EVALUATION REPORT

Orange Coast College

2701 Fairview Road, PO Box 5005
Costa Mesa, CA 92628-5005

A Report Prepared for the Accrediting Commission
for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Orange Coast College on Thursday, April 16, 2009.

James M. Meznek, Ph.D., Chair

Follow-up Report Visiting Team Roster
Orange Coast College
April 16, 2009

Dr. James M. Meznek (Chair)
Chancellor
Ventura County Community College District

Mr. Michael Carley
Director, Institutional Research
Porterville College

Summary of the Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION: **Orange Coast College**

DATE OF VISIT: **April 16, 2009**

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

Introduction:

A comprehensive visit was conducted at Orange Coast College in spring 2007. During its meeting June 6-8, 2007, the Commission reaffirmed accreditation, based on a comprehensive evaluation, with a requirement that the college complete a Progress Report. The report was followed by a visit from Commission representatives.

The visiting team, Dr. James Meznek and Dr. Rachel Rosenthal, conducted a follow-up site visit on April 15, 2008. The team met with college representatives on the Orange Coast College campus and district representatives at the district office. The purpose of the team visit was to verify the contents of the college's first Progress Report and provide assistance regarding concerns raised by the Commission.

As a result of its visit, the team verified the content of the college's 2008 Progress Report and provided recommendations to assist the institution in resolving the concerns raised by the Commission the previous year.

The Commission, in its action letter of June 30, 2008, placed the college on Warning and requested a report demonstrating resolution of the recommendations below by March 1, 2009.

A second report was called for by the Commission upon the recommendation of the April 2008 site visit team. The team, Dr. James Meznek and Mr. Michael Carley, met with district and college representatives at the district office on April 16, 2009.

The 2009 team found that the college and district were again well prepared for the visit, arranged for meetings with individuals agreed upon with the team chair, and provided appropriate documents for review by team members. Over the course of the meeting, the team met with the following individuals:

College Recommendation #1/Commission Concerns 1-2. Robert Dees, President; Melinda Nish, Vice President of Instruction; Jess Craig, Vice President, Student Services; Kate Mueller, Dean of Students; Rob Schneiderman, Secretary, Academic Senate; Irene Heavern, Curriculum Committee Chair; Georgie Monahan, Program Review Coordinator.

College Recommendation #2. Robert Dees, President; Melinda Nish, Vice President of Instruction; Jess Craig, Vice President, Student Services; Kate Mueller, Dean of Students;

Rob Schneiderman, Secretary, Academic Senate; Irene Heavern, Curriculum Committee Chair; Georgie Monahan, Program Review Coordinator; Sheri Sterner, Director of Institutional Research.

College Recommendation #3. Robert Dees, President; Melinda Nish, Vice President of Instruction; Georgie Monahan, Program Review Coordinator; Jess Craig, Vice President, Student Services; Kate Mueller, Dean of Students; Mark Goode, Maintenance and Operations.

District Recommendation #11 James Moreno, President, Board of Trustees; Ding-Jo Currie, Acting Chancellor Coast Community College District/President, Coastline College; Wes Bryan, President of Golden West College; Robert Dees, President of Orange Coast College.

College and District Responses to the Team Recommendations and Commission Concerns:

The college and district's responses to previous recommendations and the 2009 team's Progress Report findings are as follows:

<u>**College Recommendation #1**</u>: *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 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)*

Commission Concern 1: The College must demonstrate that it is in compliance with Eligibility Requirement 8, which requires that the institution's degree programs "culminate in identified student outcomes."

Commission Concern 2: The College should define and publish "for each program the program's expected student learning and achievement outcomes" (Eligibility Requirement 10).

The 2008 team confirmed that the college had made progress in meeting the recommendation. At the time, the college cumulative total for completed Course Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs) had increased to approximately 50 percent. A plan was developed by the institution to complete all CSLOs for fall 2009.

The 2009 team found that the college had fully implemented its CSLO plan. During November 2008, 100 percent of all CSLOs were developed. Final approval for CSLOs via college governance process took place in December 2008.

The 2008 team characterized the development of Program Student Learning Objectives (PSLOs) at the "awareness" level within ACCJC's rubric for institutional effectiveness. Only ten of the institution's Career Technical Education (CTE) programs had completed

SLOs at the time of the visit. The college had, however, established target dates for the completion for remaining CTE, all AA, AS, and General Education programs by the spring 2010.

The 2009 team found excellent institutional progress in the development of Program Student Learning Outcomes. In terms of creating both CSLOs and PSLOs, the institution appears to have reached "proficiency" within the Commission's rubric for evaluating institutional effectiveness. Strong college commitment in support of PSLOs was evident in the preparation of staff guidelines, worksheets, and templates to assist staff in the development and assessment of PSLOs. At the time of the visit, the team reviewed evidence supporting nearly total completion of PSLOs across all of the institution's divisional wings.

As of the spring semester 2009, all faculty use course syllabi as mutually agreed to in contract. The 2009 team noted that the district's collective bargaining arrangements treat faculty syllabi as restricted rather than public documents. Although CSLOs are now referenced in student syllabi, these materials are not available to the general public. PSLOs are published on the intranet and college catalog.

Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) exist for both Associate in Arts and Associate in Science degrees. ISLOs are included in the college's Academic Master Plan and published in the OCC catalogs.

The 2009 team reviewed institutional evidence regarding the incorporation of student learning assessments into course and program improvements. The team found that the college continued its investment in a college Program Review Coordinator position recently augmented with clerical support. The position serves as a resource in the training, tracking, and assistance necessary to implement and maintain the college's SLO assessment processes.

The 2009 team concurred with the college's follow-up report that ". . . the campus is in the early stages of the assessment process." The team characterized college assessment of Student Learning Outcomes at the "development" level in the Commission's rubric for institutional effectiveness. Measurable CSLOs and/or PSLOs with corresponding assessments are contained in current program review documents. A three-year college-wide review cycle has been designed to ensure that all SLOs and PSLOs are assessed at least once prior to the institution's next comprehensive site visit. At the time of the visit, only areas such as allied health, culinary arts, biology, English, literature, physical education, psychology, speech, and languages had completed actual assessment activities. Approximately 30 departments were engaged in SLO assessment at the course and program levels at the time of the team visit.

Evidence reviewed during the visit identified complete assessment of two SLOs within each of the college's student services areas. Assessments to improve PSLOs in the student support area was underway but remained incomplete.

Assessment was either planned or ongoing in the support programs under the college president's supervision and in the administrative service area. College assessment in the areas of public safety and personnel services had led to measurable program improvements.

The majority of the institution's programs and services had not yet been completely assessed at the time of the team visit.

2009 Team Conclusion:

The Commission expects its accredited institutions to be at the "sustainable continuous quality improvement" level of performance for student learning outcomes no later than 2012. The college has fully addressed the team recommendation regarding the creation of Course and Program SLOs. However, greater progress needs to be made in the implementation of ongoing student learning outcomes assessment in all courses and programs for improvement purposes. The team concludes that the college is at a "proficiency" stage in the creation of CSLOs and PSLOs. The assessment of student learning outcomes remains at the "development" stage. Assessment must be more rapidly and broadly implemented for the improvement and alignment of institution-wide practices.

The team further concludes that the college has addressed the Commission's Concerns 1 and 2 (Eligibility Requirements 8 and 10). Orange Coast College's degree programs culminate in identified student outcomes. Syllabi are provided for student and campus use, but restricted from distribution to the public at large. The college district and faculty's treatment of syllabi appear in conflict with Commission Standard II.A.6.c. This Standard calls for clarity, accuracy, and consistency with prospective and current students.

<u>**College Recommendation #2**</u>**:** *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 improvement 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)*

The 2008 site visit team confirmed that progress had been made in response to the recommendation. The team noted that program reviews had been implemented and monitored by the college's new Student Learning Committee (SLC), which was responsible for both program reviews and the SLO process.

The 2009 team reviewed evidence supporting continued progress in meeting the recommendation. Since 2007, the institution has moved from a six-year program review cycle to a three-year cycle. In the 2007-2008 academic year, the first year of the new cycle, post review feedback was collected and employed to strengthen the review processes and better support college operations and planning. The college was in the second year of its three-program review process during the team visit. A Program Review Calendar exists for the entire college and each of its four divisional wings employ program review spreadsheets for staffing, facility, and technology planning purposes. Program review for instructional

and student services purposes include data and analysis of student enrollment, retention, success, and the achievement of SLOs. The team also confirmed evidence that suggests institutional improvements are being made as an outcome of program review. These improvements include adjustments to class scheduling, course content modifications, and instructional equipment and technology enhancements. Facilities and staffing decisions have been informed and strengthened through enhanced program review practices.

2009 Team Conclusion:

The Commission expects that accredited college program review operate at the "sustainable quality" level. The 2009 team found substantive progress in meeting its program review recommendation during the second year of the college's three-year program review cycle. Complete compliance with the team recommendation should take place next year. The team concludes that the college is approaching the "proficiency" level within the Commission's rubric for institutional effectiveness. The institution must complete its full cycle of program assessment. SLO assessment must be fully implemented and formal ongoing evaluation of program review processes must take place.

College 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 the instructional stakeholders made more aware of the procedures and criteria employed. The process should draw upon findings and recommendations contained in the program review and be filtered through the college's planning committee structure. (Standard 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, II.D.1.c, III.D.3, IV.A.1)*

The 2008 team confirmed that Orange Coast College had accomplished varying degrees of progress in meeting the recommendation. At the time, instructional areas implemented the most comprehensive and long-range planning process. The team found that partial progress had been made by the college with regard to Human Resources planning. Only minimal progress had been made in the areas of information technology and facilities planning.

The 2009 team noted that Orange Coast College worked aggressively to strengthen its planning processes. Each of the institution's four divisional wings maintains planning councils. These bodies provide recommendations to an institution-wide planning and budget committee, and to the Student Learning Committee. The Planning and Budget Committee is the capstone planning committee for the institution. Informed resource allocations are made through this body. A Facilities and a Technology Committee also advise the Planning and Budget Committee in addition to the planning councils. Three-year plans have been created for each of the institution's divisional wings. Team review verifies that plans incorporate program reviews, learning outcomes, and a wide variety of college data and statistics. Each

of the divisional wing plans contains goals consistent with both the college's Academic Master Plan and institutional SLOs.

Human Resource planning appears to have been significantly strengthened since 2008. The 2009 team reviewed evidence in support of a three-year hiring process with uniform rubric and established staffing priorities based on a review of evidence.

The college's Facilities Committee has adopted a process for tracking facility needs in a spreadsheet format. This information is now incorporated in the divisional wing's three-year planning cycle. Facilities needs are prioritized within each of the divisional wing's planning councils. Priorities are forwarded to the Planning and Budgeting Committee for approval. Unfunded projects requests are returned to their respective divisional wings for tracking and/or reprioritization. The Facilities Planning Committee and Budget Committee have also reviewed deferred maintenance lists for disposition.

The college Information Technology (IT) function was reorganized in an attempt to strengthen services and planning. The Technology Committee's mission and scope has also been reviewed. Although the committee appears to have oversight for campus technology, IT planning, and the promotion of IT services, the team could not determine its overall effectiveness. Planned IT user surveys have yet to inform planning and decision making in this area. Full integration of IT into the college planning has yet to be achieved.

While the college has made progress in planning, the team concluded that program review and planning is moving from the "development" to the proficiency level within the Commission performance rubric. The institution is not as yet incorporating all its component departments into comprehensive planning to achieve its educational purposes or improve effectiveness. The college also needs to accelerate its SLO assessment practices so that findings can be communicated to assure quality and be available for planning purposes. The sustainability of ongoing planning processes will need to be assessed. There was little evidence that a systemic evaluation of the new planning process has taken place and that the planning process is working effectively or that planning has improved institutional effectiveness.

2009 Team Conclusion:

The Commission expects accredited college program review and planning to operate at a "sustainable quality" level. The institution has broadened the focus of its planning activities and moved beyond an annual to a three-year focus. Planning and budgets have been linked. Information Technology continues to remain outside the college's planning process. Greater IT integration into planning must take place. SLO assessment must be completed to inform Program Review and Planning. Formal assessment of the college's new planning process is necessary. The team observed evidence characteristic of "development" level performance approaching "proficiency" for college planning using the Commission's rubric.

District 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)*

2009 Team Conclusion:

The 2008 team found that the district failed to adhere to the Commission policy for the
evaluation of institutions in a multi-college district. At the time, the district and colleges had
only recently begun to address the delineation of district and college roles, authorities, and
responsibilities.

The 2009 team confirmed that a District Office/College Map(ping) and a new Board Policy
010-2-6.1: Delineation of Authority to District Chancellor had been finalized. The team also
noted that Organizational Delineation of Responsibility and Process for Decision Making and
Summary of Functions documents had been prepared prior to the team visit. The Coast
Community College District has delineated specific system functions as distinct from those
of the colleges and communicated these different roles, responsibilities, and authorities to
organizational employees and constituencies.

The 2009 team also reviewed printed material and interviewed district representatives
regarding a January 7, 2009 Board action placing the system Chancellor on leave. Evidence
indicates that the district Human Resources Officer acted as Acting Chancellor from
January 8 through January 21, 2009. By Board action, the president of Coastline Community
College began serving as both acting district chancellor and college president on January 22,
2009. This dual employment was in effect during the team visit on April 16, 2009.

The combined responsibilities for the district's acting Chancellor and Coastline College
President are inconsistent with the Board's recently developed District/College Functioning
Map(ping), Summary of Functions, and District Organizational Chart (Standard IV.b). The
blending of roles, responsibilities, and authority clouds the delineation of specific district and
college functions called for in the 2007 site visit team's recommendations. The intertwined
acting Chancellor/President roles serve as both an actual and perceived conflict of interest,
inconsistent with the Commission's delegation of authority standard. [Standard. IV.3e]

On May 6, 2009, the Commission President and college follow-up team chairs received
official Coast Community College District correspondence memorializing the immediate
appointment of an acting president for Coastline College. Evidence indicates that the
chancellor/president roles at the District are currently separated consistent with Commission
policy and Standard IV.

2009 Team Conclusion:

The 2009 team found that the district has addressed the Commission policy for the evaluation of institutions in a multi-college district by clearly defining the respective organizational roles, authorities, and responsibilities for district and its colleges.

<u>Summary Conclusion</u>

The team found that Orange Coast College has continued to make progress in addressing Recommendation #1. The institution has written SLOs for all of its courses and programs operating at the "proficiency" stage within the Commission's Institutional Effectiveness rubric. Orange Coast College has made less progress in its assessment of student learning outcomes. The majority of SLOs had not been completely assessed at the time of the team visit. College SLO assessment is operating at the "development" stage of the Commission's rubric.

Orange Coast College continued to make progress in meeting Recommendation #2. The team notes the institution was in the second year of a three-year program review cycle, and concluded that it is approaching proficiency within the Commission's rubric for institutional effectiveness. SLO assessment must be fully implemented and formal evaluation of program review processes need to take place.

The team observed evidence characteristic of "development" level college performance approaching proficiency in meeting Recommendation #3. A three-year planning cycle has been created and planning and budgets have been linked. SLO assessment must be completed to better inform program review and planning. Information Technology continues to remain outside the college's planning process. Formal assessment of the planning process is necessary.

The college district fully addressed the team recommendation to clearly define respective district and college organizational roles, authorities, and responsibilities.

Lastly, the team concludes that the college has addressed Commission Concerns 1 and 2. Orange Coast College's degree programs culminate in identified student outcomes. Syllabi are provided for student and campuses, but restricted from distribution to the public at large. The college's restricted distribution of syllabi appears to be inconsistent with Commission Standard II.A.6.c.

Dr. James Meznek (Chair)
Chancellor
Ventura County Community College District

Mr. Michael Carley
Director, Institutional Research
Porterville College