Follow-Up Visit Report

Golden West College

15744 Golden West Street

Huntington Beach, California 92647

A Confidential Report Prepared for the
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

This Report represents the findings of the External Evaluation Team that visited
Golden West College on April 13, 2015

Submitted to:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Submitted by:

Deborah J. Ikeda (Team Chair), Campus President, Clovis Community College Center

Ted Wieden (Team Member), Interim Senior Dean of Efficiency and Accreditation Liaison College, Diablo Valley College

Charlie Ng (Team Member), Vice President Business and Administrative Services, Mira Costa College

Date: April 14, 2015

To: **Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges**

From: **Deborah J. Ikeda, Team Chair**

Subject: **Report of Follow-Up Visit Team to Golden West College, April 13, 2015**

Introduction

An External Evaluation team visit was conducted at Golden West College (GWC) and the Coast Community College District (CCCD) Office on April 13, 2015. The team conducted the site visit at GWC and CCCD for the purpose of verifying evidence and determining whether actions taken to meet reported recommendations had occurred. The team found that the College has addressed all four College recommendations and in conjunction with Coastline Community College also addressed the one outstanding District recommendation.

The College did an excellent job preparing for the visit by arranging for meetings with individuals and groups that were identified by the team. All meeting rooms and the team room were excellent facilities to complete the interview process and team report. Documents that were not submitted to the team ahead of time were in the team room providing the most updated information related to the College's progress in meeting the recommendations. Complete access to databases and other resources was provided for use by the team as requested. Over the course of the day, the team met with several College staff members including the President, Vice President of Instruction, Vice President of Administrative Services, Director of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness, Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services, Student Learning Outcomes Coordinators, Council for Curriculum and Instruction chairperson, and Administrative Director and Accreditation Liaison Officer.

Additionally, a team consisting of the chairs of the Coastline and Golden West teams conducted a site visit to the Coast Community College District Office on April 9 and 13, 2015, to verify that the follow-up reports prepared by the two colleges demonstrated that the District recommendation had been addressed, that deficiencies have been resolved, and that related Accreditation Standards are being met. Members of the District visiting team met with the Coast Community College District Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Educational Services and Technology, District Director of the Office of the Chancellor/Secretary of the Board and five members of the Board of Trustees.

The Follow-Up Report and Visit were expected to document resolution of the following recommendations:

College Recommendation 2: **In order to fully meet the standards and improve institutional planning, the College must implement a process to more specifically create and link objectives**

that lead to accomplishment of the institutional goals and improvement in Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). (Standards I.A.1, I.A.4, I.B.1-7, III.B.2.b)

Findings and Evidence:

Through a series of open meetings, including broad dialogue and transparency, the College Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) adopted the Planning and Decision-Making Guide on May 15, 2014. Subsequent to the adoption of this guide, the P&B adopted additional action plans designed to clarify and implement specific components of the guide including: a revised integrated planning and program review cycle, a revised program review classified requests prioritization process flow chart, a revised request for resources form, a revised resource request from program review flow chart, a revised resource request prioritization rubric, and a revised on-going budget review and development process flow chart. The Resource Request Prioritization Rubric included in the updated Planning and Decision-Making Guide includes clear links to both college goals and key performance indicators ensuring that any allocation of resources will go toward achieving college goals and improving key performance indicators. Programs assess the utilization of any resources received and report out during the next program review cycle.

On Sept 12, 2014 an all-college meeting was held, to which all full-time employees were required to participate, which included an afternoon session on educational planning, student learning outcomes, and strategic planning. One of the primary topics of this meeting was the introduction of the revised and updated Planning and Decision-Making Guide and the linkages between program review, resource requests, college goals, and key performance indicators (KPIs).

The Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness and the College Institutional Effectiveness Committee will evaluate the revised program review process annually. Additionally, the College will host annual all College meetings to engage and inform the College on progress toward achieving goals and KPIs.

Conclusions:

With the revision of the Planning and Decision-Making Guide and the adoption of additional action plans to clarify and implement the Guide, all resource requests and planning documents clearly link activities to achieving college goals and key performance indicators (which include student achievement data such as student success, retention, graduation, and basic skills remediation). This framework sets the structure for linking objectives that lead to the accomplishment of institutional goals and key performance indicators. Further, the College has established a process and assigned responsibility for the annual evaluation of the program review process, thereby ensuring continuous improvement. The College has satisfied the recommendation, resolved the deficiencies, and meets the Standards.

*College Recommendation 3: **In order to meet the standard, it is recommended that the College complete the process of mapping or aligning the course-level SLOs with program-level SLOs***

and general education SLOs and expedite the process of assessing the SLOs. (Standards II.A.2.f, II.A.2, II.A.2.i, ER 10, ER 19)

Findings and Evidence:

The report states and evidence corroborates that as of the date of the report 97% of the college's active courses have been mapped to program learning outcomes or institutional learning outcomes. Assessment of at least one course-level student learning outcome is done every semester a course is offered, with all student learning outcomes for each course being done at least once every program review cycle (three years) pursuant to a new requirement initiated by the College SLO coordinators and the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness. The report further states that as of spring 2014, 87% of active and offered courses and 88% of programs have been assessed, an increase of 15% and 4% respectively since April 2014. The College is to be congratulated on the significant increase in assessment of active courses.

The College intentionally merged general education learning outcomes with institutional learning outcomes in the fall of 2013 through a joint effort by the College SLO coordinators, the Council for Curriculum and Instruction, and the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness. The result is eight (8) revised institutional learning outcomes that include general education learning outcomes. This allows the College to evaluate a subset of institutional learning outcomes and general education learning outcomes every term as all courses are aligned with at least one institutional learning outcome. The report states, and evidence supports, that as of spring 2014, the average proficiency rate for the eight institutional learning outcomes is 87%.

The College continues to move forward with the implementation of TracDat (a commercial tool to house learning outcomes) in phases, with full implementation now estimated to be in spring 2016. Until full implementation of TracDat is completed, the master list of course-level SLOs, program-level SLOs, and ISLOs/GELOs and which ones have been assessed is maintained by the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness.

Conclusions:

The College has significantly aligned course-level SLOs with program-level SLOs and general education/institutional SLOs. The percentage of active and offered courses that have had course-level SLOs assessed has increased substantially during the past year. With the requirement that at least one course-level student learning outcome is done every semester a course is offered, and the alignment of all courses with program SLOs and institutional SLOs, the College has institutionalized a regular assessment cycle that will ensure ongoing evaluation of student learning at all levels. The College has satisfied the recommendation, resolved the deficiencies, and meets the Standards.

*College Recommendation 5: **In order to meet the standard, the College must develop and implement a policy and/or procedures for measuring the program length and intended outcomes of degrees and certificates offered by the College. (Standards II.A, II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.2.h, II.A.6a-c)***

Findings and Evidence:

The College has implemented a standardized program sequence template and included this information in the 2014-2015 catalog. The catalog also contains clearly described program learning outcomes for degrees and certificates. To ensure that the College will sustain this effort, the Council for Curriculum and Instruction agreed, at their meeting of October 7, 2014, that all future discussions about programs and degrees would require a time to completion proposal. According to the Council for Curriculum and Instruction chairperson, the College is currently evaluating the use of the program sequence template to see if modifications should be made to increase its effectiveness.

Conclusions:

With the requirement that all future Council for Curriculum and Instruction discussions about programs and degrees include a mandated time to completion proposal and with the addition of the completed time to completion template as a part of the College catalog, the College has satisfied this recommendation, resolved the deficiencies, and meets the Standards.

2015 College Recommendation 6: **In order to meet the standards, the College must develop financial planning processes that include the following:**
   a. Consider its long-range financial priorities when making short range financial plans.
   b. Develop financial plans that are integrated with and support all institutional plans.
   c. As was noted by the 2000 and 2007 evaluation teams, the College must develop an enrollment management plan in order to maintain the financial viability of the organization (Standards III.D.1.a, III.D.1.c)

Findings and Evidence:

Recommendation 6a, when making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies, plans, and allocates resources for payment of liabilities and future obligations. Long-term fiscal planning and priorities exist in the institution's Long Range Financial Plan (LRFP approved 1/15). These priorities are referenced and linked to the District-wide Strategic Plan (DSP adopted 11/19/14), Educational Master Plan (Ed MP adopted spring 2011), Facilities Master Plan and Amendment (FMP amendment approved spring 2015), Technology Master Plan (TMP adopted 2012), and Enrollment Management Plan (Enroll MP adopted spring 2014). The institution has plans for payments of long-term liabilities and obligations, including debt, health benefits, insurance costs, building maintenance costs, etc. as evidenced by the district's 2014-15 budget and the Prop M endowment fund. The institution allocates resources to the payment of its liabilities and funds/reserves to address long-term obligations as evidenced by the district's 2014-15 Budget Allocation Model. The model describes district revenues, district services, and district-wide expense assessments, and allocations to the college and the liabilities and funds/reserves are expressed in the district's 2014-15 budget. Resources are directed to actuarially developed plans for other post-employment benefits (OPEB) obligations which are also included in the district's 2014-15 budget.

Recommendation 6b, the institution's mission and goals are the foundation for financial

planning. Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional plans. The institution reviews its mission and goals as part of the annual fiscal planning process as evidenced by the Planning and Decision Making Guide (approved 12/10/14) and a sample 2013 program review document (2013 Physical Sciences). The institution identifies goals of achievement in any given budget cycle as evidenced by the goals listed in the aforementioned institutional plans. The institution establishes priorities among competing needs so that it can predict future funding as evidenced by the ranking process in the program review/resource allocation cycle (ranking of resources pdf). Institutional plans exist and are linked clearly to financial plans, both short-term and long-range as evidenced by the aforementioned institutional plans. The financial planning process relies primarily in institutional plans for content and timelines as evidenced by the LRFP. The governing board and other institutional leadership receive information about fiscal planning that demonstrates its links to college planning as evidenced by various board meetings presentations and minutes.

Recommendation 6c, the institution has an Enrollment Management Plan in order to maintain the financial viability of the organization. The plan was approved on 5/14/14. The plan discusses goals including enrollment goals from 2013-14 to 2017-18, accreditation standards, equity and access, student involvement, student success, process refinement, student success pathways, improving remediation and completions, improving financial support, persistence and completion, and outreach goals. The plan discusses the financial implications for each respective goal to assist in maintaining the financial viability of the organization. Additionally, the Board has adopted, for fiscal year 2014-15, the implementation of a Rainy Day Fund (BOT Resolution #14-06). The Rainy Day Fund, to the extent resources are available, will front-load one-time funds to grow the student population consistent with the Enrollment Management Plan. The Enrollment Management Plan assists the college in maintaining the financial viability of the college.

Conclusions:

The financial planning processes and long-range plans have been completed and fully implemented. The College has satisfied this recommendation and now meets the Standards.

District Recommendation 2: To meet the Standards, and as recommended by the 2007 team, the team recommends that the Board and district follow their policies regarding the delegation of authority to the Chancellor for effective operation of the district and to the college presidents for the effective operation of the colleges. Further, the team recommends that the district develop administrative procedures that effectively carry out delegation of authority to the Chancellor and the college presidents. (Standards IV.B.1.j, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.g)

Findings and Evidence:

In responding to the original recommendation and findings and evidence from the Follow-Up Visit Report dated April 8-9, 2014, the District Board of Trustees further revised BP 2200 Board Duties and Responsibilities in April 2014 to include the Chancellor in the hiring and evaluation of the Board Secretary and the appointment and oversight of the District General Counsel,

District External Auditor and District Lobbyist. Prior to the April 2014 site visit, BP 2905 General Counsel was revised in December 2013 to define that direction to the District General Counsel would be received from both the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor. Other board policies pertinent to this recommendation have been revised since the April 2014 visit. BP 6430 Bids and Contracts was revised in November 2014 to clarify the conditions under which the Chancellor may approve contracts with subsequent Board ratification. BP 6100 Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor was revised in November 2014 to clarify under what conditions the Chancellor may amend the terms and conditions of a contract.

Coastline Community College's Follow-Up Report stated that BP 7110 Delegation of Authority Human Resources was approved by the District Board of Trustees in December 2013 as a new Board Policy. Upon closer inspection BP 7110 Delegation of Authority Human Resources was created in February 2003, was revised in December 2013 and again in December 2014. The purpose of the two revisions was to delineate those personnel actions that the Chancellor can approve with subsequent ratification by the Board, and those actions that require Board approval. The key phrase in all of these revisions is that direction that is provided by Board must be done by the Board of Trustees, <u>acting as a whole</u>.

The team was able to verify that the newly created and revised board policies and corresponding administrative procedures relating to the delegation of authority are being implemented. Interviews with the Interim Chancellor, Coastline's President, the Board of Trustees, Board Secretary and District General Counsel, as well as the review of several months of Board minutes indicate that board polices are being followed.

Conclusions:

There has been an incredible transformation in regards to the Board of Trustees adhering to the board policies regarding the delegation of authority to the chancellor. The board fully recognizes that its role is to delegate authority to the chancellor and then hold him/her accountable in the operation of the district. Additionally it is clear that the chancellor effectively delegates authority to the presidents and then holds them accountable in the operation of the campuses.

The District has satisfied this recommendation and now meets the Standards.