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Summary of the Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION: Orange Coast College

DATE OF VISIT: March 5-8, 2007

TEAM CHAIR: James M. Meznek, Chancellor
Ventura County Community College District

A nine-member accreditation team with two team assistants visited Orange Coast College from March 5-8, 2007 for the purpose of evaluating the college’s request to reaffirm accreditation. In preparation for the visit, the team chair attended a team chair workshop on January 18, 2007, the chair and the team attended a training session on February 5, 2007, and the chair and a team assistant conducted a pre-visit to the college and the Coast Community College District on February 14, 2007.

The team received the college’s self study report several weeks prior to the March 2007 visit, and team members found it to be comprehensive, addressing all standards and the Commission’s eligibility requirements satisfactorily. The self study report was well written and compiled through broad participation by the campus community.

During the site visit, the college provided team members a tour of the campus and an opportunity to meet numerous college staff at an open reception. Throughout the site visit, team members held over 50 meetings with college staff at the Administration building and Watson Hall. Team members were also available to meet with any member of the college community at two open meetings. Two team members visited the college’s off-site School of Sailing and Seamanship, and several team members attended committee meetings taking place on campus during the visit. In addition, several classes in session were observed.

The team reviewed documents supporting the self study report in the team room as well as board policies and procedures, official records, committee minutes and information provided through the college online portal. Despite requests to both the college and district, the team could not obtain a multi-college/district mapping document, which delineated district and college functions. A number of online courses were reviewed, including disciplines in health education, math, psychology, music, and food service management.

Overall, the team greatly appreciated the enthusiasm and support from college staff throughout the visit. College staff responded quickly to team requests and needs.

The team found the college has partially responded to the recommendations from its October 2000 site visit team.
College Commendations

The college is commended for its success in transferring large numbers of its students to the California State University and University of California systems and for the high rate of success of these students upon transfer.

The college is commended for the strong emphasis it places on outreach and recruitment as evidenced by the President’s leadership of and collegewide participation in the Outreach and Recruitment Committee and the well-produced and compelling promotional DVD, “We’ll Help You Get There.”

The college and the Associated Students of Orange Coast College are commended for the depth and breadth of the student life programs and campus cultural activities, and the contributions of these activities to an environment of diversity and civic engagement for all constituent groups.

The college is commended for its innovative approach toward instilling in students the principles of academic honesty through its Academic Integrity Seminar Program. This seminar is for students who have been referred to the Dean of Students for academic dishonesty. The course includes topics such as cheating, plagiarism, and ethics both in and out of the classroom.

College Recommendations

Recommendation 1
The team recommends that the college accelerate its efforts to identify measurable student learning outcomes for every course, instructional program, and student support program and incorporate student learning outcome assessments into course and program improvements. (Standards I.B, I.B.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.B.4, II.C.2)

Recommendation 2
The team recommends that the college strengthen the content of its program reviews to include a comprehensive and meaningful analysis of data with particular emphasis on student enrollment, program completion, retention, success, and achievement of student learning outcomes and make improvements to its programs based on the results of the enhanced program review process. (Standards I.B.3, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B.1, II.B.3.c, II.B.4, II.C.2)

Recommendation 3
The team recommends that the college broaden the focus of its academic, student services, and administrative planning and budgeting processes for human, physical, technological, and financial resources beyond an annual basis to encompass a longer-term framework. Plans, accompanied by budget allocations, must be developed for the replacement of equipment and technology, repair and maintenance of buildings and facilities, and the hiring of instructional and non-instructional personnel. The transparency of the college’s planning and budgeting processes
must be enhanced, with institutional stakeholders made more aware of the procedures and
criteria employed. The process should draw upon the findings and recommendations contained
in program reviews and be filtered through the college’s planning committee structure.
(Standards I.A.4, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.c, III.A.6, III.D.1.c,
III.D.3, IV.A.1)

Recommendation 4
The team recommends that the college assess the effectiveness of the new committee
planning structure, communicate its findings in writing to the college community, and
implement identified improvements on a continuous basis. (Standards I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6,
I.B.7, IV.A.2, IV.A.3, IV.A.5)

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

Districtwide Office Review

During the course of the simultaneous accreditation visits at Orange Coast College,
Golden West College, and Coastline Community College, district personnel were
interviewed by team chairs and team members, individually and jointly, for the purpose
of identifying any potential recommendations related to the district. In addition, several
members of all three teams met with the Board of Trustees at a special board meeting on
March 7, 2007. The team reviewed board policy and district documents as it assessed
evidence regarding district operations.

Districtwide Commendations

The college is commended for the value derived by its investment of Measure C funds in
buildings, infrastructure, facilities, technology, and equipment. Currently under
construction or in planning are projects for additional student parking, a Learning
Resource Center, fitness Center, Theater and Music Complex, Applied Science Center,
Consumer Health and Science buildings, Student Union building, and an interdisciplinary
studies complex.

The district is commended for its comprehensive plan to address its future retiree benefits
liability. With the adoption of its 2006-2007 budget, the district set aside $15.2 million in an
irrevocable Joint Powers Agreement Trust. The district plan calls for adding 2.5% of employee
salaries to the Trust in 2006-2007 with a 3% contribution in 2007-2008. Frequent actuarial
studies will occur to ensure the district makes steady progress in meeting its retiree liability.
Districtwide Recommendations

Recommendation 6
The team recommends that the board develop a clearly defined procedure for addressing board member behavior that violates its Code of Ethics. Additionally, it is recommended that the district develop a written code of professional ethics for all its personnel. (Standards III.A.1.d, IV.B.1, IV.B.1.g, IV.B.1.h)

Recommendation 7
The team recommends that the board adopt a formal written process for the selection of chancellor, vice chancellors, and college presidents. In addition, the board should develop a policy that clearly delegates authority from the chancellor to the college presidents for the effective operation of the colleges. (Standards IV.B.1.j, IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a)

Recommendation 8
The team recommends that the trustees and chancellor establish and communicate a clear vision for the importance of student learning outcomes and program review as assessment processes for institutional improvement. (Standard IV.B.1.b)

Recommendation 9
The team recommends that the board implement a process for the evaluation of its policies and procedures according to an identified timeline and revise the policies as necessary. (Standard IV.B.1.e)

Recommendation 10
The team recommends that the board establish a process and specific timeline for updating the district’s Vision 2010 plan. (Standard IV.B.3)

Recommendation 11
The team recommends that the college and district adhere to the Commission policy for the evaluation of institutions in multi-college districts by immediately delineating specific district functions as distinct from those of the colleges’ functions, and communicate these delineated functions to all college and district constituencies, so there is a clear understanding of their respective organizational roles, authority and responsibilities for the effective operations of the colleges, and in meeting the Accreditation Standards. (Standards IV.B, IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.g and Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems, January 2004)
Introduction

Orange Coast College was the third community college established in Orange County, California, and began serving students in September 1948. Located in the city of Costa Mesa, the college campus is part of the Coast Community College District. The two other district colleges are Golden West College and Coastline Community College.

The college is organized into four wings, each supporting student learning through different areas of focus. The president’s wing includes institutional research, community relations, publications, special events, staff development, and the college foundation. The instructional wing includes nine academic divisions, the library, extended education, instructional computing, and web services. The student services wing includes student services, enrollment, student health, extended opportunities programs and services, the childcare center, and bookstore operations, and the administrative services wing includes fiscal services, personnel, maintenance and operations, and construction and facilities services. College committees are considered an integral part of the governance structure and are composed of faculty, classified staff, students, and administration representatives.

The college has over 1,000 employees in a variety of positions including 29 administrators, 333 classified, 271 full-time faculty, and 461 part-time faculty. As of fall 2005, 47% of the faculty and 59% of the classified employees were female. Since 2000, the full-time and part-time faculty, administrators, and classified staff have become more diverse.

The college’s population of approximately 31,000 students has become more ethnically diverse and younger. Caucasian student enrollment decreased from 55.4% in fall 1995 to 45.9% in fall 2005 while the Hispanic/Latino population increased from 12.8% to 18.8% during the same time period. African-American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Native American student populations have remained relatively constant for the past ten years. Over the past decade, most of the college’s growth occurred in the “under-21” age group. In fall 1995, 33.6% of Orange Coast College students were under age 21 compared to 46.1% in fall 2005; whereas 58.2% of students were under age 25 in fall 1995 compared to 71.3% in fall 2005. Approximately 47% of the college students reside outside the boundaries of the district.

The college consists of a 164-acre campus with 83 buildings and its off-campus facilities: the School of Sailing and Seamanship in Newport Beach and Rabbit Island, a 22-acre island and research facility off the coast of British Columbia, Canada.

Many facilities on the college campus were constructed in the early 1950s. Much of the infrastructure dates back to when the college was an Army Air Force base.

With the passage of Measure C, a $370 million bond approved by voters in fall 2002, a great deal of facilities renovation and construction has taken place at the college. Recently completed projects include the soccer fields; stadium renovation; south campus
utilities upgrade; baseball field; Parking Lot F extension; Sailing Center sea wall and ramp repairs; the Doyle Arts Pavilion; Watson Hall seismic reconstruction; and the remodel of the Home Economics and Social Science classroom buildings.

Currently under construction or in planning are projects for additional student parking; Learning Resource Center; Fitness Center; Theater and Music Complex; Applied Science Center; Consumer Health and Science buildings; Student Union building; and an interdisciplinary studies complex.
Responses to the Recommendations of the 2000 Team

Recommendation 1

That a more effective instructional Program Review process that can lead to improvement of programs and services be developed. (Standards 3.A.4, 4.D)

The team found evidence that indicates the college partially responded to the 2000 Team’s recommendation.

The college had recently completed a six-year program review cycle at the time of the team visit. All of its instructional programs had undergone some form of review since its previous accreditation visit in 2000. Based upon the current team’s review of the content of several completed program reviews, however, the team could not conclude that the review process “can lead to the improvement of programs and services to be developed.” Most of the program reviews posted on the college portal featured extremely vague, cursory analysis of program data. Resource needs identified are not linked to program goals and objectives.

Recommendation 2

That a planning process that integrates all educational, financial, physical, and human resources planning efforts be developed and published, and that the process include regularly scheduled review and modification when necessary. (Standards 3.B.1, 3.B.3, 3.C.3, 8.5, 9.A)

The team found evidence that indicates the college partially responded to the 2000 team’s recommendation.

The team recognizes the strides made to improve the college’s planning process and effectiveness toward achieving its stated goals by the creation of the Orange Coast College Master Plan and the establishment of four new college planning committees. The Orange Coast College Master Plan establishes specific goals to improve the effectiveness of the institution consistent with its stated mission through an Academic Master Plan, Technology Master Plan, and Facilities Master Plan and tasks the college’s seven planning committees with various components of their implementation. The team found evidence of various written Master Plans but very little documentation regarding the outcomes from planning. Although the planning process has been modified over time with many new components added, the team could find no evidence that it was subject to regularly-scheduled review.

Recommendation 3

That the College High Technology Committee be revived or a new committee formed to plan for the technological needs of the College and support the ongoing implementation of the new district-wide management information system. (Standards 4.D.7, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.7)
The team found evidence that indicates the college partially responded to the 2000 Team’s recommendation.

In response to the recommendation of the 2000 team visit, the college created a new Information and Technology Committee during the 2002-03 academic year. It was discontinued and replaced by a new committee in spring 2004. The new committee meets monthly, consists of all campus constituencies, and produced the Technology Master Plan 2005-2008. However, technology planning was found to partially integrate with institutional planning. The college’s technology plan is not comprehensive. It fails to address technology policies, staffing, equipment replacements, budgets, timelines, and ongoing evaluation for effectiveness.
Eligibility Requirements

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges Eligibility Requirements for Accreditation (Revised January 2004) contain expectations about the quality of the institution’s degree of satisfaction of the Eligibility Requirements. The team found that the college broadly met all eligibility requirements.

1. Authority
The team confirmed that the college receives state approval for its programs and services and is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior College of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The college is authorized by the State of California’s Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office to operate as an educational institution and to offer two-year courses of study leading to certificates and degrees.

2. Mission
The team confirmed that the college’s mission statement is clearly defined. It was last revised and adopted by the Board of Trustees on April 5, 2006. The college’s mission statement is included in the catalog and is posted on the college’s website. The mission is appropriate to a two-year degree-granting institution of higher education.

3. Governing Board
The team confirmed that the college has a functioning governing board responsible for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the institution and for ensuring that the institution’s mission is being carried out. Its membership is sufficient in size and composition to fulfill all board responsibilities. Although the board has a code of ethics, the team noted that it lacks a policy outlining how violations of its code will be handled.

4. Chief Executive Officer
The team confirmed the college has a chief executive officer who is appointed by the governing board and whose primary responsibility is to the district. The team, however, did not find evidence that the board has a formal written policy for the selection of the chancellor, vice chancellors, and college presidents. In addition, a policy could not be identified that clearly delegates authority from the chancellor to the college presidents for the effective operation of the colleges.

5. Administrative Capacity
The team confirmed the college has an administrative staff that supports the necessary services for an institution of its size, mission, scope, and purpose.

6. Operating Status
The team confirmed the college is operational with students actively pursuing its degree programs. Approximately 1,350 Associate of Arts Degrees and 381 Certificates of Achievement were awarded in the 2004-2005 academic year.
7. Degrees
The team confirmed the college offers a majority of credit courses for the achievement of associate degrees and certificates of completion. A significant proportion of the students are enrolled in these course offerings.

8. Educational Program
The team confirmed the college’s degree programs are congruent with its mission and represent recognized fields of study in post secondary education. The degree programs contain rigor and when combined with general education components, represent two years of full-time academic work. Faculty committees ensure that programs are of appropriate length and content and are conducted at levels appropriate to the degrees offered. The team noted, however, that the college’s degrees and certificates do not represent student achievement as assessed through student learning outcomes.

9. Academic Credit
The team confirmed the college awards academic credits based on generally accepted practices in degree-granting institutions of higher education.

10. Student Learning and Achievement
The team confirmed the college has an extremely limited number of student learning outcomes and the institution has not yet addressed the development of a collegewide student learning outcomes model of assessment and improvement. Without identifying and assessing learning outcomes or compliance with this standard, the improvement of student learning will remain a difficult challenge. Collegewide dialogue must occur, leading to the establishment of clear student learning outcomes for courses, instructional and noninstructional programs, certificates, and degrees.

11. General Education
The team confirmed the college defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and promote intellectual inquiry. The team noted that although the college maintains that their graduates possess proficiency in communication, thinking skills, global awareness, and personal development and responsibility, none of these expected institutional student learning outcomes have been formally established nor assessed.

12. Academic Freedom
The team confirmed the college faculty and students are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as judged by the academic/educational community in general.

13. Faculty
The team confirmed the college employed 271 full-time faculty members as of fall 2005. The faculty members are qualified to conduct the institution’s programs and meet state mandated minimum requirements.
14. Student Services
The team confirmed the college provides for all of its students appropriate student services and develops programs consistent with student characteristics and the institutional mission.

15. Admissions
The team confirmed the college has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission that specify the qualification of students appropriate for its programs.

16. Information and Learning Resources
The team confirmed the college, through its library, learning labs, and related programs and services, provides specific long-term access to electronic and print resources sufficient to its educational purpose.

17. Financial Resources
The team confirmed the college maintains contingency reserves, which meet Accrediting Commission requirements. The college identifies its funding base and plans for financial development as adequate to support student learning programs and services, to improve institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability. Fundamental structures and practices are in place for allocating and controlling its budget. The district has a plan to meet its future retiree benefit obligations and comply with GASB45 by July 1, 2007.

18. Financial Accountability
The team confirmed the college annually undergoes and makes available an external financial audit by a certified public accountant.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation
The team confirmed that the college maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-evaluation process and informs the public regarding its achievements. The institution plans for the improvement of institutional procedures and processes, student achievement, and student learning. The team found evidence, however, that the institution’s ongoing cycle of evaluation, planning, resource allocation and implementation requires strengthened integration of its component processes. The team did not find evidence that the institution assesses its planning mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness. The college accomplishments pertaining to the definition and assessment of student learning outcomes are extremely limited.

20. Public Information
The team confirmed the college publishes in its catalog, a class schedule, and other publications information concerning the college’s purposes and objectives, admission requirements and procedures, rules and regulations affecting students, degrees offered, degree requirements, etc. In addition, the college distributes annual publications that focus on program accomplishments and student graduates.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission
The team confirmed the college adheres to the eligibility requirements, standards, and policies of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the
Western Association for Schools and Colleges (ACCJC/WASC), describes itself in identical terms to all of its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accreditation status in a timely manner, and agrees to disclose information required by ACCJC to carry out its accrediting responsibilities.
Standard I
Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

General Comments

Orange Coast College’s mission statement defines the institution’s broad educational purpose of providing “exemplary programs leading to the Associate in Arts and Associate in Science Degrees,” transfer, workforce development, basic skills, and lifelong learning. The accompanying statement of Institutional Commitment reinforces the college’s position as a “unique learning community” and includes the core competencies for its graduates of communication, thinking skills, global awareness, and personal development and responsibility. Neither the mission nor institutional commitment statements explicitly address the college’s intended student population.

Since the last accreditation visit, the college has made commitments to the areas of planning, research, and institutional effectiveness as evidenced by the organizational structures and processes in place and the dedication of resources at the college level. Over the past three years, four new planning committees have been created, including the Instructional Planning Council, Outreach and Recruitment Committee, Facilities Planning Committee and a reinstituted Technology Committee. In addition, the college has revised the Program Review process and created the Orange Coast College Master Plan 2005-2008 with three key strategic components to address institutional effectiveness: Academics, Facilities, and Technology.

Activities designed to improve institutional effectiveness through the use of research and analysis for planning and decision-making has been ongoing. Although the college has had a long-standing focus on student success measures its student learning data focuses on retention rates, degrees and certificates earned, and transfer to four-year institutions. The college has not placed emphasis on the attainment of student learning outcomes such as the acquisition of knowledge or skills the institution expects students to learn. Extremely limited progress has been made in the college’s identification, development, and assessment of student learning outcomes.

Findings and Evidence

Standard I.A Mission

The team found evidence the college is committed to its mission, and the mission statement is communicated both internally and externally. The college provides appropriate programs and services in support of the mission, and it is prominently displayed on campus as well as found in the catalog, website, and other materials. Through campus discussions with staff, it is clear that individual classified staff, students, faculty, and administrators are familiar with the mission but view it as secondary to other resources in their planning and decision making. Campus survey results indicated that faculty and staff did not feel the college “mission statement guides
planning.” Based on the evidence reviewed, the team concurs that the mission statement should be more fully incorporated into institutional planning and decision making. (Standards I.A, I.A.1, I.A.4)

The mission statement defines this college’s broad educational purposes, as required by Standard I. The college mission and corresponding “Institutional Commitments” statements directly communicate the college’s dedication to achieve student learning. The mission, however, does not directly define the college’s intended student population. (Standard I.A)

This additional “Institutional Commitments” statement enhances the mission by articulating the college’s position as a “unique learning community,” including core institutional competencies for its graduates in the areas of communication, thinking skills, global awareness, and personal development and responsibility. The team found no evidence that these core institutional competencies for graduates were being assessed, or that plans were being developed to assess them as institutional student learning outcomes. (Standards I.A, I.A.1)

The college’s mission statement was revised and approved by the board of Trustees in April 2006. There was broad-based dialogue to inform the revision of the mission statement, as evidenced by committee minutes, open meetings, and staff interviews. (Standards I.A.2, I.A.3)

**Standard I.B Improving Institutional Effectiveness**

The team found evidence that ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about student learning occurs throughout the college. The formal evidence regarding new committee structures at the college demonstrates a shift toward more inclusive planning processes. The principal collegewide committees dedicated to the improvement of student learning and institutional outcomes are the Planning, Budget, and Instructional Planning Committees. The college’s Planning and Budget Committee is comprised of stakeholders from all constituent groups, as are its other planning-related bodies. (Standards I.B, I.B.4)

The college culture also supports campuswide town hall meetings and community forums, which are utilized to articulate its goals and accomplishments related to its Academic Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Student Learning Outcomes, and other institutional matters. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.2)

The team recognizes the progress made to strengthen the college’s planning activities and institutional effectiveness in achieving its stated goals by the creation of the Orange Coast College Master Plan and the establishment of four new college planning committees. The Orange Coast College Master Plan establishes specific goals to improve effectiveness based upon an Academic Master Plan, Technology Master Plan, and Facilities Master Plan and tasks the college’s seven planning committees with various components of their implementation. Despite these improvements, however, the team following a review of evidence, concluded the college’s planning activities were restricted to a one-year cycle, and that they lack integration across the institution’s planning components. (Standard I.B.3)
In assessing the college’s planning documents, the team found little focus on student learning outcomes assessment, which forms the core of the accreditation standards. A review of planning documents identified few references to student learning outcomes. Further, the team found little evidence of focused district college leadership in the planning process to promote student learning outcomes assessment across the college. (Standards I.A, I.B., II.A., II.B., II.C)

The goals and corresponding objectives included in planning documents such as the Academic Master Plan 2005-2008 are both measurable and qualitative but do not include student learning outcomes. The Academic Master Plan objectives are implemented primarily by its Planning Council and the members work collaboratively toward their achievement with resource needs submitted to the Planning and Budget Committee. A parallel process is followed with the Technology and Facilities Master Plans and their respective planning committees. (Standards I.B.2, I.B.3)

The various planning committees used by the college offered broad opportunities for participation to staff and students. The institutions overarch the Planning and Budget Committee had representatives from all four institutional constituencies. The Planning and Budget Committee has the authority to recommend allocation of college resources; however, no criteria exist for the prioritizing of competing resource demands. Further, the Planning and Budget Committee appears to take a short-term annual approach to its planning responsibilities. (Standards I.B.3, I.B.4)

The team found evidence that the college uses the Orange Coast College Atlas 2005-2006 to communicate matters of quality assurance to constituencies. The Atlas produced by the Office of Institutional Research offers longitudinal data related to who the students are, how successful they have been, as well as traditional metrics such as success and retention rates and employee trend data. Generally speaking, however, Atlas data is presented at the aggregate level making it somewhat limited as a tool for course and program assessment.

Other tools for improving institutional effectiveness include the online enrollment database for overall college planning and semester course scheduling, a biannual statistical report on incoming students published by the Office of enrollment Services, and a new online enrollment planning model to identify courses with full wait lists. In addition, the college portal allows for the posting of committee minutes and discussion items for campuswide access. (Standard I.B.5)

Program review mechanics were understood on campus. Systematic evaluation of student learning occurs every six years through the revised program review process that now incorporates collaborative faculty evaluation of program objectives, involvement by instructional deans in program development, and a final review of the results in a meeting that includes the faculty chair, dean, college program review coordinator, and vice president of instruction. The process includes both quantitative analyses of student trends as well as qualitative feedback obtained from faculty via a survey following completion of the process. An overall assessment of completed program reviews by the team found them to be quite cursory. Student learning outcomes are not generally incorporated into this process with the noted exception of selected
student services areas. The team concurs with the college’s self study report that there is no continuous formal link between program review and the planning and budget process. The team found the college allocated faculty resources toward the implementation of student learning outcomes in fall 2006 by providing 75% release time to a faculty Program Review Coordinator. This funding level will drop to 60% for the remaining two-year term. In addition, in spring 2007, the college established the Outcomes and Assessment Council to provide leadership for integration of student learning outcomes and assessment at all levels of the institution. (Standards I.B.6, I.B.7)

Although program review results were used as background information for Measure C bond projects and are available on the college intranet, this information is not easily accessed to campus constituents on the portal. The college indicated that a new portal for program review is currently being developed. Resource allocations by the Planning and Budget Committee for faculty positions are now dependent upon inclusion of the position request in departmental program reviews. (Standards I.B.3, I.B.5)

Conclusions

The college meets the standards governing the adoption and dissemination of a mission statement. The college is urged to use its mission statement to strengthen its connection to student learning. The team also found that the college does not use its mission statement to guide planning.

The college has begun addressing and meeting the intent of core areas within this standard of Institutional Effectiveness. Program review and planning processes have been established and implemented. Progress has been made in the area of research and analysis to guide planning and decision-making at the institution. The college, however, must strengthen its program review processes and develop a systematic process to incorporate student learning outcomes assessment. Currently, the institution does not meet all commission standards regarding student learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1
The team recommends that the college accelerate its efforts to identify measurable student learning outcomes for every course, instructional program, and student support program and incorporate student learning outcome assessments into course and program improvements. (Standards I.B, I.B.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.B.4, II.C.2)
Recommendation 2
The team recommends that the college strengthen the content of its program reviews to include a comprehensive and meaningful analysis of data with particular emphasis on student enrollment, program completion, retention, success, and achievement of student learning outcomes and make improvements to its programs based on the results of the enhanced program review process. (Standards I.B.3, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B.1, II.B.3.c, II.B.4, II.C.2)

Recommendation 3
The team recommends that the college broaden the focus of its academic, student services, and administrative planning and budgeting processes for human, physical, technological, and financial resources beyond an annual basis to encompass a longer-term framework. Plans, accompanied by budget allocations, must be developed for the replacement of equipment and technology, repair and maintenance of buildings and facilities, and the hiring of instructional and non-instructional personnel. The transparency of the college’s planning and budgeting processes must be enhanced, with institutional stakeholders made more aware of the procedures and criteria employed. The process should draw upon the findings and recommendations contained in program reviews and be filtered through the college’s planning committee structure. (Standards I.A.4, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.c, III.A.6, III.D.1.c, III.D.3, IV.A.1)

Recommendation 4
The team recommends that the college assess the effectiveness of the new committee planning structure, communicate its findings in writing to the college community, and implement identified improvements on a continuous basis. (Standards I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7, IV.A.2, IV.A.3, IV.A.5)
Standard II
Student Learning Programs and Services

General Comments

Orange Coast College is a comprehensive community college offering a wide variety of general education, vocational, basic skills, and transfer courses. It is highly regarded for the quality of its instructional offerings and the range of programs and services it offers. The college transfers a large number of its students, who perform successfully, to the California State University and University of California System. The college’s statement of Institutional Commitment reflects the institution’s educational approach as a unique learning community stressing core graduation competencies in the areas of communication, thinking skills, global awareness, and personal development and responsibility.

The college’s student services provides a full range of support to all students. In addition to the traditional articulation, assessment testing, career center, counseling, financial aid, transfer center, and health center services offered to the general student population, it has programs that serve the special needs of veterans, disabled students, re-entry students, international students, economically disadvantaged students, and underrepresented students.

The college’s library and other learning support services, including campus labs, have been designed to support the instructional programs. The library provides a variety of resources for students, including books, periodicals, and Internet access. The variety of labs on campus serve many instructional programs and allows students access to technology.

Standard II.A Instructional Programs

Findings and Evidence

The team verified that the college offers high quality instructional programs in recognized fields of study that lead to degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs consistent with its mission. Because learning outcomes at the course and program level are, for the most part, yet to be identified, the extent to which the needs of students enrolled in the various programs and courses are being adequately addressed cannot be discerned. (Standard II.B)

The team found the college programs reflected both breadth and depth typical for a comprehensive community college of its size and complexity. Although a substantial amount of information is available regarding students at the aggregate level, published documents such as the self study report and the Orange Coast College Atlas, 2005-2006 are not useful to the program/course level analysis or are otherwise not accessible to
potential users. Consequently, there is a lack of evidence to determine to what extent student needs are being met by the particular programs and courses offered by the institution. (Standard II.A.1.a)

The college has begun to implement a variety of instructional delivery systems (i.e., online learning, which now comprises approximately 18% of enrolled students) and diverse teaching methodologies such as learning communities. The team found college procedures for evaluating the compatibility of these delivery systems and modes of instruction with objectives of the curriculum and the needs of its students have yet to be developed. For example, data pertaining to comparative rates of student retention and success between online students and those enrolled in traditional face-to-face classes are either unavailable or key instructional decision-makers are unaware of them. Data regarding the effectiveness of the Freshman Experience Program initiated in fall 2005, have not been systematically gathered and disseminated. Similarly, the seven learning communities launched in spring 2006 have not received systematic evaluation of their effectiveness. The team further concurs with the college’s statement in the self study report, “the college does not currently evaluate student success and retention rates for any specific delivery modes or teaching methodologies.” While the college’s planning agenda states an intention to do so, mechanisms are not currently in place to accomplish this objective. (Standard II.A.1.b)

The college is at an extremely preliminary stage with regard to developing student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates and degrees, and assessing student achievement of those outcomes to make institutional improvements. While the current ACCJC accreditation standards were adopted in 2002, the team found that the first meaningful effort to train faculty in the definition and measurement of student learning outcomes did not occur until spring 2006 when a series of reasonably well-attended workshops were held. The most recent six-year program review cycle, completed in 2005/06, did not require the identification of program-level student learning outcomes; only with the new six-year cycle, beginning in 2006/07, will programs be required to identify at least one program-level student learning outcome. This suggests it will be at least 2012, ten years following the adoption of the accreditation standards, before each of the college’s programs has at least one student learning outcome identified.

At the time of the accreditation visit, the team noted the first group of program reviews subject to the new student learning outcomes requirement had not been completed. At the course level, 195 of the 1,350 course offerings listed in the 2006/07 college catalog had been submitted to the Curriculum Committee with at least one student learning outcome. Since courses need only be revised every six years under state law, identification of student learning outcomes for all of the college’s courses may not be completed until 2012 under the current level of expectations established by the institution. Obviously, measurement of the extent to which these yet to be determined outcomes have been met and improvements to courses and programs based on these assessments are even further away from coming to fruition. While the planning agenda section of the self study report calls for the institution to “complete identification of student learning outcomes at course and program levels” and to “assess student learning
outcomes at all levels,” at the current pace, these agenda items will not be accomplished for many years.  (Standard II.A.1.c)

The team also found that college practices established to design, identify, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs using learning outcomes are years away from being effectively implemented.  Moreover, the central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs is not clear.  The college lacks a means to ensure full faculty participation in the process of learning how to define and measure student learning outcomes for the courses they teach and the programs they oversee.  The team noted that college faculty are under no obligation to engage in professional development – the recent shift from an 18-week to a 16-week semester was not accompanied by a corresponding requirement to engage in flex training activities.  Further, faculty members are not required to prepare and distribute course syllabi or to include student learning outcomes in such documents.  Under these circumstances, responsibility for identifying and measuring student learning outcomes is left to the small proportion of faculty members who choose to do so; the remainder of the faculty is exempt from the responsibility to play a central role in establishing and maintaining quality courses and programs.  (Standards II.A.2, II.A.6)

Regarding the role of advisory committees in identifying competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, and vocational education programs, the team found evidence that annual meetings are held for each vocational/career program qualifying for VTEA funding.  Review of advisory committee meeting minutes from 2005/06 and 2006/07 indicates that some committees, accounting and CIS, for example, contribute meaningful input into program curricula, while other committee meetings serve primarily as vehicles for sharing general information regarding industry trends and programmatic developments.  Attendance at advisory committee meetings ranges from as few as two to four members (e.g., marketing, business administration, and dance) to as many as 13 or more (e.g., radiological technology).  In numerous instances, meeting minutes do not provide information regarding the number of members in attendance.  Overall, however, there is little evidence that these committees consistently play a meaningful role in identifying competency levels and measurable learning outcomes for vocational courses, certificates, and programs.

Surveys of employers of college vocational program completers are rarely conducted as the college relies primarily on advisory committees to derive feedback on the quality of its vocational programs.  At the request of the team, results from surveys of employers and graduates and job placement data for six of the 100 certificate programs listed on pages 62-66 of the 2006/07 College Catalog were provided.  The infrequency of advisory committee meetings and the inconsistent attendance of employers at such meetings limit their utility as a primary source of information pertaining to vocational program effectiveness.

Data related to the number of vocational certificates and degrees conferred for each college vocational program, are neither readily available nor broadly disseminated.  At the request of the team, a spreadsheet showing the number of certificates of achievement
annually awarded by program was provided by the Office of Institutional Research. These data indicate that of the 106 programs listed on the spreadsheet, 35 conferred no certificates between 1999/2000 and 2005/06; an additional 38 programs conferred fewer than 10 certificates over this seven-year period. Although these data cast strong doubt concerning the viability of over two-thirds of the college’s vocational certificate programs, there is no evidence to suggest that in-depth analyses of either these trends or any significant programmatic changes based on such analyses have taken place. The 35.8% decline in Certificates of Achievement awarded by the college between 1999/2000 and 2004/05 is a matter of serious concern. Data regarding the number of locally approved certificates of completion awarded, while requested by the team, were not provided by the institution. (Standards II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b)

The primary means cited in the college self study report for ensuring that high quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs is the faculty evaluation process. The institution, however, acknowledges this process has not changed for many years. Moreover, only 20% of administrators and 47.6% of faculty members surveyed agree with the statement that the current faculty evaluation process is effective, while 13.3% of administrators and 51.3% of faculty members agree that the current faculty evaluation process encourages improvement. A process many regard as an ineffective means of improving instruction is, in all likelihood, insufficient to ensure high quality instruction is being offered. While aggregate data concerning degree completions, transfers, and the performance of transferring students at four-year institutions are strongly suggestive that many, if not most programs, are effective in this regard, thereby indicating Standard II.A.2.c may in fact be met, insufficient mechanisms are in place to facilitate differentiation between effective and ineffective programs. The planning agenda contained in the self study report fails to address this deficiency.

The college has recently completed a six-year program review cycle; all instructional programs have now undergone some form of review since 2001. The process employed, however, did not entail identification and measurement of program-level student learning outcomes. Moreover, given the pace of change associated with global workforce demands, a six-year cycle of review cannot ensure program currency, particularly with respect to most vocational programs, as well as academic programs in rapidly changing fields, such as computer science, mass communication, and the physical and life sciences. Further, based on a team review of the content of several program reviews conducted between 2001 and 2005, it cannot be concluded they constitute an ongoing systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans. Most of the program reviews posted on the college portal feature are an extremely vague, cursory analysis of program data. Resource needs identified are not linked to program goals and objectives. In several instances, the evaluation section consists merely of a statement indicating faculty is “satisfied” with the existing status of programs.

Finally, evidence indicates the institution engages in little integrated long-range planning and budgeting, relying instead upon annual budgets that essentially roll over virtually all
budget allocations from the previous year, with little evidence that future needs are being identified, planned and accounted for accordingly. Therefore, it cannot be concluded that the college engages in an ongoing, systematic review of program relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans. While these deficiencies may or may not be addressed by the revised program review processes being implemented beginning in 2006/07, the college clearly does not meet the systematic review standard at this time. (Standard II.A.2.e)

Based on evidence provided by the college, the team concluded the process of measuring achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, and programs has not yet begun nor have such outcomes been identified for the vast majority of courses and programs. A newly formed Outcomes and Assessment Council will be charged with accomplishing this task; the council met once, less than a week prior to the accreditation visit. Under these circumstances, improvement in outcomes and dissemination of research and planning results may take years to come to fruition. (Standard II.A.2.f.)

The team did not find evidence supporting use of departmental course and/or program examinations, with the exception of licensure examinations in a select number of vocational programs. Consequently, the college complies with the commission standard, which calls for validation of the effectiveness of such instruments in measuring student learning and minimizing test biases. (Standard II.A.2.g.)

Because the institution has not clearly identified student learning outcomes for any of its programs, it is indeterminable whether credit is being awarded and degrees and certificates conferred based on their achievement. The self study report indicates the college follows the generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education in its determination of the units of credit awarded to each course and units of credit required to fulfill degrees and certificates. The planning agenda section calls for the college to develop an evaluation process to assure that student learning outcomes are not only identified in courses and programs but also assessed to determine achievement. The team noted that very little appears to have been accomplished regarding progress on this standard. (Standards II.A.2.h, II.A.2.i)

The college’s philosophy of general education, which, according to the college self study report, comes directly from the appropriate section of Title 5, is not clearly stated in its catalog. The catalog does contain a recently adopted list of four core student learning outcome areas for general education. The evidence has led the team to conclude, however, that the institution has not begun to engage systematically in assessment of these identified outcomes nor has it begun to determine the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum by examining the stated learning outcomes for the course. (Standards II.A.3.a, II.A.3.b, II.A.3.c)
The team reviewed the college catalog and other college documents related to degree programs. Based on the program descriptions contained in the course catalog, the team concludes that all degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry has been met. (Standard II.A.4.)

Data pertaining to pass rates on licensure examinations were provided in the team evidence room for a small number of career education programs with external certification requirements. These data support the conclusion that students completing vocational and occupational certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment and other applicable standards. Based on the limited amount of data made available to the team, this determination cannot be made for all of the more than one dozen programs offered by the college that have such requirements. Only an extremely limited amount of data from employer surveys indicating their degree of satisfaction with program graduates were made available to the team. The college self-evaluation notes there is a need for a system to track all certificate and vocational program graduates upon completing their academic goals; the planning agenda, however, does not call for the establishment of such a system. (Standard II.A.5)

The course catalog contains a brief description of each career and certificate program offered by the college. Additionally, the college includes some information regarding types of occupational fields students might enter completing any given educational program. In this way, the institution assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. Since, however, student learning outcomes have yet to be identified for the college’s program offerings, instructors are not required to prepare and distribute course syllabi nor required to specify student learning objectives in those that are distributed, the team concludes this substandard is only partially met. (Standard II.A.6)

Data pertaining to student transfer to four-year institutions indicates the college is doing an outstanding job. As of 2004-2005, Orange Coast College ranked first out of the State’s 109 community colleges in the number of students it transfers to the California State University System, sixth in transfers to the University of California System, and second in transfers to the two systems combined. The team commend the institution for the high number of its students who successfully transfer to the California State University and University of California systems. (Standard II.A.6.a)

Evidence reviewed by the team indicates the college does not have clearly delineated policies or procedures related to program discontinuance. Although the self study report notes the college has suspended six certificate of achievement career education programs since 2000, the procedures by which these decisions were made and the manner by which the institution made appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption was not made clear in the self study report or in interviews conducted with instructional administrators. The
planning agenda section of the self study report does not address the lack of program discontinuance policies and procedures. The large number of certificate programs with few or no completers referred to in an earlier section of this report strongly suggests the need for such a policy. (Standard II.A.6.b)

Although the self study report makes reference to instances in which the process of producing, editing, and publishing the college catalog may break down because it is decentralized, generally speaking, the college appears to be representing itself clearly, accurately, and consistently to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through its catalogs, statements, and publications. (Standard II.A.6.c)

Discussion with staff and document review identified a strong tradition and institutional support for academic freedom. Evidence suggests that the institution meets the standards pertaining to academic freedom, integrity of the teaching-learning process and objectivity on the part of faculty. (Standards II.A.7, II.A.7.a)

Document reviews and staff interviews indicate the college has done an exemplary job with its approach to student academic honesty. The institution’s creative enforcement of student academic honesty, highlighted by the college’s Academic Integrity Seminar for students who have been referred to the dean of students for academic dishonesty, is worthy of commendation. (Standard II.A.7.b)

The college has a clearly defined and broadly disseminated code of conduct for students. While the self study report states “faculty, staff, and administrators govern their conduct in accordance with state laws and district or campus regulations,” the college lacks a formal code of conduct for faculty and administrators. The planning agenda does not address the need for the adoption of such a code. The institution does not require conformity to specific codes of conduct that seek to instill specific beliefs or world views.

The team confirmed that the college does not currently offer courses or programs in foreign locations to students other than U.S. nationals. (Standard II.A.8)

**Standard II.B  Student Support Services**

The team found that, consistent with its mission and state and district policies, the college admits all students over the age of 18 (and, by exception, some students who are younger) who are able to benefit from its programs. In the most recent academic year for which data are available, the college serves a higher percentage of Asian/Pacific and African-American students than reside in the district service area and approximately the same percentage of Latino students as reside in the district. (Standard II.B)

The college has recently augmented and better focused its outreach efforts to the local service area, in large part as a response to quantitative, longitudinal data from Enrollment Services that showed a steady decline in student participation. The importance of this effort is underscored by the creation of a new participatory governance Outreach Recruitment Committee that is chaired by the college president. Along with long-
standing outreach activities conducted by EOPS, financial aid, and other specialized programs, the greater attention to student recruitment has begun to help the college reverse some of the recent enrollment declines and to identify and attract a more diverse student population, including an increasing percentage of students from outside the district boundaries. (Standard II.B)

Students’ learning needs are assessed prior to enrollment using assessment tests and other measures in English, Math, English as a Second Language, and Chemistry. Continuing students’ learning needs are identified and addressed individually if they participate in counseling services, tutoring, or special support programs such as EOPS, DSPS, and Puente. For the general student population, learning needs are identified in research reports on student retention, persistence, and grade point averages, etc. (Standard II.B)

The team reviewed evidence suggesting the college provides a student pathway through the institutional experience that is characterized by a concern for student access, progress, learning, and success. This is demonstrated in college publications, including the website, in the augmented outreach program, and in the comprehensive array of instructional programs, student support services, and student activities available on campus. The college’s record of success in transferring students to four-year universities also speaks strongly of this institutional concern. (Standard II.B)

Evidence indicated that the college falls well short of systematically assessing student support services using student learning outcomes since only a handful of the services have identified student learning outcomes or begun assessing those outcomes. Other, more traditional measures of evaluating the support programs are in place and often cited in program reviews and other reports, including student satisfaction surveys, use of the services, and student persistence, retention, course completion, transfer, etc. (Standard II.B)

The quality of student support services is assured through the annual campus budgeting process, including state allocations and donations from the ASOCC; the assignment of sufficient staff to each of the programs; the maintenance, renovation and creation of additional work space for the services through the facilities planning process, in particular the new one-stop Student Services building, Watson Hall; and the self-examination of each program through the program review process. The team found services are provided at generally consistent levels throughout the college regardless of location (noting that some programs are in temporary and sometimes inadequate physical space as their future permanent location is undergoing construction or remodeling at the time of the site visit). In their activities and the students they serve, the programs generally support the mission of the college but not always explicitly so; that is, they do not consistently relate their program goals to the mission statement nor do the program review findings and recommendations consistently reference how they contribute to the college’s attainment of the mission statement. (Standard II.B.1)

The college’s online support services have not kept pace with the expansion in student enrollment in online courses. At the time of the site visit, students could access the
following services online: application for admission, orientation to the college, request a transcript, apply for and track financial aid status; library catalog and resources; and via touchtone telephone register for courses. Counseling, assessment and tutoring must be done in person onsite. By fall 2007, the college hopes to have in place online registration, including add/drop capability, and student access to some records (e.g., grades and unofficial transcript) via a student portal. Individual support programs are clear about what aspects of services they plan to provide online over the next several years, but there is not a collegewide plan that describes a comprehensive approach to online student support services. (Standard II.B.1)

All support services have access to campus research data and/or data produced by the program itself for program review or state reporting purposes that describe student achievement outcomes (retention, persistence, GPA, degree or certificate completion, transfer, etc.) produced by or contributed to by the program. The student services program reviews use a common template that calls for certain information on each program. At the time of the site visit, however, student learning outcomes have only been identified in a very small number of the support programs, and so recently they have not yet been assessed or used to improve student learning. (Standard II.B.1)

The Student Services Planning Council, created in fall 2006, is taking shape as a mechanism by which many of the support programs share information on their activities and future needs and develop a joint set of priorities for consideration by the College Planning and Budget Committee. A review of agendas and notes from fall 2006 and spring 2007 Student Services Planning Council meetings did not indicate the dialogue within the group regularly referenced program reviews or student learning outcomes. As the group begins to develop a three-year plan (2007-2010), these two evaluation mechanisms should take a more prominent role in discussions and in identification of priorities.

The team found the institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following: general information, requirements, major policies affecting students, and locations or publications where other policies may be found. There are adequate internal processes for identifying and correcting errors in the catalog when they are found, and the college has further identified the need to monitor continually the overall editing of the document and its online counterpart information. (Standard II.B.2)

The team verified the institution researches and identifies the learning support needs of its student population and provides appropriate services and programs to address those needs. The college research office provides analysis and distribution of quantitative data and reports on student performance in courses and programs, along with information from Enrollment Services on students’ incoming skill levels identified through the assessment process. These sources and other information, such as student and staff surveys and tracking of student use of support services, are used in the support services’ annual goal-setting processes and in the program reviews every six years. Over the years, the college has developed a very extensive set of support programs to meet these
identified student needs – assessment, counseling, financial aid and scholarships, health services, EOPS/CARE, DSPS, tutoring, Math Lab, Puente, Transfer Opportunity Program, Honors Program, the Freshman Experience Program, and others. As noted elsewhere in the report, however, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the support programs is limited by the near total absence of identified student learning outcomes in these programs. (Standard II.B.3)

The team found ample evidence the college assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method. The institution offers its students a wide array of academic, career, and personal support services that are reliably staffed and with accessible hours of operation, including evenings. A number of these services are also available on-line at the time of the site visit (e.g., admissions application, orientation, financial aid application and status-check, and access to library holdings). With the planned implementation of the Banner student data system in latter 2007, students will also have online access to registration, add-drop functions, and some access to their academic records. Student satisfaction surveys conducted by support services indicate students are generally pleased with their access to services, but the surveys’ utility in evaluating the services and in collegewide planning could be strengthened by a greater uniformity in what the surveys ask and when. (Standard II.B.3.a)

Support services, as noted above, are comprehensive and are available into the evening in most programs and on Saturdays in some areas. For the increasing number of students who take online courses, however, the online support services have not kept pace. Students can access library holdings online and conduct a number of other transactions (e.g., telephone registration, request for transcripts, tracking financial aid application and status), but at the time of the visit, an exclusively online student would not be able to take an assessment test, receive counseling or tutoring, participate in EOPS, or access the career or job placement services, to name some important examples. The college will need to plan for the accommodation of the growing needs of students enrolled in online classes (Standard II.B.3.a)

The team found that the college provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students. It offers students a tremendously broad and varied set of activities that allow them to develop personal, social, cultural, civic, athletic, ethical, and organizational skills through an active and financially well-endowed student association, between 50 and 60 student clubs, 24 intercollegiate athletic teams, numerous workshops and seminars, conferences, outside speakers, and community volunteer and service-learning opportunities. It would be useful in terms of college planning, budgeting, and eventually the assessment of student learning, to know how many college students participate in one or more of these activities and opportunities. This information is not provided in the self study report and does not appear to be collected outside of the athletic program, which must maintain very detailed student eligibility and participation data for athletic conference and California Community Colleges Commission on Athletic purposes. (Standard II.B.3.b)
Evidence indicates the college designs, maintains, and evaluates counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function. Students have access to certificated, trained counselors in the general Counseling office, in EOPS/CARE and in DSPS who can assist them with academic course planning, career exploration, personal issues, and in the case of DSPS, accommodation to college courses and services. Counselors also teach learning skills courses for learning-disabled students and a variety of transferable credit courses in student-athlete orientation and advising, study techniques, career planning, stress management, etc. The counseling services are evaluated on the six-year cycle of student services program review, while the counseling courses are evaluated through the six-year cycle of the instructional program review process. The programs are also evaluated annually through student satisfaction surveys. Student learning outcomes have not yet been identified for any of the counseling or learning skills courses. (Standard II.B.3.c)

The team concurs with evidence that demonstrates the college designs and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity. Its policies, procedures, programs, and services strongly support diversity in admissions, in the treatment of staff and students, in the array of student clubs that reflect the contributions of particular ethnic groups, and in campuswide cultural activities. The curriculum reflects this commitment to diversity in its American cultural diversity requirement for an Associates Degree, and the ASOCC likewise supports diversity through its funding of many of the campus events that highlight the college’s and community’s multicultural nature. Nevertheless, the college does not have mechanisms for actually assessing students’ understanding and appreciation of diversity, whether in course- and program-level student learning outcomes or in student and staff surveys or focus-group conversations about its diversity-related efforts. (Standard II.B.3.d)

The team found the institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases. As an open-access public community college, the college’s admissions policies minimize bias; the only specific limitation on admission is age (18 years or older), but the policies also allow for appropriate exceptions. Admissions practices are evaluated annually via student satisfaction surveys, the findings of which contribute to staff discussions on how to improve services. The Enrollment Services department also undergoes student services program review on a six-year cycle. At the time of the site visit, Admissions was one of the few support programs that developed measurable student learning outcomes that were identified in the program review document. Assessment of student learning has not yet taken place since the learning outcomes were identified only in fall 2006.

The college uses placement instruments for assessment of entering students’ English, Math, ESL, and chemistry skills. Students who have completed 15 units of coursework at another college or degree-level courses in English and Math are exempt from this required assessment. The Enrollment Services manager works with the college
researcher to conduct periodic reviews of the instruments to ensure they are free of bias and do not result in disproportionate impact on protected classes of students. (Standard II.B.3.e)

The college maintains student records in line with state and federal requirements and local district policy, including the records kept by Campus Safety, Student Health Services, and student discipline cases. It has also taken all reasonable steps to protect the confidentiality and physical integrity of the records; for example, back-up records are stored in hard copy and digital formats. Student access to their college records, and limitations on that access, are described in appropriate detail in the college catalog and on the Financial Aid web page. As part of its transition to a new student record system in latter 2007, the college is considering ways in which to provide students secure electronic access to certain of their records (e.g., grades). (Standard II.B.3.f)

The institution evaluates student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. The team found that program reviews in this area have been occurring for more than a 12-year period. Evaluation of student support services provides evidence they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement. (Standard II.B.4)

The college evaluates its support services through a regular six-year cycle of student services program reviews, as well as through the instructional support program reviews for such support services as the library and the tutoring center. The student services program reviews draw on student service use, student satisfaction, and student outcome data but do not identify or assess student learning outcomes. The team found no evidence to support the statement in the self study report that “Student learning outcomes … are integrated into the program review and planning processes.”

The results of the student services program reviews are used by the individual program managers and the Vice President of Student Services to develop annual goals for the managers and their programs, and they are discussed in meetings the vice president has with all student services managers and in meetings of the newly created Student Services Planning Council. However, since the new collegewide planning structure is still evolving, it was not yet clear exactly how the results and recommendations of the program reviews will inform decision-making and allocation of resources at the college level.

**Standard II.C  Library and Learning Support Services**

The library and other learning support services are sufficient to support the institution’s instructional programs. Based on interviews with student users, personnel are trained and competent, and the staffing is currently sufficient to meet the needs of the educational offerings on campus. (Standard II.C)

The team verifies the library collections include books, periodical subscriptions,
microfilms, videos, DVDs, multimedia, textbooks, bestsellers, and audio books in various media formats. Interlibrary loan services are available to students through the Cal-West Consortium and for faculty from libraries throughout the United States using OCLC First Search. Electronic database resources include Britannica Online, CQ Researcher, E-Books, Health and Wellness Resource Center, Health Reference Center Academic, Infotrac Expanded Academic Center, Lexis/Nexis, Literature Research Center, Los Angeles Times Online, Opposing Viewpoints Resource Center, and PsychInfo. Funding for these electronic databases comes primarily from Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure Program monies on an annual basis.

The college maintains a multimedia collection, student computing center, tutorial center, and math center. A career lab and library with a specialized collection serving transfer, career planning, and financial aid needs is also operated.

Plans are in progress for the development of a student success center that will bring together several aspects of services to ensure students are supported in many ways toward success.

Faculty and staff work with subject discipline-based faculty to select materials for the collection. Each faculty librarian serves as a subject specialist in various areas and acts as a liaison to one or more academic divisions. The selection of computer equipment for the library is made by the systems librarian. Interviews with librarians reveal that 25% of book titles purchased in the 2005/2006 academic year were based upon faculty decision-making. Acquisition of equipment is usually dependent on categorical funding, such as instructional equipment money from the state. Materials budgets over the last three years have been static and allow for some book purchases beyond continuations. Although the funding for materials seems relatively stable, it is not sufficient to maintain a collection with a high level of currency, as only 12% of total titles in the library have been published since the year 2000. In addition, funds are often not available until midyear, causing difficulties in spreading workload such as book selection and technical processing evenly over the year. The curriculum of the college is likely to be served better by the development of procedures that allow a higher level of teaching faculty participation in library materials acquisitions decisions. (Standard II.C.1.a)

The team confirmed that bibliographic instruction, provision of computer equipment, the library resources, and extensive bibliographic instruction by the librarians all contribute toward student achievement of information competency and technological competency, both portions of the four areas of the college’s core learning outcomes for graduates. (Standards I.A, II.C.1.b)

Bibliographic instruction is offered by faculty librarians in the library in the form of workshop/lecture/demonstrations and one-on-one at the reference desk. Classes are held in the library in a lab, with an average of 30 students in each workshop and 157 workshops held in the 2005/2006 academic year. Currently, the instruction librarian
teaches a one-unit, transferable course, Introduction to Library Resources (English 108). The English 108 workbook has several assignments that address some information competency skills.

The team found adequate access to the library and to its services. Although the hours of operation of the campus library have been increased recently by four hours/week, this expansion of hours represents a restoration of previously cut hours, with a further increase in weekly hours of operation projected for the opening of the new library/learning resources building. Student surveys indicate only marginal student satisfaction with current library hours and access. Fortunately, student needs should be addressed further when a large, new library structure is completed and opened in spring 2008. Online access to nine library databases is available around the clock, with one additional database (Lexis/Nexis) being available only within the library. Assistive equipment is very limited at the current library, but is available at the disabled students’ center. (Standard II.C.1.c)

Formal agreements were reviewed by the team pertaining to a consortium of Orange County community colleges (Orange Coast College, Golden West, Fullerton, and Cypress) for a shared, high-level integrated library system (Endeavor) and interlibrary loans for students. The Clark Computing Center has a partnership with Microsoft Developer’s Network Academic Alliance that allows students to have free software for courses they are enrolled in currently. The center is under contract with VUE Testing, making the college an official testing site for Microsoft certifications. Interviews with staff indicated a high satisfaction with these services as part of the college’s regular evaluation of contracts. (Standard II.C.1.e)

A program review for the library has been completed. A survey of students regarding library services is complete. User surveys of the computing center, tutorial center, and math center have been completed recently, but no program reviews of these services and facilities have been conducted. No survey or program review for the math center has been conducted. (Standard II.C.2)

Conclusions

The team verified that the college offers high-quality instructional programs and has an excellent record of accomplishment transferring students who are successful at four-year institutions of higher learning. Its programs and services appear to reflect both a breadth and depth appropriate for an institution of its size. The college has begun to implement a variety of instructional delivery systems and diverse teaching methodologies.

The college is at an extremely preliminary stage with regard to developing student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates and degrees, and assessing student achievement of those outcomes. To make institutional improvement at the institution’s current rate of progress, it may be 2013, ten years following the adoption of the student learning outcomes standard, before the academic programs have identified at least one student learning outcome.
The team noted the faculty is not wholly engaged in college practices established to design, identify, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs using student learning outcomes.

The team found evidence the college recently completed its six-year program review cycle. A review of the program reviews posted on the college portal, however, featured extremely vague cursory analysis of program data.

The college self study report indicates that six vocational certificate of achievement programs had been suspended since 2000. However, review by the team indicates the college lacks a clearly delineated policy or procedures related to program discontinuance.

The team found the college provides a student pathway through its institutional experience that is characterized by a concern for student access, progress, learning, and success. Staff is supportive of students and their learning.

The college has recently augmented and better focused its student outreach efforts in response to a steady enrollment decline. The importance of this effort is underscored by the creation of a new Participatory Governance Outreach Recruitment Committee chaired by the college president.

The college falls short of systematically assessing student support services using learning outcomes since only a handful of the services have identified student learning outcomes or begun assessing those outcomes. A review of the agendas and notes from fall 2006 and spring 2007 of the Student Services Planning Council did not indicate that dialogue within the group regularly referenced program reviews or student learning outcomes.

The college’s library and other learning support services are sufficient to support the institution’s instructional programs. The college maintains a multimedia collection, student computing center, tutorial center, and math center. Students have adequate physical access to the library and its services. Online access to most library databases is available around the clock.

**Recommendations**

See Recommendation 1 in Standard I

See Recommendation 2 in Standard I

See Recommendation 3 in Standard I
Recommendation 5
The team recommends that the district and college enhance faculty professional development activities and revise faculty and management performance evaluation procedures to focus on identifying, measuring, and achieving student learning outcomes. (Standards II.A.1, II.A.6, III.A.1.b, III.A.1.c, III.A.5, III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b)
Standard III
Resources

General Comments

The college has over 1,000 employees who are hired using selection processes adopted by the district board. The variety and qualifications of employees appear adequate and appropriate to fulfill the college’s mission. College employees are evaluated on an ongoing basis consistent with existing collective bargaining agreements. Faculty and administrators hold degrees from accredited institutions of higher learning. Faculty play a significant role in professional matters at the college. The engagement of faculty in college ranges from peer hiring, curriculum, and student success. Faculty have not assumed central roles as it relates to using student learning outcomes as a component of their evaluation of student progress.

The college exhibited sound personnel practices, following board policies and procedures in its hiring and maintaining secure confidential employee records. The institution further has a diverse workforce and engages in positive employment practices, including staff development.

Through Bond Measure C funding, the college has been renovating and constructing facilities to better serve its students. This activity was driven by a facility condition assessment and employee input within the context of the college’s Master Plan. The facilities are linked to the educational and programmatic needs of the institution. The college’s facility master planning activities built on a year-to-year budget cycle does not appear to take into account the total long-term costs of ownership related to staffing and technology.

The college’s Technology Committee links electronic support to the needs of teaching and learning as well as college communications research. The committee recommendations are forwarded to the Planning and Budget Committee for purposes of integrated planning and resource allocation throughout the academic year.

Overall technology services, hardware, and software are designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the college. Through Bond Measure C funding, the college received $4.5 million for technology upgrades. This revenue was used for new student computers and to enhance the campus network, data center computer labs, and classrooms.

Standard III.A Human Resources

Findings and Evidence

The college employs over 1,000 individuals. There are criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel consistent with board policies. These are published
on the website. The campus personnel office has developed a Hiring Committee Handbook to ensure that hiring processes meet equal opportunity guidelines. Data included in the annual college Atlas indicate that the college is improving the diversity of its personnel. (Standards III.A.1, III.A.1.a)

The team found evidence that college personnel are systematically evaluated in accordance with union contracts. Managers are expected to evaluate faculty and staff on a timely basis. To reinforce this expectation, longevity pay increments are withheld until the manager is current in completing evaluations. The faculty evaluation instrument has not been revised in many years. Data indicate that a minority of faculty and staff believe the instrument is effective or encourages improvement. In addition, data indicate that a few believe the administrator evaluation instrument is effective. There was no data on the quality of the classified instrument.

The college has developed an improved administrator evaluation instrument and process. Administrator evaluations are on a two-year cycle with the first year devoted to setting objectives. During the second year, there is a behavioral survey conducted that seeks input from every employee who reports directly to the administrator including full-time faculty, part-time faculty, classified, managers, and any other employees who interact with the administrator. The results of the survey are used to evaluate the administrator’s progress in meeting prior year goals and establishing future goals. Since the self study report was completed, the district has revamped the classified evaluation instrument to more effectively appraise individual work quality as well as abilities to be an excellent team member. Because the current faculty contract does not expire until 2008, there is no college or district process in place to update the faculty evaluation instrument. The college recognizes the necessity for revising the faculty evaluation instrument, but views this objective as a district obligation to achieve in future faculty negotiations. (Standard III.A.1.b)

Since the faculty evaluation instrument has not been revised in many years, it does not have appraisal criteria tied to the identification of and achievement of student learning outcomes. It is imperative that the instrument be updated to incorporate student learning outcomes when the next faculty contract is negotiated. (Standard III.A.1.c)

The District Classified Executive Council adopted a code of ethics and conduct in 2005. The board adopted an ethics policy in 1991. However, there is no overall code of ethics that pertains to all personnel at the college. The college recognizes the need to update the college faculty and staff handbook to include a professional code of ethics. This objective has not been accomplished yet. (Standard III.A.1.d)

The college has a sufficient number of full-time faculty. However, due to the district retirement incentives offered a few years ago, many full-time faculty are new and not familiar with district processes and procedures and are not yet integrated into the college’s committee structure. The college is having difficulties getting faculty involved in various committees. Because 91% of the college budget is already devoted to personnel, the college has been considering various reorganization strategies to reduce
classified staff in certain categories when there are retirements in order to add staff in critical areas like custodial services. (Standard III.A.2)

The district safeguards employee records by keeping them in a locked facility near the district human resources office. Discarded documents are routinely shredded. Each employee has access to his/her records as provided by contract. There is currently a process spearheaded by district human resources with participation from college representatives to put all personnel policies on the college portal. (Standard III.A.3)

The academic master plan, goal five, states that the college must implement a three-year hiring plan focused on improving diversity. Even though the last revised district staff diversity affirmative action plan dates back to 1996, the self study survey data indicate that the college is making progress in diversity hiring. The Instructional Planning Council has developed a full-time hiring philosophy to determine criteria for hiring additional faculty. The Administrative and Student Services Planning Councils have not yet come up with criteria for developing hiring plans. The college provides a supportive environment for its personnel. Self study survey data indicate that faculty and staff believe they are treated with respect and more universally, that persons from all cultures are treated respectfully. (Standards III.A.4, III.A.4.a, III.A.4.b, III.A.4.c)

Although there have been reductions in state funding support for staff development, the college president has made special budget provisions to maintain staffing of the staff development office with a faculty member on 60% released time and an 80% staff assistant. The 2005-06 staff development report indicates that the department is conducting numerous outreach activities. In total during 2005-06, the staff development office served 2,544 people. Because the faculty contract does not have any fixed flex obligations, the office has had to become quite creative in order to interest faculty. The office has instituted team grants to foster participation in staff development activities. Also, during the last negotiations, the amount allocated to faculty to attend conferences and workshops was increased from $100 to $200. Classified staff per union contract can receive as much as $5,000 per year toward education expenses or conference attendance if they meet certain criteria. The development office conducts annual surveys to determine faculty and staff development needs. In addition, the office has workshop or conference attendees evaluate the quality of the offerings. Classified staff have indicated the least satisfaction with offerings. The office has surveyed classified staff to better meet their training needs. Even with numerous offerings, the staff development office has not been able to increase faculty participation since faculty have been relieved of any flex obligations. (Standards III.A.5, III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b)

Although the Academic Master Plan establishes a goal to develop a comprehensive three-year hiring plan, this goal has not been achieved. There is no evidence that human resource planning is fully integrated with institutional planning. Although faculty hiring is tied to program review recommendations, other hires are not tied to program review at all. Furthermore, because program review is on a six-year cycle, the results are not current enough to be the sole determinant for hiring requirements. The president recognizes the necessity of rethinking how work is conducted when positions become
vacant and has initiated serious discussions in his Vice Presidents’ Council on the topic which have resulted in new organization strategies. Therefore, many position requests are denied in this venue and do not go to the Planning and Budget Committee for consideration. Last year, the college achieved $250,000 in salary savings due to implementing new organizational strategies. Although the Instructional Planning Council has developed criteria for considering additional faculty hires (a college full-time faculty hiring philosophy statement), no other planning council has developed hiring criteria. In addition, the Planning and Budget Committee has not developed overarching criteria to prioritize recommendations coming from the three planning councils. The college plans to complete this process in spring 2007 and utilize the resulting criteria in developing longer range hiring plans. (Standard III.A.6)

**Standard III.B Physical Resources**

In preparation for the successful Measure C Bond campaign, the district commissioned a facility condition assessment report that provided the college with information for needed facility repairs and modernization requirements. This information was folded into the Facilities Master Plan which was incorporated into the College Master Plan. (Standard III.B)

The college maintains an electronic database for tracking repair work orders and providing information for deferred maintenance projects. They optimize classroom usage through identifying the instructional equipment in each classroom and prioritizing room scheduling. Public safety works with maintenance and operations to collect safety information and ensure that safety issues are addressed. The campus public safety department publishes an annual statistics report on offenses, incidences, and public services. (Standard III.B.1)

Through Measure C bond funding, the college has done an impressive job of renovating facilities and grounds and constructing new buildings to expand capacity and better support its programs and services. These include a new soccer field, stadium renovation, baseball field, parking lots, new Arts Pavilion, new Fitness Center, Watson Hall seismic reconstruction, classroom remodels, and technology/infrastructure upgrades. (Standard III.B.1.a)

As part of the facilities upgrades, the college has implemented new safety and security resources. All classrooms have emergency phones for calling the campus security officers or 911. Custodians check to make sure that classroom phones are working when servicing rooms. Emergency phones have been placed in parking lots, and students or personnel may request to be escorted to their cars at night. They have implemented keyless locks in new buildings to provide better key control and room access logs. Some rooms have video surveillance and security alarms. Employees are encouraged to report any safety issues to the Safety Committee or Maintenance and Operations Director and have created a form for this purpose. The college has done SEMS training and has recently gotten started with NIMS training (National Incidence Management System). (Standard III.B.1.b)
Given the increased costs of construction, the college is not able to fund all of the building projects that were originally planned for in Measure C. Consequently, the college has recently assessed its facilities usage and space allocation to make informed decisions about the best use of their remaining funds to support its programs and services. Through evaluation and participatory processes, the college decided to use the remaining funds for building a new Interdisciplinary Studies Building. (Standard III.B.2)

In reviewing existing planning and facilities documents, the college appears to have taken into consideration the total cost for constructing or renovating facilities but not adequately considered their human resource or technology needs. It is not clear that the current year to year planning cycle of the college affords the institution with an integrated approach regarding facilities. (Standards III.A.2, III.B.2)

**Standard III.C Technology Resources**

The college tries to assure that technology support is designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, collegewide communications, research, and operational systems by working through participatory committees and processes for institutional planning. The Technology Committee is co-chaired by the director of administrative computing services and a faculty member. The committee meets on a monthly basis to discuss collegewide technology matters and evaluate technology requests. They make recommendations to the Planning and Budget Committee, academic senate, and district Information Technology. Additionally, the three technology directors (Administrative Computing, Academic Computing, and Web Services) and the three vice presidents (Administrative, Instruction, and Student Services) meet together on a regular basis to discuss technology projects, needs and support. (Standard III.C.1)

Technology services, support, facilities, hardware, and software are designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution. Administrative Computing Services supports wide area and local area networks, network applications, systems administration, wireless computing, network account services for all students and employees, computer hardware/software, digital media services and help desk support for all personnel and online students. These information systems enable all constituencies to access electronic resources for learning, instruction, operations, and research from on-campus and off-campus including virtual private network access for employees. Web Services provides development, training, and support for web applications including the college website, the college portal, the new Banner installation, and the upcoming student portal that is scheduled to go live six months from now. To assure that web services and online classes are accessible at all times, Administrative Computing Services has nearly completed a project that will double their network bandwidth capacity and provide access to a secondary network as a backup system. Instructional Computing Services ensures computer labs are functioning well with the software and hardware needed for classes and open labs. They support faculty computers in classrooms and offices and are currently implementing a major project to (a) replace all faculty computers that are three years or older, and (b) place new computers in every classroom. This will enable faculty
to access the new Banner registration system from any office, class or lab location and more efficiently serve students. (Standard III.C.1.a)

In preparation for implementing a new student information system for online registration, the college has provided staff workshops in the use of Banner with further training on the horizon. The college requires first-time instructors of online classes to complete an eight-week course called, “Teaching and Learning Online” to help ensure they are prepared for teaching online. This course is part of a sequence of courses on how to use technology in the classroom. On a one-on-one basis, the computer center and library staff provide mini-training opportunities for students in changing passwords, using the wireless network and using WebCT. The staff development office schedules ongoing beginning and advanced workshops in the use of Outlook for staff and faculty. Other technology workshops are offered based on the evaluation of needs that are expressed by annual surveys, current events, and staff development team grant proposals. However, the amount of faculty participation in professional development activities has declined dramatically since the district discontinued the Flex program a few years ago. (Standard III.C.1.b)

Through Measure C bond funding, the college received $4.5 million for technology upgrades. In 2003, funds were used for new student computers in the Computer Center and major upgrades to the campus network, data center, computer labs, and classrooms. These upgrades provide significant infrastructure and hardware upgrades to the Information Technology Center to provide reliable, high-speed, and wireless access to information services and resources. The college has installed a new server in the Data Center to provide information resources for all constituencies: websites, file storage, network printing, email, antivirus control, security, account management, online courses, databases, help desk, network monitoring, instructional applications, data backup, etc. A provision in excess of one million dollars must be allocated in the annual budget to cover the ongoing costs related to new technologies and services. Additionally, in four to five years, funds will need to be budgeted for the replacement of faculty and classroom computers. Currently, the college has not determined how to fund the total costs of technology upgrades, maintenance, and replacements on an annual basis. (Standards III.C.1.c, III.C.1.d)

Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning through participatory committee dialogue and regular meetings of the technology directors and vice presidents. These planning meetings are primarily focused on specific projects such as the portal, Banner implementation, faculty computers, etc., that are part of the technology plan to provide greater access, instruction, and support for technology. However, the Technology Plan is not comprehensive given the incredible amount of new information technologies on campus. It does not address policies, staffing, equipment replacements, budgets, timelines, or evaluation. Nonetheless, the college has made very impressive progress in the last six years towards expanding and improving technology resources to serve the needs of all constituencies. (Standard III.C.2)
Standard III.D  Financial Resources

The team confirmed that the college has financial resources sufficient to support student learning programs and improve institutional effectiveness. An attempt to integrate financial planning with institutional planning is apparent, but of limited scope and effectiveness. There is evidence in Planning and Budget Committee minutes of committee review of the college’s mission statement as well as the Academic Master Plan. Funding of $100,000 was made available in 2005-06 to support Academic Master Plan goals. The Planning and Budget Committee is the central planning committee on campus because of this however, its focus has been restricted to an annual timeframe. It considers recommendations coming from the Facilities Committee, Technology Committee, and the Instructional Planning Council. The Administrative and Student Support Services Councils are of recent creation and have not yet played an active role in making recommendations to the Planning and Budget Committee. (Standards III.B, III.B.1)

For the past two years, the college budget has essentially been a rollover budget. The budget is not a product of an effective planning process. In the self study survey, fewer than 35% of college staff agreed there were clear connections between planning, budgeting, and the allocation of resources. The college recognizes the need to communicate more effectively what happens in the Planning and Budget Committee meetings. There is an attempt to post agendas and minutes on the college portal and to encourage committee members to share information with their constituents. (Standard III.D.1.a)

The college has advocated for changes in the district budget allocation model. Consequently, there was an increase in the fixed cost allocation to the college in 2005-06. In addition to the basic budget allocation from the district, the college retains the dedicated revenue that it generates. However, this revenue category grew only slightly more than 2% from 2005-06 to 2006-07 based on the publicly-adopted budgets. Therefore, the college must focus on generating more dedicated revenues. This is particularly critical given that 91% of the budget is devoted to personnel costs. There are limited resources available to meet emerging needs. (Standard III.D.1.b)

The district has a plan to meet its future retiree benefit obligation to be in compliance with GASB 45 by July 1, 2007. An actuarial study was commissioned in spring 2006 which quantified its liability at $70.3 million. With the adoption of the 2006-07 budget, the district has set aside $15.2 million in an irrevocable Joint Powers Agreement trust fund. In addition, the district has a plan to continue to add to the trust fund by contributing a percentage of salaries. For 2006-07, it will contribute 2.5% of salaries and in 2007-08, it will contribute 3% of salaries. The college also plans to commission frequent actuarial studies to ensure that it makes steady progress in meeting this obligation. (Standard III.D.1.c)

To ensure fiscal stability, the district does not depend on year-end balances to balance the budget. With the adoption of the 2006-07 budget, the district established a 7.5 percent
reserve based on prior year actual expenditures. This computes to approximately 6.8% of current year revenues, which is above the state required contingency reserve of 5%. (Standard III.D.1.c)

To ensure financial stability and an ability to meet future college needs, the college must reduce the percentage of its budget dedicated to personnel. Although there have been some reorganization strategies implemented to better leverage classified staffing, there is no evidence based on the 2006-07 adopted budget that the college is making headway in reducing its commitment to personnel costs. (Standard III.D.1.c)

The college does not have clear processes for financial planning and budgeting. This is evidenced by the self study survey. Fewer than 30% of all staff at the college agreed that processes for financial planning and budget development are clearly defined and followed. Furthermore, the Planning and Budget Committee has not yet developed criteria for the prioritization of budget recommendations. It is on their planning agenda for spring 2007. (Standard III.D.1.d)

Based on the most recent audit reports, there are appropriate control mechanisms in financial management systems. The internal auditor makes surprise visits to the college to check out cash handling procedures. In addition, the college vice president is a former internal auditor and particularly cognizant of appropriate checks and balances in the college’s financial systems. The audit report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2006, provided an unqualified opinion of the district’s financial statements. There were no material weaknesses. There was only one finding related to noncredit courses, and management immediately addressed the matter. There were no prior year findings. (Standards III.D.2, III.D.2.a)

Financial information is available. There is a record of budget actions taken by the board. Bound budget documents are disseminated. Agendas and minutes of the Planning and Budget Committee are available on the college portal. However, self study survey information indicates the campus community is not accessing this information. Even committee members are not well versed in the particulars of the budget. (Standard III.D.2.b)

The district has sufficient cash reserves based on the audit report for the fiscal period ending June 30, 2006. All cash held by financial institutions was entirely insured and appropriately collateralized. Another indication that the district has adequate cash reserves is that it does not qualify for a TRANS financing. The district has a reserve for contingency that exceeds the 5% level recommended by the State Chancellor’s Office. (Standard III.D.2.c)

Based on recent audit reports, the district practices effective oversight and utilization of finances, including the management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations, or foundations. There were no identified internal control weaknesses or noncompliance issues. (Standards III.D.2.d, III.D.2.e)
Contractual agreements with external entities are governed by district policies. The college Vice President of Administration and the district Vice Chancellor of Administration review all contractual agreements. Both the district external auditor and internal auditor assist the college in regularly evaluating its financial management systems. (Standards III.D.2.f, III.D.2.g)

The college president recognizes the necessity for reducing the college budget commitment to personnel costs. He is requiring additional review of any new personnel requests. Under his leadership, the college has implemented some minor reorganization strategies, but has still not reduced its budget commitment to salaries. (Standard III.D.3)

Conclusions

Institutional planning and financial planning are not fully integrated. The college has established a committee structure to facilitate financial planning, but not all of the planning councils are participating in the planning process. Furthermore, the campus is not fully aware of budget planning processes and how they impact the allocation of financial resources.

The board does not have a policy or written procedure that delegates authority from the chancellor to the college president as the chief administrator charged with the daily operation of the college.

The board is currently reviewing policy for the selection of the chief administrative officer and college presidents, and a process to fill chief administrative vacancies as they occur; however, a process is not currently in place.

The college appears to lack an integrated plan related to its human resource needs. The institution also lacks a professional code of ethics for employees.

Although the college clearly has plans regarding its technology needs, the year-to-year focus of its Planning and Budget Committee may not result in mid-and long-term understanding about the total cost of their commitments. At the time of the team visit, the institution had not determined how to fund its technology improvements on an ongoing basis.

Recent budgets are essentially rollover budgets. The college budget has a commitment of 91 percent to personnel costs. This amount prevents the college from planning for necessary future resource needs for the appropriate staffing, maintenance, and support of new buildings and technology.

The district has taken prudent steps to deal with its future retiree benefit obligations. It recently commissioned an actuarial study that quantified the future retiree benefit obligation at $70.3 million. The district has set aside $15.2 million in an irrevocable trust to begin addressing its retiree benefit obligation.
The district has adequate reserves and recent audit reports indicate that there are adequate financial control systems in place.

**Recommendations**

See Recommendation 3 in Standard I

See Recommendation 5 in Standard II

**Recommendation 6**
The team recommends that the board develop a clearly defined procedure for addressing board member behavior that violates its Code of Ethics. Additionally, it is recommended that the district develop a written code of professional ethics for all its personnel.
(Standards III.A.1.d, IV.B.1, IV.B.1.g, IV.B.1.h)
Standard IV
Leadership and Governance

General Comments

The Board of Trustees for the Coast Community College District (CCCD) consists of five trustees representing five individual trustee areas and a student trustee elected by the Associated Students of the three campuses. Board members are elected to four-year staggered terms. Regular elections are held every two years in even numbered years. The district recently experienced a change in board membership with one trustee of the two open seats choosing not to run for reelection in November 2006.

The district office serves as the liaison between the college and the board. The district provides support to the college in the areas of human resources, financial resources, educational resources, information services, and administration. The board has adopted a mission statement for the district and its three colleges that supports quality lower division education. The board also adopted goals for the district that identify specific areas of focus for the district. In addition, the board implemented policy that delegates authority to the Chancellor as the chief executive of the district and confines board action to policy determination, planning, overall approval and evaluation, and maintaining the fiscal stability of the district.

Orange Coast College utilizes leadership contributions of staff across the institution and has developed an organizational structure that segments the college into administrative “wings,” three of which are supervised by vice presidents. The instructional wing, student services wing, and administrative wing consists of deans, directors/division chairs, and instructional unit assistants. The president chairs the president’s wing consisting of the vice presidents and top-level directors. The president’s wing is the leadership team that develops goals for the college, ensures communication of the institution’s goals and values, and enhances dialogue throughout the college. The president also chairs the Planning and Budget Committee, which is the key planning committee for the institution.

The president chairs the administrative cabinet, that includes the entire administrative leadership structure of the college including the academic senate president, the director of institutional research, the associated student body president, and the middle college high school principal. By also chairing the Outreach and Recruitment Committee, the president provides significant emphasis to the importance of the outreach process. The academic senate plays a significant role in the participatory process by ensuring faculty participation in the key planning committees. This allows for effective communication throughout the college community. With the support of the college president, the classified forum is in the final stage of being reestablished. Once the classified forum is
in place, it will ensure equitable representation of classified staff on key committees. The student association (ASOCC) provides for student representation on the major collegewide committees.

**Standard IV.A Decision-Making Roles and Processes**

**Findings and Evidence**

The team confirmed that the college has created a climate for widespread participation and innovation whereby students, staff, faculty, and administrators are encouraged to take initiative in the creation or improvement of college programs and services through goal setting, planning, and evaluation. Administrative leadership is organized into four distinct “wings” [divisions] to ensure effective and consistent communication. The president chairs the vice president’s council to review the implementation of institutional goals for all four wings of the institution.

The academic senate ensures faculty participation in instructional planning by designating committee chairs for key function such as the Curriculum Committee, Program Review Committee, and the Instructional Planning Council. Representatives to the various campus committees report to the academic senate. The collective bargaining agreement also specifies the composition of committees for faculty participation, but needs to be updated once the new college shared government manual has been adopted. Despite the additional strain placed on faculty in meeting the demands of the participatory governance process, there appears to be a perception that positives strides, particularly within the last two years have been made to provide for greater dialog among the constituents of the college. Once the Classified Forum is in place, the classified staff will have more equitable input in key decisions, campus improvement, and dialogue through participation in committees such as the Planning and Budget Committee, the Staff Development Committee, the Facilities Planning Committee and the Outreach and Recruitment Committee. (Standard IV.A.1)

The Orange Coast College Participatory Governance Manual was initially developed in 1993 and is undergoing revision this academic year. The manual specifies the roles for the four constituency groups: management, faculty, classified, and students in the participatory process. Employee bargaining units also prescribe representation for the major planning committees of the college to include hiring committees. The college president and the classified staff have effectively collaborated in order to increase classified staff involvement in institutional governance.

As outlined in the Orange Coast College Participatory Governance Manual, currently under consideration for approval, the associated student representatives serve on all campuswide committees such as the Planning and Budget Committee, Outreach and Recruitment Committee, Institutional Planning Council and Administrative Services Planning Committee.

The college portal is the primary tool for communication and sharing of information...
The team confirmed that the academic senate plays a key role in the governance of the college and provides input in making recommendations about student learning programs. Senate members serve in key committee roles, for example, as the Program Review coordinator and Curriculum Committee chair. (Standards IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b)

The Participatory Governance Manual, currently undergoing revision, has defined governance structures, processes, and procedures that facilitate discussion, communication, and respect among the various groups at the college. The revised document identifies themes that seek to promote discourse between the four campus constituencies: management, faculty, staff, and students. The document also identifies a planning structure consisting of three levels of the decision-making process as a means of ensuring full campus participation for approving resolutions or major decisions for the college. However, the document does not refer to a mechanism for evaluation of the effectiveness of the process. (Standard IV.3)

The Vice President of Instruction is the liaison to the Accrediting Commission and serves as the coordinator of the self study report. The vice president and faculty co-chair have attended workshops and training activities to keep abreast of current accreditation standards, policies, and guidelines. As evidenced by the most recent mid-term report and the current self study report, the college has not fully responded to the recommendations from the previous accreditation visit in 2000. (Standard IV.A.4)

The district has established procedures for the evaluation of the college president and the administrators association, Coast District Managers Association, has procedures in place for performance evaluations. The performance evaluation includes an annual review of goals and objectives, behavioral survey, and a self-evaluation. Mechanisms and procedures for evaluation of committee structure and effectiveness are not currently in place. This will be the first year the college’s participatory governance document has been updated since 1993. The role of campus leadership, governance processes, and decision-making structure will need to be evaluated for effectiveness and improvement. (Standard IV.A.5)

Standard IV.B Board and Administrative Organization

The team found that the Coast Community College District Board of Trustees has in place policy regarding ethical responsibility that defines the board as an independent policy-making body whose primary duty is to represent the entire community in carrying out its elected responsibilities. The board is a five-member board elected from trustee areas within the district. Board responsibilities for governance are outlined in the district Board Policy and Procedures, most recently updated in 2003. These procedures were established in accordance with its mission and goals that support the mission of the
college. The board adopted a mission for the district that supports quality lower division and occupational education to assist students in achieving their educational goals. Board policy confines board action to “policy determination, planning, overall approval and evaluation, and maintaining the fiscal stability of the district.” (Standards IV.B.1.a, IV.B.1.b, IV.B.1.c)

The board policies and procedures are published on the district website. The board’s mission, size, membership, terms of office, meeting dates, agendas, and minutes are available on the district website. Other operating procedures for meetings, including placing items on the agenda, public comments, and meeting rules, are defined and published in the board’s general rules for meetings. The board conducts an organizational meeting each December to select its officers and committee appointments. The board, in one of its goals, regularly updates its one-year and five-year improvement plans and updates its ten-year and twenty-year improvement plans on a five-year cycle. The district’s Vision 2010 plan for facilities was last updated in 1993. The district does not currently have a formal procedure for evaluating its policies on a regular basis. Only statutes and policies from the Community College League of California (CCLC) are currently addressed. (Standards IV.B.1.d, IV.B.1.e)

New board members attend the Effective Trustee Workshop and Trustee Orientation offered by the California Community College Trustees organization. Board members are encouraged to attend board development activities offered by state and national organizations. The five-member board terms of office are four years and staggered so that three members are elected during one election and two members are elected during the next election. Elections are held every two years on even numbered years. In February 2007, the board revised its election of officers’ process from yearly nominations to a permanent rotation system among all board members.

The board has a Code of Ethics outlining ethical responsibilities and a Conflict of Interest Code requiring financial disclosure of financial interests that may disqualify individual members. The Code of Ethics does not include a clearly defined policy for dealing with board member behavior that violates its policy. The board has been kept informed of the accreditation process for the college by the president. At board meetings, the president has informed the board about progress of the self study report development and presented final drafts for final approval in October 2006. (Standards IV.B.1.f, IV.B.1.g, IV.B.1.h, IV.B.1.i)

The team verified the district does not have a formally approved hiring policy for its district chancellor, vice chancellors, and college presidents. The board evaluates the chancellor annually at which time the board reviews the chancellor’s goals and his self evaluation. The responsibilities of the chancellor include budget development, human resources, long-term planning, community relations, and professional development. (Standard IV.B.1.j)
The president has held his current position since 2005. Prior to becoming president, he had served as vice president of instruction and was previously a faculty member of the college. The president is very familiar with college operations and is the final authority at the college level. The president provided leadership in the implementation of the college Master Plan that serves as the primary planning document for the college. The president encourages dialogue throughout the college in the planning stages, and the Master Plan now includes the Academic Master Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, and the newly developed Technology Master Plan. The Facilities Master Plan provides direction for construction from the recently passed bond measure, Measure C. The president considers recruitment and outreach efforts to be of utmost importance and chairs the Outreach and Recruitment Committee. To support evaluation and staff development, the president created Team Conference Grants to encourage faculty and staff attendance at conferences and training activities. In 2005-06, over $100,000 was allocated to support the Team Conference Grant program. (Standard IV.B.2)

The administrative organization of the college is divided into four divisions called “wings.” Vice presidents head the instructional, student services, and administrative services wings. The president heads the president’s wing. The president delegates authority to the vice presidents of each wing and to program directors for the foundation, marketing, and institutional research departments. Because the college is a large community college with approximately 31,000 students, each administrative area has several deans, directors, division chairs, and instructional learning assistants. The president regularly meets with college governance leaders and committees and chairs the Vice President’s Council and the Administrative Cabinet. The president recently brought the Disney Keys to Excellence program to the campus to focus on goal setting, teamwork, and service to students. The president has established an effective collegial process, values the input of the academic senate, and invites classified staff and students to participate in the decision-making process. The college is to be commended for the broad participation of all staff in the accreditation process. This is an indication of how strong the employees and students value the college.

Through the college Atlas, the president has supported the use of research and aggregated data in the planning and decision-making process. The college Atlas is posted on the college website. Through the college Master Plan, the president ensures that educational planning is tied to resource allocation and distribution. However, the use of the Planning and Budget Committee as the college’s primary planning body appears to have narrowed its focus to short-term decisionmaking. (Standards IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.b)

The president attends regular meetings of the chancellor’s cabinet and meetings of the board. At these meetings, the president participates in policy decisions and formulation of recommendations to the chancellor and board that comply with state statutes and the mission of the college. The president meets regularly with district vice chancellors and the presidents from Golden West College and Coastline College to review issues and policies affecting the colleges. The district is in the process of implementing common course numbering across the district to aide all students in their selection of courses at any of the district’s locations. The colleges’ vice presidents of instruction meet to work
out conflicts involving instructional programs in each service area. The district needs to act in an oversight capacity when one campus plans to develop a new center in another campus traditional enrollment service area so that long-term planning needs of the district can occur. The president directs the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies through weekly meetings with the vice presidents. The president is responsible for the financial operations of the college and is kept informed of income, expenditures, and budget projections by the vice president of administrative services. The chancellor has allowed decentralized budgeting resulting in the colleges developing their own budgets. As chair of the Planning and Budget Committee, the president has direct involvement in the budget development process. An area of concern has been the college’s declining enrollment the past few years that has resulted in fewer discretionary funds. The president is involved with the community by regularly attending community events and speaking at service organization meetings. The college’s Foundation board is comprised of community leaders from various cities served by the college. The college publishes regular newsletters such as the Coastin’ and Coast to Coast that serve as a vehicle to keep the public informed about information concerning the college. (Standards IV.B.2.c, IV.B.2.d, IV.B.2.e)

The team reviewed the district organizational chart that defines and outlines the responsibilities and functions of the district to include human resources support, legal support, fiscal support, payroll services, educational services, and staff development training. The chancellor and departments located at the district office act as the liaison between the college and the governing board. The district governance structure enables each campus to work independently in many areas such as establishing their own budgets. The district provides services that directly support the college’s mission and monitor information and reporting requirements for the college. However, there are some areas of concern with the decentralized decision-making process when new programs are developed without district level dialogue with the colleges to assess the impact on existing campuses. The college has identified a lack of overall planning for growth of the colleges from the district office in coordination with its colleges. The district funding model allocates funds to the colleges based on fixed costs and base expenditures from the previous year. The district could not produce a functional mapping of the district’s organizational structure for the team. In addition, interviews with staff identified confusion over authority, roles, and responsibilities of district and college personnel within its decentralized structure of operations. (Standards IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.c)

The district identifies through audits that it maintains a reserve above the required 5%. The board approves all expenditures and provides budget oversight through monthly reports at meetings. Internal and external audits verify the budgets do not undergo deficit spending at the district and college level. In addition, the district has established the Measure C Citizens Oversight Committee that ensures ongoing accountability of funds for the district’s building projects. The committee meets quarterly to ensure bond funds are spent according to the voter-approved bond measure. The chancellor has disbanded the District Planning and Budget Committee and delegated these responsibilities to the colleges. The chancellor meets regularly with the colleges’ presidents through the Presidents Council and with key college constituents through the chancellor’s cabinet to
communicate and exchange information considering college and district matters. He also attends campus events and meetings to support the college. The chancellor meets with the chancellor’s cabinet, the President’s Council, and personnel directors at the colleges to provide liaison between the colleges and the governing board. The chancellor delegates to the presidents the responsibility for the successful operation of the colleges. The district’s master plan, Vision 2010, is the vehicle that assists the colleges in developing their educational goals. Vision 2010 was developed in 1993 and is in need of updating. (Standards IV.B.3.d, IV.B.3.e, IV.B.3.f, IV.B.3.g)

Conclusions

The college has created a climate for widespread participation and innovation whereby students, faculty, staff, and administrators are encouraged to take the initiative in the creation or improvement of college programs and services. The notable exception to this is broad focused employee participation in the development of student learning outcomes.

The college portal is the primary tool for communication and sharing of information across the campus.

The college Participatory Governance Manual was initially developed in 1993 and is undergoing revision this academic year. The manual specifies the roles for the four constituency groups: management, faculty, classified, and students in the participatory process. As outlined in the college participatory governance manual, the associated student representatives serve on all campuswide committees such as the Planning and Budget Committee, Outreach and Recruitment Committee, Institutional Planning Council, and Administrative Services Planning Committee.

The academic senate plays a key role in the governance of the college and provides input in making recommendations about student learning programs. Senate members serve in key committee roles, for example, as the Program Review coordinator and Curriculum Committee chair.

The district has established procedures for the evaluation of the college president and the administrators association, the Coast District Managers Association, has procedures in place for performance evaluations. The performance evaluation includes an annual review of goals and objectives, behavioral survey, and a self-evaluation. Mechanisms and procedures for evaluation of committee structure and effectiveness are not currently in place.

The team found that the board has in place policy regarding ethical responsibility that defines the board as an independent policy-making body whose’ primary duty is to represent the entire community in carrying out its elected responsibilities. The board policies and procedures are published on the district website.

The board has a Code of Ethics outlining ethical responsibilities and a Conflict of Interest Code requiring financial disclosure of financial interests that may disqualify individual
members. The Code of Ethics does not include a clearly defined policy for dealing with board member behavior that violates its policy.

The team verified the district does not have a formally approved hiring policy for its district chancellor, vice chancellors, and college presidents. The board evaluates the chancellor annually at which time the board reviews the chancellor’s goals and self evaluation. The responsibilities of the chancellor include budget development, human resources, long-term planning, community relations, and professional development.

The college president held his current position since 2005. Prior to becoming president, he served as vice president of instruction and was previously a faculty member of the college. The president is very familiar with college operations and is the final authority at the college level. The president provided leadership in the implementation of the college Master Plan, which serves as the primary planning document for the college.

The president has established an effective collegial process, values the input of the academic senate, and invites classified staff and students to participate in the decision-making process.

The president attends regular meetings of the chancellor’s cabinet and board meetings. At these meetings, the president participates in policy decisions and formulation of recommendations to the chancellor and board that comply with state statues and the mission of the college.

The district governance structure enables each campus to work independently in many areas such as establishing their own budgets. The district provides services that directly support the college’s mission and monitor information and reporting requirements for the college. However, there are some areas of concern with the decentralized decision making process when new programs are developed without district level dialogue with the colleges to assess the impact on existing campuses. The college has identified a lack of overall planning for the growth of the campuses from the district office in coordination with its colleges.

The chancellor delegates to the presidents the responsibility for the successful operation of the colleges. The district’s master plan, Vision 2010, is the vehicle that assists the colleges in developing their educational goals. Vision 2010 was developed in 1993 and is in need of updating.

**Recommendations**

See Recommendation 3 in Standard I

See Recommendation 4 in Standard I

See Recommendation 6 in Standard III
Recommendation 7
The team recommends that the board adopt a formal written process for the selection of chancellor, vice chancellors, and college presidents. In addition, the board should develop a policy that clearly delegates authority from the chancellor to the college presidents for the effective operation of the colleges. (Standards IV.B.1.j, IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a)

Recommendation 8
The team recommends that the trustees and chancellor establish and communicate a clear vision for the importance of student learning outcomes and program review as assessment processes for institutional improvement. (Standard IV.B.1.b)

Recommendation 9
The team recommends that the board implement a process for the evaluation of its policies and procedures according to an identified timeline and revise the policies as necessary. (Standard IV.B.1.e)

Recommendation 10
The team recommends that the board establish a process and specific timeline for updating the district’s Vision 2010 plan. (Standard IV.B.3)

Recommendation 11
The team recommends that the college and district adhere to the Commission policy for the evaluation of institutions in multi-college districts by immediately delineating specific district functions as distinct from those of the colleges’ functions, and communicate these delineated functions to all college and district constituencies, so there is a clear understanding of their respective organizational roles, authority and responsibilities for the effective operations of the colleges, and in meeting the Accreditation Standards. (Standards IV.B, IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.g and Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems, January 2004)