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STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

Introductory Comments

Orange Coast College is pleased to submit this Focused Midterm Report to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

The college submitted its self study in December 2006, which was followed by a site visit in March 2007. At the request of the Commission, the college prepared a progress report in March 2008, addressing four recommendations and two concerns, followed by a site visit in April 2008. At its June 2008 meeting, the Commission moved to request a follow-up report due March 2009, addressing the same recommendations and concerns. The Commission also placed the college on warning.

The college submitted the 2009 Follow-Up Report, followed by a site visit in April 2009. At the June 2009 meeting, the Commission removed the warning status and requested that a focused midterm report be submitted by March 15, 2010. This report is Orange Coast College’s Focused Midterm Report in response to the Commission’s request. This report focuses on the college’s full resolution of Recommendations 1, 2 and 3, as well as updates on all other recommendations, Commission Concerns, and self-identified planning agendas from the 2006 self study.

Process and Timeline

The college created a permanent standing committee, the Accreditation Coordinating Committee (ACC), which reports to the newly formed planning committee, College Council. The ACC developed an inclusive process for drafting this report in response to the ACCJC’s request of June 30, 2009.

Members of the Accreditation Coordinating Committee include the Vice President of Instruction who also serves as the Accreditation Liaison Officer, the Academic Senate President, Vice President of Administrative Services, the faculty Program Review Coordinator, the faculty Curriculum Committee Chair, the faculty Transparency Committee Chair, the Dean of Library and Institutional Research, the Dean of Student Services, and one classified representative from each of the four operational wings of the college. The membership was expanded to include the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Coordinator (SLOAC) in November 2009 and the Faculty Staff Development Coordinator in February 2010.

In October 2009, the Academic Senate called for faculty applications from those interested in serving as a faculty writer/researcher for the report to work with the lead writer and the faculty Transparency Committee to provide faculty participation in the accreditation process and to facilitate transparency in the report. The faculty writer was selected in a competitive process in November 2009.

To assist the lead and faculty writers in producing the first draft, small teams were formed to address each recommendation. Planning agendas were assigned to interested individuals, both faculty and staff, in September 2009. All drafts were submitted to the lead and faculty writers by November 30, 2009. A first draft was presented to the campus on December 3, 2009. All faculty, staff, and administrators were encouraged to provide initial feedback through January 8, 2010. The writing team received, revised, and redistributed the draft on February 5, 2010. Feedback from the campus on the drafts was collected through February 17, 2010. This was incorporated into the third and final draft version, made available to the Coast Community College District (CCCD) Board of Trustees for review and final input, as well as the college. The final review period ended on March 1, 2010, with the completed and proofed report then submitted to the ACCJC on March 15, 2010.
Document Format

This document has been constructed specifically to assist the Commission and its representatives to quickly review the activities and supporting documentation addressing the recommendations and concerns as cited in the ACCJC’s letter of June 30, 2009.

I. First Section: 2006 College Recommendations

The first section of the report is devoted to the college-specific recommendations with a summary preamble providing an overview of college-wide activities addressing the Commission’s recommendation. Following the overview, the recommendation has been separated into an outline format that lists each component of the recommendation. Campus activities addressing the component within the recommendation are then bulleted. This type of format should allow the reader to quickly ascertain the degree to which the college has met and reconciled the recommendations/concerns.

II. Second Section: 2006 District Recommendations

The second section consists of district-specific recommendations 6 – 11 with responses developed by district staff. These are recommendations common to all three colleges within the Coast Community College District (CCCD), and therefore, the response to each is identical for all three colleges.

III. Third Section: 2006 Commission Concerns

The third section addresses the two Commission Concerns, which refer to eligibility requirements 8 and 10.

IV. Fourth Section: 2006 Self-Identified Planning Agenda Goals

The fourth section is a response to 70 self-identified planning agenda goals, which were included in the 2006 self study. A brief description reports progress made on these planning agenda goals, specifying timelines for completion and responsible parties.

V. Fifth Section: Supporting Evidence

All supporting evidence is presented at the end of the report. The electronic version of the report also includes all evidence in electronic format. Copies of evidence are on file in the Vice President of Instruction’s Office in the Administration Building. Each piece of evidence is identified by first a Roman numeral (corresponding to the recommendation number), then a lower case letter (corresponding to the component of the recommendation), and finally an Arabic number (corresponding to the document number). Thus, the first piece of evidence cited for Recommendation 1’s first component would be identified as I.a.1, signifying Recommendation 1, component a, evidence number 1.

Dennis Harkins, Ph.D.
President, Orange Coast College

March 11, 2010
Date
COLLEGE RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1:

The team recommends that the college accelerate its efforts to a) identify measurable student learning outcomes for every course, b) instructional program, and c) student support programs and, d) incorporate student learning assessments into course and program improvements.

This recommendation was cited as an area of focus and has been reconciled.

The college has moved into full proficiency with respect to its institutional effectiveness in student learning outcomes. The college was encouraged to further accelerate its assessment efforts by the visiting team reviewing the 2009 follow-up report. The college now reports that it is firmly in the development phase of assessment and moving significantly into the proficiency phase.

By November 2008, 100% of all CSLOs were identified and submitted via the curriculum approval process. All CSLOs were formally approved by the Curriculum Committee, with the last approvals occurring in December 2008. In total, all 1,387 course outlines of record (CORs) for the college have approved and published CSLOs.

Program student learning outcomes (PSLOs) for all certificate programs in the Instructional Wing were identified and approved and are included in the 2009-2010 Catalog. The college met its target date of Spring 2009 for the development of 100% of all PSLOs across all wings of the college. All SLOs, at course and program levels, are available to students and the public-at-large via the college’s website and the division offices. Additionally, CSLOs are now available within the web-based searchable class schedule.

Assessment of outcomes has been a long-standing practice in the Allied Health programs; however, full college assessment was in its formative stage in the 2007-2008 academic year. This has changed with the development of a new program review process and form for all wings and the formal inclusion of assessment in all program reviews. Integrated into the program review forms are sections where programs must describe their assessment methods, their assessment timelines, and their assessment results. Program review resources were made available on the OCC Portal, and workshops and individualized training sessions were conducted by the Program Review Coordinator. In November 2009, a Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Coordinator (SLOAC) was selected to provide overall coordination and learning for outcomes and assessment implementation.

As of March 2010, using a newly developed database for reporting, projections indicate that the college has assessed 78% of all courses and programs offered in 2009, with approximately 73% of those assessments having completed the loop of analysis and course improvement. This information will be incorporated in the March 2010 annual program review summary submitted to all wings for college-wide prioritization and planning.

The college has fully reconciled this recommendation. Specific evidence for each component of the recommendation is presented below.
a. **Identify measurable SLOs for every course.**

Thanks to the strong commitment of faculty members across the campus and the leadership of the Curriculum Committee, the college has made excellent progress and has identified measurable SLOs for every course.

- As of December 2008, 100% of Course Outlines of Record include approved student learning outcomes (I.a.1).
- As of Spring 2009, all course syllabi were required to include SLOs. The Coast Community College District and the faculty bargaining unit (AFT/CTE) mutually supported this mandate and memorialized this agreement in a Memorandum of Understanding signed on October 27, 2008 (I.a.2).
- CSLOs as published on the syllabus for each course are made available to students directly from the course instructor and in the division offices (I.a.3).
- Each division office had successfully collected 100% of all instructors’ syllabi with approved SLOs in Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 (I.a.1).

b. **Identify measurable SLOs for every instructional program.**

Due to the new program review process, the college has made significant progress and has identified measurable SLOs for every career and technical education program and all other instructional programs.

- PSLO resources, including guidelines, models, and a glossary of terms, are available on the OCC Portal, the local college document network, for faculty to access and utilize in drafting program-level learning outcomes (I.b.1; I.b.2; I.b.3).
- Workshops and individualized training sessions were conducted by the Program Review Coordinator to help facilitate writing PSLOs for instructional programs (I.b.4; I.b.5).
- As part of the program review process, programs must identify PSLOs that support a program-specific mission statement and demonstrate the mission’s and PSLO’s alignment with the institutional student learning outcomes (ISLOs). In October 2009, the Instructional Planning Committee (IPC) addressed the Student Learning Outcomes Plan originally drafted in 2005 and updated the document. These changes were presented to the committee in November 2009 and adopted (I.b.6; I.b.7).
- The student learning outcomes for the Associate in Arts and the Associate in Science degrees have been identified and published. These degree-level outcomes are the institutional student learning outcomes (ISLOs) (I.b.5).
- Both the Mission Statement and PSLOs are provided in the program review section and published on the OCC Portal. Including these items on the program review forms ensures mission statements and PSLOs are an integral part of the program review process (I.b.8).
- The Student Learning Committee (SLC) endorsed the recommendation that any program not in compliance should not be offered until it is revised to include these elements. As of this date, all programs are in compliance (I.b.9).
- Development of PSLOs for General Education was completed in Fall 2009 (I.b.10).
c. Identify measurable outcomes for student support programs.

The college provides student support in programs within the Student Services Wing, the President’s Wing, and the Administrative Services Wing. The college has made significant progress and has identified measurable outcomes for every program in these three wings.

Student Services Wing:

- As of May 2008, 100% of student support programs within the Student Services Wing have identified PSLOs complete with assessment methods (ASOCC, Bookstore, CalWORKs, Children’s Center, Enrollment Center, EOPS/CARE, Financial Aid, International Center, Matriculation, Scholarship, and Student Health Center). These PSLOs have been incorporated into the Student Services program review process (I.c.1).

- Student Service PSLOs align with the wing’s themes: student responsibility and providing students with skills needed in their academic and professional lives (I.c.1).

- The Student Services Wing themes directly align with the fourth core competency area of the ISLOs: Personal Development and Responsibility (I.c.1; I.c.2).

- As of December 2009, 74% of Student Services’ PSLOs have been assessed and in some areas have incorporated new methods for improvement (I.c.1).

President’s Wing:

- The programs identified within the President’s Wing–Communications and Marketing, Foundation, Institutional Research, Staff Development, Information Technology, and the President’s Office–are required to identify PSLOs as part of their program review process. All six programs have identified PSLOs and these PSLOs are published on the OCC Portal (I.c.3).

- The Information Technology (IT) department was reorganized in January 2009. The IT department completed a comprehensive program review last year that includes PSLOs (I.c.4; I.c.5).

- As of February 2010, 61% of the programs within the President’s Wing have been assessed with dialogue occurring during the wing assessment meeting and used in the revisions of the 2009-2012 Wing Plan (I.c.3; I.c.6).

Administrative Services Wing:

- As of November 2008, 100% of the seven support programs within Administrative Services–Bursar’s Office, Budget and Financial Operations, College Public Safety, Facilities, Maintenance and Operations, Personnel Services, and the Vice President’s Office–have drafted and finalized their PSLOs, which are aligned with the Academic Master Plan and the college ISLOs. These PSLOs are published on the OCC Portal (I.c.7).

- Program review forms for Administrative Services have been revised to include the college-wide program review planning grids to document the program’s mission statement and PSLOs. Including these items on the program review forms ensures mission statements and PSLOs are an integral part of the program review process, encouraging the reassessment of both as part of the three-year program review cycle (I.c.8; I.c.9).
As of December 2009, 100% of the Administrative Service PSLOs have been assessed with dialogue occurring during the wing assessment meetings and the Administrative Services meetings. They were incorporated into the 2009-2012 wing revision (I.c.10).

d. **Incorporate student learning assessments into course and program improvements.**

The entire campus is fully engaged in the assessment process. All units are seeing the benefits of the process. In Fall 2009, 78% of the college’s CSLOs and PSLOs have been assessed. Of this number, 73% have been analyzed.

**College-wide:**

- To assist in incorporating student learning assessment into course and program improvement, the Program Review Coordinator serves as an important resource for incorporating student learning assessment into course and program improvements. The Program Review Coordinator has attended conferences on assessing SLOs, writing effective PSLOs, and utilizing assessment software such as eLumen. This information has been communicated through program review documents, the SLO glossary, and Assessment Toolbox a set of guidelines for navigating the assessment process. These documents are on the OCC Portal and can easily be accessed by the campus community (I.d.1; I.d.2; I.d.3).

- Two college-wide assessment training workshops were held in September and October of 2009 to assist in the assessment and program review process (I.d.4).

- As part of the three-year program review process in all four wings, all identified SLOs and PSLOs will be assessed at least one time during the three-year cycle and are integrated into every program review document (I.d.5).

- In November 2009, a Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Coordinator (SLOAC) was selected to provide overall coordination and leadership for outcomes and assessment implementation. The SLOAC reports to the President and has allowed the campus to further accelerate its assessment efforts by gaining additional support and coordination services (I.d.6).

- Members of the SLOAC Advisory Council (or SAC) met in January 2010 to discuss using eLumen to coordinate the SLO assessment process. Members participated in a webinar with eLumen staff on February 11, 2010. The committee decided to start testing the report functions and then proceed to a test pilot in March. At the same time, the members also decided to look at other programs and at other college SLO assessment plans in order to decide whether to go forward with eLumen or with another program. They plan to have everyone trained and using a program for SLO assessment beginning Fall 2010 (I.d.7; I.d.8).

- The *Institutional Assessment Plan* (IAP) was drafted and distributed in September 2009. A second revision was reviewed and approved by the Instructional Planning Committee (IPC) and the Academic Senate in March 2010. This document is serving as the guide to campus-wide assessment and is considered a living document with feedback being collected and regular reviews and revisions (I.d.9).
Instructional Wing:

- The Academic Senate drafted an Assessment Philosophy statement in October 2008. The purpose of assessment is addressed, with emphasis on greater faculty dialogue, transparency of continuous improvement practices, and assisting faculty-driven decision making in student learning assessments and the improvement process for courses and programs. A final draft was distributed in December 2009 and endorsed by the IPC, the Transparency Committee, the Academic Senate and the College Council on December 15, 2009. The IPC formally asked that the Academic Senate include the Assessment Philosophy in the IAP (I.d.10).

- As of February 2010, 75% of CSLOs and 38% of PSLOs have been assessed and analyzed. A variety of assessment methods are being tested across the Instructional Wing. These include embedded test questions, rubrics, portfolios, exit interviews, entrance/exit surveys, and pre- and post-tests (I.d.11).

- By the conclusion of Spring 2010, all instructional programs will have conducted assessment of at least two-thirds of all PSLOs. Departments and programs are required as part of the program review process to discuss and analyze the results of the assessment and create a plan for improvement. Plans are incorporated in the annual program review summary submitted to all wings for college-wide prioritization and planning. The first draft was completed in mid-February, with the final document ready by mid-March, 2010 (I.d.12; I.d.13).

- All instructional departments have created assessment timelines that assure all CSLOs and PSLOs will be assessed at least once each three years to ensure continuous course and program improvement (I.d.14).

- Assessment of SLOs and PSLOs is now part of Instructional Unit Assistants’ (IUAs) job descriptions. Making these duties explicit helps institutionalize a process to assure that each instructional department/program will have a point of contact and leadership for the assessment process (I.d.15).

- Various programs and courses such as Speech Communications, Psychology, Library-Instruction, Marketing, Theater Arts, History, Business Administration, and Community Education used embedded questions in tests, closing the loop in their department dialogue, which led to departmental decisions on how to more effectively get that information across to the students (I.d.16; I.d.17; I.d.18; I.d.19; I.d.20; I.d.21; I.d.22; I.d.23).

- Due to the results of assessing the student projects for the Fashion Trend Setting course, it was determined that students who had taken Fashion Applied Textiles and Design achieved higher grades and understanding of the course. It was determined that this course should serve as a prerequisite (I.d.24).

- In the Registered Dental Assisting Program, state board passing rates were reviewed; CSLOs/PSLOs were developed and the curriculum was adjusted to improve the passing rates. Upon analysis of the data, the program increased its effectiveness and achieved the goal of improved passing rates. In 2006-2007, the practical examination pass rate was 48%, while the 2008-2009 practical examination pass rate increased to 83% (I.d.25).
• Based on program review and assessment, the Dance Program determined that students are able to learn to perform songs, basic drum rhythms, and dances from African regions if the material is presented in small groups, rather than to the class as a whole. Students who practiced in a smaller group, with and without music, helped one another learn and remember the longer combinations (I.d.26).

• Based on assessment within Leadership Studies, data revealed that students are proficient in meeting the objectives; however, it was also determined that increased assistance is needed to assist students synthesize their own leadership beliefs with the research and literature on effective leaders. Additional examples and resources will be provided to help students craft their own leadership philosophy incorporating ideas from the class literature (I.d.27).

• Based on assessment within Gender Studies, it was determined that global research paper proficiencies were low (.5-.8%), indicating that changes are necessary in this area. Media research papers proficiencies ranged from 58-62%. Faculty found that students need more work on their global awareness. The faculty members who teach this class have already made changes to their lesson plans for Spring 2010 (I.d.28).

• The Puente Project, which serves as a pilot project and proven model for campus-wide student success, achieved beyond the intended outcome: all 33 students of the current class served as the sample and 97% successfully passed. The data implies that creating a “cohort” of students in rigorous courses results in student success, and not only should this practice be continued in Puente, but also implemented in other counseling and English classes (I.d.29).

• In World Languages, the results identified areas where there should be more focus on developing skills and/or reconsider the rubrics or expectations. The assessment results provided a good springboard for pedagogical discussions. For example, data showed that Spanish reading and writing scores were lower than expected, so faculty made the decision to make an effort to assign more reading outside of the classroom. In Japanese, the data showed that reading scores were also low, but this was expected as first-semester students face quite different challenges, such as learning new writing systems. Because of this challenge, it was determined that different criteria should be used when evaluating proficiency in Japanese. In the Vietnamese courses, scores were very high, as a high number of native and heritage speakers enrolled in first-semester classes. It was also determined that there should be improved communication, particularly to part-time instructors, before the semester begins, so that all can arrange their schedules to have adequate time to perform the oral interviews at the end of the semester (I.d.30).

• Based on assessment, the Printmaking course determined that breaking down concept design into smaller sections would prove helpful to the students. It was also determined that students drop this course when they realize it is only two units and therefore becomes low priority for some. Increasing the units could help motivate more students to complete the course. Data also revealed that some students struggle with acquiring materials for the class; therefore, if the class were held in the printmaking classroom, where supplies are located, it would be helpful to students (I.d.31).

• Assessment is also done as part of the Title III grant, which established objectives to strengthen student learning. Assessment done after the first year of implementing the Title III grant showed that student tracking and early alert technology solutions were needed. The Title III
Coordinator researched both areas and worked with the Dean of Enrollment Services, the Matriculation Committee, and IT staff to develop and purchase software for this purpose. The Student Success Center has grown by over 130%. The growth is the result of centralizing services and creation of an early alert process that uses tracking software to identify students who would benefit from Student Success Center resources. The Student Success Center also developed a supplemental instruction program and increased tutoring services. (I.d.32; I.d.33; I.d.34; I.d.35; I.d.36; I.d.37).

- The Student Success Center is using utilization, retention, and program completion statistics to conduct assessment and propose improvements. As an example, data collection in the first year of the Title III grant showed the need for more space for tutoring. To create the space, the self-paced math program was moved to another location.

**Student Services:**

- In Fall 2009, 74% of student support programs performed a measured assessment of SLOs. The remaining will be assessed in Spring 2010 (I.d.11).

- Data for upcoming assessment was gathered from a variety of sources. For example, Student Government used pre- and post-tests and questionnaires; Matriculation used qualitative analysis and on-line registration statistics, the Children’s Center used student employee evaluations and student parent conferences, the International Center used enrollment data and surveys, EOPS used review and tracking of student educational plans and student transcripts, and Financial Aid used data tracking (I.d.38).

- Assessment results and program review analysis were incorporated into the Student Services Three-Year Wing Plan, drafted in March 2009, for continued improvement and to start the dialogue of post-assessment strategies, such as how to use assessment to improve and increase PSLOs (I.d.39).

- In a collaborative action, the ASOCC Bookstore and the Art Department used assessment results and completed the loop of analysis for course improvement. As a result, they developed supply lists for a majority of the Art Department courses enabling students to purchase their supplies on campus and to guarantee the quality of those supplies (I.d.40).

**President’s Wing:**

- As of Fall 2009, 61% of the President’s Wing CSLOs and PSLOs have been assessed and analyzed (I.d.11).

- All support programs within the President’s Wing proposed assessment methods for their PSLOs as part of their program review process in Spring 2009 (I.d.41; I.d.42; I.d.43; I.d.44; I.d.45).

- The Technology Committee surveyed stakeholders on Information Technology (IT) services and technological equipment in February and March 2009. The results of the survey have been used as part of the data available for the IT program review. Additionally, the survey results assisted the committee in the prioritization of IT projects. As part of writing the PSLOs and mission statements, IT identified four areas of study that will guide the department’s assessment process and data collection (I.d.46, I.d.47).
Administrative Services:

- In Fall 2009, 100% of the PSLOs and CSLOs have been assessed and analyzed (I.d.11).

- During the Spring 2008 semester, a survey assessing the Public Safety and Personnel Services was performed. Data used in the 2008 survey were included in both departments’ program review documents. Assessment conducted as part of program review led to the following improvements in Public Safety: new equipment for public safety officers, facility improvements to the public safety building, and increased communication through a reinstated public safety dispatch position (I.d.48; I.d.49).

- Assessment conducted as part of the Personnel Services program review identified and resulted in many improvements. It has opened communications, as program review is a standing agenda item for monthly staff meetings. Also, specific improvements to date are: a remodeled furniture layout for the personnel services offices for increased confidentiality and process flow; a review with payroll to discuss and expedite paperwork; the development of a procedure manual, which is on the OCC Portal; more data, forms, and deadlines have been added to the Portal for improved customer service; cross-training and realignment of staff members’ duties; and an orientation manual for new hires (I.d.50; I.d.51).

- As part of the Administrative Services Three-Year Wing Plan documents, assessment methods are identified for each measurable goal. One significant highlight of the assessment process is the Fall 2009 Administrative Services Survey. The wing utilized a survey to collect information about services, opinions, and campus feedback. This survey data was used during the October 2009 assessment meeting, during department and team meetings, and for the formulation of revised and new goals. As new goals are being formulated during the Fall 2009 planning process, assessment methods are mindful of the type of goal measurement and assessment (I.d.52).
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 b) make improvements to its programs based on the results of the enhanced program review process.

This recommendation was cited as an area of focus and has been reconciled.

One of the college’s most important outcomes during 2006-2009 was the alignment of a campus-wide program review process. This alignment has enabled the college to compare the results of the four wings’ program review goals, outcomes, and assessment, and from that point, identify and develop campus-wide planning goals. Now that SLO assessments have been fully implemented and formal ongoing evaluations of the program review processes have taken place, the college has attained full proficiency in program review and should attain the sustainable quality level as the college completes the full cycle of program assessment. Additionally, 100% of all programs have completed program review within the new cycle.

a. Comprehensive and meaningful analysis of data with particular emphasis on student enrollment, program completion, retention, success, and achievement of student learning outcomes.

- In 2006-2007, the college revised the comprehensive program review process from a six-year cycle to a three-year cycle to better meet the college’s need for master planning and assessment. This three-year cycle was established as the foundation for data-driven planning and for the assessment of all SLOs in order to provide more data for decision making and allocation of resources (II.a.1; II.a.2).

- Based on research, visiting with faculty and managers involved in program review, and taking into consideration what elements the ACCJC were seeking, the college finalized common guidelines for all four wings. This process is designed to provide a rigorous examination of services and their outcomes, engage departments in planning program improvements that are responsive to student and community needs, and provide information for resource allocation within departments and across the college. The five specific areas of review that were identified include: Description of Program, Enrollment and/or Utilization Analysis and Data Access, Success and Retention Analysis, Planning and Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes, and Three-Year Strategic Planning (II.a.3; II.a.4; II.a.5; II.a.6).

- In 2007-2008, the Curriculum Committee, with the endorsement of Academic Senate and Student Learning Committee, began to include course student learning outcomes (CSLOs) on the course outline of record. This assured the completion of writing SLOs for courses and established the foundation for assessment. All four wings began writing SLOs and identifying assessments for those SLOs (II.a.7; II.a.8).
• Campus-wide training on both program review and SLOs were provided and a common set of guidelines were further developed for the entire program review process, enabling all four wings to adopt and use these guidelines (II.a.2; II.a.9; II.a.10; II.a.11; II.a.12; II.a.13; II.a.14; II.a.15).

• Student Services had an established and sustainable peer evaluation component in its program review process, and Instruction implemented peer review as well. Concurrent to these developments in strengthening the program review process, annual technology and facilities plans were initiated for the purpose of gathering more specific information for the prioritization and planning in these areas (II.a.16; II.a.17).

• In October 2007, the Outcomes and Assessment Committee (OAC) became the Student Learning Committee (SLC), whose purpose was to facilitate decision making and coordinating efforts for a campus-wide endeavor in program review and student learning outcome (SLO) assessment and completion (II.a.18).

• With the notification of warning from ACCJC, the Accreditation Task Force (ATF) was created, with representation from all wings, the Dean of Library and Institutional Research, the Program Review Coordinator, the SLC chair, which for the fall semester ran parallel with the SLC. In March 2009, the SLC dissolved as the Accreditation Task Force took the lead on accreditation issues, focusing on coordinating efforts to address each of the ACCJC’s concerns. The final task for the SLC during Fall 2008 was to compile a campus-wide trends analysis based on comprehensive program reviews from 2007-2008 (II.a.19).

• In May 2009, the Accreditation Task Force (ATF) evolved into the Accreditation Coordinating Committee (ACC), a shared governance body to oversee efforts on program review, student learning outcomes, and transparency. A subcommittee of this new body wrote the first draft of an Institutional Assessment Plan that was vetted and is now in place. Further, the Program Review Coordinator wrote a Program Review Summary for 2008-2009 program reviews that supported updating the wing plans (II.a.20; II.a.21; II.a.22).

• In Fall 2009, it was agreed that there was a need for a Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator (SLOAC) to run a parallel effort with the Program Review Coordinator as the writing of SLOs and assessment of two-thirds of the instructional SLOs fell on the Program Review Coordinator. A new and substantial development in the college’s program review processes is the inclusion of inter-wing representation for all wing program review peer evaluations (II.a.23; II.a.24; II.a.25).

• In Fall 2009, the college piloted a College Council, whose focus is strategic planning, issue management, and communication and collegiality. The college, through endorsement of the various wings’ planning councils and review of data from the campus climate survey conducted in Fall 2009, decided to permanently implement the College Council as a planning council and have the long-standing Planning and Budget Committee evolve into a focused College Budget Committee. It is recognized that the comprehensive program review documents are the foundation for planning (II.a.26).

• In regard to the comprehensive and meaningful analysis of data, comprehensive program reviews and annual planning reviews (sections IV and V of the comprehensive program review) include SLOs and assessment and directly address measuring student success in courses and programs. 2009-2010 is seeing the advent and implementation of a policy and process for the viability review of programs (II.a.27).
• Program Review will undergo assessment of the new three-year process during the 2010 Spring semester. The committee task force will be campus-wide with each wing participating and reporting to the ACC, the Academic Senate, and the College Council. Any approved recommendations will be implemented for the next three-year cycle beginning in Fall 2010.

• The Program Review Coordinator will provide an updated campus-wide trend analysis report in March 2010, based on comprehensive program reviews completed in Fall 2009. This is a summary report that allows data-driven decision making based on program reviews and enables stronger analysis. Summary reports are feeding into the revision of the wing plans, and the college is updating and reporting on the disposition of these plans. Work continues on facilities and technology responsibilities feeding into the campus-wide strategic plan; all wings have their reports on these areas, and methods of creating campus-wide plans are in process.

b. Make improvements to its programs based on the results of the enhanced program review process.

As the program review process has been revised and strengthened, with a greater focus on continual improvement, changes that enhance programs and students’ learning have been identified and implemented.

All four wings conduct both annual and comprehensive program reviews. Program review results feed directly into wing planning, with wings submitting reports to the Program Review Coordinator for a campus-wide summary report. This campus-wide summary report and program reviews drive planning and decision making on the campus.

Updates to annual reports are based on program reviews from the previous year as well as identified accomplishments and areas of concern. The college has continually assessed the new program review process over the past three years. The most important improvements made in the last year are cited here:

• All program reviews, across all operational wings, now follow the same process and timelines, including peer review. This alignment has allowed for more collaborative action between programs in different wings. For example, the ASOCC Bookstore and the Art Department developed supply lists for a majority of the Art Department courses enabling students to purchase their supplies on campus and guaranteeing the quality of those supplies (II.b.1).

• The new program review process, which has been improved by including outcomes and assessments, has helped strengthen program self analysis regarding external accreditation. For example, based on comprehensive program review and assessment, the Registered Dental Assisting Program received a full six-year accreditation (II.b.2).

• The enhanced program review process has also helped the Theatre Arts Program define and accomplish performance goals. Specifically, the program defined a goal of producing culturally diverse plays by first planning and scheduling productions aimed at specific and general audiences. The goal of identifying specific target groups was accomplished in 2009 and has become an ongoing goal, using ticket sales as one means of assessment to analyze each production’s success (II.b.3).

• Another example of the program review process providing a framework for better goal setting comes from the English Department. The program review goal was to increase the number of Peer Assistant Study Session (PASS) sections by 10%. The goal was obtained in Fall 2009, and
the program review process prompted the department to review this and acknowledge that they had achieved the goal. Then the department went a step further and set a new goal to continue increasing by the same 10% for the next two years (II.b.4).

- The new program review process allows programs to consistently and regularly set goals. For example, the Accounting Department formally established a goal via program review to identify students at risk in the fourth week of the semester. Additionally, the department provides these students with references to additional assistance that includes online and in-person tutoring. This program completed this goal in Fall 2009 and intends to continue with a planned assessment tool (II.b.5).

- A final example comes from the Sociology Department. The faculty used the program review process to define a goal of creating a comprehensive service learning project. This was realized through a partnership with a local organization, Girls, Inc. The project is anticipated to launch in 2010 (II.b.6).

It is the more frequent program review process and the forms which better prompt faculty to set goals and establish timelines for measurement that have served as a more effective framework for programs to make continuous improvement a reality.
Recommendation 3:

The team recommends that the college a) 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. b) 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. c) 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. d) The process should draw upon the findings and recommendations contained in program reviews and be filtered through the college’s planning committee structure.

This recommendation was cited as a focus and has been reconciled.

Over the past year the college has worked to refine its planning process across the campus. Wing plans based on program review, learning outcomes, and data collection have been created for all four planning wings. Three-year strategic plans have been written to address the Commission’s recommendation that the college engage in longer term planning for the replacement of equipment and technology, repair and maintenance of buildings and facilities, and the hiring of instructional and non-instructional personnel. All wing plan goals are aligned with the Academic Master Plan as well as the institutional student learning outcomes (ISLOs).

The college has integrated its planning by aligning the comprehensive program review process. All four wings use the same forms and processes to generate their program reviews. All program reviews undergo a peer review to ensure comprehensive analysis of data that encourages dialogue about planning across all departments and wings. This process has improved the planning efficiency among wings and departments, enabling them to identify similar needs and coordinate their plans for better allocation of funds and resources.

Over the past year, the college has worked to create and instill a sustainable planning process: one that is transparent, fluid, and efficient, that ensures all allocations are based on program review, the assessment of learning outcomes, and the examination of appropriate supporting data.

During the Fall 2009 semester, the Interim President sought and obtained support for the creation of the College Council whose primary purpose would be to coordinate strategic master planning, issue management, and communication and collegiality. The College Council (CC) was approved, and the prior Planning and Budget Committee has since been reorganized as a budgeting committee only. This clearly separates the planning and budgeting processes, ensures that planning is leading budget decisions, furthering the transparency of the budgeting process.

For instance, in the 2009 site visit, it was stated that IT integration into planning must take place. Since that visit, Staff Development and Technology have been incorporated into all planning documents. The College Council is designed to ensure that all of the planning components of the campus community provide representation to the council.

The college continues to use the OCC Portal intranet as a document library, making all committee meeting agendas, minutes, meeting schedules, and other pertinent documents available to all college staff members. This web-based repository provides both on- and off-campus access. Active discussions and ongoing dialogue continue
to recommend improvements that constituents would like to see in the organization of the Portal. This demonstrates that the Portal is being used, and the college is engaged in continuous improvement of its communications method.

The Academic Senate promotes transparency of process and decision making. In November 2008, the Academic Senate endorsed the formation of the new faculty member subcommittee of the Senate, the Transparency Committee. This new body is working to review planning and decision-making processes and then make recommendations to the Senate. The college is making clear progress toward developing a sustainable planning and allocation process and making that process transparent to stakeholders.

a. **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; and, d) The process should draw upon findings and recommendations contained in the program review and be filtered through the college’s planning committee structure.**

- The newly formed College Council, created for the purpose of overseeing strategic master planning, issue management, and communication and collegiality, was approved and organized in Fall 2009. The College Council includes 26 voting members and five non-voting ex-officio attendees. Members include:

  - The college President to serve as chair of the council
  - Academic Senate President and Classified Forum President
  - Student Government of Orange Coast College (SGOCC) President
  - 3 additional faculty appointed by the Academic Senate
  - 2 additional students appointed by SGOCC
  - 4 - one representative from each wing (Instructional, Student Services, Administrative Services, and the President’s Office)
  - 1 management at-large representative
  - 1 planning committee representative (faculty, staff, or manager) as voted by each committee from: one each from Accreditation, Program Review, SLO Assessment, Enrollment Management, Facilities, Budget, Research, Staff Development, and Technology
  - Non-voting ex-officio members: 3-vice presidents; 1-research dean; 1-technology director
  - 2 additional classified appointed by Classified Forum
  - A representative from the College Budget Committee
DIAGRAM 1: COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL STRUCTURE
• The prior Planning and Budget Committee was reorganized as the College Budget Committee with the purpose to address budget issues only.

• The College Council developed and disseminated strategic planning flow charts to the campus community to provide clarity for the process of master planning and to ensure the understanding that a longer-term framework exists for the conceptualization of annual goals that lead to plan accomplishments. The College Council was responsible for discussing and disseminating the charts noted on the following pages depicting the OCC Strategic Master Planning Cycle and Process.

• Agendas and minutes from the College Council meetings demonstrate that planning goes beyond an annual review and encompasses a longer-term framework (III.a.1).

• The OCC “Plan-Implement-Evaluate” or P-I-E chart depicts in the simplest form the Strategic Master Planning Cycle. The circular flow demonstrates how the college uses accreditation guidelines to create a data-driven master plan.

• In this cycle, program review, SLOs, and assessment outcomes are linked with all other internal planning efforts.

• Each of the four wings develops and annually monitors its own plans based on the Institutional Master Plan.

• The P-I-E cycle demonstrates that planning development, budget determination, plan implementation, and plan evaluation follow a cyclical path for continuous quality improvement.
DIAGRAM 2:
STRATEGIC MASTER PLANNING CYCLE P-I-E CHART

Plan—Implement—Evaluate

“P – I – E”

PLAN
Steps 1-2

STEP 1
A. REVIEW Accreditation, State and Federal Standards,
   B. REVIEW Master Plan progress, collect internal and external data and perform SWOT analysis. Develop Planning Assumptions, review/revise Mission Statement, Values and Goals

STEP 2
CONDUCT Program Review /SLO Assessment/Review

STEP 3
UPDATE Institutional Planning, Efforts, Wing Plans, Enrollment Management Plans, Facilities Plan, Program Review Plans, SLO Assessment Results, Staff Development Plan, Multicultural Plan, Technology Plan

STEP 4
INTEGRATE and PRIORITIZE Draft Plan including annual and long-term goals. Disseminate to constituents

STEP 5
FINALIZE prioritization by College Council and send to College Budget Committee for resource allocation

STEP 6
DISSEMINATE and IMPLEMENT Final Institutional Strategic Master Plan

STEP 7
EVALUATE Planning Process and Monitor Goals
• The OCC Strategic Planning Process extends the planning cycle into greater detail and is directly aligned with the steps in the planning cycle.

• The planning process starts by using data to guide the college’s mission, values, guiding principles, and planning assumptions.

• There is a clear understanding that an Institutional Strategic Master Plan is needed to serve as the guide for completing our annual wing plans. Prior wing plans were built on a similar process using a similar model.

• This new integrated process has improved and heightened campus awareness of the importance that internal and external data play in the development of planning assumptions, which serve as the college guide for its long-range master plan as well as for its annual wing plans.
DIAGRAM 3:
ORANGE COAST COLLEGE STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS

Step 1A
ACCREDITATION STANDARDS
STATE & FEDERAL REGULATORY STANDARDS

Step 1B
Review OCC Mission Values, (CLASS), Goals

Step 2
PROGRAM REVIEW

Step 3
Wing Plans Updated and Prioritized

Step 4
Consolidation of Wing Plans by College Council

Step 5
COLLEGE COUNCIL
Final Prioritization for Budget Allocation

Step 6
INSTITUTIONAL STRATEGIC MASTER PLAN

Step 7: Ongoing Evaluation of Planning Process
*Institutional Effectiveness
*Review Internal & External Data
*SWOT Analysis
*Develop/Revise Planning Assumptions

*Identification of needs:
*Technology
*Facilities
*Human Resources
*Staff Development
*Other Needs

*Campus Prioritization of Annual & long-term goals
*Technology Plan
*Facilities Plan
*Human Resource Plan
*Staff Development Plan

College Budget Committee Funding Source Recommendations

President
Chancellor
Board of Trustees

NOTE:
Per Ed Code 70901/70902
Students participate in all steps of OCC planning process
• The strategic master planning process demonstrates that budget decisions are made once the master plan has been approved. Staff Development and Technology have been incorporated into all planning. The College Council, College Budget Committee, and the wings are carefully considering human resource needs, incorporating re-organizational options and operational strategies to address reduced funding options (III.a.2).

• In recognition of the comprehensive nature of enrollment management, the college disbanded its Outreach and Recruitment Committee in September 2009. In October 2009, the College Council endorsed the formation of an enrollment management committee to be responsible for the implementation of an enrollment management plan including data review, outreach and recruitment, and retention. Membership includes representation from the Academic Senate, Classified Forum, students, and management (III.a.3).

• Per the Orange Coast College Planning Timeline for Program Review, SLO's, Assessment and Wing Plans (2009-2010), long-range and annual plans are reviewed and modified during spring semester, incorporating program review, SLO assessment, operational prioritizations, and institutional needs into plan analysis and modifications. OCC also modified its annual planning timeline so that in the Fall 2009, seven primary changes occurred:

  1. **Planning diagrams** were designed, discussed, and disseminated to ensure that the campus community clearly understands the planning process. A deliberate and well-thought-out visual process has been developed to demonstrate clarity and sustainability in the strategic master planning processes.

  2. An alternative **planning and decision-making structure** was piloted through College Council, separating planning from the budgeting process that had been organized through the Planning and Budget Committee.

  3. **Internal and external data** was gathered and analyzed to a greater degree than it had been in the past and presented to College Council for use in developing planning assumptions and for reviewing wing plans. A systematic review of data was presented at each College Council meeting, modeling for the campus how data will be used in all future planning processes.

  4. Data-driven **planning assumptions** were created. These planning assumptions were finalized by the College Council in December 2009 and included in the *Strategic Master Plan* document. These planning assumptions will be used by the wings to modify and update their annual plans.

  5. Wing plans were updated to include **staff development, technology, and human resource planning**. Campus leadership clearly understands that these components are critical in the planning process and will be included in all future wing plans. These are also addressed in the college’s planning assumptions.

  6. Although much planning has been documented and demonstrated, a single **OCC Strategic Master Plan** summary document did not exist. College Council is in the process of finalizing a single master planning document that will exhibit planning efforts and will utilize model master planning methodologies. It is anticipated that this document will be available for review by the time the Accreditation Team visits in April 2010. This master document will serve as the link between all of the college’s planning efforts.
7. The College Budget Committee (CBC) confirms that the college’s budget processes are transparent. The College Budget Committee is formally identifying and allocating funds for the replacement of equipment and technology and the hiring of instructional and non-instructional personnel. The Facilities Committee oversees and ensures that there are sufficient funds for the repair and maintenance of buildings and facilities. Should an unfunded need occur, the request for funding will be presented to the College Budget Committee. In an emergency, the college President is authorized to make the funding determination and report the incident back to the College Budget Committee.

b. 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 OCC Integrated Strategic Master Planning Process Flow Chart (Diagram 3) provides clarity for the process of planning and budget allocations. In this process, the wing plans are integrated into the Institutional Strategic Master Plan to be reviewed by the College Council. Once approved, milestones in each of the wing plans are reviewed by the College Council and prioritized for review by the College Budget Committee.

Replacement of Equipment and Technology

The college has made serious improvements that include methods for making more stakeholders aware of the equipment and technology replacement needs college-wide. Additionally, the college has refined planning methods and tools that allow for better budget estimates.

- The college Information Technology (IT) function was reorganized in an attempt to strengthen services and planning. It has also been incorporated into all planning documents. The Technology Committee’s mission and scope has also been reviewed, and in March 2009, IT developed its vision, mission, and roles. An IT Strategic Plan was also developed in December 2009. Both are available on the OCC Portal (III.b.1; III.b.2).

- The Senior Director of Information Technology has combined the technology planning document compiled by the Program Review Coordinator with the equipment replacement list compiled by IT technicians. With a comprehensive list of identified technology needs, the Technology Committee and the Senior Director grouped related items to streamline pricing and more efficient budget funding. Information technology infrastructure upgrades and replacements have been determined by the IT department and presented to the former Planning and Budget Committee for budget allocation (III.b.3; III.b.4; III.b.5).

Repair and Maintenance of Buildings and Facilities

The Facilities Master Plan is an overarching plan for college facilities. It is annually revised to incorporate supporting documentation from program review and the deferred maintenance list. This revised plan is provided to each wing for confirmation and prioritization.

- The Facilities Master Plan is revised annually to incorporate supporting documentation from program review and the deferred maintenance list. This revised plan is provided to each wing for confirmation and prioritization. The 1993-2010 long-term facilities plan has just come to
fruition, and long-term institutional planning has occurred as demonstrated by multi-year wing plans. These wing plans (2010-2013) are currently being reviewed and updated (III.b.6).

- The Administrative Services Wing annually compiles a deferred maintenance list in consultation with its maintenance and operations staff. This list assesses the safety and comfort needs of faculty, staff, and students, and it determines the costs of repairs and maintenance. This list is regularly updated as projects are budgeted, funded, and completed (III.b.7).

### Hiring of Instructional and Non-instructional Personnel

The college continues to work on long- and short-term staffing. The budget for staffing has traditionally been static, with vacancies and the subsequent salary savings providing the funds for replacement hires or reallocated for new position hires. The college has significantly improved its internal process in prioritizing the hiring of vacant and new positions. The current budget crisis within the state of California has placed this prioritization process on hold. Currently, the college is operating under a district-wide imposed external hiring freeze.

- All hiring for classified and managerial positions is done based on program review and the analysis of data. The budgets for classified and management positions are not wing-specific (III.b.8).

- Faculty hiring requests from instructional divisions are ranked by members of the Instructional Planning Committee using common measurement criteria identified in a rubric. The college budgeting practice has been that faculty vacancies creating salary savings within the Instructional Wing have been allowed to stay within the wing and used for replacement positions. It is important to note that the wing prioritization process does not guarantee that each vacancy created will be replaced with a new hire in the same discipline. The actual disciplines that receive the new hires with the replacement funds are determined through the wing-wide prioritization process, which includes program review results (III.b.9; III.b.10).

- A district-wide external hiring freeze became effective in December 2009. This was not an easy decision because the district recognizes that there may be a variety of challenges along the way. The goal of the external hiring freeze is to protect faculty and staff members throughout the district, while it achieves necessary budget savings. Coast District fully-benefited employees, excluding those on grant money, will have opportunities to expand their experiences through transfers or by applying for promotional opportunities, competing with internal candidates only (III.b.11).

c. **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.**

Transparency has been greatly enhanced at the college. Overall, the college relies on a number of means for providing information about the basis for planning and decision making. Transparency is provided in a variety of modes. These include published minutes and open meetings of all the major planning and decision-making bodies, regular meetings of the wing planning councils, and the posting of all major planning and policy documents on the OCC Portal. The college recognizes that transparency of decision making is an ongoing area for continuous improvement.
• To ensure that the campus community understands the intricacies of the strategic planning process, meetings, presentations, town halls, and written communications have been disseminated throughout the Fall 2009 semester. The Interim President presented the planning flow charts at the November 2009 meetings to the Academic Senate, College Council, College Budget Committee, and the Accreditation Coordinating Committee. The information was also presented at Focus Day in September 2009, at two town hall meetings, and in the Mid-Semester Report. Much dialog has occurred to ensure that the campus understands the planning process (III.c.1; III.c.2; III.c.3; III.c.4; III.c.5).

• In November 2008, the Academic Senate created a Transparency Committee with a mandate to track and validate the accreditation process. This committee was instrumental in bringing the faculty perspective to the 2009 accreditation follow-up. The chair of the Academic Senate Transparency Committee was asked to join the campus-wide Accreditation Coordinating Committee (ACC). The ACC shepherds the entire campus through the accreditation process as well as program review, SLOs, and SLO Assessment. The ACC also created a Transparency Subcommittee to ensure the dissemination of information to all stakeholders regarding accreditation deliberations and decisions (III.c.6; III.c.7).

• The ACC created a master calendar to bring together all the timelines pertinent to accreditation, program review, and SLO assessment. The Transparency Subcommittee of the ACC makes sure that all constituents receive this information and understand its importance. This includes all related document deadlines and timelines pertaining to planning and budget, accreditation, program review, and SLO assessment. This has brought clarity and understanding to the processes involved in not only accreditation, but also in participatory governance (III.c.8; III.c.9).

• The new college planning structure also enhances transparency in decision making and a clear understanding of the various planning committees by campus stakeholders. The College Council brings the planning committees together. Planning is now separate from budget decisions that once were the sole purview of the Planning and Budget Committee. With the creation of the College Council and its link to planning committees, the college not only has a clear picture of how and where decisions and prioritization are made, but it also has achieved a new level of faculty and staff involvement in decision making (III.c.10; III.c.11).

• The college continues to use the OCC Portal intranet as a document library, making all committee meeting agendas, minutes, meeting schedules, and other pertinent documents available to all college staff members. This web-based repository provides both on- and off-campus access. Active discussions and ongoing dialogue continue to recommend improvements that constituents would like to see in the organization of the Portal. This demonstrates that the Portal is being used, and the college is engaged in continuous improvement of its communications method.

• Transparency has also been attained in the dissemination of information to the campus in “all user” email announcements generated from the President’s and/or the Vice President’s Offices. These “all users” announcements keep all stakeholders apprised of essential information such as the current budget, changes in committees, calendar updates, and the sharing of information that is expected in a participatory governing process.
In addition to “all users” announcements, each instructional division and college wing has hard copies of all pertinent documents in their offices. While these documents demonstrate the decision-making processes at OCC, all faculty and staff have been encouraged to review these documents, make suggestions, and provide feedback for improvement.

In particular, documents such as *Making Decisions* make clear the paths of SLOs and program review processes; the campus constituency is informed of how and where decisions are made. This document alone has enhanced campus awareness and participation.

Transparency is built into the entire planning process. All wings utilize peer review in their program review process. Peer review allows individual wing members from different departments to understand the trends and needs of the departments within their wings. Program review is no longer an insular activity limited to individual department members who are aware of the plan identified in program review. Following this peer review process wing plans are assembled by compiling the plans within program review. Once the wing plans are drafted, they are sent out to the various departments within the wing to review and prioritize. In each stage of this process, more members of individual wings are made aware of the plan identified by their wing and by other departments. The new process lends itself to transparency and to stakeholder involvement in every stage of development.

In the past year, the college has significantly improved its planning with transparent processes that are accessible and understandable. The college has achieved planning proficiency and is now operating at a sustainable level.

*(Note: component (d) of the recommendation was included with the response to component (a) on page 16.)*
Recommendation 4:

The team recommends that the college a) assess the effectiveness of the new committee planning structure, b) communicate its findings in writing to the college community, and c) implement identified improvements on a continuous basis.

This recommendation has been reconciled.

To measure the effectiveness of the college’s previous budget and planning efforts, the former Planning and Budget Committee selected the Personal Assessment of College Environment (PACE) Survey administered by the National Institute for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness (NILIE) at North Carolina State University. PACE was chosen because it would provide the campus with valuable information about the college and how it compares to community colleges nationally. The PACE Survey was to obtain perceptions of employees concerning the college climate and to provide data to assist Orange Coast College in promoting more open and constructive communication among faculty, staff, and administrators. A task team of research experts, who had not been involved in previous planning or budgeting efforts, was asked to develop additional institutional effectiveness questions. Of particular interest to the college were the questions about its Mission Statement and campus perceptions of the effectiveness of prior planning and budgeting efforts.

Based on the preliminary data from the PACE report, it was determined that there was a need for greater clarity in the planning and budget process. It was also suggested that the Mission Statement be reviewed. The college has moved forward with these findings and has asked for a task force to review the Mission Statement to be implemented by the end of the Spring 2010 semester. At the same time, College Council was approved and the prior Planning and Budget Committee reorganized as the College Budget Committee. This separates the planning and budgeting processes, ensuring that planning is leading budget decisions and furthering the transparency of the budgeting process. All of these changes have been communicated in a transparent, collaborative manner across the campus community.

a. Assess the effectiveness of the new committee planning structure.

- In October 2009, the PACE Survey was administered to 1,782 employees at Orange Coast College. Of those employees, only 19.5% completed and returned the instrument for analysis. In the process of evaluation, it was determined that the sample represented an inadequate level of participation by several campus groups on campus, and the College Council has suggested that the survey be repeated again in early Spring 2010 to gather further information and reach a broader segment across the college community (IV.a.1). However, the consolidated report provided important data about the college’s planning process.

- Preliminary data from the PACE Survey demonstrated the need for greater clarity in the planning process. The decision was made to formalize the College Council, whose primary role is master planning, and to modify the former Planning and Budget Committee so that its only purpose would be to address budget issues (IV.a.2; IV.a.3).

- The College Council recognized that the planning process is intricate, and in fall of 2009, the College Council developed and disseminated the OCC Strategic Master Planning Process chart to the campus community to provide clarity for the process of planning. This diagram is presented in Recommendation 3, on page 21.
Based on the ACCJC standards, the Orange Coast College mission, the guiding principles, and the planning assumptions, the college has completed the President’s Wing Plan, Administrative Services Wing Plan, Instructional Wing Plan and Student Services Wing Plan. As part of the new planning structure, these wing plans are being integrated into the Master Plan and reviewed by the College Council. Once the College Council approves the draft Master Plan, milestones in each of the wing plans will be reviewed by the College Council and prioritized by April 2010 (IV.a.4; IV.a.5; IV.a.6; IV.a.7).

Per the planning timeline, long-range and annual plans are reviewed and modified during the spring semester. These plans are analyzed and modified by incorporating program review, SLO assessment, human resources and operational priorities, and institutional needs. Any approved recommendations will be implemented for the next three-year cycle (IV.a.8).

b. Communicate its findings in writing to the college community.

In Fall 2009, the college assessed the effectiveness if its planning structure and modified it in a transparent collaborative manner through the Academic Senate and the Transparency Committee. It also communicated the findings and changes in writing to the college community through meeting minutes, campus emails, town hall meetings, and in a campus-wide presentation by the Interim President prior to her departure (IV.b.1; IV.b.2; IV.b.3; IV.b.4).

The College Council suggested that the PACE Survey be made available again to gather further information and reach a broader segment of the college community. In order to encourage participation, announcements were made through an “all user” email from the college President, at division meetings, at campus committee meetings, and on the OCC Portal (IV.b.5, IV.b.6).

Working through the College Council, and in line with needs identified through program review, a communications subcommittee was established to develop a comprehensive campus-wide communications and marketing plan that aligns with the college mission and values. The subcommittee is charged to identify, assess, and develop strategies and tactics about the best practices for delivering news to and soliciting input from diverse audiences and stakeholders (IV.b.7).

c. Implement identified improvements on a continuous basis.

The new College Council and College Budget Committee structure has been endorsed by all participatory governance bodies. In December 2009, the College Council voted to approve the planning structure and the responsibilities of the new College Budget Committee (CBC). The CBC will allocate budgets based on college plans and priorities set by the College Council (IV.c.1).

In December 2009, the College Council reviewed membership of the College Budget Committee. There was agreement that the College Budget Committee should be co-chaired by the Academic Senate President and the Vice President of Administrative Services. A task force was recommended to develop and propose a new College Budget Committee membership structure. It was agreed upon that the voting members of College Council should not also be voting members of the College Budget Committee (IV.c.2; IV.c.3).
• The College Budget Committee conducted a budget training session on February 26, 2010, with a second session to be held on March 12, 2010 (IV.c.4).

• As recommended by the ACCJC, the college has broadened its focus beyond an annual basis to encompass a longer-term framework with its *Master Facilities Plan*. Plans and subsequent budget allocations have been developed for the replacement of equipment and technology, repair and maintenance of buildings and facilities, and the hiring of instructional personnel (IV.c.5).

• In recognition of the comprehensive nature of enrollment management, the college disbanded its Outreach and Recruitment Committee in September 2009. In October 2009, the College Council endorsed the formation of an Enrollment Management Committee to be responsible for the implementation of an enrollment management plan including data review, outreach and recruitment, and retention. Membership includes representation from the Academic Senate, Classified Forum, students, and management. This addresses the need to create and implement a comprehensive plan that exceeds the narrow focus of the former Outreach and Recruitment Committee (IV.c.6).

• The initial charge of the new Enrollment Management Committee is to conduct a business process analysis of the college’s current programs and services, which will be completed in Fall 2010. Upon completion of the analysis, the committee will prepare a comprehensive, strategic enrollment management plan (IV.c.6).

• The Accreditation Coordinating Committee (ACC), meeting weekly, provides a frequent and regular reporting venue. Wing representatives report changes, updates, and improvements in planning processes and forms. The College Council is also involved in the review process and is the final forum for planning process endorsement. These two bodies serve as forums to identify improvements and assure that these improvements are implemented.

• Timelines developed by the Accreditation Coordinating Committee have helped the college planning bodies meet deadlines within the planning cycle. This calendaring effort has improved the planning and budgeting process and is a component of sustainability (IV.c.7).
**Recommendation 5:**

*The team recommends that a) the district and college enhance faculty professional development activities and b) revise faculty and management performance evaluation procedures to focus on identifying, measuring and achieving student learning outcomes.*

This recommendation has been reconciled.

Orange Coast College has worked in a participatory manner to address the Commission’s recommendation to enhance professional development activities and evaluation procedures to focus on student learning outcomes. Additionally, the college has engaged in meaningful and progressive dialogue concerning the use of evaluations, assessment, and the appropriate manner in which to include outcomes and assessment in the evaluation process.

**a. The district and college enhance faculty professional development activities.**

The Coast Community College District (CCCD) delegates faculty professional development activities to the individual colleges within the district. At Orange Coast College, the Academic Senate oversees the Professional Development Institute (PDI) that serves as a faculty-to-faculty resource. The PDI is led by a faculty coordinator who is responsible for the general operations of the institute stipulated by the CFE/AFT Agreement with the district. The services currently provided are based on available funding including salary advancement credit and/or funding for development of “alternative methods” of teaching and learning, conference and workshops funding, in-service training salary advancement credit, professional improvement activities salary advancement credit, and sabbatical leave funding.

Currently, the primary functions of the PDI are to administer the application and allocation of conference and workshop funds, alternative methods funds, and sabbatical leaves that are contractually guaranteed to the college from the district. Additionally, PDI also facilitates and grants salary advancement credits for full-time faculty who participate in professional development activities such as independent study, job shadowing, leadership in a professional organization, new assignment preparation, online professional development, writing for publications, and production of educational materials, which are also contractually guaranteed to the college from the district. The Academic Senates of the CCCD received a significant augmentation of PDI funds in 2008, which has resulted in an increase of OCC faculty attending professionally-related conferences and taking sabbatical leaves. Conversely, the CFE/AFT Agreement (Article XIII, Section 3) also offers release time or overload pay as an alternative for salary advancement credits. However, these professional development opportunities have not been regularly available due to inadequate funding.

Orange Coast College has a past history of appointing faculty members to serve as Staff Development Coordinators on a two-year basis with reassigned time. The Staff Development Coordinators often work with the PDI to help coordinate in-service training and workshops that may lead to salary advancement credit. PDI is encouraging departments and faculty to apply for in-service workshop status to enable faculty to earn salary advancement credit for participation in SLO workshops, reviews, and activities. Additionally, the Staff Development Coordinators are responsible to help provide development resources and activities for all classified staff and management as well as faculty members. The structure of this support system was reviewed during the 2008-2009 year with the intent to critically address and improve the service of professional advancement to all campus constituencies.
The main conclusion of this review was that the campus needed a more inclusive process to assure that classified staff and management professional development needs were more regularly addressed.

- At the May 14, 2009, Planning and Budget meeting, the committee approved the development of a Staff Development Advisory Committee. The committee also stated that the Staff Development Coordinator should serve on both the Staff Development Advisory Committee and the Accreditation Coordinating Committee (V.a.1).

- The Staff Development Advisory Committee’s purpose is to consult with its constituencies to plan, coordinate, oversee, and assist with the professional development activities of the campus; assist in creating and updating relevant portions of the OCC Faculty and Staff Handbook; support achievement of college goals; ensure that the college meets or exceeds professional development standards for accreditation; and seek innovative ways to enrich the lives of students and staff at the college. The newly formed Staff Development Advisory Committee met for the first time in September 2009 (V.a.2; V.a.3).

- In October 2009, the committee met to review a draft of the district’s Professional Code of Ethics, an accreditation requirement. The committee also reviewed the data from faculty, classified, and manager needs assessment surveys and discussed how to connect the survey results with the college’s four wing plans. The results of these surveys are still under evaluation. Also discussed were plans to develop a college staff development e-newsletter and future staff development workshops and activities (V.a.4; V.a.5; V.a.6; V.a.7; V.a.8).

- The Staff Development Advisory Committee has collected staff development activity evaluations to enhance the staff development programs such as the New Faculty Orientation, the Forum on SLO Planning and Assessment, and the campus-wide SLO workshop. The committee discussed recommended changes and determined that a more convenient evaluation form should be created to assure that evaluations will be consistently conducted. The committee continues to use the data for continuous improvement (V.a.9; V.a.10).

- The Faculty Academy is a two-year program for new full-time faculty at Orange Coast College. This program, designed for first-year and second-year faculty, is a community learning experience where faculty can collaborate in the study of teaching, learning, and defining best teaching practices. The two-hour program focuses on topics such as curriculum development, professional development opportunities, innovative teaching styles, learning strategies, and opportunities for broader campus engagement. Evaluation forms are given to those who attend, and the results are reviewed by the Faculty Academy Committee (V.a.11; V.a.12; V.a.13; V.a.14; V.a.15).

- In addition, the Staff Development Office has embedded specific staff development-related accreditation questions into each of its workshop and training evaluations to ensure that the data is collected and can be used, consistent with the stated PSLO staff development accreditation requirements (V.a.16; V.a.17).

- The Recognition Committee under Staff Development oversees the process of selecting the Outstanding Coast Colleagues for full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and classified staff. The committee members meet during the fall semester to plan and facilitate the nomination and voting procedures. During the spring semester, the committee plans the program and reception. The nominees are announced and voted on in the fall semester, and the awards program
is held in the spring. All information is on the OCC Portal and accessible for the OCC community to view.

- The Kudos Award provides faculty, staff, and students the opportunity to recognize employees who “show exceptional service, those who go ‘above and beyond’ to serve members of the OCC community, students, visitors, and/or colleagues” (V.a.18).

- Another activity to enhance faculty professional development is the funding of two Distinguished Speaker Series grants annually, worth $7,500 each. The speaker series is designed to contribute to a true teaching and learning community on the OCC campus to address the learning needs of a changing student body and to sustain a culture of teaching/learning excellence. Faculty may submit grant applications to support the costs of creating a day devoted to a topic of interest to the college community. This day includes a keynote speech or activity presented by a distinguished speaker with personal or professional interest in the topic (V.a.19).

- Since 2007, the PDI Handbook has been available on the Portal as a reference guide for full-time faculty. This handbook includes basic PDI information, subcommittee applications, and contract rules and guidelines. In January 2010, the PDI Committee created a smaller version of the handbook for full-time faculty to allow faculty to print out their own guidebooks to keep as an easy reference on their desks. The document was distributed via an “all user” email and it is also available on the OCC Portal. The notebook is a supplement to the PDI Handbook and allows faculty to access material such as basic PDI information, subcommittee applications, Board submission dates, and essential contact information quickly (V.a.20).

- The District Wellness Committee offers a district-wide workshop series open to all benefit-eligible CCCD employees. Workshops include express fitness, Pilates, yoga, mixed martial arts, and Weight Watcher meetings (V.a.21).

- Consistent with the above activities, the Staff Development Office is actively collecting data related to Staff Development’s stated PSLOs by working directly with the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Coordinator (V.a.22).

b. **Revise faculty and management performance evaluation procedures to focus on identifying, measuring, and achieving student learning outcomes.**

Considerable dialogue has occurred concerning the appropriateness of student learning outcomes and assessment as part of faculty and management performance evaluations.

All managers submit annual goals and undergo a comprehensive evaluation every two years. This bi-annual evaluation includes self-evaluation, a performance survey, and the manager’s immediate supervisor’s evaluation. During each manager’s annual goal-setting phase, he/she is asked to identify goals based on program review results from their respective departments or divisions. These goals include supporting and/or directly identifying and measuring student learning outcomes in their area of responsibility. Both the manager’s self-evaluation and the supervisor’s evaluation of the manager assess the success of achieving these goals.

- The process of assuring that outcome and assessment goals are included in all instructional management evaluations is now well-established, having been a regular practice since the 2006-2007 evaluation cycle. Managers in Student Services and Administrative Services have included
outcomes and assessment goals related to student learning outcomes in their evaluation process for the past two cycles and this process is now sustainable and continuously improving.

- Faculty evaluation forms and procedures are negotiated with the faculty union representatives. Understandably, negotiated instruments do not change frequently. There is great emphasis placed on adhering to negotiated policies and procedures in faculty evaluation. The forms and procedures for this process at Orange Coast College are negotiated for all three colleges within the district. These forms and procedures have not been re-negotiated since 2007, when the Commission’s recommendation was issued. Orange Coast College has worked within the existing forms and procedures for faculty evaluations to determine how to recognize and commend faculty members for their contributions to the establishment of student learning outcomes and assessment measures.

- An Institutional Assessment Plan (IAP) drafted by the Program Review Coordinator was presented to the campus in September 2009. The IAP defined assessment, presented an assessment vocabulary, and delineated the assessment responsibilities of employee units, specific departments, individuals, and committees. The IAP is scheduled to be finalized during the 2009-2010 year as feedback is received and actual progress in using the plan is documented (V.b.1; V.b.2).

- One of the first items of feedback concerning the IAP came from the Instructional Planning Council (IPC). The IPC recommended in October 2009 that the assessment philosophy drafted by the Senate be reviewed anew and that an assessment philosophy be formally adopted and included in the IAP. A subcommittee of the IPC was formed, including the Academic Senate President, and was charged with finalizing an assessment philosophy based on the Senate’s previous work that was reviewed by the IPC on November 4, 2009 in order to finalize a recommendation for the Academic Senate. IPC adopted the Assessment Philosophy document in December 2009 (V.b.3).

- During IPC discussions, it was agreed that faculty who are directly responsible for the majority of outcomes identification and assessment should be positively supported in their efforts. IPC determined that “closing the loop” dialogues will lead to continuous improvement in the learning process rather than punitive outcomes based on the fluid process of assessing and improving student learning. Faculty and management alike have stated that developing and assessing student learning outcomes should focus on constructive changes rather than punitive consequences. It was further agreed that the intent of the process is to encourage open and honest dialogue with the goal of improving the student learning process (V.b.4; V.b.5; V.b.6).

- In addition to the work of the IPC subcommittee, the Vice President of Instruction who serves as the IPC chair met with faculty union leadership during November 2009 to discuss how the current negotiated forms and procedures could be used to address the intent of the Commission’s recommendation and, at the same time, assure that student learning outcome assessment would not become a potentially punitive component of the process. The outcome of this meeting was an agreement to offer joint training sessions for faculty and management conducted by both college management and college union leadership. The focus was on presenting and discussing best practices in performing faculty evaluations, including the appropriate inclusion of student learning outcomes and assessment. The first of these training sessions occurred on December 11, 2009. A second was conducted on February 17, 2010. This collaborative effort between management and the faculty union is an example of the type of progressive outcome
that dialogue is bringing about at OCC; it allows tenure-track review teams to incorporate this information into their process. All full-time and part-time faculty were invited to these sessions, but it must be noted that the emphasis was on the full-time faculty process (V.b.7).

- There is the expectation that improvements to the faculty evaluation forms and procedures will be formally discussed in the next session of contract negotiations. This process will take time as any changes negotiated between the district and union will be for all three colleges, which as a matter of course necessitates greater discussion and feedback than working with just OCC.

The college has invested significant resources, including the time to seriously discuss and review processes, organizational structures, and potential improvements to staff development activities, as well as evaluating work being done in student learning outcomes and assessment.
DISTRICT 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._

This recommendation has been reconciled.

The Coast Community College District’s “Code of Ethics for Members of the Board of Trustees” policy was revised September 5, 2007, and addresses this planning agenda item. Included in this policy are “Steps in Addressing Ethical Violations” which clearly delineate how ethical violations are to be reviewed and resolved. Additionally, a section titled “Trustee Standards of Practice” is included, which outlines policy specific to accreditation standards IV.B.1.a.e.h. These standards establish the operating norms and best practices of the Board members and provide a benchmark for accountability.

In February 2010, the Board of Trustees adopted Resolution #010-04, which established the Code of Ethical Conduct for All Coast Community College Personnel. This code is printed in its entirety below. The district has established a task force that will use this resolution as the basis for development of a formal Board policy.

**CCCD Employee Code of Ethical Conduct**

This Code of Ethics is a public statement by the members of the Coast Community College District that sets clear expectations and principles to guide practice and inspire professional excellence. Employees shall exercise judgments that are dispassionate, fair, consistent, and equitable. They shall exhibit openness and reliability in what they say and do as educational leaders. They shall confront issues and people without prejudice. They shall do everything they can to demonstrate a commitment to excellence in education and without compromise to the principles of ethical behavior.

The Coast Community College District is comprised of professionals who are dedicated to promoting a climate which enhances the worth, dignity, potential, and uniqueness of each individual within the district community. Although we work in various settings and positions we are committed to protecting human rights and pursuing academic excellence.

The conduct of district employees as public employees shall be worthy of the respect and confidence of the community we serve. Employees must, therefore, avoid conduct that is in violation of their public trust or which creates a justifiable impression among the community that such trust is being violated. To this end, the following code of ethics is directed to all administrators, faculty, staff and student employees who are responsible for maintaining a positive working and learning environment in the district.
**Coast Community College District Employees:**

1. Shall dedicate themselves to the ideals and principles that will enable students to develop their talents and interests.

2. Shall adhere to the principles of nondiscrimination and equality without regard to race, color, gender, sexual orientation, marital status, age, disability, religion or national origin.

3. Shall maintain high standards of professional conduct, and act with integrity.

4. Shall understand and appreciate the dynamics of interpersonal relationships when dealing with students, co-workers and the public.

5. Are honest and accountable in all district actions and activities.

6. Demonstrate personal and professional integrity in supporting the mission of the district and the colleges.

7. Are fair and respectful in all interactions with colleagues, students, and the public.

8. Avoid conflicts of interest, or its appearance, between their obligations to the district and private business or personal commitments and relationships. (e.g., the use of district colleges’ credit cards for personal use is strictly forbidden).

9. Address issues and work with people without prejudice.

10. Act within applicable laws, codes, regulations, and district policies and procedures.

11. Treat people with respect notwithstanding differences among personal values, beliefs, and behaviors of others.

12. Maintain confidentiality regarding information about students or staff obtained in the course of their duties.

13. Be a good steward of district assets.

14. Maintain a working and learning environment free from harassment, as defined by district policies.

15. Maintain and enhance job effectiveness and competency through professional development.

16. Respect the integrity and professionalism of administrators, faculty, staff, and students.

17. Make every reasonable effort to create an equal-access learning environment that will help students succeed.
With respect to students, all employees of the Coast Community College District have the responsibility:

1. To provide and protect student access to the educational resources of the community college.

2. To protect human dignity and individual freedom, and assure that students are respected as individuals, as learners, and as independent decision-makers.

3. To invite students to participate in the established shared governance process.

4. To protect students from disparagement, embarrassment or capricious judgment.

5. To keep foremost in mind at all times that the college exists to serve students.

6. To dedicate themselves to the ideals and principles that will enable students to develop their talents and interests.

7. To adhere to the principles of nondiscrimination and equality without regard to race, color, gender, sexual orientation, marital status, age, disability, religion or national origin.

8. To maintain high standards of professional conduct, and act with integrity.

9. To understand and appreciate the dynamics of interpersonal relationships when dealing with students, co-workers and the public.
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.

This recommendation has been reconciled.

On November 19, 2007, the Coast Community College District Board of Trustees adopted a formal written selection of the chancellor, vice chancellors, and college presidents. This policy, 050-1-17-1, was developed in consultation with constituent groups and outlines the process and procedures to be followed in the selection and employment of the chancellor, vice chancellors, and college presidents (VII.1).

Additionally, according to Board Policy, 020-1-1, the governing Board delegates district operational responsibility to the Chancellor. While holding the college presidents responsible, the Chancellor may delegate authority and responsibility for specific functions to each college president. In Board Policy 010-2-6.1, the Chancellor has delegated certain powers and duties to the college presidents. In turn, each president provides leadership and advocacy for his/her college at both the local and district level and is responsible and accountable for the institution’s programs, services and operations. The President is responsible to both the Chancellor and to the governing board to ensure the appropriate implementation of district policies (VII.2; VII.3).
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.*

This recommendation has been reconciled.

The Coast Community College District Board of Trustees and the Chancellor fully support the development and assessment of student learning outcomes for all programs and services at the district’s three colleges as a way to ensure institutional improvement. At its meeting of October 21, 2009, the Board of Trustees held a study session to review the progress each of the colleges has made in the development of student learning outcomes and where each college is in the assessment process. At its meeting of November 4, 2009, the Board of Trustees passed a resolution presented by the Chancellor supporting the efforts of the district’s three colleges in complying with and exceeding the standards set forth by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges as they relate to student learning outcomes and the program review process (VIII.1). In addition, the Board of Trustees shows its commitment to program review for Career Technical Education by requiring biennial reviews to ensure program viability and effectiveness on the basis of labor market demand and the success of students based on program completion rates and employment.
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._

This recommendation has been reconciled.

The Board Accreditation Committee has reviewed this particular recommendation with great interest. The district Board policies currently do not have a regular review process and timetable. During spring 2009, the District Office, working with the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor’s Cabinet, developed a process for reviewing current Board policies and procedures as well as for developing new policies and procedures. This new process was very instrumental in the development and review of several Board policies, including the Search and Selection of the CCCD Executive Management Employee Policy, Fraud Prevention in Financial Statements & Whistle Blower Protection Policy, and the Identity Theft Protection Policy (IX.1; IX.2; IX.3). A number of additional major Board policies are currently under review and development using the new process.

**Process for the Evaluation of Policies and Procedures**

The Chancellor has worked with the Board Accreditation Committee, Board Clerk, and Board President, Chancellor’s Cabinet to develop formalized evaluations of policies and procedures so every existing Board policy will be reviewed on a regular cycle of review.

1. Review all existing and new categories of Board policies.
2. Prioritize the categories of Board policies for review.
3. Develop time tables of reviews according to priority.
4. Establish regular ongoing cycle of review.
5. Utilize existing Board policy review process.
6. Develop a Board policy for policy development and revision.

**Timetable for Review/Revision**

- **Fall 2009**  Review existing and new categories of Board policies. Complete prioritization and review/revision of timeline.
- **Spring 2010**  Continue regular reviews according to prioritization and established timetable.
- **Spring 2012**  Complete first cycle of comprehensive reviews and revisions of all Board policies.
## Current Categories of Board Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010-2</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020-1</td>
<td>Administrative Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>Educational Programs and Student Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040</td>
<td>Business Operations – Part 1 and Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>General Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060</td>
<td>Certificated Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070</td>
<td>Classified Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>080</td>
<td>Confidential Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Hourly Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Non-scheduled Assignments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation 10**

*The team recommends that the board establish a process and specific timeline for updating the district’s Vision 2010 plan.*

This recommendation has been reconciled.

The Board Accreditation Committee reviewed this recommendation along with district and college leadership. During 2008-2009, a consultant was hired to do some preliminary environmental scanning in preparation for the master planning process. Interviews were conducted with community members, college leaders, students, and Board members to assess overall needs.

During Fall Semester 2009, the district’s Vision 2010 plan was reviewed to assess the district’s accomplishments against the established goals in the plan as well as to identify gaps. In October 2009, the Board held a special study session to review the district master planning process and to recommend a timetable. The Board determined that the district would establish a 10-year vision running through 2020 and complete a five-year master strategic plan with three-year review cycles.

The Chancellor has established a process and a set of principles for district-wide participation.

**Master Planning Timetable**

2008/2009 Environment Scan for Master Plan - Complete

2009/2010

**Fall**
- Review district’s 2010 Master Plan – Accomplishments and Gaps
- Board of Trustee Study Session on Master Plan (X.1)
- Establish Master Planning Timetable and Process

**Spring**
- Board/Chancellor – Master Plan Workshop for Vision 2020
- SWOT Analysis – Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, and Threats
- Data Collection
- Launch Planning Process

2010/2011

**Fall**
- Develop Master Plan 2015 Strategic Goals
- Develop Action Plans
**Spring**
- Complete Master Plan
- Develop and/or Renew College Master Plans according to District’s Master Plan

2013/2014

**Fall**
- Master Plan Review/Evaluation & Renewal

2015/2016

**Fall**
- Renewal of Master Plan 2020

**Planning Guiding Principles**
- Guided by Board’s Vision
- Absolutely Student-Centered
- Open with Consultation and Information
- Inclusive in Participation
- Innovative in Ideas
- Comprehensive in its Scope
- Organized in Process and Support
- Facilitated with Quality Expertise
- Completion within Budget and Timetable
- Implementation with Institutionalization
- Organic with Ongoing Reviews
- Celebrations with Accomplishments
Recommended Planning Participants and Process

- Board–Vision
- Chancellor Cabinet–Steering
- Taskforces–Technology, Facility, Educational Programs, Support Programs, Innovations, Resource Development
- College Planning Councils
- Community Participation
- External Experts/Advisors
- Town Halls
- Think Tank Group Sessions

Recommended Celebrations

- Annual and Occasional Update Reports to the Board of Trustees
- Publish and Distribute Annual Report of Master Plan Accomplishments to the District, Local Communities, Legislators, and State/National Press and Organizations
- Press Releases, Press Conferences
- Open Houses for students, community, legislators, donors
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.

This recommendation has been reconciled and was addressed in detail in the 2009 Follow-up Report, which is included as Appendix I to this report.

The 2009 team found that the district had 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 the district and its colleges (XI.1).
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.”

These concerns have been reconciled and were addressed in detail in the 2009 Follow-up Report, which is included as Appendix I to this report.

The 2009 team found that the college had 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 (C.1).
PLANNING AGENDA GOALS

Orange Coast College identified 70 Planning Agenda goals in its year 2006 accreditation Self Study. Seventeen administrators, faculty members and classified staff interviewed more than 25 responsible parties and gathered documents to report progress the college has made toward accomplishing the Planning Agendas since the accreditation site team’s visit in April 2006.

The unedited first draft of the Planning Agendas is included as Appendix II to this document. Since writing the initial draft, the Planning Agendas have been edited to adhere to ACCJC instructions to provide a brief summary, including a timeline and responsible parties. All original documents and reports submitted by administrator, faculty, and staff volunteers in response to the Planning Agendas have been retained and are available upon request.

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

I.A. Mission

Planning Agenda: I.A.1.

1. Develop a plan for a Student Success Center.

Progress: Orange Coast College developed a plan and opened a Student Success Center in 2008. Two instructional associates were hired using Title III funds: one to coordinate the supplemental instruction program, which started in Fall 2008, and an associate to coordinate the writing area in Fall 2009. Services provided include tutoring—both online and in-person—study skills workshops, and supplemental instruction. In 2008-2009, the campus implemented an Early Alert System to identify students who would benefit from Student Success Center resources (PA.I.A.1.1). The Title III project’s two-year evaluation report states that the Success Center is at least six months ahead of what would be considered a ‘normal’ growth curve for a Title III project of this type (PA.I.A.1.2). Student demand for services has grown to the point of needing additional space, which will be available when the dental assisting program moves into the new ABC building in January 2011. The center is an institutional program, with an operational budget from both college and student funds, and has a place in post-grant strategic and operational planning (PA.I.A.1.3; PA.I.A.1.4; PA.I.A.1.5).

Timeline: In Year Four (2009-2010), the Student Success Center is moving all supplemental programs into its center and expanding staffing, equipment and access hours. In Year Five (2010-2011), the college will finalize institutionalization of the Student Success Center program and prepare the final report for Title III.

Responsible Party: Melissa Berta, Title III Project Director

2. Expand the college’s online course offerings and increase corresponding computing support.
Progress: During the past two years (Fall 2007-Fall 2009), OCC’s online courses have increased approximately 10% each year (PA.I.A.1.6). Partly due to program reviews and assessments, faculty and departments increasingly use Blackboard, software to supplement traditional classroom instruction or to teach online. The college has assigned three staff members to support online instruction, including course development for Blackboard, Blackboard administration, and course assistance for large group courses. Grants of $5,000 to $6,000 were awarded in 2007 to provide additional resources for further development of Blackboard, including updating the software and providing faculty training. In addition, the college offers open lab hours each week to help faculty members develop online courses (PA.I.A.1.7; PA.I.A.1.8). Faculty members continue to improve their ability to teach online courses, and their students are successfully completing courses in this new learning medium (PA.I.A.1.9; PA.I.A.1.10; PA.I.A.1.11; PA.I.A.1.12). The Online Advisory Committee is working with an ad hoc task force to create a testing center to support online classes (PA.I.A.1.13).

Timeline: Faculty training and support for online course offerings are ongoing. In February 2010, the Online Advisory Committee reviewed a report evaluating upgrading the current Blackboard learning management system (LMS) or moving to Seaport LMS, developed and maintained by Coastline College to meet its unique course delivery needs. The committee plans to share its findings with the Academic Senate, Instructional Planning Council, College Council and the District Continuous Improvement Team in Spring 2010. Due to budget pressures, cost will be a consideration (PA.I.A.1.14; PA.I.A.1.15; PA.I.A.1.16).

Responsible Party: Jill Golden, Online Program Coordinator

3. Provide increased online student services.

Progress: Since its December 2006 Self Study, the college has implemented a multi-service software suite, the Voyager Project, which includes Banner, MyOCC, and Blackboard. MyOCC’s single sign-on option makes it possible for students to access registration information, review unofficial transcripts, access a dedicated campus email address, pay fees, and receive important information about campus events and activities. The college now offers an improved searchable OCC Catalog (PA.I.A.1.17) and Schedule of Classes (PA.I.A.1.18) that can be used by current and prospective students alike. In addition, new students can complete the application process online. Students can also schedule appointments for counseling, assessment testing, and financial aid online (PA.I.A.1.19).

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Glen Profeta, Director, Infrastructure and Applications, Information Technology

Planning Agenda: I.A.2.

1. Continue to ensure that the current version of the Mission Statement is posted in prominent locations on campus, on the website, and in all official handbooks, including the Class Schedule.
**Progress:** The college’s Communications and Marketing Department published the latest version of the Mission Statement in major publications, including catalogs, class schedules, the official handbook, the OCC website, and the OCC Portal (PA.I.A.2.1; PA.I.A.2.2; PA.I.A.2.3; PA.I.A.2.4). In addition, the Communications and Marketing Department posted attractive graphic displays of the Mission Statement in 25 key locations across the campus using new hardware so changes can be updated easily (PA.I.A.2.5).

Timeline: Planning agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Jeff Hobbs, Director, Communications and Marketing

**Planning Agenda: I.A.3.**

1. Ensure that the review process for the Mission Statement will begin in the fall and culminate in early spring to enable any revisions to be included in all future publications.

**Progress:** Orange Coast College’s Academic Master Plan Subcommittee, which reports to the College Council (formerly Planning and Budget), began a review of the Mission Statement in Fall 2007 (PA.I.A.3.1). It compiled results of an April 2007 campus planning retreat, which added a Vision Statement to the Mission Statement to reflect the changing climate of the college and community (PA.I.A.3.2). In November 2009, the College Council appointed a taskforce to review the Mission Statement (PA.I.A.3.3). The task team is to submit options for a new Mission Statement in early Spring 2010 to be used in the 2010-11 Catalog, Class Schedule, and all other web and printed campus publications.

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Sheri Sterner, Dean, Library and Media Services, Institutional Research

**Planning Agenda: I.A.4.**

1. Incorporate the Mission Statement more fully into institutional planning and decision making.

**Progress:** In Spring 2008, 50 members of the campus community, including administrators, faculty, and staff members, participated in two retreats to re-evaluate the Mission Statement and ensure that it addressed the changing needs of the college and its changing demographic (PA.I.A.4.1). A Vision Statement was added, and all campus employees were invited to respond to the proposed changes at the beginning of the fall semester. The college’s major planning committees—College Council, College Budget Committee, Instructional Planning Council, Curriculum Committee, Technology Committee, Program Review, and the Academic Senate—all refer to the Academic Master Plan values that represent the Mission Statement to guide their decision making (PA.I.A.4.2; PA.I.A.4.3; PA.I.A.4.4; PA.I.A.4.5).
Planning Agenda: I.B.2.

1. Include program review in planning.

**Progress:** All identified programs undergo a comprehensive program review every three years. Annual program reviews are completed by all programs in three resource areas: staffing, facilities, and technology (PA.I.B.2.1). Instructional program review is data driven and looks at access, enrollment, success, retention, and completion. Support program reviews have a parallel structure and related data requirements. As of Spring 2009, 100% of courses and programs had completed student learning outcomes (SLOs), which are posted on the college’s website for easy public access (PA.I.B.2.2). Assessment of SLOs is an ongoing three-year cycle, which started in the 2007-2008 academic year (PA.I.B.2.3; PA.I.B.2.4; PA.I.B.2.5; PA.I.B.2.6; PA.I.B.2.7; PA.I.B.2.8; PA.I.B.2.9; PA.I.B.2.10). Summary reports have been completed to address timelines and determine whether processes have been put into place (PA.I.B.2.11; PA.I.B.2.12).

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed. Long-range and annual plans will be reviewed and modified during the Spring 2010 semester.

Responsible Party: Georgie Monahan, Program Review Coordinator

2. Incorporate student learning outcomes into the *Academic Master Plan*.

**Progress:** In Fall 2008, 100% of all course student learning outcomes (CSLOs) for a total 1,387 course outlines of record were completed and approved by the Curriculum Committee (PA.I.B.2.13). The college has set a target date of Spring 2009 for 100% completion of all program student learning outcomes (PSLOs) across all wings of the college, including Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, and the President’s wings. As a part of program review, all programs must identify PSLOs that support a program-specific mission statement and demonstrate alignment with institutional learning outcomes. Assessment of SLOs occurs in an ongoing three-year cycle, which started in the 2007-2008 academic year (PA.I.B.2.14).

Timeline: All wings completed PSLOs in 2009.

Responsible Party: Sheri Sterner, Dean, Library and Media Services, Institutional Research


1. Integrate program review recommendations into the planning and budget process.

**Progress:** Program review is in the final year of a three-year planning cycle. Currently student learning outcomes (SLOs) and Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) are
being assessed to obtain data and measure their effectiveness (PA.I.B.3.1). Outcomes from assessment are the driving force for planning and budgeting. The three-year plan in each of the four wings—Instruction, Student Services, President, and Administrative Services—integrate the program review process into planning and budget decisions (PA.I.B.3.2). Data from program review plays a leading role in planning for each program and determining how resources will be allocated (PA.I.B.3.3).

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Melinda Nish, Vice President of Instruction

---

**Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services**

**II.A. Instructional Programs**

**Planning Agenda: II.A.1.**

1. Evaluate the frequency of program review and revise the review process as is deemed appropriate.

**Progress:** From 1999 to 2007, program review had been a six-year process for assessment of the Instructional and Student Services wings. In response to ACCJC’s revised standards that require program review to be integrated into the planning process and assessment of student learning outcomes to be institutionalized, in 2007 the college introduced a three-year cycle for program review (PA.II.A.1.1). In addition to the three-year program review, annual documents distributed in the fall and the spring (annual staffing requests, annual technology requests, and annual facility requests) clearly define and streamline the process (PA.II.A.1.2).

Timeline: Assessment of program review will occur in Spring 2010 since it ends the new first three-year cycle.

Responsible Party: Georgie Monahan, Program Review Coordinator

2. Provide training for the Curriculum Committee and each program review committee in the development and assessment of student learning outcomes.

**Progress:** In Spring 2006, training began for faculty to develop student learning outcomes (SLOs) for their courses. In Fall 2007, Curriculum Committee members received a training session on writing and recognizing SLOs, which the committee requires to be included in Course Outlines of Record (CORs). In Fall 2008, the Program Review Coordinator and the Curriculum Review Chair sponsored an SLO training session for all departments and divisions. In Fall 2008, the college held two campus-wide forums on program review and assessment. In Fall 2009, Focus Day centered on unifying the campus to accomplish major SLO and assessment objectives (PA.II.A.1.3; PA.II.A.1.4). Finally, the college established a “planning day” in October 2009 to encourage everyone on campus to create their SLO and assessment plans (PA.II.A.1.5; PA.II.A.1.6). The newly appointed SLOAC and the
Program Review Coordinator will lead a subcommittee with representatives from all wings to plan additional training as needed (PA.II.A.1.7; PA.II.A.1.8). In Spring 2010, the college piloted eLumen software to collect and report SLO assessment data. In addition, the newly appointed SLOAC is planning eLumen training to assist faculty members with SLO assessment.

Timeline: Additional training in eLumen is planned in Spring 2010.

Responsible Party: Irene Heavern, Curriculum Committee Chair

3. Include the Mission Statement and the Statement of Institutional Commitment in the Curriculum Committee Handbook; devise practices that will ensure that the Mission Statement is an intended and integral part of the college’s curriculum processes.

Progress: The Mission Statement and the Statement of Institutional Commitment is included in the Curriculum Committee Handbook (PA.II.A.1.9). OCC incorporates the Mission Statement into planning during program review and in the master planning process. The theme of the Mission Statement is carried throughout the program review process, ultimately creating planning goals that reflect the overall mission of the college. Document I for program review asks each department or program to describe how it fits into the college mission as well as their own mission (PA.II.A.1.10). Document IV, the assessment planning document, requires each department or program to include its mission and show how SLOs are connected to the institutional outcomes which reflect the Mission Statement (PA.II.A.1.11). The theme of the mission is carried throughout the program review process, ultimately creating planning goals that reflect the overall mission.

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Irene Heavern, Curriculum Committee Chair

Planning Agenda: II.A.1.a.

1. Incorporate student learning outcomes into the major planning documents of the college, namely the Atlas, the Academic Master Plan, the Technology Master Plan, and the Facilities Master Plan.

Progress: In 2008-2009, the college completed student learning outcomes for all programs and courses and will include the SLOs in major planning documents once the college completes assessment of SLOs in 2011. In Spring 2009, the college piloted the first phase of SLO assessments and is currently completing the three-year cycle of SLO assessments. SLO assessment will be integrated into program review and master planning, which will prioritize asset allocation in the Technology Master Plan and the Facilities Master Plan (PA.II.A.1.a.1; PA.II.A.1.a.2; PA.II.A.1.a.3; PA.II.A.1.a.4; PA.II.A.1.a.5; PA.II.A.1.a.6; PA.II.A.1.a.7). In addition, SLOs for courses and programs are published on the college’s public website (PA.II.A.1.a.8).
Timeline: The Academic Master Plan currently includes student learning outcomes. The Atlas, Facilities Master Plan and Technology Master Plan will be updated to include SLOs once the three-year assessment cycle is complete. The original goal was to complete the three-year cycle by 2012, but efforts have been accelerated, and it is expected that assessment will be complete by 2010.

Responsible Party: Sheri Sterner, Dean, Library and Media Services, Institutional Research

Planning Agenda: II.A.1.b., II.A.2.d.

1. Provide evidence of the effectiveness of specific delivery modes and teaching methodologies.

   Progress: During the 2007-2008 program review cycle, the college implemented analysis guides that prompt programs to analyze data in greater depth, such as by modality and exploring differences in data between delivery modes and teaching methodologies (PA.II.A.1.b.1). In 2009, program review introduced a data cube, Program Success and Retention by Course and Modality that will help the college analyze delivery modes and teaching methodologies in Spring 2010 (PA.II.A.1.b.2). This assessment tool enables programs to compare the effectiveness and success of various delivery modes, including online instruction, large groups, and traditional classrooms. For example, Psychology added online courses, the newest modality, to the course schedule and reported ending enrollments better than 80% of the census enrollment numbers, which mirrors the college’s average statistics for traditional classroom delivery (PA.II.A.1.b.3). The overall success rates for online instruction in Psychology increased from 65.3% to 78.5%.

   Timeline: Assessment will take place in Spring 2010.

   Responsible Party: Sheri Sterner, Dean, Library and Media Services, Institutional Research

Planning Agenda: II.A.1.c.

1. Complete identification of student learning outcomes at course and program levels.

   Progress: All course student learning outcomes were written by each department and added to the Course of Record. By Spring 2009, all full-time faculty included SLOs on all syllabi, and program student learning outcomes had been completed. The CSLOs and PSLOs are published on the college’s public website (PA.II.A.1.c.1).

   Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

   Responsible Party: Irene Heavern, Curriculum Committee Chair

2. Assess student learning outcomes at all levels.

   Progress: 78% of all SLOs were assessed in 2009. Campus-wide workshops were held to train faculty to assess SLOs through a Learning Outcomes Assessment Model (PA.II.A.1.c.2).
The planning timeline for program review, SLOs, and wing plans provides specific target deadlines and identifies responsible parties. The college will continue to assess remaining SLOs through the 2009-2010 academic year (PA.II.A.1.c.3). In October 2009, the campus, through the Academic Senate, appointed a Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Coordinator (SLOAC), who has established a steering committee to provide support for the assessment process campus-wide as well as assessing the effectiveness of plans and processes (PA.II.A.1.c.4).

Timeline: The college has achieved its goal of assessing two-thirds of SLOs before Spring 2010. Many more SLOs will be assessed at the end of the spring semester.

Responsible Party: Sheri Sterner, Dean, Library and Media Services, Institutional Research

Planning Agenda: II.A.2., II.A.2.a., II.A.2.b.

1. Target training in the identification and assessment of student learning outcomes for the Curriculum Committee, individual program review committees, and Student Services Wing.

   Progress: The Program Review Coordinator organizes campus-wide workshops to train faculty and staff to work with the assessment and program review process (PA.II.A.2.1). The Program Review Coordinator attended conferences in May and October of 2008 specifically focused on improving student success through program review and the assessment of SLOs. The Coordinator has incorporated this knowledge into workshops and has shared best practices in the Academic Senate, Instructional Planning Council, and Accreditation Task Force meetings (PA.II.A.2.2; PA.II.A.2.3). The Program Review Coordinator also works in collaboration with Institutional Research and facilitates program review workshops in September with all leads that complete program review each year. Campus-wide workshops are well attended, with a 95% attendance rate. The Program Review Coordinator does individual training with those who cannot attend the scheduled workshops. To assist the assessment process, the Program Review Coordinator has organized an “Assessment Toolbox” on the OCC Portal (PA.II.A.2.4). The Program Review portal site also has information and tools to assist with SLO assessment (PA.II.A.2.5; PA.II.A.2.6; PA.II.A.2.7; PA.II.A.2.8; PA.II.A.2.9; PA.II.A.2.10; PA.II.A.2.11; PA.II.A.2.12).

   Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

   Responsible Party: Georgie Monahan, Program Review Coordinator

Planning Agenda: II.A.2.c.

1. Provide comprehensive course and program sequencing in the Catalog and the Schedule and online.

   Progress: During the 2008-2009 academic year, the Curriculum Committee reviewed all course outlines for prerequisites and co-requisites, and changes were reflected in the 2009-2010 Catalog (PA.II.A.2.c.1). The Office of Instruction requires a sequencing report from
each academic division. At its December 2009 meeting, the Curriculum Committee reported that the college is in full compliance with state and district course sequencing guidelines (PA.II.A.2.c.2). Assessment through program review will indicate areas that need change or revision. Once assessment data is received from program review, any revisions to courses and programs will be submitted to the Curriculum Committee, and changes will appear in the Catalog, the Class Schedule, and online. The program review process will continually dictate the college’s sequencing needs.

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Melinda Nish, Vice President of Instruction

Planning Agenda: II.A.2.e.

1. Train faculty, in particular members of the Curriculum Committee and individual program review committees, in the development and assessment of student learning outcomes.

Progress: Training and assessment tools have been provided to faculty members, especially those on the Curriculum and program review committees, to develop and assess student learning outcomes. The faculty has completed 100% of SLOs for all active courses of record. At this time, the Curriculum Committee is developing SLOs for General Education requirements (PA.II.A.2.e.1) that will be published in the 2010-2011 Catalog and Class Schedule in Fall 2010. Training included workshops and the introduction of template documents on the OCC Portal to assist faculty in the development and assessment of student learning outcomes (PA.II.A.2.e.2; PA.II.A.2.e.3). The Program Review Committee also conducted SLO assessment training at department and division meetings. In addition, a campus-wide assessment workshop, attended by 130 faculty members, was held in early October 2009. In November 2009, a Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Coordinator (SLOAC) was appointed to assist faculty with SLO assessment (PA.II.A.2.e.4). She will lead a subcommittee with representatives from all wings to plan additional training as needed. In Spring 2010, the college introduced eLumen software to collect and report SLO assessment data. The SLOAC is planning eLumen training to assist faculty members with SLO assessment (PA.II.A.2.e.5; PA.II.A.2.e.6).

Timeline: Workshops in eLumen are planned in Spring 2010. The remaining SLO assessments for courses offered in Spring 2010 will be completed as soon as the data can be collected and analyzed.

Responsible Parties: Responsible Party: Vinta Oviatt, Student Learning Outcome Assessment Coordinator (SLOAC), and Georgie Monahan, Program Review Coordinator

Planning Agenda: II.A.2.f.

1. Integrate program evaluation into the planning process.

Progress: The Orange Coast College Academic Master Plan (PA.II.A.2.f.1), which espouses the five values of Community, Learning, Access, Stewardship, and Sustainability (CLASS),
is supported by the *Technology Master Plan* (PA.II.A.2.f.2) and the *Facilities Master Plan* (PA.II.A.2.f.3). All of the objectives are part of each wing’s three-year plan (PA.II.A.2.f.4; PA.II.A.2.f.5; PA.II.A.2.f.6; PA.II.A.2.f.7; PA.II.A.2.f.8). The strategic master planning process clearly outlines the steps to be included in planning, including review of accreditation standards and the college Mission Statement; collecting and analyzing data to improve institutional effectiveness; and integrating that information into wing plans, enrollment management plans, facilities planning, program review, technology planning, and staff development (PA.II.A.2.f.9).

**Timeline:** Planning Agenda completed.

**Responsible Party:** Melinda Nish, Vice President of Instruction

**Planning Agenda:** II.A.2.h., II.A.2.i.

1. Develop an evaluation process to assure that student learning outcomes are not only identified in courses and programs, but also assessed to determine achievement.

   **Progress:** The Program Review Committee conducted workshops and meetings to help faculty and staff develop and assess SLOs and PSLOs, including “closing the loop” to use assessment results in planning for continuous program improvement (PA.II.A.2.h.1). An “Assessment Toolbox,” a set of guidelines for navigating the assessment process, was placed on the Program Review Committee portal site as a resource to assist with assessment of student learning outcomes (PA.II.A.2.h.2). The site also includes a schedule of deadlines for various stages of the review process in both checklist and flow chart formats (PA.II.A.2.h.3). The OCC Staff Development website provides faculty with basic guidelines for writing course student learning outcomes (PA.II.A.2.h.4). Thirty-nine departments completed OCC’s first comprehensive program reviews in 2008-2009. Plans generated from those program reviews are being implemented during the 2009-2010 academic year, and the effectiveness of the assessment process will be determined at the end of the year (PA.II.A.2.h.5; PA.II.A.2.h.6).
Timeline: This Planning Agenda is ongoing; program review is a three-year cycle. Two-thirds of assessments had been completed by 2009, with the remaining one-third to be completed by 2010.

Responsible Parties: Vinta Oviatt, Student Learning Outcome Assessment Coordinator (SLOAC), and Georgie Monahan, Program Review Coordinator

Planning Agenda: II.A.3.a., II.A.3.b., II.A.3.c.

1. Align General Education Options with Institutional Student Learning Outcomes.

   Progress: Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) will be published in the 2010-2011 Catalog (PA.II.A.3.1). The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Coordinator is working with the eLumen vendor to enter data for the ISLOs, courses, and programs into eLumen program (PA.II.A.3.2), which will enable the college to link general education options with ISLOs.

   Timeline: Data entry into the new eLumen program is just starting. The college plans to align General Education Options with ISLOs in 2010-2011.

   Responsible Party: Vinta Oviatt, Student Learning Outcome Assessment Coordinator (SLOAC)


1. Develop better quality control processes to ensure the accuracy of information included in the Catalog and Class Schedule.

   Progress: The College Publication Committee has implemented guidelines to process changes to the Catalog and Class Schedule, including multiple checks of information by each division to maintain accuracy. Once final drafts of the publications are ready to print or publish on the college website, the Vice President of Instruction examines the publication and gives final approval (PA.II.A.6.1; PA.II.A.6.2).

   Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

   Responsible Party: Jeff Hobbs, Director, Communications and Marketing

2. Work with faculty to increase awareness of the benefit of a syllabus.

   Progress: As of spring semester 2009 all course syllabi are required to include SLOs. The Coast Community College District and the faculty bargaining unit (AFT/CFE) mutually supported this mandate and memorialized this agreement in a Memorandum of Understanding signed October 27, 2008 (PA.II.A.6.3). In November 2008, the Academic Senate adopted a resolution to add student learning outcomes on each syllabus to help meet the learning needs of students (PA.II.A.6.4). At the beginning of each semester, division
deans remind faculty to submit syllabi before the end of the second week of the semester. A syllabus template and checklist can be downloaded from the OCC Portal to help faculty produce their syllabi (PA.II.A.6.5; PA.II.A.6.6). In the future, the college plans to link course syllabi to the Banner system class listing so students can access a syllabus for a course before the class begins. In Spring 2009, the college surveyed students to see if they received a syllabus in each of their courses (PA.II.A.6.7; PA.II.A.6.8).

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Melinda Nish, Vice President, Instruction

**Planning Agenda: II.A.6.c.**

1. Create a mechanism to assure accuracy of information provided online and in the Catalog.

**Progress:** In Fall 2008, the college introduced an online searchable class schedule that is produced directly from Banner data, resulting in a live-data representation of the Schedule of Classes. For the print version of the OCC Catalog and Class Schedule, the College Publication Committee has implemented guidelines to process changes, including multiple checks of information by each division to maintain accuracy. Once final drafts of the publications are ready to print, the Vice President of Instruction examines the publication and gives final approval.

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Jeff Hobbs, Director, Communications and Marketing

**II.B. Student Support Services**

**Planning Agenda: II.B.**

1. Assess Student Services using identified student learning outcomes.

**Progress:** All 13 departments and programs within the Student Services wing have completed their program student learning outcomes (PSLOs) and have assessed 74% of those outcomes. The program review guidelines document, the timeline, and the student learning outcomes rubric (PA.II.B.1; PA.II.B.2; PA.II.B.3), are all accessible on the OCC Portal and address all Student Service-related student learning outcomes (PA.II.B.4; PA.II.B.5). As current SLOs receive continued assessing and are updated, changes will be documented (PA.II.B.6). The Student Services Planning Council, with representatives from all Student Services departments and programs, plays an important role in planning, implementing, and completing the SLO and assessment process. The Student Services Wing has posted SLOs for every department on the OCC Portal and the public Student Services webpage (PA.II.B.7). Student Services SLOs are also sent to students via “MyOCC.”
Timeline: Remaining PSLOs will be assessed in Spring 2010.

Responsible Party: Kate Mueller, Dean, Student Services

Planning Agenda: II.B.1.
Implement student learning outcomes within the Student Services Wing.

Progress: Each program and department in the Student Services Wing wrote two program student learning outcomes as part of program review. In Fall 2009, all managers wrote a third student learning outcome, and in October 2009, ASOCC Fiscal Affairs was added as an additional program. 74% of all Student Services programs and departments have completed assessment of their SLOs (PA.II.B.1.1; PA.II.B.1.2).

Timeline: Remaining PSLOs will be assessed in Spring 2010.

Responsible Party: Kate Mueller, Dean, Student Services

Planning Agenda: II.B.2.a.-d.

1. Create a mechanism to assure the accuracy of information provided online and in the OCC Catalog.

Progress: In Fall 2008, Orange Coast College introduced an online searchable class schedule that is produced directly from Banner data, resulting in a live-data representation of the Schedule of Classes. For the print version of the OCC Catalog and Class Schedule, the College Publication Committee has implemented guidelines to process changes, including multiple checks of information by each division to maintain accuracy. Once final drafts of the publications are ready to print, the Vice President of Instruction examines the publication and gives final approval.

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Jeff Hobbs, Director, Communications and Marketing

Planning Agenda: II.B.3.a.

1. Provide online registration.

Progress: The college introduced online registration in Spring 2008 (PA.II.B.3.a.1). Students are able to register for classes via their MyOCC webpage (PA.II.B.3.a.2). Once the college receives a completed application, the student is assigned a username and password and receives a registration appointment time. The student can view the Class Schedule online and register for classes (PA.II.B.3.a.3). If there is an impediment to registration, such as a “hold” on a student account, the student can view the reason. Once online registration is completed, the student may pay class fees online. Online registration is available to students
24 hours a day (PA.II.B.3.a.4).

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Kristin Clark, Dean, Enrollment Services

2. Implement a system for online appointments in assessment, orientation, and financial aid and completion of orientation online.

**Progress**: Online counseling and orientation appointments can be made through eSARS on the Counseling Department’s website (PA.II.B.3.a.5; PA.II.B.3.a.6; PA.II.B.3.a.7; PA.II.B.3.a.8; PA.II.B.3.a.9; PA.II.B.3.a.10). SARScall, a new development, works with the eSARS system and automatically phones students with a reminder about their appointment. The Financial Aid Office has incorporated online appointments on its website (PA.II.B.3.a.11; PA.II.B.3.a.12). Orientation may be scheduled online, but it takes place in person. The two-hour meeting explains the financial aid program, describes services for students, and outlines requirements necessary to receive funds. Students may also use the Financial Aid Office online appointment system to schedule a meeting with their financial aid advisor (PA.II.B.3.a.13). As of Fall 2009, the Assessment Center implemented eSARS to enable students to schedule appointments online for placement testing (PA.II.B.3.a.14).

Timeline: Appointments can be made online for assessment, orientation, and financial aid. Orientation takes place in person, and currently there is no plan to provide orientation sessions online.

Responsible Party: Kristin Clark, Dean, Enrollment Services

Revise Student Services surveys to include accessibility.

3. **Progress**: Student Services surveys are conducted individually by departments, and the methods used, including online surveys and in-person questionnaires, differ from department to department. The Financial Aid Office has improved its student satisfaction survey by incorporating technology to make their surveys ADA compliant and accessible to students with disabilities (PA.II.B.3.a.15). There is not a standard method used to deliver surveys to students. Revising Student Services surveys currently have not been addressed.

Timeline: The Financial Aid Office student satisfaction survey is ADA compliant, but there is no standard method used to deliver Student Services surveys to students.

Responsible Party: Kristin Clark, Dean, Enrollment Services

**Planning Agenda: II.B.3.c.**

1. Continue to increase the number of counseling appointments available to students, particularly using online technology.
Progress: The Counseling Division recently introduced online scheduling of counseling appointments on the division’s website using eSARS (PA.II.B.3.c.1; PA.II.B.3.c.2). This has decreased staff time spent scheduling appointments and has also reduced time students spend waiting for their appointment from 30 to 10 minutes. In Spring 2009, approximately 30 to 40% of appointments were made online. In addition, two weeks before the start of each semester and another two weeks into the semester, five counselors are assigned to work between three to five hours a week answering students’ questions using email. The Counseling Division has not implemented online counseling because it requires a system that would be able to verify student identification and maintain confidentiality and track student counseling appointments. The division hopes to employ a chat-based format that will be user friendly for both students and counselors. A task force was formed in November 2009 to make recommendations by October 2010 for an online counseling platform. The college currently has 21 full-time counselors and four part-time counselors. Plans to increase the number of counselors hired has been negatively affected by state budget cuts, including a 50% reduction in the hourly employees, which has left the Counseling Division unable to meet growing demand for counseling services (PA.II.B.3.c.3; PA.II.B.3.c.4; PA.II.B.3.c.5; PA.II.B.3.c.6).

Timeline: The ability to schedule counseling appointments online has enabled counseling staff to spend more time assisting students. However, the state budget situation has forced the Counseling Division to cut hourly employees, which left the division unable to meet the growing demand for services.

Responsible Party: Hue Pham, Dean, Counseling, Special Programs and Services

Planning Agenda: II.B.3.d.

1. Increase international student enrollments.

Progress: The college’s International Student Center focuses on recruitment and retention. Since 2005, enrollment has increased significantly (PA.II.B.3.d.1). The center plans to increase active recruitment by expanding partnerships with various language programs, frequent outreach and visits to language schools that enroll international students, establishing strong relationships with partners abroad, stronger overseas marketing, and participating in national and regional conferences to enhance recruitment strategies. If funding is available, the Center also hopes to participate in international recruitment fairs. The International Student Center has also initiated and sustained a variety of retention programs. Cultural and ethnic activities for students include movie nights, on-campus gatherings, sightseeing trips, and informational workshops to help international students successfully adjust to college life and a different culture (PA.II.B.3.d.2; PA.II.B.3.d.3).

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Madjid Niroumand, Director, International Center
2. Continue to support faculty and student opportunities to study abroad.

**Progress:** The college’s Study Abroad program was suspended in 2003 and is no longer supported by the Coast Community College District, although it invites faculty to organize individual study abroad projects and advertises them on the district website (PA.II.B.3.d.4). In the past, the Study Abroad Office supported semester-long and short-term courses, but currently any study abroad opportunities are organized and run by individual faculty members without district support, including faculty salaries, which are paid by students who participate. Some faculty members and administrators would like to see the college renew its study abroad program, which was once the third-largest study abroad program in the United States. The program would help the college achieve its stated mission to “develop globally aware citizens” (PA.II.B.3.d.5). In December 2009, a campus-wide International and Multicultural Committee was established. One of the committee objectives is to work with the International Center and other campus departments to encourage and promote study abroad programs (PA.II.B.3.d.6; PA.II.B.3.d.7; PA.II.B.3.d.8).

**Timeline:** The Coast Community College District no longer supports study abroad. Individual faculty members organize any study abroad programs.

**Responsible Party:** Michael Mandelkern, Dean, Literature and Languages; Shared Governance Committee Chair

**Planning Agenda: II.B.3.f.**

1. Expand conversion to electronic student records wherever possible with limited and protected access.

**Progress:** Campus applications and registration are currently completed online through MyOCC (PA.II.B.3.f.1; PA.II.B.3.f.2). The Student Records Office also accepts requests for transcripts online (PA.II.B.3.f.3). Financial Aid is also implementing a system to allow students to complete their verification documents online using PowerFaids software (PA.II.B.3.f.4; PA.II.B.3.f.5). The district recently purchased Banner software’s document management suite and is waiting for an upgrade of the core Banner software before it implements the new software (PA.II.B.3.f.6). Once the new document management suite is implemented, the district is expected to authorize conversion of ATI files. Student file information prior to 1989 is scanned into the system whenever a student request is made for records. Financial Aid made all forms available online in January 2010 for the 2010-2011 academic year. Only correspondence and tax records will require scanning; all other documentation will be stored electronically on a secure server in IT (PA.II.B.3.f.7).

**Timeline:** Except for correspondence and tax records, which must be scanned, documents are automatically stored as electronic files. Student file information prior to 1989 is converted into electronic format whenever a student request is made for records.

**Responsible Party:** Kristin Clark, Dean, Enrollment Services
Planning Agenda: II.B.4.

1. Adjust the Student Services program review six-year calendar to evenly distribute the review of programs within the wing.

   **Progress:** The Student Services wing has adopted a three-year calendar for program review. The three-year calendar has been updated and implemented, and the workflow has been evenly distributed to accommodate the changes (PA.II.B.4.2; PA.II.B.4.3).

   Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

   Responsible Party: Kate Mueller, Dean, Student Services

2. Integrate the program review process into wing and division processes.

   **Progress:** At the recommendation of the Interim President, all wings are reviewing and updating their plans and incorporating program review items into their planning process. The Student Services program review is operating on a three-year calendar and has achieved the sustainability mode (PA.II.B.4.3; PA.II.B.4.3). The Student Services wing is working on assessment data gathered from year two. Final reports for years one and two have been completed. The report for year three will be completed in March 2010 (PA.II.B.4.6). The assessment data will help ensure that the wing-level plan accomplishes the established goals of the college’s Academic Master Plan. A program review steering committee, including four to five faculty members and a representative from each service wing, will create an assessment document after the three-year assessment cycle is complete. This assessment data will assist future college planning, clarify division and department needs (PA.II.B.4.7).

   Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

   Responsible Party: Kate Mueller, Dean, Student Services

### II.C. Library and Learning Support Services

Planning Agenda: II.C.1.

1. Develop a strategic plan for the maintenance and replacement of the Clark Computing Center equipment.

   **Progress:** The Technology Committee prioritizes new computing equipment needs for all departments and divisions that have been submitted through the Annual Technology Request (ATR) Prioritization Form (PA.II.C.1.1), Annual Technology Review/Annual Facility Review (ATR/AFR) (PA.II.C.1.2), Program Review/Planning Instructional Equipment and Supplies process (PA.II.C.1.3). This list is then forwarded to College Council and the College Budget Committee for approval. In spring, all wings, divisions, departments, and programs submit a planning timeline for annual technology requests (PA.II.C.1.4). The OCC Technology Committee, Vision, Mission and Roles (PA.II.C.1.5), approved in March 2009, outlines plans to ensure that campus computers are maintained, including the Clark Computing Center.
Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Craig Oberlin, Senior Director, Information Technology

2. Proceed with Student Success Center plans.

**Progress:** With the help of a Title III grant that includes funding for five academic years from 2008 to 2012, the college opened a new Student Success Center that provides tutoring, supplemental instruction, peer mentoring, an Early Alert system, online tutoring, and student tracking (PA.II.C.1.6; PA.II.C.1.7; PA.II.C.1.8). State funds have also been provided with a basic skills initiative. The Success Center also provides on-site computers for students to use. During the past year, the Student Success Center increased its services to students by more than 130%. To accommodate growth and the need for more space, the Writing Center, one of the Student Success Center’s services, moved to an adjacent building. After 2012, when Title III funds expire, programs and personnel will be institutionalized (PA.II.C.1.9; PA.II.C.1.10).

Timeline: The Student Success Center is in Year 3 of a Five-Year Title III grant. It is on schedule to be institutionalized in 2012.

Responsible Party: Melissa Berta, Title III Project Director

**Planning Agenda: II.C.1.a.**

1. Expand student and faculty ability to remotely access library research materials.

**Progress:** Remote access to the Library’s online catalog and full-text databases and other information is available 24 hours, seven days a week on the Library’s website and through MyOCC (PA.II.C.1.a.1; PA.II.C.1.a.2). The Library now offers all of its instructional handouts on its web page and on the Portal. The Library also participates in a venture with the Community College League of California (a joint endeavor of the Council of Chief Librarians and the Community College League of California) to preview, purchase annual subscriptions, and maintain electronic resources and online databases at a reduced price. Online databases provide remote access to reference books and essays, as well as to journal, magazine, and newspaper articles. The Library currently subscribes to 12 online databases annually. In addition, the Library has purchased several eBook collections. The online services librarian coordinates the selection and maintenance of these online databases in collaboration with the California League of Community Colleges. Several additional databases have been identified for possible purchase to fill gaps in the Library’s collection. These databases have not been purchased due to a lack of funding. The Library has also made a number of research guides and instructional handouts available to students on its web page. The Library plans to expand these research guides to support the curriculum, as librarian staffing and funding permit. More specifically, it is planned that the research guides will be expanded through the use of the LibGuides service if funding can be found. The Library provides remote assistance through its Ask-a-Librarian email reference service. Students and faculty can email a librarian for help through the Library’s website. This initiative is part of
a plan to expand online services in the Library. Starting in 2006-2007, the Library expanded its electronic resources after major reductions occurred in 2005-2006 due to lack of funding (PA.II.C.1.a.2). However, the Library does not have stable funding for these databases. With state budget reductions in 2009-2010, TTIP and State Funded Equipment (SFE) monies historically used to annually subscribe to databases were completely eliminated from the state budget. Planning and Budget Committee allocated emergency funding to maintain the databases for the current year, but funding has not been identified for future years. The need for an ongoing, stable budget has been identified in the Library’s program reviews and incorporated into its most recent three-year plan (PA.II.C.1.a.3; PA.II.C.1.a.4).

Timeline: The Library continues to improve its ability to access research materials electronically, but budget reductions threaten continuation of database availability and the continued subscription to electronic resources.

Responsible Party: Sheri Sterner, Dean, Library and Media Services, Institutional Research

2. Proceed with implementation of equipment and resources to provide video-on-demand that will be linked with the multimedia center in the Library.

Progress: The public services librarian has investigated various media-on-demand products. With the changes in technology and the addition of multi-media carts in most classrooms on campus, the Library includes a goal in its three-year plan to further investigate the college’s needs by conducting a needs analysis in the 2009-2010 academic year (PA.II.C.1.a.4). Part of this needs analysis will include investigating new services that the companies now provide. With technology changing so quickly and the advent of streaming video online, the system that was originally envisioned is no longer needed, but a need may exist for other services that are now available versus a system where the Library loads its own videos to be broadcast remotely.

Timeline: The Library will conduct a needs analysis in 2009-2010.

Responsible Party: Sheri Sterner, Dean, Library and Media Services, Institutional Research

3. Develop a plan to replace and recycle the computers in the Clark Computing Center.

Progress: The Technology Committee prioritizes new computing equipment needs for all departments and divisions that have been submitted through the Annual Technology Request (ATR) Prioritization Form (PA.II.C.1.a.5), Annual Technology Review/Annual Facility Review (ATR/AFR) (PA.II.C.1.a.6), and Program Review/Planning Instructional Equipment and Supplies Process (PA.II.C.1.a.7). This list is then forwarded to the College Council for approval. In spring, all wings, divisions, departments, and programs submit a planning timeline for annual technology requests (PA.II.C.1.a.8). The OCC Technology Committee, Vision, Mission and Roles, approved in March 2009, outlines plans to ensure that campus computers are maintained, including the Clark Computing Center (PA.II.C.1.a.9).
Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Craig Oberlin, Senior Director, Information Technology

4. Upgrade computing resources in the Math Center.

**Progress:** The Math Center was dissolved as a separate center and is now part of the Student Success Center. The following computer resources are available for students: Mathematica (math/physics) and Skills Tutor (PA.II.C.1.a.10). The Student Success Center is in the process of installing available electronic versions of textbooks used by academic divisions on Blackboard so students can access this material at any time (PA.II.C.1.a.11).

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Melissa Berta, Title III Project Director

**Planning Agenda: II.C.1.b.**

1. Expand the opportunities to improve students’ skills in information competency with the support of the Library and other campus resources.

**Progress:** In Fall 2009, the Library revised and offered the Library A100 class, “Library and Information Competency,” with a change in title and an added SLO due to broader content to help students learn to be information competent (PA.II.C.1.b.1; PA.II.C.1.b.2; PA.II.C.1.b.3). In addition, the Library offers lectures and workshops throughout the year for classes and individual students that include aspects of information competency when librarians teach students how to access, search, evaluate, and cite library and information resources, including ethical issues of plagiarism and the importance of correct citation to avoid unintentional plagiarism (PA.II.C.1.b.4). The instruction librarian developed a handout on information competency and added it to the Library’s instructional services webpage (PA.II.C.1.b.5). The instruction librarian is also a member of the Basic Skills Initiative Task Force and the Title III Steering Committee and is working with these two joint committees to introduce the campus to the concept of information competency. The Office of Instruction Institutional Learning Outcome Plan lists information competency as an outcome under thinking skills (PA.II.C.1.b.6). The Library Division’s Three-Year Strategic Plan includes the goal to “integrate and expand library instruction and information competency into courses and programs” (PA.II.C.1.b.7). The Library would like to see more campus-wide plans for information competency and collaborative efforts to help students become information competent (PA.II.C.1.b.8).

Timeline: The campus and the Library continue to develop plans to help students become more information competent.

Responsible Party: Sheri Sterner, Dean, Library and Media Services, Institutional Research
Planning Agenda: II.C.1.c.

1. Advertise the Clark Computing Center’s available services and operational procedures more effectively to students.

   Progress: The Clark Computing Center is now featured more prominently on the OCC website (PA.II.C.1.c.1), and improved signage in the Computing Center makes the hours of operation and available services readily visible to students. In addition, Clark Computing Center hours and services are publicized in Computer Information Science and Computer Science classes.

   Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

   Responsible Party: Jeff Hobbs, Director, Communications and Marketing

2. Advertise all the learning resource centers with their hours and location.

   Progress: There are a variety of learning resource centers on campus including the Library, the Student Success Center, and the High Tech Center for students with special needs. All centers have their location and hours of operation posted on their OCC web pages and clearly indicated at their front entrances. In addition, the Student Success Center has placed large poster-size signs near the Administration Building, the Student Success Center, the Chemistry Building, and the Library. Fliers announcing operating hours and services are available in the Student Success Center, at several locations in Watson Hall, and distributed at special events such as Senior Day and Student Services events in the quad. Fliers are also placed in faculty mailboxes. The Success Center advertises on information monitors in Watson Hall, on the “spotlight” announcements on the college’s main web page, and in the school paper. Targeted emails are sent to students in basic skills classes (PA.II.C.1.c.1; PA.II.C.1.c.2; PA.II.C.1.c.3; PA.II.C.1.c.4; PA.II.C.1.c.5).

   Timeline: Planning Agenda is complete.

   Responsible Party: Jeff Hobbs, Director, Communications and Marketing

3. Monitor the new Learning Resource Center hours of operation to determine if they are sufficient.

   Progress: After opening the new facility in Spring 2008, the Library received temporary augmentation to increase hours on weekends, including Sundays. Additional funding was provided by the OCC Foundation to support weekend Library hours in 2008-2009 after the new building opened in Spring 2008. Due to budget shortfalls and cuts in hourly clerical assistant budgets, the Library is now closed on Sundays (PA.II.C.1.c.5). In November 2009, the Associated Students of Orange Coast College allocated $6,000 for hourly support staff to keep the Library open on Saturdays. The Library plans to supplement its hourly staff costs from its ancillary account with revenues generated from copier and printer use to maintain
current weekday hours of operation in Spring 2010. Having to depend on this source, retaining current hours might be difficult and the Library hours might be reduced in future semesters. The Library increased traffic 325% from 2006-07 to 2008-09. An additional 25% increase in traffic was experienced in Fall 2009. A student survey conducted in Fall 2009 indicated students would prefer extended library hours at night and on weekends, and they would be negatively impacted by a reduction in hours (PA.II.C.1.c.6).

Timeline: Budget shortfalls may require the Library to reduce hours of operation.

Responsible Party: Sheri Sterner, Dean, Library and Media Services, Institutional Research

Planning Agenda: II.C.2.

1. Provide opportunities for students to evaluate the services provided by the Clark Computing Center.

Progress: The Clark Computing Center plans to survey students using Gmail accounts in 2010. A 2008 survey was tied to the computing and online training program, but its scope was limited. The Gmail survey will reach a wider student population. In addition, the center has a suggestion box for student feedback as well as a link on the Clark Computing Center website for suggestions and comments.

Timeline: A student survey is planned in 2010.

Responsible Party: Craig Oberlin, Senior Director, Information Technology

2. Track the success of tutorial services with follow-up evaluation of retention, course grades, degrees earned, transfer rates, and surveys of students and tutors.

Progress: The Office of Institutional Research is working collaboratively with the Title III Coordinator to collect and analyze data from a variety of sources, including surveys, to be used to evaluate Student Success Center services, including tutorial services, supplemental instruction, peer mentoring, the Early Alert system, online tutoring, student tracking, and grant administration. Usage, success, and retention data have been collected and analyzed for tutorial and supplemental instruction. Institutional measures for the Title III grant related to success, retention and completion have been generated for required grant reports (PA.II.C.2.1; PA.II.C.2.2; PA.II.C.2.3; PA.II.C.2.4).

Timeline: Student tracking is ongoing.

Responsible Party: Melissa Berta, Title III Project Director
Standard III: Resources

III.A. Human Resources

Planning Agenda: III.A.1.b.

1. Regularly review the evaluation processes for human resources.

   Progress: The Coast Community College District Office of Human Resources reviews and assesses the evaluation processes of all employees in coordination with each college’s personnel office. Evaluation processes are continually reviewed, and recommendations for changes are made in consultation with the appropriate employee groups representing full-time faculty, part-time faculty, classified employees, and managers. The primary focus is timely completion of employee evaluations and consistency in the evaluation processes. In 2006, a subcommittee of the Coast District Management Association evaluated procedures for managers (PA.III.A.1.b.1). Forms were created to promote consistency, and a timeline was developed. Management training was provided in spring of 2007 on evaluation processes. The classified evaluation instrument was revised in 2006 and fully implemented in 2007. It now includes a component for employee self-evaluation. The part-time faculty evaluation process is now linked to retention and potential interviews for full-time teaching positions, increasing its relevancy and completion rate. The District Board of Trustees also approved longevity pay enhancement for managers who are current on their employee evaluations. Contract renewals for education managers also require current evaluations. Evaluation reminder prompts have been added to each manager’s “My-Site,” a computer interface provided by the district’s Banner system. The Coast Federation of Classified Employees is in the process of scheduling negotiation sessions for the full successor agreement. The evaluation article is open for negotiation. Both sides hope to eliminate redundancies and enhance overall effectiveness of the evaluation process for classified employees. Full-time faculty and the district will negotiate a successor agreement in 2010-2011. At that time, the district team hopes to open the discussion on evaluation and negotiate changes to meet current needs (PA.III.A.1.b.2; PA.III.A.1.b.3).

   Timeline: Planning agenda completed.

   Responsible Party: Laury Francis, Director, Personnel Services

Planning Agenda: III.A.1.c.

Develop processes to identify and evaluate student learning outcomes in adherence with contractual evaluation processes.

   Progress: In Spring 2009, 100% of all Course Outlines of Record and approved programs completed student learning outcomes. The college negotiated an agreement with the faculty bargaining unit requiring faculty to provide syllabi with student learning outcomes, and in Spring 2009, there was 100% compliance. Program review, which is responsible for student learning outcome and assessment data, is fully implemented and approaching sustainability.
Division deans have been encouraged to ask full-time tenured faculty to include their involvement in student learning outcomes and assessment in their self-evaluations. In addition, the division deans are encouraged to commend faculty members work on outcomes and assessment on the administrative evaluation form for every faculty member who is evaluated (PA.III.A.1.c.1; PA.III.A.1.c.2; PA.III.A.1.c.3; PA.III.A.1.c.4).

Timeline: Planning agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Melinda Nish, Vice President of Instruction

Planning Agenda: III.A.1.d.

Update the *Orange Coast College Faculty and Staff Handbook* to include a professional code of ethics.

**Progress:** In February, 2010, the Board of Trustees adopted Resolution #010-04, which established the Code of Ethical Conduct for All Coast Community College Personnel (PA.III.A.1.d.1). The new code of ethics will be included in the *2010-2011 Orange Coast College Faculty and Staff Handbook*.

Timeline: The college will include the new district Code of Ethical Conduct in the *2010-2011 Faculty and Staff Handbook*.

Responsible Party: Robert Mendoza, Dean, Instructional Programs

Planning Agenda: III.A.2.

1. Continue to monitor and evaluate the need for hiring full-time faculty.

**Progress:** Since Fall 2005, the Instructional Planning Committee has used a clearly defined prioritizing process to ensure that the needs of the college are met. Every year the process is evaluated and modified to better serve the needs of the college. The *Decision Making Document* (PA.III.A.2.1) clearly outlines a timeline for consideration of hiring full-time faculty. Due to the state budget crisis, it is anticipated that there will be a slowdown in hiring for the next two to three years. As vacancies occur, the Instructional Planning Council creates rankings to guide full-time faculty hiring (PA.III.A.2.2; PA.III.A.2.3; PA.III.A.2.4).

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Melinda Nish, Vice President of Instruction

Planning Agenda: III.A.3.

1. Gather information about personnel policies from their various sources, create a single document, and place it on the OCC Portal.
Progress: Most of the district personnel policies are on the district website, but not on the OCC Portal (PA.III.A.3.1). Hiring policies are under review to make sure that they address diversity. Equal opportunity employment and equal pay policies are also under review. All policies are approved by the Board of Trustees and reviewed at the district level. A district committee reviewed and recommended revisions to district hiring policies that were approved by the Board of Trustees in February 2010 (PA.III.A.3.2).

Timeline: Hiring policies approved by the district Board of Trustees in February 2010 will be placed on the OCC Portal.

Responsible Party: Laury Francis, Director, Personnel Services

Planning Agenda: III.A.5., III.A.5.a., III.A.5.b.

1. Increase professional development programs to specifically address the needs of classified staff.

Progress: In May 2009, the Planning and Budget Committee created a position for a Classified Staff Development Coordinator who receives four hours of release time per week (PA.III.A.5.1). The newly organized Staff Development Committee met for the first time in September 2009 to determine the selection process as well as the duties of the new Classified Staff Development Coordinator. In Spring 2008, classified staff completed a survey to determine what types of programs staff development should offer (PA.III.A.5.2; PA.III.A.5.3). The new coordinator has met with members of the Classified Forum and OCC training team to plan future training opportunities. Plans are underway to include training information on the Portal, for an end-of-the-year classified luncheon, and development of a program to mentor new classified hires. Currently, funding for classified programs is through a Staff Development grant. A discussion of the Staff Development budget will take place in Spring 2010 with the college’s new President (PA.III.A.5.4).

Timeline: Planning Agenda is ongoing. A budget will be developed in Spring 2010.

Responsible Party: Robert Mendoza, Dean, Instructional Programs

III.B. Physical Resources

Planning Agenda: III.B.1.b.

1. Anticipate the depletion of Measure C bond funds and explore alternative future methods of funding facilities improvements.

Progress: Measure C funding depletion is an ongoing planning process that involves planning councils from all three wings, including Student Services Planning Council, Administrative Services Planning Council, and Instructional Planning Council. Measure C will not be able to support Vision 2020. The Facilities Planning Committee will finalize the 2010-2015 Facilities Master Plan and review projects on the Measure C list for allocation of remaining Measure C funds (PA.III.B.1.b.1; PA.III.B.1.b.2; PA.III.B.1.b.3; PA.III.B.1.b.4).
Timeline: Planning Agenda is progress.

Responsible Party: Rich Pagel, Vice President, Administrative Services

**Planning Agenda: III.B.2.b.**

1. Develop a process for the systematic assessment of physical resources.

   **Progress:** Orange Coast College Facilities Master Plan is updated annually, and each year the Bursar’s Office conducts an inventory of all equipment on campus (PA.III.B.2.b.1). The Facilities Condition Index is updated annually by Administrative Services. The assessment information is shared with the Administrative Services Planning Committee, Program Review, College Council, and Administrative Cabinet. In addition, information to the campus is available on the college website, through targeted announcements to faculty and staff, and “all user” emails. The Facilities Master Plan is posted on the OCC Portal (PA.III.B.2.b.1; PA.III.B.2.b.2; PA.III.B.2.b.3).

   Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

   Responsible Party: Rich Pagel, Vice President, Administrative Services

**III.C. Technology Resources**

**Planning Agenda: III.C.1., III.C.1.a.**

1. Establish procedures for purchasing and placing new computers and recycling older equipment to appropriate areas of campus.

   **Progress:** The Technology Committee prioritizes new computing equipment needs for all departments and divisions that have been submitted through the Annual Technology Request (ATR) Prioritization Form, Annual Technology Review/Annual Facility Review (ATR/AFR), Program Review/Planning Instructional Equipment and Supplies process (PA.III.C.1.a.1; PA.III.C.1.a.2; PA.III.C.1.a.3). This list is then forwarded to College Council for approval. In spring, all wings, divisions, departments, and programs submit a planning timeline for annual technology requests (PA.III.C.1.a.4). The OCC Technology Committee, Vision, Mission and Roles, approved in March 2009, outlines plans to ensure that campus computers are maintained, including the Clark Computing Center (PA.III.C.1.a.5). In December 2008, the Technology Committee created the Subcommittee on Request and Replacement Prioritization (SRRP) to create a process for replacement planning for all technologically-related items on campus, including computers. (PA.III.C.1.a.6; PA.III.C.1.a.7; PA.III.C.1.a.8; PA.III.C.1.a.9).

   Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

   Responsible Party: Craig Oberlin, Senior Director, Information Technology
Planning Agenda: III.C.1.c.

Commission an independent audit of policies, procedures, and standards pertaining to the security operations of Administrative Computing Services, Instructional Computing Services, and Web Services

1. **Progress:** In October 2008, Orange Coast College engaged Trustwave Corporation to conduct a third-party “gap analysis” to analyze the current state of the college systems against the requirements set forth in the Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard (PCI-DSS). A formal report was delivered to the college by Trustwave in November 2008. In addition to being supplied to college administration, the document was provided to “affected” constituents in early 2009. Action plans to mitigate the identified gaps were developed and implemented between November 2008 and Summer 2009. Because of the sensitive nature of the document (potential IT security “gaps”), this information was not shared broadly amongst the various college constituency groups (PA.III.C.1.c.1).

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Craig Oberlin, Senior Director, Information Technology

2. Prepare a systematic plan to acquire new technology equipment.

**Progress:** The Technology Committee prioritizes new computing equipment needs for all departments and divisions that have been submitted through the Annual Technology Request (ATR) Prioritization Form, Annual Technology Review/Annual Facility Review (ATR/AFR), Program Review/Planning Instructional Equipment and Supplies process (PA.III.C.1.c.2; PA.III.C.1.c.3; PA.III.C.1.c.4). This list is then forwarded to College Council for approval. In spring, all wings, divisions, departments, and programs submit a planning timeline for annual technology requests (PA.III.C.1.c.5). *The OCC Technology Committee, Vision, Mission and Roles*, approved in March 2009, outlines plans to ensure that campus computers are maintained (PA.III.C.1.c.6). In December 2008, the Technology Committee created the Subcommittee on Request and Replacement Prioritization (SRRP) to create a process for purchase and replacement for all technology equipment on campus (PA.III.C.1.c.7).

Timeline: Planning Agenda is in process.

Responsible Party: Craig Oberlin, Senior Director, Information Technology

Planning Agenda: III.C.2.

1. Develop comprehensive surveys to assess the effects of the implementation of new technologies.

**Progress:** In early 2009, the Technology Committee conducted a comprehensive survey of students and faculty dealing with a number of technology issues, including the effect of new technologies (PA.III.C.2.1; PA.III.C.2.2). The results are still under review and will be used in future planning. The committee plans to continue annual surveys of students, faculty, and staff. The committee will forward results to the College Council to be included in “internal
data sources” for strategic planning and posted on the OCC Portal for review. This data will also be incorporated into Information Technology’s Program Review process.

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Marc Perkins, Chairman, Technology Committee

**III.D. Financial Resources**

**Planning Agenda: III.D.1.a.**

1. Increase the understanding and involvement of Planning and Budget Committee members in the development of the college budget.

**Progress:** In Fall 2009, the college restructured Planning and Budget Committee to form two separate committees, the College Council, which focuses on planning, and the College Budget Committee (CBC), which will make budget allocation decisions (PA.III.D.1.a.1). A taskforce was established to determine membership of the Budget Committee. Members received training in February 2010 (PA.III.D.1.a.2; PA.III.D.1.a.3). The Vice President of Administrative Services updates and provides budget overview to CBC twice a year. Emphasis is on the spring update, when more information is available, especially from the state. In Spring 2009, three subcommittees were formed to make recommendations on budget plans. The Operations Subcommittee looked for opportunities for savings at the operational level (PA.III.D.1.a.4; PA.III.D.1.a.5); the Dedicated Revenue Subcommittee made recommendations to generate new revenue (PA.III.D.1.a.6; PA.III.D.1.a.7; PA.III.D.1.a.8); and the Categorical Subcommittee reviewed line item cuts and programs (PA.III.D.1.a.9).

Timeline: A new College Budget Committee has been organized and members received training in February 2010.

Responsible Party: Rich Pagel, Vice President, Administrative Services

2. Improve the communication to the campus community regarding planning, budgeting, and allocation of financial resources.

**Progress:** During Summer 2009, when the college and district were facing the state budget crisis, the college published a weekly online report, *Budget Update*, which was distributed to all users and the campus community, including the Board of Trustees, district offices, and emeritus (PA.III.D.1.a.10). In September, a campus-wide survey provided feedback from the campus (PA.III.D.1.a.11; PA.III.D.1.a.12). In addition, a green hotline was established on campus to facilitate energy-saving ideas from anyone on campus (PA.III.D.1.a.13). Campus-wide meetings were held September 18, 2009 (PA.III.D.1.a.14); October 28, 2009 (PA.III.D.1.a.15); December 11, 2009 (PA.III.D.1.a.16); and February 5, 2010 (PA.III.D.1.a.17) to discuss important campus issues with faculty and staff in an open forum.
Planning Agenda: III.D.1.b.

1. Regularly review, assess, and disseminate information about financial resource availability to assist with institutional planning.

Progress: A committee comprised of the Academic Senate President, the Program Review Coordinator, the Curriculum Chair, and the Dean of Library and Media Services and Institutional Research has written a draft for a decision-making manual that details the program review, planning, and budgetary process for faculty and staff (PA.III.D.1.b.1). The draft Decision Making Document contains planning flow charts to graphically demonstrate the process for the allocation of resources for full-time faculty hiring, classified and management hiring, instructional equipment and supplies, and annual equipment and facilities updates. The document also clarifies the deadlines and process sequence for program review and the planning process. On December 8, 2009, the College Council voted to endorse the new planning structure and restructure the Planning and Budget Committee into two separate committees: College Council and College Budget Committee (CBC) (PA.III.D.1.b.2). The new College Budget Committee’s responsibilities will be to integrate the college plan and priorities set by College Council with the college budget. A taskforce was recommended to develop and propose a new College Budget Committee structure. There was common agreement that voting members on College Council should not also be voting members on the budget committee (PA.III.D.1.b.3). College Budget Committee members will include students, faculty, staff, and managers and will make recommendations to the college President (PA.III.D.1.b.4). Mandatory spring training budget “boot camp” was held February 26 and March 12, 2010, to acquaint committee members with financial resources, sources of revenue, and district planning. (PA.III.D.1.b.5; PA.III.D.1.b.6; PA.III.D.1.b.7). The Vice President of Administrative Services updates and provides a budget overview to the College Budget Committee twice each year (PA.III.D.1.b.8).

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Rich Pagel, Vice President, Administrative Services

Planning Agenda: III.D.1.c.

1. Regularly review district and college long-range financial priorities when making short-range financial plans.

Progress: In 2009, the California state budget emergency created a budget shortfall of $20 million in reductions for the 2009/2010 year, resulting in $1.8 million in reductions for Orange Coast College. The college made reductions in personnel costs and approximately $900,000 in operational costs recommended by the Planning and Budget Operations Subcommittee (PA.III.D.1.c.1). The district anticipates future impacts of $35 million in
reductions (PA.III.D.1.c.2). The District Budget Advisory Committee, created in Spring 2009 by the Acting Chancellor, met continuously throughout Summer and Fall 2009 to discuss potential shortfalls and solutions (PA.III.D.1.c.3). In addition to district planning, the College Budget Committee will address the 2010/2011 academic year estimated budget shortfall during Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 (PA.III.D.1.c.4; PA.III.D.1.c.5). Long-range target cuts include a hiring freeze and reduced energy usage. The district suspended most Spring 2010 Intersession Classes, and Orange Coast College will reduce Summer 2010 Session by 50 percent. The district is currently meeting with each of the bargaining units to discuss options for meeting future budget shortfalls (PA.III.D.1.c.3).

Timeline: Planning Agenda ongoing.

Responsible Party: Rich Pagel, Vice President, Administrative Services

Planning Agenda: III.D.1.d.

1. Develop a publication or website that clearly defines and explains the college’s planning and budgeting processes, e.g. personnel hiring, budget allocations.

Progress: In 2008-2009, the college created the Decision Making Document, which describes the role of shared governance groups and budgeting and master planning (PA.III.D.1.d.1). The document includes a decision-making timeline, the hiring process, processes for acquiring instructional equipment and supplies, annual technology and facility review, curriculum development, and program review cycles. The Decision Making Document is available on the OCC Portal and hard copies are in division offices. The document was also distributed as an “all user” email to college employees. College Council presentations are made regularly, and an online publication, Budget Update, is periodically distributed via “all user” email and it is also posted on the Communications and Marketing Department web page (PA.III.D.1.d.2; PA.III.D.1.d.3; PA.III.D.1.d.4).

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Jeff Hobbs, Director, Communications and Marketing

Planning Agenda: III.D.2.b.

1. Increase and improve the communication from the Planning and Budget Committee to the campus community regarding planning, budgeting, and allocating financial resources.

Progress: The Planning and Budget Committee initiated a weekly Budget Update (PA.III.D.2.b.1) beginning in July 2009, which provided ongoing communication on budget issues. In addition, the Interim President completed a Budget Report (PA.III.D.2.b.2; PA.III.D.2.b.3). This report is posted on the OCC Portal and was distributed through Planning and Budget and College Council. Budget Update includes links to the email of all three college vice presidents to encourage feedback from the campus community. The publication also included an “Energy Savings Hotline” to canvass faculty and staff for energy-
saving suggestions (PA.III.D.2.b.4). The Interim President conducted bi-monthly College Council meetings, dividing the agenda between budget issues and planning uses to make a clear distinction between the two. The Interim President has made many presentations regarding the difference between budgeting and planning (PA.III.D.2.b.5). In December 2009, the College Council was established to coordinate and lead the strategic master planning process (PA.III.D.2.b.6; PA.III.D.2.b.7). Planning and Budget communications continued to be disseminated through Planning and Budget and College Council minutes, which are available on the OCC Portal (PA.III.D.2.b.8; PA.III.D.2.b.9). In December 2009, the College Council established the College Budget Committee, which officially replaced Planning and Budget (PA.III.D.2.b.6).

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Jeff Hobbs, Director, Communications and Marketing

**Planning Agenda: III.D.2.g.**

1. Continue to evaluate the college financial management processes and financial management systems.

**Progress:** The recent *Decision Making Document* reviews and documents the college’s financial management processes (PA.III.D.2.g.1). A structure was put in place through the Planning and Budget Committee to request funds to meet unmet or emerging needs (PA.III.D.2.g.2). A graphic showing the relationship between planning and budgeting was distributed campus-wide and discussed at Planning and Budget and the College Council (PA.III.D.2.g.3; PA.III.D.2.g.4; PA.III.D.2.g.5). In 2006, the district implemented the Banner Financial Management System to manage finances, student enrollment, admissions, grades, and human resources. Banner is a comprehensive enterprise resource program (ERP) that was adapted for two-year schools by the California Solution Center. The district established a Continuous Improvement Group, including representatives from the Academic Senate, staff, and students, who meet regularly to determine how to use Banner most effectively. The college plans to implement the next Banner milestone, Version 8, in Spring 2010 (PA.III.D.2.g.6; PA.III.D.2.g.7). The goal is to streamline the enrollment process and improve reports and access (PA.III.D.2.g.8). It will also help the college comply with new state reporting guidelines (PA.III.D.2.g.9).

Timeline: Planning Agenda is ongoing.

Responsible Party: Rich Pagel, Vice President, Administrative Services
Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

IV.A. Decision-making Roles and Processes

Planning Agenda: IV.A.1.

1. Revitalize the Classified Forum or investigate alternative means to further engage classified staff in institutional governance.

**Progress:** In Fall 2009, the Classified Forum Committee met to discuss a proposed structure similar to the Faculty Senate (PA.IV.A.1.1; PA.IV.A.1.2). The new Classified Forum site on the OCC Portal has been updated with current minutes (PA.IV.A.1.3). The Classified Forum assigns classified representatives to campus planning committees, and the representatives report back to the committee on a monthly basis (PA.IV.A.1.4). The Classified Forum has also proposed a career ladder program, publication of a classified orientation booklet, and was instrumental in encouraging town hall meetings each semester to develop open communication on campus. In Spring 2010, the Classified Forum, with Staff Development, plans to survey classified staff about their needs.

**Timeline:** Planning Agenda is ongoing. A classified survey is planned in Spring 2010.

**Responsible Parties:** Julie Clevenger and Allison Paine, Classified Forum Co-chairs

2. Review strategies to encourage students to participate in college decision-making roles.

**Progress:** During the 2009-2010 academic year, 24 campus-wide committees had seats for 40 students (PA.IV.A.1.5). Of those 40 openings, 36 were filled. Student representatives also serve on two new district committees, the District Advisory Budget Committee and the District Policy Development and Review Committee. The Associated Students of Orange Coast College encourages students to participate on campus committees. The Vice President of Diplomatic Affairs, a member of the ASOCC Executive Board, is responsible for publicizing various leadership roles, including campus-wide committee participation with the help of the Vice President of Communications (PA.IV.A.1.6). Various methods are used to announce open seats on decision-making committees, including the ASOCC Student Life website (PA.IV.A.1.7), fliers posted on ASOCC publicity boards, posters displayed on campus, class announcements, fliers placed in the monthly InterClub Council packets, announcements at ICC monthly meetings, and to InterClub Council and College Life Committee officers. In addition, the 12 ASOCC senators and executive officers are required to sit on at least one campus committee. Strategies used to recruit students to serve on campus committees are reevaluated for their effectiveness on an ongoing basis. Student Services is also developing a survey to determine the effectiveness of placing students on college committees. Student leaders are also encouraged to sponsor events such as the annual Multicultural Celebration and a spring student leadership conference (PA.IV.A.1.8; PA.IV.A.1.9; PA.IV.A.1.10).
Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Kate Mueller, Dean, Student Services

3. Review strategies to maintain faculty involvement in institutional governance.

Progress: The Academic Senate president encourages faculty members to get involved and participate in institutional governance. A draft of *Making Decisions Document* (PA.IV.A.1.11) was sent to all faculty and staff through “all users” email. The document shows faculty how they can play a role in campus decisions. The Academic Senate has developed other documents to encourage faculty involvement and input, including the *Academic Senate Handbook* in draft form, and resolutions dealing with diversity, learning communities, involvement, and shared governance (PA.IV.A.1.12; PA.IV.A.1.13; PA.IV.A.1.14; PA.IV.A.1.15). The Faculty Senate is expected to approve the *Academic Senate Handbook* in Spring 2010. The Academic Senate may also develop a survey to assess the effectiveness of current strategies to maintain faculty involvement in institutional governance, although no timeline has been determined.

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed. The Academic Senate may survey faculty in the future, but no timeline has been determined.

Responsible Party: Eduardo Arismendi-Pardi, Academic Senate President

4. Complete the revision of the college’s shared governance document.

Progress: The Shared Governance Committee met in 2006 and 2007 to complete and revise the college’s *Shared Governance Manual*. The final revision was posted on the OCC Portal under Shared Governance Committee on Oct. 22, 2007 (PA.IV.A.1.15). In September 2009, the College Council agreed to revise the Shared Governance Document to include a decision-making model (PA.IV.A.1.16).

Timeline: The *Shared Governance Manual* was revised in 2007, but College Council determined that the document needs to include a decision-making model and should be revised again.

Responsible Party: Michael Mandelkern, Dean, Literature and Languages; Shared Governance Committee Chair

**Planning Agenda: IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a., IV.A.3.**

1. Revise the shared governance manual, including committee structures, participation and term limits and post revisions on the OCC Portal.

Progress: The *Shared Governance Manual* was last revised by the Shared Governance Committee on Oct. 22, 2007 (PA.IV.A.2.1). The manual includes procedures for committees to follow, including term revisions and posting agendas and meeting minutes on the OCC Portal.
Portal. The document also outlines overall committee planning structure. An organizational chart depicting the committee planning structure is in Appendix III of the Shared Governance Manual. In September 2009, the College Council agreed to revise the shared governance document to include a decision-making model (PA.IV.A.2.2).

Timeline: The Shared Governance Manual was revised in 2007, but College Council determined that the document needs to include a decision-making model and should be revised again.

Responsible Party: Michael Mandelkern, Dean, Literature and Languages; Shared Governance Committee Chair

2. Widely disseminate the Planning and Budget Committee term limit policies for committees. Evaluate term limits for committees.

Progress: Planning and Budget tabled consideration of term limit policies for campus committees until the committee purpose and configuration of Planning and Budget was finalized, pending results of the Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) Survey in Fall 2009. Survey results showed campus-wide dissatisfaction with the organization of Planning and Budget, and College Council moved to create a separate College Budget Committee (PA.IV.A.2.3). The new College Council, which became the official planning committee for the college in December 2008, has not addressed term limit policies for committees. The Academic Senate introduced a draft resolution on committee membership that recommends that length of service on important campus planning committees, such as College Council and College Budget Committee be limited to a two-year term with no term limits (PA.IV.A.2.4).

Timeline: The newly established planning body, the College Council, has not addressed this issue.

Responsible Party: College Council

3. Increase OCC Portal communication regarding institutional governance, including posting organizational charts.

Progress: The OCC Portal has been in use since Summer 2004. In July 2009, a new version of the Portal was launched (PA.IV.A.2.5; PA.IV.A.2.6; PA.IV.A.2.7). The new site, using upgraded Sharepoint 2007 software, redesigned the faculty and staff pages and introduced an announcements feature. The committee incorporated many suggestions from faculty, including “hot links,” frequently used forms, and an events calendar (PA.IV.A.2.8). All staffing groups, including classified, faculty, and administrators, are encouraged to use the OCC Portal for a variety of communications needs including informational items, official documents, personnel forms, departmental items, student learning outcomes, and organizational charts (PA.IV.A.2.9; PA.IV.A.2.10; PA.IV.A.2.11).
Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: College Council

**Planning Agenda IV.A.4.**


**Progress:** In November 2009, the Technology Committee created a sub-committee to develop TCO models to formulate equipment replacement schedule, review the existing “draft” Technology Master Plan; improve the processes of the Technology Master Plan development and integration with Facilities Master Plan and incorporation into the Academic Master Plan; develop a clear, repeatable, and transparent process to acquire new technology and incorporate the results of which into the Technology Master Plan; and assess the technology master planning process and provide feedback to the Technology Committee. In December 2009, the Technology Committee finalized and approved the Technology Master Plan with the understanding that additional information, such as a rolling five-year financial forecast of technology refresh, would need to be incorporated into the document in preparation for the 2010-2011 planning and budgeting process (IV.A.4.1; IV.A.4.2; IV.A.4.3).

Timeline: Planning Agenda is ongoing. College Council and the Facilities Planning Committee will review the Technology Master Plan and Facility Master Plan in Spring 2010.

Responsible Party: Rich Pagel, Vice President, Administrative Services

**Planning Agenda: IV.A.5.**

Develop a formal procedure for evaluating the effectiveness of the college’s shared governance structure and practices.

**Progress:** In Fall 2009, the College Council was established to oversee master planning, issue management, and communication and collegiality (PA. IV.A.5.1). The Interim President worked with the college to implement an effective decision-making model. In December 2009, the College Council voted to create a separate College Budget Committee (PA. IV.A.5.2). The action separates the planning and budget allocation processes. In October 2009, the college disseminated the Personal Assessment of College Environment (PACE) Survey, which includes planning and governance questions. Due to low participation by some segments of the campus community, the College Council is planning to ask faculty and staff to take the survey again so the results can be used as a planning tool (PA. IV.A.5.2).

Timeline: The college is in the process of reorganizing its planning and budgeting process with the newly established College Council and College Budget Committee, which replaced Planning and Budget.
Responsible Parties: Denise Whittaker, Interim President (prior to January 1, 2010) and Dennis Harkins, President.

**IV.B. Board and Administrative Organization**

**Planning Agenda: IV.B.1., IV.B.1.c.**

1. Provide ongoing information about the sale of KOCE, particularly to faculty and staff.

   **Progress:** The district provided information in a timely manner in public press releases that were available to all members of the college, district and community-at-large (PA. IV.B.1.c.1; PA. IV.B.1.c.2; PA. IV.B.1.c.3). The district’s decision to sell KOCE to the KOCE Foundation for $32 million in 2004 was challenged by Daystar Television Network in a lawsuit (PA. IV.B.1.c.4). On June 21, 2007, the Board of Trustees President announced in a press release that settlement had been reached between KOCE-TV Foundation and Daystar Television Network (PA. IV.B.1.c.5). The press release further stated that the KOCE-TV Foundation would retain the station license, and that the station would remain an affiliate of the Public Broadcasting System.

   **Progress:** Planning Agenda completed.

   Responsible Party: Coast Community College District

2. Prepare for potential financial impact of the KOCE sale.

   **Progress:** KOCE-TV was sold to the KOCE Foundation for $32 million. The sale involves a series of payments over time to the district, but the KOCE Foundation retains the station license, and the district plans to utilize air time to provide quality education opportunities.

   **Timeline:** Planning Agenda completed.

   Responsible Party: Coast Community College District

**Planning Agenda: IV.B.1.a.**

1. The district will review the sale of KOCE in a manner that reflects the best interests of the institution.

   **Progress:** In February 2005, the CCCD Board of Trustees reviewed the status of the post-closing documents related to the sale of KOCE-TV. While the transfer of the license and acceptance of the down payment occurred on November 1, 2004, there were outstanding issues to be resolved to make the financial transaction and transition in ownership complete (PA. IV.B.1.a.1; PA. IV.B.1.a.2). Since the sale involved a series of payments over time, the district continues to report this revenue in a timely and transparent manner (PA. IV.B.1.a.3).
Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Coast Community College District

Planning Agenda: IV.B.1.e., IC.B.1.g.

1. Improve communication, specifically with the college classified staff, regarding the Board’s adherence to its published policies.

Progress: Since 2006, there has been a change in the composition of the Board, with two new members. In 2008, the Board hired its own General Counsel, who assists at all Board meetings. These changes have been accompanied by a movement by the Board to more regularly review and update policies and to assure that the Board is following the Education Code, Title V, and Board policies (PA.IV.B.1.e.1). The addition of the General Counsel has aided in this movement to more open and consistent compliance. The Board communicates its actions in a formal manner through the Board meeting agendas and minutes. The Board also publishes an online newsletter, Coast Board Connection (PA.IV.B.1.e.2) with highlights from Board meetings. There are other means of communication that are less formal. The district publishes an electronic newsletter each month, D-Mail Online Newsletter (PA.IV.B.1.e.3), which provides the Board another opportunity to communicate its decisions and opinions. Most recently, the Board used this vehicle, as well as more formal means, to communicate its hiring decision for the position of Chancellor.

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Coast Community College District

Planning Agenda: IV.B.1.f.

1. Review existing practices for orientation of new Board members.

Progress: New members serving on the CCCD Board of Trustees review of the following items as a part of their orientation: Board policies, Board schedule, Board committees, district budget, Board agenda, Board minutes, Community College League of California Handbook for Trustees, district benefits information, trustee contact information, information on the Board of Trustees’ organizational meeting (following each election), Board of Trustees’ office staff and contact information, and college staff and contact information. New trustees also tour facilities and trustee offices, meet with district executives, and are introduced to district computing resources and the district telephone networks and Blackberry devices. They also receive information about attendance at the Chancellor’s President Council Meeting, and college accreditation status and reports (PA.IV.B.1.f.1).

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Coast Community College District Board of Trustees
Planning Agenda: IV.B.1.h.

1. Develop a clearly defined Board policy for dealing with behavior that violates the Code of Ethics.

   **Progress:** The CCCD’s *Code of Ethics for Members of the Board of Trustees* policy was revised September 5, 2007 (PA.IV.B.1.h.1), and addresses this Planning Agenda item. Included in this policy are “Steps in Addressing Ethical Violations” that clearly delineate how ethical violations are to be reviewed and resolved. Additionally, a section titled “Trustee Standards of Practice” is included, which is policy specific to accreditation standards IV.B.1.a., e., and h. These standards establish the operating norms and best practices of the Board members and provide a benchmark for accountability.

   **Timeline:** Planning Agenda completed.

   **Responsible Party:** Coast Community College District Board of Trustees

2. Provide mandatory ethics training for all current and new Board members.

   **Progress:** All Board members have received ethics training. Board members are well aware of the probability that legislation will make certified ethics training mandatory with the passage of SB106.

   **Timeline:** Planning Agenda completed.

   **Responsible Party:** Coast Community College District Board of Trustees

Planning Agenda: IV.B.1.i.

1. Provide more ongoing information to the Board regarding accreditation in general.

   **Progress:** A board committee including Board members, a Faculty Senate representative, student trustee, study body presidents (3), vice chancellor, college presidents (3), and accreditation liaison officers, was formed to coordinate communication between the Board of Trustees, the district, and the three colleges. The subcommittee meets regularly and has held five meetings. A common due date, February 24, 2010, was set for submission of midterm reports to the Board by the three colleges (PA.IV.B.1.i.1; PA.IV.B.1.i.2; PA.IV.B.1.i.3).

   **Timeline:** Planning Agenda completed.

   **Responsible Party:** Coast Community College District Accreditation Committee

2. Organize a meeting with Board members and accreditation committee members at one time.

   **Progress:** The College’s accreditation liaison officer, who serves as chair of the accreditation coordination committee, regularly attends the Board of Trustees Accreditation Committee. The last meeting was held on February 24, 2010, when each of the three district college’s midterm accreditation draft reports was reviewed (PA.IV.B.1.i.3).
Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Coast Community College District Accreditation Committee

Planning Agenda: IV.B.1.j.

1. Complete the review of the hiring policy for the Chancellor, vice chancellors, and college presidents.

Progress: On November 19, 2007, the Coast Community College District Board of Trustees adopted a formal written process for the selection of the chancellor, vice chancellors, and college presidents (PA. IV.B.1.j.1). Policy 050-1-17-1, entitled Search and Selection of the Coast Community College District Executive Management Employees, was developed in consultation with constituent groups, and outlines the process and procedures to be followed in the selection and employment of the Chancellor, vice chancellors, and college presidents (PA. IV.B.1.j.2). At its March 3, 2010 meeting, the Board of Trustees discussed policies for district executive management profiles, recruitment, and selection (PA. IV.B.1.j.3).

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Coast Community College District Board of Trustees

Planning Agenda: IV.B.2.

1. Further integrate program review into the planning process.

Progress: Program review has become the critical component of the effective operation and stewardship for the college. In September 2007, the Academic Senate adopted an Instructional Program Review Philosophy (PA.IV.B.2.1) that articulates the college’s commitment to use program review in continual evaluation, self study, and improvement of courses and programs. The Academic Master Plan for 2008-2011 also includes a formal commitment by the college to employ program review in the decision-making and planning processes (PA.IV.B.2.2). The President's Wing Three-Year Plan, finalized in July 2009 (PA.IV.B.2.3), also incorporates program review into planning. Additionally, each campus program is required to prepare program student learning objectives (PSLOs) to measure program success (PA.IV.B.2.4). The Program Review Committee established a comprehensive review process and document set for campus-wide use that demonstrates how data is collected and analyzed during program review to drive planning and decision making. (PA.IV.B.2.5; PA.IV.B.2.6; PA.IV.B.2.7; PA.IV.B.2.8). With a formalized review process in place, each program’s plans and results can be traced from one year or cycle to the next (PA. IV.B.2.9). Full implementation of the program review process and its integration into the planning process will be facilitated through ongoing follow-up and support from the Program Review Committee and its chair (PA.IV.B.2.10). Additional workshops and departmental and program meetings will assist remaining and incoming new faculty with the program review process.
Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Georgie Monahan, Program Review Coordinator

Planning Agenda: IV.B.2.a.

1. Implement the new management evaluation process once it is completed by CDMA.

Progress: Over the past two years, the Coast District Management Association (CDMA) revised the guidelines for evaluation and facilitated its dissemination throughout the district (PA.IV.B.2.a.1). The current overview and summary of the management evaluation process is included in the CCCD Manager's Handbook (PA.IV.B.2.a.2), which was distributed to each manager at a district-wide managers’ workshop in summer 2007, and to each new manager hired. The handbook includes references to the district website where the most current detailed information, guidelines, and forms may be found. A section for management evaluation was added to the OCC Administrative Services Manual, and a weblink on the employee tab of MyOCC leads to the district website and the most up-to-date evaluation instruments, reporting forms, and timelines (PA.IV.B.2.a.3). Completion and submittal of management evaluations is tied to longevity pay increases and contract renewals, which require that evaluations be submitted to district Human Resources Department. The district Human Resources Director reports that the rates of compliance are near 100%.

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Laury Francis, Director, Personnel Services

Planning Agenda: IV.B.2.b.

1. Increase campus awareness of the college’s ongoing need to revise and reprioritize planning and goals in the face of fiscal realities.

Progress: After her arrival on campus in July 2009, the Interim President widely discussed the master planning and prioritization process. Although the campus previously completed extensive wing and area planning, no single master plan existed. The college also needed to create a prioritized list of personnel and campus needs. The Interim President issued a Mid-Term Semester Report to all employees to share her assessment of campus needs (PA.IV.B.2.b.1). In addition, a presentation was made to the campus on Focus Day at the start of the Fall 2009 semester (PA.IV.B.2.b.2). The college instituted a College Council to set planning goals that will guide budget priorities in the college’s new College Budget Committee. In October and December 2009, the Interim President provided updated information in town hall presentations to the campus community (PA.IV.B.2.b.3; PA.IV.B.2.b.4; PA.IV.B.2.b.5; PA.IV.B.2.b.6). In addition, flow charts were distributed on “all user” email to the campus community to clearly explain the planning process and the relationship between program review and student learning outcome assessment (PA.IV.B.2.b.7). A special online report, Budget Update, was introduced in Summer 2009 to keep the campus community aware of the latest developments during the state’s budget crisis (PA.
IV.B.2.b.8; PA.IV.B.2.b.9). As the budget crisis continues, the College Council and College Budget Committee will continue to inform the campus community of budget priorities in relationship to planning goals.

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Parties: Denise Whittaker, Interim President (prior to January 1, 2010) and Dennis Harkins, President

**Planning Agenda: IV.B.2.d.**

1. **Increase enrollment.**

   **Progress:** Orange Coast College steadily increased enrollment between 2005 and 2009, which is documented in the FTEs Breakdown charting enrollment for the last four years (PA.IV.B.2.d.1). However, during the current state budget crisis, the state capped the college’s enrollment, and OCC must adjust this Planning Agenda to reflect fiscal realities. As a result, the college is offering fewer courses with fuller classes. The college plans to reduce course offerings in a way to cause the least adverse effect to programs during challenging economic times. The district recently suspended Winter 2010 Intersession for most programs, and the college is looking at a smaller Summer 2010 Session (PA.IV.B.2.d.2). The college recently disbanded its Outreach and Recruitment Committee and replaced it with an Enrollment Management Committee to address new enrollment goals for the college (PA.IV.B.2.d.3). The new goals state that the college will “seek to balance programs and support services to ensure student access and success within the capacity of available resources.” The district will maintain baseline FTES for each college and identify growth targets whenever state or alternative financing is available (PA.IV.B.2.d.4).

   Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

   Responsible Party: Melinda Nish, Vice President of Instruction

2. **Work with the campus and district constituencies to find adequate funding to complete campus projects.**

   **Progress:** Finding adequate funding to complete campus projects is an ongoing challenge for the college. Orange Coast College has a *Facilities Master Plan* (PA.IV.B.2.d.5) that includes a vision of campus facility needs through 2020. In 2002 voters passed Measure C, a $360 million bond to fund projects in Coast Community College District, including $199 million allocated specifically for Orange Coast College. Even with Measure C funds, the college did not have adequate revenue to meet *Facilities Master Plan* goals, so the college has aggressively sought other revenue (PA.IV.B.2.d.6). The Facilities Planning Taskforce meets regularly to discuss the status of projects and make recommendations to the Facilities Committee (PA.IV.B.2.d.7; PA.IV.B.2.d.8). The college has been working with district to procure state funding for major campus projects (PA.IV.B.2.d.9). For example, the state contributed $22 million to the cost of OCC’s new $32 million Library, which opened in
Another source of revenue is the OCC Foundation, which raised $2 million to build the Thomas Doyle Arts Pavilion and $600,000 for renovations at the OCC Sailing Center (PA.IV.B.2.d.10; PA.IV.B.2.d.11). Each spring, divisions submit annual request reports to identify areas of need. Needs are summarized and presented to the Facilities Planning Committee. In October/November 2009, the college completed another Facilities Master Plan review. Budgets were assessed and the college’s resources for completing projects were evaluated, resulting in a “revised master plan.” The Facilities Master Plan is continuously being revised and updated (PA.IV.B.2.d.12).

Timeline: Planning Agenda is ongoing.

Responsible Party: Rich Pagel, Vice President of Administrative Services

Planning Agenda: IV.B.2.e.

1. The President will increase his/her own, and the college’s, outreach with under-represented groups in the community.

Progress: Orange Coast College, led by the college President, continues to make special efforts to maintain relationships with high schools that have a high Latino population. Counseling and Extended Opportunity Program and Services (EOPS) representatives visit schools in the Santa Ana Unified School District, Westminster and Ocean View High Schools in the Huntington Beach School District, and schools that invite our counselors in the Garden Grove Unified School District. OCC created partnerships with Estancia High School and Costa Mesa High School that provided college classes and counseling for high school students (PA.IV.B.2.e.1; PA.IV.B.2.e.2). The college has hired bilingual staff in Admissions and Records to serve the Latino population, and it also makes bilingual information available for middle and elementary school parents about opportunities at OCC. College representatives attend California Department of Education English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) meetings at middle and elementary schools where they make bilingual presentations to parents about opportunities at OCC. The college sponsors annual multicultural events and ethnic activities on campus for the community, including World Dance Day and Fiesta de la Raza, as well as free annual community events such as Community Science Night and the Orange County Children’s Book Festival (PA.IV.B.2.e.3). The college operates a successful Puente Program, where 85.7% of enrolled students are Hispanic. In December 2009, the Academic Senate’s Multicultural Committee officially became a campus-wide, shared governance committee reporting to the College Council. The committee’s mission statement states that the committee’s mission is “to promote diversity and to support international and multicultural teaching and learning at Orange Coast College” (PA.IV.B.2.e.4).

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Dennis Harkins, President
2. Investigate ways to provide more opportunities for staff to interact and communicate with each other and the President.

Progress: Creating two-way communication between the President’s Office and the college staff has been a top priority. Three major forms of communication have been utilized: the OCC Portal, the online weekly newsletter *Coast to Coast*, and “all users” email. The OCC Portal provides information and documents that can be accessed by faculty and staff. Every department and committee has a home page on the Portal; there is also a main page with announcements that can be tailored to faculty and/or staff, as well as “Quick Links” to frequently visited Portal sites, common forms and “Help” (PA.IV.B.2.e.5). The college also publishes *Coast to Coast*, an online weekly publication for faculty, staff, retirees, and friends of Orange Coast College, as well as special online publications such as *Budget Update* and *Accreditation Update* that address specific issues (PA.IV.B.2.e.5; PA.IV.B.2.e.6; PA.IV.B.2.e.7; PA.IV.B.2.e.8). In addition, “all user” email reaches all staff with important information, such as announcements for town hall meetings and Focus Day. Working through College Council, and in line with needs identified through program review, a Communications Subcommittee has been established to study and help develop a comprehensive campus-wide communications plan that aligns with the college mission and values. The subcommittee will explore best practices for delivering news and information to diverse audiences and stakeholders, including electronic publishing and html platforms to enhance interactivity, speed delivery of information and feedback, and cut use of paper, ink, and waste resulting from hard-copy communications (PA.IV.B.2.e.9). The Communications and Marketing Department is also in the process of designing a master calendar accessible to staff, faculty, and administrators to help eliminate scheduling conflicts for campus-wide events. In the future, the Communications and Marketing Department plans to incorporate video components into *Coast to Coast* and the college website (PA.IV.B.2.e.10). The Communications and Marketing Department receives feedback via email from faculty and staff, and a formal survey to help assess communications is planned.

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Jeff Hobbs, Director, Communications and Marketing

**Planning Agenda: IV.B.3.**

1. Review and update the long-range planning document for the district.

Progress: During 2008-2009, a consultant was hired to do preliminary environmental scanning in preparation for the master planning process. Interviews were conducted with community members, college leaders, students, and Board members to assess overall needs. In Fall 2009, the district’s *Vision 2010* plan was reviewed to assess the district’s accomplishments against the established goals in the plan as well as the gaps (PA.IV.B.3.1). The Board held a special study session to review the district master planning process and timetable recommendations. It is determined that the district will establish a 10-year vision for 2020 and complete a five-year master strategic plan with a three-year review cycle (PA.IV.B.3.2). In the February 2010 *D-Mail Online Newsletter*, the Chancellor announced plans for Vision 2020 forums to be held on each of the three campuses in the near future (PA.IV.B.3.3).
2. Address areas where decentralized administration has led to lack of district leadership in the coordination of individual college needs and interests.

**Progress:** Several areas have benefited from greater district leadership and coordination. These are enrollment management, career technical education, accreditation, land development, and budget planning. The district employed an Interim Associate Vice Chancellor of Educational Services to help coordinate the three colleges’ efforts to address the various components of enrollment management. The Board of Trustees created three committees to coordinate career/technical education (CTE), accreditation, and land development issues. The Chancellor created a District Budget Advisory Committee, which provides an inclusive, participatory governance opportunity for discussing and recommending budget proposals to the district and the Board. Most recently, in December of 2009, the Board created a Board budget committee and a Board personnel committee (PA.IV.B.3.4; PA.IV.B.3.5).

**Timeline:** Planning Agenda completed.

**Responsible Party:** John Breihan, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor of Educational Services

---

**Planning Agenda: IV.B.3.b.**

1. Reestablish a district long-range planning document.

**Progress:** In Fall 2009, the district’s Vision 2010 plan was reviewed to assess the District’s accomplishments against the established goals in the plan as well as the gaps (PA.IV.B.3.b.1). The Board held a special study session to review the district master planning process and timetable recommendations. It is determined that the district will establish a 10-year vision for 2020 and complete a five-year master strategic plan with a three-year review cycle (PA.IV.B.3.b.2; PA.IV.B.3.b.3).

**Timeline:** Planning Agenda completed.

**Responsible Party:** Ding-Jo Currie, Chancellor

---

**Planning Agenda: IV.B.3.c.**

1. Adjust the funding allocation model to more fairly distribute resources among the three campuses and the district.

2. **Progress:** In 2006, Senate Bill 361 provided equalization funding to the California community college system. At the same time, Coast Community College District modified its allocation model to move to a full-time equivalent student (FTES) model for budget allocations. The district funding model moved $10 million from fixed costs to the FTES
distribution model. In 2009-2010, the district’s $182.8 million budget was based on 66% FTES distribution and 34% on fixed costs. In Spring 2009, the district established the District Budget Advisory Committee to increase campus participation on district-wide budget issues, including the impact of budget reductions on the 2009-2010 budget year (PA.IV.B.3.c.1).

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: C.M. Brahmbhatt, Vice Chancellor, Administrative Services

**Planning Agenda: IV.B.3.e.**

1. Develop long-range district planning goals.

**Progress:** In Fall 2009, the district’s Vision 2010 plan was reviewed to assess the District’s accomplishments against the established goals in the plan as well as the gaps. The Board held a special study session to review the district master planning process and timetable recommendations. It is determined that the district will establish a 10-year vision for 2020 and complete a five-year master strategic plan with a three-year review cycle (PA.IV.B.3.e.1).

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Ding-Jo Currie, Chancellor

**Planning Agenda: IV.B.3.f.**

1. Ensure that the new ERP system supports and improves communication between the district and the colleges.

**Progress:** A selection committee chose the software for the district’s new enterprise resource planning (ERP) system, Banner, designed to improve communications between colleges and the District (PA.IV.B.3.f.1; PA.IV.B.3.f.2). An Implement Team will ensure that the new system meets the needs of all colleges (PA.IV.B.3.f.3; PA.IV.B.3.f.4) and that the Banner 8 system upgrades are accomplished on schedule. In an effort to improve communication with the district regarding the implementation of Banner 8 and other related Banner projects, Orange Coast College created a subcommittee of the OCC Technology Committee called the OCC Continuous Improvement Team (OCC CIT) (PA.IV.B.3.f.5). This committee prioritizes projects and communicates regularly with the District’s Continuous Improvement Team (CIT) (PA.IV.B.3.f.6). In addition, OCC CIT created the “Banner 8.x OCC Campus Upgrade Plan” (PA.IV.B.3.f.7). In an effort to improve future communication between the district and the college, OCC’s CIT prepared a reference guide, the *Continuous Improvement Team (CIT) Service Requests Reference Guide* (PA.IV.B.3.f.6) to help end-users report problems, corrections, queries, reporting, and requests for enhancements. In addition, OCC CIT has created *Banner 8.x OCC Campus Upgrade Plan* (PA.IV.B.3.f.7; PA.IV.B.3.f.8), including a specific timeline listed for each step of implementation through March 2010. A training timetable for end-users, including staff, faculty, management, and administrators, will be established when Banner 8 implementation is closer to completion.
Timeline: Planning agenda completed. A training timetable will be established in Spring 2010.

Responsible Party: Kristin Clark, Dean, Enrollment Services

2. Ensure that all employees are trained in the new ERP system so that the college can benefit from this improved electronic means of communication.

**Progress:** The initial implementation of the original Banner system included training for end-users from campus and District departments in “Banner Basic Components” including navigation, searches short cuts, My Banner, My Links, naming conventions, and tips. Training included hands-on workshops and computer video and PDF instruction manuals (PA.IV.B.3.f.9). An upgrade to Banner will be completed in Spring 2010, and additional training is planned.

Timeline: Planning agenda completed. A training timetable will be established in Spring 2010.

Responsible Party: Kristin Clark, Dean, Enrollment Services

**Planning Agenda: IV.B.3. g.**

1. Ensure that the district planning document is updated and widely communicated.

**Progress:** In Fall 2009, the district’s *Vision 2010* plan was reviewed to assess the district’s accomplishments against the established goals in the plan as well as the gaps. The Board held a special study session to review the district master planning process and timetable recommendations. It is determined that the district will establish a 10-year vision for 2020 and complete a five-year master strategic plan with a three-year review cycle (PA.IV.B.3.g.1).

Timeline: Planning Agenda completed.

Responsible Party: Ding-Jo Currie, Chancellor
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STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

Introductory Comments

Orange Coast College is pleased to submit this report to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The college submitted its self study in December 2006 followed by a site visit in March 2007. At the request of the Commission, the college prepared a progress report in March 2008, addressing four recommendations and two concerns, followed by a site visit in April 2008. At its June meeting in 2008, the Commission moved to request a second progress report, addressing the same recommendations and concerns. The Commission also placed the college on warning. This report is Orange Coast College’s response to the Commission’s June 2008 request.

Process and Timeline

Orange Coast College (OCC) developed an inclusive process for drafting this follow-up report to the ACCJC’s request of June 30, 2008.

This process began with the creation of an Accreditation Task Force which first met on August 25, 2008. Since then it has continued to meet on a weekly basis. The members include the college President, the Academic Senate President, all vice presidents, the faculty Program Review Coordinator, the faculty Curriculum Committee Chair, the faculty Student Learning Committee Chair, the Dean of Library and Institutional Research, the Technology Division Dean, and recently the faculty Transparency Committee chair.

In September 2008, the college administration and the Academic Senate called for faculty applications from those interested in serving as the lead writer/researcher for the report. In October 2008, the administration and Senate selected a faculty member who was subsequently ratified by Academic Senate vote. That same month, the Academic Senate created a faculty Transparency Committee to encourage greater faculty participation in the accreditation process and to facilitate transparency in creation of the campus report.

Working closely with the Office of Instruction and the Academic Senate, the faculty writer/researcher began her duties with interviews, document research, and drafting. The first draft was presented to the Transparency Committee on December 5, 2008, and distributed to the entire college via email on December 8, 2008. A revised draft was sent to the campus on February 2, 2009, accompanied by a “self-report” or feedback memo, asking for faculty input to the draft: approximately 74 individuals replied. These contributions represent participation from 48 departments and programs across the college.

Although the college had originally established a different calendar for the creation of this report, the Board of Trustees announced in early January that it wished to receive draft versions of the document by mid-February. The second draft of this report was submitted to the Coast Community College District Board of Trustee’s accreditation subcommittee on January 30, 2009. The Board of Trustees received a reformatted version of the second draft for its February 18, 2009, meeting.

Feedback from the campus on the drafts was collected through February 12, 2009. This was incorporated into the final version, which was made available for final college review on February 22, 2009. The due date for submission to the ACCJC was March 1, 2009.
Document Format

This document has been constructed specifically to assist the Commission and its representatives to quickly review the activities and supporting documentation addressing the recommendations and concerns as cited in the ACCJC’s letter of June 30, 2008.

Each section of the report is devoted to one recommendation or concern. The section begins by listing the recommendation/concern, followed by a summary preamble providing an overview of college-wide activities addressing the Commission’s recommendation. Following the overview, the recommendation/concern has been separated into an outline format that lists each component of the recommendation. Campus activities addressing the component within the recommendation are then bulleted. This type of format should allow the reader to quickly ascertain the degree to which the college has met and reconciled the recommendations/concerns.

An exception to this presentation format is found in the response to Recommendation 11, which is a common recommendation to all three colleges within the Coast Community College District and, therefore, the response is identical for all three colleges.

All supporting evidence is listed at the end of the report. The electronic version of the report includes all evidence in electronic format. Hard copies of evidence are on file at the college. The evidence convention used is simple and intuitive: each piece of evidence is identified first by a Roman numeral corresponding to the recommendation number, then a lower case letter corresponding to the component of the recommendation, and finally an Arabic number corresponding to the document number. Thus, the first piece of evidence cited for Recommendation 1’s first component would be identified as I.a.1, signifying Recommendation 1, component a, evidence number 1.

Robert Dees, President, Orange Coast College

February 26, 2009

Date
The Commission asks that a Follow-up Report be submitted by March 1, 2009. The Follow-up Report should focus on the institution’s resolution of the recommendations and Commission concerns as noted below:

**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 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.c, 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 (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).

**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 above-mentioned concerns are based upon the institution’s statement that instructors are “not contractually required to provide a syllabus” thus placing the institution out of compliance with Commission Standards (Standard II.A.6).
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 the 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-Unity Districts or Systems, January 2004).
Recommendation 1:

*The team recommends that the college accelerate its efforts to a) identify measurable student learning outcomes for every course, b) instructional program, and c) student support programs and d) incorporate student learning assessments into course and program improvements.*

The college has moved into full proficiency with respect to its institutional effectiveness in student learning outcomes.

At the time of the April 2008 site visit, 52% of all course student learning outcomes (CSLOs) had been completed. By November 2008, 100% of all CSLOs were completed and submitted via the curriculum approval process. All CSLOs were formally approved by the Curriculum Committee, with the last approvals occurring in December 2008. Divisions and departments conducted a variety of workshops and retreats to assist in the training and writing of CSLOs. A subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee reviewed all CSLOs prior to general committee review and approval. In total, all 1,387 Course Outlines of Record (CORs) for the college have approved and published CSLOs.

During April 2008, the instructional wing was in the process of drafting a definition of “program” appropriate for the campus. It was also engaged in identifying all certificate programs in order to suspend programs no longer needed and to identify viable certificate programs. Following these two necessary activities, the faculty, with the help of the Curriculum Committee and the Program Review Coordinator, drafted PSLOs for all certificate programs in the instructional wing. These PSLOs are currently being reviewed and approved by the curriculum committee for inclusion in the 2009-2010 catalog.

The college had set a target date of spring 2010 for the development of 100% of all PSLOs across all wings of the college. At the time of the April 2008 site visit, only Student Services had identified Program Level Outcomes (PSLOs) for all of its support programs and departments. Based on the Commission’s 2007 and 2008 actions, the college greatly accelerated its efforts to establish PSLOs across all wings. As of February 2009, nearly 100% of all programs in all four wings of the college have developed PSLOs. Those programs not finished at the time of this report’s publication have committed to PSLO completion no later than March 13, 2009. This was accomplished by creating self-help guidelines and models for writing and assessing PSLOs and by integrating PSLOs into the Program Review process for the instructional, Student Services, Administrative Services and President’s wings of the college.

Assessment of outcomes has been a long-standing practice in some areas of the instructional wing, most specifically in the Allied Health programs. However, full college assessment was in its formative stage in the 2007-2008 academic year. This has changed with the development of a new comprehensive program review form for all wings and the formal inclusion of assessment in all program reviews. Integrated into the program review forms are sections where programs must describe their assessment methods, their assessment timelines, and their assessment results. It is important to note that all wings – Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, and the President’s wing – are currently in the process of assessing their PSLOs. Instruction is also assessing CSLOs.

The college has fully reconciled this recommendation. Specific evidence for each component of the recommendation is presented below.
a. Identify measurable SLOs for every course:

Thanks to the strong commitment of faculty members across the campus and the leadership of the Curriculum Committee, the college has made excellent progress and has identified measurable SLOs for every course.

- As of December 2008, 100% of Course Outlines of Record include approved student learning outcomes (I.a.1).
- As of spring 2009, all course syllabi must include SLOs. The Coast Community College District and the faculty bargaining unit (AFT/CTE) mutually supported this mandate and memorialized this agreement in a Memorandum of Understanding signed on October 27, 2008 (I.a.2).
- CSLOs as published on the syllabus for each course are made available to students directly from the course instructor as well as in each division office (I.a.3; I.a.4).
- Division offices reported in week three of the semester that 92% of all full-time faculty and 81% of all part-time faculty have submitted syllabi with SLOs. These are impressive results for the first semester of the new syllabi policy and procedure. The college expects that 100% of syllabi with SLOs will be on file by the end of the fourth week (1.a.4).

b. Identify measurable SLOs for every instructional program:

Due to the new program review process, the college has made significant progress and has identified measurable SLOs for every career technical education program and over two-thirds of all other instructional programs.

- PSLO resources, including guidelines, models, and a glossary of terms, are available on the OCC Portal, the local college document network, for faculty to access and utilize in drafting program level learning outcomes (I.b.1).
- Workshops and individualized training sessions were conducted throughout fall 2008 by the Program Review Coordinator to help facilitate writing PSLOs for instructional programs (I.b.2).
- On September 5, 2008, a college-wide definition of “program” was discussed at an informational symposium on program review and was later revised and adopted by the Program Review Coordinator. The accepted definition for “program” at OCC helped the college to identify that there are the three categories of programs requiring PSLOs:
  
  Category 1) any series of courses culminating in a certificate of achievement or certificate of specialization;

  Category 2) any series of courses leading to a terminal degree or to transfer;

  Category 3) any department or service that offers a cluster of courses or resources that contribute to a student’s academic progress (I.b.3; I.b.4).

- As part of the program review process, programs must identify PSLOs that support a program-specific mission statement and demonstrate the mission’s and PSLO’s alignment with the Insti-
• Including these items on the program review forms ensures mission statements and PSLOs will be an integral part of the program review process and will encourage the reassessment of both every three years as part of the program review cycle.

• Both the Mission Statement and PSLOs are provided in the Program Review and published on the OCC Portal (I.b.7).

• As of February 12, 2009, 100% of all certificate programs have submitted a mission statement and their PSLOs. PSLOs will be approved by the Curriculum Committee as part of the program catalog description no later than March 4, 2009. This ensures that all certificate PSLOs will be published in the 2009 – 2010 catalog (I.b.8).

• As of February 12, 2009, 67% of all instructional PSLOs (which includes Category 1 “Certificate” and Category 2 “Transfer” programs) have been identified and approved through the Program Review process (I.b.9).

• The college President has recommended and the Student Learning Committee (SLC) has endorsed his recommendation that any program not in compliance—i.e., any program without an approved mission statement and identified PSLOs—should not be offered until it is revised to include these elements (I.b.10; I.b.11).

• Development of PSLOs for General Education has begun in spring 2009 and will be completed by fall 2009 (I.b.12).

• The student learning outcomes for the Associate of Arts and the Associate of Science degrees have been identified and published. These degree level outcomes are the institutional student learning outcomes (ISLOs) (I.b.5).

c. Identify measurable outcomes for student support programs:

The college provides student support in programs within the Student Services wing, the President’s wing, and the Administrative Services wing. The college has made significant progress in identifying measurable outcomes for every program in these three wings.

Student Services Wing:

• As of May 2008, 100% of student support programs within the Student Services Wing have identified two PSLOs, complete with assessment methods (Academic Integrity Seminar, ASOCC, Bookstore, CalWORKs, Children’s Center, Enrollment Center, EOPS/CARE, Financial Aid, International Center, Matriculation, Peer Mentoring, Scholarship, Student Health Center, and Student Government). These PSLOs have been incorporated into the Student Services Program Review process (I.c.1).

• Student Service PSLOs align with the wing’s themes: student responsibility and providing students with skills needed in their academic and professional lives (I.c.1).
The Student Services wing themes directly align with the fourth core competency area of the ISLOs: Personal Development and Responsibility (I.c.1; I.c.2).

As of December 2008, 80% of Student Services’ PSLOs have been assessed. The remaining 20% will be assessed in spring 2009. By the end of the spring 2009 semester, 100% of Student Services’ programs will have undergone the first cycle of assessment (I.c.3).

President’s Wing:

The six programs identified within the President’s wing (Community and Marketing Relations, College Foundation, Institutional Research, Staff Development, Information Technology, and the College Enterprise) are required to identify PSLOs as part of their program review process. All six programs have identified PSLOs (I.c.4).

The Information Technology (IT) department was reorganized in January 2009. The IT department has completed a comprehensive program review which includes PSLOs. These PSLOs, as well as their program mission statements, will be finalized in February 2009 (I.c.5; I.c.6; I.c.7).

Administrative Services Wing:

As of November 2008, 100% of the seven support programs within Administrative Services (Bursar’s Office, College Budget and Financial Operations, College Public Safety, Facilities, Maintenance and Operations, Personnel Services, and the Vice President’s Office) have drafted and finalized their PSLOs, which are aligned with the Academic Master Plan and the college ISLOs. These PSLOs are published on the OCC Portal (I.c.8; I.c.9).

PSLOs were developed with input from staff and management and reviewed by the Administrative Services Planning Council (I.c.10; I.c.11).

Program Review forms for Administrative Services have been revised to include the college-wide program review planning grids to document their program’s mission statement and PSLOs. Including these items on the program review forms ensures mission statements and PSLOs will be an integral part of the program review process, encouraging the reassessment of both as part of the three-year program review cycle (I.c.12).

d. *Incorporate student learning assessments into course and program improvements.*

Although most of the campus is in the early stages of the assessment process, it is already seeing the benefits of the process. Thirty-three academic departments are engaging in course level assessment in spring 2009, with some departments performing assessment for every course. All support programs within Student Services and Administrative Services have undergone or are undergoing assessment of their PSLOs.
College-wide:

- OCC’s Program Review Coordinator is an important resource for assessment. She has attended conferences on assessing SLOs, writing effective PSLOs, and utilizing assessment software such as eLumen. She has conveyed the training information to the college via division and departmental workshops (I.d.1).

- Measurable CSLOs and/or PSLOs and their assessment are integrated into every program review document across all four college wings (I.d.2).

- As part of the three-year program review process in all four wings, all identified SLOs and PSLOs will be assessed at least one time during the three-year cycle.

Instructional Wing:

- The Academic Senate drafted an assessment philosophy statement in October 2008. The purpose of assessment is addressed, with emphasis on greater faculty dialogue, transparency of continuous improvement practices, and the use of assessment in assisting faculty-driven decision making. This statement is currently in discussion by Senate members (I.d.3).

- Of particular note, all 10 School of Allied Health programs and the Culinary Arts program have conducted outcomes-based assessment since the inception of each program. Additionally, each of these programs is accredited separately by professional agencies which assure an exceptionally high level of quality control (I.d.4).

- For the 2008-2009 academic year, 33 instructional departments have self-reported they are engaged in CSLO and/or PSLO assessment (I.d.5).

- A variety of assessment methods are being tested across the instructional wing. These include embedded test questions, rubrics, portfolios, exit interviews, entrance/exit surveys, and pre- and post-tests (I.d.5).

- Both full- and part-time faculty members are participating in course and program assessments (I.d.5).

- Many programs report all courses in the process of assessment and assessment analysis. These programs include all 10 Allied Health programs, Culinary Arts, Biology, English/Literature, Physical Education/Athletics, Psychology, Speech Communications, and World Languages (I.d.5).

- By the conclusion of spring 2009, a minimum of 50% of all instructional programs will have piloted an assessment of one SLO and begun a review of the assessment method and process. Departments and programs are required as part of the program review process to discuss the results of the assessment as well as the effectiveness of the method selected for assessing student learning. Results will be incorporated in the program review process (I.d.5; I.d.6).

- Departments not participating in assessment during the 2008-2009 year are creating timelines for completing all of their SLO assessments and are discussing the most effective methods and instruments for assessing their courses. Timelines assure that all CSLOs and PSLOs will be assessed at least once each three years (I.d.7).
Assessment of SLOs and PSLOs is now part of “Instructional Unit Assistants (IUAs)” job descriptions. Making these duties explicit helps institutionalize a process to assure that each instructional department/program will have a point of contact and leadership for the assessment process (I.d.8).

Assessment is also done as part of the Title III grant, which established objectives to strengthen student learning. By centralizing the Student Success Center, creating an early alert process and tracking software, developing the supplemental instruction program, and increasing tutoring services, the Student Success Center has grown by over 130% (I.d.9; I.d.10).

The Student Success Center is using utilization, retention, and program completion statistics to conduct assessment and propose improvements, even though required program review is not scheduled until 2009-2010. As an example, data collection in the first year of the Title III grant showed the need for more space for tutoring. To create the space, the self-paced math program was moved to another location (I.d.10).

Student Services:

In fall 2008, 80% of student support programs performed a measured assessment of two SLOs. The remaining 20% will be completed in spring 2009 (I.d.12).

Data for upcoming assessment will be gathered from a variety of sources. For example, Student Government will use pre-/post-tests and questionnaires; Matriculation will use qualitative analysis and on-line registration statistics; the Children’s Center will use student employee evaluations and student parent conferences; EOPS will use review and tracking of student educational plans and student transcripts; and Financial Aid will use data tracking (I.d.13).

Assessment done after the first year of implementing the Title III grant showed that student tracking and early alert technology solutions were needed. The Title III Coordinator researched both areas and worked with the Dean of Enrollment Services, the Matriculation Committee, and IT staff to develop and purchase software for this purpose (I.d.14).

Assessment results and program review analysis will be incorporated into the Student Services three-year wing plan, which is scheduled to be drafted in March 2009 (I.d.15; I.d.16; I.d.17; I.d.18).

Student Services has started the dialogue of post-assessment strategies. Specifically, this dialogue addresses how to use assessment to improve PSLOs (I.d.18).

President’s Wing:

Five of the six support programs within the President’s wing will propose assessment methods for their PSLOs as part of their program review process in spring 2009 (I.d.19; I.d.20; I.d.21; I.d.22; I.d.23).

The Technology Committee will survey stakeholders on Information Technology (IT) services and technological equipment in February and March 2009. The results of the survey will be used as part of the data available for the IT program review as well as a tool for assessment of its PSLOs (I.d.24).
As part of writing the PSLOs and mission statements, IT identified four areas of study that will guide assessment process and its data collection (I.d.25).

**Administrative Services:**

- During the spring 2008 semester, a survey assessing the departments of Public Safety and Personnel Services was performed. Data used in the 2008 survey were included in both departments’ program review documents (I.d.26; I.d.27).

- Assessment conducted as part of program review led to the following improvements in Public Safety: new equipment for public safety officers, facility improvements to the public safety building, and increased communication through a reinstated public safety dispatch position (I.d.28).

- Assessment conducted as part of the Personnel Services program review identified and resulted in many improvements. First, it has opened communications, as program review is a standing agenda item for monthly staff meetings. Second, specific improvements to date are a remodeled furniture layout for the personnel services offices for increased confidentiality and process flow; a review with payroll to discuss and expedite paperwork; the development of a procedure manual which is on the OCC Portal; more data, forms, and deadlines added to the Portal for improved customer service; cross-training and realignment of staff members’ duties; and an orientation manual for new hires is in process (I.d.27; I.d.29; I.d.30).

- The other four areas of Administrative Services are conducting a college-wide survey in spring 2009 and will incorporate the results into program improvements, as have Public Safety and Personnel Services (I.d.31).
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 b) make improvements to its programs based on the results of the enhanced program review process.*

Orange Coast College has significantly revised and improved its comprehensive program review process over the past two years. Beginning in 2007, all program reviews moved from a six-year cycle to a three-year cycle. During the 2007-2008 academic year, the first year of the new cycle, many lessons were learned. The most important outcome of that first year and its experiences was to revise and align the process such that forms and timelines of program review were common across all four wings of the college. This has significantly improved the ability of the college to compare program review goals, outcomes, and assessment.

The new college-wide program review alignment ensures that each program review includes the program’s mission statement, student or program level outcomes, and assessment as an integral part of the process. Additionally, all program reviews have been made available to all stakeholders by being posted on the same program review page, located on the college portal.

To further the analysis of data and to enhance the program review process for Student Support Services, the Program Review Coordinator has created a portal-based document, “Program Review Guidelines,” which explains the steps of the program review process. The document offers definitions of terms and models for data collection and analysis. The guidelines have facilitated the process, especially for support services performing program review for the first time, and the document has helped to align the program review process for all four wings.

All program reviews undergo peer review to facilitate translation of the required data and to assure the program review plans include the goals articulated in the Academic Master Plan and the Institutional Student Learning Outcomes. The peer review process is anonymous and is intended to assure a constructive means of quality control. Instructional wing peer review is performed by a team of faculty members, with the requirement that peer reviewers must be from a different academic division than that of the program they are reviewing. Previously, peer review for Administrative Services and Student Services was performed within each wing. As of February 2009, the peer-review process for these two wings, as well as the President’s wing, will include inter-wing participants.

Through consultation with all four college wings, the Program Review Coordinator and the Dean of Library Services and Institutional Research have generated a Program Review calendar for the entire college. The calendar includes the important due dates for program review, as well as the timeline for incorporating the program review results, which include the assessment of CSLOs and PSLOs into the planning process and the generation of departmental, divisional, and wing plans.

Program review now serves as the foundation for all institution planning processes and allocation of resources. This is a significant improvement in the very culture of the college.
a. **Comprehensive and meaningful analysis of data with particular emphasis on student enrollment, program completion, retention, success, and achievement of SLOs.**

**College-wide:**

Comprehensive and meaningful analysis of data in the program review process has been a key component in the college’s continuous improvement efforts. The college has utilized feedback resulting in better processes, increased resources, and training. The college as a whole has benefited from the comprehensive approach provided by the work of the Student Learning Committee (SLC) and the Accreditation Task Force (ATF).

- The college is currently in the second year of its three-year program review process. After the first year of implementing the new comprehensive program review process, program review participants provided feedback on the new forms, method of data collection, and the peer review process. This input has made the program review process more efficient and better addresses needs identified by the new planning process (II.a.1).

- Using the college planning and allocation processes, and to assure that appropriate resources are allocated to program review, a new position, Educational Research Analyst (ERA), was created and approved in spring 2008. Hired as a senior research analyst, this specialist assists the college with data collection, processing, and interpretation. Additionally, the senior research analyst is available for staff and faculty who are drafting their program reviews to help them analyze and interpret their data. In October 2008, the position was filled (II.a.2; II.a.3; II.a.4; II.a.5).

- Workshops have been organized by the Program Review Coordinator and funded by the President’s Office to train faculty to work with data collection during the assessment and program review process (II.a.6).

- The Program Review Coordinator attended conferences in May and October of 2008 specifically focused on improving student success through program review and the assessment of SLOs. The Coordinator has incorporated this knowledge into workshops and has shared best practices in Senate, Instructional Planning Council, and Accreditation Task Force meetings (II.a.1; II.a.7; II.a.8).

- The ACCJC provided a speaker to outline the necessity of program review for the college planning process. Approximately 100 college members representing all four wings attended this presentation on September 5, 2008 (II.a.9).

- All four wings have integrated an annual program review for staffing, facilities, and equipment/technology. The results of these annual program review components for facilities and equipment/technology have been compiled into spreadsheets and given to the appropriate planning bodies for prioritization, decision-making, and inclusion in the wing plans. This is now an on-going process, such that each year the spreadsheets are updated with new program review content (II.a.10; II.a.11).
The Student Learning Committee (SLC), responsible for SLO oversight, has received a Student Services wing trend analysis, and the 2007-2008 instructional and Administrative Services program reviews. Using a rubric, the committee evaluated these documents, and results were compiled. The SLC created a comprehensive trend analysis draft document, which was reviewed and endorsed in November 2008. The committee will discuss final approval of this document in March 2009. The draft document was disseminated to all planning councils in December 2008, and the finalized document will be sent to the appropriate planning councils for prioritization in spring 2009 (II.a.12; II.a.13).

At the Accreditation Task Force it was decided on September 3, 2008, that all program reviews would undergo peer review that involved reviewers external to the division (in the case of instructional reviews) or external to the wing (in the case of other wings). This assures a higher level of quality control and allows for wider participation in the program review process (II.a.14; II.a.15).

**Instructional Wing:**

The instructional wing represents nearly 80% of college operations, with student learning being the ultimate focus of every member of the college community. The program review process and forms have improved data analysis of key student learning indicators. Furthermore, use of this data has been more thoroughly integrated into decision-making in the wing.

- Program review for the instructional wing includes data analysis of student enrollment, program completion for career programs, retention, success, and achievement of SLOs (II.a.16; II.a.17).
- The prompts for program review were revised in order to improve the analysis of data and to encourage examination of the cause and sources of the data (II.a.16; II.a.17).
- The Deans’ Council used the annual program review equipment/technology documents to disperse 2008-2009 State Funded Equipment Funds (II.a.18).
- The Instructional Planning Council used the annual staffing program reviews to prioritize full-time faculty hire requests in October 2008 (II.a.19; II.a.20).
- The SLC created a draft trend analysis document, in which trends were statistically measured by frequency of request, and through categorization of departmental needs. Trends identified ranged from concerns about faculty hiring, facilities, and student retention rates. The SLC trend analysis document will be finalized in March 2009 and submitted to all planning councils. The use of comprehensive trend data compiled from program reviews ensures that the instructional wing has a means of overcoming a silo-effect and truly allows for more comprehensive and meaningful analysis of data (II.a.12).

**Student Services:**

The Student Services wing takes particular pride in having a long-standing process of self-evaluating the level of success its support services provide. This includes the use of appropriate data and meaningful analysis of that data.
The Student Services program review process relies heavily on data analysis of enrollment trends, student success, retention, completion and achievement. Given the more support-specific role of Student Services programs, the data sources and analysis have been adapted to support programs (II.a.21; II.a.22).

As part of its comprehensive program review process, Student Services integrated the assessment of two SLOs for each program undergoing program review (II.a.23).

100% of departments within Student Services have undergone comprehensive program review. Beginning in 2008-2009, this is the same review process for all wings, and to date, 100% of all Student Services programs have identified PSLOs, with 80% having been assessed (II.a.24).

To aid in analysis of data, Student Services has practiced intra-wing peer review for many years. Beginning in March 2009, comprehensive program reviews will also undergo inter-wing program review (II.a.25; II.a.26).

President’s Wing:
The President’s wing has not previously undergone program review. However, in the on-going discussions of lessons learned from last year’s new three-year cycle program review experience in the other three wings of the college, it was immediately recognized that the President’s wing provides important student and college-wide support services that would greatly benefit from formal, rigorous program review, including the meaningful analysis of appropriate data.

Five of the six departments within the President’s wing are undergoing program review for the first time. As part of the process, departments wrote PSLOs. These PSLOs and their proposed assessment methods were integrated into the department’s program review forms. Additionally, each department must recommend appropriate data to determine its effectiveness (II.a.27; II.a.28; II.a.29; II.a.30; II.a.31).

Information Technology (IT) services underwent a substantial reorganization this year. IT also completed program review this year. As part of the IT assessment process, the Technology Committee is devising a survey to generate data on user satisfaction and user needs. The survey will investigate service levels, customer satisfaction, and user needs. The survey will be distributed to students and faculty in February 2009 and to staff in March 2009. The data will be compiled, analyzed, and distributed in spring 2009. It will also be included as data/support for the IT strategic plan (II.a.27; II.a.32).

To facilitate comprehensive and meaningful analysis of data, the program reviews generated by the President’s wing will undergo an inter-wing peer review process in February/March 2009 (II.a.33).

Administrative Services:
At Orange Coast College it is widely recognized that every component of our operations directly affect the success of our students, and this includes our Administrative Services programs and departments. The Administrative Services wing has embraced the program review process and is actively engaged in the new three-year cycle.
Program level outcomes have been identified and incorporated into the program review forms for Administrative Services. Data compiled on work load, service records, work-order requests and stakeholder surveys will be evaluated to assess these outcomes and to prioritize the Administrative Services wing plan (II.a.34; II.a.35).

As of fall 2008, three of the seven departments under Administrative Services had completed the new method of program review involving comprehensive data analysis. Two departments had performed survey data collection: Personnel Services and Public Safety. All seven departments will be included in the 2009 college survey for data collection (II.a.36; II.a.37; II.a.38).

To aid in data analysis, Administrative Services refined its past peer review process and implemented its new method of both intra- and inter-wing peer review in January/February 2009 (II.a.39; II.a.40).

b. Make improvements to its programs based on results of enhanced program review.

College-Wide:

The college has made significant improvements based on program review. This section lists the most important improvements made in the last year and which have a college-wide impact.

After one year of the new program review cycle, many improvements have been made to the program review and planning process.

• A problem identified in the first cycle of program review was the need to clearly define the difference between equipment and supplies for planning and budgeting purposes. The SLC observed this trend and discussed the need to improve the program review forms and/or process so that the distinction between supplies and equipment was explicit, thereby facilitating the planning process (II.b.1; II.b.2).

• The SLC is in the process of finalizing a comprehensive trend analysis document by analyzing the program review documents submitted last year. The process of compiling a comprehensive trend analysis has already demonstrated its usefulness in planning. The evidence of this is that the four wings, in drafting their three-year plans, all availed themselves of the SLC’s trend draft documents distributed last fall. This enables the wing plans to have a means of integrating overall trends identified in a comprehensive analysis of program review (II.b.1; II.b.3; II.b.4; II.b.5; II.b.6; II.b.7).
• The SLC recognized the need to create more common processes for prioritizing hiring requests across staffing units. SLC recommended that all wings and the Planning and Budget Committee write and utilize rubrics for prioritization of all hiring requests. The instructional wing had already been using a rubric for prioritizing hiring requests for several years. A draft rubric for classified staff hiring request was presented to Planning and Budget on February 12, 2009 and will be tested for the first time on February 26, 2009. This new process, based on program review analysis, will greatly improve the college’s ability to meaningfully prioritize staffing needs across wings (II.b.8; II.b.9; II.b.10).

• The SLC recommended the development of a process to track facilities needs across the college. Spreadsheets itemizing facilities requests and equipment/technology requests were created. These two spreadsheets are distributed to all four wings of college to facilitate prioritization of facilities projects and equipment/technology projects—concerns that crosses all four wings. The creation and use of these spreadsheets, based on the SLC’s recommendation, and compiled from elements of program review, are essential to the college’s success in planning and decision-making (II.b.11; II.b.12).

Instructional Wing:
The instructional wing has for many years engaged in the process of program review. It is with the new enhanced program review process, the new three-year cycle, and the vast improvements made in integrating program review into decision-making and planning that this wing has experienced many recent benefits. Key improvements are listed below.

■ Relying on the annual equipment/technology reviews from 2007-2008, the Dean’s council distributed State Funded Equipment (SFE) funds for purchasing supplies and equipment needed for the classroom. The prior process for determining supplies and equipment funding relied on individual divisional practices. Compiling supply and equipment requests made in the program reviews from 2007-2008 created a macro-picture from which the deans could better identify needs and costs. Allocating funds based on program review requests was a small, but much more efficient adjustment to the process (II.b.13; II.b.14).

■ As a result of the Office of Instruction’s program review process, a new staffing need was identified and the position, Staff Aide, was approved through the college’s planning committees. The position was filled in February 2009 (II.b.15).

■ As a result of program review, the English department identified a trend responsible for the drop in enrollment of 100 students in its literature program. After identifying this trend, the department made adjustments to its scheduling, and in fall 2008, the semester following the program review, literature enrollment showed a substantial increase (II.b.16).

■ The library’s program review resulted in placing research guidelines online as well as updating/rescheduling workshops as a direct result of student surveys, which were part of the program review assessment method (II.b.17; II.b.18).
Career Services conducted a program review of its Internship Academy and as a direct result has improved its handbook and increased orientations, both of which have contributed to the highest number of internship academy enrollments since the program’s inception (II.b.19; II.b.20).

Program review yielded improvements in the course content, course creation, and/or course offerings in numerous areas, including Counseling, Library, Interior Design, Physical Education/Athletics, Computer Science, Economics, Psychology, Fashion, Architecture, Film/Video, Emergency Medical Technician, Chemistry, Welding, Dental Assisting, Art History, Respiratory Care, English as Second Language, Accounting, Theatre, Political Science and American Studies, and Business Administration (II.b.21-41).

Programs reporting staffing changes due to program review include Library, Physical Education/Athletics, Architecture, Accounting, and Respiratory Care (II.b.42-46).

Programs reporting facility changes due to program review include the Student Success Center, Interior Design, Physical Education/Athletics, Theatre, Architecture, Anthropology, and Chemistry (II.b.47-53).

Programs reporting significant equipment/technology improvements due to program review include Counseling, Diagnostic Medical Sonography, Cardiovascular Technology, Architecture, Welding, and Dental Assisting (II.b.54-58).

Programs that have significantly changed their program curriculum include Architecture, Interior Design, Theatre, and Psychology (II.b.59-62).

Student Services:
The Student Services wing has embraced the new program review process and timeline and has experienced tangible program improvements due to the much more explicit integration of program review into the planning and decision-making processes of the college. Recent key improvements are listed below.

As a result of the program review process, the Children’s Center determined the need for new playground equipment based on safety concerns identified through the process and analysis of growth trends. The request for new playground equipment went through the new planning process and culminated in the installation and use of new playground equipment (II.b.63).

The Financial Aid annual staffing program review recommended the need for more staff based on the use of workloads as a source of data for analysis and future growth based on trend estimates. This has resulted in the transfer of a staff member from a different department into Financial Aid to help with the increased work load and to aid the efficiency of the department (II.b.64).

The data analysis in program review of the Student Government showed the need to expand the facilities for ASOCC. This expansion is currently in process (II.b.65).

The Student Health Center analyzed user frequency and projected growth trends in its program review which resulted in a recommendation for new furniture. The furniture request has gone through the planning process and has been installed in the Center (II.b.66).
In conjunction with the Title III Coordinator, Enrollment Services identified in its program review the need for software that would track at-risk students to help increase retention. The result was the combined efforts of the Title III Coordinator, the Dean of Enrollment Services, and the IT department to install a tracking system in fall 2008, with continued improvement made in spring 2009; to monitor students utilizing the Student Success Center; and to help identify and support at-risk basic skills students (II.b.67).

President’s Wing:

Although new this year to the formal program review process, the President’s wing has also benefited from improvements to its programs and operations as a direct result of program review. Evidence of this is listed below.

- An outside consultant’s evaluation recommended the IT department be moved into the President’s wing to improve oversight and to centralize the planning process for IT college needs. The consultant’s report and the reorganization plan have been included as components of IT’s program review where they were analyzed and used as a foundation for program improvement recommendations (II.b.68; II.b.69; II.b.70).

- It is the program review process that is allowing IT to better address needs and make recommendations for improvement. A specific need was identified from the annual technology component of program review undertaken by all programs in all wings. This need was for a more reliable and dispersed wireless network to facilitate learning and classroom instruction. The Technology Committee forwarded this identified need to the IT department, where it is being addressed as part of its program review (II.b.71; II.b.72).

Administrative Services:

Of the three departments that underwent comprehensive program review in 2007 – 2008, two have experienced tangible improvements as a direct outcome of the process. An additional benefit emanating from the Administrative Services wing and providing college-wide benefits is the creation of better facilities planning tools.

- Personnel Services identified the need to modify furniture layout to improve customer service and confidentiality. The Administrative Services Planning Council (ASPC) reviewed and ranked this need as the highest facilities priority for the wing. The modification was possible with existing surplus furniture and was completed in January 2009 (II.b.72; II.b.73).

- Public Safety, based on program review, made improvements in facilities, communication, and equipment. New carpet and paint were identified as needs, placed on the deferred maintenance list, and completed in summer 2008. Quarterly staff meetings have been organized to allow staff more opportunity to participate and suggest improvements. The dispatch process was improved through the reimplementation of centralized dispatch staff (II.b.74; II.b.75).

- The Program Review process has led to the creation of a facilities planning document. This document will be combined with the prioritized deferred maintenance list to create a master list of facility needs and priorities. The creation of a facilities planning document has promoted discussions regarding college facilities and maintenance needs for all wings and the prioritization of those needs into the three-year wing plans (II.b.76; II.b.77).
Recommendation 3:

The team recommends that the College a) 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. b) 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. c) 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. d) The process should draw upon findings and recommendations contained in the program review and be filtered through the College’s planning committee structure.

The college has worked diligently this past year to refine its planning process across the college. The college is organized into four wings, each wing has its own planning council, and each planning council is organized to ensure participatory governance. The planning councils provide recommendations to the college-wide Planning and Budget Committee and to the Student Learning Committee. The purpose of these two committees is to make recommendations to the college President. In addition to the planning councils, there are three college-wide committees that report to the Planning and Budget Committee. These are the Outreach and Recruitment, Facilities, and Technology Committees.

Wing plans based on program review, learning outcomes, and data collection have been created for Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, and the President’s wing. These are three-year plans which address the Commission’s recommendation that the college engage in longer term planning. All wing plan goals are aligned with the Academic Master Plan as well as the institutional SLOs. The wing plan drafts were reviewed by the Planning and Budget Committee on December 8, 2008, and will be finalized later this spring.

The college has integrated its planning by aligning the comprehensive program review process across all four wings, each wing using the same forms and prompts to generate its program reviews. All program reviews undergo a peer review process which ensures comprehensive analysis of data and furthermore encourages discussions about planning across departments within a wing and departments across wings. The new process is already improving the college’s efficiency by allowing wings and departments to identify similar needs and to combine their plans for better allocation of funds and other resources.

This marks the first year of such comprehensive and integrated planning. The college intends to conduct the same review, revision, and presentation of wing plans to Planning and Budget each spring, incorporating the new data and recommendations from program review each year.

Statistical analysis of trends occurring in the instructional and Student Services program reviews were performed by members of SLC. The trend analysis work has allowed the college to create unified planning documents for equipment/technology and facilities.

These documents are based on program review and will be updated each spring as the cycle of a new program reviews are finalized. The collation of facilities and equipment requests has been used to draft the four wing plans. Additionally, the college is moving to a hiring plan for non-instructional personnel that mirrors the one used in
instruction for tenure-track hiring. This new process includes a three-time per year hiring request round (October, March, and June) which moves through the planning councils to Planning and Budget and utilizes a new rubric for prioritization of classified positions. The rubric was tested for the first time at the February 26, 2009, Planning and Budget meeting.

The college has worked to create a sustainable planning process, one that is transparent, fluid, and efficient. The current process also ensures all allocations will be based on program review, assessment of learning outcomes, and the examination of appropriate supporting data. A committee composed of three faculty members and one administrator has completed a first draft of a decision-making manual that explains the planning process and ensures transparency. The document contains planning flow charts of the allocation of resources for full-time faculty, classified, and management hiring; instructional equipment and supplies; and annual equipment/technology and facilities updates. The document also clarifies the deadlines and sequences for program review and the planning process.

The Planning and Budget Committee, which makes final recommendations for the allocation of resources to the college President, is the highest level planning committee at the campus. Members of this committee serve for three-year terms, as opposed to the more common one- or two-year terms for other committees. The increase in length of term was considered necessary to assure continuity and full-understanding of the planning process and reducing the learning curve by reducing the turnover of members. This length of term was a topic of discussion and included a Planning and Budget Committee vote. Additionally, three members of the college Planning and Budget Committee will now serve on the District Budget Committee, created by the Acting Chancellor and meeting for the first time on March 5, 2009.

The college continues to use the OCC Portal intranet as a document library, making available all committee meeting agendas, minutes, meeting schedules, and other pertinent documents available to all college staff members. This web-based repository provides both on- and off-campus access. Active discussions are taking place concerning the proposed improvements that constituents would like to see in the organization of the Portal. This demonstrates that the Portal is being used, and the college is engaged in continuous improvement of its communication methods.

The Academic Senate promotes transparency of process and decision-making. It endorsed the formation of a new faculty member subcommittee of the Senate, the Transparency Committee. This new body is working to review planning and decision-making processes and then make recommendations to the Senate.

The college is making clear progress towards developing a sustainable planning and allocation process and on making that process transparent to stakeholders.

a. **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.**

b. The process should draw upon findings and recommendations contained in the program review and be filtered through the College’s planning committee structure.
Human resource planning:

Human resources represent the most significant investment the college makes, accounting for approximately 89% of the total college budget. Drawing upon program review findings and using the college’s planning structure, improvements have been made this past year in both the way the college prioritizes and plans to best allocate for this resource.

- The most dominant thread identified in the SLC’s trend analysis document, compiled from and cited in 15.4% of the 2007-2008 program reviews for instruction and Student Services, was the need for more full-time faculty and classified staff to meet the demands of our growing student population and the projected increasing workloads. The SLC recommended that all wing plans take this trend into consideration and plan accordingly (III.a.1).

- In response to this need, the Planning and Budget Committee, following the recommendations contained in the SLC trend analysis of program reviews from 2007-2008, has drafted and piloted the use of a prioritization rubric for the ranking of hiring requests for classified positions across all four wings. A similar hiring rubric for ranking requests for new faculty positions has been used by the instructional wing for several years. The hiring rubric will make the prioritization of classified hires more transparent (III.a.2; III.a.3).

- Instructional departments were required to utilize their comprehensive program reviews and the supporting data to create their full-time faculty hiring requests, which were then reviewed by members of IPC, who relied on a prioritization rubric to rank departmental needs and to allocate funds for hiring new full-time faculty. IPC has continued to refine the rubric process, which includes both qualitative and quantitative data, and recommended in 2008 the hiring of eight faculty positions (III.a.4; III.a.5).

- Relying on the rubric results and the recommendation of the IPC, the Planning and Budget Committee approved six of the eight positions in December 2008 and February 2009 (III.a.6; III.a.7).

- The new three-year cycle and rubric hiring process has also triggered a college-wide discussion regarding the method of “replacement” allocations. Previously, replacement hires for classified positions tended to be automatic rather than planned, with requests coming at any time during the year. The college planning bodies did not have time or a mechanism to rank short-term or long-term hiring needs across the college. Though the practice is still fairly new, dialogue has led to a reaffirmation of the three-times per year hiring request cycle as well as a college-wide common rubric to establish priorities (III.a.8; III.a.9; III.a.10; III.a.11).

- The college has also agreed to allow positions of a sensitive nature, such as those that are needed for specific safety and compliance reasons, to be brought forward more often than the tri-annual cycle (III.a.12).

- The new Planning and Budget process of accepting hiring requests only three-times a year rather than on a continual basis has given departments and services the time to better identify their hiring goals and to reprioritize or reorganize their work loads as well as to use results from program review and assessment processes.
• The Financial Aid annual staffing program review recommended the need for additional staff based on the use of workloads as a data source and future growth based on trend estimates. This has resulted in the transfer of a staff member from a different department into Financial Aid to help with the increased work load and to aid the efficiency of the department (III.a.13).

• An example of an administrative position following the college’s planning process from start to finish comes from the IT department. Based on an outside consultant’s report in fall 2007 which analyzed user statistics, enrollment growth, and service records, the college approved a reorganization plan that included the creation and hire of a lead IT administrator. Review and approval took place in the Technology Committee, as well as in all wing planning councils. Their recommendation for hiring this position was presented and approved by the Planning and Budget Committee on October 23, 2008. The hiring was successful, with the new manager reporting to duty in February 2009 (III.a.14; III.a.15; III.a.16).

• After examining data of user trends and device usage, the IT department reorganized into three sections. As part of the process, the Interim Senior Director of IT, using the consultant’s report as a guideline, reorganized by shifting staff into areas of most need and to better utilize staff talents. Though the workload measurements demonstrated a need to hire more technicians, the Interim Senior Director recommended a more efficient use of staffing resources by creating a pool of technicians to float between regional areas, thus conserving costs and maximizing the use of staff. Additionally, a standing agenda item of the Technology Committee is now an organizational effectiveness report from the IT department (III.a.17; III.a.18).

Physical Resource Planning:
A simple stroll across the campus reveals that physical resources are a high college priority. With the passage of Measure C, the college has benefited from a significant inflow of funds primarily dedicated to physical improvements. The physical campus has changed dramatically over the past four years with new buildings, renovations to existing structures, signage improvements, and the advent of continuous construction. The college has also experienced continuous improvement in its planning processes for physical resources.

- The Student Learning Committee (SLC) recommended that better college-wide methods of developing and tracking facilities needs be created and implemented. To that end, the Facilities Committee created a comprehensive spreadsheet by compiling the annual equipment/technology reviews. This document identifies the specific request, the program review from which the request was generated, the reasons/justifications for the requests, and a timeline for accomplishing the tasks (III.a.19).
This facilities planning document will be used as a resource in the development of three-year wing plans. Each year the planning document will be updated and will be distributed to planning councils, who will in turn complete an annual review and revision of their wing plans (III.a.20).

Included in the planning process executed by the wings, facilities requests will be prioritized. The plans will be returned to the Facilities Committee to forward onto Planning and Budget for approval and allocation. Projects that are unfunded will be sent back to the wings for reprioritization (III.a.20).

A spreadsheet has been created to monitor “Measure C” bond funds over the next five years. The spreadsheet includes building plans as well as their estimated costs to facilitate budgeting and allocation of the funds for college development (III.a.21).

A Title III grant was awarded to the college in October of 2007 to develop its pre-transfer curriculum and address the specific basic skills needs of the college’s underprepared and at-risk students. The grant has incorporated facility needs into its comprehensive five year plan. Currently the Title III Coordinator is working on establishing space specifically for the basic skills programs in the Math, ESL, World Languages, and English departments (III.a.22).

In 2008 the deferred maintenance list was reviewed by the Facilities Planning committee and presented to the Planning and Budget Committee for consideration of funding. During the May 2008 and June 2008 Planning and Budget Committee meetings the list was reviewed and $900,000 from ending balance was identified for deferred maintenance projects. The projects were scheduled for the summer and fall of 2008. In the summer of 2008 approximately $500,000 in projects were completed (III.a.23; III.a.24).

With the State Budget issues identified in the early fall of 2008, the Planning and Budget Committee made the recommendation to hold on the remainder of deferred maintenance projects in order to determine if mid-year budget cuts were necessary. The committee members have demonstrated a much higher level of planning proficiency now that they have comprehensive planning document, such as the deferred maintenance list (III.a.25).

**Technological Resource Planning:**

Technology, both infrastructure and end-user equipment/applications, has become a much more significant component of college planning, particularly over the past ten years. While preparing the 2006 self study, the college realized a need for better planning and operational organization of its Informational Technology (IT) services. This past year, the college has succeeded in bringing many of the plans and recommendations from 2006 and 2007 to fruition.

As part of the revised comprehensive program review process, all departments perform an annual review of equipment/technology needs. Using these annual reviews, the Program Review Coordinator assembled a comprehensive equipment/technology planning document. This document has been presented to the Technology Committee and the Planning and Budget Committee, and has been forwarded to all planning councils (III.a.26; III.a.27; III.a.28; III.a.29).
Following the first cycle of our new program review process, confusion was apparent in distinguishing between the proper use of funds for equipment as distinct from technology as distinct from supplies (both instructional and non-instructional). As part of refining our planning process and ensuring accuracy, specific processes have been put into place to end this confusion and thereby assure accurate planning and allocation of funds (III.a.30; III.a.31).

The annual equipment/technology review forms and the comprehensive spreadsheet have streamlined divisional dispersal of State Funded Equipment funds. These documents allow the deans to better predict their future budgetary needs (III.a.26; III.a.27).

The college’s IT structure has been improved to allow clear communication between the different sections within the IT department, and between the IT department as a whole and its users. This new structure should allow the college to determine its technology needs and to budget for those needs. Since the last site visit in spring 2008, the IT department was centralized and moved into the President’s wing, and a new IT organization has been implemented. The reorganization allows clear delineations of responsibilities and methods for tracking user needs across the college. The IT department can now better determine its resources and its projected budgetary needs (III.a.17).

As part of the reorganization of the IT department, a planning process for IT development and acquisitions has been drafted. The IT department is combining needs identified in its own comprehensive program review with those already identified in other college departments by the Program Review Coordinator. This document, when finalized, will be sent to the Technology Committee for prioritization. After prioritization IT will design an operational plan and a budget, to be then sent on to Planning and Budget for allocation (III.a.32; III.a.33; III.a.34).

In December 2008, the Technology Committee created three new subcommittees for the purpose of drafting a new mission statement, a delineation of functions, and a rubric/ranking method for prioritization of technology requests from program review (III.a.35; III.a.36).

Following the first year of the new Program Review process, a spreadsheet of technology needs compiled from the annual program review for equipment/technology revealed an overlap between areas of the college. The process demonstrated the need for the Technology Committee to adopt the role of recognizing college-wide needs and providing a forum for coordinating these types of requests—ultimately assuring more efficient budgeting (III.a.35).

In its coordinating role, the Technology Committee will serve as the liaison body between the instructional and support service areas of college, the IT department, and the Planning and Budget Committee (III.a.35).

**Financial Resource Planning:**

Longer-term planning of financial resources is perhaps the greatest challenge the college faces, particularly in a multi-college district where competition for scarce resources can be exacerbating. The college has worked closely with district management and sister-colleges to adopt and implement a new budget model that establishes FTES targets for each college on a three-year basis, allowing the college to better plan for apportionment revenue.
California’s current financial emergency has heightened the college’s awareness of how important financial resource planning is and the need for flexibility in processes and models. At each Planning and Budget Committee meeting of the 2008-2009 year, there have been ongoing reports and updates as to the state budget impasse and potential funding reductions.

- Incorporating district FTES targets, the instructional wing has developed and implemented a budget allocation model for part-time/overload funding. This model is based on FTES generation, productivity measured by seat fill, student demand, and historical base-funding levels (III.a.37).

- Instructional divisions have participated in budget workshops led by the Director of Campus Budget and Financial Operations. These workshops continue to be scheduled as the divisions work to better budget methods using the Banner ERP system fully implemented a year ago (III.a.38).

- The Vice President of Administrative Services and the Director of Campus Budget and Financial Operations make regular presentations to planning councils, the Academic Senate, and the Planning and Budget Committee to inform and educate the college as to how the budgets are constructed, how the ending balance is derived, and where improvements are needed (III.a.39; III.a.40).

- The Vice President of Administrative Services and the Director of Campus Budget and Financial Operations prepared and presented a 2009 Budget Workshop for the college President and the vice presidents of instruction and Student Services. This workshop, conducted over a day and half, allowed the entire executive management team to closely review and gain a greater in-depth understanding of all wings’ budgets (III.a.41).

- The college President has presented to the Planning and Budget Committee a new funding practice for classified positions. Given that the available budget is insufficient to meet all classified permanent requests, the top prioritized requests will be funded as possible, and the remaining requests will be allowed up to one-year of hourly funding from the current year-end balance. The committee has approved this model and will implement it beginning February 26, 2009 (III.a.42).

b. 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.

Plans, with budget allocations, developed for the replacement of equipment and technology:

Whereas the previous section focused on planning, this section is more specific to plans with budgets. In the area of equipment and technology replacement, the college has made serious improvements which include methods for making more stakeholders aware of the replacement needs college-wide. Additionally, the college has refined planning methods and tools which allow for better budget estimates.
The new Senior Director of Information Technology is currently combining the technology planning document compiled by the Program Review Coordinator with the equipment replacement lists compiled by IT technicians. With a comprehensive list of identified technology needs, the Technology Committee and the Senior Director will group related items to streamline pricing and more efficiently budget funds. Once budgets have been determined, the list will be prioritized by IT and the Technology Committee to be forwarded on to the Planning and Budget Committee (III.b.1).

In 2008-2009, program review was the basis for allocating SFE funds. Relying on program review allowed deans in the instructional wing to allocate funds more quickly because the data showed the areas of most need. This process allows the deans to better predict what their budgetary needs will be in future years as they create a list of unfunded, and therefore future, requests (III.b.2).

Classroom technology needs, both upgrades and replacements, have been planned with input from the instructional wing and the IT department. These plans include budget needs. Measure C bond funds have served as the primary budget source for instructional IT (III.b.3; III.b.4).

Information technology infrastructure upgrades and replacements have been planned by the IT department and presented to the Planning and Budget Committee. Budget allocations have been approved by the Committee using ending balance funds. The Committee has recognized the need to build in on-going budget lines for planned replacements (III.b.5; III.b.6).

Plans, with budget allocations, developed for the repair and maintenance of buildings and facilities:

As noted in the previous section, the physical plant of the college is a top priority. The college is 60 years old and requires a high level of repair and maintenance. Additionally, many new buildings have been completed and others are in planning and construction stages. New facilities, particularly those that represent a net increase in square footage and those that increase the technological level of the spaces, require special maintenance. The college has and continues to improve its planning and budgeting in these areas.

The Administrative Services wing annually compiles a deferred maintenance list in consultation with its maintenance and operations staff. This list assesses the safety and comfort needs of faculty, staff, and students and determines the costs of repairs and maintenance. The list is regularly updated as projects are budgeted, funded, and completed (III.b.7).

The Facilities Master Plan is an overarching plan for college facilities. It will be annually revised to incorporate supporting documentation from program review and the deferred maintenance list (III.b.8).

- During fall 2008, a total list of facility needs from program review was compiled. This planning list was provided to each wing for confirmation and prioritization (III.b.9).
In spring 2009, a master list of deferred maintenance and program review needs will be prepared and prioritized by the campus Facilities Planning Committee. Annually, this “Facilities-Needs” list will be updated based on program review information and deferred maintenance assessment (III.b.10).

Plans, with budget allocations, developed for the hiring of instructional and non-instructional personnel:

The college has greatly improved hiring planning as addressed in section III.a. Budgets for staffing have traditionally been static, with vacancies and the subsequent salary savings providing the funds for replacement hires or reallocated for new position hires.

- Faculty hiring requests from instructional divisions are ranked by members of the IPC using common measurement criteria identified in a rubric. The college budgeting practice has been that faculty vacancies creating salary savings within the instructional wing have been allowed to stay within the wing and used for replacement positions. It is important to note that the wing prioritization process does not guarantee that each vacancy created will be replaced with a new hire in the same discipline. The actual disciplines that receive the new hires with the replacement funds are determined via the wing-wide prioritization process, which includes program review results (III.b.11; III.b.12).

- All hiring for classified and managerial positions is done on a tri-annual basis and is based on program review and analysis of data. The budgets for classified and management positions are not wing-specific (III.b.13).

- At the recommendation of SLC, the Planning and Budget Committee has recently drafted a rubric for ranking hiring requests of classified staff. The rubric was piloted on February 26, 2009 (III.b.14).

- Long-term budgets and hiring plans are complicated, due to the unpredictable nature of retirements and separations, especially among classified staff. The new three-times a year hiring schedule has allowed the college to have a more complete overview of its personnel needs. The current process includes a temporary budgeting solution: for any requested permanent position that is not approved due to insufficiently high prioritization, the college will provide one-year hourly funding from the current year’s ending balance. These positions may be brought back for reconsideration of permanent funding at the next hiring request meeting. This allows for longer-range planning while honoring classified staffing needs (III.b.15).
c. 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.

Transparency and, concomitantly, awareness of procedures, have both been greatly enhanced at the college. Overall, the college relies on a number of means for providing information about the basis for planning and decision-making. Transparency is provided in a variety of modes. These include published minutes and open meetings of all the major planning and decision-making bodies; regular meetings of the wing planning councils; reports from the SLC, Outreach and Recruitment, Facilities and Technology Committees; and the posting of all major planning and policy documents on the OCC Portal. The college recognizes that transparency of decision-making is an on-going area for continuous improvement.

- A subcommittee of the ATF, composed of the Academic Senate President, the Program Review Coordinator, the Curriculum Chair, and the Dean of Library and Institutional Research, has written a draft for a decision-making manual that details the college’s program review, planning, and budgetary processes. The document is modeled on the Moorpark College decision-making guide and will aid in making the planning process more transparent and in encouraging increased understanding and participation in shared governance throughout the college. A draft of the manual will be made available for college-wide review in spring 2009 (III.c.1).

- The Academic Senate created the Transparency Committee for the purpose of improving transparency of college processes and plans that relate to the “10 + 1” duties of the Senate. There is a special focus on the accreditation process (III.c.2; III.c.3; III.c.4).

- The Transparency Committee has met several times during fall and spring semesters this year and recently provided the ATF and the President with recommendations for strengthening the transparency of the college accreditation efforts and program review. The ATF and the President are reviewing these recommendations and working with the Transparency Committee chair, now a member of the ATF (III.c.5).

- The Program Review Coordinator has and continues to organize workshops for departments and divisions in the instructional wing on program review, writing PSLOs, and assessment training. These individual workshops are tailored to inform divisions of their specific role in the planning process and to familiarize faculty with the implementation of PSLOs in their assessments and program reviews. Transparency of decision making must include stakeholders being aware of the process, and this type of training helps assure this (III.c.6).

- An additional method of informing and making stakeholders aware of decision-making processes occurs in division meetings. All division deans are required to hold a minimum of three meetings per semester. The deans routinely discuss common college-wide agenda items to assure that consistent information is being conveyed to faculty and staff members (III.c.7 – 11).

- All planning documents, including peer-reviewed program reviews, three-year wing plans and drafts, and prioritization hiring lists for the instructional, Student Services, and Administrative Services wings, are made available to all college staff members on the OCC Portal (III.c.12).
■ The ability to see all the college needs in one document allows for a more complete and informed discussion regarding technology and facilities planning. To this extent, the college spreadsheets for facilities and equipment/technology needs and priorities allow all stakeholders this type of review (III.c.13; III.c.14).

■ Awareness of the ranking categories and the college priorities has allowed instructional departments to better assess their hiring needs through the use of data. Rubrics for hiring prioritization allow this awareness and are easily accessed via the OCC Portal (III.c.15; III.c.16).

■ Transparency is built into the planning process.
  - All wings utilize peer review in their program review process. Peer review allows individual wing members from different departments to understand the trends and needs of other departments within their wings. Program review is no longer an insular activity in which only individual department members are aware of the plan identified in program review.
  - Following the peer review process and finalization of the program review, wing plans are assembled by compiling the plans within program review. These wing plans, once drafted, are sent out to the various departments within the wing to review and prioritize.
  - In each stage of this process more members of individual wings are made aware of the plans identified by their wing and by other departments.
  - The new process lends itself to transparency and to stakeholder involvement in every stage of the process (III.c.17).

■ Concern regarding transparency of IT planning was identified in the 2007 and 2008 site visits, as well as the 2007 consultant’s report. The recent IT reorganization has allowed the college to review and discuss ways of facilitating more transparency of IT plans (III.c.18 – 21).

■ The Technology Committee is working with the newly hired Senior Director of Information Technology to identify ways of making IT planning more transparent. At the December meeting of the Technology Committee, a subcommittee was created to address mission and purpose. This subcommittee is actively meeting to determine the overall mission and purpose of the Technology Committee and to formalize how the committee fits into the college technology planning process. Preliminary conclusions include the Technology Committee providing oversight of campus technology, steering of IT planning, and promotion of technology resources. The overall goal is increased transparency and overall planning improvements (III.c.22 - 27).

■ The Technology Committee has formal plans to conduct three user surveys in spring 2009. Survey results will not only allow feedback, but results will also be published to allow greater transparency and invite discussion and feedback from college constituencies (III.c.28).
Commission Concern 1:

The College must demonstrate that it is in compliance with Eligibility Requirement 8, which requires that a) the institution’s degree programs “culminate in identified student outcomes.”

The 2007 and 2008 Commission reports stated that Commission Concern 1 and Concern 2 (below) were based on the 2006 self study statement that instructors are not contractually required to provide a syllabus.

Although at the time of the site visits in March 2007 and April 2008 the college had already identified Institutional SLOs (ISLOs) which are the SLOs for the Associate in Art and Associate in Science degree programs, the campus had no method for “ensuring” student awareness of those SLOs. A syllabus is seen as necessary for “identifying” student outcomes. The Commission’s first concern was resolved in three ways: CSLOs were approved for every course; a syllabus MOU was negotiated with the faculty union; and a process drafted by the syllabus task force which requires CSLOs on syllabi be made available to students was supported by the Academic Senate. In order to assure availability of course syllabi and by extension, course SLOs, every instructor is required to submit a copy of their course syllabus to their division office.

Our new program review process ensures that degree programs “culminate” in identified student outcomes. In writing their mission statements and their PSLOs as part of the program review process, programs aligned their learning outcomes with the ISLOs which are also the learning outcomes for OCC’s degree programs. With each cycle of program review, every program will be assessing and improving their programs to help students meet their SLO’s and the campus’ ISLOs.

a. The institution’s degree programs “culminate in identified student outcomes.”

■ As of November 2008 all course outlines of record contain identifiable student learning outcomes, and as of December 2008 all CSLOs were formally approved by the Curriculum Committee (C.I.a.1).

■ As of spring semester 2009 all course syllabi are required to include SLOs. The Coast Community College District and the faculty bargaining unit (AFT/CTE) mutually supported this mandate and memorialized this agreement in a Memorandum of Understanding signed on October 27, 2008 (C.I.a.2).

■ As of February 12, 2009 all certificate programs contain identifiable program level outcomes (C.I.a.3; C.I.a.4).

■ All programs undergoing comprehensive program review must include PSLOs and those PSLOs must be aligned with the campus ISLO’s as part of the program review process (C.I.a.5).

■ The learning outcomes for the Associate in Arts and the Associate in Science degrees are the Institutional SLOs which were approved by Planning and Budget on December 5, 2005, and are included in the Academic Master Plan, are integrated into program review and are published in the OCC catalog (C.I.a.6; C.I.a.7; C.I.a.8; C.I.a.9).
Despite general education requirements not being a “degree program,” they are recognized as a “Category 2” program since they lead to transfer. Discussion has taken place in the Academic Senate, Curriculum Committee, and IPC, with the decision made that a faculty team, led by the Program Review Coordinator, will begin work on drafting general education SLOs in spring 2009, with final approval to take place in fall 2009 (C.I.a.10).
Commission Concern 2: 

The College should a) define and publish “for each program the program’s expected student learning and achievement outcomes.”

The 2007 and 2008 Commission reports stated that Commission Concern 1 and Concern 2 (below) were based on the 2006 self study statement that instructors are not contractually required to provide a syllabus. This has been reconciled in part by the syllabus process described above (p. 31) which ensures student access to learning outcomes. It is also addressed by the Curriculum Committee’s work to include PSLOs in the college catalog. Additionally, PSLOs are made public by posting program review documents on the OCC Portal. The college has fully reconciled this concern by assuring that all programs have defined PSLOs and that all PSLOs are published.

a. Define and publish “for each program the program’s expected student learning and achievement outcomes.”

- In November 2008, the Syllabus Task Force drafted a policy and procedure for ensuring that all course syllabi have SLOs and are made available to students. Faculty must provide their division office in the first week of class either a paper or electronic copy of the syllabus for each course. The syllabi are collected and maintained by the office coordinators and are available for any student to review (C.II.a.1).

- As of spring 2009, all course syllabi are required to include SLOs. The Coast Community College District and the faculty bargaining unit (AFT/CTE) mutually supported this mandate and memorialized this agreement in a Memorandum of Understanding signed on October 27, 2008 (C.II.a.2).

- The Staff Development Coordinator, with the endorsement of the Academic Senate, organized one-hour workshops covering methods of incorporating SLOs in course syllabi and different methods for publishing course SLOs. Also, to facilitate inclusion of SLOs on course syllabi, the Staff Development Coordinator generated easily completed templates including prompts for course description, learning objectives, student learning outcomes, and student responsibilities. This template was made available on the OCC Portal (C.II.a.3; C.II.a.4; C.II.a.5; C.II.a.6).

- All program level SLOs for certificate programs will be published in the OCC catalog, effective 2009-2010 (C.II.a.7).

- All program review documents are available on the OCC Portal and contain PSLOs for each program. This allows a means of not only identifying but also publishing outcomes for all wings of the college: Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, and the President’s wing (C.II.a.8).

- Student Services identified two PSLOs for every student program. These PSLOs have been arranged in a brochure available on MyOCC and the OCC website. A targeted announcement containing the Student Services PSLOs will be sent to students at the beginning of each semester (C.II.a.9; C.II.a.10; C.II.a.11).
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.

The Coast Community College District (CCCD) has, over a significant period of time, maintained a relatively collegial atmosphere, with all its constituent groups operating in a decentralized model. This was an informal and undocumented process. The Accreditation Recommendations submitted in 2007 prompted the college and the district to examine the “delineation of specific district functions as distinct from those of the colleges’ functions.” At that time, the District and the college began a process to clarify and formalize the respective organizational roles, authority, and responsibilities.

In response to the observations of the evaluating team and the Commission Recommendation, the following documents were created:

- A revised Organizational Delineation of Responsibility and Process for Decision Making (XI.1)
- District Office/College Functioning Map (XI.2)
- Summary of Functions (XI.3)
- District Organizational Chart (XI.4)

These documents were vetted and will be reviewed periodically through the Chancellor’s Cabinet, the participatory governance structure for the District (XI.5; XI.6; XI.7). Additionally, each document has been communicated to and critiqued by constituent groups at the district and college levels.

The governing Board of Trustees has been informed on the progress of these ongoing discussions. It heard reports regarding our progress report at its regular meeting on November 19, 2008. The Board has also had under discussion the revision of the current Board Policy – 020-1-2 Duties of the Chancellor. A new policy 010-2-6.1, Delineation of Authority to District Chancellor and college Presidents, has been under discussion and was finalized at the Board’s meeting on January 21, 2009 (XI.8).

The documents related to the delineation of responsibilities will be disseminated to all college and district constituencies via existing communication channels and organizational structures during the spring of 2009. These documents will be posted on District and college electronic bulletin boards, websites, or portals. Established District and college committees such as planning teams, advisory councils, and Academic Senates will review and discuss them. In some cases, training workshops are expected to be conducted for the purpose of solidifying a clear understanding of respective organizational roles, authority, and responsibilities.
It should be noted that on January 7, 2009, the Board announced that the Chancellor is on leave and that the Vice Chancellor for Human Resources had been appointed Acting Chancellor. On January 21, 2009, the Board appointed the President of Coastline Community College to serve as Acting Chancellor. During this brief period of transition, there was some concern regarding the Board and Chancellor. To some in the District the governance process may appear to have been impacted. At the time of this report, there is close cooperation and organization of the Board and the Acting Chancellor. There is a strong commitment between the Board, District, and the three colleges to ensure that the business of the entire District remains a top priority.

The Board, District staff, college Presidents, and constituent groups take the accreditation process very seriously. As evidence of this ongoing commitment to meeting the standards, the trustees have established a Board Accreditation Sub-Committee to work with District staff and the college Presidents. In turn, the Presidents have been working with their respective staffs to address the recommendations of the Accreditation Teams.

The challenge now is to further define and revise the various functions between the District and colleges to improve effectiveness and efficiency, as well as leverage resources under the challenges of the current economic environment. The initial anxiety caused by the changes in leadership has calmed, as the Board of Trustees, Acting Chancellor, and college leaders continue to dedicate their efforts to conducting daily operations without interruption. The Acting Chancellor has already begun working with the Board to facilitate the transition, organize work on Board committees, and engage in discussions to clarify areas of responsibilities at the Board, District, and college levels.
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I.a.1. Curriculum Committee Minutes 12/10/08
I.a.2. Syllabus MOU
I.a.3. Syllabi Task Force Recommendation
I.a.4. Statement of Syllabi with SLOs
I.b.1. Guidelines for Writing PSLOS Document
I.b.2. PR Coordinator Training Summary
I.b.3. Adoption of Program Definition
I.b.4. ATF Minutes 8/25/08
I.b.5. ISLOs Document
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I.c.3. Student Services Chart
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I.c.8. Administrative Services PSLO Spreadsheet
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I.d.4. Allied Health List of Accrediting Agencies
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I.d.10. Student Success Center Success and Retention Statistics
I.d.11. Self-Paced Math and Tutor Expansion Memo
I.d.12. Completed PR Forms for Student Services (same as I.c.2)
I.d.13. Student Services Summary (same as I.c.1)
I.d.14. Title III Activity 2 Minutes 7/10/08
I.d.15. Student Services Trend Analysis
I.d.16. Student Services Planning Grid
I.d.17  Student Services Wing Plan
I.d.18  Wing Plan Model
I.d.19-23 President’s Wing PR
I.d.24  Draft of Technology Committee Survey
I.d.25  IT PSLOs (same as I.c.5)
I.d.26  Public Safety PR
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I.d.28  Public Safety Improvements
I.d.29  Personnel Services Procedural Manual
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I.d.31  Administrative Service Survey Samples

RECOMMENDATION 2:
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II.a.2  Academic Senate Minutes 5/13/08
II.a.3  IPC Minutes 5/7/08
II.a.4  Planning & Budget Minutes 6/5/08
II.a.5  ERA/Research Analyst, Senior Job Description
II.a.6  PR Coordinator Training Summary (same as I.b.2)
II.a.7  IPC Minutes 9/3/08
II.a.8  ATF Minutes 8/25/08
II.a.9  ACCJC Maradian’s PR PPT
II.a.10 Facilities Spreadsheet
II.a.11 Equipment/Technology Spreadsheet
II.a.12 SLC Trend Analysis Draft

II.a.13 Student Services Trend Analysis
II.a.14 ATF Minutes 9/3/08
II.a.15 Peer Review Rubric
II.a.16 PR Prompts and Analysis Guide
II.a.17 Economic Department’s PR
II.a.18 Deans’ Council Minutes 11/5/08
II.a.19 IPC Minutes 10/8/08
II.a.20 Sample of Staff Request Form
II.a.21 Student Services PR Form
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II.a.25 Student Services Peer Review Process (intra-wing)
II.a.26 Student Services Peer Review Process (inter-wing)
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II.a.27  IT Program Review
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II.a.34 Administrative Services PSLOs Compilation Document
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II.a.36 Maintenance and Operations PR
II.a.37 Public Safety PR
II.a.38 Personnel Services PR
II.a.39 Administrative Services Peer Review (internal)
II.a.40 Administrative Services Peer Review (external)
II.b.1  SLC Trend Analysis Draft
II.b.2 Decision Making Document Draft: Equipment and Supplies Flow Chart

II.b.3 Student Services Trend Analysis

II.b.4-7 Wing Plan Drafts

II.b.8 SLC Minutes 11/14/08

II.b.9 Planning & Budget Minutes 2/12/09
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II.b.17 Library Self Report: course improvements
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II.b.53 Student Success Center Self Report: facilities improvements
II.b.54 Counseling Self Report: equipment additions
II.b.55 Diagnostic Medical Sonography & Cardiovascular Tech Self Report: equipment additions
II.b.56 Architecture Self Report: equipment additions
II.b.57 Welding Self Report: equipment additions
II.b.58 Dental Assisting Self Report: equipment additions
II.b.59 Architecture Self Report: significant program change
II.b.60 Interior Design Self Report: significant program change
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II.b.62 Psychology Self Report: significant program change
II.b.63 Student Services: Children’s Center improvements
II.b.64 Student Services: Financial Aid improvement
II.b.65 Student Services: ASOCC improvement
II.b.66 Student Services: Student Health Center improvement
II.b.67 Student Services: enrollment management improvement
II.b.68 Consultant’s Report Recommendations
II.b.69 IT Reorganization Chart
II.b.70 IT Program Review
II.b.71 IT Goals & Objectives
II.b.72 Technology Committee 10/8/08
II.b.73 Personnel Program Review
II.b.74 ASPC Minutes 11/19/08
II.b.75 Public Safety Program Review
II.b.76 ASPC Minutes 1-23-08
II.b.77 Facilities Spreadsheet
II.b.78 Deferred Maintenance List 08/09

RECOMMENDATION 3:

III.a.1. SLC Trend Analysis
III.a.2. Planning & Budget Minutes 2/12/09
III.a.3. Staffing Prioritization Rubric
III.a.4. IPC Hiring Rubric (tenure-track hires)
III.a.5. IPC Ballot
III.a.6. Planning & Budget Minutes 12/4/08
III.a.7 Planning & Budget Minutes 2/12/09
III.a.8 SLC Minutes 11/14/08
III.a.9 ATF Minutes 12/1/08
III.a.10 ATF Minutes 1/12/09
III.a.11 Planning & Budget Minutes 2/12/09
III.a.12 Planning & Budget Minutes 11/13/08
III.a.14 Technology Committee Minutes 12/18/07
III.a.15 Technology Committee Minutes 5/13/08
III.a.16 Planning & Budget Minutes 10/23/08
III.a.17 IT Reorganization Plan
III.a.18 Technology Committee Agenda
III.a.19 Facilities Spreadsheet
III.a.20 Wing Plan and PR Planning Timeline
III.a.21 Measure C Spreadsheet
III.a.22 Title III Facilities Plan
III.a.23 Budget Overview 2008
III.a.25 Planning & Budget Minutes 10/9/08
III.a.26 Annual Technology Review Forms
III.a.27 Equipment/Technology Spreadsheet
III.a.28 Technology Committee Minutes 10/22/08
III.a.29 Planning & Budget Minutes 10/30/08

III.a.30 Annual Review Forms (equipment and supplies)
III.a.31 Decision Making Document (equipment requests)
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III.a.33 IT Department Priority List
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III.a.35 Technology Committee Minutes 12/10/08
III.a.36 Description of Subcommittees of Technology Committee
III.a.37 Budget Model for Part-time/Overload Allocations
III.a.38 Fiscal Services Report on Budget Workshops
III.a.39 Administrative Services 6/5/08 PPT
III.a.40 Academic Senate Minutes 2/10/09
III.a.41 Budget Workshop Agenda
III.a.42 Planning & Budget Minutes 12/12/09
III.b.1 Prioritized List from IT with Budgets
III.b.2 Planning & Budget Minutes 10/10/08
III.b.3 IT Classroom Equipment Spreadsheets #1
III.b.4 IT Classroom Equipment Spreadsheets #2
III.b.5 IT Infrastructure Plan
III.b.6 Planning & Budget Minutes 10/24/08
III.b.7 Deferred Maintenance List
III.b.8 Facilities Master Plan with Prioritized List
III.b.9 Facilities Spreadsheet
III.b.10 Facilities Committee Minutes 8/7/08; 9/4/08; 10/2/08; 11/13/08; 2/5/09
| III.b.11 | IPC Hiring Rubric (tenure-track hires) |
| III.b.12 | IPC Hiring Ballot |
| III.b.13 | Decision Making Document Draft: Staffing Flow Chart |
| III.b.14 | Classified Staffing Rubric |
| III.b.15 | Planning & Budget Minutes 2/12/09 |
| III.c.1 | Decision Making Document Draft |
| III.c.2 | Academic Senate Minutes 9-23-08 |
| III.c.3 | Academic Senate Minutes 9-23-08 |
| III.c.4 | Transparency Committee Statement of Purpose |
| III.c.5 | ATF Minutes 2/2/09 |
| III.c.6 | PR Coordinator Training Summary |
| III.c.7-11 | Dean's Council Minutes and Division Meeting Minutes (folder) |
| III.c.12 | Program Reviews and Peer Reviews Published on the Portal |
| III.c.13 | Facilities Spreadsheet |
| III.c.14 | Equipment/Technology Spreadsheet |
| III.c.15 | IPC Hiring Rubric (tenure-track hires) |
| III.c.16 | IPC Portal: Hiring Criteria Document |
| III.c.17 | Decision Making Document (Peer Review Process) |
| III.c.18 | Instructional Wing Plan |
| III.c.19 | Student Services Wing Plan |
| III.c.20 | Administrative Services Wing Plan |
| III.c.21 | President’s Wing Plan |
| III.c.22 | Technology Committee Minutes 12/10/08 |
| III.c.23 | Planning & Budget Minutes 10/23/08 |
| III.c.24 | IPC Minutes 10/08/08 |
| III.c.25 | SSPC Minutes 12/12/07 |
| III.c.26 | ASPC Minutes 5/14/08 |
| III.c.27 | IT Reorganization Plan |
| III.c.28 | Draft of Technology Committee Survey |

**CONCERNS 1:**

- C.I.a.1 Curriculum Committee Minutes 12/10/08
- C.I.a.2 Syllabi MOU
- C.I.a.3 Curriculum Committee Minutes 3/4/09
- C.I.a.4 Certificate PSLOS
- C.I.a.5 Program Review Portal Site
- C.I.a.6 Planning & Budget Minutes 12/5/05
- C.I.a.7 Academic Master Plan
- C.I.a.8 Program Review form
- C.I.a.9 OCC AA & AS Degree Catalog Page
- C.I.a.10 SLC Minutes 11/14/08

**CONCERN 2:**

- C.II.a.1 Syllabus Task Force Procedure
- C.II.a.2 Syllabi MOU
- C.II.a.3 Staff Development Workshop Syllabi Flier
- C.II.a.4 Staff Development Syllabi Template
- C.II.a.5 Staff Development Syllabus Checklist
- C.II.a.6 Staff Development Portal Page
C.II.a.7 Curriculum Committee Minutes 3/4/09
C.II.a.8 Program Review Portal Page
C.II.a.9 Student Services Trifold Brochure on MyOCC
C.II.a.10 Student Services Trifold Brochure on OCC website
C.II.a.11 Student Service Targeted Announcement

RECOMMENDATION 11:

XI.1 Organizational Delineation of Responsibility and Process for Decision Making
XI.2 District Office/College Functioning Map
XI.3 Summary of Functions
XI.4 District Organizational Chart
XI.5 Chancellor Cabinet Membership 2008-2009
XI.6 Chancellor Cabinet Summary 7/7/08
XI.7 Chancellor Cabinet Summary 10/6/08
XI.8 Board Policy 010-2-6.1
APPENDIX II
Planning Agenda Goals

Orange Coast College identified 70 Planning Agenda goals in its year 2006 accreditation Self Study. Following is a list of those goals and a brief description of the progress the College has made toward accomplishing them since the accreditation site team’s visit.

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

I.A. Mission

Planning Agenda:

I.A.1.

1. Develop a plan for a Student Success Center.

   Progress: Orange Coast College developed a plan and opened a Student Success Center in 2008. Two instructional associates were hired using Title III funds: one to coordinate the supplemental instruction program, which started in Fall 2008, followed by an associate to coordinate the writing area in fall 2009. Services provided include tutoring—both online and in-person, study skills workshops, and supplemental instruction. In 2008-2009 the campus implemented an Early Alert System to identify students who would benefit from Student Success Center resources. The goal is to institutionalize programs and personnel currently funded by Title III funds.

2. Expand the College’s online course offerings and increase corresponding computing support.

   Progress: During the past three years (Fall 2007-Fall 2009), OCC’s online courses have increased approximately 10% each year. Partly due to program reviews and assessments, faculty and departments increasingly use Blackboard as a teaching tool. They are also adding to the number of online courses they offer each year. The College has assigned three staff members to support online instruction, including course development for Blackboard, Blackboard administration, and course assistance for large group courses. Grants of $5,000 to $6,000 were awarded in 2007 to provide additional resources for further development of Blackboard, including updating the software and providing faculty training. In addition, the College offers “open lab hours” each week to help faculty members develop online courses. Faculty members
continue to improve their ability to teach online courses, and their students are successfully completing courses in this new learning medium.

3. Provide increased online student services.

**Progress:** Since its December 2006 Self Study, the College has implemented a multi-service software suite, the Voyager Project, which includes Banner, MyOCC, and Blackboard. MyOCC’s single sign-on option makes it possible for students to access registration information, review unofficial transcripts, access a dedicated campus email address, pay fees, and receive important information about campus events and activities.

**Planning Agenda:**

**I.A.2.**

1. Continue to ensure that the current version of the Mission Statement is posted in prominent locations on the campus, on the website, and in all official handbooks, including the *Class Schedule*.

**Progress:** The College’s Communications and Marketing Department is responsible for publishing the latest version of the Mission Statement in major publications, including catalogs, class schedules, the official handbook, the OCC website, and the OCC Portal. In addition, the Communications and Marketing Department posted attractive graphic displays of the Mission Statement in 25 key locations across the campus using new hardware so changes can be updated easily.

**Planning Agenda:**

**I.A.3.**

1. Ensure that the review process for the Mission Statement will begin in the fall and culminate in early spring to enable any revisions to be included in all future publications.

**Progress:** Orange Coast College’s Academic Master Plan Subcommittee, which reports to the Planning and Budget Committee, began a review of the Mission Statement in Fall 2007. It compiled results of an April 2007 campus planning retreat, which added a Vision Statement to the Mission Statement to reflect the changing climate of the college and community. The Communications and Marketing Department updated the new version of the Mission Statement in all college publications and campus-wide signage.

**Planning Agenda:**
I.A.4.

1. **Incorporate the Mission Statement more fully into institutional planning and decision making.**

   **Progress:** In Spring 2008, 50 members of the campus community, including administrators, faculty, and staff members, participated in two retreats to re-evaluate the Mission Statement and ensure that it addressed the changing needs of the College and its changing demographic. A Vision Statement was added, and all campus employees were invited to respond to the proposed changes. The College’s major planning committees—Planning and Budget Committee, Instructional Planning Council, Curriculum Committee, Technology Committee, Program review, and the Academic Senate—all refer to the Academic Master Plan values that represent the Mission Statement to guide their decision making.

**Planning Agenda:**

I.B.2.

1. **Include program review in planning.**

   **Progress:** Student learning committees have been assembled to determine the viability and vitality of curriculum as it applies to college programs. Program review is data driven and looks at access, enrollment, and retention. As of Spring 2009, 100% of courses and programs had completed student learning outcomes (SLOs), which will be posted on the College’s website for easy public access. Assessment of SLOs is an on-going three-year cycle, which started in the 2007-2008 academic year. Summary reports have been completed to address timelines and determining whether processes have been put into place.

2. **Incorporate student learning outcomes into the Academic Master Plan.**

   **Progress:** In Fall 2008, 100% of all course student learning outcomes (CSLOs) for a total 1,387 course outlines of record were completed and approved by the Curriculum Committee. The College has set a target date of Spring 2010 for 100% completion of all program student learning outcomes (PSLOs) across all wings of the College, including Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, and the President’s wings. As a part of program review, all programs must identify PSLOs that support a program-specific mission statement and demonstrate alignment with institutional learning outcomes. Assessment of SLOs occurs in an on-going three-year cycle, which started in the 2007-2008 academic year.

**Planning Agenda:**
I.B.3., I.B.5.

1. Integrate program review recommendations into the planning and budget process.

   Progress: Program review is in the final year of a three-year planning cycle. Currently student learning outcomes (SLOs) and program student learning outcomes (PSLOs) are being assessed to obtain data and measure their effectiveness. Outcomes from assessment are the driving force for planning and budgeting. The three-year plan in each of the three wings—Instruction, Student Services and Administrative Services—integrate the program review process into planning and budget decisions. Data from program review plays a leading role in planning for each program and determining how resources will be allocated.
Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

II.A. Instructional Programs

Planning Agenda:

II.A.1.

1. Evaluate the frequency of program review and revise the review process as is deemed appropriate.

Progress: Since 1999, program review has been a six-year process for assessment of the Instructional and Student Services wings at Orange Coast College. In response to ACCJC’s revised standards that require program review to be integrated into the planning process and assessment of student learning outcomes to be institutionalized, the College introduced a three-year cycle for program review in 2007 (evidence: Program review portal site). In addition to the three-year program review, annual documents distributed in the fall and the spring (annual staffing requests, annual technology requests, and annual facility requests) clearly define and streamline the process. A new committee, the Student Learning Council (SLC), was created in 2007 to write an annual summary of the current year’s final comprehensive program reviews. Peer Review for Instruction, with a minimum of two to three faculty members, was instituted the first year of the new program review. Faculty members use rubrics to analyze each program review draft before they submit them for a final draft.

2. Provide training for the Curriculum Committee and each program review committee in the development and assessment of Student learning outcomes.

Progress: In Spring 2006, training began for faculty to develop student learning outcomes (SLOs) for their courses. In Fall 2007, Curriculum Committee members received a training session on writing and recognizing SLOs, which the committee requires to be included in course outlines of record (CORS). In Fall 2008, the Program review Coordinator and the Curriculum Review Chair sponsored an SLO training session for all departments and divisions. The training day was labeled “Fiesta Friday” and included a free meal as part of the SLO and assessment training. The College determined that an SLO coordinator was needed to continue assisting and providing support for faculty. The position, Student Learning Outcome and Assessment Coordinator (SLOAC), was filled in November 2009. In Fall 2008, the College held two campus-wide forums on program review and assessment. The first workshop addressed accreditation goals, how to plan the assessment of SLOs, and writing of the Midterm Report. A second workshop, held with outside experts from Cabrillo Community College and Barstow Community College, provided additional training about the use of assessment tools and the overall assessment process. Focus Day was a third event that centered on unifying the campus to accomplish major objectives. Finally, the College established a “planning day” to encourage everyone on campus to
create their SLO and assessment plans for this year. The newly appointed SLOAC and the Program review Coordinator will lead a subcommittee with representatives from all wings to plan additional training as needed. Student Services has developed a grid mapping all SLOs from 2008-2009 that documents the effectiveness of SLOs and their assessments.

3. Include the Mission Statement and the Statement of Institutional Commitment in the Curriculum Committee Handbook; devise practices that will ensure that the Mission Statement is an intended and integral part of the College’s curriculum processes.

**Progress:** There are two specific areas where OCC has addressed this objective in the planning agenda: program review and in the master planning process. The theme of the Mission Statement is carried throughout the program review process, ultimately creating planning goals that reflect the overall mission of Orange Coast College. Two years ago, OCC began creating a stronger and more effective master planning process. Last year Orange Coast College held three significant breakout sessions on planning that included representatives from all constituent groups. A subcommittee was formed to organize the skeleton of a master plan based on the first of the three breakout sessions. These efforts resulted in a new Mission Statement and a set of values (CLASS), which replaced the existing institutional commitment statement. The Mission Statement is now part of program review and the planning process. Each department and program is required to clearly link their stated goals to the values representing the institutional commitment of Orange Coast College as well as the overall college goals. In addition, Program Review recently created a committee to improve the process through assessment. In addition, a newly formed campus-wide committee, College Council, is looking over the Mission Statement following a campus-wide climate survey. The results will indicate if the Mission Statement should be revised. Through the work of this committee, the College is improving strategic planning by revising the master plan using the values linked to the planning assumptions. Since all major constituents are represented on College Council, the mission and institutional commitment is continuously part of the ongoing planning process.

**Planning Agenda:**

**II.A.1.a.**

1. Incorporate student learning outcomes into the major planning documents of the College, namely the *Atlas*, the *Academic Master Plan*, the *Technology Master Plan*, and the *Facilities Master Plan*.

**Progress:** The College is presently completing the assessment phase of student learning outcomes. Once assessment is complete, student learning outcomes will be included in the *Atlas*. The *Academic Master Plan* includes student learning outcomes in its statement of values under “Learning.” It states: “We value measure learning
outcomes that guide continuous improvement. The institutional student learning outcomes (ISLOs) are Communication, Thinking Skills, Global Awareness, and Personal Development and Responsibility.” Student learning outcomes and assessment results are a part of planning at the department level. Allocation of resources based on data drives decision making in Planning and Budget. Those efforts determine asset allocation in the *Technology Master Plan* and the *Facilities Master Plan*.

**Planning Agenda:**

**II.A.1.b., II.A.2.d.**

1. Provide evidence of the effectiveness of specific delivery modes and teaching methodologies.

   **Progress:** During the 2007-2008 program review cycle, the College implemented analysis guides that prompt programs to review their data by modality and explore differences in data between delivery modes and teaching methodologies. This will enable the College to compare the effectiveness and success of various delivery modes, including online instruction, large groups, and traditional classrooms. Institutional Research and the Program review Committee will complete assessing effectiveness of these modalities in the Spring 2010 semester.

**Planning Agenda:**

**II.A.1.c.**

1. Complete identification of student learning outcomes at course and program levels.

   **Progress:** All course student learning outcomes were written by each department and added to the Course of Record. By Spring 2009, all full-time faculty included SLOs on all syllabi, and Program Student learning outcomes had been completed.

2. Assess Student learning outcomes at all levels.

   **Progress:** Two-thirds of all SLOs were assessed in Fall 2009. Campus-wide workshops were held to train faculty to assess SLOs through a Learning Outcomes Assessment Model. The planning timeline for program review, SLOs, and wing plans provides specific target deadlines and identifies responsible parties. The College will continue to assess remaining SLOs through the 2009-2010 academic year. In October 2009, the campus, through the Academic Senate, appointed a Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Coordinator (SLOAC), who will create a steering committee to provide support for the assessment process campus-wide as well as assessing the effectiveness of plans and processes.
Planning Agenda:

II.A.2., II.A.2.a., II.A.2.b.

1. Target training in the identification and assessment of student learning outcomes for the Curriculum Committee, Individual Program Review committees, and Student Services wing.

Progress: (only student services addressed. Training is not mentioned in report). The Student Services wing will complete assessment of its program student learning outcomes in Fall 2010. Student Services completed program student learning outcomes in 2009-2010 and has published them on the public website.

Planning Agenda:

II.A.2.c.

1. Provide comprehensive course and program sequencing in the Catalog and the Schedule and online.

Progress: During the 2009/2009 academic year, the Curriculum Committee reviewed all course outlines (1,392) for prerequisites and co-requisites, and changes were reflected in the 2009/2010 Catalog. The Office of Instruction requires a sequencing report from each academic division. To date, five of eight divisions have completed the report. Assessment through program review will indicate areas that need change or revision. Once assessment data is received from program review, any revisions to courses and programs will be submitted to the Curriculum Committee, and changes will appear in the Catalog, the Class Schedule, and online. The program review process will continually dictate the College’s sequencing needs.

Planning Agenda:

II.A.2.e.

1. Train faculty, in particular members of the Curriculum Committee and individual program review committees, in the development and assessment of student learning outcomes.

Progress: Training of faculty members, especially those on the Curriculum and program review committees, to develop and assess student learning outcomes, has been thorough and is complete. As evidence, the faculty have completed 100% of SLOs for all active courses of record. At this time, the Curriculum Committee is
developing SLOs for general education requirements that will be published in the 2010-2011 Catalog and Class Schedule in Fall 2010. Training included workshops and the introduction of template documents on the OCC Portal to assist faculty in the development and assessment of student learning outcomes. The Program Review Committee also conducted SLO assessment training at department and division meetings. In addition, a campus-wide assessment workshop, attended by 130 faculty members, was held in early October.

Planning Agenda:

II.A.2.f.

1. Integrate program evaluation into the planning process.

   **Progress:** The Orange Coast College Master Plan, which espouses the five values of community, learning, access, stewardship, and sustainability, links the Technology Master Plan and the Facilities Master Plan. All of the objectives are part of each wing’s three-year plan.

2. Provide all key planning committee members with copies of the College Mission Statement, ISLO Plan, and the Academic Master Plan goals.

   **Progress:** Each college vice-president, through the Instructional Planning Committee, is responsible for the dissemination of all key documents. The documents are also available on the OCC Portal which faculty, managers, and staff can access online. The College Mission Statement is also published on the College’s public website.

Planning Agenda:

II.A.2.h., II.A.2.i.

1. Develop an evaluation process to assure that student learning outcomes are not only identified in courses and programs, but also assessed to determine achievement.

   **Progress:** The Program Review Committee conducted workshops and meetings to help faculty and staff develop and assess SLOs and PSLOs, including “closing the loop” to use assessment results in planning for continual program improvement. An “Assessment Toolbox,” a set of guidelines for navigating the assessment process, was placed on the Program Review Committee portal site as a resource to assist with assessment of student learning outcomes. The site also includes a schedule of deadlines for various stages of the review process in both a checklist and flowchart formats. The OCC Staff Development website provides faculty
with basic guidelines for writing course student learning outcomes. Thirty-nine departments completed OCC’s first comprehensive program reviews in 2008-2009. Plans generated from those program reviews are being implemented during the 2009-2010 academic year, and the effectiveness of the assessment process will be determined at the end of the year.

Planning Agenda:

II.A.3.a., II.A.3.b., II.A.3.c
1. Align General Education options with institutional student learning outcomes.

Progress: There are two specific areas where OCC has addressed this objective in the planning agenda: program review and in the master planning process. The theme of the Mission Statement is carried throughout the program review process, ultimately creating planning goals that reflect the overall mission of Orange Coast College. Two years ago, OCC began creating a stronger and more effective master planning process. Last year Orange Coast College held three significant breakout sessions on planning that included representatives from all constituent groups. A subcommittee was formed to organize the skeleton of a master plan based on the first of the three breakout sessions. These efforts resulted in a new Mission Statement and a set of values (CLASS), which replaced the existing institutional commitment statement. The Mission Statement is now part of program review and the planning process. Each department and program is required to clearly link their stated goals to the values representing the institutional commitment of Orange Coast College as well as the overall college goals. In addition, Program Review recently created a committee to improve the process through assessment. In addition, a newly formed campus-wide committee, College Council, is looking over the Mission Statement following a campus-wide climate survey. The results will indicate if the Mission Statement should be revised. Through the work of this committee, the College is improving strategic planning by revising the master plan using the values linked to the planning assumptions. Since all major constituents are represented on College Council, the mission and institutional commitment is continuously part of the ongoing planning process.

Planning Agenda:

II.A.6.

1. Develop better quality control processes to ensure the accuracy of information included in the Catalog and Class Schedule.

Progress: The College Publication Committee has implemented guidelines to process
changes to the Catalog and Class Schedule, including multiple checks of information by each division to maintain accuracy. Once final drafts of the publications are ready to print or publish on the College website, the Vice President of Instruction examines the publication and gives final approval.

2. Work with faculty to increase awareness of the benefit of a syllabus.

**Progress:** In Spring 2009, 100% of faculty members submitted their course syllabi to their division offices. In November 2008, the Academic Senate adopted a resolution to add student learning outcomes on each syllabus to help meet the learning needs of students. The beginning of each semester, division deans remind faculty to submit syllabi before the end of the second week of the semester. A syllabus template and checklist can be downloaded from the OCC Portal to help faculty produce their syllabi. In the future, the College plans to link course syllabi to the Banner system class listing so students can access a syllabus for a course even before the class begins. In Spring 2009, the College surveyed students to see if they received a syllabus in each of their courses.

**Planning Agenda:**

**II.A.6.c.**

1. Create a mechanism to assure accuracy of information provided online and in the Catalog.

**Progress:** The College Publication Committee has implemented guidelines to process changes to the Catalog and Class Schedule, including multiple checks of information by each division to maintain accuracy. Once final drafts of the publications are ready to print or publish on the College website, the Vice President of Instruction examines the publication and gives final approval.

**II.B. Student Support Services**

**Planning Agenda:**

**II.B.**

1. Assess Student Services using identified student learning outcomes.

**Progress:** All 24 departments and programs within the Student Services wing have completed their program student learning outcomes (PSLO), and 23 of these programs have completed assessment of PSLOs, a 96% completion rate. The program review guidelines document, the timeline, and the student learning outcomes rubric are all accessible on the OCC Portal and address all Student
Service-related student learning outcomes. As current SLOs receive continued assessing and are updated, changes will be documented. The Student Services Planning Council, with representatives from all Student Services departments and programs, plays an important role in planning, implementing, and completing the SLO and assessment process. The Student Services wing has posted SLOs for every department on the OCC Portal and the public Student Services webpage. Student Services SLOs are also sent to students via “MyOCC.”

Planning Agenda:

II.B.1.

1. Implement student learning outcomes within the Student Services wing.

Progress: Each program and department in the Student Services wing wrote two program student learning outcomes as part of program review. All managers have agreed to write a third student learning outcome, and in October, ASOCC Fiscal Affairs was added as an additional program. Of the 24 Student Services programs and departments—23 or 96%—have completed assessment of their SLOs.

Planning Agenda:

II.B.2.a.-d.

1. Create a mechanism to assure the accuracy of information provided online and in the OCC Catalog.

Progress: The College Publications Committee, which oversees production of the OCC Catalog, sets style guides, timelines, and implementation plans for the annual production of the print Catalog and the online Catalog. The committee distributes information printed in the previous Catalog to each Division, which reviews the information and makes changes for the coming year. The committee incorporates changes into the new document. Each academic division signs off on the updated Catalog information. The College’s Publications Office assimilates any changes into a new Catalog for both print and online. Before the project is printed or published online, the Vice President of Instruction gives final approval. Each year the committee reviews the process to make improvements for the next cycle.
Planning Agenda:

II.B.3.a.

1. Provide online registration.

   **Progress:** The College introduced online registration in Spring 2008. Students are able to register for classes via their MyOCC webpage. Once the College receives a completed application, the student is assigned a username and password and receives a registration appointment time. The student can view the *Class Schedule* online and register for classes. If there is an impediment to registration, such as a “hold” on a student account, the student can view the reason. Once online registration is completed, the student may pay class fees online. Online registration is available to students 24 hours a day.

2. Implement a system for online appointments in assessment, orientation and financial aid and completion of orientation online.

   **Progress:** Online counseling and orientation appointments can be made through eSARS on the Counseling Department’s website. SARScall, a new development, works with the eSARS system and automatically phones students with a reminder about their appointment. The Financial Aid Office has incorporated online appointments on their website. Orientation may be scheduled online, but it takes place in person. The two-hour meeting, which explains the financial aid program, describes services for students and outlines requirements necessary to receive funds. Students may also use the Financial Aid Office online appointment system to schedule a meeting with their financial aid advisor. The Assessment Center has not made online appointments available, but plans to offer online test scheduling by Spring 2010.

3. Revise Student Services surveys to include accessibility.

   **Progress:** Student Services surveys are conducted individually by departments, and the methods used, including online surveys and in-person questionnaires, differ from department to department. The Financial Aid Office has improved their student satisfaction survey by incorporating technology to make their surveys ADA compliant and accessible to students with disabilities. There is not a standard method used to deliver surveys to students. Revising Student Services surveys currently have not been addressed.
Planning Agenda:

II.b.3.c.

1. Continue to increase the number of counseling appointments available to students, particularly using online technology.

**Progress:** The Counseling Division recently introduced online scheduling of counseling appointments on the division’s website using eSARS. This has decreased staff time spent scheduling appointments, and has also reduced time students spend waiting for their appointment from 30 to 10 minutes. In Spring 2009, approximately 30 to 40% of appointments were made online. In addition, two weeks before the start of each semester and another two weeks into the semester, five counselors are assigned to work between three to five hours a week answering students’ questions using email. The Counseling Division has not implemented online counseling because it requires a system that would be able to verify student identification and maintain confidentiality and track student counseling appointments. The division hopes to employ a chat-based format that will be user friendly for both students and counselors. A taskforce committee will form in October 2010 to make recommendations for an online counseling platform. The College currently has 21 full-time counselors and four part-time counselors. Plans to increase the number of counselors hired has been negatively affected by state budget cuts, including a 50% reduction in the hourly employees, which has left the Counseling Division unable to meet growing demand for counseling services. (evidence: counseling and special services retreat agenda)

Planning Agenda:

II.B.3.d.

1. Increase international student enrollments.

**Progress:** The College’s International Student Center focuses on recruitment and retention. Since 2005, enrollment has increased significantly (see evidence). The center plans to increase active recruitment by expanding partnerships with various language programs, frequent outreach and visits to language schools that enroll international students, establishing strong relationships with partners abroad, stronger advertisement and marketing overseas, and participating in national and regional conferences to enhance recruitment strategies. If funding is available, the Center also hopes to participate in international recruitment fairs. The International Student Center has also initiated and sustained a variety of retention programs including cultural and ethnic activities for students, including movie nights, on-campus gatherings, sightseeing trips, and informational workshops to
help international students successfully adjust to college life and a different culture.

2. Continue to support faculty and student opportunities to study abroad.

**Progress:** The College’s Study Abroad program was suspended in 2003 and is no longer supported by the Coast Community College District. In the past, the Study Abroad Office supported semester-long and short-term courses, but currently any study abroad opportunities are organized and run by individual faculty members without District support, including faculty salaries, which are paid by students who participate. Some faculty members and administrators would like to see the College renew its study abroad program which at one point was the third largest study abroad program in the United States. The program would help the College achieve its stated mission to “develop globally aware citizens.”

**Planning Agenda:**

**II.B.3.f.**

1. Expand conversion to electronic student records wherever possible with limited and protected access.

**Progress:** Campus applications and registration are currently completed online through MyOCC. Financial Aid is also implementing a system to allow students to complete their verification documents online using PowerFaids software. The District recently purchased Banner software’s Document Management Suite and is waiting for an upgrade of the core Banner software before it implements the new software. Once the new Document Management Suite is implemented, the District is expected to authorize conversion of ATI files. Student file information prior to 1989 is scanned into the system whenever a student request is made for records. Financial Aid plans to have all forms online by January 2010 for the 2010-2011 academic year. Only correspondence and tax records will require scanning; all other documentation will be stored electronically on a secure server in IT.

**Planning Agenda:**

**II.B.4.**

1. Adjust the Student Services program review six-year calendar to evenly distribute the review of programs within the wing.

**Progress:** The Student Services wing has adopted a three-year calendar for program review. At the same time, the Counseling Division moved from Student
The three-year calendar has been updated and implemented, and the workflow has been evenly distributed to accommodate the changes.

2 Integrate the program review process into wing and division processes.

**Progress:** At the recommendation of the Interim President, all wings are reviewing and updating their plans and incorporating program review items into their planning process. The Interim President has encouraged all constituent groups, including Planning and Budget Committee and the College Council, to include program review personnel and other budget needs into their wing plans. The Student Services program review is operating on a three-year calendar and has achieved the sustainability mode. The Student Services wing is working on assessment data gathered from year two. Final reports for years one and two have been completed. The report for year three will be completed in March 2010. The assessment data will help ensure that the wing-level plan accomplishes the established goals of the College’s *Academic Master Plan*. A program review steering committee, including four to five faculty members and a representative from each service wing, will create an assessment document after the three-year assessment cycle is complete. This assessment data will assist future college planning, clarify division and department needs, and improve methods of instruction.

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

**Planning Agenda:**

**II.C.1.**

1. Develop a strategic plan for the maintenance and replacement of the Clark Computing Center equipment.

**Progress:** Information Technology prioritizes new computing equipment needs for all departments and divisions, which then are submitted to Planning and Budget Committee for approval. “The OCC Technology Committee, Vision, Mission and Roles,” approved in March 2009, outlines plans to ensure that campus computers are maintained, including the Clark Computing Center.

2. Proceed with Student Success Center plans.

**Progress:** With the help of a Title III grant which provides funding for five academic years from 2007 to 2010, the College opened a new Student Success Center that provides tutoring, supplemental instruction, peer mentoring, an early alert system, online tutoring, and student tracking. State funds have also been provided with a basic skills initiative. The Success Center also provides on-site computers for students to use. During the past year, the Student Success Center
increased its services to students by 110%. To accommodate growth and the need for more space, the Writing Center, one of the Student Success Center’s services, moved to an adjacent building. After 2010, when Title III funds expire, programs and personnel will need to be institutionalized.

Planning Agenda:

II.C.1.a.

1. Expand student and faculty ability to remotely access library research materials.

   Progress: Remote access to the Library’s online catalog and full-text databases and other information is available 24 hours, seven days a week on the Library’s website. The Library now offers all of its instructional handouts on its web page as well as on the OCC Portal. The implementation of a new enterprise resource planning system (ERP) facilitates remote access. Also, wireless access is available throughout the entire campus. The Library also participates in a venture with the Community College League of California (a joint endeavor of the Council of Chief Librarians and the Community College League of California) to preview, purchase, and maintain electronic resources and online databases at a reduced price. The Library provides 10 online databases which include *Britannica Online, CQ Researcher, Health and Wellness Resource Center, Health Reference Center Academic, InfoTrac Expanded Academic Center, Literature Research Center, Los Angeles Times Online, NewsBank, Opposing Viewpoints Resource Center*, and *PsychInfo*. These online databases provide remote access to reference books and essays, as well as to journal, magazine, and newspaper articles. The electronic resources librarian coordinates the selection and maintenance of these online databases in collaboration with the California League of Community Colleges.

2. Proceed with implementation of equipment and resources to provide video-on-demand that will be linked with the multimedia center in the Library.

   Progress: The public services librarian has investigated various media-on-demand products. With the changes in technology and the addition of multi-media carts in most classrooms on campus since this planning agenda item was written, the Library developed a goal in its three-year plan last year to further investigate the College’s needs by conducting a needs analysis. The College will investigate services that the companies now provide. With technology is changing so quickly and the advent of streaming video online, the system that was originally envisioned is no longer needed, but a need may exist for other services that are now available (such as, specific content streamlining online from PBS, Nat Geo, etc.) versus a system where the Library loads its own videos to be broadcast remotely.
3. Develop a plan to replace and recycle the computers in the Clark Computing Center.

**Progress:** The Technology Committee prioritizes campus needs, including computers at the Clark Computing Center. Recommendations for computer equipment purchases are submitted to Planning and Budget. When the John Clark Computing Center receives replacement computers, the old computers are allocated to other campus locations, based on the priority list. If the computers cannot be used by campus divisions or departments, they are recycled to the home networking program, to be used by the College’s home lighting classes, or the Anaheim Unified School District.

4. Upgrade computing resources in the Math Center.

**Progress:** The Math Center has introduced the following computer resources for students: *Mathematica* (math/physics), BSI (Basic Skills Initiative), and *Skills Tutor* (practice). The Math Center is in the process of installing available electronic versions of textbooks used by academic divisions on Blackboard so students can access this material anytime.

---

**Planning Agenda:**

**II.C.1.b.**

1. Expand the opportunities to improve students’ skills in information competency with the support of the Library and other campus resources.

**Progress:** Though there has been no campus-wide discussion or of plan for information competency, or any collaborative efforts, the Library has moved forward in attempting to help our students become information competent. The OCC Library’s one-unit class changed its title, content, and SLOs—approved by the Curriculum Committee in fall, 2008 and effective fall, 2009—to incorporate broader aspects of information competency. In the Library’s lectures to classes and workshops for students, librarians include aspects of information competency when they teach students to know what’s available and how to access, search, evaluate, and cite library and information resources. They cover the ethical issue of plagiarism and the importance of correct citation to avoid unintentional plagiarism, but no other issues. This summer, the Instruction Librarian, developed a handout on Information Competency and added it to the library’s instructional services webpage [http://www.orangecoastcollege.edu/academics/library/Instruction+and+Help.htm/]. The Instruction Librarian is a member of the Basic Skills Initiative Task Force and the Title III Steering Committee and is working with these two joint committees to introduce the campus to the concept of information competency.
Planning Agenda:

II.C.1.c.

1. Advertise the Clark Computing Center’s available services and operational procedures more effectively to students.

   Progress: The Clark Computing Center is now featured more prominently on the OCC website, and improved signage in the Computing Center makes the hours of operation and available services readily visible to students. In addition, Clark Computing Center hours and services are publicized in Computer Information Science and Computer Science classes.

2. Advertise all the learning resource centers with their ours and location.

   Progress: incomplete

3. Monitor the new Learning Resource Center hours of operation to determine if they are sufficient.

   Progress: The Library received temporary augmentation to increase hours on weekends, including Sundays. Additional funding was provided by the OCC Foundation to support Library hours after the new building opened in Spring 2008. Due to budget shortfalls and cuts in hourly clerical assistant budgets, the Library is now closed on Sundays. In November, The Associated Students of Orange Coast College Fiscal Affairs Committee allocated $6,000 to keep the Library open on Saturdays. The Friends of the Library provide financial assistance and volunteers to extend the Library’s evening hours to 11:00 p.m. during the week of final exams. The Library plans to supplement its hourly staff costs from its ancillary account with revenues generated from copier use, to maintain current weekday hours. Having to depend on this source, retaining current hours might be difficult and the Library hours might be reduced in Spring 2010. The Library has experienced a 25% increase in traffic this year. A student survey will be conducted in November.

Planning Agenda:

II.C.2.

1. Provide opportunities for students to evaluate the services provided by the Clark Computing Center.

   Progress: The Clark Computing Center plans to survey students using Gmail accounts in 2010. A 2008 survey was tied to the computing and online training program, but its scope was limited. The Gmail survey will reach a wider student
population. In addition, the center plans to provide a suggestion box for student feedback as well as a link on the Clark Computing Center website for suggestions and comments.

2. Track the success of tutorial services with follow-up evaluation of retention, course grades, degrees earned, transfer rates, and surveys of students and tutors.

Progress: The Office of Institutional Research is in the process of collecting data from surveys to be used to evaluate Student Success Center services, including tutorial services, supplemental instruction, peer mentoring, the early alert system, online tutoring, student tracking, and grant administration. Once sufficient data has been acquired to ensure that survey results are reliable, the Office of Institutional Research will complete the evaluations.
Standard III: Resources

III.A. Human Resources

Planning Agenda:

III.A.1.b.

1. Regularly review the evaluation processes for human resources.

**Progress:** The Coast Community College District Office of Human Resources reviews and assesses the evaluation processes of all employees in coordination with each college’s personnel office. Evaluation processes are continually reviewed, and recommendations for changes are made in consultation with the appropriate employee groups representing full-time faculty, part-time faculty, classified employees, and managers. The primary focus is timely completion of employee evaluations and consistency in the evaluation processes. In 2006, a subcommittee of the Coast District Management Association reconstruction evaluated procedures for managers. Forms were created to promote consistency, and a timeline was developed. Management training was provided in spring of 2007 on evaluation processes. The classified evaluation instrument was revised in 2006 and fully implemented in 2007. It now includes a component for employee self-evaluation. The part-time faculty evaluation process is now linked to retention and potential interviews for full-time teaching positions, increasing its relevancy and completion rate. The District Board of Trustees also approved longevity pay enhancement for managers who are current on their employee evaluations. Contract renewals for education managers also require current evaluations. Evaluation reminder prompts have been added to each manager’s “My-Site,” a computer interface provided by the District’s Banner system. The Coast Federation of Classified Employees is in the process of scheduling negotiation sessions for the full successor agreement. The evaluation article is open for negotiation. Both sides hope to eliminate redundancies and enhance overall effectiveness of the evaluation process for classified employees. Full-time faculty and the District will negotiate a successor agreement in 2010-2011. At that time, the District team hopes to open the discussion on evaluation and negotiate changes to meet current needs.

Planning Agenda:

III.A.1.c.

1. Develop processes to identify and evaluate student learning outcomes in adherence with contractual evaluation processes.
Progress: In Spring 2009, 100% of all course outlines of record and approved programs completed student learning outcomes. The College negotiated an agreement with the faculty bargaining unit requiring faculty to provide syllabi with student learning outcomes, and in Spring 2009, there was 100% compliance. Program review, which is responsible for student learning outcome and assessment data, is fully implemented and approaching sustainability. Division deans have been encouraged to ask full-time tenure faculty to include their involvement in student learning outcomes and assessment in their self-evaluations. In addition, the division deans are encouraged to list outcomes and assessment on the administrative evaluation form for every faculty member who is evaluated.

Planning Agenda:

III.A.1.d.

1. Update the Orange Coast College Faculty and Staff Handbook to include a professional code of ethics.

Progress: The Coast Community College District Vice Chancellor of Human Resources is coordinating the development of a district-wide professional code of conduct statement. The Vice Chancellor of Human Resources anticipates that the new professional code of ethics will be approved in Spring 2010. Once it is board approved, the College’s Staff Development Advisory Committee will include the statement in the new 2010-2011 Orange Coast College Faculty and Staff Handbook.

Planning Agenda:

III.A.2.

1. Continue to monitor and evaluate the need for hiring full-time faculty.

Progress: Since Fall 2005, the Instructional Planning Committee has used a clearly defined prioritizing process to ensure that the needs of the College are met. Every year the process is evaluated and modified to better serve the needs of the College. Since 2008, there have been no changes. Factors considered in hiring full-time faculty include:

- Programs in which no full-time faculty teach and where there are a sufficient number of well-enrolled sections to ensure an on-going, full-contract teaching load.
- Programs in which a specified number of full-time faculty is necessary to meet accreditation or licensing requirements
- Programs in which appropriate courses or needed sections, with a history of strong enrollment, cannot be offered because of a lack of available part-time
Throughout this process, individual worksheets for each of the 29 disciplines are used to rank the need for full-time faculty. These summary worksheets are available on the OCC Portal, which requires a login ID and password to protect privacy.

Planning Agenda:

III.A.3.

1. Gather information about personnel policies from their various sources, create a single document, and place it on the OCC Portal.

**Progress:** Most of the District personnel policies are on the District website, but not on the OCC Portal. Hiring policies are under review to make sure that they address diversity. Equal opportunity employment and equal pay policies are also under review. All policies are approved by the Board of Trustees and reviewed at the District level. A District committee is currently reviewing and recommending revisions to District hiring policies. Its recommendation is expected to be submitted to the Board by December 2009 and receive approval before the end of the year.

Planning Agenda:

III.A.5., III.A.5.a., III.A.5.b.

1. Increase professional development programs to specifically address the needs of classified staff.

**Progress:** In May 2009, the Planning and Budget Committee created a position for a classified staff development coordinator who would receive four hours of release time per week. The newly organized Staff Development Committee met for the first time in September 2009 to determine the selection process as well as the duties of the new classified staff development coordinator. The job description for this position needs to be defined. Proposed programs and the budget for classified staff development have not been determined. Currently, funding for classified programs is through a staff development grant. A discussion of the budget for staff development will take place after January 2010 when the College’s new president is hired.
III.B. Physical Resources

Planning Agenda:

III.B.1b.

1. Anticipate the depletion of Measure C bond funds and explore alternative future methods of funding facilities improvements.

**Progress:** Measure C funding depletion is an ongoing planning process that involves planning councils from all three wings, including Student Services Planning Council, Administrative Services Planning Council, and Instructional Planning Council.

Planning Agenda:

III.B.2.b.

1. Develop a process for the systematic assessment of physical resources.

**Progress:** Orange Coast College *Facilities Master Plan* is updated annually, and each year the Bursar’s Office conducts an inventory of all equipment on campus. The Facilities Condition Index is updated annually by Administrative Services. The assessment information is shared with the Administrative Services Planning Committee, Planning and Budget, Program Review, College Council, and Administrative Cabinet. In addition, information to the campus is available on the college website, through targeted announcements to faculty and staff and “all user” emails. The *Facilities Master Plan* is posted on the OCC Portal. The Bursar’s Office keeps results of the annual equipment inventory.

III.C. Technology Resources

Planning Agenda:

III.C.1., III.C.1.a.

1. Establish procedures for purchasing and placing new computers and recycling older equipment to appropriate areas of campus.

**Progress:** Division deans submit requests for computers and computing equipment to the Technology Committee, which prioritizes campus needs. Recommendations for computer equipment purchases are submitted to Planning and Budget. When the John
Clark Computing Center receives replacement computers, the old computers are allocated to other campus locations, based on the priority list. If the computers cannot be used by campus divisions or departments, they are recycled to the home networking program, the College’s home lighting classes, or to Anaheim Unified School District.

Planning Agenda:

III.C.1.c.

1. Commission an independent audit of policies, procedures, and standards pertaining to the security operations of Administrative Computing Services, Instructional Computing Services, and Web Services.

Progress: Division deans submit requests for computers and computing equipment to the Technology Committee, which prioritizes campus needs. Recommendations for computer equipment purchases are submitted to Planning and Budget. When the John Clark Computing Center receives replacement computers, the old computers are allocated to other campus locations, based on the priority list. If campus divisions or departments cannot use the computers, they are recycled to the home networking program, to the College’s home lighting classes, or to Anaheim Unified School District.

2. Prepare a systematic plan to acquire new technology equipment.

Progress: Division deans submit requests for computers and computing equipment to the Technology Committee, which prioritizes campus needs. Recommendations for computer equipment purchases are submitted to Planning and Budget. When the John Clark Computing Center receives replacement computers, the old computers are allocated to other campus locations, based on the priority list. If campus divisions or departments cannot use the computers, they are recycled to the home networking program, to the College’s home lighting classes, or to Anaheim Unified School District.

Planning Agenda:

III.C.2

1. Develop comprehensive surveys to assess the effects of the implementation of new technologies.

Progress: In early 2009, the Technology Committee conducted a comprehensive survey of students and faculty dealing with a number of technology issues, including
the effect of new technologies. The results are still under review and will be used in future planning. The committee plans to continue annual surveys of students, faculty, and staff. The campus community will forward results to the College Council to be included in “internal data sources” for strategic planning and posted on the OCC Portal for review.

**III.D. Financial Resources**

**Planning Agenda:**

**III.D.1.a.**

1. Increase the understanding and involvement of Planning and Budget Committee members in the development of the College budget.

**Progress:** The Vice President of Administrative Services updates and provides budget overview to the Planning and Budget Committee twice a year. Emphasis is on the spring update, when more information is available, especially from the state. In Spring 2009, three subcommittees—operations, revenue, and categorical—were formed to make recommendations on budget plans. The operations subcommittee looks for opportunities for savings at the operational level, the revenue subcommittee makes recommendations to generate new revenue, and the categorical subcommittee reviews line item cuts and programs.

2. Improve the communication to the campus community regarding planning, budgeting, and allocation of financial resources.

**Progress:** The College distributes an online report, *Budget Update*, which is distributed to the campus community, including the Board of Trustees, District offices and emeritus. Budget information is also distributed in the campus online newsletter, *Coast to Coast*. In mid-December, a campus-wide survey will provide feedback from the campus. In addition, a green hotline has been established on campus to facilitate energy-saving ideas from anyone on campus. The Interim President has also organized two Town Hall Meetings, held October 28 and December 11, to discuss important campus issues with faculty and staff in an open forum.

**Planning Agenda:**

**III.D.1.b.**

1. Regularly review, assess, and disseminate information about financial resource availability to assist with institutional planning.
Progress: incomplete

Planning Agenda:

III.D.1.c.

1. Regularly review District and College long-range financial priorities when making short-range financial plans.

Progress: In 2009, the California state budget emergency created a budget shortfall of $20 million in reductions for the 2009/2010 year, resulting in $1.8 million in reductions for Orange Coast College. The College made reductions in personnel costs (hiring freeze) and approximately $900,000 in operational costs recommended by the Planning and Budget Operations Subcommittee. The District anticipates future impacts of $35 million in reductions. The District Budget Advisory Committee, created in Spring 2009 by the Acting Chancellor, will meet throughout Fall 2009 to discuss potential shortfalls and solutions. In addition to District planning, the College Budget and Planning Committee will address the 2010/2011 academic year estimated budget shortfall during Fall 2009 and Spring 2010. Long-range target cuts include a hiring freeze and reduced energy usage. The District has suspended most Spring 2010 Intersession Classes, and Orange Coast College is exploring a reduced Summer 2010 Session. The District is currently meeting with each of the bargaining units to discuss options for meeting future budget shortfalls.

Planning Agenda:

III.D.1.d.

1. Develop a publication or website that clearly defines and explains the College’s planning and budgeting processes, e.g. personnel hiring, budget allocations.

Progress: In 2008-2009, the College created the Decision Making Document, which describes the role of shared governance groups and budgeting and master planning (evidence). The document includes a decision-making timeline, the hiring process, processes for acquiring instructional equipment and supplies, annual technology and facility review, curriculum development, and program review cycles. The Decision Making Document is available on the OCC Portal and hard copies are in division offices. The document was also distributed as an “all user” email to College employees. Planning and Budget presentations are made regularly, and an online publication, Budget Update, is periodically distributed via “all user” email.
Planning Agenda:

III.D.2.b.

1. Increase and improve the communication from the Planning and Budget Committee to the campus community regarding planning, budgeting, and allocating financial resources.

**Progress:** The Planning and Budget Committee initiated a weekly *Budget Update* (evidence) beginning in July, which provided ongoing communication on budget issues. In addition, the Interim President completed a Budget Report (evidence). This report is posted on the OCC Portal and was distributed through Planning and Budget and College Council. *Budget Update* includes links to the email of all three college vice presidents to encourage feedback from the campus community. The publication also included an “Energy Savings Hotline” to canvass faculty and staff for energy-saving suggestions. The Interim President conducts bi-monthly Planning and Budget meetings, dividing the agenda between budget issues and planning uses to make a clear distinction between the two. The Interim President has made many presentations regarding the difference between budgeting and planning (see charts-evidence). In Fall 2009, the College Council was established to coordinate and lead the strategic master planning process (evidence – minutes and organizational charts). Planning and Budget communications continue to be disseminated through Planning and Budget and College Council minutes, which are available on the OCC Portal (evidence).

Planning Agenda:

III.D.2.g.

1. Continue to evaluate the College financial management processes and financial management systems.

**Progress:** The recent *Decision Making Document* reviews and documents the College’s financial management processes. A structure has been put in place through the Planning and Budget Committee to request funds to meet unmet or emerging needs. A graphic showing the relationship between planning and budgeting was distributed campus-wide and discussed at Planning and Budget and the College Council. *(Strategic Planning Structure Chart, SLO Org Chart, P&B minutes, Fall 2009)* In 2006, the District implemented the Banner Financial Management System to manage finances, student enrollment, admissions, grades, and human resources. Banner is a comprehensive enterprise resource program (ERP) specifically designed for two-year schools. The District established a Continuous Improvement Group, including representatives from the Academic Senate, staff and students, which meets regularly to determine how to use Banner most effectively *(Banner Systems Audit Reports)*. The College plans to implement the next Banner milestone, Version 8, in
Spring 2010. The goal is to streamline the enrollment process and improve reports and access. It will also help the College comply with new state reporting guidelines. Administrative services also plans a survey (Climate survey?) to evaluate the One Card System, a magnetic card students can use to pay for all items on campus, such as books and meals. If results of the survey are negative, the One Card System will be discontinued.
Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

IV.A. Decision-making Roles and Processes

Planning Agenda:

IV.A.1.

1. Revitalize the Classified Forum or investigate alternative means to further engage classified staff in institutional governance.

**Progress:** In Fall 2009, the Classified Forum Committee met to discuss a proposed structure similar to the Faculty Senate that will be organized by departments and wings instead of by academic divisions (draft Organizational Chart). The committee is in the process of determining its structure and selecting permanent members from each of the wings and the CFCE representatives. The committee is also developing an action plan for the remainder of the semester. The new Classified Forum site on the OCC Portal has been updated with current minutes. Progress is being made on a new staff development plan that will assign four hours of release time each week for a classified coordinator. The job description needs to be refined in the coming year. The Staff Development Committee needs a dedicated budget to be successful. At present, budget allocated is used for faculty programs and all-campus recognition programs. A discussion of the budget will take place in January when the College’s new president is hired. The Classified Forum has also proposed a career ladder program, publication of a classified orientation booklet, and initiation of town hall meetings each semester to develop open communication on campus. In Spring 2010, the Classified Forum plans to survey of classified staff about their needs.

2. Review strategies to encourage students to participate in College decision-making roles.

**Progress:** During the 2008-2009 academic year 24 campus-wide committees had seats for 40 students. Of those 40 openings, 39 were filled, including seats on two new District committees, the District Advisory Budget Committee and the District Policy Development and Review Committee. Student government, the Associated Students of Orange Coast College, encourages students to participate on campus committees. The Vice President of Diplomatic Affairs, a member of the ASOCC Executive Board, is responsible for publicizing various leadership roles, including campus-wide committee participation with the help of the Vice President of Communications (ASOCC Constitution, Article IV Executive Board, Second C: Duties). Various methods are used to announce open seats on decision-making committees, including fliers posted on ASOCC publicity boards, posters displayed on campus, class announcements, fliers placed in the monthly InterClub Council packets, announcements at ICC monthly meetings, and to InterClub Council and College Life
Committee officers. In addition, the 12 ASOCC senators and executive officers are required to sit on at least one campus committee. Strategies used to recruit students to serve on campus committees are reevaluated for their effectiveness on an ongoing basis. Student Services is also developing a survey to determine the effectiveness of placing students on college committees.

3. Review strategies to maintain faculty involvement in institutional governance.

**Progress:** The Academic Senate president encourages faculty members to get involved and participate in institutional governance. A draft of *Making Decisions at Orange Coast College* (evidence) was sent to all faculty and staff through “all users” email. The document shows faculty how they can play a role in campus decisions. The Academic Senate has developed other documents to encourage faculty involvement and input, including the *Academic Senate Handbook* in draft form, and resolutions dealing with diversity, learning communities, involvement, and shared governance (evidence). The Academic Senate may also develop a survey to assess the effectiveness of current strategies to maintain faculty involvement in institutional governance, although no timeline has been determined.

4. Complete the revision of the College’s *Shared Governance Document*.

**Progress:** The Shared Governance Committee met in 2006 and 2007 to complete and revised the College’s *Shared Governance Document*. The final revision was posted on the OCC Portal under Shared Governance Committee on Oct. 22, 2007 (evidence), and was approved by the Planning and Budget Committee in late 2007. Since that revision, the College president may have added revisions to the document. The committee should meet again to update the manual again. This document should be revisited on an annual basis to ensure its accuracy.

**Planning Agenda:**

IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a., IV.A.3.

1. Revise the shared governance manual, including committee structures, participation and term limits and pos revisions on the OCC Portal.

**Progress:** The *Shared Governance Manual* was last revised by the Shared Governance Committee on Oct. 22, 2007 (evidence), and was approved by the Planning and Budget Committee in late 2007. The manual includes procedures for committees to follow, including term revisions and posting agendas and meeting minutes on the OCC Portal. The document also outlines overall committee planning structure. An organizational chart depicting the committee planning structure is in Appendix III of the *Shared Governance Manual*. 
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2. Widely disseminate the Planning and Budget Committee term limit policies for committees. Evaluate term limits for committees.

**Progress:** Planning and Budget has tabled consideration of term limit policies for campus committees until the committee purpose and configuration of Planning and Budget has been finalized, pending results of the Campus Climate Survey. The survey, disseminated in Fall 2009, will verify the effectiveness of current planning and budgeting processes and will determine the future role of Planning and Budget. Once Planning and Budget’s future is clarified, term limit policies for committees will be reconsidered.

3. Increase OCC Portal communication regarding institutional governance, including posting organizational charts.

**Progress:** The OCC Portal has been in use since Summer 2004. In Fall 2008, a Portal redesign committee was established to address current issues and communications deficiencies. Renamed the OCC Portal Committee, it continues to promote and structure the Portal that contributes to increased institutional governance communication. The OCC Portal is a communication tool used by staff, faculty, and administrators. Eventually students will be able to access parts of the Portal. The OCC organizational chart is available on the Portal under “Hot Links” of the Portal’s opening page. All staffing groups, including classified, faculty, and administrators, are encouraged to use the OCC Portal for a variety of communications needs including informational items, committee make-up, agendas and minutes, personnel forms, departmental items, and student learning outcomes.

**Planning Agenda:**

**IV.A.4.**

1. Systematically evaluate and update integration of the *Technology and Facilities Master Plans* with the *Academic Master Plan*.

**Progress:** In September 2009, the Facilities Planning Committee formed a task force to revise the *Facilities Master Plan* (Evidence: Taskforce Agenda, Taskforce Minutes, Membership on Portal). The task force held meetings during October and November 2009 to assess the 2005 master plan, the College Mission Statement, Values (CLASS), 2009 Planning Assumptions (Draft), Cambridge West Document and Presentation (July 2009), Administrative Services Assessment Survey (October 2009), *Vision 2010* Document (1993), Measure C Bond Language (November 2002), and the *OCC Master Plan* (2005). The committee is using this information to plan and draft a revised *Facilities Master Plan*. In November 2009, the committee reviewed an update of the planning process (PowerPoint presentation, November 5, 2009, Facilities Planning Committee Portal). Following review and endorsement by the Facilities Planning Committee and College Council, the plan will be submitted to Planning and
Budget for Spring 2010. In Fall 2009, the Facilities Planning Taskforce prepared an assessment document (excel spreadsheet), which linked the Vision 2010 plan, 2005 master plan, Measure C bond language, and the current status of facilities. In addition, the 2009 Facilities Condition Index Report (internally prepared) was compared to the 2003 Facilities Condition Index Report (externally prepared). These comparisons, along with the assessment document, were used to assess the current plan. Based on the Fall 2009 assessment data, a revised Facilities Master Plan document was created. The 2009 Facilities Master Plan provides for both a short-range plan (five years) and a long-range plan (through 2020). Based on the college’s strategic planning principles (Planning, Implementations, and Evaluation - PIE), the Facilities Master Plan will require future assessments and plan revisions. For example, in the Fall 2010, the externally prepared 2010 Facilities Condition Index Report will be received from the State Chancellors Office. It is anticipated this new information will be reviewed to determine if plan revision is required.

Planning Agenda:

**IV.A.5.**

1. Develop a formal procedure for evaluating the effectiveness of the College’s shared governance structure and practices.

**Progress:** In Fall 2009, the College Council was established to oversee master planning, issue management, and communication and collegiality. The Interim President continues to work with the College to implement an effective decision-making model. The new council will be evaluated in December 2009 (results?) to determine whether the College should continue with this structure or return to the former shared governance model, Planning and Budget. In October, the College disseminated the Campus Climate Survey, which includes planning and governance questions. The College Council will review the survey outcomes and use them to make future decisions about the institutional governance structure.

**IV.B. Board and Administrative Organization**

Planning Agenda:

**IV.B.1., IV.B.1.c.**

1. Provide ongoing information about the sale of KOCE, particularly to faculty and staff.

**Progress:** The District provided information in a timely manner in public press
releases which were available to all members of the College, District and community-at-large. On June 21, 2007, the Board of Trustee President announced in a press release that settlement had been reached between KOCE-TV Foundation and Daystar Television Network. The press release further stated that the KOCE-TV Foundation would retain the station license.

2. Prepare for potential financial impact of the KOCE sale.

Progress: All colleges of the District were informed about the terms of the sale and the financial impact of the sale on the District. Since the sale involved a series of payments over time, the District has continued to report this revenue in a timely and transparent manner.

Planning Agenda:

IV.B.1.a.

1. The District will review the sale of KOCE in a manner that reflects the best interests of the institution.

Progress: All colleges of the District were informed about the terms of the sale and the financial impact of the sale on the District. Since the sale involved a series of payments over time, the District has continued to report this revenue in a timely and transparent manner.

Planning Agenda:

IV.B.1.e., IC.B.1.g.

1. Improve communication, specifically with the College classified staff, regarding the Board’s adherence to its published policies.

Progress: This planning agenda item was the result of the College’s self-study survey, which indicated that a majority of OCC classified staff surveyed do not agree that the Board acts in a way that is consistent with its policies. Since 2006, there has been a change in the composition of the board, with two new members. In 2008, the Board hired its own General Counsel, who assists at all board meetings. These changes have been accompanied by a movement by the Board to more regularly review and update policies and to assure that the board is following the Education Code, Title V, and Board policies. The additional of the General Counsel has aided in this movement to more open and consistent compliance.

The Board communicates its actions in a formal manner through the Board meeting
agendas and minutes. There are other means of communication that are less formal. Each of the bargaining units publishes newsletters that often contain reports of meetings and articles addressing Board actions. The District publishes an electronic newsletter each month: D-mail (http://www.cccd.edu/d-mail), which provides the Board another opportunity to communicate its decisions and opinions. Most recently, the Board used this vehicle, as well as more formal means, to communicate its hiring decision for the position of Chancellor.

Additionally, the Board has formed three new committees that have greatly increased the ability for regular, in-person communication. These committees address accreditation, land development, and career/technical education.

Planning Agenda:

IV.B.1.f.

1. Review existing practices for orientation of new Board members.

Progress: Since the writing of the 2006 Self Study, two new Board members have been elected, one in December of 2006 and the other in November of 2008. These elections provided the Board with two opportunities to review existing orientation practices.

Planning Agenda:

IV.B.1.h.

1. Develop a clearly defined Board policy for dealing with behavior that violates the Code of Ethics.

Progress: The CCCD’s Code of Ethics for Members of the Board of Trustees policy was revised September 5, 2007, and addresses this planning agenda item. Included in this policy are “Steps in Addressing Ethical Violations” that clearly delineate how ethical violations are to be reviewed and resolved. Additionally, a section titled “Trustee Standards of Practice” is included which is policy specific to accreditation standards IV.B.1.a., e., and h. These standards establish the operating norms and best practices of the Board members and provide a benchmark for accountability.

2. Provide mandatory ethics training for all current and new Board members.

Progress: All Board members have received ethics training within the last 12 months. Board members are well aware of the probability that legislation will make certified ethics training mandatory with the passage of SB106.
Planning Agenda:

IV.B.1.i.

1. Provide more ongoing information to the Board regarding accreditation in general.

   Progress: A subcommittee including Board members, a Faculty Senate representative, student trustee, study body presidents (3), vice chancellor, college presidents (3), and accreditation liaison officers, was formed to coordinate communication between the Board of Trustees, the District, and the three colleges. The subcommittee meets regularly and has held five meetings. A common timetable, February 24, 2010, was set for submission of midterm reports to the Board by the three colleges. In addition, the subcommittee continues to lobby for a permanent vice chancellor to serve as the District contact for accreditation (Board minutes, Dec. 10, 2008; ACC minutes, Jan. 15, 2009).

2. Organize a meeting with Board members and accreditation committee members at one time.

   Progress: Accreditation committee members will meet with the Board of Trustees on February 24, 2010, to submit each college’s midterm accreditation reports.

Planning Agenda:

IV.B.1.j.

1. Complete the review of the hiring policy for the Chancellor, vice chancellors, and college presidents.

   Progress: The District Hiring Committee was formed in early Spring 2009 and first met on May 1, 2009, to look at the hiring practices for each constituency: managers, faculty, and classified staff. Names were suggested from each constituency group from each college, including presidents’ management representatives, Coast Federation of Classified Employees (CFCE), California Teachers Association (CTA), Coast Federation of Employees (CFE), the Coast District Management Association (CDMA), Faculty Senate, Classified Forum, and confidential representatives. The committee meets at least twice a month. The hiring policies are completed, have been vetted by each constituency group, and have been reviewed and modified by the Board’s attorney. The proposed policies will be presented at the December Board of Trustees’ meeting for approval. The procedures are in the process of being reviewed and vetted by each constituency group. The committee has just begun work on the Classified Hiring Procedures, which will not be ready for Board review until late Spring 2010.
Planning Agenda:

IV.B.2.

1. Further integrate program review into the planning process.

**Progress:** Program review has become the critical component of the effective operation and stewardship for the College. In September 2007, the Academic Senate adopted an *Instructional Program Review Philosophy* (evidence 9/18/07) that articulates the College’s commitment to use program review in continual evaluation, self-study, and improvement of courses and program. The *Academic Master Plan* for 2008-2011 also includes a formal commitment by the College to employ program review in the decision-making and planning processes. The *President’s Wing Three-Year Plan*, finalized in July 2009 (evidence, July 31, 2009), also incorporates program review into planning. Additionally, each campus program is required to prepare program student learning objectives (PSLOs) to measure program success (Portal, tab labeled “Submit PLsOs”). The Program Review Committee established a comprehensive review process and document set for campus-wide use that demonstrates how data is collected and analyzed during program review to drive planning and decision making. With a formalized review process in place, each program’s plans and results can be traced from one year or cycle to the next (more documentation). Full implementation of the program review process and its integration into the planning process will be facilitated through ongoing follow-up and support from the Program Review Committee and its chair. Additional workshops and departmental and program meetings will assist remaining and incoming new faculty with the program review process.

Planning Agenda:

IV.B.2.a.

1. Implement the new management evaluation process once it is completed by CDMA.

**Progress:** The Coast District Management Association (CDMA), which had previously formalized a district-wide standard for management evaluation in (year?), has over the past two years revised the published guidelines for evaluation and facilitated its dissemination throughout the District. Initially published in exhaustive detail, the current overview and summary of the management evaluation process now occupies a section of the *CCCD Manager’s Handbook*, which was distributed to each manager at a district-wide managers’ workshop in summer 2007, and to each new manager hired. The handook includes references to the District website where the most current detailed information, guidelines, and forms may be found. Implementation of the “new” management evaluation process has largely been a
matter of communicating the existence of a single, district-wide standard for collaborative managerial goal setting, scheduling, evaluation, and reporting. The formalized evaluation process was further communicated through email memos from the District Human Resources Department and, on the campus level, through email memos from the OCC Director of Personnel. A section for management evaluation was added to the OCC Administrative Services Manual, and a weblink on the employee tab of MyOCC leads to the District website and the most up-to-date evaluation instruments, reporting forms, and timelines. More recently, the timely completion and submittal of management evaluations has been tied to longevity pay increases and contract renewals, which require that evaluations be in the District Human Resources Department files before the CCCD District Board of Trustees will consider them. The implementation of the new management evaluation process is complete. The rates of longevity pay increases and contract renewals granted provide evidence that the process is has been implemented and is producing the desired results for the receipt of timely evaluations. The District Human Resources Director reports that the rates of compliance are near 100%.

Planning Agenda:

IV.B.2.b.

1. Increase campus awareness of the College’s ongoing need to revise and reprioritize planning and goals in the face of fiscal realities.

   Progress: Since her arrival on campus in July 2009, the Interim President has widely discussed the master planning and prioritization process. Although the campus previously completed extensive wing and area planning, no single master plan existed. The College also needed to create a prioritized list of personnel and needs. The Interim President issued a letter (evidence) to all employees to share her assessment of campus needs. In addition, a presentation was made to the campus on Focus Day at the start of the fall semester. The College instituted a College Council to set planning goals that will guide budget priorities in Planning and Budget. In October and December, the Interim President provided updated information in Town Hall presentations to the campus community. In addition, flow charts have been reviewed and distributed on “all user” email to the campus community to clearly explain the planning process and the relationship between program review and student learning outcome assessment. As the budget crisis continues, Planning and Budget will be informed of budget priorities in relationship to planning goals. (Budget update?) Evidence: P&B minutes, CC Minutes, Focus Day presentation, Town Hall presentation, President’s Mid-semester Report, Campus Climate survey.
Planning Agenda:

IV.B.2.d.

1. Increase enrollment.

Progress: Orange Coast College steadily increased enrollment between 2005 and 2009, which is documented in the FTEs Breakdown charting enrollment for the last four years (evidence). However, during the current State budget crisis, the State capped the College’s enrollment, and OCC must adjust this Planning Agenda to reflect fiscal realities. As a result, the College is offering fewer courses with fuller classes. The College plans to reduce course offerings in a way to cause the least adverse effect to programs during challenging economic times. The District recently suspended Winter 2010 Interession for most programs, and the College is looking at a smaller Summer 2010 Session. The College recently disbanded its Outreach and Recruitment Committee and will replace it with an Enrollment Management Committee to address new enrollment goals for the College.

2. Work with the campus and District constituencies to find adequate funding to complete campus projects.

Progress: Finding adequate funding to complete campus projects is an ongoing challenge for the College. Orange Coast College has a Facilities Master Plan that includes a vision of campus facility needs through 2020. In 2002 voters passed Measure C, a $360 million bond to fund projects in Coast Community College District, including $199 million allocated specifically for Orange Coast College. Even with Measure C funds, the College did not have adequate revenue to meet Facilities Master Plan goals, so the College has aggressively sought other revenue. The College has been working with District to procure State funding for major campus projects. For example, State contributed $22 million to the cost of OCC’s new $32 million library, which opened in 2008. Another source of revenue is the OCC Foundation, which raised $2 million to build the Thomas Doyle Arts Pavilion and $600,000 for renovations at the OCC Sailing Center. Each spring, divisions submit annual request reports to identify areas of need. Needs are summarized and presented to the Facilities Planning Committee. In October/November 2009, the College completed another Facilities Master Plan review. Budgets were assessed and the College’s resources for completing projects were evaluated, resulting in a “revised master plan.” The Facilities Master Plan is continuously being revised and updated. (Evidence: Facilities Planning Committee Project Update, Sept. 2008 & 2009 and other material submitted).
Planning Agenda:

IV.B.2.e.

1. The President will increase his/her own, and the College’s outreach, with under-represented groups in the community.

   Progress: Before his retirement in June 2009, OCC’s President met with the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) businessmen and women to assess the perception of the College in the Latin community. During the last six months, the Interim President has met with the Chancellor and the Academic Senate President to discuss ways the College can broaden its accessibility, visibility, and involvement with ethnic groups. The Academic Senate President suggests that the College develop a partnership with MANA of Orange County to support and uphold the College’s commitment to diversity in general and to Latinas in particular. Examples of the College’s efforts to reach under-represented groups include UMOJA implementation to address academic and student support needs of Black students; EOP&S and Puente programs, providing materials in Spanish including OCC’s recruitment DVD and AB543 (The Nurse Family Partnership), building relationships with elementary and high schools with a high Latino population, creating partnerships with Estancia High School and Costa Mesa High School that provided college classes and counseling for high school students, hiring bilingual staff sensitive to the needs of Latino students, Spanish or bilingual presentations about educational opportunities at OCC for middle and elementary school parents, sponsoring multi-cultural events and activities on campus for the community, inviting elementary school children from low income areas to the College’s annual Community Science Night, and attending Early Learning Advisory Council (ELAC) meetings at middle and elementary schools. The College operates a successful Puente Program, where 85.7% of enrolled students are Hispanic. Ongoing outreach is developed through contact with Puente high school counselors, OC Puente parents, Puente mentors, and Puente students who have transferred to four-year universities. Presentations are made to elementary and high school parents and students in Costa Mesa. Diversity and multicultural awareness presentations have been made to the Academic Senate, and in Fall 2009, the College Council will review the College’s efforts to address diversity awareness. The newly created Enrollment Management Committee and the Matriculation Committee will continue to address issues of diversity in their outreach, recruitment, and retention planning. The Division of Mathematics and Sciences needs to support the District commitment and work with the Personnel Director to increase diversity in hiring practices (evidence).

2. Investigate ways to provide more opportunities for staff to interact and communicate with each other and the President.

   Progress: Creating two-way communication between the President's Office and the
College staff has been a top priority. Two major forms of communication have been utilized: Coast to Coast, an online weekly publication for faculty, staff, retirees, and friends of Orange Coast College, and special online publications such as Budget Update and Accreditation Update that address specific issues. In addition, “all user” email reaches all staff with important information, such as announcements for Town Hall meetings and Focus Day. The Communications and Marketing Department is also in the process of designing a “Master Calendar” accessible to staff, faculty, and administrators to help eliminate scheduling conflicts for campus-wide events. In the future, the Communications Department plans to incorporate video components into Coast to Coast and the College website. The Communications Department receives feedback via email from faculty and staff, and a formal survey to help assess communications is planned.

Planning Agenda:

IV.B.3.

1. Review and update the long-range planning document for the District.

**Progress:** During 2008/2009, a consultant was hired to do preliminary environmental scanning in preparation for the master planning process. Interviews were conducted with community members, college leaders, students, and Board members to assess overall needs (Appendix – Report). In Fall 2009, the District’s Vision 2010 plan was reviewed to assess the District’s accomplishments against the established goals in the plan as well as the gaps. The Board held a special study session to review the District master planning process and timetable recommendations. It is determined that the District will establish a 10-year vision for 2020 and complete a five-year master strategic plan with a three-year review cycle.

2. Address areas where decentralized administration has led to lack of District leadership in the coordination of individual college needs and interests.

**Progress:** Several areas have benefited from greater District leadership in coordination. These are enrollment management, career technical education, accreditation, land development, and budget planning. The District employed an Interim Associate Vice Chancellor of Educational Services to help coordinate the three colleges’ efforts to address the various components of enrollment management. The Board of Trustees created three committees to coordinate career/technical education (CTE), accreditation, and land development issues. The Chancellor created a District Budget Advisory Committee, which provides an inclusive, participatory governance opportunity for discussing and recommending budget proposals to the District and the Board.
Planning Agenda:

IV.B.3.b.

1. Reestablish a District long-range planning document.

Progress: In Fall 2009, the District’s *Vision 2010* plan was reviewed to assess the District’s accomplishments against the established goals in the plan as well as the gaps. The Board held a special study session to review the District master planning process and timetable recommendations. It is determined that the District will establish a 10-year vision for 2020 and complete a five-year master strategic plan with a three-year review cycle.

Planning Agenda:

IV.B.3.c.

1. Adjust the funding allocation model to more fairly distribute resources among the three campuses and the District.

Progress: In 2006, Senate Bill 361 provided equalization funding to the California community college system. At the same time, Coast Community College District modified its allocation model to move to a full-time equivalent student (FTES) model for budget allocations. The District funding model moved $10 million from fixed costs to the FTES distribution model. In 2009-2010, the District’s $182.8 million budget was based on 66% FTES distribution and 34% on fixed costs. In Spring 2009, the District established the District Budget Advisory Committee to increase campus participation on district-wide budget issues, including the impact of budget reductions on the 2009/2010 budget year.

Planning Agenda:

IV.B.3.e

1. Develop long-range District planning goals.

Progress: In Fall 2009, the District’s *Vision 2010* plan was reviewed to assess the District’s accomplishments against the established goals in the plan as well as the gaps. The Board held a special study session to review the District master planning process and timetable recommendations. It is determined that the District will establish a 10-year vision for 2020 and complete a five-year master strategic plan with a three-year review cycle.
Planning Agenda:

IV.B.3.f.

1. Ensure that the new ERP system supports and improves communication between the District and the colleges.

   Progress: A selection committee chose the software for the District’s new enterprise resource planning (ERP) system, Banner, designed to improve communications between colleges and the District (handout #1). An Implement Team will ensure that the new system meets the needs of all colleges (Project Scope Handout #2) and that the Banner 8 system upgrades are accomplished on schedule. In an effort to improve communication with the District regarding the implementation of Banner 8, Orange Coast College created a subcommittee of the District’s Continuous Improvement Team (CIT) (handout #3 Coast Community College District Continuous Improvement Teams – Voyager Systems Suite). In addition, OCC CIT created the “Banner 8.x OCC Campus Upgrade Plan (see evidence). In an effort to improve future communication between the District and the College, OCC’s CIT prepared a reference guide, the Continuous Improvement Team (CIT) Service Requests Reference Guide (evidence) to help end-users report problems, corrections, queries, reporting, and requests for enhancements. In addition, OCC CIT has created Banner 8.x OCC Campus Upgrade Plan (handout #5), including a specific timeline listed for each step of implementation through March 2010. A training timetable for end-users, including staff, faculty, management, and administrators, will be established when Banner 8 implementation is closer to completion.

2. Ensure that all employees are trained in the new ERP system so that the college can benefit from this improved electronic means of communication.

   Progress: The initial implementation of the original Banner system included training for end-users from campus and District departments in “Banner Basic Components” including navigation, searches short cuts, My Banner, My Links, naming conventions, and tips. Training included hands-on workshops and computer video and PDF instruction manuals (evidence: CCCD website under Voyager: End user Training and OCC Portal, Admissions & Records, “Document Library” Banner training manuals).

Planning Agenda:

IV.B.3. g.

1. Ensure that the District planning document is updated and widely communicated.
Progress: In Fall 2009, the District’s Vision 2010 plan was reviewed to assess the District’s accomplishments against the established goals in the plan as well as the gaps. The Board held a special study session to review the District master planning process and timetable recommendations. It is determined that the District will establish a 10-year vision for 2020 and complete a five-year master strategic plan with a three-year review cycle.
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