

This Week at the District

Accreditation Study Session

I would like to thank the Board for hosting a study session on accreditation. The session was informative and led to a good discussion regarding the district accreditation findings. I have attached the presentation for your reference and would like to acknowledge the hard work of the staff responsible for accreditation. I think it is important to remember that accreditation is the recognition that an institution maintains levels of quality and continuous improvement in the delivery of educational materials. Further, accreditation is a process for responsible self-regulation, evaluation and improvement. The Board recognized the importance of meeting the requirements of the accreditation findings in the timeframe allotted and I am appreciative of their commitment to the accreditation process and our colleges. As noted at Wednesday's Board meeting, it is imperative that we complete our processes and meet all required standards in time for the March 2014 follow-up visit.

Ad Campaign

For the last several weeks, the District has been running hundreds of commercials on area cable television. The commercials air on Time Warner and Cox Cable on channels such as MTV, Bravo, Spike and History. While many of you may not have seen them, I assure you that they are targeted toward a specific audience. If you have not seen the commercials, you can view them on our Coast Colleges Facebook page or by watching the MTV Video Music awards. To coincide with the television ads, Coast Colleges participated in the US Open of Surfing, which provided information to an estimated 500,000 potential students. Our colleges have also done mailers and banners and will be delivering tee shirts to thousands of students this coming semester. As you are aware, the District is looking to boost enrollment in order to garner much needed Proposition 30 funding and these marketing efforts are helping do just that.

Furlough Restoration

I would like to acknowledge the Board for their leadership in voting to provide stipends in the amount of salary taken due to furloughs for all impacted Coast Colleges employees. This week, the state budget workshop combined with our year-end closing confirmed that we will have an ending balance that will allow us to repay all furlough days. I would like to commend the CFCE for advocating on behalf of their members and thank the Board for voting on behalf of all of our Coast Team (managers and confidential employees) that were willing to give up salary to ensure fiscal health for the District. Details will be forthcoming in a couple of weeks as we prepare the budget update.

Sincerely,



Board Meeting Reminders

August 7 – Study Session

August 21 – Regular Meeting

September 4 – Regular Meeting

Chancellor's Schedule

Week of August 12

Monday – Thursday
In the office

Friday – Vacation



Accreditation Recommendations

Report to Board of Trustees
August 7, 2013

Inspiration. Innovation. Graduation.



District Recommendation 1

To meet the Standard, and as recommended by the 2007 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.I.c)

Inspiration. Innovation. Graduation.

District Recommendation 1

Responsible for Coordination	District Office (DO) and College Groups/Representatives Involved in Writing and/or Review
Chancellor	DO Human Resources
Vice Chancellor of Human Resources (this is a negotiated item with the Faculty Unions)	Chancellor's Cabinet
	College Academic Senates
	Faculty Unions

Inspiration. Innovation. Graduation.

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)

Inspiration. Innovation. Graduation.



District Recommendation 2

Responsible for Coordination	District Office (DO) and College Groups/Representatives Involved In Writing and/or Review
Board President, Board Clerk	Board of Trustees
Chancellor	Board Accreditation Committee
	Chancellor's Cabinet
	District Governance Council
	College Academic Senates
	College Primary Participatory Governance Committee/Group

Inspiration. Innovation. Graduation.



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)

Inspiration. Innovation. Graduation.



District Recommendation 3

Responsible for Coordination	District Office (DO) and College Groups/Representatives Involved in Writing and/or Review
Board President	Board of Trustees
	Board Accreditation Committee

Inspiration. Innovation. Graduation.



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)

Inspiration. Innovation. Graduation.



District Recommendation 4

Responsible for Coordination	District Office (DO) and College Groups/Representatives Involved in Writing and/or Review
Board Clerk/Secretary	Board of Trustees
Chancellor Vice Chancellor of Educational Services and Technology (overall coordination)	Board Accreditation Committee
Vice Chancellor of Human Resources	Chancellor's Cabinet
Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration	District Governance Council

Inspiration. Innovation. Graduation.



Commission Recommendation 1

To meet the Standards, the District needs to examine the role of the four board employees who report directly to the Board of Trustees to ensure there is no conflict with the delegation of authority of the Chancellor and the college presidents. (Standard IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b)

Inspiration. Innovation. Graduation.



Commission Recommendation 1

Responsible for Coordination	District Office (DO) and College Groups/Representatives Involved in Writing and/or Review
Board President	Board of Trustees
Chancellor	

Inspiration. Innovation. Graduation.

WASC Accreditation Frequently Asked Questions

What is accreditation?

Accreditation is the process for evaluating and assuring the quality of education used by the higher education community. It is a quality assurance process through which institutions collectively set standards for good practice, conduct peer-based evaluations of institutions on a regular basis, confer accredited status on institutions, and make the results of accreditation review of institutions known to the public. Through accreditation, the higher education community is responsible for monitoring the quality of the programs and services of member institutions. Agencies that develop and apply standards are often called accrediting commissions. Accrediting commissions were created by the collective group of institutions that wished to engage in the quality review and assurance process, and those institutions were and are referred to as the member institutions of a commission.

Regional Accreditation: The most highly regarded form of institutional accreditation, and that sought by most academic institutions with comprehensive missions, is conducted by accrediting agencies that have chosen to organize themselves into six broad geographic regions of the country. These are referred to as the regional accrediting commissions and operate in the New England states, the mid-Atlantic states, the southern states, the middle or north central states, the northwestern states, and the western states and U.S. territories of the Pacific. The commissions in these six regions, which have standards that cover the entire institution, require that a component of general education be included in all degree programs. These commissions issue a periodic report on the quality of the entire institution according to processes and procedures established by each commission. The regional accrediting commissions set a very high standard for the performance of the entire institution. Not all higher education institutions can meet these standards.

What is ACCJC?

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) accredits associate degree granting institutions in California, Hawaii, the Territories of Guam and American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of the Marshall Islands. ACCJC is one of three commissions under the corporate entity known as the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

What is WASC?

The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) is the corporate entity that consists of three separately organized commissions within the western region. WASC separates the two

kinds of higher education institutions (two-year and four-year) into separate commissions. The three commissions that make up WASC are:

- The **Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities (ACSCU)**, which accredits public and private senior colleges and universities;
- The **Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)**, which evaluates and accredits public and private postsecondary institutions that offer two-year education programs and award the associate degree;
- The **Accrediting Commission for Schools (ACS)**, which has the responsibility for the accreditation of all schools below the college level. Included are elementary, junior high, middle, high and adult schools, whether public, private or church-related.

What are the purposes of ACCJC?

The purposes of ACCJC are to evaluate member institutions to assure the educational community, the general public, and other organizations and agencies that an institution has clearly defined objectives appropriate to higher education; has established conditions under which their achievement can reasonably be expected; appears in fact to be accomplishing them substantially; is so organized, staffed, and supported that it can be expected to continue to do so; and demonstrates that it meets commission standards. The commission encourages and supports institutional development and improvement through self study and periodic evaluation by qualified peer professionals.

How does ACCJC evaluate colleges?

Process for becoming accredited

Prior to making a formal application, an institution wishing to become a candidate for accreditation by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges must begin by assessing itself in relation to the basic criteria for institutional eligibility through an eligibility application and supporting documentation. The institution should also review the standards of accreditation and commission policies, which provide a clear statement of ultimate commission expectations of institutional performance and quality and give further definition to the eligibility criteria. The eligibility process is designed to screen institutions prior to a period of formal and extensive institutional self study so that only institutions that meet the basic criteria for eligibility may proceed. Following review, the institution may be granted or denied eligibility.

If eligibility is granted, the institution may apply for candidacy status by completing and submitting a "Self Study Report" using the standards of accreditation, the Self Study Manual,

and other commission policies and resources. This report is supported by evidence that is retained at the college for review by the accreditation team. The report is submitted to the commission, which sends a team to visit the college for the purpose of determining if the institution meets the standards, policies and eligibility criteria of the commission. Following the review, the institution may be granted candidacy or extension, deferral, denial or termination of candidacy by the commission.

If the commission grants candidacy, which is generally awarded for a period of two years, the institution next applies for initial accreditation. This is accomplished by submitting the Self Study Report using the standards of accreditation, the Self Study Manual, and other commission policies and resources. This Self Study Report is supported by evidence that the institution continues to meet the eligibility requirements, as well as the standards and policies. Following submission of the report, a team visits the institution for the purpose of ensuring the college meets all standards of the commission. Following the review of the self study and team reports, the institution may be granted initial accreditation, extension or denial of initial accreditation.

If initial accreditation is granted, the institution then begins a six-year cycle of periodic review for reaffirmation of accreditation, which has several parts. These include a six-year comprehensive evaluation, a mid-term evaluation in the third year, annual reports and annual fiscal reports to the commission, and other progress and substantive change reports and visits as deemed necessary by the commission.

Sources: Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions, 2005 Accreditation Reference Handbook, page 50; 2004 Eligibility, Candidacy and Initial Accreditation Manual.

Procedures

The entire process described above is characterized and driven by peer review. An institution at any stage in the process (eligibility, candidacy, initial accreditation and reaffirmation of accreditation) begins its self study by examining itself and preparing a report detailing how well and to what degree it continues to meet the eligibility criteria, standards and policies of the commission. During that period of self evaluation, the institution is encouraged to seek broad input from the various constituent groups on campus and provide for periodic and open dialog and contribution. The resultant Self Study Report represents the institution's honest appraisal of how it continues to meet all commission expectations.

Peer review is also characteristic of the subsequent levels of evaluation of an institution. A team is selected from a pool of peer evaluators that has been recommended by the ACCJC member institutions themselves and scrutinized by commission staff. Team members are trained by commission staff in their roles and responsibilities as representatives of the commission while conducting the evaluation visits. Under the direction of a team leader, the team evaluates the quality of the institution by assessing the degree to which it meets standards and adheres to policies. The resultant team report and confidential recommendation

are submitted to the commission for consideration. Following submission of the report, the commission (itself made up of 19 individuals, of whom 14 are institutional representatives) acts on the accredited status of the institution and decides on a course of follow-up to cover the six years leading to the next comprehensive review.

Sources: 2005, Self Study Manual; 2005 Team Evaluator Manual; Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions – 2005 Accreditation Reference Handbook (ARH), page 50; Code of Commission Good Practice in Relations with Member Institutions – 2005 ARH, page 47; Disclosure and Confidentiality of Information – 2005 ARH, page 65; Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems – 2005 ARH, page 70; Policy on the Rights and Responsibilities of ACCJC and Member Institutions in the Accrediting Process – 2005 ARH, page 104; Representation of Accredited Status – 2005 ARH, page 108; Review of Commission Actions – 2005 ARH, page 110; Substantive Change Policy – 2005 ARH, page 127.

Who oversees the accreditors?

The **U.S. Department of Education (DOE)** provides oversight to the American system of accreditation. It conducts a review of each legitimate accrediting commission every five years and confers, on accrediting bodies that qualify, the status of recognition. All institutions wishing to provide students with federal financial aid must seek accreditation from a U.S. Department of Education-recognized accrediting body. The **Higher Education Act**, periodically reviewed and renewed by the **Congress of the United States**, contains the criteria that accrediting commissions must meet if they are to obtain recognition from the US DOE.

In addition, the **Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA)** has established criteria of excellence and a quality review system that define quality for accrediting bodies. Although accrediting commissions are not compelled to seek CHEA recognition, many accrediting agencies voluntarily participate in the CHEA quality review process as part of their own efforts to establish and maintain quality in accreditation practices.

Pirates Win Two National Titles at ACRAs

Friday, August 9, 2013

GAINESVILLE, GA -- The Orange Coast College men's crew capped off a very successful 2013 season with a pair of national titles at the American Collegiate Rowing Association National Championships, held at Lake Sydney Lanier in late May.

In all, 29 rowers made the trek out to Georgia for the championships and when the final race was finished, all 29 rowers earned a medal at the national competition.

"That is very rewarding," OCC head coach Paul Prioleau told the local media in regards to the medal count. "They are a great bunch of kids to have. They are a strong bunch and they are very spirited. These kids got out there this weekend and never looked back and I am awfully proud of them."



In the Men's Varsity 4 race, the group of Austin Gentry, Joe Morris, Kaleb Prichett, Ben Webster and coxswain Kenzie Shoneman had to battle back down the stretch to successfully defend last year's championship. Trailing the University of Virginia and Purdue University at the halfway point, the Pirates dug deep and found that extra gear to top the field with a time of 6 minutes, 36.8 seconds. Purdue (6:38.1) finished second, while George Mason (6:45.1) took third.

"During the weekend, we had been able to get the boat out front early, but the championship race made for a nervous situation," Prioleau said in an interview with the Gainesville Observer. "Instead of fighting the boat, they let the boat do the work and that made the difference. That took a lot of maturity and patience. The sport of rowing is a team sport and all the links in the chain have to be strong for success. They exhibited that today."

Another OCC national championship came in the Men's 2nd Freshmen/Novice 8 race, as the Pirates claimed victory with a time of 6:18.8. The University of Michigan finished second at 6:22.9, while Notre Dame (6:39.4) finished third and UC Santa Barbara (6:43.1) placed fourth.

OCC's crew of Cody Roberts, Hayes Dollis, Cody Raphael, Jourdan Richman, Joe Martin, Angel Galvan, Sean Buck, James Paino and coxswain Helena Cosentini led the race from wire to wire to earn Coast's fifth national title in the school's 60-year history.

In the other Men's Freshmen/Novice 8 race, the Pirates were edged out at the wire by the University of Virginia, which took home the title with a time of 5:55.3. In what turned out to

be a two-boat race down the stretch, OCC was the only other sub-six-minute boat and finished second with a 5:56.6. The University of Michigan finished third at 6:04.3.

In the finals of the Freshmen/Novice 4 competition, the Pirates finished third overall with a time of 6:46.7, behind the first-place tie between Bucknell and Michigan (6:40.7 each).



Campus Grounds Supervisor is Manager of the Year

Sean Rivell, OCC grounds supervisor, has been named the Orange Coast College's 2012-13 Manager of the Year.

"I was absolutely surprised," said Sean, who has worked at OCC for 11 years. As a manager, Sean supervises 13 full-time and three part-time employees. He is responsible for "everything outside" from campus landscaping to rooftops and parking lots and underground utilities. Green recycling and soil recycling are also included in his long list of duties. He also has a pesticide license and supervises chemical applications and rodent control on campus.

Sean grew up on a family farm in New Jersey and earned a degree in nursery horticulture and agribusiness at Rutgers University. He also minored in turf science, which comes in handy when he is sprucing up the college's athletic fields.

Early in his career, Sean moved to the West Coast and worked for a landscaping firm in that designed and installed custom landscaping for new homes in Newport Coast. When an employment opportunity opened at Orange Coast College, he jumped at the chance to work on the college campus.

"Every day there is something different, either wonderfully pleasant or very challenging," Sean said. "I love working with interesting people." He also met his fiancée, Karen Latham, a staff aide for Maintenance & Operations.

Sean enjoys making a difference on campus, whether it is helping to plan new construction or making the campus greener. One of his latest projects was acquisition of a \$70,000 soil recycling machine. "It's awesome to preserve the environment and make the campus better at the same time."

Director of Maintenance and Operations Mark Goode nominated Sean for the Manager of the Year recognition, which is presented by the Coast District Management Association.

"Sean is a tireless worker, often found on campus on the weekends and usually covered in mud. Sean never shies from a challenge, and keeping this campus looking like it does is a direct reflection of his 'can do' philosophy," said Goode in his nomination. "Sean is a 'lead by example' manager and spends more time in the field, digging, making repairs, planting, spraying, grading or sometimes even attending a meeting or two....Sean is the reason the grounds here at OCC are as beautiful as they are."