Governor Schwarzenegger Signs 2008-09 Budget

Today, Governor Schwarzenegger signed the 2008-09 state budget, ending an historic 85-day standoff. State funds--delayed since the impasse began July 1--should begin flowing to community colleges within the next 48 hours.

The local assistance budget (funds appropriated by the state to local districts) remains unchanged from our update last week. With the governor making over $700 million in line-item vetoes, this is welcome news for our colleges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community College Budget Highlights</th>
<th>Governor's January Budget</th>
<th>Final Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost-of-living adjustment</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.68% (apportionments only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment growth</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical programs</td>
<td>Cuts between 4-10%</td>
<td>2007-08 funding levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Backfill</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$75,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Cal Grants</td>
<td>Proposed to be eliminated</td>
<td>Program preserved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfortunately, the System Office of the California Community Colleges, which had been scheduled to receive a $200,000 cut by the Legislature, was cut an additional $331,000 (for a total of $531,000) by the Governor today. These cuts are unallocated, and hamper an agency that has already been cut significantly and will likely create hurdles for the transition to the new state Chancellor, Senator Jack Scott.

Technical Details

Cash Flow: The budget includes a change in cash flow provided by the state to education agencies, including community colleges. Unlike previous years, around 23% of state payments normally provided in January, February and March will be deferred until April. The League is coordinating a supplemental tax revenue anticipation notes (TRANs) issuance for districts that will need additional cash due to this change.

Growth and Restoration: One-year language included last year to prioritize restoration over enrollment growth was removed from the budget. Thus, restoration and enrollment growth will be treated separately and will both be deflected, if needed, accordingly.

Budget Chart: The Community College League's Budget Chart will be available on the League Web site by midday tomorrow.

Thank you

I said it last week, when the budget bill was initially passed, but it's worth saying
again. While this budget is not one that will enable community colleges to meet all of the needs of our students, communities and hard-working faculty and staff, it could have been much worse. The governor and Legislature have recognized the importance of our colleges, particularly during this difficult economic time. Your advocacy—and more importantly, the hard work you do on campuses every day—made our case and protected our colleges from the most onerous cuts.

I joined Chancellor Diane Woodruff and Academic Senate President Mark Wade Lieu for a visit to Butte College today, where we saw examples of the great efforts to tackle our students’ basic skills needs and a rapidly growing nursing program. This budget protects the investments we have made in recent years, even during a time of significant belt-tightening.

The continued campaign for adequate funds to provide the student access and success expected by taxpayers begins tomorrow. Today, on behalf of the students and communities that your colleges serve—thank you for your strong voice.
What Accreditors Expect from College Program Review

by Barbara A. Beno, Executive Director

This Essay is intended to provide a framework for thought that institutions can use in designing and implementing program reviews. The term “program review” has been used in higher education to define a wide range of efforts to define and evaluate educational programs. Many colleges in the Western Region have asked the Accrediting Commission to clarify how it uses the idea of program review in the Accreditation Standards.

What is required?

The recently adopted Accreditation Standards that were provide much information that clarifies what the Commission means by program review, but the requirement that institutions engage in program review is a long standing one. The 1996 standards stated that institutions must have “clearly defined processes for establishing and evaluating all educational programs” and to insure “program evaluations are integrated into overall institutional evaluations and planning and are conducted on a regular basis.” (Std. 4.D.1) Institutions are specifically required by Accreditation Standards to “assure the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution” (Std. II.A.2) and evaluate all courses and programs through an “ongoing systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of student learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.” (Std. II.A.2.e) While there are many other references to program review activities in the standards, these three statements give us a starting point for discussing the purpose and components of a good program review process.

What is program review?

Program review ought to be a “360-degree” review, or a review from all angles and over time, of the effectiveness of an “educational program”. Fundamentally, program review requires an institution to ask important questions about itself and to do some good thinking about its own performance. The quality of questions asked, and the care with which answers to those questions are sought and then analyzed, determine whether a program review will lead to meaningful information that can be used to improve institutional effectiveness and student learning. (While this essay discusses the program review of educational programs, the principles used in program review can be used as well to assess the effectiveness of other institutional efforts that are not directly related to student learning.)

By “program” accreditors mean a certificate or degree program, a coherent educational experience such as a tutoring or orientation program, a co-curricular learning program, or even an academic discipline (e.g., the social science “program.”). Institutions may differ in what they choose to define as a “program”, but the program ought to be coherent enough that its goals and purposes can be defined, and its effectiveness evaluated.

A complete program review cycle involves several distinct conceptual steps: a precise and accurate description of things as they exist, evaluation of whether those things are sufficient or appropriate or “good enough” to satisfy the institution’s pursuit of excellence, planning for needed improvement, implementation of those plans, and evaluation of the
effectiveness of the actions taken in achieving the desired results. Plans for improvement that result from program review should be integrated with or connected to overall institutional plans so that the regular institutional processes for setting directions and timelines, and providing resources for action, support the implementation of those plans that result from those plans. Ultimately, the actions taken to improve programs must themselves be evaluated for effectiveness, perhaps as part of the subsequent program review cycle. Through recurring cycles of program review, an institution can assess its progress in improving effectiveness over time. It can also identify the way in which student enrollment, student progress and student learning are changing over time, providing information important for planning future programmatic changes.

How should program review be conducted?

An institution can start by examining the stated mission, purpose, or goals of a program, and what a program is doing to achieve that mission. Some questions one might ask about the stated mission or purpose of a program are:

- Is the mission or purpose of this program clear as we have defined it?
- Is the mission or purpose appropriate to our students' needs and our communities' needs?
- Is the mission or purpose "current" and relevant to present-day society, the current labor market, or other contemporary conditions of the society?
- Is the mission or purpose consistent with the overall mission and goals of our institution?
- What have we defined as "student success" in this program? Is it relevant to the students' future needs when they leave this institution? Is it a definition that our community shares or could agree with?
- What are the specific goals and learning outcomes of this program? Have we designed them carefully? Are we certain the array of learning experiences we have designed for this program allows participants to achieve the goals and outcomes we have said we want to achieve?
- What is the array of educational services used to meet the stated mission of the program? How are those services offered? What are the class schedule, the kind of learning environment and pedagogy, the array of support services, and the marketing or promotion used to offer this program? Are these appropriate to the program's mission and purpose?

After defining and examining program purpose or mission and the array of educational services used to achieve that mission, the next step is to examine results, or program effectiveness. As Peter Ewell has pointed out, effectiveness has two components. An effective program is one that achieves its goals, but the notion of efficiency is also inherent in the idea of effectiveness. Hence, an effective program also uses its resources as efficiently as possible – it doesn't waste them. Some questions one might ask about program effectiveness include:

- Who are the students enrolling in this program? What are their goals – what do they want to do with the knowledge gained from this program? What are their needs, including any special needs (scheduling, support services, etc.) that this program or the college should address in order to assure student success? Are we adequately addressing those needs?
- How well are students progressing through the program? What information do we have on their retention, course completion, persistence, and movement and success beyond college (e.g., graduation, transfer, job placement, etc.)? Is that student progress "good enough" in the institution's judgment? In the students' judgment? In the public's judgment? What can we do to improve student progress?
- Are students learning all the learning outcomes we've set for this program? In which areas are they learning more or less? Is this amount of learning "good enough" in the institution's judgment? In the students' judgment? In the public's judgment? What can we do to improve learning?
- Does this program have sufficient resources (human, physical, technological, time) to promote student progress and student learning? Does this program need additional or different resources to better accomplish its mission?
- Is this program using its resources efficiently? Are classes sufficiently full? Does the program have sufficient enrollments or student interest to keep running?
Here’s where an institution should consider advice given by external groups. Ask such questions as:

- Did we consider changes made by the last accreditation team? By external program reviews conducted on our behalf? By program or institutional advisory committees?
- Did we consider recommendations we made to ourselves in our last self study? (planning agenda)

After evaluating program effectiveness, the next step is to develop and implement good plans to make needed improvements in a program. The institution should consider the following questions:

- What changes do we need to make the improvements we’ve identified for this program? What resources are needed to make improvements? Is there any required sequence of change? Do we need to do certain things before others? What are the timelines we need to set for making these programmatic changes?
- What short and long term plans does the institution need to make to implement changes? Do these plans require the involvement or assistance of other college programs or operations? How do we record these plans and keep them in our view so that we act on them? What individual or group should be responsible for follow-up?
- How can the plans necessary to improve program be incorporated into the institution’s regular planning and resource allocation process so that the plans can be funded and implemented?

A last conceptual stage of any program review involves evaluating the impact of the changes that have been made to the program. At some point, whether it is after implementation of any stage of program change, or at the time of a next regularly scheduled review, the institution needs to specifically and carefully evaluate whether the changes made have resulted in improvements desired. The questions an institution might ask include the following:

- Did we make all of the changes we planned? If we did not, what were the impediments to making those changes? Do we still believe those changes would lead to improvements?
- How effective were the changes in improving program effectiveness? Have we improved student progress through the program, student learning, or other aspects of program quality such as efficiency?
- What have we learned by looking at the results of these change efforts that would inform future attempts to change and improve this program?

**Conclusion**

This article has tried to provide a framework for conceptualizing program review. The quality of questions asked, and the care with which answers to those questions are sought and then analyzed, determine whether a program review will lead to meaningful information that can be used to improve institutional effectiveness and student learning. Institutions seeking excellence benefit from program reviews that are shaped around well-framed questions that are of importance to the college and its staff. Ultimately, the shared interest of college staff and accreditors is in student success.

*Thoughtful questions can only be answered with relevant and good information or data. The next edition of Accreditation Notes will include an article on good data.*

Requirements for Evidence in the Self-Study

Excerpted from ACCJC Accreditation Team Training (August 2008)

Data on Program Review should include:

- Institutional program review data including longitudinal data
- Course outlines/syllabi showing learning outcomes and assessment methods
- Catalogs showing program goals and learning outcomes
- Budgets showing adequate resources
- Policies on curricular review
- Evidence of regular course review and improvement

Data on Student Learning Outcomes should include:

- Catalog and institutional descriptions with related SLOs
- Course outlines/syllabi with stated SLOs
- Portfolios, productions and samples of student work
- Grading rubrics where they exist
- Summary data on SLO attainment
- Evidence that SLO data are used for institutional self-evaluation, planning and improvement of teaching and learning

Data on Student Services should include:

- Student services program reviews
- Student satisfaction or follow-up surveys
- Records of student use of services
- Student services planning documents
- Catalog, handbook, web page descriptions of student services
- Policies on academic progress, honesty, codes of conduct, grievance and complaint procedures
- Availability of services for students off campus and in distance education
Assuring Quality and Consistency of Distance and Electronically Mediated Learning

Excerpted from ACCJC Accreditation Team Training – August 2008

Teams are being told to pay particular attention to programs that have exhibited significant growth in their online programs looking for increases in:

- Number of courses offered
- Number of faculty teaching online courses
- Number of students taking online courses

Teams are being told to verify that institutions are meeting the growing expectations of students in online courses by examining the following “institutional processes that impact students’ access and completion of online programs:"

- Admissions, orientation, registration, advising, financial aid
- Course delivery, grade integrity, tutoring services, communication with students
- Graduation applications, transcript requests, student survey collection and analysis

Teams are being told to look for the following student success data in relation to students in online courses:

- Class size
- Retention and withdrawal rates/data
- Student course completion rates/data
- Online pass rates compared with seat-time pass rates
- Analysis of above data
- Use of student data for improvement

Teams are being told to look for evidence that institutions have the following quality assurances in place:

- Academic integrity: course content between online and seat-time courses
- Faculty online teaching capability
- Student capability for online delivery
- Faculty and student support services
- Faculty and student learning assessment systems
- Integration with institutional mission
# SUMMARY OF ESTIMATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EST</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SITEWORK (BASE BID - AREAS BEYOND BUILDING FOOTPRINT + PLAZA)</td>
<td>54,810 SF</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>86.03</td>
<td>4,715,490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH TECH/LECTURE HALL - NEW 2-STORY BUILDING W/ FULL AIR CONDITIONING</td>
<td>69,830 SF</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>525.37</td>
<td>36,886,441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41,401,931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEPARATE PRICES FOR ITEMS INCLUDED IN ABOVE BASE ESTIMATE (PLEASE SEE END OF RELEVANT ESTIMATE SECTIONS FOR DETAILED BACKUP)**

**LEED RELATED SITEWORK REQUIREMENTS**
1.0 ON SITE STORM DRAINS & BMP'S (BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICE) 188,380

**LEED RELATED BUILDING REQUIREMENTS**
2.0 RESTROOM, SHOWERS & CHANGING ROOMS (RMS. 217 & 218) 126,903
3.0 ELECTRICAL LEED ENERGY SAVINGS (PER ELECTRICAL ENGINEER) 91,534
4.0 COST FOR CHILLED BEAM SYSTEM VS. SINGLE DUCT VAV W/ REHEAT TROUGH - PER d'A-HELMS & ASSOCIATES, INC. "ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE COST", DATED 4/9/08 [PLEASE SEE BACKUP ATTACHED] 312,173
5.0 LEED ATTRIBUTABLE DOUBLE GLAZING, LOW -E VS. STANDARD GLAZING (PRICING $8.50/SF FOR LOW E PER COAST GLASS TELECON 8/19/08) 98,252
6.0 INCREASE ROOF INSULATION FROM R-19 TO R-21.7 49,562
7.0 LEED MANAGEMENT IMPACT TO GENERAL CONTRACTOR (BUILDING + SITE) 185,398

**DSA SITEWORK REQUIREMENTS**
8.0 SWITCHBACK RAMP, WESTSIDE 113,119
9.0 SWITCHBACK RAMP, PLANTERS, & STEPS, SOUTHWEST CORNER (AREA=3570 SF) 321,523
10.0 TWO (2) IDENTICAL RAMPS, WESTSIDE 62,982
##設計發展成本估計

**項目**: SBCC - 高科技大樓
**位置**: 圣塔芭芭拉, CA
**客戶**: Kruger, Benson, Ziemer 建築師, Inc.

###描述

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>項目編號</th>
<th>描述</th>
<th>劳工</th>
<th>單位</th>
<th>單價</th>
<th>小計</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>AUTO CAD 及繪圖程序增設</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>329,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>專案 1 建築結合電腦家具</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,168,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>修改計畫安排從 6/09 起至 12/09 起</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,333,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**總估計份離價格估計值**: 4,380,861

**總估計項目成本減去份離價格**: 37,021,070

###上升包括在上述估計中的上升包括在下列參數中:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>前次安排</th>
<th>經修訂安排</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul-08</td>
<td>Jul-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-09</td>
<td>Dec-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-10</td>
<td>Aug-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.75%</td>
<td>6.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

###注意

如項目延長到上述參數之外，成本按上述指標的年度上升預計將上升，基於當前趨勢。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School of Media Arts Estimate Sept. 2007</th>
<th>School of Media Arts Estimate Sept. 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Fees</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction costs</td>
<td>25,731,000</td>
<td>25,731,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>1,287,000</td>
<td>1,287,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect Oversight</td>
<td>412,000</td>
<td>412,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection /Testing</td>
<td>523,000</td>
<td>523,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>515,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>2,204,000</td>
<td>2,204,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total State Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 32,072,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 32,072,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Cost Estimate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Fees</td>
<td>1,096,212</td>
<td>1,096,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction costs</td>
<td>9,440,502</td>
<td>15,670,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>1,347,911</td>
<td>783,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect Oversight</td>
<td>190,265</td>
<td>190,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection /Testing</td>
<td>670,733</td>
<td>670,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>237,831</td>
<td>126,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site work, alternate</td>
<td>1,361,746</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/C Alternate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swing Space</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total District funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 14,345,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 18,538,005</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 46,417,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 50,610,005</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent District Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>31%</strong></td>
<td><strong>37%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Estimate</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 35,171,502</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,401,931</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The estimate for 2007 was less the alternate site work and landscape.

**9/24/2008**