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DELINEATION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

PREFACE

This working paper on Delineation of Responsibilities is one of a series of papers resulting from a three-year project to improve evaluation and planning in the community colleges. The project is sponsored jointly by the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges and by the Western Association Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. Project work is concentrated in California and Hawaii, the jurisdiction of the Western Accrediting Commission. Support for the project is provided by community colleges in these states, the two sponsoring agencies, and by the Federal Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education (IPSE).

Project objectives include developing a clear statement of the responsibilities for evaluation and planning that are appropriate for state control agencies, accrediting commissions, and for local community colleges. Tensions about the appropriate division of these responsibilities exist throughout the country. A long tradition of cooperation in California and Hawaii, however, has created a most congenial atmosphere in which to analyze and clarify the proper delineation of roles.

Project staff also are developing a series of tools to improve the state-of-the-art of evaluation and planning for community colleges. Beginning in the Fall of 1982, these tools have been introduced, used, and assessed in a dozen workshops, self-study seminars, symposia, and problem-solving sessions conducted in California and Hawaii. These activities will continue through the Fall of 1984. While project work is being concentrated in the two states, it should be possible to generalize the results to virtually any community college operation or governance structure in the country.

Working Paper Four was prepared earlier in the Project in order to guide the staff, the sponsoring agencies, and cooperating institutions in understanding and carrying out coordinated responsibilities. It is a plan of purposes and activities which experimentally tests a model of delineation of responsibilities, particularly in California, among the accrediting commission, the state agency and the local community college districts. The experiment will be formally evaluated in 1984-85. The findings will be used to guide the participants in adopting policies and/or arrangements for responsibilities in evaluation and planning in California community colleges.

A prime reason for including Hawaii in the Project is that responsibilities in that state are formally defined and serve to guide the evaluation and planning by individual colleges, the Office of the Chancellor of Community Colleges, and the University of Hawaii which is both the state agency for postsecondary education and the state planning agency for higher education. This unique
A major thesis of the FIPSE Project is that the improvement of evaluation and planning and the credibility of such efforts are influenced, and perhaps, dependent upon appropriate delineation of responsibilities particularly between non-governmental accreditation and the planning and review functions of the appropriate state agency.

The reader will note that we, the project staff, have other responsibilities. Consequently, it is not for the help and assistance of countless others in both Hawai‘i and beyond, this effort would be impossible. Unfortunately, space does not permit us to list all these individuals. However, we do want to thank Evelyn Stace, the State Chancellor’s Office and Rich Montori of Monterey Peninsula College for their excellent work, respectively, in typing the manuscript and in preparing the art and printing for this document.

We especially appreciate the support from FIPSE. Receipt of the Fund’s grant has set in motion a series of commitments on the part of others whose support (in money and in kind) is essential to the successful completion of this project and the implementation of its results.

Chuck McIntyre
Project Director
Director, Analytical Studies Unit
State Chancellor’s Office
California Community Colleges

Robert Swenson
Project Co-director
Executive Director, Western Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Dale Tillery
Principal Project Consultant
Professor Emeritus, School of Education
University of California, Berkeley
DELINEATION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

ASSUMPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

Certain assumptions and expectations should be understood in defining the complementary roles of the state agency (CCC) and the accrediting commission (ACCJC) in the Improvement of Evaluation and Planning Project (FIPSE), and in the Project's potential influence on statewide policies and practices related to accountability of California's and Hawaii's community colleges.

Among the assumptions are:

1. The existing dual process of agency review and accreditation self-study and visitation is costly, duplicative, and wasteful of local staff and resources.

2. The state agencies and the accrediting commission, heretofore, have given insufficient attention to institutional evaluation and planning, and to the improvement of such capabilities.

3. Current institutional and agency planning tends to be segmented as a result of specialization in state agency functions, and perhaps because of the discreteness of commission standards.

4. Review of local effort has generally been based on process rather than outcome criteria.

5. Future state accountability demands are likely to emphasize compliance if agency and commission responsibilities are not coordinated so as to promote comprehensive planning and student outcome evaluation.

Major expectations are:

1. Excessive, duplicative, and costly state compliance requirements can be reduced so that only the most critical mandates are monitored or enforced by the state agency.

2. Specialized state agency functions can be coordinated in order to (a) encourage comprehensive planning; (b) eliminate duplicative reporting requirements; and (c) facilitate joint visits between agency and commission.

3. A set of statewide priorities can be derived cooperatively from state interests, legal mandates, and the most universal goals and objectives of local institutions.
4. Comprehensive planning documents can be prepared so as to be useful for both agency review and accreditation visits.

5. Improved planning and evaluation capabilities can be achieved through training workshops jointly designed and conducted by the state agency and the accrediting commission in cooperation with the colleges.

6. Coordinated development of a dual purpose information system should result in cost savings to colleges, uses of comparative data for self studies and comprehensive plans, and in improved qualitative review of plans and programs.

Other states are coordinating reviews by state agencies and accreditation visits (see Working Paper Three). However, the Project to Improve Evaluation and Planning goes beyond the common wisdom that whereas the state agency is responsible for assessing the public interests, the accrediting commission complements this state function by assessing the internal efficiency of a college in relationship to its own stated purposes. Specifically, the Project has as objectives (1) training for improved capabilities in evaluation and planning; (2) completion of information systems useful at the state and local levels; and (3) use of institutional planning documents for joint accreditation and agency review visits.

Whereas such joint efforts should enhance the credibility of college and state accountability, they also bring into focus concerns for the integrity of voluntary accreditation on the one hand and the rigor of agency review on the other: thus, the need to delineate responsibilities of the two Project sponsors. In this working paper, it seems appropriate to suggest related project responsibilities of the field advisory committee, consultants, and the local institutions. Chart 1 presents a matrix of objectives, participants, and responsibilities.

Chart 1 will be amended after appropriate consultations to delineate state agency requirements for Hawaii.

The FIPSE Project's policies, objectives, and practices can be viewed as ongoing modes of improving institutional accountability both to the state and to local communities. The Project is a vehicle for institutional, agency, and commission improvement, leading to recognition of accountability within the community college network in making efficient uses of scarce resources while demonstrating attention to the improvement of learner outcomes.

It is anticipated that early in the Project a set of statewide priorities will be derived from existing CCC goals. As these priorities are used and refined in the evaluation and planning processes of the workshops, joint visits, and other agency and field activities, they may then be proposed as a set of statewide objectives for field review and CCC Board of Governors' adoption.

The FIPSE Project's policies, objectives, and practices can be viewed as ongoing modes of improving institutional accountability both to the state and to local communities. The Project is a vehicle for institutional, agency, and community college network in making efficient uses of scarce resources while demonstrating attention to the improvement of learner outcomes.

After review of this working paper on delineation of responsibilities, a time-
frame was then agreed to by the Project directors and consultant. This revision shows the activities which have already been completed and recommended target dates or periods for both near-term and long-term responsibilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>STATE AGENCY</th>
<th>ACCREDITING COMMISSION</th>
<th>ADVISORY COMMITTEE</th>
<th>CONSULTANTS</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Promote Project understanding and support</td>
<td>Get Chancellor approve</td>
<td>Get Commission approval</td>
<td>Review proposals clarify objectives/procedures</td>
<td>Position papers on literature; delineation of roles; questions for field survey</td>
<td>Make known college needs and interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agency staff participation</td>
<td>Consult with field leaders</td>
<td>Interpret field interests and concerns</td>
<td>Survey of legislative and policymaking groups</td>
<td>Survey of principal agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/81 - 9/82</td>
<td>SELECT AND MEET WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEE &amp; CONSULTANTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/82 - 7/82</td>
<td>5/82 - 9/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSULT WITH LEGISLATIVE &amp; CONSTITUENCY GROUPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Define roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>Provide agency documents and identify relationship issues</td>
<td>Provide commission documents and identify relationship issues</td>
<td>Critique papers &amp; make recommenda- tions</td>
<td>Working papers; delineation of roles in state network; &amp; on Project responsibilities</td>
<td>Consider and respond to proposed role of colleges in Project objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposals on compliance &amp; agency role in planning</td>
<td>Propose use of standards in improving planning &amp; evaluation</td>
<td>Advise on duplication of reporting and local capabilities</td>
<td>Paper on CCC goals &amp; ACCJC standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/82 - 12/82</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/82 - 12/82</td>
<td>CEOs - 10/82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/82 continuing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ALOs - 11/82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insure accountability to Legislature</td>
<td>Protect integrity of accrediting process</td>
<td>Consult with directors in policy and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4/82 - 6/83
Strengthen role in planning/evaluation
Continuing

FACILITATE DECISIONS AND ADOPT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
10/82 6/82

3. Complete state-wide information system
Propose additional data from self-studies
6/82
Determine existing and needed data and sources
9/82

6/82 - 6/83
Design models for use in training & local planning
9/82 - 12/82

Recommend uses of system in self-studies
9/82

Determine scope & uses of system within agency capabilities and resources
9/82

Determine most cost-effective means of collecting data & making available for state & local use
12/82

4. Plan self-study seminars for 20 colleges (joint commission & agency visits)
Prepare training materials & problem solving techniques for improving planning using information system & state-
9/82

Prepare training materials and techniques for use of standards in preparing self-studies
9/82

Review plans & test against field realities; propose alternate strategies
9/82

Propose seminar objectives & methods for helping colleges prepare for joint visits
Summer 1982

Review seminar plans, appoint college participant, prepare needed materials
9/82

Provide necessary data; determine uses in planning and self study
5/82 - 5/83

Use and evaluate information system
1982 - 1983

Provide necessary data; determine uses in planning and self study
5/82 - 5/83

Use and evaluate information system
1982 - 1983

Provide necessary data; determine uses in planning and self study
5/82 - 5/83
Two 2-day seminars, 1 North, 1 South

Summer 1982

Two 2-day seminars, 1 North, 1 South

Summer 1982

ADAPT OBJECTIVES AND METHODS FOR OUTCOME SURVEYS

9/82

Providing leadership, staff and funding for training seminars

10/82

Review evaluations reports of seminars & make recommendations for improvements

1/83

Consult with college during self-study year

1982 - 1983

Propose workshop objectives, staff, methods, and evaluations

8/82

Consider appropriate participants

Fall 1982

Prepare requested materials

2/83

APPOINT TRAINING TEAMS FOR REGIONAL WORKSHOPS

1/83

Two-day

ADAPT SIMULATED ASSESSMENT AND
workshops
California 9/82 - 1/83
Hawaii 2/83

PLANNING ACTIVITIES EMPHASIZING INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS AND LEARNER OUTCOMES

Evaluation & reporting plans 3/83
Consider use of workshop experiences in collective evaluation & planning 3/83 (continuing)

Responsible for workshop logistics & funding 3/83

Advise on workshop logistics 3/83

Consider use of workshop experiences in collective evaluation & planning 3/83 (continuing)

Responsibilities

7. Conduct regional workshops
Carry out logistics & funding plans 3/83

Participate in workshops 3/83

Participate in workshops upon request 3/83

Take part in workshops 3/83

Arrange for college participants 2/83

Evaluate & report 4/83

Provide requested materials 2/83

Two-day workshops

COORDINATE WORKSHOP STAFF AND INTERPRET OBJECTIVES OF AGENCY & COMMISSION TO PARTICIPANTS 3/83

8. Plan for coordinated visits 1983-84

Determine agency objectives & staff members Spring 1983

Determine commission objectives & orient term members Spring 1983

Review plans & make recommendations Spring 1983

Advisory on objectives for joint visits Spring 1983

Plan for joint visit with attention to coordinating self-study and comprehensive plan Spring 1983

AGREE ON MEMBERS OF JOINT VISIT TEAMS Spring 1983

Prepare proposal for evaluation Spring 1983

PREPARE GUIDANCE MATERIALS FOR JOINT TEAMS Spring 1983

Review self study & final plan for joint visit Spring 1983

Recommend uses of self-study data in institutional self-study and outside accreditation Spring 1983

Advise on economic benefits from joint visits Spring 1983
9. Conduct and assess joint visits
   1983-1984

   Appoint agency staff members
   Spring 1983

   Appoint commission members
   Spring 1983

   Review assessments and make recommendation
   4/84

   Assess value to agency and make recommendations
   5/84

PREPARE TEAMS AND INSTITUTIONS
   FOR OBJECTIVES, METHODS, AND USES
   OF JOINT VISITS
   9/83

   Assess value to commission and make recommendations
   5/84

10. Future collaboration and dissemination
    1984

    ADOPT POLICIES FOR FUTURE COLLABORATION
    AND STRATEGIES FOR DISSEMINATION
    6/84

    Review proposals and make recommendations
    6/84

    Make decisions about institutional review
    6/84

    Make accreditation decisions
    1 & 6/84

11. Improve evaluation and planning
    1984-85

    Reconsider state-wide goals and objectives as a result of
    20 visits
    Summer 1984

    Review standards and guidelines for self studies and
    visits
    6/84

    Review scope and assessments of evaluation and planning work-
    shops and institutional efforts
    5/84

    Interview participants in joint visits re evaluation and planning
capabilities
    Spring 1984

    Interview participants in joint visits re evaluation and planning
capabilities
    Spring 1984

    Make qualitative evaluations of improvements in evaluation and plan-
    ning. Make recommendations to Project
    Spring 1984

    Make qualitative evaluations of improvements in evaluation and plan-
    ning. Make recommend-
QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF JOINT VISITS IN REFERENCE TO IMPROVING EVALUATION AND PLANNING CAPABILITIES SUMMER 1984

Refine information system in light of use in training and joint visits Summer 1984

Determine commission interests in further collaboration 6/84

Cooperate with consultants in assessment of changes Spring 1984
ADOPT POLICIES FOR CONTINUED
COLLABORATION AND IMPROVEMENT
1984 - 1985

12. Effective resource allocations
1984 - 1985
Continue intra-agency collaboration to promote
comprehensive planning
1984 - 1985
Quality control and internal efficiency as
expectation for well-planned self-study
1984 - 1985
Staff recommend and Board approve policies for
allocations under control of agency
Fall 1984

13. Improve programs for learning
1984 - 1985
Increase attention to program outputs in evaluation and planning
1984 - 1985
Assess uses of standards and joint visits in program improvements
1/85
Incorporate more comparative program output data in statewide
information system
1984 - 1985
ASSESS AGENCY AND COMMISSION OBJECTIVES AND PROCEDURES FOR FUTURE COLLABORATION IN PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT
Fall 1984

Review proposals relating evaluation and planning to resource allocation
Spring 1984
Assess objectives relating evaluation and planning to resource allocation
Spring 1984
Report on appropriate literature
Spring 1984

JOINT REPORTING AND DISSEMINATION
TO DEMONSTRATE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IMPROVE EVALUATION AND PLANNING AND ACCOUNTABILITY TO STATE AND LOCAL COMMUNITY
1984 - 1985

Study relationship between improved evaluation and planning and program changes
Summer 1984
Paper on relationships between process variables (program changes)
and outcome variables (student learning)
Fall 1984
Share models of program changes as results of evaluation and planning
Continuing
14. Improve student outcomes
1984 - 1985
Increase attention to student outcomes in evaluation and planning
Include more comparative data on student outcomes in information system

Review standards in light of emphasis on assessing student outcomes
Increase attention to student outcomes in evaluation and planning
Include more comparative data on student outcomes in information system

Evaluation paper on Project achievements in this objective
Summer 1984
Propose dissemination strategies
6/84
Share models of student outcome assessments
Continuing
Provide data for information system
Continuing

DISSEMINATE FINDINGS SHOWING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN REVIEW PROCESSES AND DESIRED STUDENT OUTCOMES
Summer 1984

ADDITIONAL (FALL 1983)

15. 1983 Self-Study Seminars
North 9/21/83
South 9/29/83
Prepare training materials, particularly census track data. Conduct session on state priorities
Prepare training materials, invite participants. Arrange for self-studies to be used in critique sessions.
Conduct sessions on standards and planning network

Review plans.
Propose agenda; moderate and evaluate seminars
Send participants. Make plans for use of ideas and materials in own self study.

16. Drive-in Workshops on Planning
San Francisco 11/1/83
Long Beach
Jointly design workshops. Present session on inter-state expectations and trade-offs on planning
Jointly design workshops. Present session on inter-district networks on planning
Conduct sessions on standards and planning network

Review plans.
Propose design and agenda. Moderate certain sessions and evaluate. Work with districts.
Participate on regional, voluntary basis. Contribute to building of planning networks. Host districts present model of planning.
11/9/83
Riverside
11/10/83
Yosemite
11/22/83
Organization

The California community college organizational network is quasi-hierarchical in that there is only partial decision-making authority by any one organizational level over the others. As we consider the role of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges in relationship to the California State Chancellor's Office it is clear that the structure is one of unequal authority and influence. The rational goals of actors in such a complex and ambiguous network as shown in Chart 2 have historically sought to avoid, limit, and/or resolve conflicts.

In spite of such intended rationality, conflicts among organizational levels is a typical part of their relationships. This is particularly so if there is (1) obscurity regarding the distribution of power, authority, and influence; (2) competition for scarce resources, domains, and values; and (3) inconstancy of organizational membership. All of these conditions have and do exist in the community college network in California. Furthermore, the scope, intensity, and outcomes of such conflicts are influenced by other environmental factors.

As other components of the network must take such factors into consideration in planning, evaluation, and action, so must the FIPSE Project which is extrastructural, voluntary, and ameliorative in nature. The Project has great potential in conflict avoidance and resolution because it can bring into constructive relationships the primary state agency, the accrediting body, and the local institutions. More specifically in regard to the evaluation and planning process, the Project links goals, objectives, and standards in a way that enhances the credibility of institutional accountability. It can diminish the push for increased compliance requirements.
Chart 2

QUASI-HIERARCHICAL ORGANIZATIONAL LEVELS
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STATE HIGHER EDUCATION AGENCY
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Program Review
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The objective of the FIPSE Project can further the accountability outcomes of evaluation and planning as suggested in the triad of Chart 3.

As we examine Chart 3 two important ideas emerge: The functions of the three domains do require delineation, however, more to guide integrative behaviors than to define power relationships. It is almost too obvious to say that accountability depends on (1) trained planning and evaluation capabilities; (2) delineated but articulated network responsibilities; and (3) respect for the distribution of authority rather than its centralization.

Table 1 shows some of the influences which may enhance or impede accountability within the community college network.

* The Chancellor's Office is seeking to clarify statewide objectives which may lead to revision of BOG Goals and influence the stated objectives of the colleges.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Environmental Influences in The Community College Accountability Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REDUCE CONFLICT</strong></td>
<td><strong>PROMOTE CONFLICT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of valid information systems</td>
<td>Inconstancy in legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative planning</td>
<td>Competition for resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State agency coordination</td>
<td>Unplanned shifts in funding sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated fiscal accountability</td>
<td>Conflicting advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-segmental articulation</td>
<td>Breakdown in articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOVERNANCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of statewide objectives</td>
<td>Inter-constituency strife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear differentiation of authority</td>
<td>Real or imagined shifts, locus of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Instability of membership and leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective leadership</td>
<td>Centralization of authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>EVALUATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated goals, objective, standards</td>
<td>Ambiguous statewide objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained capabilities at all levels</td>
<td>Arbitrary decisions at any level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments to accountability</td>
<td>Opportunism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of planning responsibilities</td>
<td>Poor planning capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate information systems</td>
<td>Inadequate information system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflicting accountability demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor system coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVALUATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessable standards</td>
<td>Unassessable standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained evaluators</td>
<td>Inadequate information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to evaluation</td>
<td>Limited capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination among other evaluating groups</td>
<td>Belief that education outcomes cannot be assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus on expectation</td>
<td>Collision of expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are certain universal conditions which can be mitigated by collaboration among the state agency, the accrediting body, and the colleges. They are:

- The struggle to defend and to extend the areas in which one organization in the network has control over the others.
- Constant felt but unresolved conflict among domains of authority or responsibility.
- Inappropriate expectations about the organizational behavior of others in the network.
- Environmental uncertainty and complexity.

Within the community college network in California there are differentiations of functions between the Chancellor's Office and the Accreditation Commission for Community and Junior Colleges in implementing the FIPSE Project. The former has primary responsibility for clarifying and communicating statewide goals, objectives, and compliance requirements; and in improving the state-level information system. These contributions will come not only from the leadership and quality of staff work in the Chancellor's Office, but also by the legal mandate defining the Board of Governors as a coordinating agency. These functions invite collaboration with the Accrediting Commission which has statutory responsibilities from the Legislature, and is financially supported and governed by the colleges and other members. As the custodian of standards of evaluation and the delegated authority to accredit member institutions, ACCJC is in a splendid position to work with the Chancellor's Office in improving evaluation and planning capabilities of the colleges, and in reducing the stress on those institutions by joint visitation. The delineation of functions invites their integration in the service of efficiency and accountability.

This working paper above suggests a delineation of responsibilities in achieving the objectives of the FIPSE Project. (See Appendix A.) An objective here is to relate existing BOG goals to the new ACCJC standards.

There is general agreement on the essential components of institutional planning and evaluation in complex organizations, even though theories of style and form vary. Chart 4 suggests the spiral relationship in the planning and evaluation process over time.
Chart 4
CYCLICAL STAGES IN INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING

MISSION

REAFFIRMATION OR REVISION

GOALS

EVALUATION

OBJECTIVES

IMPLEMENTATION

STANDARDS

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

It is apparent in our efforts to relate goals with standards that there are missing links, objectives, which must be determined by the individual colleges. These are derived not only from their own missions and goals, but are influenced by the external forces shown in Chart 2. As we seek to determine the relationship of BOG goals to ACCJC standards we discover that statewide objectives are also relevant to the full evaluation and planning process. Neither will suffice without unambiguous statements of statewide interests as well as assessable objectives which reflect needs of local colleges.

ACCREDITING STANDARDS AND STATE AGENCY GOALS

It is useful, indeed, to assess the relationships between the new accreditation standards and the Board of Governors' goals in the early stages of a collaborative effort, an objective of the FIPSE Project. (Board goals are listed in Appendix B and AACJC Standards are listed in Appendix C.)

Two independent efforts were made to relate the two sets of "values", as shown in Table 2. Although there is substantial agreement, Evaluator A was somewhat more parsimonious than Evaluator B. The differences are inherent in the task of trying to fit very precise, operational standards to a set of generalized goals. The major differences were in reference to Goal 1 (Access) and Goal 10 (Effective Cooperation and Planning). Evaluator B seems to assume that comprehensive and efficient uses of public information about programs and services is essential to achieving the goal of student access. This evaluator also takes a wider view of planning as set forth in the standards.
Since the Project Advisory Committee will be working with the Project directors and consultant in efforts to improve evaluation and planning capabilities and collaborative evaluation visits to the colleges, it may be particularly useful to consider possible gaps in either goals and standards. Even more important will be concentration on the missing links, statewide objectives and local sets of objectives. One might analyze some self studies to determine the fit among BOG goals, institutional objectives, and the standards by which the latter are evaluated. A more idealized approach would be to assess the fit for a model self study selected by ACCJC. The consultant is prepared to do a second working paper using either or both designs. Plans are already underway to write a preliminary set of statewide objectives.
### Table 2
TWO ATTEMPTS TO RELATE BOG GOALS AND ACCJC STANDARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOG GOAL</th>
<th>EVALUATOR A</th>
<th>ACCJC STANDARDS</th>
<th>EVALUATOR B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ACCESS</td>
<td>1B.1, 1B.5, 4A.15, 4A.16, 4A.17, 2A.6</td>
<td>1B.1, 1B.3, 2A.6, 2B.3, 2D.3, 2F.5, 4A.3, 4A.16, 4A.17</td>
<td>1B.1, 1B.3, 2A.6, 2B.3, 2D.3, 2F.5, 4A.3, 4A.16, 4A.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ACADEMIC FREEDOM</td>
<td>2A.10, 3D</td>
<td>2A.10, 3D, E3.1</td>
<td>2A.10, 3D, E3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. STAFF EXCELLENCE</td>
<td>3A, 3B, 3C, 4B, 2F.5, 6D, 9B</td>
<td>2C.1, 2F.5, 2H.2, 3A, 3B, 3C, 3E.2, 4B, 6D, 9B</td>
<td>2A.6, 2F, 5A, 5C, 5D, 5F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. EFFICIENT USE OF RESOURCES</td>
<td>2B, 3C.1, 6A, 7A, 7B, 7C</td>
<td>2B, 3C.1, 6A, 7A, 7B, 7C</td>
<td>2B, 3C.1, 6A, 7A, 7B, 7C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. COMMUNITY OUTREACH</td>
<td>2A.6, 2F, 5A, 5C, 5D, 5F, 6C</td>
<td>2A.6, 2F, 5A, 5C, 5D, 5F</td>
<td>2A.6, 2F, 5A, 5C, 5D, 5F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. DIVERSITY OF PROGRAMS, METHODS, AND SERVICES</td>
<td>1B.5, 2A, 4A</td>
<td>1B.5, 2A, 4A</td>
<td>1B.5, 2A, 4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EFFECTIVE AND EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS</td>
<td>8B, 8C</td>
<td>8B, 8C</td>
<td>8B, 8C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. EVALUATION</td>
<td>1C.3, 2A.8, 2B, 2C, 2E, 6B, 3E.1, 4A.21</td>
<td>1C.3, 2A.8, 2B, 2C, 3D.1, 4A.21, 5B.1, 5B.1, 5B.3</td>
<td>1C.3, 2A.8, 2B, 2C, 3D.1, 4A.21, 5B.1, 5B.1, 5B.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. INNOVATIVE DEVELOPMENTS</td>
<td>“Policy on Nontraditional Study” (page 95)</td>
<td>3B.2, 4A.4, 5C, 10C</td>
<td>3B.2, 4A.4, 5C, 10C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. EFFECTIVE COOPERATION AND PLANNING</td>
<td>1A, 1B.4, 1B.5, 1C.2, 2A, 7C, 8B, 2B</td>
<td>1A, 1B.4, 1B.5, 1C.2, 2B, 2H.1, 5C.1, 52.1, 6A.4, 7C, 8A, 9A.1, 9D, 9B.3, 9C.1</td>
<td>1A, 1B.4, 1B.5, 1C.2, 2B, 2H.1, 5C.1, 52.1, 6A.4, 7C, 8A, 9A.1, 9D, 9B.3, 9C.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. CONSULTATION</td>
<td>1C, 2B, 6B.1, 7C.2, 8B.1, 9A.8, 9C, 9D, 10B</td>
<td>1C, 1C.3, 2C.4, 2G.1, 3C, 5B.2, 5F, 6B.1, 9A.8, 9C.2, 9D, 10A.1, 10D.4</td>
<td>1C, 1C.3, 2C.4, 2G.1, 3C, 5B.2, 5F, 6B.1, 9A.8, 9C.2, 9D, 10A.1, 10D.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

FIPSE PROJECT

PROPOSED DELINEATION OF FUNCTIONS

College Self-Study Report

Each community college prepares a self-evaluation report to comply with the ACCJC five-year cycle. The CCC office determines what reporting shall be submitted for its purposes to supplement the requirements of ACCJC. This information is placed in a separate section of the self-study with appropriate cross-referencing. The complete report is submitted to both ACCJC and CCC in the number of copies stipulated.

The CCC section of the report focuses on the college’s achievement of the statewide goals and objectives established by the Board of Governors.

The self-evaluation report emphasizes evaluation of achievement of institutional and statewide objectives, and plans for improving performance or changing programs and services to meet new objectives.

Evaluation Team Visits

ACCJC assigns team members in accord with its policies and procedures, fitting the team to the type of institution and its particular needs. The Commission on which CCC has representation, reviews team chairperson proposals. CCC furnishes staff to serve on teams and provides for their expenses. CCC staff concentrate on the college’s achievement of statewide objectives. ACCJC members evaluate the internal operation of the college, focusing on its achievement of its stated objectives, the quality of its programs and services, and the integrity of its operation.

Evaluation Reports

Separate reports are prepared by the two groups making up the team. The two reports are furnished to the college, ACCJC, and CCC.

Questions to be Considered in the Project Study

1. Should the CCC five-year plan requirement be incorporated in the self-study?
2. Can the BOG statewide goals be translated into measurable objectives?
3. Can the statewide information system effectively serve the needs of the colleges, ACCJC, and CCC?
4. Should the ACCJC and CCC representatives serve as one team, or as separate teams whose visit is coordinated?

5. Should the institutional record on achievement of statewide goals affect its accreditation status?

6. How will CCC use the self-study and team reports? Will sanctions be imposed in event of poor performance on statewide goals?

7. Will the joint procedures apply to fifth-year reviews as well as the ten-year evaluations?
GOALS

In keeping with this philosophy, the Board of Governors endorses and encourages achievement of the following statewide goals for California Community Colleges:

- Equal opportunity for access to quality community college education for all eligible individuals in California irrespective of age, sex, race or ancestry; economic, cultural or physical condition; previous educational experience; or geographic location.

- Preservation of academic freedom to maintain the integrity of instruction by thorough exploration of all ideas related to the topic under discussion.

- Fostering of staff excellence.

- Effective use of human and physical resources.

- Extensive use of community resources to augment the traditional campus or college center, expending off-campus outreach instructional facilities to meet the varying needs, interests and capacities of individuals.

- Diversity of programs, instructional methods, and services to meet the needs of society and the preferences of individuals for education as needs and preferences exist and change throughout California.

- Effective and equitable distribution of state funds among districts.

- Responsible evaluation through accreditation, self-appraisal, and other appropriate and locally determined measures of accountability.

- Policies that will encourage innovative and creative developments, based on anticipation of the future, in the provision of college services and use of community resources.

- Effective cooperation and planning among all educational institutions and other organizations to secure accessible education for all in an efficient manner.

- Timely consultation with all concerned segments of California Community Colleges so that the plans and the needs of the colleges are accurately identified and articulated to state and federal-level agencies and so that state policies are effectively communicated to local districts and colleges.
Description and Application

ACCJC standards represent an approved model of good practice for those institutions which fall within its jurisdiction. They provide a basis for the institutions, the evaluation teams, and the Commission to make judgments on the quality of educational programs and services, and the integrity of institutional practices.

The standards are designed to accommodate the diverse group of post-secondary institutions served by ACCJC, without compromising the Commission's commitment to evaluating institutional quality and integrity. Unique institutions may find it difficult at times to fulfill some of the standards, which often appear to reflect traditional practice. In such cases demonstrated equivalency of quality or accomplishment of the objective of the standard is the responsibility of the institution.

Public community colleges are the predominant membership group in ACCJC. The standards have been written to describe good practice in these institutions, most of which offer comprehensive programs and services.

Special purpose institutions and community colleges with limited purposes will find certain standards inapplicable, and should explain why in their self-study reports.

The sub-heads, or components of the standards, are not in themselves absolute mandates for candidacy or accreditation. Visiting teams and the Commission examine an institution in its totality, and non-compliance or poor compliance with some components of the standards does not of itself preclude Commission approval. It should further be noted that institutional accreditation as practiced by the regional commissions does not accredit specific courses or programs as such, and some aspects of an institution will always be stronger than others. However, extreme weakness of some program or programs may threaten an institution's candidate or accredited status.

Use of the Standards in the Self-Study

The heart of accreditation lies in periodic self-appraisal by each member institution. Between scheduled visits, the institutions in their annual reports describe significant changes and efforts toward improvement. In preparation for each accreditation review, institutions prepare extensive self-evaluations using the ACCJC standards as criteria.

Use of the Standards by the Team in the Evaluation Visit

After completion of the institutional study, professional colleagues from similar-type institutions join in the voluntary accreditation process by conducting an evaluation visit. The team follows carefully-
designed Commission procedures, and uses the Commission standards as a model of good practice in developing its evaluation report. In keeping with accreditation emphasis on institutional improvement, the majority of team recommendations fall in the category of recommended (but not mandated) changes and improvements. Occasionally an institution may properly take issue with a team recommendation and respond with its own rationale for existing practice.

**Use of the Standards by the Commission in its Review**

The Commission uses the standards to achieve consistency and objectivity in making judgments about the accredited status of institutional members and applicants. The Commission also recognizes the need for continuing reassessment of the accreditation standards, and uses member advice to keep the standards up-to-date.

**Mandatory Requirements**

In addition to an evaluation procedure using Commission standards, all institutions must:


3. Demonstrate integrity in relations with students, the institution's constituencies, the Commission, and the public. See "Commission Procedures in Matters of Institutional Ethics and Integrity," p. 75.

4. Pay the fees and service charges assessed to finance Commission operations.
Standard One: Goals and Objectives

Most one and two-year postsecondary institutions are committed to one or more of these goals: general, transfer, occupational, or continuing education; education in the basic skills; provision of student services; and special community services appropriate to the area served.

Standard 1A

The institution is guided by clearly stated general goals and specific objectives which are consistent with the historical and legal mission of the public community college, or in the case of the independent institutions, are appropriate to the usual functions of postsecondary education. Components typically include:

1A.1 Specific objectives to implement the institution's long-range goals.

1A.2 Objectives which:
   a) Have sufficient clarity and precision to be assessable.
   b) Are substantiated by supporting data.
   c) Are understood and accepted by the college community.
   d) Are included in appropriate institutional publications.

Standard 1B

The statement of goals and objectives defines the degree of comprehensiveness of the institution and its distinctive nature. Components typically include:

1B.1 Continuing study of the educational needs of the clientele served by the institution.

1B.2 A descriptive title for the institution appropriate to its objectives and legal status.

1B.3 An accurate portrayal of institutional functions in its published material.

1B.4 Planning and resource allocation which relate to the goals and objectives.

1B.5 Programs and services appropriate to the institution's service area, size, facilities, financing, age, instructional methods and procedures, and nature of support.

Standard 1C

The goals and objectives are re-examined periodically with participation by all segments of the institution. Components typically include:
1C.1 Review by students, staff, and trustees at least once since the last accreditation report.

1C.2 Evidence that goals and objectives guide planning and decision-making.

1C.3 A plan for assessing the achievement of each objective, and the availability of such evaluation studies to all segments of the institution.

ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. The relevance of the institution's goals and objectives to its social, economic, and political environment.

2. The extent of participation in the formulation of institutional goals and objectives.

3. The degree to which there is staff and governing board awareness of and commitment to the institution's goals and objectives.

4. The degree to which institutional planning and resource allocation relate to objectives.

5. The degree to which institutional objectives are being met, using such methods as student satisfaction surveys, employment surveys, competency measures, achievement records of transfer students, etc.
STANDARD TWO: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The institutional objectives will determine the extent to which these standards are applicable. Institutions are asked to indicate the applicability of each standard in the self-evaluation reports.

Standard 2A

The educational program is clearly related to the objectives of the institution. This relationship between objectives and program is demonstrated in the policies of admission, content of curricula, requirements for graduation, and institutional methods and procedures. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

2A.1 Degree and certificate programs characterized by continuity, sequential progression, and synthesis of learning. Logical and appropriate curricula and course prerequisites which are adhered to in practice.

2A.2 Degree programs which provide opportunities for all students to be introduced to the major fields of knowledge (e.g., social and natural sciences, arts, humanities, etc.). Breadth of offering adequate to furnish students with opportunities to fulfill general education requirements. Demonstrated competence required in communication and computation skills.

2A.3 Programs and courses designed to develop specific intellectual and/or affective or creative capabilities and/or specific occupational or professional skills.

2A.4 Lower division programs to prepare students for transfer to baccalaureate degree institutions.

2A.5 Programs to prepare students for a specific field of employment, designed with advice from practitioners in the field. Advisory committees utilized in all vocational programs.

2A.6 Provision made for the curricular needs of special groups of students served by the institution.

2A.7 Published listings of "major" areas of concentration and of courses included in degree and certificate programs.

2A.8 All programs, whether traditional or nontraditional, developed, approved, and administered through defined institutional channels, and subjected to a system of periodic review and evaluation.

2A.9 Programs, wherever offered, which adhere to recognized educational standards.
2A.10 Access to and open consideration of differing points of view so that students are equipped to develop critical abilities.

Standard 2B

Educational evaluation and planning is systematic, involves representatives of all appropriate segments of the institution, and provides the basis for planning the use of human, financial, and physical resources. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

2B.1 A curriculum/course planning process which culminates in a written statement of an educational master plan that is regularly updated and which reflects the relationship between institutional programs and instructional purposes.

2B.2 Clearly specified institutional procedures and responsibility for the evaluation of program need and program quality.

2B.3 Vocational programs which are periodically reviewed and evaluated in light of changing technologies and job markets.

2B.4 Evidence of the success of students in meeting educational objectives; e.g., preparation for employment, transfer for further study, etc.

2B.5 Responsibility for curricular design and implementation vested in a designated body or bodies with clearly established channels of communication and control. A major role for faculty in the design, implementation, and coordination of programs.

2B.6 Human, financial, and physical resource allocations made in terms of educational program needs and plans.

Standard 2C

The principal institutional focus is a commitment to learning, including its evaluation and continuous improvement. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

2C.1 Faculty competent in assigned fields responsible for instruction.

2C.2 Continuous evaluation and supervision directed toward the improvement of instruction.

2C.3 Program development related to student learning capabilities and student objectives.

2C.4 Faculty involved in the development of library and other instructional resources, and in urging student use of such resources.
Standard 2D

Through catalogs, bulletins, handbooks, and other publications, students and the public are provided with clear, accurate, and helpful information about programs, course offerings, and alternatives available to assist them in attaining their personal educational goals and meeting institutional requirements. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

2D.1. Public documents, such as catalogs, bulletins, and handbooks which contain precise, accurate, and current statements of policies and procedures, including requirements for admission and graduation, grading policies, educational programs, and current course offerings, including their transferability.

2D.2. No statements that cannot be documented, especially regarding excellence of program or success in placement and achievement of graduates.

2D.3. A clear statement of the financial obligations and requirements of students, including accurate information regarding financial aids and tuition/fee refund policies.

Standard 2E

Evaluation of student learning or achievement and awarding of credit are based upon clearly stated and distinguishable criteria. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

2E.1. Published criteria for evaluating student performance/achievement.

2E.2. Evaluation of student performance which differentiates among levels of achievement.

2E.3. Credit awarded consonant with student learning or achievement and based upon generally accepted norms or equivalencies.

2E.4. Credit awarded for prior learning experience in accordance with Commission policy. (See ACCJC policy on "Credit for Prior Experiential Learning in Undergraduate Programs.")

Standard 2F

Off-campus educational programs and courses are integral parts of the institution. Their goals and objectives must be consonant with those of the institution. The institution maintains quality control of these programs and provides appropriate resources to maintain quality. Non-campus based institutions will demonstrate satisfactory quality control systems. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

2F.1. Goals and objectives of off-campus programs and courses consonant with those of the institution. If off-campus programs or courses...
differ in purpose or procedure from those offered on-campus, the differences justified or their connection with the institution's mission clearly specified.

2F.2 Admission, retention, certificate, and degree requirements for off-campus programs and courses qualitatively consistent with those in effect on-campus. Comparable amounts of class time and student preparation for course credits.

2F.3 Off-campus programs and courses administered under established institutional policies and procedures, and supervised by an administrator who is part of the institutional organization.

2F.4 To assure quality in these programs and courses, on-campus administrators and faculty with appropriate involvement in planning, approval, and on-going evaluation of off-campus programs and courses, and in the selection of instructors.

2F.5 Qualifications of instructors in off-campus programs and courses commensurate with those for on-campus instructors.

2F.6 All conditions governing off-campus programs and courses fully disclosed in appropriate catalogs, brochures, announcements, and other promotional materials, including tuition/fee charges, refund policies, admission and academic requirements. Published materials with accurate, comprehensive descriptions of student services and learning resources. Exceptions to on-campus conditions indicated clearly. Publicity to prospective students factual and consistent with services actually provided.

2F.7 Credit for travel/study awarded for educational achievement and performance within program objectives, not for visits and tourist activities. Credit awarded for participation in travel/study courses based on the same standards required for on-campus courses.

2F.8 Work experience/cooperative education courses which are an integral part of program offerings and are adequately supervised and staffed.

Standard 2G

An accredited institution entering into any contractual relationship for credit programs or courses with persons or non-accredited organizations, ensures that educational and fiscal responsibility and control remain with and are exercised by the accredited institution. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

2G.1 Regular supervision and evaluation of the contract program by faculty and administrative personnel from the accredited institution.

2G.2 Degrees, certificates, and courses to be offered, and the amount of credit or the competence required for their successful completion,
determined in advance of the signing of the contract by the accredited institution. Contract processing in accordance with established institutional procedures and under the usual mechanism for faculty and administrative review. All degrees, certificates, or course credit awarded by the accredited institution.

2G.3 Curricular requirements and content established by the accredited institution in accordance with regular institutional procedures. Educational resources, such as library and instructional materials, of the same standards as those used for comparable non-contract educational programs.

2G.4 Student services, including permanent records and transcripts, a responsibility of the accredited institution. Student rights and grievance procedures governed by policies of the accredited institution.

Standard 2H

Non-credit courses and programs, whether offered on- or off-campus, are integral to the educational mission of the institution and are characterized by an equivalent quality of planning, instruction, and evaluation to that in credit programs. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

2H.1 A core of full-time staff significantly involved in planning, operating, and evaluating all non-credit programs.

2H.2 Faculty with competence in the fields in which they teach.

2H.3 All conditions governing non-credit courses/programs fully disclosed in catalogs, brochures, announcements, and other promotional materials. (This information includes fees, refund policies, admission procedures, program standards, and requirements to complete the course or program.)

2H.4 Programs administered under appropriate institutional policies and procedures.

ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. The outcomes of the educational program, using student satisfaction surveys, follow-up studies of former students, employer evaluations and/or records of achievement of transfer students.

2. The extent, process and outcomes of educational program review.
3. The curriculum development and revision process.
4. The degree to which innovative teaching practices are encouraged and supported.
5. The grading practices of the institution.
6. Studies relating to student retention rates and efforts to improve student retention.
7. The degree to which program and course descriptions listed in various publications are valid and accurate.
8. The program offerings in the light of community and/or student needs assessment.
9. Methods of quality control of personnel and educational practices for off-campus offerings, including any contractual relationships.
10. The method and extent of articulation with secondary schools and four year institutions.
11. The degree to which instructor evaluation is geared toward improvement of instruction.
STANDARD THREE: INSTITUTIONAL STAFF

Staff includes all employed personnel. (Definitions for various types of staff are found in the glossary, Appendix B.) The categories of those who are employed by a postsecondary institution vary substantially from one institution to another, but typically include those who teach, those in student services, and those in learning resources and other related activities, para-professionals, support personnel, and those appointed to administrative and supervisory positions.

Standard 3A

The staff is qualified by training and experience to achieve and promote the educational objectives of the institution. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

3A.1 Criteria for faculty selection, both full-time and part-time, clearly stated, public, and directly related to institutional and program objectives.

3A.2 Teaching effectiveness a principal criterion used in the selection and retention of teaching faculty.

3A.3 Criteria for the selection of administrators and the support staff which are clearly stated, public, and related to the duties and responsibilities of the assignment.

Standard 3B

The faculty is committed to achieving and sustaining high levels of instruction, and may provide special campus and public services in the community served by the institution.

The faculty's primary professional commitment is to the institution's goals and objectives, which are achieved through effective teaching, scholarly activities, and, frequently, related public services. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

3B.1 Faculty who are available to students through the instructional program and academic advising.

3B.2 Faculty encouraged in scholarly or creative activities in their fields because of the importance of such activities to effective instruction.

Standard 3C

The staff is sufficient in number and diversity of preparation to provide effective instruction and support services, while participating in educational planning and policy-making, curriculum development, and institutional governance.
The preparation and experience of the staff are significant factors in determining the quality of an institution and should be such as to further the objectives of the institution. The continuous professional growth of all members of the staff should be encouraged, and the institution should assist members of the staff to further their professional development. Effective instruction and support services are related to load. While assigning equitable and reasonable workloads for teaching faculty and other staff, an institution must also provide realistically for supervision of student activities and for participation in institutional governance, other institutional functions, and committee assignments. Periodic appraisal of workload assures that readjustments occur as institutional conditions change. Safeguards are provided against internal or external responsibilities which might jeopardize the quality or quantity of work that a faculty member is employed to perform. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

3C.1 Staff assignments which reflect the institutions' objectives and the proper use of the qualifications which each staff member possesses.

3C.2 Criteria for determining workloads which are clearly stated.

3C.3 Sufficient staff employed full-time at the institution to provide instruction, student services, educational planning and curriculum development, and to participate in institutional governance.

3C.4 Institutional provision of staff development opportunities. Staff participation and/or engagement in self-initiated programs.

3C.5 Policies regarding the obligations and responsibilities of full-time and part-time staff.

3C.6 Appropriate involvement of staff in the development and review of institutional policies.

Standard 3D

Institutional policy regarding the safeguarding of academic freedom and responsibility is clearly stated and readily available.

A sound educational climate requires a secure framework of academic freedom, which gives the scholar the right, and implies the obligation, to examine all data and to question every assumption. It obliges a teacher to present all information fairly and asserts the student's right to know the facts. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

3D.1 Within adopted and recorded institutional principles of academic freedom, faculty members are secure to teach and participate as responsible citizens in community activities. Any policies which may inhibit the exploration or promulgation of ideas contrary to institutional philosophy made clear to all staff in advance of employment and to students prior to admission.
3D.2 Faculty protection of the academic freedom of its members.

Standard 3E

Personnel policies and procedures affecting staff are clear, equitable and available for information and review.

Distinct policies and procedures should be developed for each staff group. Items which are common to all groups should also be part of available published materials. The institution should demonstrate the means by which it is responding to legislation pertaining to equal employment and educational opportunities, as well as to promotional standards and practices. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

3E.1 Procedures and criteria for personnel appointment, evaluation, retention, advancement, and due process explicitly stated. Staff involvement in these processes clearly defined.

3E.2 Salaries and benefits adequate to attract and retain qualified personnel.

3E.3 Personnel policies and procedures which are clearly stated, equitably administered, and available for information and review.

3E.4 A policy regarding privacy of information which is clearly stated and consistently administered.

ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. The extent to which staff qualifications, working conditions, career development and retraining opportunities, compensation practices, and general institutional climate enable staff to work harmoniously to achieve institutional objectives.

2. The compatibility of administrative, teaching, and support staff assignments with their training and experience qualifications.

3. The provision of staff development opportunities for each segment and the participation by staff.

4. The effectiveness of recruitment, selection, and evaluation procedures for each staff segment.
5. The adequacy of staffing to achieve institutional objectives.

6. The adequacy of institutional policies governing academic freedom and responsibility, and staff awareness of the policies and their limitations because of religious or other institutional aims.

7. The extent to which collective bargaining agreements limit consultative processes on academic and professional matters. If there are agreements with faculty units, do these agreements preserve consultative processes for academic senates, where defined by law?
STANDARD FOUR: STUDENT SERVICES

These services should reflect an institutional concern for students' physical and mental health, developing their capacities and talents, motivating their educational progress, and helping them to relate to others in the campus community. The comprehensiveness of the services will depend on the purposes of the institution, the diversity of its student body, and whether students commute or live in campus residence facilities. The services should be accurately publicized through the catalog and other means.

Standard 4A

Student services are provided to enhance educational opportunities and to meet special needs of students. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

4A.1 An admissions, registration and records service which is designed to fit the purposes of the institution and the clientele served.

4A.2 A clearly defined and well publicized admissions policy, including an explicit statement on foreign student admissions which relates properly to institutional purposes.

4A.3 Articulation procedures with high schools, employers, and other postsecondary institutions to enable students to make a smooth transition in and out of the institution.

4A.4 A policy on acceptance of transfer credit which relates appropriately to the institution's educational programs.

4A.5 A records system with security against improper use, loss, or theft, including safeguarding the privacy of student records in accordance with law.

4A.6 A counseling service appropriate to institutional purposes and the clientele served.

4A.7 An organized student orientation program designed to establish an individual and personal relationship between the entering student and the institution.

4A.8 A special program for foreign students (if they are enrolled) which recognizes cultural differences, language difficulties, and other adjustment problems.

4A.9 A student activities program appropriate to the student body served and the residential or non-residential character of the campus. Special activities which meet the interests and needs of the students are properly supported, and are jointly managed by students and staff.
4A.10 A student government which operates for the benefit of all students and which provides for student participation in the governance of the institution.

4A.11 Policies establishing the role and management of student publications.

4A.12 If the institution sponsors intercollegiate athletics, policies setting forth the philosophy, regulations, and supervision of the program.

4A.13 Policies on student rights, student conduct, student grievances, and due process which are well publicized.

4A.14 A financial aid service efficiently administered, well publicized, and tailored to individual needs.

4A.15 Services for ethnic minorities and the economically or culturally disadvantaged.

4A.16 Special services and programs for the physically disabled.

4A.17 Services for special groups such as women returning to education, veterans, and older students.

4A.18 Services to meet the physical and mental health needs of students, including referral sources for students with psychological problems.

4A.19 Student and career employment services, and career information centers.

4A.20 Food, bookstore, and housing services where needed.

4A.21 Regular evaluation of the services to determine their effectiveness in meeting student needs.

4A.22 Publications which accurately describe the services.

**Standard 4B**

Administrators, counselors, and support staff have the qualifications to provide effective services. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

4B.1 Staff with appropriate training and experience, and with a commitment to the purposes of the institution.

4B.2 Staffing commensurate with institutional purposes, size, and level of instruction.

4B.3 Opportunities for staff development.
Standard Four (Continued)

ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. The adequacy of facilities, staffing, and services to support institutional objectives and meet special needs of students.

2. The use of services by staff, students, and the community.

3. The effectiveness of particular services such as admissions and registration, counseling, financial aids, health services, student records, services to special groups, etc.

4. The use and effectiveness of student grievance procedures.

5. The adequacy and quality of published information describing student services.

6. The effectiveness of special programs such as student publications, student activities, intercollegiate athletics, student government, etc.
STANDARD FIVE: COMMUNITY SERVICES

Public community colleges have traditionally opened their facilities to community use and have provided educational, cultural, and recreational services which extend beyond the regular college credit courses. The standards provide a model for a comprehensive community services program. Public community colleges will vary in their program objectives because of differences in the type of area served and in the services furnished by other community institutions.

Specialized institutions or private colleges which do not include community services among their objectives may omit this section.

Standard 5A

Institutional policies and procedures encourage use of college facilities by the public. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

5A.1 A designated office which coordinates college and community facilities use, arranges for necessary services, and communicates appropriate information to college staff, students, and the general public.

5A.2 Facilities use by community groups for purposes of civic and personal improvement.

Standard 5B

Community service courses are integral parts of the college educational program, intended to serve people who are not reached by the credit courses.

In California public community colleges, non-credit courses offered through community services have been defined as community service classes. Other non-credit classes which are state supported are included in the Educational Programs Section (Standard Two). COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

5B.1 Community liaison to identify needs and help evaluate programs.

5B.2 Liaison with teaching divisions to avoid unnecessary duplication and help assure course quality.

5B.3 Effective techniques to publicize classes, enroll participants, select and evaluate instructors, and provide necessary materials and services to campus and community locations.

Standard 5C

A varied program of cultural activities is provided to the community, both by college and community based groups. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:
5C.1 Articulation with community groups to coordinate program planning, calendaring, fund raising, and facilities use.

5C.2 Use of college facilities by community groups for co-sponsored activities.

Standard 5D

Special programs and services are designed to reach senior, ethnic, youth and other kindred-interest groups within the community.

Standard 5E

Budget, staffing, and placement in the organizational structure demonstrate recognition of community services as an institutional objective. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

5E.1 Provision for administrative leadership and necessary support staff.

5E.2 Effective planning procedures which involve college staff and community representatives.

5E.3 Budget allocations from fees, general funds, or other sources to furnish adequate financing to achieve program objectives.

Standard 5F

Community liaison is developed and maintained through community surveys, public information materials, and other appropriate methods. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

5F.1 Systematic methods of surveying community opinion to aid in program development, publicity, and program evaluation.

5F.2 An organized procedure for use of news media.

5F.3 College publications of appropriate quality and quantity.

ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. Telephone assessment of community leaders regarding knowledge of college program and, in particular, community service opportunities.
Standard Five (Continued)

2. Staff evaluation of program.

3. Student and audience evaluations of classes and events.

4. Studies of community use of facilities.

5. Effectiveness of programs which serve special community groups.
STANDARD SIX: LEARNING RESOURCES

All resources of an educational institution exist to implement the educational program and thereby accomplish institutional purposes. Learning resources include personnel who provide support services for the curricular offerings, facilities, equipment, materials, books and other software such as: the library facility with its collections, equipment, service personnel, and other resources; the instructional technology program of the institution including traditional audio-visual distribution services, materials, and equipment; and the more sophisticated electronic design/production/distribution of curricular support information; telecommunications including radio and microwave; and the computer support system. Learning resources encompass instructional development functions as well as direct instructional service.

For most institutions, learning resources are a central support to the total educational program. Both collection requirements and the service program will differ depending on the mission and program of the institution.

Standard 6A

All learning resources (print and non-print library materials, media equipment, facilities and staff) are sufficient in quantity, depth, diversity, and currentness to support all of the institution's educational offerings at appropriate levels. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

6A.1 Learning resources designed to provide support for modes of instruction suited to a variety of student needs and learning styles.

6A.2 Learning resource holdings sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the needs of the students and the objectives of the institution.

6A.3 Learning resource holdings balanced in direct relationship to the nature and level of curricular offerings.

6A.4 Periodic review of learning resource holdings and a long-range plan for meeting any deficiencies in learning resource holdings. An efficient cataloging system in place to provide students with access to materials. Obsolete materials systematically removed.

6A.5 Properly maintained equipment which is readily accessible to faculty and students. Delivery system to furnish materials and equipment.
6A.6 Computer support for instruction for programs normally requiring its use.

6A.7 Current audio-visual materials related to the curriculum and readily accessible to students.

6A.8 Assistance to faculty in the production of tests, syllabi and other classroom materials.

Standard 6B

There is an organized procedure for the selection and evaluation of learning resource materials.

Materials related to the curriculum are best developed with close cooperation among faculty, students, professional librarians, and other instructional resource personnel. The availability of appropriate materials which support learning in a variety of disciplines, presenting a wide range of factual and interpretative material, is essential. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

6B.1 Participation by staff and students in the selection and evaluation of learning resource materials.

Standard 6C

Learning resources are readily available and used by staff and students both on and off-campus.

Several patterns of organization, administration, acquisition, storage, and distribution of learning resources have demonstrated their effectiveness in institutions with diverse personnel, physical facilities, and traditions, and different levels of financial support.

Most important is the extent to which staff and students make use of all kinds of learning resources. An institution needs generous reading, viewing, and study spaces in facilities that are available at periods which are long enough and convenient to the users. This may include evening and weekend hours to accommodate the nontraditional, part-time student.

While neighboring, available libraries may augment its resources, an institution cannot rely exclusively, or even largely, on these resources unless it can influence acquisitions to support its programs or can assure continuity, consistency, and effectiveness of service for its students through formal agreements and financial commitments. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

6C.1 Collections and facilities readily available and appropriately used.
6C.2 Instructional methods and course requirements which encourage the use of the library and other learning resources.

6C.3 If off-campus programs exist, provision for students to have ready access to resource collections or their equivalents as well as the equipment for using these materials.

6C.4 Hours of service which provide convenient access to collections.

Standard 6D

A professional staff with pertinent expertise is available to assist users of learning resources.

Effective use of learning resources depends on the efforts of adequately prepared professional librarians, learning specialists, and other resource staff. The number and specializations of the staff are affected by many factors, including the number of students and faculty, the extent and variety of services provided, availability of nearby off-campus learning centers, and the physical rate of growth of the total operation. To assist users, competent personnel are needed whenever the facilities are open. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

6D.1 Professional staff adequate in number and properly qualified in various specialty areas to serve users and to provide technical support; opportunities for professional development available.

6D.2 Orientation of students, new faculty, and other users to the learning resources. Opportunities for professional development to keep all staff members current in the use of new learning resources.

ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. The adequacy of facilities, materials, staffing, and services so support institutional objectives (opinion surveys).

2. The use of the library and other learning resources by staff, students, and community.

3. The effectiveness of particular services such as computer assisted learning, audio-visual services, reading and writing centers, etc.

4. Staff participation in selecting and evaluating materials, establishing library policies, and determining the resources needed for off-campus centers.
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7B.3 Periodic replacement of institutional equipment scheduled, budgeted, and implemented, and adequate inventory and control maintained.

Standard 7C

**Comprehensive planning for development and use of physical resources is based on educational planning.**

A systematic, planned approach to the future development of facilities is needed. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

7C.1 A master plan for campus development, consistent with the objectives of the institution and its educational master plan.

7C.2 Appropriate involvement of the governing board, staff, and students in planning facilities.

**ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES**

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. Relationship of the facilities master plan to the educational master plan.

2. Surveys of staff and students on the adequacy of facilities, equipment, and maintenance services.

3. Surveys to identify problems of handicapped students.

STANDARD EIGHT: FINANCIAL RESOURCES

A careful analysis of the financial condition of an institution will reveal much about its operational priorities, its effectiveness in serving students, and its prognosis for long-range quality.

Resources must be adequate to maintain the various programs to which an institution has made a commitment. Whether the institution is public or private, stability of income, demonstrated by a consistent history through at least the past three years, is fundamental. An excessive dependence upon a single source of income which lacks the expectation of stability can be detrimental.

Standard 8A

Financial resources are sufficient to support institutional objectives, maintain the quality of its programs and services, and serve the number of students enrolled. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

8A.1 Current and anticipated income adequate to maintain quality programs and services.

8A.2 Adequate planning to meet potential financial constraints.

8A.3 Reasonably accurate projections of yearly income and expenditures for the last three years.

8A.4 An operationally sound debt repayment plan.

8A.5 Adequate insurance to cover liabilities to persons and to protect physical resources.

8A.6 Reserves adequate to provide for sound fiscal management.

Standard 8B

Financial planning is based on educational planning.

The institution's plan for financing should reflect sound educational planning and a commitment to its stated objectives. Financial support for programs and services should be adequate to maintain the number and quality of personnel as well as other needed operational support. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

8B.1 A budget process providing for staff participation.

8B.2 Financial planning that reflects instructional plans and other programs of service. Budget allocations which relate to program priorities.
Standard 8C

Business management of the institution exhibits sound budgeting and control, and proper records, reporting, and auditing.

Management of financial resources should adhere to the State Accounting Manual (California Community Colleges) or other recognized accounting procedures. The process should provide for adequate safeguards in the expenditure of public (or private) funds, fiscal reports for administrative decision-making and sufficient flexibility to meet emerging needs. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

8C.1 Clearly defined organization for financial administration with specific assignments of responsibilities set forth. Provision of efficient and timely services.

8C.2 An annual audit of the institution's financial records by an independent certified public accountant. Proprietary institutions should provide, in addition, profit or loss schedules, distribution of proceeds, copies of corporate income tax returns, both state and federal, and a list of those officers and board members who have a significant equity relationship.

8C.3 Regular distribution of current financial information.

8C.4 A three-year history of operating without substantial budgeting deficiencies, or a realistic plan to achieve a balanced budget and remove accumulated deficits within a reasonable period of time.

ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. Effectiveness of budget development and control procedures.
2. Effectiveness of business office services.
3. The extent to which funding allocations reflect educational planning.
4. Adequacy of financial resources to support institutional objectives.
In the American system of higher education, the governing board is the legal entity charged with determining basic policies. In fulfilling this responsibility, it reflects the public interest, protects the institution from undesirable interference, and interprets the institution to its constituency.

The board defines its duties and responsibilities in an official policy statement, which should include a differentiation between the policy-making function of the board and the executive responsibilities of those who carry out those policies.

The chief executive officer provides staff leadership in developing policy proposals for board action, is responsible to the board for the execution of policy, and keeps the board informed on matters affecting the institution.

Other agencies and organizations participate in the governance of both public and private educational institutions; the state and federal governments through legislation, regulations, and funding procedures; staff organizations through senates, associations, and bargaining units; students through student government organizations. The board, with the aid of the administration, coordinates all of these diverse interests in setting the direction of the institution.

Standard 9A

The board establishes broad policies to guide the institution, selects an effective chief executive officer and administration, approves educational programs and services, secures adequate financial resources and ensures fiscal integrity, and exercises responsibility for the quality of the institution through an organized system of institutional planning and evaluation. The board is entrusted with the institution's assets, with upholding its educational mission and program, with ensuring compliance with laws and regulations, and with providing stability and continuity to the institution. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

9A.1 Review and approval of educational programs and facility master planning.

9A.2 Establishing and ensuring compliance with basic institutional policies and approving substantive change in institutional purposes and policies.

9A.3 Responsibility for the financial soundness of the institution, approving financial plans and the annual budget, and reviewing the periodic audits.

9A.4 Ensuring that only the number, types, and levels of programs, degrees, or certificates offered are those which can be provided with a satisfactory standard of quality, given the institution's resources.

*Institutions in multi-unit districts or systems should also respond to Standard Ten.
9A.5 Selection of the institution's chief executive officer after appropriate consultations.

9A.6 Approval of an academic and administrative structure or organization which serves institutional purposes, approval of basic personnel policies, and provision for the professional growth of board and staff through appropriate policies and funding.

9A.7 Representing the public interest in its trustee role but also protecting the institution, its administration, and the academic freedom of its faculty from external or internal pressures. Whether the institution is public or private, the board should have representation of the public interest.

9A.8 Provision for organized participation in governance by staff and students and continuous, open, and frank communication between and among all of the institutional constituencies.

9A.9 A policy that precludes individual participation of board members and staff in actions involving possible conflict of interest. In proprietary institutions, particular care should be used to assure that the primary commitment is to educational excellence, and that conflicts with this commitment are avoided.

Standard 9B

A primary function of administration is to provide leadership that makes possible an effective teaching and learning environment for achievement of the institution's stated purposes.

Good administration fosters continuous frank communication among the governing board, administrators, faculty, support staff, and students. It keeps the purposes and functions of the institution in focus among its constituencies and effectively uses available resources to accomplish them.

The administration strives to create working conditions and learning opportunities which permit and encourage faculty and students to concentrate on education.

The administration interprets the institution to supporting constituencies and considers seriously the concerns of such groups. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

9B.1 An administration organized and staffed to reflect institutional objectives, size, and complexity, and to provide effective management; administrative organization, roles, and responsibilities defined clearly; a chief executive officer with a major time commitment to the institution.

9B.2 Administrators qualified by education and experience to provide leadership and good management, and with access to a professional renewal program.
9B.3 Allocation of resources based upon program planning directly related to institutional objectives; appropriate priorities controlling budget and expenditures; efficient management of resources; proper implementation of statutes, regulations, and board policies; decision-making based on institutional research.

9B.4 An administration which values human resources as much as financial and physical resources, and which recruits, evaluates, and provides professional development for staff.

Standard 9C

The role of faculty in institutional governance is clearly defined.

The faculty have been chosen because of their competence in given disciplines, learning skills, and support services, and because they possess the qualifications for determining the substance of the educational program and the appropriate learning resources and student services.

If an institution follows the collegial model, the faculty have an elected body, such as an academic senate or faculty council, through which faculty positions are expressed. The public community colleges have defined roles for such senates or councils in the formation of institutional policies on academic and professional matters.* COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

9C.1 The role and composition of various policy-making, planning, and special purpose bodies clearly and publicly stated.

9C.2 A recognized voice for faculty in such academic and professional policy matters as educational program, personnel selection and evaluation, staff development, and other institutional policies which relate to faculty areas of responsibility and competence.

9C.3 A clear delineation of function between the collective bargaining agent (if applicable) and the academic senate or faculty council.**

* California public community colleges are referred to Title 5, Chapter 2, 53200(b). Hawaii public community colleges are referred to Regents' Policy on Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision-Making and Policy Development.

** In addition to the sources in the first footnote, California public community colleges are referred to Government Code Section 3543.2 for the scope of representation of bargaining units and Hawaii institutions to the Hawaii Public Employment Collective Bargaining Law, Section 89.3.

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has furnished a position statement on delineation of function which is included in the Appendix.
Standard 9D

The role of support staff (nonfaculty status) and of students in institutional governance is clearly defined.

Support staff possess special insights which can be helpful to the policy development process. Students have valuable opinions regarding their own needs for educational and ancillary programs. There are many patterns of governance which provide opportunities for participation by both groups. An effective institution is responsive to the views of its employees and its constituencies. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

9D.1 Provision for support staff to influence decisions which relate to their areas of responsibility and competence.

9D.2 A student governing body, if established, with well-defined responsibilities and functions.

ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. The policies and regulations of the institution for their comprehensiveness, their availability, and their contribution to the integrity of actions affecting staff and students.

2. The participation by staff and students in policy development and decision-making.

3. The degree to which policy implementation is delegated to staff.

4. The effectiveness of communication among board, staff, students and community.

5. The effectiveness with which the board represents the public interest.

6. Administrative assistance to the board in meeting its responsibilities.

7. Administrative leadership in planning the educational program, physical facilities, and allocation of fiscal resources.

8. The adequacy of administrative staffing to provide leadership and support services in achieving institutional objectives.

9. The degree to which institutional channels have been developed and adhered to in decision-making.

10. The effectiveness of the academic senate or council.
STANDARD TEN: DISTRICT OR SYSTEM RELATIONSHIPS

Over one-half of ACCJC's member institutions are in multi-unit systems, some at the local district level and some at the state level. In addition to the public system colleges, independent multi-unit organizations are applying for membership.

Historically, ACCJC has accredited operationally separate units, not systems. The growth of multi-college districts in California, the development of the state system in Hawaii, and applications from other types of systems necessitates increasing attention to the appropriate role of the systems office and its relationship with the operating units, both in the accreditation self-study and in the evaluation and review process. Standard Ten is designed for that purpose.

Standard 10A

The system has an official set of objectives, policies which define system-college relationships, and an organizational plan which establishes lines of authority and allocates responsibilities. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

10A.1 A procedure for continuing review of educational objectives and provision for appropriate participation in the review by system constituents.

10A.2 Mechanisms, procedures, and channels for policy development, revision and implementation adopted by the governing board and published as part of the policy document.

10A.3 Organizational charts, policy statements, and job descriptions which define the role of the governing board and the system officers, and which establish their relationships to the colleges or operating units. Similar type materials which relate the operating units to the system.

Standard 10B

The system has communication methods, both internal and external, which provide for the flow of information in a timely and efficient manner. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

10B.1 Agendas and minutes of governing board meetings and system coordination meetings maintained and available in convenient locations.

10B.2 An appropriate means for providing information to both college and district constituents.

10B.3 Published instructions on the use of system and college communication channels.
10B.4 Procedures which provide for systematic communication from the colleges to the system office.

Standard 10C

The system has an organized process for coordinating program development and evaluation, facilities planning, and budget development and administration. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

10C.1 Procedures for program development, coordination, and evaluation at both the college and system levels.
10C.2 Procedures for facilities planning, construction, and maintenance.
10C.3 Procedures for budget development, resource allocation, and budget administration.

Standard 10D

The system develops and publishes appropriate policies and agreements governing employment, compensation and benefits, working conditions, staff evaluation, and staff transfer and reassignment. (See ACCJC policy on "Accreditation and Collective Bargaining").

ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. Comparative studies of policies and procedures in other systems.
2. Opinion surveys of groups served by the system.
3. Effectiveness of public information methods and materials.
4. Consultant studies of system organization and administration.
5. Understanding of system communication methods and channels.