a single master personnel file that is maintained in the district Office of Human Resources. Access to the file is restricted to the

employee or authorized agent and authorized administrators and supervisors. Employee medical and benefits records files are maintained separately from personnel files in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Access to an employee's medical file and any medical-related information is restricted to the employee and the Vice-chancellor of Human Resources or his/her designee. Each employee has the right, by appointment, to review and copy, but not remove, the contents of his or her own official personnel file. Personnel files are safeguarded in a lockable room at the district Office of Human Resources. The team has concluded that the college has adequate provisions for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. (III.A.15)

Conclusion:

The college meets the standard.

III.B. Physical Resources

General Observations:

The college has physical resources that support programs and services that improve institutional effectiveness and ensure safety, with physical resource planning integrated with institutional planning.

Findings and Evidence:

The college's Facilities, Safety and Sustainability Committee (FSSC) reviews and recommends policies governing facilities and safety to the College Council, as evidenced by FSSC meeting minutes. Major projects that compete for college funding are referred to the PIEAC, which then prioritizes and refers requests to the Budget Committee as evidenced in the 2017-18 Administrative Wing Plan. The college has an emergency plan, has installed a campus-wide public address system to broadcast emergency information, and has installed emergency blue phones in three of their sites' parking garages to support the safety of the institution. The district, in conjunction with their insurance JPA, conducts annual a biannual safety and loss prevention inspection of all facilities. The college has primary responsibility for maintenance of the campus and operates a responsive maintenance system to submit requests for service and repairs as evidenced through maintenance logs. (III.B.1, III.B.3)

The Comprehensive and Annual Program and Department Reviews include four main elements, of which one is facilities needs, as evidenced by the Program and Departmental Review Handbook. These requests are being forwarded to the FSSC for a feasibility and alignment review with the Vision 2020 Facilities Master Plan (FMP) to ensure proper facility resources for supporting programs and services. In addition, Maintenance and Operation also conduct an annual survey and blends this information in with the program review requests. (III.B.2, III.B.3)

The FMP includes nine projects at the college, of which seven have been committed to date, as evidence in the most recent Citizens Oversight Committee quarterly report. These projects are based upon projections of demographics, student demand, program demand, and input from the

constituency processes as detailed in the FMP. Recently, the total cost of ownership has been implemented as Board Policy 3250 and Administrative Procedure 3251 and the district is working with the college to provide standards to support planning for impacts of new space, as evidenced FSSC meeting minutes. The district is allocating deferred maintenance funding primarily on the basis of the State chancellor's Office Facilities Condition Index, which supports resources allocation based on needs. (III.B.4)

Conclusion:

The college meets the standard.

III.C. Technology Resources

General Observations:

Coastline College integrates a wide range of current technology resources into the educational programs and support services at its physical locations as well as its expansive distance education and related alternative instruction programs. Hardware, software, and IT infrastructure support are coordinated and supported through the district, and substantial instructional services support is also offered through the college. The college has a clearly stated vision for technology-enhanced learning environments, articulated in a Coastline Technology Master Plan. This college-level strategic plan is produced by the shared governance Technology Committee which includes strong representation from constituent stakeholders. Using its program review process for prioritization and working in tandem with district-level prioritization processes, the college maintains and updates technology resources on a regular basis

Findings and Evidence:

The college offers a range of technology services for students, staff and faculty, with a strong emphasis on distance education and correspondence course support. The district maintains the public and staff computers at the instruction centers and administrative offices. The district also manages the Canvas Learning Management System, district servers, communications and phone systems, printers, networking services, and security. A centralized district IT service desk is available to support the college's management and operation functions, as well as its academic programs and support services. Additional support for faculty, staff, students, and administrators is available through college support systems. The college follows recommended protocols to ensure reliable and secure networks. (III.C.1)

The college uses a program review process to review, prioritize and update its technology infrastructure. The Technology Committee reviews technology-related requests for consideration as part of this resource allocation planning process, which is transparent and offers multiple opportunities for stakeholder input. The college proactively obtains varied funding sources to ensure instructional access to state-of-the art learning technologies. System-wide upgrades to classroom and lab technologies ensure consistency of instructional experience, while opportunities exist for constituents to bring forward new initiatives for consideration. The district

coordinates computer upgrades, audio and video presentation technology upgrades, expansion of wi-fi access and maintenance of digital signage. (III.C.2)

The district provides technology support to the college. Faculty and students who are using Canvas have access to college-based support services as well as 24x7 support through Coastline Canvas. IT technology support personnel are located at each campus center and are able to provide hands-on support for classroom-based technology. The college also offers customized technology solutions for the college through Extended Learning programming support and assistance. Disaster recovery planning and support for telecommunications, network, and critical enterprise resource planning systems such as Banner are addressed at the district level as part of the CCCD Strategic Technology Plan. The district recently established a Security Deputy position as evidence of its ongoing commitment to data and identity security and maintains reliable security measures to authenticate access to college systems. (II.C.3)

The college offers multiple resources and services to provide instruction to, and support of constituents in the effective use of technology. Professional development opportunities for all constituent groups are present and active at the college. The Faculty Success Center offers teaching and learning support for instructors, including technology-related training programs. Faculty also have access to instructional designers and distance learning staff to further support technology-infused online class design. In-person and online training opportunities are available to instructors on technology topics. The college also offers learning and professional development opportunities through Lynda.com, and the Online Education Initiative. (III.C.4)

As part of the Coast Community College District, the college adheres to all of the technology-related policies and procedures covered in district level board policy pertaining to computer and network use. Additionally, the college adheres to district level board policy that governs Distance Education and includes compliance with accessibility requirements. (III.C.5)

Conclusion:

The college meets the standard.

III.D. Financial Resources

General Observations:

The institution has demonstrated the workings of an effective financial framework, both at the district level and at the college level. In addition, they have demonstrated a thoughtful approach to creating an internal controls framework for programs, payments, and purchases. The college and district use processes that gather input to allocate financial resources in a manner that supports the educational mission of the college.

Findings and Evidence:

The college uses the program review process as a source of identifying funding requisitions from the course/program level as outlined in the college Integrated Planning Handbook and carried out through the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness, and Accreditation Committee, the Budget Committee, and the Wing Planning processes. In addition, there are policies and processes in place to guide the budget process as well as monitor the budget throughout the year as evidenced by Board Policy 6200, Board Policy 6300, and the college Integrated Planning Handbook. Funding decisions are effectively articulated through both district and college participatory governance committees as evidenced in public board items, Wing Plan prioritization lists, and employee surveys. (III.D.1, III.D.2, III.D.3)

The planning and budgeting process reflect reasonable assessments of both revenues and expenditures as evidenced by the assumptions supporting the 2017-18 Tentative Budget board presentation and reviews of the prior year fund balances. The district has a healthy level of reserves at 10-percent, and sufficient cash flow to eliminate the need for external borrowing, as evidenced by the 2017-18 Tentative Budget and the 2017-18 annual audit. The district has \$5 million of property coverage and \$20 million of excess liability coverage through insurance joint powers authorities to mitigate significant risks. (III.D.4, III.D.9)

As evidenced in the annual independent financial audits from 2012-13 through 2017-18, the district has a generally good practice of internal controls, and the information contained in them fairly presents the district's financial position. In general, the district quickly resolves audit issues; however, a recent audit finding related to monthly reconciliations and closing procedures has persisted from 2014 and was only recently resolved. The district and college routinely report and disseminate important information for sound financial decision making as evidenced by the Administrative Services KPIs, the distribution of monthly budget reports, and through budget presentations at the college Budget Committee. Further, the college's KPIs include a metric on student loan default to ensure they are in compliance with federal regulations. (III.D.5, III.D.6, III.D.7, III.D.8, III.D.15)

The district's policies and procedures for financial management and oversight extend to grants, ancillary, and auxiliary operations. While the district utilizes a separate enterprise resource management system for ancillary and auxiliary operations, including the college's Foundation, these are considered component units that are included in the annual financial audit for review of accuracy. In addition to oversight by college and district personnel, the Foundation also has its own Board of Directors and Investment Committee to oversee financial matters. The contractual agreements with these entities, as well as other entities, generally contain provisions that protect the district's interest and are in line with the overall goals and mission of the institution. (III.D.10, III.D.16)

The college's five auxiliary activities have the same financial oversight as other district funds and have received clean audits as evidenced in the district's annual audit. The district's \$698 million general obligation bond program has a functioning oversight committee that meets regularly and is presented with separate annual audit reports to ensure expenditures are consistent with the ballot language, which is evidenced by the committee minutes and the audit

reports. On an annual basis, the district and college work in tandem to ensure there are sufficient general obligation bond resources necessary for the implementation of the facilities master plan. The only other locally incurred debt, outside of general obligation bonds, is a note payable for the Newhope property in the amount of \$3.8 million, which has a revenue stream and reserves to cover the future payments, as evidenced through the fund balance report. The district has long-term funding plans, and has annually funded employer pension cost increases and makes payments to cover the unfunded OPEB liability as evidenced by the 2017-2020 Fiscal Plan, recent budgets, and in their annual audit report. Compensated absence liabilities are funded by the district on an annual basis to keep pace with the liability. (III.D.11, III.D.12, III.D.13, III.D.14)

Conclusion:

The college meets the standard.

The district has demonstrated an ability to generally remedy audit findings in a reasonable timeframe; however, it has taken more than three years to remedy a finding related to monthly reconciliations and closing procedures.

Recommendation to Improve Effectiveness:

In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends the district should ensure audit findings are responded to in a timely manner. (III.D.7)

Standard IV

Leadership and Governance

IV.A. Decision-Making Roles & Processes

General Observations:

Coastline College relies on board policies and administrative procedures to define roles and processes for decision-making at the college. Board Policy 2510, Participation in Local Decision Making and the accompanying Administrative Procedure 2510, created in 2012 and 2013, respectively, are regularly reviewed and approved by the Board, the latest versions dated April 2018. The Board Policy states the Board's commitment to participatory decision-making, and the Administrative Procedure details the roles and responsibilities for each contingency group. The *Coastline Participatory Governance Philosophy and Procedures Handbook, June 2018*, further addresses the mechanisms and structure in which leadership and collaborative decision-making take place at the college. The college curriculum processes follow those recommended by the State Academic Senate, and the college uses CurricUNET to store all curriculum information. Numerous newsletters and bulletins, along with college wide meetings, keep the college community informed regarding decisions made at the college.

Findings and Evidence:

Coastline College has an established foundational structure that supports innovation leading to institutional excellence, as reflected in the college mission statement. This support includes a Dean of Innovative Learning who oversees professional development and the Faculty Success Center. The college also offers innovation funds that support various activities at the college, including the Leaders Innovating Together for Tomorrow program—a year-long leadership program open to faculty, classified professionals, and managers. The college's participatory/shared governance process is detailed in the *Decision-Making Structure/Participatory Governance Document 2018*, and decisions regarding planning and implementation of processes are communicated through the *Annual Planning and Close the Loop Report*, president's Open Forums, and student and faculty/staff newsletters. The *2017-2018 Planning Report* provides the status of initiatives across the college. A review of the college Council minutes shows participation of all the college's participatory governance committees and constituency groups in institutional planning. (IV.A.1)

Several board policies define the roles of the various college contingencies. CCCD Board Policy 2510, Participation in Local Decision Making, outlines the Board's role and states its commitment to participatory decision making. CCCD Administrative Procedure 2510 defines where the Board relies primarily on the college governance bodies for recommendations, including the Associated Student Government. Minutes from governance committee meetings provide evidence that information regarding decision-making is disseminated throughout the college. The Coastline College Committee List provides membership lists, meeting times,

mandates, and chair/co-chair information for all committees, councils, constituency, ad hoc, and workgroups. (IV.A.2)

CCCD Board Policy 2510 identifies the roles administrators and faculty members have in policy, planning, and budget processes. This Policy also delineates where in the processes various constituencies must be included; for example, it established the role of the Board and the Academic Senate in the 10 + 1 governance items. BP 2510 also establishes the 11 items that the Classified Senate must be “relied upon” for input in the decision-making process. In addition, the college uses its *Coastline Participatory Governance Philosophy and Procedures Handbook*, *College Committee List*, and the *College Integrated Planning Handbook* to guide integrated planning. The 2016 PACE survey offers evidence that decision-making roles are clearly defined and followed. (IV.A.3)

The college relies on CCCD Board Policy 2510 and Administrative Procedure 2510 to define administrative and faculty roles regarding curriculum. The Policy/Procedure states that the Board will rely primarily on the Academic Senate for curriculum and student learning programs and services decisions. The college utilizes CurricUNET for all curriculum information and follows a five-year review cycle for curriculum review. The Curriculum Committee membership list indicates that academic administrators are voting members. Discussions with the curriculum co-chairs confirm that the college follows the policies and procedures regarding curriculum. (IV.A.4)

The college has established practices about ensuring that decision-making regarding planning, policies, and curriculum are informed with input from appropriate perspectives. Board Policy and Administrative Procedures 2510, 4020, and 4105 define the roles regarding decision-making, curriculum, and distance education, respectively. The *College Integrated Planning Handbook* details the planning cycles for the college’s major plans and program and department initiatives, including the roles and responsibilities of committees and councils in the planning processes. (IV.A.4, IV.A.5)

Documents that detail the decision-making processes at the college are available on the college website. The participatory governance handbook clearly outlines the decision-making process; the Committee List includes information on the membership and meeting times of all committees, councils, constituency groups, ad hoc panels and workgroups and indicates all meetings are open to all campus members. The college also provides numerous newsletters, including the *president’s Bulletin*, the *Faculty and Staff Newsletter*, and a student newsletter, and holds college wide meetings (e.g. All-College FLEX Day) to ensure communication regarding decision-making and the resulting decisions is available campus wide. In addition, discussions with various campus members, including the deans, indicate that informal communication is very effective at the college. (IV.A.6)

The college has in place a process for evaluation of governance decision-making policies and procedures. Board Policy 2410 indicates that the chancellor is responsible for the review of Board Policies as necessary and Administrative Procedures every four years. In addition, to measure the implementation of such policies and procedures, the Department of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness annually conducts surveys of each college governance

committee. The surveys measure levels of collaboration, transparency, the reliance on evidence in decision-making, effectiveness, and efficiency of the committees. The Department of Institutional Research provides a summary of the evaluation for each committee. Discussions with the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness confirm that the evaluations are used to improve committee performance. (IV.A.7)

Conclusion:

The college meets the standard.

IV.B. Chief Executive Officer

General Observations:

The college president provides a culture of professional learning focused on improving the quality of educational services delivered across the college by engaging all constituency groups in discussions and professional growth activities. She is deeply committed to professional development for all constituencies, is a strong proponent of integrated planning, and ensures that planning drives the allocation of resources. From the president's role as the principal administrator to her participation within participatory governance structures and numerous other communication venues, the quality of the college is assured including planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing college effectiveness.

Findings and Evidence:

A review of the college president's job description confirms that the president is the institutional chief executive officer (CEO) with primary responsibility for the quality of the institution. The CEO provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness through several collegial, shared governance processes. A review of meeting agendas and minutes shows that through these shared governance structures, the president regularly communicates institutional values, goals, institution-set standards, and other relevant information, to internal and external stakeholders. The president communicates the importance of a culture of evidence and a focus on student learning through her staffing decisions and the concomitant organizational structure, as well as her regular participation in the various committees and forums that address these issues. A review of the Integrated Planning Handbook confirms that the institution has mechanisms in place to link institutional research, particularly research on student learning, to institutional planning processes, and resource allocation processes, which has been driven by the CEO, under whose direction the Department of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness maintains rigorous evaluation and ongoing analysis of planning processes, resource allocation, and outcomes. (IV.B.1)

A review of the college's organizational chart shows that the president plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure that is organized and staffed to reflect the institution's purposes, size, and complexity. Observation of the various sites and conversations with staff at

all sites confirms that the president delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate. Staff at all levels expressed appreciation for the collaborative nature of the president and her leadership team, and the autonomy that each demonstrates in their areas of responsibility. Recent administrative hires demonstrate that the president actively maintains the organizational structure to address the changing needs of the college. (IV.B.2)

A review of college planning processes and procedures, as well as minutes of various shared governance meetings, as well as conversations with various college staff, confirm that the president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities, and sets institutional performance standards for student achievement. A demonstration from the college's institutional researcher confirmed that the college has established an environment of data-driven decision making and process development, and that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis of external and internal conditions. A review of the college's Integrated Planning Handbook, and associated planning meeting minutes, confirms that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and allocation to support student achievement and learning and to ensure that allocation of resources supports and improves achievement and learning. A review of the 2016-2020 Educational Master Plan and 2017-2020 Integrated Wing Plan shows that the mission is the lens through which all institutional planning efforts and resource allocation decisions are made as outlined in the Integrated Planning Handbook, which also establishes procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts to achieve the mission of the institution. A review of College Council meeting minutes confirms that the collegial processes established by the president are rigorously evaluated by all constituency leaders and that the outcomes of these processes are in accordance with these established procedures. (IV.B.3)

BP 3200 ensures that the district chancellor and the college president have primary leadership roles for accreditation, ensuring that the institution meets or exceeds Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies. The president, in collaboration with the institution's ALO, takes the lead role in the accreditation process, in creating a culture of commitment to continuous quality improvement, and in ensuring that others on campus understand accreditation. The president is a member of the shared governance committee that oversees integrated planning and accreditation and promotes ongoing awareness of ACCJC standards and advances the practice of continuous quality improvement. The president is also an active participant in leading external review teams on behalf of the Commission which enhances her skill in leading accreditation processes at the college and encouraging continuous quality improvement. A review of rosters of accreditation leadership teams shows that faculty, staff, students, and managers share responsibility for assuring compliance with accreditation requirements. (IV.B.4)

A review of Board Policies and Administrative Procedures shows that the district chancellor has delegated to the college president the authority to implement statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and to ensure that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies, including effective control of budget and expenditures. A review of committee agendas and minutes shows that the president has regular and substantive contact with all constituency group leaders to share information about the college and to update leaders about

statutes, regulations, and policies that may be changing or need attention. Other delegated responsibilities include developing the college's strategic plan, fiscal responsibility for fiscal operations and the college budget, personnel, professional development, leadership, accountability, and professional conduct. Conversations with college administrators, as well as a review of board and college-level meeting minutes confirms that the college president has full delegated responsibility and authority to direct the operations of the college with the full support of the district chancellor and the Board of Trustees. (IV.B.5)

A review of documents and reports, as well as conversations with staff from the various college sites, confirms that the CEO works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution. Staff are well informed by the college president through a variety of venues, such as, open forums, semester orientations for all staff, monthly email bulletins and newsletters, daily email communications, all-college flex day activities, townhalls, and other personal contacts. Staff report that the president visits the various sites and takes time to make personal contact with all college constituents. Additionally, documentation demonstrates that the president and her executive staff meet regularly with the local unified school district Superintendents, and the president attends USD Board meetings when relevant topics are on the agenda. The president regularly attends City, Board, and Chamber of Commerce events in all the communities served by the college, and the college publishes and widely distributes year-end reports to ensure that communities served by the college are regularly informed about the institution. (IV.B.6)

Conclusion:

The college meets the standard.

IV.C. Governing Board

General Observations:

The Coast Community College District (CCCD) is governed by a five-member board elected by citizens of the district, and a student trustee who has an advisory vote. The student trustee is chosen by the district Student Council. The governing board, assisted by the chancellor, establishes policies that uphold the district's mission and assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the financial condition and the student learning programs and services of the district and its three colleges. District policies and procedures are easily found on the district website, and the evidence indicates that the governing board regularly reviews key indicators of student learning and achievement as well as plans for improving academic quality.

The governing board is an autonomous body that follows the public interest, advocates for and defends its colleges, protects them from undue influence and political pressure, and develops and employs policies that are comprehensive, publicly available, and consistent with the district and college missions. The governing board adheres to a clearly and well-established Code of Ethics and Conflict of Interest Policy.

The district offers the governing board a variety of opportunities to engage in district-funded

ongoing professional development. The governing board conducts regular self-evaluations and evaluations of the chancellor including input from its constituencies. Through the evaluations, the governing board develops goals for itself and has input on the chancellor's goals.

The governing board advocates for the district and its colleges and is informed about and engaged in the Accreditation process. Moreover, the governing board went through a thorough process including special public hearings and approval of area maps, to move from district-wide at-large elections to by-area elections in 2018.

Findings and Evidence:

Board policy (BP 2200) delineates the scope of the governing board's roles and responsibilities which include assuring the academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the district. (IV.C.1)

The 4000 series of Board Policies address in some way the academic affairs of the institution including the student learning and achievement in the programs offered in the district. The 5000 series addresses aspects of the services provided to students to ensure their successful outcomes. These services range from outreach to enrollment to registration to completion and transfer or employment. Finally, the 6000 series provides for all aspects of the business and fiscal management of the district and the colleges. (IV.C.1, IV.C.5)

The governing board speaks with one voice, and once they reach a decision, despite occasional split votes, all members support that decision. The governing board reviews Board Policy 2715 Code of Ethics annually and affirms the notion that the governing board acts as a whole and that authority rests only with the governing board and not with individual members. It also reviews its conflict of interest policy, procedure, and code. Board Policy 2720 sets guidelines for acceptable communication outside of properly-posted meetings, and the Board also adheres to the Ralph M. Brown Act. (IV.C.2)

The governing board follows clearly-defined policies for selecting and evaluating the chancellor. Board Policy 2431, chancellor Selection, and Board Policy 2435, Evaluation of the chancellor, outline the rules and requirements for hiring and evaluating the district CEO. In response to two failed chancellor searches, the governing board amended Board Policy 2431 to include an expedited process by which the current chancellor was hired. The peer review team found the chancellor Selection policy to be unnecessarily prescriptive given that an expedited policy was needed to successfully complete the chancellor search. The governing board may wish to review the chancellor Selection policy to allow them greater flexibility when they next search for a chancellor. Evidence of the chancellor's evaluation as well as the chancellor's goals for the district, specific to academic years 2017-19, are contained in the first of six separate closed session agendas over the past several years. (IV.C.3)

The governing board is an independent, policy-making body that reflects the public interest in the quality of the institution's educational programs and services. The governing board advocates for and defends the district and protects it from undue influence or political pressure. The peer review team observed evidence that documents governing board actions supporting

legislation that met the interests of students, including support for dual high school enrollment legislation, support for undocumented students, and expansion of the Cal-Grant program for community college students. Completing the process to move from “at large” to “by area” voting and staggering the terms of governing board members, as well as Board Policy 2110, Vacancies on the Board, Board Policy 2715, Code of Ethics, Board Policy 2200, Duties and Responsibilities, Board Policy 2345, Public Participation at Board Meetings, and Board Policy 2340, Agendas, are also evidence of the governing board’s awareness of its roles and responsibilities to its constituents. (IV.C.4, IV.C.11)

The governing board has developed, implemented, and followed policies consistent with the district’s mission to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them. Evidence of this is reflected in a host of specific policies in the 4000 series of Board Policies, Academic Affairs, the 5000 series, Services to Students, and 6000 series, Fiscal Services. These policies relate to such processes as curriculum approval, review of institutional effectiveness, and policies ensuring adequate budget capacity to serve its student population. (IV.C.5)

The governing board publishes bylaws and policies specifying its size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures in Chapter 2 of their policies, Board of Trustees. These policies describe the size and composition of the governing board, how members are elected, how meetings are conducted, the duties and responsibilities of governing board members, and the code of ethics members are expected to follow. (IV.C.6)

The governing board acts consistently with its policies such as Board Policy 2200, Board Duties and Responsibilities. The governing board regularly reviews and updates policies in accordance with Board Policy 2410 to achieve effectiveness in meeting the missions and visions of the district and the colleges and to stay abreast of legal changes. (IV.C.7)

To keep its focus on ensuring student success, the governing board reviews key indicators of student learning and achievement and institutional plans for improving academic quality. The most recent key indicators are contained in the district-wide Institutional Effectiveness Reports, 2017 and 2018. The reports also contain district and college performance on the California Community College Chancellor’s Office Scorecard measures. Throughout the year, the governing board hears other reports at their meetings and study sessions from district and college staff members detailing achievement. Recent presentations to the governing board included topics such as strategic objectives, guided pathways, transfer success, and land infrastructure for support services at the colleges. (IV.C.8)

The governing board has a comprehensive training program for their own education and development that includes a new member orientation, access to other trainings through such organizations as the Community College League of California (CCLC), an ethics training and certification, budget allocation workshops, and regular reports from a variety of sources. While significant training opportunities are available, governing board members indicate that they take uneven advantage of the training depending on their personal interest and available time. The Board demonstrates its commitment to professional development through Board Policy 2735, Board Member Travel, which allows each member to participate in conferences, meetings, and workshops annually. In addition, each governing board member has access to a generous budget

for conference travel and training. In interviews, governing board members report that most of them take advantage of training opportunities, and they often share an oral or written report to the full governing board and the public at open meetings. Over time, various governing board members have taken on state- or national-level service to the California Community Colleges. (IV.C.9)

The governing board evaluates itself through Board Policy 2745, Board Self-Evaluation, to identify strengths and areas for improvement. This self-evaluation is scheduled for once every two years since 2013. The peer review team validated that three evaluation cycles were completed by the governing board since 2013, with the most recent occurring in November 2017 and January 2018. The evaluation process assesses the governing board's effectiveness in promoting and sustaining academic quality and institutional effectiveness. The results of the evaluation are discussed in public and for each evaluation, the district establishes a website where self-evaluation surveys, surveys of district employees, and governing board goals can be accessed. (IV.C.10)

The governing board upholds a Code of Ethics, Board Policy 2715, and Conflict of Interest Policy, Board Policy 2710 and 2712, and individual members adhere to the policies. The governing board also has a clearly-defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code and implements it when necessary. The district has had no claims of conflicts of interest since the Code of Ethics was adopted, so there are no examples of Board members having employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution.(IV.C.11)

Through Board Policy 2430, Delegation of Authority to the chancellor, the governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to the chancellor to implement and administer board policies without interference and holds the chancellor responsible for the operation of the district. The peer review team validated this through the existence of Board Policy 2430 which delegates authority for administering district policies to the chancellor, and through interviews with the chancellor, his subordinates, and governing board members. (IV.C.12)

The governing board maintains a focus on accreditation by being informed about Eligibility Requirements, the Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, accreditation processes, and the colleges' accredited status. The governing board supports the district's efforts to improve and excel. The governing board also participates in the evaluation of their roles and functions in the accreditation process. (IV.C.13)

Conclusion:

The college and district meet the standard.

IV.D. Multi-College Districts or Systems

General Observations:

The Coast Community College District benefits from the leadership of an effective chancellor who was selected by the district's governing board in 2016. The chancellor provides leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence. The district has established clearly-defined roles of operation between the college and district offices, although the district has begun a review and revision of its functional map of role delineations between the district and Colleges. Policies for resource allocation and reallocation are in place to ensure that the college can operate effectively. While there is general agreement across the colleges that the resource allocation model is working, the chancellor is interested in revamping the allocation model to align it with recent changes in the state's funding formula that reward colleges for improving student success completion metrics. The district's college presidents have independence to lead and control the operation of their colleges and the chancellor won praise for his effective leadership style. District and college planning processes are well integrated and have an appropriate emphasis on student learning, achievement, and institutional effectiveness. The district has communication channels in place to ensure timely input into budget and planning processes and these channels contribute to the effective operation of the colleges. As noted earlier, the district is in the process of reviewing its delineation of roles and responsibilities relative to the colleges. Beyond that, the district has a regular review process for updating board policies and administrative procedures and for evaluating governance and decision-making processes. The district regularly completes climate surveys in order to document institutional effectiveness and how the college performs in meeting goals for student learning and achievement. The results of these surveys are communicated widely to the district and its relevant audiences.

Findings and Evidence:

The district CEO ("chancellor") provides leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. Working with the colleges, the chancellor establishes clearly defined roles, authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district. The district has a clear policy, Board Policy 2430, that delegates authority and responsibility for district and college operations. The chancellor uses bi-weekly cabinet meetings that feature the three college presidents and three vice chancellors to set expectations for the college leaders and the district. Periodic meetings with college presidents also afford the chancellor a one-on-one opportunity to set expectations and discuss the operations at the colleges. Interviews with the chancellor and cabinet members suggest that these meetings work well to establish shared expectations and communicate areas of college divergence that are appropriate. For instance, the chancellor indicated that the college presidents feel free to agree to implement innovations at two of the colleges while another might not if the innovation would not fit the other college's culture. The chancellor also chairs the district Consultation Council (DCC), which serves as the district coordinating governance council with representatives from the various constituencies of the three colleges. The chancellor's annual State of the District documents, which began with his tenure in

February 2017, and his regular newsletters clearly state his goals and expectations of educational excellence and integrity. (IV.D.1)

The district chancellor clearly delineates, documents, and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice. Various Board Policies delineate the responsibilities of the chancellor and the college presidents, including Board Policy 2430. The district and colleges appear to rely on a detailed description of functional responsibilities in a 26-page functional map. This document helps to delineate the lines of operational responsibilities for district staff and college staff on various functional duties. Interviews with college and district staff during the visit documented that the functional map is being reviewed by the colleges and the district leadership to bring it in line with operational expectations and to improve its utility. For example, on January 29, 2019 the key leaders at the three colleges met to discuss the functional map. There was consensus that the current map may be too focused on the roles of each senior administrator at the district. Interviews with various leaders suggested that this document is ripe for revision and the peer review team believes that the initial progress being made on this component could lead to a clearer delineation of roles and responsibilities. The peer review team looks forward to checking in on the progress of this work as the district seeks to re-shape the lines of responsibility and ensure district operations support the overall effectiveness of the colleges.

Even with these changes, the peer review team was able to review the functional map and inquire about the district's efforts to support effective allocation of resources and planning to support the accredited status of the college. No concerns emerged and the functional map revision represents evidence of on-going institutional improvement. In addition to these changes, district services were evaluated through the 2016 Personal Assessment of the college Environment (PACE) Survey, which indicated that a majority of respondents at the college and district level were satisfied with the working environment of the colleges and the district. All evidence indicated that the district's documents and operations were seen as supporting the effective operation and improvement of the colleges.

Besides the functional map and board policies mentioned above, the peer review team was able to elicit very positive views about the manner in which the chancellor communicates about college and district governance and lines of responsibility. Interviews with governing board members, college presidents, and college faculty and staff leaders indicated that the chancellor had brought a calming, trustworthy sense of confidence to the district's operations. The chancellor's communications about district-wide projects and college updates are frequent and well received. Despite an ambitious series of construction projects that were underway using Measure M dollars, overall perceptions concerning the district and college governance were extremely positive and the chancellor received praise from a number of sectors for his communication and leadership style. (IV.D.2)

The district has a policy for allocation and reallocation of resources that is adequate to support the effective operations and sustainability of the colleges and district and the current chancellor ensures effective control of expenditures. Board Policies and Administrative Procedures (6200, 6250, 6300, 6902, and 6903) define and ensure the allocation of district general fund resources to the colleges. The chancellor and college presidents expressed general satisfaction with the

district's budget allocation model, although some concerns were voiced in the Golden West college Institutional Self-Evaluation Report about the model not providing a fair amount of resources to their campus. Additionally, the chancellor indicated that the overall budget allocation model would be reviewed to bring it in closer alignment with recent changes in state funding principles in the California system in ways that would reward the colleges for strong performance on student success metrics. As described earlier in this report, the district has policies in place that ensure a sufficient budget reserve of 10 percent of general fund unrestricted revenue, while also allowing for surplus funds to be designated for one-time projects at the colleges or the district. The 2017 Fiscal Plan has three clearly defined goals for allocation of funds: supporting student access and success; meeting all long-and short-term obligations; and proactive budgeting for financial stability in on-coming years. Besides a desire to revamp the budget allocation process to align it more closely with new statewide funding formula principles, interviews with college and district leaders indicated that there were no on-going concerns about the budget and resource allocation model used by the district. (IV.D.3)

The chancellor delegates full responsibility and authority to the presidents of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district policies without interference and holds the college presidents accountable for the operation of the colleges. Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 2430 outline the delegation of authority to the college presidents at the campus level. The district's functional map also speaks to the role delineation between the chancellor and college presidents, and as suggested earlier, the district leadership is making progress on re-drawing this functional map. Interviews with the current college presidents and the chancellor indicate that the designation of CEO responsibility and accountability is an area of strength for the district. college presidents expressed the view that they had clear authority to lead their colleges without interference and conveyed a very favorable impression of the chancellor's style of "quiet leadership." This sense of collegial independence was expressed by both an experienced college CEO and a newly hired one in interviews. The chancellor expressed the view that he sees his role as a supporting one for the college presidents. Overall, the chancellor won strong praise for his style of interacting with college leaders and allowing them the space to lead their respective colleges. (IV.D.4)

District planning and evaluation are integrated with planning and evaluation to improve student learning and achievement and institutional effectiveness. As discussed earlier in Standard I, the college's Educational Master Plan (EMP) and goals are aligned with the district's strategic goals via a crosswalk that is highlighted in the college EMP documents. There are appropriate emphases in the planning documents on student access and success. This integration across district and college plans is strengthened by a six-year planning cycle that ensures a connection is made between college and district planning processes. As noted in Standard I, the college has effective resources in place to communicate the linkages between planning processes. The district also has a district Facilities Master Plan, a district Strategic Technology Plan, and a district Strategic Fiscal Plan each of which were established collaboratively with the major councils and committees of the district. District-wide plans for facilities and technology provide strategic priorities and incorporate college-specific goals and activities to achieve these priorities and goals. The effectiveness of the integration is evaluated through the outcome metrics included in the district-wide Strategic Plan and it is evaluated and discussed throughout the -on an annual basis. (IV.D.5)

Communications between the colleges and district office ensures effective operations of the colleges and are timely, accurate, and complete in order for the colleges to make decisions effectively. Communication flows between the two levels via the chancellor's Cabinet, the DCC, which has representation of college constituency leaders and bargaining groups, and through various subcommittees with responsibility over district-wide resource issues. The chancellor also uses a weekly email brief and communications documents that are distributed widely and prepared by his marketing staff. Budget development timelines appear to be consistent with a process that allows the colleges to provide timely input into the budget and resource allocation process. Interviews with key college leaders, the chancellor and governing board members documented a high level of satisfaction with communication flows between the district and the colleges. (IV.D.6)

The chancellor appears to regularly evaluate district and college role delineations, governance and decision-making processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals for student achievement and learning. While the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report for the three colleges provided just slim evidence of this, it was clear to the peer review team that policies like Board Policy 2430 and Administrative Procedure 2430, which outline roles and responsibilities for the chancellor and college presidents, undergo regular review for their relevance to the effective operation of the colleges. Moreover, the colleges conduct periodic climate surveys that provide evidence of satisfaction with the college-district role delineations. The district widely communicates the results of the climate surveys processes and uses them as the basis for improvement. Interviews conducted during the visit also documented that the functional map that outlines role delineations is currently under review to ensure it remains up to date in addressing district and college roles and responsibilities. The peer review team encourages the district and college to continue this work in revamping its functional map document. (IV.D.7)

Conclusion:

The college and district meet the standard.

District Commendation:

The chancellor is commended for his ability to promote a calming leadership style and to communicate effectively about college and district governance roles, resulting in a climate that emphasizes a strong sense of confidence about college and district operations. (IV.D.2, IV.D.4)

Quality Focus Essay

The peer review team reviewed Coastline College's Quality Focus Essay (QFE) and found that the college has established two laudable goals to strengthen student learning and student achievement. One goal is to develop the college's guided pathways approach by "embarking on organizational culture change in order to become more equitable." The goal of achieving "culture change" is to be reached by the second of the QFE's stated goals, namely, improvement in the college's professional development programs.

In light of these goals, the team offers its assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the QFE.

Strengths of the QFE:

1. There is evidence of the college's commitment to a guided pathways approach that will strengthen student learning and achievement.
2. As demonstrated in the chart on page 237 of the ISER, there is evidence of alignment between guided pathways goals and college goals, thus establishing guided pathways as an approach with broad, institutional applications.

Weaknesses of the QFE:

1. There is no evident system to evaluate expected improvements in student learning and achievement resulting from the QFE's stated goals.
2. There is little, if any, explanation how and why professional development emerged as an activity that will enhance the guided pathways program.
3. There is no explanation how the professional development programs and training cited in the QFE will promote guided pathways. In fact, most of the professional development programs cited lacked mention of "guided pathways," "equity," "culture change," "institutional change," or any of the other benefits the QFE claims will result from professional development enhancements.

The peer review team recognizes the college's commitment to these two areas and appreciates the time and effort the college has taken in developing the QFE. At the same time, the peer review team believes the college would be well-served by a thoughtful re-examination of how the goals expressed in the QFE will be evaluated, how and why professional development emerged as a means to enhance guided pathways and how the referenced professional development programs and training relate to the goals of guided pathways.