External Evaluation Report

Golden West College

15744 Golden West Street

Huntington Beach, California

A Confidential Report Prepared for the Accrediting Commission

For the Community and Junior Colleges

The report represents the findings of the External Evaluation Team
that visited Golden West College on March 18 – 21, 2013.

Deborah J. Ikeda, Team Chair

Golden West College

External Evaluation Visit Team Roster
Monday, March 18-Thursday, March 21, 2013

Ms. Deborah J. Ikeda (Chair)
Campus President
Willow International Community College Center

Ms. Kelly Fowler (Assistant)
Vice President of Instruction and Student Services
Willow International Community College Center

Dr. Dennis Gervin
President
Columbia College

Dr. Ron Oxford
Librarian
West Hills College Lemoore

Mr. Howard Kummerman
Dean, Institutional Research & Planning
Rio Hondo College

Ms. Suzette Robinson
Director of Academic Programs
University of Hawai`i Community Colleges

Mr. Joseph Meyer
Professor of Political Science
Los Angeles City College

Dr. Mark Sanchez
Dean of Student Services, Counseling
Fresno City College

Mr. Charlie Ng
Vice Chancellor-Fiscal Services
San Bernardino CCD

Mr. Ted Wieden
Professor of Geography/Meteorology
Diablo Valley College

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: Golden West College

DATE OF VISIT: March 18 – 21, 2013

TEAM CHAIR: Deborah Ikeda
                 Campus President, Willow International Community College Center

A ten-member accreditation team visited Golden West College from March 18-21, 2013, for the purposes of evaluating how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes, analyzing how well the College is meeting the Accreditation Standards, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the status of the College.

In preparation for the visit, the 10 team member team, including one team assistant attended an all-day training session on February 8, 2013, conducted by the ACCJC and studied Commission materials prepared for visiting teams. Team members read the College's Self Evaluation Report, including the recommendations from the 2007 visiting team, and assessed the various forms of evidence provided by the institution.

Prior to the visit team members reviewed the 2012 Institutional Self Evaluation Report, completed initial written assignments regarding the Self Evaluation Report and identified areas that required further investigation. On the evening before the formal beginning of the visit, the team members spent the evening discussing their views of the written materials and evidence provided by the institution as well as the Midterm Report completed by the institution on March 15, 2010, and other materials submitted to the Commission since its last comprehensive visit.

During the visit, the team met and interviewed 110 people and held 60 meetings with faculty, staff, administrators, Board of Trustees, and students. In addition, two open meetings were held with over 30 people in each session. The team chair, Standard IIID team lead, Standard IV team lead and members from other College teams met with members of the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, other district administrators and staff. Team members also attended several College committee meetings, and scheduled two open meetings to take comment from the public or anyone on campus. Team members also visited various classes.

The College was well prepared for the visit and everyone on campus was welcoming and helpful. The team felt that the Self Evaluation Report was comprehensive and thorough. The College community made themselves available for interviews and last minute appointments and was very accommodating.

COMMENDATIONS

1. Golden West College should be commended on the consistent use of its five-column planning model implemented throughout the College as a recognized process for evaluation, improvement, and dialog.

2. GWC should be commended on the Program Vitality Process. The well thought out process includes all campus constituents, relying on data and good dialogue to make important decisions about program discontinuance and improvement.

3. The College is to be commended on the development and implementation of the 'Planning Guide for Transfer Students,' written for students who plan to transfer from GWC to another College.

4. The College has a broad range of student activities, clubs, and programs to serve its increasingly diverse student population. It also has many different events on campus that celebrate their diversity. The College is committed to sustaining these programs and activities to continue to foster cultural awareness and understanding on campus.

5. The library staff is commended for carrying out a thorough weeding and evaluation of the collection while planning for the new Learning Resource Center. The reclassification of all items was no doubt a tedious process that appears to have been carefully handled.

6. The College provides extensive academic support through such programs as the Tutorial and Learning Center (T&LC) which also houses the Math Tutoring Center and International Student Conversation Lab, Student Computer Center (SCC), and Writing and Reading Center (WRC). These services are robust and well utilized.

7. A well developed and heavily utilized system of social networking has recently been developed and is being expanded. Library and Learning Support Services is commended for reaching out to students in a forum that is so heavily utilized by their demographic.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2013 Visiting Team

District Recommendations

1. To meet the Standard and as recommended by the 2007 Orange Coast team, the team recommends that faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.1.c)

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)

3. To meet the Standard, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees follow its established process for self-evaluation of Board performance as published in its board policy. (Standard IV.B.1.g)

4. To meet the Standards and as recommended by the 2007 team, the team recommends that the board implement a process for the evaluation of its policies and procedures according to an identified timeline and revise the policies as necessary. (Standard IV.B.1.e)

College Recommendations

1. In order to improve effectiveness, the College should implement a process and timeline to evaluate the newly implemented structure for staffing, core planning structure, and planning processes to ensure they align with the mission and have resulted in improved student success. (I.A.1, I.A.3, I.A.4, I.B, III.A.2, IV.B.2.a)

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 KPIs. (I.A.I, I.A.4, I.B.1-7, III.B.2.b)

3. In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that the College complete the process of mapping (aligning) course-level SLOs with program-level SLOs and general education SLOs and expedite the process of assessing all SLOs. Doing so will allow the College to ensure that it is awarding credit based on student achievement of a course's stated learning outcomes as well as awarding degrees and certificates based on student achievement of stated learning outcomes. (II.A.2.f, II.A.2.h, II.A.2.i, ER 10, ER 19)

4. In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that the College ensure that all students receive a course syllabus containing course-level student learning outcomes, properly labeled, for all courses regardless of delivery modality. (II.A.6)

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

6. (2013) In order to meet the Standards, the College must develop financial planning processes that include the following:

   a. Consideration of its long-range financial priorities when making short-range financial plans
   b. Development of financial plans that are integrated with and supports all institutional plans
   c. Development of an enrollment management plan in order to maintain the financial viability of the organization (as noted in 2000 and 2007) (Standard III.D.1.a, III.D.1.c)

ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT FOR

GOLDEN WEST COLLEGE

Introduction

Golden West College is a comprehensive community College located in Orange County, California and is part the three College Coast Community College District. Based upon an analysis of residential zip codes reported by enrolled students, the College serves students from Orange and adjacent Los Angeles County that encompasses a 9-mile radius surrounding the College. Student enrollments comes from 21 different cities with Huntington Beach generating the highest percentage of students accounting for 20.9 percent followed by Westminster with 13.5 percent. The College served an unduplicated headcount of 13,312 students in 2011 and generated 5,182 FTE's during the Fall 2011 semester. The College opened in 1966 and celebrated its forty-fifth anniversary in 2011.

Golden West College (GWC) offers a variety of instructional programs that reflect the mission of the College. GWC offers 9 transfer degrees and an Associate in Arts degree with 44 different majors or 10 areas of emphasis. In addition, GWC offers 27 certificates of achievement and 10 certificates of specialization.

The District passed Measure C in 2002, and the College received $96,000,000 to complete twelve projects. The District recently passed Measure M, and the College is in discussion regarding the use of their portion of the $700,000,000 from Measure M. According to the Facilities Master Plan, the College's priorities are to build math/science, criminal justice, and language arts facilities.

The student body is comprised of 54 percent female and 45 percent male. The College has a younger than average student population with 64 percent of the students age 24 years old or younger. The ethnic distribution is approximately 37 percent White Non-Hispanic, 28 percent Asian, and 24 percent Hispanic. Day time attendance makes up 70 percent of the student population, and evening only attendance is 23 percent. Two-thirds of the first-time students that take the placement test place into basic skills English or English as a Second Language. 60 percent of the students place into basic skills math.

The College also offers a wide variety of student support services to assist students towards successful completion of their goals. Student Support Services recently implemented new technologies to increase efficiency and better serve students. These include the implementation of SARS, a student appointment system, and the online orientation program. The Student Activities Office hosts a variety of activities geared towards fostering cultural awareness on campus.

Golden West College and indeed the Coast District have gone through a considerable transition in leadership and restructuring since the last comprehensive visit. The College is still in an administrative restructuring process that hasn't been universally accepted. Nevertheless, there appears to be willingness by most to move forward and to put student success first.

EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES TO PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS (2007)

Recommendation 1
The team recommends that the College review College Goals to ensure that they are aligned with the mission and measurable so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed (Standards I.A.1, and I.B.2).

The quality of the institution's response for Recommendation 1 is sufficient to provide evidence that the College has focused on both the mission and alignment of the institutional goals with the mission. The self-evaluation includes evidence of updated Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) as evidence of completing both the measurable component of Recommendation 1 and also the specific recommendation for KPI's in Recommendation 4. Although the KPI's provide measures for indicators within the broad institutional goals, they do not provide the specific steps to meet the KPI goal. There seems to be a missing link between the Mission, the broad Goals and Objectives, and how the goal in the Key Performance Indicators will be met. This recommendation is partially addressed. See 2013 College Recommendation 2.

Recommendation 2
The team recommends that the College initiate and sustain dialogue about Student Learning Outcomes to reach a broad-based understanding of outcomes and assessment (Standards I.B.1, I.B.2, and I.B.5).

The college has established Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) for each of the courses but has not completed the mapping to program level or general education SLO's. In addition, the assessment processes for Student Learning Outcomes at all levels is not complete. This recommendation has been partially addressed and deficiencies have continued to be addressed to meet Standard IB. See 2013 College Recommendation 3.

Recommendation 3
The team recommends that the College stabilize, make vibrant, and validate the nascent planning structure. The team further recommends that the College formalize processes to evaluate the effectiveness of the various components of the Core planning structure, including its committees, processes, and planning tools (Standards I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, and I.B.5).

The College has established well thought out planning structures and evaluation processes. The College has made major changes in its Key Performance Indicators, Goals and Program Review process since the last visit. The new all-inclusive planning and decision making guide provided as evidence in the Golden West College Addendum is a huge step to place all core planning documents, program review processes and resource allocation in one all-inclusive document. This recommendation has been addressed and deficiencies have continued to be addressed to meet Standard IB.

Recommendation 4
The team recommends that the College identify and formalize key performance indicators for Institutional Effectiveness, and clarify the connection of Institutional Effectiveness to the Program Review process (Standard I.B.6).

Golden West College does a good job in Recommendation 4 establishing KPI metrics within the College goals to indicate the current College data for the indicator, comparison data, and in some cases where the College should be in the future. The missing component for the Goals and Objectives are the specific measurable steps that the College will take to achieve the desired indicator and how doing so will meet the stated goals. This recommendation is partially addressed. See 2013 College Recommendation 2.

Recommendation 5:
The team recommends that the College evaluate its current progress in defining and establishing student learning outcomes, and through broad based and inclusive dialogue renew its efforts to develop a common understanding of student learning outcomes. The College must establish student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees (Standards II.A.1.c, II.A.2 and II.A.3).

The College has developed course-level SLOs for virtually all courses. Program-level SLOs have been established for most, but not all programs. The College has also developed SLOs for general education. The College has dedicated considerable resources to the development, assessment and evaluation of SLOs. SLOs are a key component of all instructional and student services program reviews. Efforts to infuse SLOs into the College planning and resource allocation processes have resulted in widespread dialogue about student learning and achievement. According to GWC's SLO report, the College has established SLOs for 98% of all courses and 98% of all programs. This recommendation has been addressed.

Recommendation 6:
The team recommends that the College establish effective evaluation for all educational delivery methods, specifically distance education and large lecture instructional formats, in order to improve student success (Standard II.A.2).

The College has established separate program reviews for large lecture format courses and for distance education courses. The Key Performance Indicators (3/2/13) indicate that student enrollment in large format classes (greater than 55) has increased over the past several years with over 45% of all students now enrolled in large format classes. Although student success in large format, face-to-face classes has remained stable since fall 2008, it remains at least 6 percentage points lower than courses with enrollments less than 55. A similar pattern exists in online courses with higher success rates in classes with enrollments less than 55. The use and support for large format classes is currently a topic of discussion between the academic senate and the College administration. This recommendation has been addressed.

Recommendation 7:
The team recommends that the College commit to student equity and diversity through implementing the goals of the student equity task force, in order to assure equitable access and learning support for all of its students (Standards II.B.3.a and II.B.3.d).

Based on the response, the College has implemented a process utilizing its Student Equity Committee (SEC) which is a standing sub-committee of the Student Success Committee to begin reviewing the equity issues that are affecting the College. The SEC has begun to review data and develop objectives for addressing equity issues. The SEC is currently focused on three primary equity areas: 1. low student placement rates into transfer level English; 2. low placement rates into transfer level math courses; and 3. low transfer rates for underrepresented student groups.

The evidence presented for supporting the College's commitment to planning to address student equity and diversity issues was the Student Equity Plan, 2009-2011.
The College has made progress to begin dialogue and program adjustments in addressing equity issues and should continue on with these processes as Standard II.B.3.a and IIB.3.d is very clear that the College should assure equitable access and learning support for all of its students. The Student Services Division is now using data and planning to begin to address the gaps in access and learning support for students.

The Student Activities office plans a broad range of events for student involvement with the goal of developing personal growth in students. Student Activities collaborates with the Intercultural Center on campus to host a variety of activities geared towards fostering cultural awareness on campus. One event worth noting is Chicano/Latino Day on campus. This is an event which hosts 400-500 Chicano/Latino high school students on the Golden West campus to provide these students a one-day College experience. These activities create venues for students to engage on campus while also providing an opportunity for the entire campus community to get involved in celebrating the diversity of the population the College serves.

Student support services programs partner with the Learning Resource Center and Tutorial services to ensure students have the academic support necessary to meet their educational goals. Tutorial services provide support in person either individually or in study groups based on the delivery method preference of the students. Tutorial has committed to providing academic support to students enrolled in the EOPS program and also student athletes. All student service program participants and general student populations have access to tutorial services offered through the Learning Resource Center (Standards II.B.3.a and II.B.3.d). This recommendation has been addressed.

Recommendation 8:
The team recommends the College provide adequate resources to ensure the institution meets the professional development needs of its personnel (Standard III.A.5.a)

Golden West College has two committees, the Staff Development Advisory Committee and the Institute for Professional Development (IPD) Committee, whose responsibilities include

organizing, coordinating, and approving the funding of staff development activities. The Staff Development Advisory Committee, composed of four members each from the faculty and classified staff, three administrators, one part-time faculty, and one student representative, recommends the distribution of state staff development funds when available. The IPD Committee supports faculty professional development requests and is funded through the agreement between the AFT/CFE and the District. The District funds the Professional Development program for classified employees in the amount of $55,000 per year, and for the faculty in the amount of $12,000 per year. Faculty, however, also have access to professional development funds from other sources (e.g., campus funds) to help support professional staff development for faculty. This recommendation has been addressed.

Recommendation 9:
The team recommends that because funds authorized under Measure C for the GWC campus facilities improvement will be insufficient to meet all of the needs identified in the Facilities Master Plan, a specific strategy must be developed to secure additional funding for these deferred projects (Standard III.B.2.a.)

The District has secured $700,000,000, Measure M, for capital projects. Golden West College is in the midst of discussions to identify College needs based on the College's Facilities Master Plan (Standard III.B.2.a). This recommendation has been addressed.

Recommendation 10:
The team recommends the College complete the Enrollment Management Plan as specified by the 2000 and 2007 visiting teams. In order to maintain financial viability of the organization, special attention must be given to district reported decline in enrollment for 05/06 (Standard III.D.1.c).

The institution's response to this recommendation from its Accreditation Midterm Report dated March 15, 2010 was, "In process..." and that in fall 2009, "the District's Enrollment Planning Team... completed an Enrollment Management Plan titled 'Enrollment Management Principles and Guidelines.'" The plan addressed common course transfer/numbering, student applications, registration, inter-College registration, common assessment instruments, and financial aid. The plan did not address actual enrollment to assist in maintaining the financial viability of the institution.

In October 2010, a PowerPoint titled "GWC Enrollment Management" described enrollment management of the institution, but it only addressed the performance of the spring 2011 semester. The document was not an Enrollment Management Plan used to by the institution to "maintain financial viability of the organization."

In the Self Evaluation Report the institution states on page 301 that the Instructional Planning Team is "creating an enrollment management plan." The institution provided the visiting team a draft Enrollment Management Plan 2012-16 dated 5/30/12. However, this plan does not discuss actual enrollment "in order to maintain financial viability of the organization." Instead, the plan discusses accomplishing goals including 1) increasing focus on student completion; 2) increasing capacity in, and ease of navigation through student pathways; 3) identify ways to streamline majors and certificates; 4) improving scheduling patterns and; 5) implement year-ahead scheduling.

The 2012-13 District Budget includes projections that assume California Proposition 30 passing and not passing in the 2012-13 Budget. However, this information was used for illustrative purposes in discussing the impact of passing (and not passing) Prop 30 on the District's budget, and it did not serve as the institution's Enrollment Management Plan. The institution plans enrollment on an annual basis. Also, the institution is in discussions with District to develop a standard in developing FTES projections, the process for determining FTES, and a calendar/schedule for the process. At this time, the institution does not have an Enrollment Management Plan that allows the institution to maintain its financial viability. This recommendation has not been addressed. See 2013 College Recommendation 6.

Recommendation 11:
The team recommends that the board develop a clearly defined procedure for addressing board member behavior that violates its Code of Ethics. Additionally, it is recommended that the district develop a written code of professional ethics for all its personnel (Standards II.A.1.d, IV.B.1, IV.B.1.g, and IV.B.1.h)

The Coast Community College District Board of Trustees updated Board Policy 2715 (Code of Ethics for Members of the Board of Trustees) on July 25, 2012. This recommendation has been addressed.

Recommendation 12:
The team recommends that the board adopt a formal written process for the selection of chancellor, vice chancellors, and College presidents. In addition, the board should develop a policy that clearly delegates authority from the chancellor to the College presidents for the effective operation of the Colleges. (Standards IV.B.1.j, IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a)

The district has responded effectively to the recommendation for a formal written process to select the senior administrators in the district by revising Board Policy 7909, most recently in May 2012. Thus the district meets the initial statement in Standard IV.B.1.j. The district provides effective leadership to and liaison with the Colleges and appropriately has defined

and implemented clear roles of authority and responsibility between the Colleges and the district, thus meeting Standard IV.B.3. The district has partially responded to the recommendation regarding delegation of authority by developing such a policy although that policy is not consistently followed. Consequently, the district does not fully meet Standards IV.B.1.j and IV.B.3.a.

The Board of Trustees adopted revised hiring policies in January 2012. Interviews with district and College personnel affirmed that policies are followed with the occasional exceptions corrected expeditiously. The Board of Trustees delegates district operational responsibility to the chancellor as stated in Board Policy 2201. The district has also defined such responsibilities in a Delineation of Functions Map. Review of minutes of Board committees and of minutes of Board meetings plus interviews with members of the Board of Trustees and constituent group leaders demonstrate that the Board is still in the process of clarifying its role regarding the distinction between policies to govern the district and procedures to operate the district and its Colleges. Of particular concern are Board initiation of academic plans such as changes in the manner in which the Colleges offer English as a Second Language, Board involvement in proposing changes to the Colleges' self-studies, and Board incursion in the authority delegated to the chancellor such as evaluation of the vice chancellors. This recommendation is partially addressed. See 2013 District Recommendation 2.

Recommendation 13:
The team recommends trustees and chancellor establish & communicate a clear vision for the importance of student learning outcomes and program review as assessment processes for institutional improvement (Standard IV.B.1.b)

The trustees and chancellor have sufficiently established and communicated a clear vision for the importance of student learning outcomes and program review as assessment processes and has complied with this recommendation. This recommendation is addressed.

Recommendation 14:
The team recommends that the board implement a process for the evaluation of its policies and procedures according to an identified timeline and revise the policies as necessary. (Standard IV.B.1.e)

The district has begun the process of reviewing and revising its policies and procedures as recommended. In February 2012 the district created Administrative Procedure 2410 in order to clarify and formulize the process by which existing board policies and administrative procedures are revised or created. This process was started just within the last two years and

is not yet complete. The district does not yet meet the Standard. See 2013 District Recommendation 4.

Recommendation 15:
The team recommends that the board establish a process and specific timeline for updating the district's Vision 2010 plan. (Standard IV.B.3)

The District has updated the Vision 2010 plan as the Vision 2020 plan and this has complied with this recommendation and meets the Standard. This recommendation is addressed.

Recommendation 16:
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 district has partially addressed this recommendation by developing a Functional Map of district and College responsibilities related to the Commission's standards. The map displays both the affected and responsible parties for the major activities of the district and College, as they align with the Accreditation Standards. The Board and staff do not display clear understanding of this delineation of functions, and so the district does not completely meet the Standards.

Review of minutes of Board committees and of minutes of Board of Trustee meetings plus interviews with members of the Board of Trustees and constituent group leaders demonstrate that the Board is still in the process of clarifying its role regarding the distinction between policies to govern the District and procedures to operate the district and its Colleges. Of particular concern are Board initiation of academic plans such as changes in the manner in which the Colleges offer English as a Second Language, Board involvement in proposing changes to the Colleges' self-studies, and Board incursion in the authority delegated to the chancellor such as evaluation of the vice chancellors. This recommendation is partially addressed. See 2013 District Recommendation 2.

Commission Concern.
The Commission expects that institutions meet standards that require the identification and assessment of student learning outcomes, and the use of assessment data to plan and implement improvements to educational quality, by fall 2012. The Commission therefore

requires that the College demonstrate in its next comprehensive evaluation report that the College has met these standards. (Standards I.B.1, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B.4, and II. C.2)

The Commission's concern in regards to Standard II.C.2 has been partially addressed by the institution. The College has identified Student Learning Outcomes at the course level but has not yet fully mapped Program Level Outcomes. In addition, staff interviews and evidence viewed do not confirm that there is an ongoing process of assessment in place for all courses. See 2013 College Recommendation 3.

Eligibility Requirements

1. AUTHORITY
The visiting team confirmed that Golden West College is authorized to operate as an educational institution and is authorized by the State of California to award degrees and certificates. Golden West College is part of the Coast Community College Districts and is evaluated and accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Colleges and Schools. Golden West College meets the minimum requirement and has the requisite authority.

2. MISSION
The visiting team confirmed that Golden West College has an established a clearly defined mission statement that describes the College's commitment to student learning. The College reviewed and revised the mission statement in 2007 followed by the approval of the mission statement by College's Planning and Budget Committee in February 2008. The mission statement was later re-authorized by the Board of Trustees in February 2011.

3. GOVERNING BOARD
The team has confirmed the governing board of Golden West College is the Board of Trustees for the Coast Community College District. The Board of Trustees consists of five elected members who ensure the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the College. However, there are Board Policies without the companion administrative procedures, which would operationalize and ensure compliance with the policies.

4. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
The visiting team confirmed that Golden West College has a Chief Executive Officer that was appointed by the Board of Trustees in 2005. The Chief Executive Officer's full-time responsibility is to the College and does not serve as the chair of the Board of Trustees. The Chief Executive Officer possesses the authority to administer board policies.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY
The visiting team confirmed Golden West College has the administrative capacity to support the chief executive officer and College programs and services.

6. OPERATING STATUS

The visiting team confirmed Golden West College is operational, with students actively enrolled in degree and certificate programs.

7. DEGREES

The visiting team confirmed Golden West College offers 86 associate degree and certificate programs. Survey data indicates that a substantial proportion of the College's postsecondary students are enrolled in courses leading to a degree or transfer.

8. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The visiting confirmed Golden West College offers a variety of educational programs congruent to the College's mission. Seven degree programs and 16 certificate programs can be completed with 50 percent or more of the courses offered online and have been approved in 2012 by ACCJC as a result of the substantive change process. The College offers approximately 53 associate degrees that are two academic years in length.

9. ACADEMIC CREDIT

The visiting team confirmed that Golden West College awards academic credit based on accepted practices of higher education. The College's practices and policies delineated in the catalog state one unit of College credit are defined as one hour of lecture and two hours of homework outside of class per week. For laboratory courses, three hours in the classroom per week with no outside work constitutes one unit of credit. The catalog reiterates that credit value assigned to a course is determined by the number of hours of work required for the student and not by the number of class meetings per week.

10. STUDENT LEARNING AND ACHIEVEMENT

The visiting team confirmed the College has partially defined and published program learning outcomes. For the majority of the College's programs, program learning outcomes have been established regarding student learning and achievement. Assessment is demonstrated through alignment of course student learning outcomes to program learning outcomes. Evidence to demonstrate course alignment was not complete, but did demonstrate that the College is engaged in an established systematic process to regularly assess course and program learning outcomes. The course level outcomes need to be mapped to the program level outcomes and general education outcomes. Although this mapping is complete for some programs it has not been fully completed for the College. (See 2013 College Recommendation 3)

11. GENERAL EDUCATION

The visiting team confirmed Golden West College provides a general education component that ensures the breadth of knowledge and promotes academic inquiry of its students. Competency requirements in mathematics, reading, writing, and speaking are part of the College's general education requirements. The College follows a philosophy and criteria established by the Board of Trustees for the selection of courses for the degree and general education patterns.

12. ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The visiting team confirmed Golden West College has established Board Policies in regards to intellectual freedom and independence. (BP 4030). Board Policy 4030 Academic Freedom supports an atmosphere of independence to examine and challenge ideas that brings about intellectual freedom ultimately leading to discovery and knowledge.

13. FACULTY.

The visiting team confirmed Golden West College is staffed in with a substantial core of 123 full-time faculty who have also met the minimum qualifications set forth by the California Community College Chancellor's Office. The core is sufficient in size and experience to support the College's instructional program. A clear statement of faculty responsibilities included development and review of curriculum as well as assessment of student learning.

14. STUDENT SERVICES

The visiting team confirmed Golden West College provides student services to all students to support student learning and development. In addition, these services support student learning and achievement within the context of the College's mission.

15. ADMISSIONS

The visiting team confirmed Golden West College, consistent with the institutional mission, adheres to admission practices are described per Board Policy 5010 Admissions Policy. The process is also published in the College's catalog and website. Application for admission to Golden West College may be filed either on campus through a hard copy process or electronically through the College's admission's website.

16. INFORMATION AND LEARNING RESOURCES

The visiting team confirmed Golden West College provides long-term access to sufficient information and learning resources in support of the College's mission and instructional programs.

17. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The visiting team confirmed Golden West College has documented a funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development which are adequate to support the College's mission, educational programs, promote institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability.

18. FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The visiting team confirmed Golden West College annually undergoes an audit by an independent certified public auditor. The audit is conducted in accordance with the standards applicable to financial audits as described in the Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statements Numbers 34 and 35 utilizing the Business Type Activity Model recommended by the California Community College Chancellor's Office on Fiscal and Accountability standards. The audit also abides by the requirements as set forth in the California Community Colleges "Contracted District Audit Manual." Golden West College is also in compliance with federal requirements as a Title IV eligible institution.

19. INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION

The team confirmed Golden West College systematically evaluates the progress towards achieving the College's purpose and goals and publishes the results on the College's website. Evidence of planning for improvement of institutional structures and processes was provided along with evidence to demonstrate the College systemically assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals, makes decisions regarding improvement through an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation.

The team was provided evidence that partially supported a systematic cycle of evaluation of improvement regarding student learning outcomes and student achievement. The College campus is actively engaged in utilizing assessment tools such as Nichol's Five-Column Model and continues to engage in open dialogue and discussion about assessments and using results of assessment for improvement. However, the College is not at the proficiency level for student learning outcomes and results of student learning outcomes are not made public at this time. (See 2013 College Recommendation 3)

20. PUBLIC INFORMATION

The team confirmed Golden West College publishes in the College catalog (hardcopy and electronic) and on the website the College's general information: official name, address, telephone number, mission, course, program, and degree offerings, financial aid, available learning resources, and names of faculty and administrators. Although not described in the College catalog, the information regarding the Academic Freedom Statement and Board of Trustee information can be found on the Coast Community College District's website.

Also included in the College's catalog and website is information about admissions, student fees and other financial obligations, and information about degrees, certificates, graduation, and transfer. Major policies affecting students such as academic regulations (including Academic Honesty), non-discrimination, grievance and complaint procedures, sexual harassment and refund of fees.

21. RELATIONS WITH THE ACCREDITING COMMISSION

The visiting team confirmed Golden West College adheres to the Eligibility Requirements and Standards and policies of the Commission. The College describes itself in identical terms to all of its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accredited status, and agrees to disclose information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities. The institution has complied with the Commission's requests, directions, decisions and policies, and the team trusts that the College has made complete, accurate, and honest disclosure.

Standard I
Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Standard IA – Mission

General Observations

Golden West College (GWC) included a well thought out evaluation of Standard I in general. Major evidence in this section included the core planning processes, Educational Master Plan, and Program Review information. GWC is still in the process of implanting changes to its organizational structure which included changes to some committee structures. The College made major changes since the last visit in its Key Performance Indicators, Goals, and Program Review process. These changes set the stage for discussion in Standard I about how the College evaluates student learning and conducts program review and planning processes. The new, all-inclusive planning and decision making guide provided as evidence in the GWC Addendum, is a huge step to place all core planning documents, program review processes, and resource allocation in one all-inclusive document. This is an exemplary practice.

An area that could have been improved in the report itself included better specificity when citing evidence. GWC often provided large documents or websites as evidence to support a claim without providing the specific page numbers. The same evidence such as the Educational Master Plan or the Program Review website was cited multiple times in this manner. There were also several items of evidence that were missing or the link did not work.

For Standard I, institutional improvements from SLOs were indicated through the process to include assessment data in the Program Review process for 2013. SLOs at GWC are reviewed with their five column model. The College indicated that inclusion of additional SLO information in program review was a new development, and this area will need to be evaluated for effectiveness in the process.

The College's updated KPI draft in the addendum indicates a use of student achievement data and the institutional goals that lead to dialog at the College. Dialog on student achievement data also transpires in the GWC program review process and through governance committees as well as in the resource allocation process.

The College should be commended on the consistent use of its 5 column model implemented throughout College as a recognized process for evaluation, improvement, and dialog.

Findings and Evidence

The Golden West College mission statement defines its purposes as listed in their quick facts and Educational Master Plan. Golden West College initiated a process to review and revise its mission statement in 2007 followed by a revised Vision and Values in 2008. In 2009, the

College began the process to develop new College goals. All of these components were included in the adoption of the Educational Master Plan in 2011. (I.A.I)

The College does a good job of publishing the mission statement in College publications and recently had the board approve the current mission as required on September 5, 2012. (I.A.2)

The College recently set in place a process to review the mission statement on a two-year cycle in response to the recommendation from the previous self-evaluation process. The College uses its core planning structure, which includes all constituencies as part of the decision making process, to review and revise the mission. Golden West's program review process helps the College understand from the bottom up any changes at the College that might prompt the need to change the statement. (I.A.3)

The College has utilized its mission statement to focus on student success and the three major tiers of its statement (improve basic skills, develop and enhance career opportunities, and / or prepare for transfer to a four-year institution) as it instituted major changes to organizational structure including staffing and committees. As the new structure was put into place, decision making based on the mission continued using the core planning structure. In fall 2011, the three tiers of the mission guided expenditure reductions for classes that were not in line with the mission. (I.A.4)

The institution provided the standards that were established to address student success and achievement per the USDE Regulations. The team reviewed these standards and determined they had been met. (USDE 34.C.F.R. 602.16(a)(1)(i)

Conclusion

The College meets this standard. Learning programs and services are aligned with the mission, character, and student population. The mission statement is approved by the governing Board and published. The institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary. The institution's mission is central to institutional planning and decision making processes are in place for the mission statement to guide these efforts.

The self-evaluation for I.A.4 includes an Actionable Improvement Plan that states: *The College will monitor and review the effectiveness of the changes adopted in the new organizational structure to ensure that the College continues to improve services to students in accordance with our mission.* This improvement plan should include how the College will use its core planning structure and decision making guide to monitor and review the organizational structure changes and what criteria will be used to measure the effectiveness for this endeavor.

Recommendations
None

Standard I
Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Standard IB – Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The College should be commended for the level of dialogue regarding student learning and institutional process and the inclusion of constituency groups according to the Core Planning Structures. The College appears to be following the document created to guide the process for the campus to remain involved with decision making.

The members of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and the chairs of Program Review and Student Learning Outcomes show a great commitment to the College and the process of assessment and continuous improvement. The processes consolidated in the College Decision Making Guide are followed by College staff and committees.

The College will implement changes to program review for the upcoming cycle based on recommendations from the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. The College program review process will require additional evaluation once the 2013 cycle is complete to ensure that the changes are producing the intended outcome.

The College is utilizing student achievement data in a wide range of planning levels to assist in decision making and assessment of its programs. Student learning outcomes assessment data will be utilized in future cycles of the program review process.

Findings and Evidence

The College should be commended for the Program Review evaluation process by IEC with dialog leading to specific recommendations for improvement. The information on the Program Review web page and corresponding evidence regarding the result of the evaluation process indicates that the College meets the Standard. (1.B.1)

As discussed in response to the College analysis of Recommendations 1 and 4 from the previous team, the KPIs help to establish the measures for the broad general goals, but the specific links to how improvement will take place is dispersed throughout the College. The College needs to specifically link work or objectives that will fulfill the stated goals that meet the mission. KPIs are only measures of current status and indicate the goal of the ultimate result. How the College will reach the ultimate desired results is unclear.

The updated KPI report in the Addendum was helpful to see that the College has moved from a draft document that was missing information to an institutionally approved version with complete data. There are "sub-goals" within the KPI document for some indicators but not others.

The College program review process does include College goals as they relate to programs on the two-year cycle. The program objectives are included in the five-column model based on one of the seven College goals. The objectives for these goals stay at the program level.

Managers also develop objectives that meet one of the College goals. The template for the managers goals obtained during the site visit indicates it is for submitted to supervisors for their own personnel evaluation purposes. The document is not used for campus-wide planning.

The Employee Accreditation Survey administered in fall 2001 indicated that discussion regarding the College's goals is needed. Conversation with administrative and classified staff at the College supported these results and the need for employees to have a better understanding of the College goals and how they will be achieved through everyday work at the institution. It should be noted that the survey sample was low and participation in the survey by administrators not significant. (I.B.2)

The College is moving forward with an integrated planning process model and core planning structure. The College has made great progress by incorporating a well-structured cyclical program review process and program vitality process into a planning structure that utilizes data to promote dialog and decision making. The overall process also incorporates a documented resource allocation process detailed in the Planning and Decision-Making Guide.

The program review and vitality review process include student achievement data that programs analyze and use as the basis for resource allocation requests. The last process of program review included only data on student learning outcomes inventory and limited assessment data as the College lacked this data as part of their SLO process. The College indicates that the SLO assessment data would be included in the 2013 program review process. (I.B.3)

The planning model and decision making processes incorporate mechanisms to include all constituencies through committee structures and program review process. It should be noted, however, that students are not represented to the same degree as staff, faculty and administration when it comes to their representation as a constituent group in the Core Planning structure. The current planning structure receives input from these constituent groups through their participation in other College-wide committees. Documented changes have occurred through the GWC program vitality process where some programs have been eliminated and others modified for improvement.

The College Goals Workshops have been included as evidence and referenced a number of times. Staff indicated, however, that with the change in the College structure, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) will continue these discussions in place of the

workgroups. The IEC members represent all constituencies, and having the group complete this work will avoid duplication of efforts by multiple committees.

The evaluation of SLOs, program review, and planning by the seven core planning teams is broad based and inclusive of all constituency groups. (I.B.4)

The College indicates that it utilizes and publicizes internally and externally the Accountability Report for Community Colleges (ARCC) data, program review, SLO five-column reports, and the Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Report. These documents appear to be readily available to the campus internally and open to the public on the College's website. The College does not appear to have a way to determine if the information about institutional quality is effectively communicated to the public.

The College should be commended on the Program Vitality Process. The well thought out process includes all campus constituents, relying on data and good dialogue to make important decisions about program discontinuance and improvement.

As noted earlier, the College is lacking SLO assessment data in past program review templates and was not required in the process. The College plans to include SLO assessment in the 2013 process for program review. (I.B.5)

The College indicates that planning bodies and task forces assess the planning process after each cycle. As found in the Decision Making Guide, the IEC coordinates the committee self-evaluation process where members of the groups use the five column model along with the eight factor model of committee effectiveness. Earlier in the self-evaluation document, the College had evidence for review and revision by the IEC of the Program Review process. They made recommendations for changes to sections, data, and forms.

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee evaluates the program review process following each cycle. The most recent two-year cycle included the following major committee recommendations.

- Change to a Spring Program Review report with resource allocation ratings in the fall so a prioritized list of faculty is available sooner.
- Strengthened availability of student achievement data through ARGOS cubes and improved questions for data analysis.
- The IPT will conduct peer review and feedback related to the quality of the written report.
- SLO inventory is no longer required to allow more analysis of assessment data using the five column model.

Although the addition of SLO assessment data is commendable, the analysis of data and information in the program review document is not validated or discussed more widely outside of the basic review of the quality of written report by the IPT.

Although the core planning structure has significantly changed including the program review process, the last review of the resource allocation ranking process for faculty by Academic Senate and the process for ranking classified requests took place in 2006. Staff indicated that the process has been reviewed but no evidence exists for specific discussions by Academic Senate or other planning bodies.

The College's process for allocating one-time requests was reviewed by a task force of the Planning and Budget Committee. These changes in the 2010-2012 cycle were changed and are in the current budget allocation model in the decision making guide.

The College also includes all core planning teams in an annual assessment of program review, planning, and student learning outcomes based on the ACCJC Rubrics. The teams ranked each area on a four point scale, and the aggregated results are scored. The data indicates that respondents have scored the College at the Developmental Level for all rubrics. College staff indicates that these are individual perceptions based on the rubrics and that scores are close to proficiency. The most important factor in doing this assessment is to hold dialog about improving each of the focus areas. (I.B.6)

The information and evidence in I.B.7 includes program review as the primary process for gathering evidence about the effectiveness of programs and services. The evaluation by IEC and other planning bodies of the program review and resource allocation process are indicated as the process the College uses to assess its evaluation mechanisms. (I.B.7)

Conclusions

Although the College created goals with Key Performance Indicators that are measurable, it is unclear how the goals will be accomplished. The College should provide a link from program review, administrative goals and objectives, and other College processes to the specific goals and key performance indicators that they support.

An area of planned improvement for the College's Program Review process includes a more formalized template to integrate student learning outcomes. Although the team recognizes this as an improvement in the program review process, the College will need to complete the 2013 cycle before it can be evaluated. The plan to include SLO assessment data does not include details about how the information will influence resource allocation or greater dialog about improved student support or learning. The College does not meet sections of this Standard.

Recommendations

College Recommendation 1:
In order to improve effectiveness, the College should implement a process and timeline to evaluate the newly implemented structure for staffing, core planning structure, and planning

processes to ensure they align with the mission and have resulted in improved student success. (I.A.1, I.A.3, I.A.4, I.B 1-7, III.A.2, IV.B.2.a)

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 KPIs. (I.A.I, I.A.4, I.B.1-7, III.B.2.b)

Standard II
Student Learning Programs and Services

Standard IIA – Instructional Programs

General Observations

Golden West College offers a variety of instructional programs that reflect the mission of the College. The College offers nine transfer degrees and an Associate in Arts degree with forty-four different majors or ten areas of emphasis. In addition, twenty-seven certificates of achievement and ten certificates of specialization are offered. Organizationally, the College has undergone some recent structural changes in the instructional area due to retirements and budget reductions. These changes included the reorganization and consolidation of the academic divisions. In addition, the College reduced the number of vice presidents from three to two.

Findings and Evidence

The College ensures that all its offerings, regardless of delivery mode, fit its stated mission and uphold its integrity. To ensure integrity across the curriculum, the Council on Curriculum and Instruction (a committee of the academic senate) reviews all curriculum for content, quality, existence of student learning outcomes (SLOs) and currency. Discussions regarding instructional issues with the College's executive management team are done in the Academic Issues Council (AIC). In addition, the College uses its Mission to guide the development and evaluation of courses and programs. (II.A.1)

Annual meetings with Advisory Committees in Career Technical Education (CTE) areas provide information to the College regarding student needs. Assessment tests are also used to determine needs of incoming students. In the fall of 2011, an Accreditation Student Survey was conducted to determine the level to which students were satisfied with the educational effectiveness of the College. These results were generally positive; however, no evidence was provided that the College uses internal research functions to determine student needs. Although the College appears to have developed SLOs for all courses and most programs, evidence only shows that approximately 35% of course-level SLOs have been assessed. (II.A.1.a)

Courses are offered in the traditional face-to-face mode, entirely online, and hybrid. The number of online courses has remained steady over the past few years (2008-2010). The College submitted a substantive change proposal for sixteen certificates and seven associate degrees, for which more than 50 percent of the courses could be taken in a distance education format, in the spring of 2011. This proposal was approved by the ACCJC Committee on Substantive Change at their meeting of June 30-July 1, 2011. The College utilizes the Blackboard Learning Management System (LMS) and provides training for faculty to develop and offer online courses using this system. The College verifies that students who are enrolled in distance education courses are the same students as those who receive credit

by issuing a student identification number and confidential password with which students log into the Blackboard LMS. (II.A.1.b)

The College appears to have developed SLOs for all courses and most programs. Course-level SLOs are linked to the official course outline of record. The College is in the process of implementing an online curriculum management program (CurricuNet). Although electronic files have been put into CurricuNet, the information has not yet been validated for accuracy. A sampling of the outlines in CurricuNet revealed that most courses do have course-level SLOs, however many of the courses reviewed did not contain any content or course objectives. A sampling of the hard copy course outlines of record, maintained in the vice president's office, verified that course outlines do contain course-level SLOs. General Education SLOs are published in the College catalog; however, program-level SLOs for degrees, certificates and majors are not published in the College catalog. All General Education SLOs and program-level SLOs are published on the GWC web site. Course and program-level SLO assessment results and mapping/alignment spreadsheets are stored in a shared cloud-based storage system (DropBox). Access to the cloud-based storage system was provided in advance of the visit and was reviewed. Documents in DropBox indicated which course, program, general education and institutional SLOs had been assessed by each program. In addition, spreadsheets displayed the mapping/alignment between course-level SLOs and program-level SLOs, general education SLOs and institutional SLOs. A random sampling of 552 courses with course-level SLOs shows that 191 had been assessed (approximately 35%). The College has not established a definitive timeline or schedule for assessing the remaining course-level SLOs. Responsibility rests with the individual instructional departments to ensure that all course-level SLOs are assessed at least once every three years. The College indicates that approximately 56% of all instructional programs have ongoing assessment of program-level SLOs. To accomplish the assessment of program-level SLOs faculty use course-level SLOs that are mapped/aligned to program-level SLOs. An evaluation of the mapping/alignment spreadsheets in the DropBox showed that many, but not all, disciplines had mapped/aligned cSLOs to pSLOs. Incomplete mapping between course-level SLOs and program-level SLOs calls into question the extent to which the College is assessing program-level SLOs. There does not appear to be widespread use of the results of SLO assessment to make improvements in the instructional programs thereby improving student learning and success. The College appears to have linked SLOs with program reviews. In order for an Instructional Unit (IU) to be eligible for additional resources, the IU must show that it has completed its SLO obligations. (II.A.1.c)

The Council on Curriculum and Instruction (CCI), a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, is charged with reviewing course proposals, course revisions, programs, certificates and degrees. The CCI has a well-developed course approval process as well as forms for course approval and course revision and a separate form for approving a course to be offered in an online format. The online course approval form specifically requires faculty to provide information on how the instructor will ensure that student-instructor contact will be equivalent to a face-to-face class. These processes and forms assure the quality of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution. Access was provided to all online courses in advance of the site visit. A review of a sample of these courses revealed regular and substantive interaction between the instructors and students with

communication being initiated by both groups. (II.A.2) The College may want to consider using the administrative functions in a learning management system to provide more quantitative evidence regarding the amount of interaction between faculty and students in online courses in order to comply with US Department of Education regulations. Faculty, along with Advisory Committee input as appropriate, initiate the development and review of curriculum, including learning outcomes. Curriculum and programs are reviewed on a regular basis in accordance with College policy and procedures. (II.A.2.a)

Competency levels and measurable learning outcomes are developed by GWC faculty with input from Advisory Committees as appropriate. Student progress toward achieving learning outcomes is a component of the biennial program review process. (II.A.2.b)

The College ensures high-quality instruction through the rigorous application of program review. All instructional units complete a program review every two years. As a result of this program review process and the program vitality review process, the College has reduced the number of certificates from 50 to 23, with the intent of focusing resources on only those disciplines that provide students with certificates that are current. The College also reduced its program offerings in athletics from 24 to 16 and redistributed the resources to the remaining programs. (II.A.2.c)

Delivery modes and teaching methodologies reflect the diverse needs of its students. The 2011 Student Accreditation Survey asked students to rank course offerings on quality (2.92 out of 4), reflecting an appreciation for the different groups of people, including ethnic and disabled people (3.15 out of 4), and broadening students view on cultural diversity (2.88 out of 4). Finally students indicated that courses offered meet their needs (3.03 out of 4). (II.A.2.d)

Evaluation of courses and programs is conducted regularly through the program review process. In addition, all courses are evaluated at least once every six years through the Council on Curriculum and Instruction (CCI). Program review includes an evaluation of the relevance and appropriateness of the course and program as well as a review of the achievement of learning outcomes. Concerns that arise during the program review process may result in a program being sent forward for Program Vitality Review (PVR). Up to three programs can be sent forward for PVR annually. The PVR process determines the vitality and continued viability of the program. Both the Program Review process and the PVR process link to resource allocation. The report cites the results of one survey of the members of the core planning and governance committees (6 different committees) that was used to review the program review and PVR process. The College may want to expand the list of individuals who participate in similar surveys in the future. Since program review affects almost everyone on campus, a broader evaluation of the effectiveness of the program review and PVR process could result in a better, holistic assessment. Although the College appears to conduct instructional unit program reviews on a regular basis (every two years), there is no indication that the completed program reviews are validated for accuracy, both in terms of data and analysis. The College is planning to implement a validation process for the 2012-13 program reviews. This process will involve having the Instructional Planning Team (IPT) validate the program reviews using a checklist developed by the Institutional Effectiveness

Committee (IEC). Considering that instructional unit program reviews are the basis for many resource allocation decisions, it is suggested that the College implement the planned validation process to ensure that information contained in the instructional unit program reviews is both accurate and realistic. (II.A.2.e)

The College has dedicated significant resources to ensuring that it engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of all of its stated SLOs. The CCI is charged with evaluating and approving these SLOs. The College has provided reassigned time for four SLO faculty coordinators. These coordinators are charged with working with faculty to ensure all courses, degrees, certificates and programs have developed SLOs; that the course-level SLOs are mapped (aligned) with program, general education and institutional SLOs; that assessment is conducted regularly; and that assessment results are used to make improvements. In addition, the coordinators serve on the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) which is responsible for providing a framework for the documentation of assessment and the integration of results in decision-making across the campus. The College currently stores SLO assessment results and plans for improvement on a shared cloud-based storage system (DropBox). An evaluation of the SLO information for 34 disciplines contained in this DropBox shows that approximately 35% of all course-level SLOs have been assessed. In addition, many but not all of the course-level SLOs have been mapped (aligned) to the program and general education SLOs. According to the Self Evaluation Report, at the end of the 2010-11 academic year, the College had assessed 12% of all courses, 0% of all certificates, 0% of all majors and 0% of all general education areas.

The College specifies, in its catalog, the relationship between contact hours, homework hours, lab hours and credit. An evaluation of the following four courses confirms that the College adheres to generally accepted standards in higher education.
- Anthropology G130, 3 units, 54 lecture hours: Format – Distance Education
- Physics G185, 4 units, 54 lecture hours and 54 lab hours: Format – Classroom Based with Lab Component
- Nursing G150, 10 units, 90 lecture hours, 40.50 lab hours and 229.50 other hours: Format – Clinical Practice Course
- COOP G101, 1 unit, 60 volunteer hours or 75 paid hours: Format – Clock Hours to Credit Hours (II.A.2.f; II.A.2.h; II.A.2.i)

Four instructional units (divisions) use departmental course and/or program examinations as a method of measuring student achievement. Three of these programs, Criminal Justice, Nursing, Cosmetology and Esthetics are specific examinations that are mandated by a government licensing agency that regularly evaluates examinations in these areas for both effectiveness and bias. The English and English as a Second Language programs both use standardized exams to provide feedback to students, but do not use those exams as factors in the student's final grade. (II.A.2.g)

In accordance with Board Policy 4025, GWC has established its own philosophy for degrees and general education. This philosophy includes comprehensive learning outcomes as described in the GWC Catalog. These learning outcomes include an understanding of the

content and methodology in the social sciences, natural sciences and humanities, and fine arts. (II.A.3.a) In addition, students learn an appreciation for life-long learning, oral and written skills, information and computer literacy, scientific and quantitative reasoning, and the ability to think critically and acquire information through a variety of sources (II.A.3.b) The College has established SLOs for general education (geSLOs). These geSLOs outline the expectation that students who complete general education will recognize what it means to be an ethical human being, respect and celebrate diversity, respect civility, develop sensitivity to history and aesthetics and be willing to assume their role in the civic, political and social society. These geSLOs have been mapped to many, but not all, of the existing programs, degrees and certificates. In addition many, but not all of the course-level SLOs have been mapped to these geSLOs. The College is in the process of establishing standards for satisfactory performance for student achievement at the programmatic and institutional level. (II.A.3.c)

The College catalog identifies nine transfer degrees, forty-four associate in arts degrees and ten associate in arts degree areas of emphasis. In all cases, students are required to take a minimum of 18 units of focused study. (II.A.4)

All vocational and occupational programs are developed in accordance with the guidelines for new course development and are subject to review by the CCI. In addition, program reviews are conducted on all career technical education (CTE) programs every two years. Further, each CTE program must have an Advisory Committee comprised of local business representatives to help keep programs current with industry trends and technological advancements. All CTE programs meet with their Advisory Committees annually. Information on licensure and certification exam pass rates exists for four programs. Pass rates vary from a high of ninety-six percent for Esthetics/Esthetician to a low of seven percent for Basic Police Academy. No evidence was provided that the College has established standards of satisfactory performance for these or other CTE courses. (II.A.5)

GWC provides a catalog and web site with information to current and prospective students about educational courses, programs, and transfer policies offered by the College. Degrees and certificates are clearly described in these venues including purpose, content and course requirements. Program learning outcomes for general education have been specified; however, program learning outcomes for degrees, certificates and majors are not included in the catalog. The College recognizes that evidence may not be available to support the contention that all students receive a course syllabus with expected learning outcomes for that course. Effective for spring 2013, all faculty are required to provide their course syllabi on the BlackBoard learning management system. A review of courses offered in spring 2013 that were listed in the Blackboard LMS, indicates that not all syllabi, for either online or face-to-face courses contained course-level SLOs. Syllabi for many courses contained sections entitled, 'Course Objectives' or 'Student Learning Objectives' while others contained a section properly entitled 'Student Learning Outcomes'. In addition, multiple sections listed on the Blackboard LMS, did not have any syllabus associated with the course. (II.A.6)

GWC outlines transfer policies in both the College catalog and on its web site. The College addresses transfer of credit from GWC to other Colleges as well as the transfer of credit from other Colleges to GWC. The College states that it evaluates incoming transfer requests based on course content. The use of course-level SLOs is not often used as institutions from which students transfer have not consistently established course-level SLOs. As such, the College does not certify that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable with courses at GWC. The College has done a very good job at providing outgoing transfer students with guidance. The Planning Guide for Transfer Students, written for students who plan to transfer from GWC to another College, is to be commended. (II.A.6.a)

Through the program vitality review process, the College has recently made significant reductions in the number of CTE certificates (from fifty to twenty-three). In order to provide students with the opportunity to complete these certificates, the College has developed informal agreements with other surrounding Colleges, which offer similar programs, to provide instruction for students. These courses are then accepted as fulfilling the requirements for the certificate. It is suggested that the college submit a substantive change for the certificates that were deleted. (II.A.6.b)

The College publishes a catalog every year and makes it available electronically on the College web page. The College web page is Section 508 compliant, making it available to individuals with disabilities. The College has an established timeline and chart detailing responsibilities for the production of the College catalog. The catalog is reviewed and updated annually. The College Promotions Office is responsible for the general College information contained on the web site. Individual departments and divisions are responsible for content on their individual web pages. Information in the catalog is consistent with information on the web site. (II.A.6.c)

The Academic Senate Faculty Statement on Professional Ethics, dated December 6, 2011 clearly outlines faculty's responsibilities when presenting controversial material. This document is consistent with Coast Community College District (CCCD) Board Policy 4030 (Academic Freedom). Faculty are expected to clearly distinguish between professionally accepted views and their personal views. According to the 2011 Student Accreditation Survey, students responded favorably with a 2.98 (out of 4) rating on this question. (II.A.7; II.A.7.a)

Expectations for student academic honesty and the consequences for dishonesty are clearly published in several arenas including Board Policy (3902), the College catalog, the College website, the faculty handbook, and the student handbook. (II.A.7.b)

Conclusions

The College develops and regularly evaluates curriculum according to established procedures through the CCI, relying on faculty expertise and advisory committees as appropriate. Additionally, the College ensures that curriculum is consistent with the College mission and College wide plans, maintains integrity, and meets the needs of its student population regardless of how or where it is offered. GWC has established a philosophy for degrees and

general education (II.A.3.c) and has develop SLOs for general education (geSLOs) although not all of these geSLOs have been mapped/aligned to course and program-level SLOs.

The College has developed course-level SLOs (cSLOs) for virtually all courses and most, but not all, programs. New courses and programs must be submitted with appropriate SLOs already developed in order to be approved by the CCI. The CCI should ensure, as part of the approval process, that SLOs have, in fact, been completed prior to approving new courses and programs. Not all cSLOs have been assessed, and no specific assessment timeline has been established. It appears that somewhere between 35 and 40 percent of all cSLOs have been assessed as of this visit. Assessment of program-level SLOs (pSLOs) is more difficult to determine since many of the alignment/mapping matrices available in the DropBox are not complete. SLOs are a component of instructional program reviews which will allow them to be considered when making decisions about resource allocation. It is recommended that the College complete the process of mapping (aligning) course-level SLOs with program-level SLOs and general education SLOs and expedite the process of assessing all SLOs. Doing so will allow the College to ensure that it is awarding credit based on student achievement of a course's stated learning outcomes as well as awarding degrees and certificates based on student achievement of stated learning outcomes. (II.A.2.f; II.A.2.h; II.A.2.i)

The College is in the process of establishing standards of satisfactory performance for student achievement at the programmatic and institutional level. (II.A.3.c)

The College conducts program review of all instructional programs every two years. No timeline or schedule was presented for how often the survey evaluating the program review and program vitality review process is conducted, it is recommended that the College broaden the number of individuals surveyed to include all individuals involved in the program review/PVR process. (II.A.2.e)

All programs that utilize a standardized examination/assessment method as a component of awarding students credit regularly evaluate these examination/assessment methods to ensure that they effectively measure student learning and achievement as well as evaluating them to minimize any test biases. (II.A.2.g)

The College needs to establish standards of satisfactory performance for student achievement in CTE courses and then evaluate itself against those standards. (II.A.5)

A review of syllabi for online and face-to-face courses that utilize the BlackBoard LMS clearly shows that not all students are receiving a course syllabus with course-level SLOs. Incorrect and inconsistent use of terminology on course syllabi makes it more difficult for students to identify the learning outcomes for each course. It is recommended that the College ensure that all programs have program-level SLOs established and that these SLOs are published in accordance with the standards. In addition, it is also recommended that the College ensure that all students receive a course syllabus containing the approved course-level SLOs for that course. (II.A.6)

The College publishes transfer of credit policies, but does not certify that course-level SLOs are comparable to courses in order for the incoming transfer of courses with credit to be awarded by the College. It is suggested that the College develop transfer policies for incoming transfers that rely on, evaluate and certify that the learning outcomes for the incoming course are comparable to the learning outcomes. (II.A.6.a)

Recommendations

College Recommendation 3:
In order to meet the standards, it is recommended that the College complete the process of mapping (aligning) course-level SLOs with program-level SLOs and general education SLOs and expedite the process of assessing all SLOs. Doing so will allow the College to ensure that it is awarding credit based on student achievement of a course's stated learning outcomes as well as awarding degrees and certificates based on student achievement of stated learning outcomes. (II.A.2.f; II.A.2.h; II.A.2.i, ER 10, ER 19)

College Recommendation 4:
In order to meet the standards, it is recommended that the College ensure that all students receive a course syllabus containing course-level student learning outcomes, properly labeled, for all courses regardless of delivery modality. (II.A.6)

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

Standard II
Student Learning Programs and Services

Standard IIB – Student Support Services

General Observations

There has been a very high turnover in senior leadership positions in Student Services over the last six years; however, the Division has been able to move consistently forward in achieving their division goals. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) have been developed in most Student Services programs and services. The team suggests disaggregating foster youth SLOs from EOP&S program SLOs because Foster Youth have some specific needs that are not addressed by the EOP&S Program. The Student Services Division uses the five-column model template for assessing their program level SLOs in most areas. It was noted some programs and services did not use the five-column template for identifying and assessing SLOs.

Consistent with the Standard, program reviews have been systematically conducted every two years, regardless of location or means of delivery, to ensure student learning consistent with their College mission (Standard II.B.1.).

The College has also begun to utilize technology to increase program efficiencies, particularly in Counseling, Matriculation, Registration, Re-Entry/CalWorks, and Financial Aid. The College has posted online service listing on the Online Instruction website so these services are clearly communicated with students (Standard II.B.1.). The College has begun to allow students to make counseling appointments online utilizing the SARS scheduling tool. This was developed to make it easier for students to plan a counseling appointment based on their schedule availability. This is an exemplary practice. (Standard II.B.1.). The Student Services Division also has moved to an online orientation model to increase the number of students they can provide access to College information (Standard II.B.1.).

A move towards an increase in the use of technology on the campus to increase efficiency and effectiveness in serving students is a relatively recent change in the College's operation in Student Services. The Student Services Division at Golden West College, it appears, is using consistent process evaluation methods to ensure the programs and services they deliver to students are effective and meet the needs of the students.

Findings and Evidence

The Student Services Division at Golden West College, despite high turnover in senior leadership, has maintained a systematic process for developing and measuring Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and a consistent timeline for implementing program reviews every two years (Standard II.B.1.). Based on the evidence, the College also has a very strong

student activities program on campus, which emphasizes academic success and diversity as its core values (Standard II.B.1.). The processes add to the strength of the Division by integrating planning and assessment into the way they conduct business. This allows for them to continually assess the work they are doing to ensure effectiveness.

The Student Services Division also utilizes systematic and integrated planning to ensure a model for resource allocation (Standard I.B.3.). The College uses a basic Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation (P.I.E.) process as its overall planning model (Standard I.B.3.). This planning model runs on an ongoing six-year cycle (Standard I.B.3.).

The Student Services Division at Golden West College conducts regular surveying of students to evaluate and measure student satisfaction, while also identifying student learning needs. This evaluation has been a key part in the development of the College's Educational Master Plan completed in 2011 (Standard II.B.3.). In spring 2011, the College also participated in the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). This survey was conducted with the intent of compiling feedback data from students so the College could improve programs and services (Standard II.B.3).

The Student Services Division uses planning and data methodically to determine how their services are impacting students, also, how the data might inform them to make adjustments to their programs and services.

The College has a broad range of student clubs, organizations, and programs to serve its increasingly diverse student population. They also have many different events on campus that celebrate diversity (Standard II.B.3.d.). The College is committed to sustaining these programs and activities to continue to foster cultural awareness and understanding. The College maintains a strong community partnership in its collaboration with the "El Viento" program. This program is a partnership between the College and the Oak View community in Huntington Beach. This program focuses on early College preparation and life success for residents that live in that community. This is a creative partnership that invests in the residents of the College's service area and meets the mission of the institution.

The College has multiple campus committees that focus on Student Success Initiatives (Student Success Committee, which is comprised of Basic Skills, Student Equity, and Matriculation, and Student Equity Committee). These committees were, at one point, standalone committees until it was realized they overlapped in many ways. Therefore, many of these committees merged and sub-committees were formed under the larger Student Success Committee. This is a further example of how planning and dialogue is shaping the direction of the College focused on increased efficiency (Standard I.B.3.).

The Student Services Division at Golden West College operates in a culture of dialogue and continuous improvement. The Division has a consistent and systematic process for survey

data collection and program enhancements. The enhancements they have made to their programs and services appear to be based on planning and implementation to more effectively meet the needs of the students. The College has utilized technology to increase program efficiencies, e.g. online counseling appointments for students and a new online student orientation. The College meets the Standard (Standard II.B.1).

The College's Catalog is clear and states the required information. The College meets the Standard in this area (Standard II.B.2)

Based on the evidence, the Student Services Division at Golden West College conducts regular surveying of students to evaluate and measure student satisfaction, while also identifying student learning needs. This evaluation has been a key part in the development of the College's Educational Master Plan completed in 2011 (Standard II.B.3.). In spring 2011, the College also participated in the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). This survey was conducted with the intent of compiling feedback data from students so the College could improve programs and services (Standard II.B.3).

The College provides an array of services both on campus and in the community ranging from financial aid workshops to matriculation services at local feeder high schools. The College has also worked to enhance its online student orientation as well as the technology necessary for students to be able to make counseling appointments online. The College has also developed a creative partnership with the Boys & Girls Club of Huntington Beach, which is located on campus to provide child care for students. The College meets the Standard (Standard II.B.3.a.).

Golden West College has an array of Student Services programs and Campus Clubs that encourage student participation on campus. The broad range of clubs and activities offered through Student Activities allows for an environment in which a student can connect to the College by connecting with students with like interests. The College has provided the facilities for students to meet to talk about issues in the classroom or ways to make the College more appealing to students. Student Activities publishes their events online and announces everything from scholarship workshops to planned cultural activities on campus. The College meets this Standard (Standard II.B.3.b.)

The Golden West College Counseling Department works diligently to ensure students have multiple venues to receive academic counseling and advising. The Department has also worked to utilize technology to make it more efficient in the delivery of services to students. This is evidenced by their utilization of ESARS for students to be able to schedule an appointment with a Counselor online. The Department has also recently developed a counseling express kiosk for students to be able to get quick answers to their questions. The Department is working on streamlining its counseling services through its work in hiring a faculty Transfer Director. Counseling and advising also occurs through student service

programs on campus, e.g. EOP&S/CARE, Puente, ACE, Cal WORKs, SOAR, and specialized orientation for student athletes. The Counseling Department maintains consistent workshop trainings for their counselors and also holds training for adjunct counselors. Their trainings focus on changes in academic programs and providing the counselors the information necessary to properly advise students. The College meets the Standard (Standard II.B.3.c.).

The College has many programs, student clubs, and services to ensure it is creating connection points for students. The College supports diversity and cultural awareness by supporting the work of Student Activities and the Intercultural Programs. These two offices facilitate a lot of work to get students engaged in various cultural awareness and co-curricular activities. This is also reflected in the large number and diversity of student clubs on campus. The Student Activities Department facilitates a culture of awareness and inclusion on campus. The College meets the Standard (Standard II.B.3.d.).

In the fall 2012 semester, Golden West College conducted a validation study of their English placement test. Based on the validation, the English placement test used by the College has a strong reliability. Test bias is deemed acceptable as outlined by the placement test publisher. The College also reviews the information outlined in the CCCApply College application system. They have a team of individuals from the Admissions & Records staffs from the three Colleges in the District to discuss, develop, and implement new processes and improvements that enhance the admissions, registration, and records processes. This is a standing group that meets weekly to address these issues that may be barriers to students applying and matriculating to the campus. The College meets the Standard (Standard II.B.3.e.).

Golden West College maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, and has controls for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The College also publishes and follows established policies for release of student records as outlined by California Education Code and with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA) regulations. Students who apply for admission online are given the option to opt out of or deny permission to release information to third parties, e.g. the National Student Clearinghouse. Students may also make a similar request in person in the Admissions & Records office. The College meets the Standard (Standard II.B.3.f.).

The Student Services Division at Golden West College uses the program review and program vitality review processes on campus to consistently evaluate the effectiveness of student services programs. All support services programs go through program review every two years using a Strength, Weaknesses/Limitations, Opportunities, Threats (SWOT) analysis. Student Services programs use SLOs created by each program to evaluate and provide evidence on student learning. Student services programs use the five-column

assessment process, which includes mission and goals of the program, intended outcomes, means of assessment, summary of data collected, and use of data results. The team found every student services program at Golden West College had SLOs written, with the exception of the Emancipated Foster Youth (EFY) program. That program utilized the SLOs developed for EOPS as Foster Youth students were co-enrolled into the EOPS program. With legislation focusing heavily on Foster Youth, it is suggested that the EFY program at Golden West develop its own SLOs geared specifically for Foster Youth students. Furthermore, most of the student services programs SLOs were listed on the Colleges five column template for SLO development and assessment; however, some of the programs' SLOs were not. It is recommended to ensure all student service programs are consistent in listing the programs SLOs on the five column SLO template. The College meets the Standard (Standard II.B.4).

Conclusions

The team concludes Golden West College has a broad array of programs and services to meet the needs of its students. Based on the evidence, the College maintains a commitment to ensuring it is meeting the needs of students, including underrepresented College student groups. The College is committed to ensuring it continues to meet the student needs by surveying and analyzing data.

Recommendations

None

Standard II
Student Learning Programs and Services

Standard IIC – Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

The new Learning Resource Buildings completion in 2011 has streamlined the services offered for students to reach their academic goals by combining the library and Student Success Center in one building. This indicates a commitment by the College to provide student academic support in library services, tutoring, communication skills, computer skills, and writing and reading.

Information Competency is developed in students via one-on-one reference support, library lectures requested by faculty for their courses, and by having students satisfy the campus AA requirement for Information Literacy with either of two eight-week long one-unit classes Library 110 & Library 120. The Library courses are offered both online and face-to-face. In order to accommodate online courses in regards to lectures and orientations, the library provides an embedded librarian service which assigns a librarian to a particular class to support the curriculum and instill information literacy concepts. There are also individual courses with a library component added that are developed with librarian collaboration.

There is ample evidence that the library staff develops the collection based on campus curriculum needs, faculty and staff expertise, circulation statistics, campus committee interaction, and instructor librarian communication.

Findings and Evidence

The construction of the new Learning Resource Center building at GWC indicates a commitment to providing students with a variety of learning support services in various formats to facilitate student learning and achievement. The quantity and depth of these learning support services are apparent by the "one-stop location" housing the Library, Tutorial and Learning Center (T&LC) Student Computer Center (SCC), and Writing and Reading Center (WRC).

There is extensive evidence that faculty expertise is utilized in the selection of educational materials and that the need for maintenance of equipment is recognized. As evidenced by the LRC Manual and Collection Development Assignments document, librarians work closely with the Council on Curriculum and Instruction (CCI), instructors, vocational programs, and other support area personnel in order to provide resources that support the campus and College curriculum. (II.C.1)

The collection size is documented as 37,910 volumes, 8,470 e-books, and 1,292 media items. The Self Evaluation Report notes a major review and weeding of the collection has taken

place since the 2005 accreditation visit. Library staff have proactively identified and sought materials and equipment to support the College mission with alternative funding sources. In February 2013 the library received $50,000 from Lottery funds in order to purchase new materials. The overall collection numbers are small compared to some recommendations regarding collection size, however, during library staff and faculty interviews, the quantity, quality, depth, and variety of the collection size were addressed. Collection development is geared specifically towards the curriculum offered with a system of district intercampus and interlibrary loans expanding on access to materials when necessary. Because of the intercampus agreements within the CalWest Consortium, students have adequate access to print resources. Electronic resources are adequate in regards to research databases and are being streamlined with the introduction of EbscoHost Discovery system that will provide access to all available resources with a single search interface. Access to the electronic resources is also being enhanced with the addition of EZProxy for single sign-on to all password protected resources.

Campus budget cuts are identified as being a continual detriment to meeting budget requests. The Self Evaluation Report identifies continuing budget allocation requests for replacement of computers, printers, and copiers as well as for the book budget. The library book budget does not clearly identify what materials expenditures were, are, or what is considered adequate. During the course of the team visit interviews however, library faculty, staff, and administrators were able to elaborate on the current budget situation. Online periodical databases for off-campus research and to enhance the print collection are specifically noted for not having a specified budget allocated by the College since the TTIP funds for electronic resources were cancelled by the Chancellor's Office. These funds are currently being supplemented by the Associated Students of GWC. In order to develop a permanent budget, the request is documented in the currently being developed Library Program Review which will in-turn lead to examination by the Planning & Budget Committee for funding. In order to adequately support campus instructional needs adequate staffing levels are also cited as necessary with a library position going through the governance process for funding. Although the Self Evaluation Report indicated a need for increased book funds, the current library administration does not see this as high a priority as other concerns. Replacement of library computers was also pointed out as an area of concern due to aging machines. Although budget concerns are noted, the library staff was able to fully articulate through documentation and interviews the planning processes in place to address them.

Learning support beyond library services is provided by the Tutorial and Learning Center (T&LC), Student Computer Center (SCC), and Writing and Reading Center (WRC). The T&LC provides flexible services to meet student needs and has seen an increasing demand. Funding is also mentioned here for the provision of ongoing services, increased technology, and the replacement of older computers and software. The funding issue is being addressed through a Program Review recommendation to the Planning and Budget Committee which is

standard College procedure. Through interviews, it appears the Computer Replacement Cycle has not been followed since it was developed; however, the Learning Resources building administration was recently notified of a complete computer replacement of labs, staff, and faculty machines that will be taking place. The description for online tutoring is limited and identified as an area that needs exploration on how it can be increased. Currently, students do have access to an email system of assistance from tutors which is not heavily utilized. There is a growing demand for instructional assistance to provide support in courses both online and face-to-face. New systems are currently being explored to provide enhanced service to online learners, but a particular product has not been decided upon. The WRC also offers student support by providing computers for essay writing, research, and the completion of learning course materials which are provided for independent study. The SCC provides across the curriculum support with subject specific instructional software, printing service, lab computers, and a vast array of licensed software.

The librarians have a well-developed system of communication with faculty in order to gather information on the selection of library materials and to ensure the quality and depth of the collection. There is a recurring semester informational email to the various departments about resources that have been added to the collection in order to keep faculty informed and initiate dialog. All full-time and some adjunct librarians do collection development in particular subject areas and rely heavily on faculty expertise, the professional literature, and student requests at the reference desk. Although informal, the communication between the acquisitions librarian and subject area specialists appears to fully keep the collection development geared towards meeting the curriculum at GWC. (II.C.1.a)

The Self Evaluation Report provides evidence of utilizing student learning outcomes (SLOs) to teach information competency skills and offers them in an on-line and a face-to-face format that meets the needs of all students at GWC. The Library courses are offered in order to meet an established GWC requirement for graduation regarding information competency. These SLOs are directly embedded in the credit courses offered. Instruction of information competency skills is also offered beyond library courses in one-on-one reference support and lectures to individual classes. Effectiveness of the T&LC is rated by student surveys and the Program Review process. Student needs are assessed for the Student Computer Center by surveys. The Writing and Reading Center utilizes instructors' observation of student needs involving research that almost always require library resources according to the Self Evaluation Report. (II.C.1.b)

GWC provides ample access to materials both on campus and online. Hours for the Library and support services are adequate, and the ability to borrow books from the interlibrary loan program enhances student access to research materials. The Self Evaluation Report cites, and interviews confirmed, the development of video tutorials, instructional handouts, and orientations via CCConfer as means of adding student support. The utilization of social networking to update faculty, staff and students on library services and events is noted.

Utilization by students of the T&LC indicates a successful program with surveys indicating satisfaction and course improvement by students accessing its services. Student printing in the Student Computer Center has had its efficiency increased with the adoption of the Go-Print system for basing student printing on need rather than a flat rate as previously utilized. A documented concern by the Writing and Reading Center is limited staffing to provide accommodation for the current and increasing student demand of the service offered. This staff shortage is being addressed though the program review process. Online access to services is readily available and the campus maintains adequate hours for students to utilize Learning Resources. (II.C.1.c)

GWC enhanced its provision of monitoring and security for the library, T&LC, SCC, and WRC when the new building was occupied in 2010. This was accomplished by establishing security procedures and technology that includes video cameras, alarms, and other monitoring devices. Computer equipment and software is maintained by the TSS Department that has technicians assigned to this area. The collection is also safeguarded by 3M security gates and security strips. TSS also upgrades the computer equipment and maintains firewalls and anti-virus software. (II.C.1.d)

GWC maintains a materials borrowing program with the CalWest Library Consortium that also hosts advisory group meetings that address common concerns. California State Long Beach also has a mutual lending agreement with GWC. Participating in the Community College Library Consortium (CCLC) allows for discounts on electronic services and resources. There is also an outreach service that provides fee-based tutoring for students from other educational institutions. The Student Computer Center has a high demand for funds to maintain and enhance the site licenses and software needed to meet demand with funding requests documented through the program review process. (II.C.1.e)

The campus wide approved five-column method of SLO evaluation is utilized for the library instructional programs. Library orientation SLO data is generated from a survey given during the orientation sessions. Student, faculty, and staff input are also generated and gathered by a publically accessible drop-box and a growing system of social networking tools that currently includes, Facebook, text, blog, and instant messaging. Program review data is utilized to improve the program and is completed on a two-year cycle. A vast amount of data is also generated and tracked via spreadsheets that allow for the preparation of reports for the California Community Colleges Library and Learning Resources Programs Annual Data Survey, and the California Academic Library Report. This data is also utilized in the program reviews. Beyond the instructional SLOs that currently being assessed in the Library courses, program level SLOs have also been developed to evaluate and improve upon all areas related to information competency and student learning. The Tutorial and Learning Center, Student Computer Center, and Writing and Reading Center all cite areas of success that were discovered in their data gathering and assessment processes. Each area utilizes the

program review process and surveys to evaluate their services on a regular basis and have completed program level SLOs. (II.C.2)

Conclusions

The College has addressed this standard. Academic support is well documented throughout the Self Evaluation Report, but the "intellectual, aesthetic, and cultural activities" available to students through the library are absent. Interviews with library staff acknowledged that this has not been a priority with the new building project and current staffing levels. Rotating displays for Women's History, Spring Break themed items, etc. are done on a regular basis. The use of social media to display a recent "Harlem Shake" held in the library and communicate to the campus community library functions is noted. Library and Support Services have an ongoing system of evaluation that includes completion of the SLO process. The library has a noteworthy approach to reaching out to students, staff, and faculty in both online and on campus environments. There were numerous activities and support services being developed and discussed to further enhance the library's ability to serve the College community. Electronic resources were also being evaluated and updated to further enhance student success.

Recommendations

None

Standard IIIA – Human Resources

General Observations

The College has experienced dramatic changes in the past few years including several retirement incentives resulting in a loss of staff, faculty and administrators. The institution employs qualified personnel who support student learning, regardless of delivery mode. Personnel are treated equitably, are evaluated regularly (tenured faculty every six semesters), and are given many opportunities for professional development. However, there is no faculty or staff obligation to participate in professional development. There continues to be great effort put forth by faculty and staff to develop and assess student learning, but there is no contractual mechanisms for tracking participation in development and assessment of learning outcomes.

While the current composition of the faculty, staff, and administrators does not reflect the ethnic background of the community it serves, the College continues to take steps to address this issue in its hiring and planning. Human resource planning has begun to be integrated with the several other planning processes in the College and district.

Findings and Evidence

GWC has ample evidence of its recruiting and selection processes. Using the Coast Community College District Board Policies, GWC is guided by such policy as BP 7839 Faculty Qualifications to BP 7909 Search/Selection of Executive Management.

Its Affirmative Action Plan Policy Statement and Non-Discrimination Policy are evidence of its commitment to diversity and equal opportunity. The Search Committee Orientation power point presentation includes federal laws such as the Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the American with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975.(Standard III.A.1.a)

Golden West College has in place recruitment and selection processes that assure the appointment of personnel who have the appropriate education, training, and experiences to provide and support programs and services. See Board Policy 7121, *Employee Selection Policy.* The evaluation of faculty, staff, and administrators are said to be based in board policy (*Board Policy 7828, Agreement Between the Coast Federation of Educators/AFT and the CCCD*) and (*Board Policy 7848 Agreement Between CCCD and Coast Federation of Classified Employees Local 4794*). (Standard III.A.1 and Standard III.A.1.a)

All the College's personnel are evaluated systematically, and the College has written criteria for evaluation. *Board Policy 7828, Agreement Between the Coast Federation of Educators/AFT and the CCCD* and *Board Policy 7848, Agreement Between CCCD and Coast Federation of Classified Employees Local 4794, and Board Policy 7829, Agreement*

Between the California Teachers Association/NEA and the *CCCD* establish the procedures for evaluation. (Standard III.A.1.b)

GWC does not meet the Standard III.A.1.c. which states, "Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes." The faculty bargaining unit and the district have been negotiating a new faculty contract for four semesters. The leadership of the bargaining unit believes that SLO activity and assessment will become part of the new contract's evaluation of faculty members. (III.A.1.c.) (See District Recommendation 1)

Both the Academic Senate of the College and the District has well publicized codes of ethics and conduct. (III. A. 1.d.)

The College has seen a reduction in its workforce through retirement incentives and budgetary restrictions. In addition, the College has a high dependency on lecturers (467 lecturers and 125 full-time faculty). However, as many as 200 of the adjuncts are instructors in the Policy Academy and are hired for their specific expertise. A College Staffing Plan is being developed (completion date June 2013) using the District's Staffing Plan as its model. This plan will serve as the basis for identifying needs and maintaining academic integrity. (Standard III.A.2)

The College and District have 140 Board Policies that guide the institution and its personnel to ensure equity on a consistent basis. (Standard III.A.3.a)

All personnel records are securely held at the district office. HR staff at the District and College has reviewed all board regulations involving hiring and diversity and have updated them. (III. A. 3. a.)

The diversity of its workforce does not reflect its student population. In Appendix H of Vision 2020, it states,

As is clearly identifiable in Table H1.4 below, the diversity of the Coast workforce is not reflective of the student population we serve. For instance, almost 20% of our student population is Hispanic, while only slightly over 11% of our full-time faculty, 8% of our part-time faculty and 6% of our educational administrators are Hispanic. A similar discrepancy exists for our Asian student population. While 25% of our students are Asian, only 8% of our full-time faculty, 11% of our part-time faculty and 10% of our educational administrators are Asian. It is clear that increasing the diversity of our employees who serve our students is an important goal to optimize our service to our students. Having our employee diversity that mirrors our student population will provide positive role models and an increased understanding of the multi-cultural realities that our students experience.

Although the diversity of the faculty and staff does not reflect the diversity of the community, steps have been taken to hire faculty and staff that reflect the diversity of the student population the College serves. The District has developed an EEO plan with implementation scheduled in June 2013. In addition, in 2011 the Board of Trustees passed a resolution which focused on the value of diversity. At the campus level, when the curricular

decision was made to delete the French program, the program was replaced with the Vietnamese program and a Vietnamese faculty was hired.(III. A. 4. a. and b.)

There was widespread agreement among the faculty, administrators and staff that the institution subscribes to, advocates, and demonstrates integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty and students. There is a student complaint process. Faculty who teach large format classes aired their concerns about student learning in such classes, and their activities eventually lead to large format classes being grouped together for the purposes of program review.(III. A. 4. c.)

Professional growth opportunities are available to staff as well as faculty through such entities as the Coast Federation of Classified Employees which offers salary stipends, released time, and expense reimbursement for classified staff. GWC has provided professional development opportunities that have assisted classified staff with acquiring skills and knowledge which has allowed them opportunities for career advancement. For faculty, the IPD provides conference and travel funding, workshops, salary advancement and training opportunities, seminars, and sabbaticals. GWC has used professional development to increase the skills and abilities of their CE/DE faculty and to bring more faculty into CE/DE. Every instructor has been given a Blackboard shell and faculty can receive training in Blackboard from the workshops offered regularly though out the year or by one-on-one instruction through the Blackboard Academy. . The faculty have no contractual obligation for professional development. (III.A.5. a. and b.)

The College personnel office appears to have a collaborative working relationship with the District's personnel office. This type of relationship helps to ensure that there is a minimum of conflicting information given to the College and decreases the probability of mishandling of sensitive personnel matters.

The College offers faculty and staff opportunities to be trained on blackboard, the College's CMS. The College has also instituted a series of workshops called the Gratitude program This year there are five workshops on topics such as Gratitude, Complaints, Leadership, Inspiration, and Listening. These workshops, which are open to all members of the campus community, involve skill development tied to morale building. Participants are asked to define the concept, identify how it affects them in the workplace as well as home, and to look at strategies that will help them understand, deal with, and incorporate the strategies into their personal and professional lives. (III. A. 5. a.)

Staff and professional development planning and assessment has also been brought under the program review process. (III. A. 5. b.)

Human Resources, like all other units of the College, undergoes program review which is linked with institutional planning. One major component of evaluation is assessing the staffing needs of the College. GWC is creating its College Staffing Master Plan that will nest within the framework of the District Staffing plan. This is expected to be completed by June 2013. This plan will be based on the Staffing Plan developed at the District level as part of the larger Master Planning Process, GWC was authorized to hire 12 new full-time faculty. (III. A.6.)

Conclusions

GWC recruits and hires qualified personnel, supports its faculty and staff, and assesses its human resources policies, need, and effectiveness. However, GWC does not include the assessment of student achievement of SLOs in faculty evaluations and does not have personnel that reflect the students it serves. In addition, the staffing prioritization process from identification of need to decision-making is unclear with multiple paths, but the paths are vague. The faculty prioritization process is shown in a flow chart but the link between SLO assessment and prioritization of the College's resources is not clear.

In addition, GWC must take aggressive steps to find qualified personnel who are reflective of the students it serves. (Standard III.A.4, III.A.4.b)

Recommendations

District Recommendation 1:

To meet the Standard and as recommended by the 2007 Orange Coast team, the team recommends that faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.1.c)

Standard III
Resources

Standard IIIB – Physical Resources

General Observations

Golden West College has facilities at varying levels of age and modernization. Some facilities are old with no renovation; others are old with renovation; still others such as the Learning Resource Center, are new and equipped to meet the present and future needs of the students. With the help of consultants, the College has developed a Facilities Master Plan, an Educational Master Plan, and a Technology Plan. These plans will provide the College with direction as it holds discussions on projects for Measure M.

In addition, to these comprehensive plans, GWC has created committees and has instituted processes that will help the College in its decision-making. However, the complexity of the processes and the number of plans make transparency difficult, and that in turn slows implementation and decision-making.(Standard III.B.2.b)

Findings and Evidence

Golden West College's facilities, built in phases between 1965 and 1978, are in different stages of renovation and upgrading needs. To meet these needs, GWC has sought several different means of securing funds. Through Measure C, a local bond measure passed in 2002, GWC was able to secure $96,000,000 to complete twelve projects, some of which involved renovating buildings and upgrading facilities such as:

a. Student Center Renovation
b. Repairs to Eroding Concrete
c. Campus wide Technology Upgrades
d. Central Plant with Upgrades to 18 buildings
e. Upgrade to Swimming Pool/Locker Rooms—ADA compliant
f. Track Resurfacing
g. Student Success Center
h. Nursing Building with Student Health Center
i. International Student Center
j. Classroom improvements
k. Learning Resource Center
l. Lighting Retrofit for energy efficiency

Presently, the College is in discussion regarding the use of a portion of the $700,000,000 from Measure M. According to the Facilities Master Plan, the College's priorities are to build

math/science, criminal justice, and language arts facilities. (Standard III.B.1 and Standard III.B.2.a)

The College has also created or established the following programs or committees to ensure that its physical resources support student learning and improve institutional effectiveness:

- Facilities Master Plan
- Ten-year Capital Improvement Program
- Five-year Scheduled Maintenance Plan
- Computer Lab Replacement Plan
- Facilities, Safety & Land Development Committee

The College uses these plans and committees to gather data and evidence of the effectiveness of the facilities and to improve them when needed. (Standard III.B.1)

The campus' Facilities, Safety& Land Development Committee reviews projects and their progress. This committee is responsible for reviewing requests that come through the program review process and forwarding them to the Planning and Budget Committee, which ties the facilities requests to the College's financial plan. (Standard III.B.1.a and III.B.2.b)

Imbedded in the program review process is a resource planning component that allows departments to request such things as facilities improvements. The facilities requests are reviewed, ranked, and funded as monies become available. In addition, included in the process is the ability of individual departments to identify whether they think their facilities request is due to health and safety concerns. (Standard III. B.1.a and III.B.2.a)

The College is required to submit plans for new buildings to the Division of State Architect (DSA) to ensure the integrity and quality of the facility. The Division of State Architect (DSA) standards address safety, accessibility, and structural integrity. DSA standards are also used when planning large renovation projects. (Standard III.B.1.b)

GWC has taken actions to ensure the safety and well-being of students through the renovation and upgrading of facilities. However, its fall 2011 survey show a lower level of satisfaction (compared to 2006 results) among the age, gender, employment status, and work area groups when asked if the facilities are sufficient to support its programs and services. Given the number of renovations and new construction around the campus, there is quite a bit of upheaval. Therefore, it is not surprising that there is a lower level of satisfaction recently among the students and staff. However, once renovations and construction are completed, the students and staff's satisfaction level should rise as the plans for renovation and construction are focused on meeting the needs of the College community. (Standard III.B.1.b)

While a majority of the staff and students feel safe on campus during the day, that same level of comfort is not felt at night. Therefore, discussions regarding Measure M funds include projects such as additional night lights as well as strategically placed phones and cameras around the campus. (Standard III.B.1.b)

When new facilities are built, the College has been challenged to find funds to provide infrastructure support. When planning renovations and new facilities, discussion should include "total cost of ownership." (Standard III.B.2.a)

The College in its efforts to systematically assess the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement must develop a clear path of inputs with transparent outcome decisions. (Standard III.B.2.b)

Conclusions

The College has made great strides in putting together plans and convening committees to bring about thoughtful, engaged decision-making. There appears to be too many pieces, but the pieces are not all put together in a cohesive package that can be easily communicated and understood by the campus community. This gap in communication could impede the implementation of the plans. It is suggested that the College develop a process to take all the plans and put them into a cohesive package that can be communicated to the college community.

Recommendations

None

Standard III
Resources

Standard IIIC – Technology Resources

General Observations

The overall quality of Standard III.C clearly reflects GWC's investment in technology to support student learning and improve institutional effectiveness. Even though there are not sufficient funds to fully implement them, the College does have plans in place for instructional lab replacement. The creation of a new data center during tough budgetary times is also noteworthy. Training for both students and staff is in place, and technology support is readily available. Online learning has a well-designed support system to increase student success and there is help for instructors to increase efficiency in the online environment. The College has a Technology Master Plan in place that works in unison with the Educational Master Plan and Coast Community College District Vision 2020 Supplemental Plan - Technology to provide guidance for the effective planning of technological improvement. Technology requests emanating from department program reviews are thoroughly evaluated by Technology Support Services and the College Technology Committee before recommendations for purchase are made.

Findings and Evidence

The College provides an adequate system of support for all of its technology resources designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, College-wide communications, research, and operational systems. The Self Evaluation Report notes that all College constituent groups are represented in the decision-making process regarding technology. Help desks are maintained for both technology support and for online instructional support. Every classroom has multimedia capability, and several instructional programs have unique technological needs that are maintained by Technology Support Services (TSS). GWC utilizes Banner for enrollment services and student records and has a robust system of backing-up permanent records both electronically and off-site for older hard copy records. College-wide communication is facilitated by high speed internet for all personnel and a campus wide wireless system. Email and access to calendars are offered by Microsoft Exchange 2003 and Outlook 2003. A range of services are also offered to support copying and graphics production. The College provides two storage area networks (SANs) that store the large amounts of data necessary for the College to achieve effectiveness. (III.C.1)

In 2012 a Technology Plan was completed that was designed to build the infrastructure and services to fulfill the vision articulated within. Continual evaluation of technology requests is overseen by the College Technology Committee (CTC) that has campus-wide representation and presents recommendations to the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B). Most departmental technology purchase requests are generated through the program review

process. All instructional computer labs are scheduled for a four-year replacement cycle, but due to lack of funding, this has not been adhered to. The Dean must approve all instructional software requests to insure they are compatible with the current systems before they are installed in the labs. In 2008 a new main distribution facility (MDF) was completed that provides a back-up power generator, fire-suppressant system, air conditioning, power supply, and room for growth. A major problem mentioned is the older line-of-sight microwave system in use during the development of the Self Evaluation Report. This system was ineffective when connecting the District office with Banner. A solution to this was identified during interviews as being found in the purchase of a new Ethernet system that provides ten times the bandwidth. Two new buildings are reported as having been built that have substantially increased the needed technology infrastructure. However, as this increased need developed five positions were lost. A District-wide analysis of technology services is in process that will allow for increased efficiency and effectiveness of the District IT staff. (III.C.1.a)

Training opportunities for faculty and staff are provided by the Institute for Professional Development (IPD), and the Online Instruction Department. A dedicated trainer with staff development has open lab hours and is available for one-on-one training for new software. Faculty also have access to general training sessions or individual training in the use of Blackboard, the College's learning management system. Training interests are determined by surveys given to the staff, faculty, and students. For student technology use GWC has a variety of discipline-specific computer labs that support the curriculum as well as open computer labs that are staffed with personnel able to help students with their technological needs. There are over 1,100 computers in instructional labs with one specifically dedicated to students with disabilities. Hours of operation for the labs appear adequate for the College's need. The new Student Success Center located on the first floor of the Learning Resource Center has 100 computers and there are two computer-teaching labs as well. The library databases are accessible from home using a newly installed system of single password access. This greatly enhances the previous system of having individual passwords given out by the library when shown current student IDs. The rapid pace of technology change is mentioned as a challenge especially with the current smart phones that students want help with. The director of TSS and the Vice President of Administrative Services and Student Life are discussing how to address this issue. (III.C.1.b)

In addition to the College Technology Master Plan, GWC also used three other major planning tools to address the College's technology needs. The District Technology Master Plan and College Technology Master Plan are guides utilized to meet the Educational Master Plan for the College. Individual departments use the program review process to make their technology requests. The College Technology Committee insures that all proposals comply with the Technology Master Plan before being forwarded to the P&B for purchase where the proposal is further scrutinized for alignment to the campus goals. An example given during

interviews of how this system functions was provided by a discussion of the new Adobe Creative Suite 6 software that was recently purchased after going through the campus technology request process. The replacement plan for instructional lab computers created six years ago has not been implemented due to budget constraints. Information gained through interviews indicates that the computer lab replacement cycle has been approved to begin with allocated funds for some lab, faculty, and staff computers being scheduled for update. Each department purchases computers for their area if funds are available, and the study reports that replacing staff computers is one of the College's most significant challenges. The Banner system is upgraded annually. How to fund and keep up with technology is being guided by the District Vision 2020 Educational Master Plan, Appendix H.2 – Technology Plan. (III.C.1.c)

The Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) allocates resources for technology based on recommendations from the College Technology Committee (CTC). The CTC has membership representing all constituent groups and reviews the requests generated by the various department's program reviews. Although Technology Support Services has identified their technology operating expenditures, there currently is not an allocated budget to support it. In order to increase effectiveness, the team suggests that the College Planning and Budget Committee establish a sustainable method of budgeting for technology operating expenditures. The College supports its educational programs with state-of-the-art technology; however, there is no process in place to systematically upgrade, maintain, or replace the technology infrastructure. Two examples given in the Self Evaluation Report of the state-of-the-art technology are the human patient simulator for the Nursing program and the Virtual Interactive Combat Environment which is a simulator for the police academy. The College is also experimenting with Virtual Desktop Infrastructure (VDI) that will lower costs and give more flexibility to their instructional labs. (III.C.1.d)

The District level technology planning focuses mainly on the Banner system and has created a project called the Voyager Program. Program review at the campus level is the guiding factor for requesting any new technology. The CTC reviews these requests for compatibility before moving them forward for budgeting. The campus Technology Support Services (TSS) also insure compatibility with the current infrastructure before forwarding the request to the P&B. Classroom technology, implementation of the Banner system, and the creation of the data center to house the College's various information systems were given as examples of how this process of technology planning functions within the College and district. (III.C.2)

Conclusion

The institution meets this standard. The College is effectively maintaining the current technology while planning for future enhancement even during difficult budgetary times. College technology needs are addressed through a thorough system of governance that

involves program review and consultation with the CTC and TSS before approval and purchase. The CTC has good representation from the College's constituency groups. The new data center appears to have been well planned and designed for not only the current campus technology but for what lies ahead as well. The College recognizes the increasing demand for technology support and the lower staffing levels currently in place to supply this and has begun conversations on how to address this at the campus and district level. The Self Evaluation Report indicates all aspects of the College are supported by adequate technology support and planning. The College does not however clearly define how it prioritizes funding for technology needs at the Planning and Budget Committee.

Recommendations

None

Standard III
Resources

Standard IIID – Financial Resources

General Observations

The institution has sufficient resources to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of short-term financial solvency.

Although the College has a Facilities Master Plan and a Technology Master Plan, and the institution has identified some funding to accomplish the goals of these plans with Measure M, the institution has challenges with long-term financial planning and integrating its financial plans with other College plans/District plans. Operationally, financial planning and budgeting occurs annually for the next fiscal year. Long-range financial priorities such as changes in enrollment, programs, services, and HR staffing are not planned for or integrated into financial plans.

Findings and Evidence

GWC's overall 2012-13 budget is $43,877,862. Based on expenditures for the past three years, this appears to be sufficient to support educational improvements. Board Policy 6200 and budget allocations described in the 2012-13 District Budget are in place to ensure financial stability of the College as demonstrated by a $23,805,676 district fund balance against a $204,500,549 appropriation for the District. GWC has its own ending balance as of June 30, 2012 of $2,438,005. Consequently, institutional resources are sufficient to ensure financial solvency. The resource allocation model provides a means for setting priorities for funding institutional improvements (III.D.1).

The institution reviews its mission and goals as part of the planning and program review process as evidenced in several completed program review documents. However, the institution does not review its mission and goals as part of the annual rollover development budgets (III.D.1.a).

The institution identifies goals for achievement in any given budget cycle, establishes priorities among competing needs so that it can predict future funding, has planning and program review documents that are linked clearly to short-term financial plans, and demonstrated that past fiscal expenditures have supported achievement of institutional plans, as evidenced by the "Program Review prioritization and examples of funding" (III.D.1.a).

However, the institutional did not provide evidence that long-range planning relying primarily on institutional plans for content and timelines exists except for Facilities and Technology. The institution did not provide evidence of financial plans that support other institutional plans such as their 2011 Educational Master Plan, or other plans such as an Enrollment Management Plan, a Human Resources Staffing Plan, or other institutional/District plans with long-range financial priorities (III.D.1.a).

The institutional leadership receives information about fiscal planning that demonstrates its link to short-term institutional planning as demonstrated by Planning and Budget committee meeting minutes dated May 26, 2010 and testimonials of administrator meetings. However, the institution did not provide evidence that the governing board receives information about the institution's fiscal planning that demonstrates its link to institutional planning although the governing board does receive information about the District's budget (III.D.1.a).

Individuals involved in institutional planning receive accurate information about available funds, including the annual budget showing ongoing and anticipated commitments. Evidence of this is demonstrated in minutes of the Planning and Budget Committee Meeting minutes dated May 26, 2010. The meeting minutes of September 28, 2011 indicate that the institution establishes funding priorities in a manner that helps the institution achieve its mission and goals and items are focused on student learning given appropriate priority. (III.D.1.b)

The institution has evidence of long-term fiscal planning and priorities including having a Capital Replacement Schedule for its capital-related assets and a Scheduled Maintenance Program with building maintenance costs for its facilities. The institution does have plans for payments of long-term liabilities and obligations including debt, health benefits, and insurance costs, to address long-term obligations. Resources are directed to actuarially developed plans for Other Post-Employment Retirement Benefit (OPEB) obligations as indicated in their actuarial study for OPEB and in their Board minutes of September 15, 2010 (III.D.1.c)

However, the institution did not provide evidence of how other long-term financial priorities are considered when making short-range financial plans. For example, the institution did not provide evidence of growth projections for FTES being supported by financial plans. Additionally, the institution did not provide evidence of planned changes (increases or decreases) in programs and services of strategic importance being supported by financial plans (III.D.1.c)

The processes for financial planning and budget development are recorded and made known to College constituents via the planning and budget committee. The planning and budget committee ensures constituent participation in financial planning and budget development as evidenced in the meeting minutes of September 28, 2011(III.D.1.d).

Funds are allocated, as shown in the budget, in a manner that will realistically achieve the institution's stated goals for student learning as evidenced in the District Budget 2012-13. The audit statements indicate that the auditors "did not identify any deficiencies in internal control or compliance that they consider to be material weaknesses" about financial management. The institution provides timely corrections to audit exceptions and management advice. Evidence of this is in the 2012 Financial Audit. There were no repeat findings for GWC in this audit. The institutional budget is an accurate reflection of institutional spending and has credibility with constituents. This is evidenced in the District Budget 2012-13 and the September 28th minutes of the Planning and Budget Committee. Internal audit findings are communicated to appropriate institutional leadership and constituents. Evidence of this is the Quarterly Review of Internal Audit Report given to the Board of Trustees dated June 30, 2012. (III.D.2.a).

Amounts of the budget, fiscal conditions, financial planning, and audit results are provided throughout the College by way posting the information and making the audit available to all constituencies. The information is sufficient in content and timing to support institutional and financial planning and financial management as evidenced in the 2012 audit (III.D.2.b).

The ending balance of the unrestricted funds for the District's immediate past three years has been $19.7M, $27.3 M, and $23.5M from 2009-10 to 2011-12. This amount is sufficient to maintain reserves needed for emergencies (approximately 15% of expenditure budget). The institution receives its General Fund, unrestricted revenues from the State, student enrollment fees, and from property taxes. Given State deferrals on apportionment payments, the District has some exposure to risk in having cash flow difficulties. The estimate deferral payment for 2011-12 was $19,255,983. However, "When cash flow is tight and funds are needed to meet operational costs, the District has had an agreement with County Treasurer to borrow cash during the fiscal year as evidenced by the "Temporary Transfer Agreement" for fiscal year 2011-12 and 2012-12. The institution has sufficient insurance to cover its needs as indicated by its SWACC membership as evidenced by the District's certificate of coverage, the SWACC Proforma, and the Memorandum of Coverage Declarations dated 6/30/12, July 1, 2012 – July 1, 2013, and July 1, 2012 – July 1, 2013, respectively. The institution has sufficient reserves to handle financial emergencies as evidenced in the 2012-13 District Budget. (III.D.2.c)

The Planning and Budget committee along with administration review fiscal management processes on a regular basis. There are no financial audit findings to indicate the performance of fiscal management is a concern. The institution reviews its control systems on a regular basis as demonstrated by annual external audits and quarterly internal audits. The institution has responded to internal control deficiencies identified in the annual audit in a timely manner as demonstrated by no evidence of repeat audit finding for GWC. The annual assessment of debt repayment obligations (GO Bonds, OPEB) is identified in the annual audit and resources are allocated in a manner that ensures stable finances (III.D.2.d).

The institution's special funds are audited and reviewed by funding agencies regularly. An example of this was evidenced by an Orange County Community Resources memo dated November 4, 2011 where the institution's funding was audited. The institution ensures expenditures from special funds are made in a manner consistent with the intent and requirements of the funding source. An example of this was evidenced in a memo between Fiscal and Recycling and Resource Management dated June 27, 2012. Bond expenditures are consistent with regulatory and legal restrictions as evidenced by the 2012 Annual Bond Audit. (III.D.2.e).

The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and develops contingency plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences as evidenced by the District's fiscal reserve for 2013 being $10,600,000 (5.5%) (III.D.3.a).

The Board of Trustees reviews quarterly budget reports as evidenced by the CCFS-311Q Report, quarter ending 12/21/12 being reviewed at their March 6, 2013 meeting. The institution uses the GWC Fiscal Services Department, District Office, and auxiliary operations monitors all expenditures as evidenced in the "GWC Executive Summary Report, Unrestricted General Fund, 2012-13 1st Quarter" to ensure its use is systematic and effective. Categorical programs and contracts are audited on an annual basis at the District Office as evidenced by the 2012 District Audit (III.D.3.b).

The institution plans for and allocates appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations, including Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations. The institution has more than fully funded its annual OPEB obligation as evidenced in the 2012 Financial Audit where the District has funded 43.97% of the plan and that the Net OPEB obligation is actually an asset ($10.5M) (III.D.3.c).

The actual plan to determine Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) is prepared as required by appropriate accounting standard. The plan is prepared by a qualified contractor with appropriate accounting standards as evidenced by the actuarial report (III.D.3.d).

The College has no locally incurred debt instruments (III.D.3.e).

The default rate for student loans the past three years has been 9.9 %, 12.1%, and 13.2% for 2011, 2010, and 2009, respectively, well under the federal requirements of 25% (for two consecutive years) (III.D.3.f).

Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution. Campus administrators approve the institution's contract agreements and are signed by the Director of Purchasing as evidenced in "Program Review

prioritization & examples of funding" and supporting board policy 6340 for contracts. Also, general counsel monitors all contracts as evidenced in an email "IMPORTANT INFORMATION RE: CONTRACTS/AGREEMENTS/LEGAL REVIEW Matters" dated 2/26/09. Agreements are consistent with institutional mission and goals and the institution can change or terminate contracts that don't meet its required standards of quality as evidenced by the "District's Contractor Agreement." The College did not provide evidence that external contracts were being managed in a manner to ensure that federal guidelines were being addressed (III.D.3.g).

The institution has an annual audit to provide feedback on its processes as evidenced by the 2012 Financial Audit. The Self Evaluation Report indicates that the institution reviews the effectiveness of its past fiscal planning as part of planning for current and future fiscal needs as by the institution's departments working together with the internal auditor and campus Fiscal Services as evidenced by the "materials fees" example (III.D.3.h).

The institution ensures that financial decisions are developed from program review results, institutional needs, and plans for improvement as evidenced by the program review process, participation of the Planning and Budget Committee, and campus administrators. The institution uses the program review process to base its financial decisions on the results of evaluation of program and service needs, the institution uses the program review process to prioritize needs when making financial decisions as evidenced by a variety of completed program review documents and purchase orders supported by the program review requests. The institution participates in the program review process and makes determinations as to how effective financial needs in program and service areas being met from previous financial decisions as evidenced in the various completed program review documents (III.D.4).

Conclusions

The institution's mission and goals are the foundation for financial planning. Financial planning is integrated with and supports all short-term institutional planning. Institutional planning reflects realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements. When making short-range financial plans, the institution does not consider its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability due to the institution not having long-range plans such as an Enrollment Management Plan or a Human Resources staffing plan that include long-range financial priorities to consider. The institution clearly identifies plans, and allocates resources for payment of liabilities and future obligations. The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development, with all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets (III.D.1, III.D.1.a, III.D.1.b, III.D.1.c, III.D.1.c, III.D.1.d).

The internal control structure has appropriate control mechanisms, and the institution widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making to ensure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of financial resources. Financial documents, including budget and independent audit, have a high degree of credibility and accuracy and reflect appropriate allocation of use financial resources to support student learning programs and services. Institutional responses to external audits are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately. Appropriate financial information is provided throughout the institution, in a timely manner. All financial resources, including short- and long-term debt instruments, auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source. The institution's internal control systems are evaluated and assessed for validity and effectiveness and the results of this assessment are used for improvement (III.D.2, III.D.2.a, III.D.2.b, III.D.2.c, III.D.2.d, III.D.2.e)

The institution has policies and procedures to ensure sound financial practices and financial stability. The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and develops contingency plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences. The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, an institutional investments and assets. The institution plans for and allocates appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations, including Other Post-Employment Benefits, compensated absences, and other employee related obligations. The actual plan to determine Other Post-Employment Benefits is prepared, as required by appropriate accounting standards. The institution did not have any locally incurred debt instruments that could affect the financial condition of the institution. The institution monitors and manages student loan default rates, revenue streams, and assets to ensure compliance with federal requirements. Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution. The institution regular evaluates its financial management practices and the results of the evaluation are used to improve internal control structures (III.D.3, III.D.3.a, III.D.3.b, III.D.3.c, III.D.3,d, III.D.3.e, III.D.3.f, III.D.3, g, III.D.3.h)

Financial resource planning is integrated with institutional short-term planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement of the institution (III.D.4)

Recommendations

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 supports 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)

Standard IV
Leadership and Governance

Standard IVA – Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

Golden West College went through a significant reorganization of its administrative structure and institutional governance committees. This collaborative process took shape in the fall of 2010 and was accomplished through the leadership of the College president. These changes were driven by institutional planning processes and were also in response to reduced availability of staff and administrators.

The most notable administrative change is that two top administrative positions have now been consolidated into a single position. A new position, the Vice President of Student Success, now covers the responsibilities previously delegated to vice presidents of instruction and student services. This change has helped to unify instruction and student services but has limited the degree of access these areas have to the vice president.

The primary shared governance body is the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B), which is the central participatory governance body for the College. The central role for this committee has remained intact for the institution, but some of the organizational pathways and representation have recently shifted. Budgetary and planning issues that are of an institutional nature go through this committee and they make recommendations to the president. Other College advisory committees report through the Planning and Budget committee, providing a framework for institutional participatory governance.

Regarding institutional planning and governance, the 2012 Self Evaluation Report notes, *"Some of these changes have been viewed positively while others have been resisted, and/or opposed, which is why the changes must still be considered fluid and in process."* The College appears to value, discuss and understand its organizational structure.

Findings and Evidence

Evidence demonstrates that institutional leaders from all constituencies at Golden West College have collaborated to develop a sound and practical governance structure that supports empowerment, innovation and institutional improvement. This structure of governance is being put to the test as the institution is in the process of responding to major levels of change. The institution is addressing changes of organizational structure, the planning and decision-making structure and changes to administrative personnel at both the College and District levels

College Goals went through a collaborative revision process from 2007 to 2011. As such, it has been a challenge to effectively communicate these goals due to all the changes the

institution is experiencing. Another significant challenge in the implementation of these revised planning processes is that there are a great number of changes to documents which at times has led to more than one version of such documents. This has resulted in some inconsistencies, such as different versions of the College Goals that can be found on the GWC Website and Educational Master Plan, from those found in the 2012 Self Evaluation Report and other current planning documents.

The College mission states that, *"Golden West College's mission is to create an intellectually and culturally stimulating learning environment for students and the community."* Other College planning documents, such as the GWC Vision, Values and Goals, provide focus for the mission towards ongoing cycles of improvement to learning and achievement. The College Vision emphasizes this and states, *"Golden West College is committed to excellence and endeavors to provide an optimum teaching and learning environment"*.

Critical characteristics for the institution to sustain an effective and collaborative governance structure are highlighted in the College Values. These values bring focus on such areas as Collaborative Climate, Excellence and Innovation, Inclusiveness and Diversity, Learning and Leadership.

Faculty, staff and administrators have a primary interface with the institutional planning structure through the process of Program Review. The GWC Program Review Template includes a five-step chart that is used for both the development and analysis of Program Specific Objectives.

The first step in GWC's Program Review Process is to connect programmatic objectives with the College Mission and Goals. This is then followed by Programmatic Objectives and Intended Outcomes, Means of Assessment, Data Analysis, and then how the results were used to implement change. The College Mission and Goals are central and clearly visible in the institutional planning processes. Regular cycles of Program Review provide a sound mechanism to reinforce the central role the Mission and Goals play in planning and resource allocation for all staff.

The Research and Planning webpage highlights organized links to GWC Quick Facts, Institutional Effectiveness, Strategic Planning and the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes. These links drill down to greater levels of detail and are intuitively organized into areas of assessment and planning. It should be noted that some links appear to need maintenance, as they are not functional. The structural organization of the site helps to inform the user as to where to find data relating to student learning outcomes and achievements, as well as how such data is integrated into institutional strategic planning processes. This site provides easy access to key documents and planning processes and evaluative data.

Information regarding institutional performance is readily accessed via the web, under the heading, 'Institutional Effectiveness'. This information is available to staff, students and the community. It is kept current through active links to the CCC Datamart and also information in the *GWC Quick Facts* and updates to the Institutional Key Performance Indicators Report.

Critical institutional planning documents provide a mechanism to shape dialogue and focus on an integrated and understandable 'big picture' of planning for the College. Among these documents are the GWC Core Planning Structure, GWC Planning Timeline 2007-2013, GWC Decision Making Guide and the GWC Key Indicators of Institutional Performance. The Core Planning Structure provides a visual map of the planning components (committees) and how they interact with each other and lead to decisions through the College president, chancellor or Board of Trustees. The timeline shows a visual representation for the timing of the various planning processes for the College. The Decision Making describes the structure and mechanisms for decisions-making within the participatory governance environment at Golden West College, and the Key Indicators provide a mechanism to measure institutional progress.

Information relating to institutional performance is shared through the Office of the President. The President regularly sends out a Planning & Budget Committee Summary that clearly identifies recommendations from the College Master Plan, Planning Objectives from the previous year, Budget Summary, and identified Unbudgeted Needs.

The planning processes and documents for the College clearly stress the importance of ongoing cycles of evaluation and improvement. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee provides the structure and support for the documentation, assessment and integration between data and decision-making. The GWC Core Planning Structure shows this committee to be placed within the organizational structure to provide multiple venues to engage the campus community and to improve the institutional linkages between data and planning.

Evidence supporting campus-wide engagement in instructional evaluation and improvement can be identified through the process used for the review and revision of the College Goals, the development of Key Institutional Performance Indicators, the Program Review Process Evaluation, processes for the evaluation of Committee Effectiveness, Administrative Behavioral Surveys, Program Review and the development of the Planning and Decision-Making Guide.

There are multiple governance structures and committees in place to encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students to become actively involved in dialogue, planning, and improvement. Examples of collaborative organizational structures are the Academic Issues Council (AIC), Institutional Effectiveness Committee, constituent based Advisory Committees. The Golden West College Core Planning Structure chart provides a visual

representation of an overall planning structure that is designed to facilitate participation, feedback and improvement.

Individuals can bring forward ideas for institutional improvement forward and receive a systematic participative review. Evidence shows processes where input can originate in a variety of different venues and still enter into the process of review, discussion, and planning. Examples were validated as to how feedback was obtained during the processes of Program Review Evaluation, the development of an Accelerated Associate Degree, implementation of planning for the Basic Skills Initiative and input during the revision of College Goals.

Governance processes enhance student learning through the discussion and sharing of ideas relating to a culture of ongoing cycles of evaluation and improvement. The GWC Decision Making Guide provides linkage between planning and governance structures at the College. Section 4 of that document focuses specifically on the connections between governance structures and institutional planning processes. The Self Evaluation Report refers to an ongoing process for evaluation of the primary shared governance committees through the biennial Committee-Effectiveness Self-Evaluation process. An example of this process was validated for the Student Success Committee. (IV.A.1)

Written policies and procedures have been established for participation in the decision-making process. Board Policies exist that outline the roles and processes relating to how ideas, feedback or commentary are aligned with planning processes. Specific policies exist that define the governance roles for Certificated Employees and Students. Classified Staff have some documentation (relating to their role in governance) in the form of a Side Letter of Agreement between Golden West College and the Coast Federation of Classified Employees, AFT Local 4794. This documents a formal agreement regarding the roll of classified staff in College governance.

The GWC Decision Making Guide provides detailed descriptions for the roles of faculty, staff, students, and administrators in the decision-making process. Additional context is provided through various organizational charts for the College. (IV.A.2.a)

The Self Evaluation Report provides some evidence that the policies, agreements and organizational structure are functioning effectively. There does appear to be 'buy in' throughout the College with regard to significant changes in Program Review, College Goals, and the development of Key Institutional Performance Indicators. These are significant undertakings and involve all primary shared governance committees. The College could not move forward with changes in these critical areas without a strong shared governance structure. Additionally, the CCCD Board of Trustees has Special Committee Meetings directed towards specific areas that require faculty input and guidance. These include committees directed towards Accreditation and Career and Technical Education.

While accomplishing significant progress, the Self Evaluation Report provides evidence that appropriate measures have been taken to ensure the academic and professional responsibilities and authority of faculty have been upheld and integrated into this system. Faculty roles related to curriculum, program development, credit requirements, program review, and professional development have been appropriately preserved. The Self Evaluation Report attributes some of the credit for this to faculty input through various standing committees and shared governance processes.

Criteria for these academic and professional matters are cited as being directed through Board Policies and the California Code of Regulations. Greater definition as to how these responsibilities are carried out are documented in the Academic Senate Bylaws and documentation from the Curriculum Committee. (IV.A.2.b)

Effective Governance Structures

In general, changes to administrative structure and governance structures appear to have improved communication between faculty, staff, and administration. The 2011 Accreditation Staff Survey showed improvement in some areas relating to communication and administrative support. The survey indicated that faculty, staff, administrators, and students believe they "have a voice on campus through established committees" (average rating B-; 2.65), there was a much lower rating (average rating C; 1.98) when classified staff were asked if they felt they, "have a voice in decision making processes." This may have some relation to the fact that classified staff do not have a recognized structure within the governance system of the institution. The GWC Core Planning Structure recognizes the administration and faculty as constituent groups that have collective input into the decision-making process, but classified staff are not recognized in a similar fashion. Staff input is provided through their participation on other committees. However, the Core Planning structure does not identify Classified Staff as a specific constituent group providing input to the governance process. This reduces the classified voice in governance.

This effect of this is more pronounced in that classified staff do not feel they have the time to participate through the committee process. Lower numbers of staff and the necessity to take time from their full-time positions to participate in shared governance activities, do appear to result in lower participation although there is a high degree of need. This is an area of governance that the College can improve upon. The College has already moved towards improvement in this are as evidenced by the existence of the Classified Connection. The College is encouraged to continue in the development and support for this component of their governance structure.

Relating to the recent consolidation of VP positions at the College, discussions with faculty and staff presented a balance between the challenge of losing frequency of contact with a vice president (of student services), and the positive aspects of having a more integrated administrative structure that provides better connections between instruction and student services.

Additionally, the employee survey showed that faculty, staff and administrators generally felt that they collectively understood the College goals and worked collaboratively toward their achievement. (The average rating in this area was C+; 2.38). (IV.A.3)

The College posts current and historic accreditation information on their webpage. Campus reports on the web go back to 2008. Documentation includes Action Letters from the Commission, Institutional Reports, and current evidence to support the 2012 Self Evaluation Report. (IV.A.4)

The College's review of the governance and planning structure at Golden West College has helped to identify institutional weaknesses and develop collaborative plans for improvement. Examples of such improvement include the evaluation and revision of the Program Review Process, the revision of College Goals, and development of Key institutional Performance Indicators. This structure led to a major change in the Program Review cycle. (IV.A.5

Conclusions

The institution has made significant progress in developing a culture of planning that is based on continuous cycles of evaluation and improvement. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) has played a key role with regard to the integration of data and information into the governance and planning structure of the College. Noted areas of improvement include an increased emphasis on incorporating the analysis of data into the planning and governance structure, as well as improving the level of engagement of classified staff in these processes. The IEC has worked effectively to integrate institutional research and planning into the governance process of the College.

It is also noted that the institution should consider updating its Educational Master Plan as the Mission, Goals, administrative organization and shared governance processes have changed significantly since the last update in 2011.

Recommendations

None

Standard IV
Leadership and Governance

Standard IVB – Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations

Golden West College is part of the Coast Community College District, a multi-College district governed by a five-member Board of Trustees. The Coast Community College District Board of Trustees are publicly elected and are responsible for setting district policies, as well as the hiring and evaluation of the Chancellor. Board Policies can be accessed via the internet from the Coast Community College District Website. Information relating to the Board of Trustees found on the District Website includes Board Meetings, Policies, Board Special Committees, contact information and biographical information for each of the trustees.

The Board of Trustees Special Committees include Accreditation, Audit and Budget, Career and Technical Education, Land Development (Measure M), Legislative Affairs, Personnel, District Student Council, and Enterprise Board of Directors. The purpose for each of these committees is to better inform the board of district perspectives and issues relating to activities at the various Colleges. Each of these committees posts minutes on the website.

Under the leadership of the President, the College began the 2010-2011 year with a College-wide initiative called, "Framing the Future." College-wide discussions led to a restructuring of College governance and organization. This restructuring was carried out in a manner that provided communication and organizational connections with the district leadership and Chancellor.

Findings and Evidence

Board responsibilities and duties are outlined in BP2200 and support ACCJC's Accreditation Standards IV.B.1.d and IV.B.1.j. Their specific participation in local decision making is outlined in BP2510, and policy addressing issues relating to conflicts of interest are found in BP2710. The 2012 Self Evaluation Report cites challenges with the CCCD Board of Trustees working as a whole. This does not appear to have affected the duties or responsibilities of the Board. The Chancellor and Board have been working together to further develop a culture of working as a whole. (IV.A.1.a)

The Coast Community College District Mission is found in BP1200, but is not readily visible on the District Website. The District would benefit by bringing focus to the Vision, Mission, Goals, and Master Planning documents for the District. Academic and professional matters have been developed through collegial consultation between the Academic Senate and designees of the Board (College management).

The Board reviews and approves the annual District budget, and reviews financial reports for the District, authorizes expenditures for the construction and maintenance of facilities, and approves all educational programs. The CCCD Board of Trustees has ultimate responsibility for the educational quality, legal matters and financial integrity of the institutions it governs.

There are processes for the Board to give approval for all educational programs and construction of all facilities. The Board also reviews and approves changes to the District and College budgets throughout the year. BP 2510 (Participation in Local Decision Making) states that, "*The Board of Trustees has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity. Indeed, it is the legal responsibility of the Board of Trustees to maintain, operate, and govern the District and its Colleges. In executing that responsibility, the Board is committed to the principles of participatory decision-making.*"

The Board has developed policies that are consistent with the mission statement. However, the ability of those policies to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services is compromised by the fact that essential policies have not been regularly reviewed. Examples include policies relating to Curriculum Development (BP 4020) and the Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education (BP 4025) which have not been updated as provided by CCCD Board Policy 2410.

Coast Community College District BP 2200 (Board Authority, Responsibility and Duties), establishes the Board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures. This policy specifically identifies areas relating to educational quality, legal matters and financial integrity. Some of the identified Board responsibilities, to include the regular updating of Board Policies, should be examined as part of the next regular Board of Trustees Self-evaluation. All educational and student support programs would benefit greatly through the collegial development of Administrative Procedures for Board Policies governing those areas. (IV.B.1.b, IV.B.1.c; IB.B.1.d)

Numerous Coast Community College District Board Policies are out of date and most do not have accompanying Administrative Procedures. The 2007 visiting team noted this as a deficiency, and while a board policy addressing the updating and revision of board policies exists, it has not been followed. The district has begun the process of reviewing and revising its policies and procedures.

In February 2012, the district created Administrative Procedure 2410 in order to clarify and formulize the process by which existing board policies and administrative procedures are revised or created. This process was started just within the last two years and is not yet complete. (IV.B.1.e)

There are four-year terms for each trustee, with elections held every two years, in even numbered years. The terms for trustees are staggered so that two trustees shall be elected during one election and then three trustees elected during the next election (BP 2100).

Board policies relating to the development of the board consist of BP 2740 (New Trustee Orientation) and BP 2223 (Board of Trustees' Accreditation Committee). Additionally, the Board maintains travel and educational funds for its members on an annual basis. A number of Trustees also have membership in professional organizations and have served on the Board of the California Community College Trustees, CCLC's Advisory Committee on Education Services and conduct retreats and study sessions. Evidence shows that the board has effective ongoing development activities. As such, the board would benefit through the formalization of these ongoing activities into a Board Development Program. (IV.A.1.f)

The Board of Trustees has established Board Policy 2745 as its process for self-evaluation. The policy was last updated in August of 2012. The self-evaluation is performed "in order to identify strengths and areas in which it may improve its functioning." The Board conducted its most recent self-evaluation at the meeting on October 17, 2011and carried out some discussion of the results of the self-evaluation at following meetings. This process was not carried out as outlined in BP 2745, noting non-adherence to the month in which the self-evaluation is specified to be carried out. Additionally, the board's follow through was not timely and was incomplete. (IV.A.1.g)

Board Policy 2715 (Code of Ethics for Members of the Board of Trustees) outlines ethical responsibilities for the Coast Community College District Board of Trustees. The policy states that the board shall, *"Understand that it has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, financial integrity, and operational efficiency."* It is noted that the operational efficiency of the district is the responsibility of the Chancellor. Ethical violations have defined consequences, and the board has a history of following this policy when violations are identified. (IV.A.1.h)

The board's responsibilities relating to accreditation are outlined in BP 3200 (Accreditation)

This policy states that, *"the Chancellor shall ensure the District and the Colleges comply with the accreditation process, eligibility requirements and standards of the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges and of other District programs that seek special accreditation."* It is noted that the policy references Administrative Procedure 3200, but no such Administrative Procedure is associated with the policy. It would benefit the Board of Trustees and District to develop such an Administrative Procedure that outlines training provided to the board, board participation in accreditation, critical institutional reports due to the Commission, board training, and an assessment of the board's performance using Accreditation Standards. (IV.B.1.i)

The evaluation of the Chancellor is outlined in BP 2435. This policy states that, "the Board of Trustees shall conduct an evaluation of the Chancellor at least annually." An annual timeline accompanies this policy. The 2012 Self Evaluation Report reports that, *"The Board appears to be evaluating the Chancellor on a monthly basis as this item appears regularly on the Board agenda during closed session. In 2010, the evaluation of the chancellor appeared*

no less than thirteen times on the Board agenda. " The Chancellor and Board are working together in a productive an ongoing manner which does not violate the intent of this policy.

There is not a specific board policy addressing the evaluation of the President. Developing such a policy would provide greater consistency and improve this ongoing process. The delegation of authority is outlined in BP 2430 (Delineation of Authority to District Chancellor and College Presidents). This reinforces the authority of the Chancellor by stating, *"The Chancellor of the Coast Community College District is appointed to assist the Board of Trustees in policymaking for the District and shall have the authority for and be fully accountable to the Board of Trustees for ordering, administering and supervising of all District activities."*

Coast Community College District Board Policy 2510 (Participation in Local Decision Making) could be clarified through examination and revision of any aspects that infer the Board has responsibilities at the operational level of the Colleges. Additionally, the board's practice of employing four board staff (secretary, staff aide, senior staff assistant, and board office assistant) who do not report to the chancellor, may actually violate Standard IV.B.1.j. The policy states, *"Indeed, it is the legal responsibility of the Board of Trustees to maintain, operate, and govern the District and its Colleges."* Further development and discussion of the District Function Map will help in the interpretation of this policy. (IV.B.1.j)

The role of the President is outlined in Board Policy 2430 (Delineation of Authority to Chancellor and College Presidents). The Chancellor gives full responsibility and authority to the President of the College to implement and administer delegated District policies without interference, and holds the President accountable for the operation of the College. Additionally, the February 4, 2013 District-wide Functional Map, outlines duties of the President and distinguishes them from those of the Chancellor. Those duties encompass appropriate planning, oversight of the administrative structure. (IV.B.2.a)

The President plays a strong role in guiding institutional improvement and has worked with through governance processes to set values and goals for the institution. Significant progress has been made in the area of developing Key Performance Indicators for the institution and it appears that a strong model for planning and resource allocation is evolving. It is noted that the planning processes are organized well and comprehensibly presented in the GWC Decision Making Guide. The College is encouraged to make the GWC Decision Making Guide more visible to the College community, and to continue developing and sharing this document. (IV.B.2.b)

The primary mechanism by which the President assures the implementation of statutes, regulations and governing board policies is through collegial and timely consultation with College constituent groups, and through the oversight of the Planning and Budget

Committee, as well as regular meetings with College governance committees and the administrative team . (IV.B.2.c)

The President effectively controls the institutional budget and expenditures through consultation with the Chancellor the Vice Presidents of the College and the Planning and Budget Committee. (IV.B.2.d)

The President communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution through the use of institutional planning documents such as the Educational Master Plan, Technology Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, and other institutional planning documents found on the Golden West College website. The President also holds regular College-wide meetings and regular interaction with community groups and speaking engagements. (IV.B.2.e)

The roles of setting and communicating district-wide expectations of educational excellence and integrity are broadly suggested in BP 2200 (Board Authority, Responsibility and Duties). In relation to the district role in communicating such expectations, the 2012 Self Study states that,

> *"The Chancellor has established three major stretch goals for the District:*
>
> > • *Attain a 60% completion rate for students by the year 2014*
> >
> > • *Attain a 15% international student population by the year 2020*
> >
> > • *Be a most desirable employer by the year 2015*
>
> *These goals are in addition to the strategic goals outlines in Vision 2020, the District strategic plan adopted in June 2011 (IV.B.3.a.01: Vision 2020, District Master Plan)."*

From the information provided in the 2012 Self Evaluation Report, or Master Planning information on the CCCD Website, it was not clear what priorities guided these goals, or how they were connected to or supported Vision 2020.

The District has responded effectively to the 2007 recommendation for a formal written process to select the senior administrators in the district by revising Board Policy 7909, most recently in May 2012. Thus the District meets the initial statement in Standard IV.B.1.j. The District provides effective leadership to and liaison with the Colleges and appropriately has defined and implemented clear roles of authority and responsibility between the Colleges and the district, thus meeting Standard IV.B.3. The District has partially responded to the recommendation regarding delegation of authority by developing such a policy although that

policy is not consistently followed. Consequently, the District does not fully meet Standards IV.B.1.j and IV.B.3.a.

The Board of Trustees adopted revised hiring policies in January 2012. Interviews with District and College personnel affirmed that policies are followed with the occasional exceptions corrected expeditiously.

The Board of Trustees delegates District operational responsibility to the chancellor as stated in Board Policy 2201. The District has also defined such responsibilities in a Delineation of Functions Map. Review of minutes of Board committees and of minutes of Board meetings plus interviews with members of the Board of Trustees and constituent group leaders demonstrate that the Board is still in the process of clarifying its role regarding the distinction between policies to govern the District and procedures to operate the District and its Colleges. Particular concerns include Board involvement in academic planning such as changes in the manner in which the Colleges offer English as a Second Language, Board involvement in proposing changes to the Colleges' self-studies, and Board incursion in the authority delegated to the chancellor such as evaluation of the vice chancellors. (IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b)

As outlined in the 2012 Self Evaluation Report, the "District provides fair distribution of resources that support the effective operations of the Colleges. The inadequacy of funding is due to the State of California and not to the District budget process. The District uses a fair and consistent full-time equivalent student (FTES)-based formula for allocation of resources. Funds are allocated utilizing the District's designed budget principles and formulas. Members of the District Budget Advisory Committee, the Presidents' Council and the governing councils of the three colleges review the process regularly". Site visit interviews and review of meeting minutes support that the board is effective in this area. (IV.B.3.c)

The control of expenditures is effectively controlled through the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services as outlined in BP 6200 (Budget Preparation) and BP 6300 (Fiscal Management). (IV.B.3.d)

The Chancellor delegates full responsibility and authority to the President. The District Functional Map that has been developed gives clear delineation of responsibilities and authority between the Chancellor and President. (IV.B.3.e)

As outlined in the 2012 Self Evaluation Report, the District acts as the liaison between the colleges and the Board of Trustees and exchanges information and philosophy on a regular basis. The Chancellor meets with the College presidents through regular Chancellor's Cabinet Meetings. District organizational structure integrates well with that of the College. The Chancellor and District office staff facilitate the analysis of decisions and communication flow between and among the Colleges and the Board of Trustees. This is accomplished through the governance and committee structure of the colleges and District.

As part of this structure, the Chancellor has regular Chancellor's Cabinet Meetings with the Presidents. Communication relating to District operations and inter-College issues are shared with the entire district through a weekly news brief released by the Chancellor.

To assure its integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals, the Board of Trustees has a number of Special Committees that help to provide information from the Colleges relating to such topics as Accreditation, Career and Technical Education, Personnel, Legislative Affairs, and Land Development. (IV.B.3.f)

The District does not have a formal system to regularly evaluate District the role in the delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes. This is currently accomplished through feedback from Special Board Committees and staff surveys. The Board of Trustees' self-evaluation is scheduled to be carried out every other year in the odd-numbered years, but has not been consistently followed. The recent development of a District-wide functional map will facilitate the evaluation of the board's effectiveness in these areas. (IV.B.3.g).

Conclusions

The Coast Community College District Code of Ethics for Members of the Board of Trustees, revised in July 2012 as Board Policy 2715, sets forth both the policy and process for ethics standards and the review and response to potential violations. Reviews of minutes of meetings of the Board of Trustees and interviews with both members of the Board of Trustees and of constituent groups affirmed that the process is understood and followed.

The District has developed a Code of Professional Ethics for all employees, adopted by the Board of Trustees in August 2012 as Board Policy 3050. Interviews with constituent leaders affirmed that the policy is in place although no procedure for implementation has yet been developed.

The district has responded effectively to the previous recommendation for a formal, written process to select the senior administrators in the district by revising Board Policy 7909, most recently in May 2012. Thus the District meets the initial statement in Standard IV.B.1.j. The District provides effective leadership to and liaison with the colleges and appropriately has defined and implemented clear roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the District, thus meeting Standard IV.B.3. The District has partially responded to the recommendation regarding delegation of authority by developing such a policy although that policy is not consistently followed. Consequently, the District does not fully meet Standards IV.B.1.j and IV.B.3.a. The Board of Trustees adopted revised hiring policies in January 2012. Interviews with District and College personnel affirmed that policies are followed with the occasional exceptions corrected expeditiously.

The Board of Trustees delegates District operational responsibility to the chancellor as stated in Board Policy 2201. The District has also defined such responsibilities in a Delineation of Functions Map. Review of minutes of Board committees and of minutes of Board meetings plus interviews with members of the Board of Trustees and constituent group leaders demonstrate that the Board is still in the process of clarifying its role regarding the distinction between policies to govern the District and procedures to operate the District and its colleges. Of particular concern are Board initiation of academic plans such as changes in the manner in which the colleges offer English as a Second Language, Board involvement in proposing changes to the colleges' Self Evaluation Reports, and Board incursion in the authority delegated to the chancellor such as evaluation of the vice chancellors.

Interviews with Board of Trustees members, the chancellor, and leaders of College constituent groups demonstrate consistent and appropriate support for the work of the Colleges to establish and assess student learning outcomes and utilize the results to improve teaching and learning.

The Board has a well-defined and published self-evaluation process formally established in board policy. Most recently, the Board delayed the evaluation from September to October 2011, deviating from the policy. The Board did not discuss the self-evaluations until meeting on March 21 and May 16, 2012 rather than at the following meeting as stated in the policy. In addition, the Board did not adopt any action plans to improve their functioning as stated in the policy.

The District has begun the process of reviewing and revising its policies and procedures as recommended. In February 2012 the District created Administrative Procedure 2410 in order to clarify and formulize the process by which existing board policies and administrative procedures are revised or created. This process was started just within the last two years and is not yet complete. The District does not yet meet the Standard.

The District has partially addressed a previous (2007) recommendation by developing a Functional Map of District and College responsibilities related to the Commission's Standards. The map displays both the affected and responsible parties for the major activities of the district and College, as they align with the Accreditation Standards. The Board and staff do not display clear understanding of this delineation of functions, and so the district does not meet the Standards. (IV.B.3.a.)

Review of minutes of Board committees and of minutes of Board of Trustee meetings plus interviews with members of the Board of Trustees and constituent group leaders demonstrate that the Board is still in the process of clarifying its role regarding the distinction between policies to govern the District and procedures to operate the District and its colleges. Of particular concern are Board initiation of academic plans such as changes in the manner in which the colleges offer English as a Second Language, Board involvement in proposing

changes to the colleges' self-studies, and Board incursion in the authority delegated to the chancellor such as evaluation of the vice chancellors.

Recommendations

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)

District Recommendation 3:
To meet the Standard, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees follow its established process for self-evaluation of Board performance as published in its board policy. (Standard IV.B.1.g)

District Recommendation 4:
To meet the Standards and as recommended by the 2007 team, the team recommends that the board implement a process for the evaluation of its policies and procedures according to an identified timeline and revise the policies as necessary. (Standard IV.B.1.e)