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 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.*

---

January Commission Actions/Institutions

**Reaffirmed Accreditation**
- College of the Canyons
- Crafton Hills College
- Cuesta College
- Long Beach City College
- Pasadena City College
- San Bernardino Valley College
- Santa Barbara City College
- Santa Rosa Junior College

**Accepted Midterm Report**
- City College of San Francisco
- College of the Redwoods
- Columbia College
- De Anza College
- Defense Language Institute
- Foothill College
- Fresno City College
- Guam Community College
- Lake Tahoe Community College
- Los Angeles Harbor College
- Modesto Junior College
- Mt. San Jacinto College
- Queen of the Holy Rosary College
- Reedley College
- Shasta College

**Accepted Focused Midterm Report**
- Feather River College
- Hawaii Tokai International College
- Yuba College

**Accepted Focused Midterm Report & Visit**
- Barstow College
- Heald College
- Los Angeles Southwest College
- Santiago Canyon College
- Solano Community College
- West Los Angeles College

**Accepted Interim Report**
- Coastline Community College
- College of the Sequoias
- Los Angeles Mission College
- Marymount College
- MTI College of Business and Technology
- Riverside Community College
- Cañada College
- College of San Mateo
- Skyline College
- Hawaii Community College
- Leeward Community College

**Accepted Interim Report with Visit**
- Copper Mountain College
- Don Bosco Technical Institute
- Imperial Valley College
- Los Angeles County College of Nursing and Allied Health
- Los Angeles Valley College
- Maui Community College
- Western Career College
- Windward Community College

**Accepted Progress Report**
- Oxnard College
- College of Micronesia-FSM

**Accepted Progress Report & Visit**
- Hartnell College

**Special Report not Accepted**
- Kern Community College District
- Peralta Community College District

**Placed on Warning**
- American Samoa Community College
- Kauai Community College

**Placed on Probation**
- College of the Marshall Islands

**Progress Report not Accepted**
- Antelope Valley College

**Accepted Substantive Change Report**

**American River College**: approval for Sacramento Regional Public Safety Center and Ethan Way Center

**Cosumnes River College**: approval to separate Folsom Lake College Center; approval to offer certificate programs at Rancho Cordova Center

**College of Oceaneering**: approval to open campus in San Diego

**Cypress College**: approval to relocate culinary arts program

**Heald College**: approval to consolidate Santa Rosa campus

**Sacramento City College**: approval for West Sacramento Center

**Western Career College**: approved purchase by US Education Corporation

**West Valley College**: approval to offer on-line certificate in Administrative Management

**Note**: The Substantive Change Committee of the Commission meets regularly to assess Substantive Change Reports. Institutions considering substantive changes are encouraged to contact Commission staff if they have questions about changes.
Commission Policy Actions

Adoption
Commission Membership and Appointment Procedure
Revision of this policy had been circulated to member institutions and was adopted by the Commission as a second reading. Content changes from current policy include:

- announcement of anticipated vacancies at the January meeting;
- notification of vacancies to member institutions and other interested parties;
- process for filling of vacancies occurring after the meeting of the Selection Committee and before winter Commission meeting.

This policy will now be used in appointments to the Commission. The policy will be distributed to member institutions and posted on the Commission’s web site.

Policy and Procedures on Public Disclosure
This policy had been adopted in 1999 and required editing to bring it in accord with other Commission policies as well as changes in the Higher Education Act. Revision of this policy had been circulated to member institutions and was adopted by the Commission as a second reading. Changes to this policy are primarily reinforcing statements on the Commission’s expectations that team members maintain confidentiality and that the Commission retain the right to deal with public inquiries about an institution which has been warned, placed on probation, or issued a Show Cause order. This policy is now in effect and will be distributed to member institutions and posted on the Commission’s web site.

First Reading
Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions
This policy consolidates and clarifies the many statements the Commission has about actions on institutions into a single policy. The policy covers actions on institutions applying for candidacy or extension of candidacy and actions on institutions that are applicants for initial accreditation. The policy also covers those actions that reaffirm accreditation—without conditions, with a request for a Focused Midterm Report (with or without a visit), and with a request for a Progress Report (with or without a visit). In addition the policy covers procedural actions as well as sanctions and termination of accreditation.

Sanctions include issuing a Warning, imposing Probation, and requiring Show Cause. Institutions may remain on sanction for a cumulative total of no more than two years.

If concerns are not resolved within this period, the Commission will take action to terminate accreditation.

The policy will be circulated to member institutions in spring 2003 for comment before final action by the Commission at its June 2003 meeting.

U.S. Department of Education Authorization
At its meeting of December 3, 2002 the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity voted to grant a full five-year authorization, with no conditions, to the ACCJC. The committee had reviewed the Commission’s application developed by ACCJC staff led by Associate Director Gari Browning. The application takes the form of a self study of how the Commission meets US Department of Education criteria and covers every aspect of the ACCJC’s activities. Executive Director Barbara Beno reports that the five-year authorization is the maximum allowable and that ACCJC was the only Commission under review that received this authorization with no conditions.

Council for Higher Education Accreditation Recognition (CHEA)
As a result of the hearings held by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation Committee on Recognition in late November, the ACCJC will receive a full five year recognition from CHEA. The committee applauded the ACCJC’s efforts in developing standards that require institutions to develop and measure student learning outcomes. As with the US Department of Education application, Commission staff, under the direction of Associate Director Gari Browning, prepared lengthy and detailed materials as evidence of its activities. CHEA is a national organization that coordinates accreditation activity in the United States. CHEA represents more than 3,000 colleges and universities and 60 national, regional, and specialized accreditors.

ACCJC and the US General Accounting Office
A Congressional Committee chaired by Senator Smith from New Hampshire is currently investigating the degree to which accreditors review the quality of distance learning programs and can provide quality assurance on such programs. On behalf of the committee the US General Accounting Office (GAO) is collecting information from all regional accreditors. The ACCJC recently mailed information and documents to the GAO, detailing how member institutions use Commission standards and policies to assess distance learning programs and how they report activities to the Commission. GAO staff visited the Commission in the March to collect information on policies and practices regarding distance learning.
The Commission requires member institutions to submit an Annual Report which contains information on a number of issues including potential substantive changes, fiscal health, distance learning, and student loan default rates. Always at the heart of the annual report are issues that require substantive change reports. In recent years, the report has also required information on courses offered through distance learning. A number of colleges have requested an interactive version of the annual report be available on our website to ease reporting. We will be considering that possibility as we update our web capabilities. To date, 138 of the 140 member colleges have filed reports for 2001-02.

**Offerings at new locations** Twenty colleges reported having new sites or campuses at which students can complete at least 50% of the credits for a degree or certificate program. These programs are working their way through the substantive change process.

**New programs** The Commission does not require approval of individual program changes within a comprehensive institution unless the change represents a significant departure from current offerings, but colleges are asked to report program additions and deletions in the annual report. Seventy-two colleges reported having added programs, up from sixty-four last year. The overwhelming majority of additions once again were concentrated in computer-related degrees and certificates, many focusing on graphic and digital art. Business degrees and certificates are also proliferating, with several colleges offering specializations in international business. Other areas receiving noticeable attention include environmental studies, biotechnology, culinary arts, human services, allied health, and physical fitness. Teaching-related programs are also appearing at several colleges. Other more unusual programs offered for the first time at some colleges are substance abuse, viticulture, gerontology, and casino management.

**Distance learning programs** Eighteen colleges reported having degree or certificate programs in which 50% or more of the credits required are available through distance modes. This year 110 colleges reported offering two-way internet courses, compared to 98 for last year and 92 the year before. Enrollment in distance learning courses shows steady increase over the last three years.

**Programs offered abroad for non-US nationals** Four colleges have started new programs for non-US nationals, down sharply from last year when 24 of the one hundred colleges reporting described new programs for non-U.S. national students.

**Fiscal issues** Most colleges, 120 of 138, reported operating surpluses for the 2000-01 fiscal year. Fifty-eight colleges reported audit exceptions, most involving procedural problems rather than material issues of noncompliance.

**Financial aid participation and student loan default** Of the 138 colleges submitting annual reports, 130 or 94% are participants in federal financial aid programs, representing a significant increase in participation from a few years ago. The student loan default rates for our institutions continued to drop. Only 2 colleges reported student loan default rates that exceeded 20%, and one of those colleges had only one student in loan payback, yielding a misleadingly inflated default rate of 100%.

### New Commissioner Seated

As reported in the June edition of Accreditation Notes, the Commission acted to appoint a new Commissioner as a public member. **Dr. Carter Doran** was seated at the January meeting. **Dr. Doran**, who begins a three-year term, has a long history of community involvement, including board service and volunteer work. A retired community college educator, Dr. Doran served as Assistant Superintendent/Vice President of Instruction and Student Services at College of the Canyons and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs for the Rancho Santiago Community College District. He has also taught speech and drama at Mt. San Antonio College.

Dr. Doran’s accreditation experience includes service as an accreditation liaison officer for both College of the Canyons and the Rancho Santiago Community College District and participation in site visits to seven public and private two-year colleges. He served as chair on three of those visits and will be chairing a team in March. Dr. Doran has served as editor for the revised ACCJC standards. Dr. Doran is a resident of city of Upland.

### Commission Positions to be Available

The term of current Commission Public Member Chuck Ayala will end June 30, 2003 and Public Member James Cunningham has resigned. As such, there will be two positions open for public members whose terms will begin on July 1, 2003. In addition, Commissioner Michael Widener, Professor of History at Compton College is retiring. In accordance with Commission process, applications for these positions (two members of the public and a
faculty member) will be reviewed in April 2003 by a Selection Committee. Applications will be accepted beginning in late February; application forms are available from the Commission office.

Per ACCJC By-laws, the Commission Selection Committee consists of seven members, including at least two administrators, two faculty members, and two representatives of the public interest. Three of these members are appointed by the Commission Chair, two from the Commission and one from the private institutions it accredits with one to be designated as chair of the committee. One member is appointed by the Pacific Postsecondary Education Council. The Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges, the California Chief Executive Officers, the California Community College Trustees, and the Hawaii Community College Academic Senate Chairs appoint whatever additional faculty, administrative, and representatives of the public are required to complete the composition of the committee. The Executive Director serves as nonvoting secretary to the committee.

Commissioners are appointed for staggered three-year terms and are limited to two three-year terms unless the person is elected an officer for a term which extends beyond a sixth year, in which case an additional three-year term may be served.

**Comprehensive Visits 2003-2004**

Under current U.S. Department of Education regulations, ACCJC must provide opportunity for third-party comment regarding institutional qualifications for accreditation. The institutions noted below are scheduled to undergo a comprehensive visit in fall 2003 and spring 2004. Review by the Commission will occur at its January and June 2004 meetings. Third-party comment on these institutions should be made to Executive Director Barbara A. Beno at 10 Commercial Boulevard, Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949. For consideration, such comment must be submitted in writing, signed, accompanied by return address and telephone number, and received no later than five weeks before the scheduled Commission meeting.

**Fall 2003**
- American River College
- Citrus College
- College of Oceaneering
- Cosumnes River College
- Folsom Lake College
- Napa Valley College
- Sacramento City College

**Spring 2004**
- Allan Hancock College
- Brooks College
- Chaffey College
- College of Micronesia-FSM
- College of the Siskiyous
- D-Q University
- Glendale Community College
- MiraCosta College
- Monterey Peninsula College
- Palau Community College
- Santa Monica College
- West Hills Lemoore College*

*Initial Visit

**Update from the Pacific**

Following are highlights from the Pacific presented at the January Commission meeting by Commissioner Susan Moses who represents the colleges of the western Pacific: **American Samoa College**
The college has launched its first distance learning courses as part of a federally funded initiative called “Project 2000.” Courses included general education courses and courses in the Samoan language; they were offered to off-campus students as well as students living on the outer islands of Manu’a.

**College of Micronesia-FSM**
Enrollments at the five campuses of the college are up by 3.2% over fall 2001; college officials expect the growth trend to continue. The college is designing a B.Ed degree in Education as well as vocational programs in electronics and telecommunications.

**Northern Marianas College**
In August 2002, Dr. Kenneth E. Wright became the college’s third president.

**Palau Community College**
The college’s relationship with the government of Japan has brought a new language lab and a building to house the musical instruments donated by the Japanese. The college was also notified by the USDOE that funding for the college’s proposal for a Minority Science Improvement Grant has been approved. A Talent Search Grant was also approved for funding.

**WGU Accredited**
On Feb. 13, 2003, Western Governors University became the first and only university to receive regional accreditation from four regional accrediting commissions at the same time. ACCJC is among these Commissions.

WGU’s competency-based system has met the same educational standards for performance, integrity, and quality met by more traditional universities. WGU conducted extensive university-wide evaluations and prepared multiple self-evaluation reports for a committee representing each of the four regional associations. A team of national evaluators representing each association made on-site visits to the university to review WGU’s operations.
Comprehensive Visits
Spring 2003
Under current U.S. Department of Education regulations, ACCJC must provide opportunity for third-party comment regarding institutional qualifications for accreditation. The institutions noted below are scheduled to undergo a comprehensive visit in spring 2003 and a review by the Commission at its June 2003 meeting. Third-party comment on these institutions should be made to Executive Director Barbara A. Beno at 10 Commercial Boulevard, Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949. For consideration, such comment must be submitted in writing, signed, accompanied by return address and telephone number, and received no later than five weeks before the scheduled Commission meeting.
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Taft College
Vista Community College
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Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part I: Program Review

| Levels of Implementation | Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Program Review  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Sample institutional behaviors)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Awareness**
- There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review.
- There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research.
- There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals.
- The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units.

**Development**
- Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness.
- Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness.
- Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin. Etc.)
- Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality.
- Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement.
- Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.

**Proficiency**
- Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly.
- Results of all program review are integrated into institution- wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making.
- The program review framework is established and implemented.
- Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness.
- Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples.
- The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes.

**Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement**
- Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.
- The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.
- The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.
Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part II: Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Implementation</th>
<th>Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Planning (Sample institutional behaviors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>- The college has preliminary investigative dialogue about planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There is recognition of case need for quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The college has initiated pilot projects and efforts in developing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning and implementation (e.g. in human or physical resources).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Planning found in only some areas of college operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There is exploration of models and definitions and issues related to planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There is minimal linkage between plans and a resource allocation process, perhaps planning for use of “new money”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The college may have a consultant-supported plan for facilities, or a strategic plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>- The Institution has defined a planning process and assigned responsibility for implementing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The Institution has identified quantitative and qualitative data and is using it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Planning efforts are specifically linked to institutional mission and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The Institution uses applicable quantitative data to improve institutional effectiveness in some areas of operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Governance and decision-making processes incorporate review of institutional effectiveness in mission and plans for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Planning processes reflect the participation of a broad constituent base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>- The college has a well documented, ongoing process for evaluating itself in all areas of operation, analyzing and publishing the results and planning and implementing improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The institution's component plans are integrated into a comprehensive plan to achieve broad educational purposes, and improve institutional effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The college has documented assessment results and communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies (documents data and analysis of achievement of its educational mission).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The institution assesses progress toward achieving its education goals over time (uses longitudinal data and analyses).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The institution plans and effectively incorporates results of program review in all areas of educational services: instruction, support services, library and learning resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement</td>
<td>- The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Implementation</th>
<th>Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Student Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Sample institutional behaviors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>• There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they relate to student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>few people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>level of some courses or programs or degrees; where to begin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>• College has established an institutional framework for definition of student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing organizational structures (e.g. Senate, Curriculum Committee) are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership groups (e.g. Academic Senate and administration), have accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>• Student learning outcomes and authentic assessment are in place for courses,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programs and degrees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Results of assessment are being used for improvement and further alignment of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>institution-wide practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purposefully directed toward improving student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed on a regular basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in which they are enrolled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Continuous</td>
<td>• Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Improvement</td>
<td>continuous quality improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning is ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>structures across the college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BP 4170  PROGRAM REVIEW

Reference: Education Code Section 78016; Accreditation Standard I.B; BP2510

Santa Barbara City College requires systematic review of all instructional, faculty-led student services, and operational programs and units for the purpose of evaluating and improving effectiveness and integration with the institution’s planning and budgeting processes. The Superintendent/President, in consultation with the appropriate shared governance groups as stipulated in Board Policy 2510, ensures that procedures are developed and implemented for conducting instructional, faculty-led student services, and operational unit program reviews.
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE 4170A
INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW

Reference: Accreditation Standard I.B; BP4170
Approved by the Academic Senate October 22, 2008

Timeline

a. All instructional departments will conduct a full program review every three years. The program review reports shall be completed by the end of the academic year that corresponds to the first year of implementing the Three-Year College Plan (i.e., 2008-09, 2011-12, 2014-15).
b. All instructional departments will update their Program Review Templates by the end of the academic year in each of the two years when a full program review is not being undertaken. The Program Review Templates shall be sent to the area dean and the Executive Vice President for their review.
c. Instructional departments that wish to have new resource requests considered for funding through the College’s planning and budget processes will need to update the appropriate Program Review Templates by November 1.

The Program Review Procedure

Planning for Program Review

a. The appropriate area dean will initiate the program review process. The area dean will be responsible for ensuring that by the start of the fall semester the department chair receives statistical data described below and a copy of the previous program review report.
b. The area dean and the department chair shall review the outcomes of the prior program review report, the statistical data for the department, the goals and objectives for the department, and other issues that need to be addressed.

Conducting the Review

a. The department chair will convene a meeting to discuss the program review with all contract faculty and regular classified staff. The department chair will invite adjunct instructors who wish to participate. The department chair may also invite individuals within or outside the college to provide input into any aspect of the program review.
b. The participants will review the College Plan as it relates to the department/program, evaluate the achievement of previous goals and objectives, address issues identified in the preliminary meeting, and identify future goals and objectives.
Preparing the Program Review Report

a. The department chair, in consultation with the department/program members, will be responsible for preparing the program review report.

b. The program review report will address the following topics:

I Mission and Relation of the Instructional Program to the College

a. State the mission of your department/program (What does your department do?). This mission statement will be incorporated into the description of the department in the College Catalog. (The mission statement is on the College’s website and in the College Catalog.)

b. Identify or outline how your department/program contributes to the Mission of the College.

II History

History (update) since the last program review

a. Describe the major developments, activities, changes, and/or projects in the department/program since the last program review.

List the goals and program recommendations in the department’s last program review and how the department/program has responded to those goals and recommendations.

a. Describe the strategies that have been used to accomplish the goals and recommendations.

b. Comment on your experiences with or observations of the effectiveness of these strategies in achieving their intended purposes.

III Statistical Data Analysis

Statistical data for the last three years will be provided by the Office of Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning by the start of the fall semester. The data will include:

*Departmental WSCH*
First census WSCH and FTES for the department
First census WSCH and FTES by course

a. Write about enrollment trends that the department/program believes are important to its planning and resource needs and comment on your department’s/program’s insights on why they are occurring.
b. Describe how the department/program is responding to these changes.

**Student Statistical Data**

Aggregate data on student completion of courses, degrees and/or certificates
Aggregate completion rates for fully online classes
Number of majors who transfer (if available) and/or who are Transfer Prepared (if available)
For Career Technical Education programs, the program completers’ earnings information and/or job placement information (if available)
Additional data unique to the department/program as determined by the department chair/program coordinator

a. Provide an analysis of the data for each of the student statistical data items noted above. Where appropriate, include qualitative information.
b. Describe the strategies you are planning and/or are implementing to improve student performance on each of these outcome measures.

**Student Learning Outcomes Assessment**

Student SLO performance reports

a. Provide a brief description of your department’s/program’s analysis of the student performance data on the course, program and Institutional SLOs (ISLOs).
b. Summarize the strategies your department/program has implemented to improve student achievement of the course SLOs, certificate, degree and/or program SLOs, and the ISLOs. Include the documented and/or perceived changes in student learning.
c. Review your department’s/program’s SLO Implementation Cycle Plan and indicate whether or not you are on target for its completion. Explain any changes to your SLO plan.

**Faculty Information**

Faculty head count (contract and adjunct)
TLU and FTEF totals (by contract and adjunct)
Contract overload for department by year
Where appropriate, explain how the faculty information noted above is affecting the department’s ability to achieve its mission and/or objectives.

**Department/Program Revenue and Expense data**

- General Fund unrestricted and restricted budget (costs)
- Full-time equivalent (FTE) employee and costs
- Total expenditures per year
Revenue generated by program (where appropriate)
Where appropriate, use this information to identify your faculty, staff and resource needs.

IV Programs and Curriculum

a. Review the list of the department’s/program’s courses (URL for website) and indicate on the Course Inventory Review Checklist if they are up-to-date or need to be revised. For those courses in need of revision, indicate the anticipated date that the course(s) will be sent to CAC for review. Course of Record Outlines (formerly Course of Study Outlines) need to be modified to reflect changes in Title 5.

The following factors should be considered in conducting the review of your courses:

Knowledge requirements
Skills/competency requirements (course sequences, pre-requisites co-requisites and advisories).
Instructional methods

b. Please note on the Course Inventory Checklist whether or not the SLO addendum has been entered into the College’s SLO Reporting System. Identify the anticipated date the course SLO addendum will be entered into the College’s SLO Reporting System for those courses for which SLOs need to be developed.

V Collaboration with Other Units Including Instruction, Student Services and/or Administrative Units

Discuss any collaborative efforts you have undertaken with other units of the College. Offer an assessment of the successes and challenges in working with these units.

VI Outreach Activities

Discuss any activities or projects you have undertaken with other educational institutions (high schools, colleges or universities), the community, and/or business/industry. Describe any new outreach activities that you are considering.
VII Program Review Templates

Complete each of the following Program Review Templates. These templates will be used in the College’s planning processes to inform resource allocations, assess institutional effectiveness, and identify strategies for achieving the College’s goals and objectives. They will also be used in individual department planning. Each department will be asked to update these templates on an annual basis.

Major goals and objectives

If applicable, complete one or more of the following templates:
- Request form for new classified staff
- Request form for new faculty
- Request form for facilities needs for the following academic year (e.g., remodels, renovations, office space, days/times additional classroom/laboratory space is needed)
- Request form for new/replacement equipment and equipment repairs
- Request for other resources

VIII Recommendations for Improving the Effectiveness of the Program Review Procedure

List suggestions for changes that will make the program review process more helpful to your department.

Follow Up

a. The program review report will be reviewed by the department chair, the area dean, and the Executive Vice President of Educational Programs at the program review meeting. As a result of this meeting, the program review report may be modified to reflect the agreed upon outcomes.
b. If there are no substantial changes made to the report, the Executive Vice President of Educational Programs will sign the report and forward it to the Superintendent/President.
c. If substantial changes in the final report are identified in the program review meeting, the department chair will discuss those changes with members of the department. If members of the department do not concur with the suggested changes, the differences shall be noted as an attachment to the Program Review Report. The department chair will forward the revised report to the Executive Vice President of Educational Programs no later than the last day of the academic year.
d. The department chair may be invited to give a presentation on the outcomes of the program review at a Board of Trustees meeting.
e. The Executive Vice President of Educational Programs will submit annually to the Superintendent/President a summary of the outcomes of these program reviews that were completed.

f. The Program Review Reports and Templates will be used in the College’s planning and budgeting process.
### Name of Department/Unit:

______________________________

List your department/unit’s major goals and related objectives for the upcoming year:

### MAJOR GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR 2008-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Objectives, Activities for Achievement &amp; Timeline for Completion *</th>
<th>Link to Mission, &amp; to 2008-11 College Plan Goals &amp; Objectives</th>
<th>Office/Person Responsible for Completion &amp; Impact, if any, on Other Departments/Units</th>
<th>New Resources Needed for Completion</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes &amp; Methods of Assessment</th>
<th>Status of Attainment of Objectives (Fill in when complete)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/Estimated Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All departments are required to include at least one objective pertaining to the completion of its SLO Implementation Cycle Plan and the development, implementation and evaluation of its Course Improvement Plan and Program SLO
REQUEST FORM FOR NEW/REPLACEMENT AND EQUIPMENT REPAIRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List Equipment and/or Equipment Repairs Needed for the Following Academic Year</th>
<th>Rationale for Requests</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUEST FORM FOR FACILITIES NEEDS
(Any needs listed here should also appear in the Department/Program Objectives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List Facilities Needed for the Following Academic Year (remodels, renovations, office spaces, days/times additional classroom space is needed)</th>
<th>Rationale for Requests</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUEST FORM FOR NEW FACULTY AND/OR STAFF
(Include request for one-time and ongoing faculty reassigned time.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Requested</th>
<th>Description of Why Position is Needed</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Year Position is Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### REQUEST FORM FOR OTHER RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Research Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Training &amp; Support for Using Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Outreach Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other New Resource Requests (readers, tutors, supplies, printing &amp; duplicating)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE 4170B
FACULTY-LED STUDENT SERVICES PROGRAM REVIEW

Reference: Accreditation Standard I.B; BP4170
Approved by the Academic Senate October 22, 2008

Timeline

a. All student service departments will conduct a full program review every three years. The program review reports shall be completed by the end of the academic year that corresponds to the first year of implementing the Three-Year College Plan (i.e., 2008-09, 2011-12, 2014-15).
b. All student service departments will update their Program Review Templates by the end of the academic year in each of the two years when a full program review is not being undertaken. The Program Review Templates shall be sent to the area dean and the Executive Vice President for their review.
c. Student services departments that wish to have new resource requests considered for funding through the College’s planning and budget processes will need to update the appropriate Program Review Templates by November 1.

The Program Review Procedure

Planning for Program Review

a. The appropriate area dean will initiate the program review process. The area dean will be responsible for ensuring that by the start of the fall semester, the program manager (director or coordinator) receives statistical data, described below, and a copy of the previous program review report.
b. The area dean and the program manager shall review the outcomes of the prior program review report, the statistical data for the program/service, the goals and objectives for the program/service, and other issues that need to be addressed.

Conducting the Review

a. The program manager will convene a meeting to discuss the program review with all contract faculty and regular classified staff. The program manager will invite adjunct faculty and regular classified staff who wish to participate. The program manager may also invite individuals within or outside the college to provide input into any aspect of the program review.
b. The participants will review the College Plan as it relates to the program/service, evaluate the achievement of previous goals and objectives, address issues identified in the preliminary meeting, and identify future goals and objectives.
Preparing the Program Review Report

a. The program manager, in consultation with the program/service members, will be responsible for preparing the program review report.

b. The program review report will address the following topics:

I. Mission, Relation to the College, and Overview of the Student Services Program

   a. State the mission of your program/service. (What does your program/service do?) This mission statement will be incorporated into the description of your program/service in the College Catalog. (The mission statement is on the College’s website and in the College Catalog.

   b. Identify or outline how your program/service contributes to the Mission of the College.

   c. Describe the functions of your program/service.

   d. Provide an organizational chart of your program/service. Include all levels of service and classified staff positions. If necessary, provide a very brief narrative describing the organizational structure of the program/service.

II History

   History (update) since the last program review

   a. Describe the major developments, activities, changes, and/or projects in the program since the last program review.

   List the goals and recommendations in the program’s/service’s last program review and how it has responded to those goals and recommendations.

   a. Describe the strategies that have been used to accomplish the goals and recommendations.

   b. Comment on your experiences with or observations of the effectiveness of these strategies in achieving their intended purposes.

III Statistical Data Analysis

Statistical data for the last three years will be provided by the Office of Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning by the start of the fall semester. The data will include:
Student Information

Appropriate institution-maintained data (e.g., SARS, STARRS, SIRS, student surveys)
List additional data (e.g., client surveys, interviews) used to prepare the program review report.

a. Write about factors and trends that the program/service believes are important to its planning and resource needs and comment on your program’s/service’s insights on why they are occurring.
b. Describe how the program/service is responding to these changes.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Student SLO performance reports

a. Provide a brief description of your analysis of the student performance data on the program SLOs and the Institutional SLOs (ISLOs).
b. Summarize the strategies your program/service has implemented to improve student achievement of its program SLOs and ISLOs. Include the documented and/or perceived changes in student learning.
c. Review your program’s/service’s SLO Implementation Cycle Plan and indicate whether or not you are on target for its completion. Explain any changes to your SLO plan.

Faculty Information (if applicable)

Faculty head count (contract and adjunct)
TLU and FTEF totals (by contract and adjunct)
Contract overload for department by year
Where appropriate, explain how the faculty information noted above is affecting the program/service’s ability to achieve its mission and/or objectives.

Department/Program Revenue and Expense data

General Fund unrestricted and restricted budget (costs)
Full-time equivalent employee (FTE)
and costs
Total expenditures per year
Revenue generated by program (where appropriate)
Where appropriate, use this information to identify your faculty, staff and resource needs.
IV Programs and Curriculum (if applicable)

a. Review the list of the department’s/program’s courses (URL for website) and indicate on the Course Inventory Review Checklist if they are up-to-date or need to be revised. For those courses in need of revision, indicate the anticipated date that the course(s) will be sent to CAC for review. Course of Record Outlines (formerly Course of Study Outlines) need to be modified to reflect changes in Title 5.

The following factors should be considered in conducting the review of your courses:

- Knowledge requirements
- Skills/competency requirements (course sequences, pre-requisites co-requisites and advisories).
- Instructional methods
- Title 5 requirements for Course of Record Outlines

b. Please note on the Course Inventory Checklist whether or not the SLO addendum has been entered into the College’s SLO Reporting System. Identify the anticipated date the course SLO addendum will be entered into the College’s SLO Reporting System for those courses for which SLOs need to be developed.

V Collaboration with Other Units Including Instruction, Student Services and/or Administrative Units

Discuss any collaborative efforts you have undertaken with other units of the College. Offer an assessment of the successes and challenges in these collaborative efforts.

VI Outreach Activities

Discuss any activities or projects you have undertaken with other educational institutions (high schools, colleges or universities), the community, or business/industry. Describe any new outreach activities that you are considering.

VII Program Review Templates

1. Complete each of the following Program Review Templates. These templates will be considered in the College’s planning processes to inform resource allocations, assess institutional effectiveness, and
identify College goals and objectives. Each program/service will be asked to update these templates on an annual basis.

Major goals and objectives

If applicable, complete one or more of the following templates:
Request for new classified staff
Request form for new faculty
Request form for facilities needs for the following academic year (e.g., remodels, renovations, office space, days/times additional classroom/laboratory space is needed)
Request form for new/replacement equipment and equipment repairs
Request for other resources

IV Recommendations for Improving the Effectiveness of the Program Review Procedure

List suggestions for changes that will make the program review process more helpful to you.

Follow Up

a. The program review report will be reviewed by the program manager, the area dean, and the Executive Vice President of Educational Programs at the program review meeting. As a result of this meeting, the program review report may be modified to reflect the agreed upon outcomes.
b. If there are no substantial changes made to the report, the Executive Vice President of Educational Programs will sign the report and forward it to the Superintendent/President.
c. If substantial changes in the final report are identified in the program review meeting, the program manager will discuss those changes with members of the program/service. If members of the program/service do not concur with the suggested changes, the differences shall be noted as an attachment to the Program Review Report. The program manager will forward the revised report to the Executive Vice President of Educational Programs no later than the last day of the academic year.
d. The program manager may be invited to give a presentation on the outcomes of the program review at a Board of Trustees meeting.
e. The Executive Vice President of Educational Programs will submit annually to the Superintendent/President a summary of the outcomes of these program reviews that were completed.
f. The Program Review Report and Templates will be used in the College’s planning and budgeting process.
## MAJOR GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR 2008-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Objectives, Activities for Achievement &amp; Timeline for Completion *</th>
<th>Link to Mission, &amp; to 2008-11 College Plan Goals &amp; Objectives</th>
<th>Office/Person Responsible for Completion &amp; Impact, if any, on Other Departments/Units</th>
<th>New Resources Needed for Completion</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes &amp; Methods of Assessment</th>
<th>Status of Attainment of Objectives (Fill in when complete)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All departments are required to include at least one objective pertaining to the completion of its SLO Implementation Cycle Plan and the development, implementation and evaluation of its Course Improvement Plan and Program SLO.
REQUEST FORM FOR NEW/REPLACEMENT AND EQUIPMENT REPAIRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List Equipment and/or Equipment Repairs Needed for the Following Academic Year</th>
<th>Rationale for Requests</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUEST FORM FOR FACILITIES NEEDS
(Any needs listed here should also appear in the Department/Program Objectives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List Facilities Needed for the Following Academic Year (remodels, renovations, office spaces, days/times additional classroom space is needed)</th>
<th>Rationale for Requests</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8
REQUEST FORM FOR NEW FACULTY AND/OR STAFF
(Include request for one-time and ongoing faculty reassigned time.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Requested</th>
<th>Description of Why Position is Needed</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Year Position is Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUEST FORM FOR OTHER RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Research Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Training &amp; Support for Using Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketing &amp; Outreach Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other New Resource Requests (readers, tutors, supplies, printing &amp; duplicating)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE 4170C
OPERATIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW

Reference: Accreditation Standard I.B; BP4170

Timeline

a. Operational units of the college will conduct a program review every year. The annual review will 1) describe the progress made in the past fiscal year towards the goals and objectives identified and 2) establish goals and objectives for the upcoming fiscal year as well as the resources needed, as described below. The online program reviews shall be completed by November 1 of each year. The unit manager and the Vice President for the division to which the unit belongs will review and approve the review.

b. The new resource requests identified in the program reviews will be considered for funding through the College’s planning and budget processes.

Planning for Program Review

a. The unit manager will initiate the program review process. The unit manager will be responsible for ensuring that by the start of the fall semester he/she receives statistical data requested in the template below from the Office of Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning. The unit manager and the Vice President shall review the outcomes of the prior program review, the statistical data for the unit, the goals and objectives for the unit, and other issues that need to be addressed.

Conducting the Review

a. The unit manager will convene meeting(s) to discuss the program review with all unit employees. The unit manager may also invite individuals within or outside the college to provide input into any aspect of the program review.

b. The participants will review the College Plan as it relates to the unit, evaluate the achievement of previous goals and objectives, address issues identified in the preliminary meeting, and identify future goals and objectives.

Preparing the Program Review Report

a. The unit manager, in collaboration with unit members, will be responsible for preparing the program review report.

b. The program review report will address the topics included in the template below.

Program Review Template

Complete online the Program Review Template (included below for illustration purposes). The information in the templates will be considered in the College’s planning
processes to inform resource allocations, assess institutional effectiveness, and identify College goals and objectives.

Follow Up

The program review report will be reviewed and finalized by the unit manager and the Vice President.

The unit manager may be invited to give a presentation on the unit progress as documented through the annual program review at a Board of Trustees meeting.

By December 1, each Vice President will submit annually to the Superintendent/President a summary of the outcomes of the program reviews of the units within their division.

The Program Review Report and Templates will be used in the College’s planning and budgeting process.
I. The Unit Overview

The Unit Overview should reflect the consensus of the staff within the unit. It is meant to provide a broad understanding of the unit, current trends related to the unit’s mission, and how the unit serves to meet the overall mission or goals of Santa Barbara City College and its campuses.

1. What is the mission of your unit?

2. Identify or outline how your unit serves the mission of the college.

3. Provide an Organizational Chart of your unit (including all levels of service and classified staff positions). If necessary, provide very brief narrative descriptions by numbering the chart and including a numbered list with clarifications on a subsequent page.

4. Describe the functions of your unit.
   Please use a bulleted list with headings as necessary to make it clear and easy to read.

5. In order to more appropriately assess the effectiveness of your unit what types of data have you collected last year and will you collect during the next year?
   Make a list. Mention only data that you believe will help you improve the effectiveness of your unit.

6. Unit Self Assessment and Collaboration with Students and/or Other Units
   a. What are the unit’s strengths and weaknesses?
   b. Describe the progress made towards the goals and objectives included in last year’s program review.
   c. How effectively does information flow from and to this unit to other units on campus? Identify any areas where communication could be improved.
d. What changes in the area of outreach and collaboration are needed to make this unit more effective in its mission?

e. In the final analysis how does your unit support student learning and the overall satisfaction of students and employees with the college/district? Are you providing the needed and desired services?

7. List your unit’s major goals and related objectives for the upcoming year:
   If not clear in your table, detail if and how you met the goals and objectives you set in the prior year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major and Objectives 200X-200X for Unit:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Unit Needs Assessment

1) Does the staffing structure meet the unit’s needs?

If your answer is “no,” please consider the following in framing your answer:

a) The workload of your unit over the past two years (you may wish to provide further historical reference points, but keep them very brief). You may wish to consider the following questions in formulating your response:
   - Which aspects of the work are key to the institution’s mission?
   - Has the staff increased, decreased or remained the same to meet those changes?
   - Has technology made it possible to do more work with the same staff? Or, has technology increased your work load (adding web features which need updating for example)?
   - Does the workload have significant peaks and valleys during the fiscal year? If so, describe.
   - Do you anticipate the workload will increase, decrease or remain constant in the upcoming one to three years? Is this a temporary situation?
   - If your workload is increasing and resources will not allow for increased staffing, how do you anticipate being able to ameliorate the negative consequences of too much work and maintain a positive atmosphere in your unit?
b) What steps can be taken to improve your unit’s organizational efficiency within its current budget?

c) What strategies have been used to improve delivery of support services within the unit (e.g., technology, online options, etc.)?

2) Five-Year Program Staffing Profile
Using the table below, show the staffing levels in each category for the previous five years, and the percentage change over that period of time. Use only numbers, not job titles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Staffing Levels for Each of the Previous Five Years</th>
<th>Anticipated needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidential Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Reassigned FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Reassigned FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fill out the Management and/or Staff request form that follow if new employees are needed.
3. Staff Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This section to be filled out by the unit</th>
<th>This section to be filled out by reviewing group (CPC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please list/summarize the needs of your unit below (justification needs to be provided and supported by evidence)</td>
<td>Recommend for Approval Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Positions Needed for Academic Year ___________________</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Equipment (Note: Any needs listed here should also appear in the Needs/Objectives List)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This section to be filled out by the Administrative Unit</th>
<th>This section to be filled out by reviewing group (CPC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please list/summarize the needs of your unit below</td>
<td>Recommend for Approval Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Equipment or Equipment Repair Needed for Academic Year</td>
<td>Approximate Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Facilities Needs  (Note: Any needs listed here should also appear in the Needs/Objectives List)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This section to be filled out by the Administrative Unit</th>
<th>This section to be filled out by reviewing group (CPC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please list/summarize the needs of your unit below</td>
<td>Recommend for Approval Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Cost</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Facility Needs for Academic Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Remodels, Renovations, or added new facilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER NEEDS:

6. Institutional Research Needs

7. Technical Training and Support Needs

8. Marketing and Outreach Needs

9. Other (supplies, etc.)
Appendix: Operational Units

Please note that this is not a comprehensive list, rather it is intended to exemplify units that fit the category of “operational.”

SUPERINTENDENT/PRESIDENT’S OFFICE
Public Information, Marketing, Enrollment Management, Scheduling
Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS (Instruction/Student Services)
Office of Educational Programs
Online College
Student Technical Support
Bookstore
Admissions & Records
Career Center
Veterans Support Program
Assessment Office
ISSP/Study Abroad
EOPS/CARE
Financial Aid
Student Life

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
Administrative Systems
Network Services
User Services

HUMAN RESOURCES/LEGAL AFFAIRS
Human resources/Legal Affairs
BUSINESS SERVICES
Administrative Services
Facilities/Campus Development
Fiscal Services
Food Services
Purchasing
Security

CONTINUING EDUCATION
Student Support Services
Admissions/Registration/Lumens
BP 2410   BOARD POLICY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

Reference: Education Code Section 70902; Accreditation Standard IV.B.1.b & e; BP 2510

The Board may adopt such policies as are authorized by law or determined by the Board to be necessary for the efficient operation of the District. Board policies are statements of intent by the Board on a specific issue within its subject matter jurisdiction.

The policies have been written to be consistent with provisions of law, but do not encompass all laws relating to District activities.

Policies of the Board may be adopted, revised, added to or amended at any regular Board meeting by a majority vote. Proposed changes or additions shall be introduced not less than one regular meeting or Educational Policies Committee or Study Session of the Board prior to the meeting at which action is recommended.

Administrative procedures are statements of method to be used in implementing Board Policy. Administrative procedures are to be issued and revised by the Superintendent/President, in consultation with the appropriate shared governance groups as stipulated in Board Policy 2510. Such administrative procedures shall be consistent with the intent of Board Policy.

The Superintendent/President shall provide each member of the Board with any revisions since the last time they were reviewed. The Board reserves the right to direct revisions of the administrative procedures should they, in the Board’s judgment, be inconsistent with the Board’s own policies.

Board policies and administrative procedures shall be electronically available to District employees through the District website as maintained by the Office of the Superintendent/President.
ASSUMPTIONS USED TO DEVELOP THE TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR 2009-10

GENERAL
1. These are the assumptions used to develop the tentative budget to be taken to the Board for approval in June 2009.
2. The assumptions listed below do not reflect the results of the May 19, 2009 election which may result in a reduction of $4.4 million dollars to the General Fund Allocation from the state if Proposition 1A fails.
3. Ending balances will be reduced by over $6.5 million due to the deferred payments that are in place. This is not reflected in the ending balances due to the accrual method of accounting; but are shown for illustration purposes.
4. CPC received and discussed the estimated tentative budget at the May 5, 2009 meeting.

REVENUE
1. COLA - COLA for State Apportionment is estimated at 0.0%.
2. Deficit factor – The 2008-09 deficit factor of 1.3% is assumed to reoccur in fiscal year 2009-10 as property tax shortfall and state structural deficit continue.
3. FTES – Growth is not budgeted in the tentative budget. Growth revenue will be added as FTES growth materializes and is funded in 2009-10. THE PRELIMINARY ALLOWABLE GROWTH FOR SBCC FOR 2009/10 IS ONLY 0.7%.
4. Enrollment fees – No enrollment fee rate increase is anticipated for 2009-10.
5. Nonresident student fees from international and out-of-state students will increase by $539,100 and $161,600, respectively due to increases in tuition rates. The number of units in which international and out-of-state students are enrolled is expected to remain at the 2008-09 levels.
6. Interest revenue is conservatively estimated based on declining interest rates and earning cash balances.
7. Lottery revenue is assumed to decline by 5%.

EXPENSE
1. Expenditure reductions of $4.2 million put into effect in 2008-09 will be maintained in the tentative budget.
2. Salaries and wages are budgeted for the year at pay rates that were effective January 1, 2008.
3. The budget for salaries and wages are based on expected spending patterns and assumes that all permanent positions are filled during the entire fiscal year.
4. FULL-TIME FACULTY OBLIGATION (FTFO) – The obligation to hire 6 additional full-time tenure-track faculty to start in Fall 2009 has been waived and deferred to Fall 2010. In addition, there are 3 positions that will need to be added as a result of an error made by the Chancellor’s office in calculating the FTFO for Fall 2008. Also 4 to 5 new faculty positions will need to be added as a result of the 2.24%
growth in 2008-09. This will result in 13 or 14 new full time faculty to be hired to start in Fall 2010.
5. The increase for fixed and mandated expenses is based on actual or trends. Fixed and mandated expenses consist of increases in maintenance agreements, utilities, postage, rent, etc.
6. Other areas of concern which may result in increases are: School of Culinary Arts, Adult Education classified hourly, Cosmetology, Professional Development contracts, Citizenship Center, GED and adult high school.
7. Workers comp is projected to increase 24%.
8. Sabbaticals suspended for 2009-10 (savings of $350,000).

TRANSFERS
These are the transfer of funds from the General Fund Ending Balances.
1. Transfer to the Children’s Center Fund is estimated to be $290,000. This may need to be revised up based on the current year results.
2. Transfer to the Construction Fund is estimated to be $640,000 plus the amount of anticipated loan payments to the California Energy Commission for the photovoltaic system loan. This amount is the minimum required for ongoing maintenance of the campus. In normal budget years, the annual transfer to the Construction Fund has been at least $1.5 million.
3. Transfer to the Equipment Fund is estimated to be $100,000 to purchase furniture and equipment for the new faculty. In normal budget years, the annual transfer to the Equipment Fund has been at least $1.5 million.
4. The transfers for the copier replacement and energy project are the same as in 2008-09.

FUND BALANCE
1. State Mandated Operating Contingency = 5%.
2. Other Post Retirement Benefits – The District will be paying for early retiree medical insurance on a pay-as-you-go basis. The cost of medical insurance allowances for early retirees will be budgeted as an operating expense.
3. The liability for banked TLU’s is estimated and reserved for approximately $1 million.
4. Ending balances will be reduced over $6.5 million due to the deferred state payments that are in place. This is not reflected in the ending balances due to the accrual method of accounting: but are shown for illustration purposes.

RISKS
1. The State will not reach a budget by June 30. A delay in state funding beyond the end of August 2009 will create additional cash flow problems and lost interest income.
2. The property tax shortfall continues to grow at a statewide level.
3. Uncertainty at the state level imperils our assumption that the property tax shortfall will be backfilled.
4. There is 0% COLA eliminating any flexibility in meeting our obligations.
5. Rising costs will increase the cost of goods and services.
6. The budget reductions of 2008-09 may not be sustainable in 2009-10.
7. The Tentative budget does not reflect the results of the May 19 election which may result in a reduction of $4.4 million dollars to the General Fund Allocation from the state.
## Santa Barbara Community College District

### General Fund - Unrestricted

#### Work in Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-09 End of year projections</th>
<th>2009-10 Preliminary Budget</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease) in Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State General Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Apportionment</td>
<td>74,436,204</td>
<td>74,505,659</td>
<td>69,455 Recalc from 2007-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty compensation</td>
<td>680,488</td>
<td>680,488</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>1,945,046</td>
<td>1,847,800</td>
<td>(97,246)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,053,618</td>
<td>49,491</td>
<td>(1,004,127) Backfill from 2007-08 + settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>445,100</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>(145,100) Lower Balances/lower rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student Fees</td>
<td>5,961,500</td>
<td>6,500,600</td>
<td>539,100 9% tuition increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Resident Fees</td>
<td>3,249,000</td>
<td>3,410,600</td>
<td>161,600 5% tuition increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,614,430</td>
<td>2,087,200</td>
<td>472,770 CE funds now reported in Banner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,548)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Salaries</td>
<td>41,587,941</td>
<td>41,680,484</td>
<td>92,543 plus 1% growth cost less sabbaticals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Salaries</td>
<td>20,523,469</td>
<td>20,491,731</td>
<td>(31,738) hourly not backfilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>14,005,793</td>
<td>14,129,684</td>
<td>123,891 COLA adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>2,177,409</td>
<td>2,337,958</td>
<td>160,549 CE instructional materials included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Operating Expenses</td>
<td>7,562,139</td>
<td>7,876,582</td>
<td>314,443 Increase in fixed costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>352,333</td>
<td>272,933</td>
<td>(79,400) One-time expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Outgo</td>
<td>49,585</td>
<td>49,585</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>86,258,669</td>
<td>86,838,957</td>
<td>580,288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Net Revenues & Operating Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Revenues &amp; Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>3,126,717</td>
<td>2,542,881</td>
<td>(583,836)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other Financing Sources (Uses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrafund Transfers - In</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers - In</td>
<td>141,084</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>(127,084)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers - Out - Equipment Fund</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers - Out - Construction Fund</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>640,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers - Out - Constr Fund - Loan Pymt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>191,846</td>
<td>(191,846)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers - Out - Children's Center</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>290,000</td>
<td>(90,000) Reduction in grants &amp; Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers - Out - Equip copiers</td>
<td>117,909</td>
<td>117,909</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers - Out - Equip - Energy Project</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)</strong></td>
<td>(1,526,825)</td>
<td>(1,575,755)</td>
<td>(48,930)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Excess of Revenues & Other Sources over (under) Expenditures & Other Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess of Revenues &amp; Other Sources over (under) Expenditures &amp; Other Uses</strong></td>
<td>1,599,892</td>
<td>967,126</td>
<td>(632,766)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Beginning Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>11,209,120</td>
<td>12,809,012</td>
<td>1,599,892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ending Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>12,809,012</td>
<td>13,776,138</td>
<td>967,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Memo:

- Undesignated Fund Balance | 791,459 | 1,733,485 | 942,026 |
- Mandated Contingency (5%) | 4,396,300 | 4,421,400 | 25,100 |
- Designation for Banked TLUs | 1,120,253 | 1,120,253 | 0 |
- Deferred Payments | 6,501,000 | 6,501,000 | 0 |

---

Attachment 10

05/14/09

“A new college wide policy committee, Board Policy and Procedure Committee (BPAP), created by the Superintendent/President and representing all constituency groups has been charged with identification and development of all policies…” (Standard IIIA, Draft #4 page 19, March 2, 009) “There is an emphasis on the need to differentiate between policy and procedure.” (p 20)

From the Minutes of the Special Meeting/Study Session of March 12, 2009, p. 3) – “The Board Policies and Administrative Procedures Committee (BPAP), in addition to reviewing the policy element of documents will be going through the consultation process to separate policies from procedures, so that policies can be brought to the Board for approval and administrative procedures would go through the consultative process and will not go to the Board for approval.”

Note: There is no mention in the Self Study document of Board approval or non approval of Administrative procedures. At the present these procedures are in the Board policy manual by being placed there by Board approval.

Question: Is it a relinquishment of Board responsibility to relinquish approval of Academic Procedures which have previously required this approval?
From Board President Kay Alexander


From the Accreditation Standards (A, 3. a). - The institutions establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures.

Question: Is our use of hiring freezes and exceptions based on institutional need, consistent with fairness in our employment procedures and our second budget principle contained in our policies? Or are employees at the lower end of the scale more heavily impacted, (i.e. are adjunct faculty and portions of the classified staff more heavily impacted?)

From the Accreditation Standard III: Resources – D. Financial Resources – Appropriate financial information is provided throughout the institution.

“The financial information in the online system can be viewed at a variety of levels according to need. At a high level, the budget can be rolled up to an “all funds” level. Or the budget can be viewed at the fund, Vice President, Dean/Manager, grant, or cost center level. Administrators can drill down to the transaction level to see individual receipt, disbursement, encumbrances and budget entries.”

Question: Does the financial information provided by the online system provide the Board with the financial information it needs to exercise its fiscal responsibilities to the same degree provided by the old hard copy Budget books?
Relation of the Board Review of Draft 4 of the Institutional Self Study for Re-affirmation of Accreditation (SBCC March 2009) to possible hypothetical question of the visiting Accreditation team in October 2009.

1. Accreditation team. We see from your presentation of Standard III-D: Financial Resources that the College is in excellent financial condition. However, we also read that the College Superintendent/President reported to the college in November 2008, that the college is in a “desperate financial condition” which threatens the fiscal integrity of the college. How are these reports to be reconciled?

2. Response. The problem arises if we continue to balance the ongoing budget using the one-time money from the ending balances.

3. Why is the problem arising at this time?

4. Because we have a new cash flow problem caused by the financial condition of the State which makes it no longer responsible to do this. (i.e. we are moving toward a situation where we will have to borrow to meet our monthly obligations in a time when borrowing is problematical)

5. Why did you do it in the past when it is a violation of your Budget principles?

6. At first, when we had ample reserves, it seemed like a fair way to spend these reserves when the argument was made that it was money the staff at the college had earned and when spending down the reserves did not appear to be threatening the financial integrity of the college.

7. Yes, but why did you continue to do this when this practice threatened the financial integrity of the college?

8. One reason is that we would not receive the tentative budget in time to make responsible choices.

9. What do you mean you would not receive the budget? We thought you were responsible for the budget?

10. Well, since last you were here we have a new system for the developing the budget involving a College Planning Council. (Note: It is described in detail in Standard 1.)

11. We saw that but they cannot take the responsibility for the budget. That responsibility is exclusively yours. So how has the CPC threatened your exercise of that responsibility?
From Board President Kay Alexander

12. Well increasingly, you can see it outlined in Standard 1, the Board has been regarded as a robber stamp for the budget.

13. Yes we noticed that. So what are you going to do about it?

14. Well as part of the Board review of the self study we conferred on several questions, the answer to which might start to lead us back to full Board responsibility.
Key Fiscal Questions for Trustees

California's community colleges are complex organizations; budgets, financial reports, and accounting can be daunting. Even though most trustees do not have financial or accounting backgrounds, they provide direction for and monitor the fiscal strength of the district. They must understand basic fiscal concepts, budgets and financial reports, and be able to evaluate internal controls and audits. They should ask the right questions and understand the answers.

State Budget Allocations & Constraints
Do you have a basic understanding of how state budget allocations to districts are determined?

Are you aware of the implications of Proposition 98 guarantees?

Do you understand how your district's allocation is affected by prior year revenues, COLA, equalization, and enrollment patterns?

Are you aware of and do you understand the implications of categorical funding and other state funds that are targeted for a specific purpose?

Do you understand the 50% law, 75/25 rule, full time faculty obligation regulations, and their impact on the budget?

Budget Development
Does board policy require an appropriate level of involvement by administrators, faculty, staff, and students in the budget development process?

Is your board aware of and has it discussed the planning assumptions on which the budget is based?

Do you understand the projected revenues and other resources in the budget? Are the projections based on reasonable assumptions? Are the revenues from state funds, federal funds, grants, donations, student fees, and property taxes, and other resources clearly stated?

Does the board have policy guidelines for budget allocations? For instance, are mission priorities reflected in the overall allocations? If your board has established target percentages for dedicated to personnel, maintenance, supplies, and other major categories appropriate? Do they meet the 50% law and make progress toward the full time faculty obligation?

Is the ending balance or unrestricted reserves sufficient to meet unexpected needs?

Are the following clearly identified in the budget?
- The level of debt
- The level of income compared to the level of expenditures, and
- Cash is sufficient to meet expenses

Long-Range Planning
Is your board aware of the implications of making long-term commitments, such as:
- employee union contracts, including retirement and health benefits,
- construction and maintenance,
- new programs,
- indebtedness, and
- multi-year contracts?

Has your board explored and does it understand the long-range impact of:
- State and regional economic trends,
- Enrollment projections and trends,
- Facility and maintenance needs, and
- The need to upgrade technology and other equipment?

Does the district's planning process ensure that educational and facilities master plans are linked to long-range budget projections? Are technology and program plans linked to the master plans?

Is your board sufficiently confident that revenues will be available to cover projected financial commitments?

Fiscal Management
Does your board have clear policy guidelines for fiscal and asset management?
Policies & Parameters
Has the board adopted all policies that it is legally required or advised to have? Are they regularly reviewed and current?

Has the board established parameters or guidelines for budgeting, financial management, investments, collective bargaining, contracting, purchasing, and facilities?

Investments
Does your board have an investment policy that defines an appropriate level of risk and reflects other investment values of your board?

Are you confident that college funds are invested securely and appropriately? How do you know?

Foundation & Gifts
Is your board confident that gifts are accounted for and used appropriately?

Is your board aware of how the foundation is spending its money? Does the foundation comply with related laws and board policy? Are you assured that its required financial reports are filed in a timely manner?

Monitoring & Reporting
Does your board use the monitoring criteria and tools provided by the CCC System Office and the Accrediting Commission? Do you understand the standards and regulations that apply to community college finance?

How much responsibility for financial monitoring does your board delegate to the CEO and/or to a subcommittee of the board? Does the board have clear expectations and parameters for the authority delegated?

Does the district have systems and controls in place that prevent and detect wrongdoing and inefficiency?

Do all trustees adhere to practices that prevent conflict of interest and uphold ethical conduct?

Are fiscal reports required by state and federal agencies accurate and filed in a timely manner? Does your board review the reports when required? When you are asked to approve the reports, do you understand them well enough to approve them?

Audits
Districts are required to have an annual audit conducted by an external firm. Do you understand the purposes of financial audits?

Does your board help develop the request for proposals and select the auditing firm? Does the firm report to the board?