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Introduction

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

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

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

Recommendation #1. Robert Dees, President; Melinda Nish, Vice President of Instruction; Irene Heavem, Curriculum Committee Chair; Georgie Monahan, Academic Senate President; Allison Paine, Classified Forum Co-Chair; and Sheri Sterner, Director of Institutional Research.

Recommendation #2. Robert Dees, President; Melinda Nish, Vice President of Instruction; Karen Felts, Assistant Professor, English, Peer Review Participant; Georgie Monahan, Academic Senate President; Allison Paine, Classified Forum Co-Chair; and Sheri Sterner, Director of Institutional Research.

Recommendation #3. Robert Dees, President; Melinda Nish, Vice President of Instruction; Georgie Monahan, Academic Senate President; Allison Paine, Classified Forum Co-Chair; and Sheri Sterner, Director of Institutional Research.

Recommendation #11 College Meeting. Robert Dees, President, and Melinda Nish, Vice President of Instruction.
Recommendation #11 District Meeting. Dr. Kenneth Yglesias, Chancellor; Joyce Black, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor, Educational and External Affairs; and Joseph Qualres, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources.

An individual allegedly representing six Orange Coast College employees (who wished to remain anonymous) delivered a document to the team regarding their concerns. The representative declined an invitation to discuss the document with the team at the time of its receipt.

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

**College 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.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.B.4, II.C.2)

The team confirmed that the college has made substantive progress toward this recommendation. The college has renamed and expanded both the membership and responsibilities of the committee charged with oversight for the implementation of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), now called the Student Learning Committee (SLC). The SLC reports directly to the president, is chaired by the Program Review Coordinator, and is charged with implementation and unification of Program Review and SLOs.

The major progress in relation to Recommendation #1 has occurred in the development and implementation of measurable SLOs at the course level. As stated in the Progress Report and corroborated by the chair of the college's curriculum committee, the college has added SLOs to an additional 33 percent of all Course Outline of Record (COR) since spring 2007. As of April 15, 2008, the college's cumulative total for completed SLOs in the COR has increased to 49.2 percent. The college provided a plan indicating that completion of all course SLOs is targeted for fall 2009. To ensure this deadline is achieved and that Commission Concerns 1 and 2 are addressed, the team encourages accelerating the college's current plans for requiring course syllabi for all courses.

The college has reinforced support for SLOs through various avenues. These include the addition of SLOs to the New Faculty Academy, workshops, and formalizing the role of Instructional Unit Assistants' (department chairs) responsibilities to include course SLOs facilitation.

In contrast to the significant progress from level one, "Awareness," toward level two, "Development," as defined by ACCJC's Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness for course level SLOs, only a limited number of programs have identified SLOs. Program SLOs are at the "Awareness" stage with only ten of the college's career technical education
(CTE) programs having completed SLOs at the time of this visit. The SLC has, however, established target dates for the remaining CTE, all AA and AS, and General Education programs that fall between spring 2009 and spring 2010. In addition to these instructional units, Student and Administrative Services also have target dates of spring 2010. The college stated the target date of the spring 2010 semester was driven by a new, more rapid three-year program review cycle as compared to the previous six-year cycle, and therefore could not be accelerated further.

Despite progress, the team found that Commission Concerns #1 and #2 regarding the Eligibility Requirements remain valid. The college must continue to make rapid progress to meet eligibility requirements #8 and #10.

Team Conclusion:

The team confirmed that the college had made substantive progress in meeting College Recommendation #1. Considerable development and implementation of measurable student learning outcomes (SLOs) has occurred at the course level. In contrast to this progress, the team found that only minimal progress had been made in completing program SLOs. The team concluded that despite progress, Commission Concerns #1 and #2 regarding Eligibility Requirements remain valid. The college must continue to make progress to meet eligibility requirements #8 and #10.

**College 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 improvement to its programs based on the results of the enhanced program review process. (Standards I.B.3, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B.1, II.B.3.c, II.B.4, II.C.2)

The team confirmed that substantive progress has been made in response to Recommendation #2. Program reviews are now implemented and monitored by the college's new Student Learning Committee (SLC), which is responsible for both program reviews and implementing and monitoring the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) process. The SLC has streamlined the program review process to focus upon four of the five elements indicated in the recommendation: student enrollment, retention, success, and achievement of SLOs. The team confirmed that the college did not support program completion as a valid metric because many of their students move directly into the workforce before completing a certificate or degree program. The students may have achieved their educational goals, but the institution may or may not receive notification.

Additional enhancements to the program review process include acceleration of the cycle and a new peer review process for instructional areas. The formal program
review cycle has been shortened from six to three years, with annual reporting for all areas of technology, facilities, and staffing needs. A new Peer Review Committee provides feedback and evaluates the credibility of plans for instructional areas. Program review results are evaluated by the Peer Review Committee, prioritized by the division dean, assigned a leader and a timeline, and presented to the Vice President of Instruction (VPI). The VPI then includes program review goals in the division dean’s evaluation process. Although Student Services and Administrative areas do not participate in peer review, their program review timelines now align with the instructional program review cycle.

Team Conclusion:

The team confirmed that substantive progress has been made in response to College Recommendation #2. Program Reviews are now implemented and monitored by the college’s new Student Learning Committee (SLC), which is responsible for both program reviews and the SLO process.

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

The team confirmed that the college has made varying degrees of progress in meeting Recommendation #3. The college has had two planning retreats with another scheduled for May 2008. The result of these retreats has been the establishment of seven planning areas, four key planning principles, a new vision statement, and three new mission statement drafts. The college has clearly dedicated institutional time and effort to redesign and refocus its planning processes.

Instructional areas have implemented a more comprehensive and longer-range planning process through development of a “Year Ahead” schedule development process and a Scheduler’s Forum. These strategies were implemented in response to student requests and were strongly supported by the Counseling Division faculty and staff.
The team confirmed that the Instruction, Student Services, and Administrative Services wings all submit annual year-end reports. These reports are submitted to the Planning and Budgeting Committee as well as the president. Longer-range plans for each wing do not exist, with the exception of the college’s three-year Academic Master Plan.

With regards to Human Resources, partial progress has been made. Plans for streamlining and aligning the human resources processes have been developed and implemented, but information services and facilities planning have yet to demonstrate significant planning and budgeting transformations. Regarding Human Resources, the president proposed, and the Planning and Budgeting Committee approved, a new hiring request cycle for all campus hiring needs in December 2007. All replacement and/or new classified and management positions are hired only three times during each calendar year: October, February, and June.

Faculty positions are identified annually through the program review process each fall utilizing an annual faculty survey of emerging trends and a faculty-requested hiring rubric. Enhancements to the hiring process include fall 2008 plans for including three-year faculty hiring projections prepared by division deans and program review results.

Information Technology (IT) planning has achieved only minimal progress and is in its infancy. A consultant was hired in summer 2007, who identified six recommendations related to organizational structure, including creation of a Chief Instructional Services Officer and creation of a vision for IT services. However, these recommendations have not yet been implemented. The college’s Technology Committee does plan to survey all staff at the college in fall 2008 and develop a three-year technology plan.

Finally, the team confirmed that facilities planning has not been addressed. Academic master planning and facilities planning need to be linked.

Team Conclusion:

The team confirmed that the college has accomplished varying degrees of progress in meeting College Recommendation #3. Instructional areas have implemented the most comprehensive and long-range planning processes.

The team found that partial progress has been made by the college with regard to Human Resources planning. New Human Resources processes have been developed but have yet to demonstrate significant integration into a planning budget system.

The team verified that only minimal progress has been made in the areas of information technology and facilities planning. The college’s technology committee intends to survey all staff in the fall 2008 and develop a three-year technology plan. The team found that facilities planning remains to take place. The college Academic Master Plan will need to support facilities planning.
District Recommendation #11: The team recommends that the college and district adhere to the Commission policy for the evaluation of institutions in multi-college districts by immediately delineating specific district functions as distinct from those of the colleges’ functions, and communicate these delineated functions to all college and district constituencies, so there is a clear understanding of their respective organizational roles, authority and responsibilities for the effective operations of the colleges, and in meeting the Accreditation Standards. (Standards IV.B, IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.g, and Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems, January 2004)

The Team confirmed that the college and district has made only limited progress in meeting Recommendation #11. Team members validated the existence of an organizational chart for the Board of Trustees/District Administration for the 2007-2008 year. The chart documents the reporting relationships of district positions and personnel but does not clearly delineate functions, roles, authority, and responsibilities of district and college operatives or units.

The team found that the district and its colleges have only recently begun to address Recommendation #11. District activity in support of Recommendation #11 has been undertaken at the conceptual/philosophical level. The team noted that a workshop for “board-chancellor governance” occurred on February 28, 2008. The workshop’s March 4, 2008 Summary Report observed that “…the District is experiencing confusion over roles and responsibilities, widespread frustration, and unnecessary and excessive expenditures of resources, energy, and time.” The team also verified that the district Board had conducted a special meeting on March 5, 2008, to hear a joint presentation titled, “Participating Effectively in District and College Governance,” given by Scott Lay, Chief Executive Officer of the Community College League of California, and Mark Wade Lieu, President of the Statewide Academic Senate of California Community Colleges. The presentation included a discussion of AB1725, participatory governance, and regulations for academic senates, staff, and students in relationship to community college boards.

Working documents, Delineation of Authority and Organizational Delineation of Responsibility prepared by the district administration, were discussed with team members by the chancellor’s executive staff. These documents had not been the subject of broad constituent review nor trustee deliberation at the time of the team visit. Consequently, these documents did not constitute an official mapping of current district/campus functions.

The team found that the district is proposing “…to explore proposals and options to clarify the distribution of authority, accountability, and college autonomy, lead[ing] to a more definitive response to the accreditation standards …,” as part of its district planning process in spring 2008.
The team confirmed the district has failed to adhere to Commission policy for the evaluation of institutions in multi-college districts. The district continues to lack clarity in defining its functions as distinct from those of the colleges. The district and its constituent colleges operate without a clear understanding of their respective organizational roles, authority, and responsibilities.

Team Conclusion:

The team found that the district had failed to adhere to the commission policy for the evaluation of institutions in a multi-college district. At the time of the Progress Report Team visit, the district and colleges had only recently begun to address District Recommendation #11. District activity in support of Recommendation #11 had been undertaken at the conceptual/philosophical level. The district and its colleges continue to operate without a clear understanding of their respective organizational roles, authority, and responsibility.

Progress Report Visiting Team Recommendations

To reach the second, or Development phase of the rubric for programs, the team recommends that the college accelerate its efforts in establishing program SLOs. Specifically, the efforts should be focused upon implementing assessment practices for course SLOs and the identification and assessment of program SLOs.

Progress Report Visiting Team Recommendations

To attain the “Development” level for Program Review, the team recommends that the college focus efforts on ensuring that links exist between the results of program assessment and program improvement. In parallel, the college must make certain that resource allocation is closely aligned with program review results.

Progress Report Visiting Team Recommendations

The team recommends that the college place greater emphasis on the integration of their information technology and facilities needs within their planning/budgeting activities.

Progress Report Visiting Team Recommendations

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.
Eligibility Requirements

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)
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