

ACCJC Conference 2017

New ALO Workshop

Dr. Stephanie Droker, ACCJC Vice President & Presenter

Dr. Norv Wellsfry, ACCJC Vice President & Presenter

Dr. Brian Lofman, Host Facilitator & Conference Advisory
Committee Member

Relevant Background of Presenters & Host Facilitator

Additional Facilitators at This Morning's Workshop

Experienced ALOs

Dr. Danene Brown, Dean of Business and
Technology, Mesa College

Dr. Leandra Martin, VPI, Mission College

Dr. Ray Somera, VPAA, Guam Community College

Dr. Bobbi Villalobos, VPAA, Los Angeles Harbor
College

Dr. Dan Walden, VPAA, Los Angeles City College

Icebreaker: Self-Introductions at Tables

- a. Experienced ALO introduces self and each new ALO follows.
- b. How did you become ALO? Did you volunteer, get “voluntold,” or something in between?
- c. What accreditation related activity is currently most pressing at your institution or district?

Record responses to b. and c., and submit completed form.

Self-Introductions to Workshop Participants

- ✓ Provide your name and institutional or district affiliation
- ✓ What is the single most important thing that you hope to learn from participating in the workshop today?

Workshop Learning Outcomes (WLOs)

1. Explain why peer review is critically important in the institutional accreditation process
2. Describe the ALO's multifaceted responsibilities
3. List five key accreditation activities
4. Be aware of the specialized and overlapping responsibilities of ACCJC staff
5. Provide three valuable lessons that you learned during the workshop

Ground Rules & Housekeeping

1. No questions are bad questions!
2. Experienced ALOs may identify and recognize ***especially noteworthy*** questions, responses, and interactions at their table.
3. Make sure that you credit the ACCJC staff and experienced ALOs when our train chugs along, and blame only your host facilitator if the train derails.

We'll have a 15 minute break midway through the workshop. We'll conclude at 12 noon for lunch.

Philosophy of Accreditation and Commitment to Peer Review

- Acknowledged as the most appropriate and desirable approach to evaluate the complex environment of higher education
- Serves as a rich and diverse resource for quality improvement for colleges
 - A process that uses academic inquiry to inform practices of institutions for quality improvement, based on evidence
 - The results are used to further articulate the meaning of such practices within the higher education context and allow for the evolution of policies and practices
- Is frequently at odds with governmental-directed evaluation which often relies on standardization of expectations and quantitative analyses that cannot capture the nuances of complex phenomena, such as student achievement

ALO Role and Responsibilities

- Principles and Values of Accreditation
- Specific Leadership Responsibilities
- Strong Knowledge of Standards, Policies, and Processes
 - Organize the ISER
 - Understand Substantive Change Requirements and Processes
 - Ongoing Quality Improvement

ALO Role/Responsibilities (Con't)

- Ability to Find Relevant ACCJC Policies
- Ability to Advise the College when Decisions Impact Standards and Federal Regulations
- “Librarian” of Accreditation information
- Help CEO Ensure Quality Practices

ALO Role/Responsibilities (Con't)

- Practical things
 - Store and Retrieve Accreditation Files (more on this)
 - Understand Types of Standards (Processes, Practices, and Conditions)
 - Organization of ISER
 - Communicate ACCJC information
 - Work with Governance Structure and Process to Ensure Standards are Met

ALO Role/Responsibilities (Con't)

- Stay Current on National Issues
 - USED Actions Impacting Accreditation (Regulations, Gainful Employment, etc.)
 - Congressional Actions Impacting Accreditation (HEA Reauthorization)
- Changes to ACCJC Policies and Practices

“Librarian of Accreditation” Directory Structure

ACTION LETTERS

COMPREHENSIVE
VISIT

MIDTERM REPORTS

COLLEGE HISTORY

ANNUAL REPORTS

FOLLOW UP
REPORTS

SUBSTANTIVE
CHANGE

CORRESPONDENCE

OTHER
ACCREDITATION
INORMTION

Key Accreditation Activities

- Annual Report and Annual Fiscal Report
- Substantive Change – Applications and inquiries
- Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER)
- Midterm Report
- Special Reports – Follow Up Reports

Lessons Learned: What Works, What Doesn't

Stories from Experienced ALOs
& Conversations at Tables

ACCJC Staff

- **Stephanie Droker, Vice President**
 - Policy, Research, Annual Report, ISER, Midterm Report, Evaluation and Feedback from Member Institutions, ACCJC Strategic Planning, Training
- **Norv Wellsfry, Vice President**
 - Substantive Change, Annual Fiscal Report, Follow-Up Report, Midterm Report, ISER, Training, Eligibility and Candidacy
- **Jack Pond, Vice President**
 - Team Staffing and Communication, Training, ISER, Midterm Report, Follow-Up Report
- **Richard Winn, Interim President**

Success Stories: Why Accreditation Matters

Kristin Charles
Associate Vice Chancellor of
Institutional Development/ALO, CCSF
&
Experienced ALOs

WRAP-UP

- Assessment of WLOs
- Sharing of Final Thoughts
- Successful Completion of New ALO Workshop
- Thank You's
- Lunch & All ALO Workshop

ACCJC Conference 2017

ALO Workshop

Dr. Stephanie Droker, ACCJC Vice President & Presenter

Dr. Norv Wellsfry, ACCJC Vice President & Presenter

Dr. Brian Lofman, Host Facilitator & Conference Advisory
Committee Member

Relevant Background of Presenters & Lead Facilitator

Ground Rules & Housekeeping

1. Experienced ALOs – please be seated beside new ALOs at your table.
2. Do you have a brief but great story about your accreditation experience to share with workshop participants? Perhaps a true story from the battle lines, a comical tale, or a brief narrative with an inspirational message? Provide information on the form at your table.
3. No questions are bad questions!
4. Please credit the ACCJC staff when our train chugs along, and blame only your host facilitator if the train derails.

We'll have a 15 minute break midway through the workshop.
We'll conclude at 4:30.

Icebreaker: Self-Introductions at Tables

- a. Each ALO introduces self and affiliation.
- b. If you are a new ALO, state how you became the ALO. If you are an experienced ALO, provide information on any area of expertise or extensive background that you have.
- c. Whether new or experienced, state what you most hope to learn during the workshop.

Workshop Learning Outcomes (WLOs)

1. Succinctly describe how federal regulation shapes institutional accreditation
2. Concisely explain why national dialog has focused increasingly on student achievement
3. Provide two examples demonstrating how accreditation drives institutional improvement
4. List two changes in the midterm report, three types of substantive change, and four components of the QFE
5. Briefly state Standards I.B.3 and I.B.6 in your own words
6. Delineate three significant changes at the ACCJC
7. List three names of new and/or experienced ALOs with whom you interacted at this workshop

Accreditation and Federal Regulation

- Required Standards and their Application (34 CFR §602.16 - §602.21)
 - Evaluation of an institution's achievement of its stated educational objectives...using standards
 - In-depth self-study which includes an assessment of the institution's educational quality

Accreditation and Federal Regulation (Con't)

- On-site review by an agency-selected team of peer evaluators which collects sufficient information to determine if the institution or program complies with agency standards
- An analysis/decision by the decision-making body, with a detailed report to the institution assessing compliance with agency standards
- A comprehensive re-evaluation of the institution at established intervals
- On-going monitoring which includes collection of headcount data, student achievement data, and financial data
- Enforcement of standards which requires the agency to take immediate action to terminate accreditation when an institution is not in compliance or alternatively allows a limited period of time for the institution to come into compliance
- Review of standards to ensure adequacy, relevance, and appropriateness

The National Focus on Student Achievement

Federal Scorecard ACCJC Regional Data

Rectangular Solo

ACCJC SUMMARY DATA						
	150% GRADUATION RATE (IPEDS)		MEDIAN EARNINGS		% (#) of Students Earning above HS Grads	
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct
Bottom Third	107	70%	76	50%	88	58%
Middle Third	20	13%	58	38%	53	50%
Top Third	18	12%	8	5%	2	10%

Data Reported to Comprehensive Teams

COLLEGE SCORECARD DATA (Federal) – U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ACCJC Spring 2017 Comprehensive Visits

Federal Scorecard Data Elements	XYX College
Enrollment-Degree Seeking	9,163
First Time Full Time %	40.0%
FTFT Retention	73.7%
FTPT Retention	46.0%
150% Completion Rate-FTFT	15.5%
200% Completion Rate-FTFT	24.6%
Full Time Faculty %	35.4%

Data Reported to Comprehensive Teams (cont)

Average Net Price	\$3,034
Number-Title IV Students	613
3 Year Default Rate - FSL	0.0%
3 Year Repayment Rate	NA
Median Student Debt	NA
Students with loans - %	0.0%
Student with Pell - %	100.0%
Family Income-avg	\$ 20,078
Family Income-median	\$16,223
Mean earnings - after 10 yrs	\$30,000
% earning over \$25K after 10 yrs	51.7%

Institutional Improvement Student Achievement and Student Learning

- Institution-Set Standards (I.B.3)
- Learning Outcomes (including I.B.6)
- Quality Focus Essay
- Annual Report

The View from the Chancellor's Office

Key Points of Interaction with ACCJC

- ISER
 - Quality Focus Essay
- Midterm Report
- Substantive Change Applications/Inquiries
- Follow-Up Report
- Special Reports
- Annual Report and Annual Fiscal Report

Quality Focus Essay

- In the Quality Focus Essay (QFE), the college will discuss, in essay format, two or three areas it has identified for further study to **improve student learning and achievement**
- The QFE topics and resulting projects are selected during the college's self evaluation process
 - Quality Focus Projects
- Visiting team will give feedback on the QFE, and the Commission may also comment.

*See Self Evaluation Manual and
Guide to Evaluating and Improving Institutions*

QFE Continued

- Is related to the Accreditation Standards
- Is realistic, coming out of data and reflected in the self evaluation process and ISER
- Has a 5,000 word limit
- Sets multi-year, long-term direction(s) for the college
- Demonstrates institutional commitment to **increasing student learning and achievement**

QFE Components

- Identification of quality focus projects
- Desired Goals/Measurable Outcomes
- Action Steps for implementation
- Timeline
- Responsible parties
- Resources needed
- Assessment plan to evaluate outcomes
- Follow-Up on QFE in the Midterm Report

Midterm Report - Changes

- Improvement Plans Arose During ISER Preparation
 - Description of:
 - Integration into College Planning
 - Implementation
 - Outcomes

Midterm Report - Changes

6. Institutional Reporting on Improvements in Quality Visits **Prior** to Spring 2016

6A. Response to Improvement Recommendations

- Explanation of how improvement recommendations were considered and institutional actions (if any) that resulted from recommendations

6B. Data Trend Analysis (Template)

Midterm Report - Changes

6. Institutional Reporting on Improvements in Quality

Visits **After** Spring 2016

6A. Response to Improvement Recommendations

- Explanation of how improvement recommendations were considered and institutional actions (if any) that resulted from recommendations

6B. Data Trend Analysis (Template)

6C. Report on outcomes of Quality Focus Projects

7. Evidence

Midterm Report – Data Template

ANNUAL REPORT DATA			
INSTITUTION-SET STANDARDS			
Category	Reporting year		
	2014	2015	2016
STUDENT COURSE COMPLETION			
(Definition: The course completion rate is calculated based on the number of students completions with a grade of C or better divided by the number of student enrollments.)			
Standard			
Performance			
Difference between Standard and Performance			
Analysis of the data:			
DEGREE COMPLETION			
(Students who received one or more degrees may be counted once.)			
Standard			
Performance			
Difference			
Analysis of the data:			

Data Template (Con't)

CERTIFICATE COMPLETION

(Students who received one or more certificates may be counted once.)

Standard			
Performance			
Difference			
Analysis of the data:			

TRANSFER

Standard			
Performance			
Difference			
Analysis of the data:			

Data Template (Con't)

ANNUAL FISCAL REPORT DATA

Category	Reporting year		
	2014	2015	2016
General Fund Performance			
Revenues			
Expenditures			
Expenditures for Salaries and Benefits			
Surplus/Deficit			
Surplus/Deficit as % Revenues (Net Operating Revenue Ratio)			
Reserve (Primary Reserve Ratio)			
Analysis of the data:			
Other Post Employment Benefits			
Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL) for OPEB			
Funded Ratio (Actuarial Value of plan Assets/AAL)			
Annual Required Contribution (ARC)			
Amount of Contribution to ARC			
Analysis of the data:			
Enrollment			
Actual Full Time Equivalent Enrollment (FTES)			
Analysis of the data:			
Financial Aid			
USDE official cohort Student Loan Default Rate (FSLD - 3 year rate)			
Analysis of the data:			

Substantive Change

- 34 CFR §602.22
 - Any change in the established mission or objectives of the institution
 - Any change in legal status, form of control, or ownership of the institution
 - **The addition of courses or programs that represent a *significant departure from existing offerings of educational programs*, or method of delivery, from those that were offered when the agency last evaluated the institution**

Substantive Change §602.22 (Con't)

- The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential different from that which is including in the institution's current accreditation
- A change from clock hours to credit hours
- A substantial increase in the number of clock or credit hours awarded for successful completion of a program

The Change of Sub Change

- Define and Codify Significant Departure
 - Certificates and Degrees, Disciplines
 - CTE
 - General Education
 - Distance Education
- Where We Are....
 - Working on the Definition
 - Templates Developed
- Work with Region ALO Representatives

Real Talk – I.B.3 and I.B.6

- I.B.3

- I.B.6

ALO Table Talk – 2014 Standards

- Further Clarification and Training
 - What do you need?
- Ask the staff

The New ACCJC Website

QUESTIONS?

Stephanie: SDROKER@ACCJC.ORG

Norv: NWELLSFRY@ACCJC.ORG

Phone: 415-506-0234

WRAP-UP

- Assessment of WLOs
- Sharing of Final Comments
- Thank You's
- ALO Reception

Student success measures included in the trustee dashboard include course success, retention, and persistence of overall completion (degrees, certificates, or transfer). The institution-set standards were first established in spring 2014 through College-wide review of five-year trends and county and statewide averages. Based upon this, the College set standards through its collegial governance process, and the standards were included in the trustee dashboard. Institution-set standards and five-year performance trends are detailed in the introduction section of this report and have been set for the following:

- Course success
- Fall-to-fall persistence
- Degree completion
- Certificate completion
- Transfer volume
- Nursing pass rates
- Vocational nursing pass rates
- Certified nursing assistant pass rates
- Surgical technology pass rates.

The trustees mostly recently reviewed this information as part of a board workshop focused on student success outcomes in July 2015 and as part of the annual report that was submitted to ACCJC in spring 2015. The trustees also reviewed the IEPI measures at the July 2015 workshop. Similarly, the BOT will again review student success data, along with IEPI target goals and ACCJC institution-set standards in August 2016.

The BOT regularly reviews the College's plans for improving student success and achievement. This occurs through the periodic review of the College's basic skills plan, the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) Plan, and the Student Equity Plan. The progress on these plans and future actions were reported to the board in July 2015 in a workshop focused on student success. At that time, the board received updates on the current plans, future priorities, and actions as well as success and outcome metrics. In addition, monthly divisional updates are submitted to the BOT that include student achievements and departmental efforts toward student success ([IV.C.8-1](#)).

Additionally, the BOT has been very supportive of the College's efforts to join Achieving the Dream, a national community college network focused on ensuring that more students achieve successful outcomes. The College sees this as a way to unite the multiple success efforts at the MiraCosta, and the BOT has appointed Dr. David Broad as its liaison to this effort. In summer 2015, the board reflected on its self-assessment, constituent feedback, and progress toward goals. The resulting goals for 2015/16 included support for the College in its efforts to scale up student learning and success efforts to effectively reach more students.

The BOT committed to the GISS, a one-and-a-half-day conference sponsored by the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) and held September 24–25, 2015, in San Diego. The conference was attended by six of the seven publicly elected trustees as well as the student trustee. At GISS, the board engaged in focused discussions about the its role in student success and equity. The trustees reviewed the SSSP, Student Equity, and Basic Skills Plans and considered methods for keeping an intense focus on student success and equity and creating an environment that supports the College in this work. In March 2016, they again participated at GISS where the specific goals for the institute included engagement of trustees in the use of data to achieve better understanding of student needs and the design of a case study to serve as a framework for how the superintendent/president and trustees can facilitate student success, equity, and completion.

The BOT also reviews curricular and programmatic changes to improve institutional quality at least twice per year as recommended by the College’s governance process and has been extremely supportive of the College’s efforts to offer a baccalaureate in biomanufacturing. This degree builds on the established strengths of the existing associate degree and certification in biotechnology and helps to meet a demonstrated community need.

Finally, the BOT annually receives a distance education update whereby the Online Education Plan is reviewed along with goals and student outcomes. Crucial information regarding distance education students, distance education offerings, and student outcomes and achievement are reviewed and discussed during an open board meeting ([IV.C.8-2](#); [IV.C.8-3](#); [III.B.2-9](#)).

Analysis and Evaluation

The BOT has regular access to student outcome and achievement data as well as institutional effectiveness metrics to support their role in ensuring academic quality. The board reviews key indicators of student outcomes and success through the data dashboard as well as through scheduled workshops. Trustees also review the institution-set standards as well as IEPI metrics via the dashboard.

The BOT is kept up-to-date and reviews plans for improvement, including the Basic Skills, SSSP, and Student Equity Plans and the more recent unifying efforts of Achieving the Dream. Additionally, the board reviews and approves curricular and programmatic changes as well as reviews the Online Education Plan regularly. Taken together, this indicates the BOT’s strong interest in, and responsibility for, student success and achievement as well as the academic quality of programs and offerings at the College.

The College meets Standard IV.C.8.

Evidence

- III.B.2-9 Online Education Plan, 2015-18
- IV.C.8-1 Monthly Divisional Report to the BOT
- IV.C.8-2 DE Plan, BOT Minutes, 11-18-15
- IV.C.8-3 DE Plan Presentation

IV.C.9 The governing board has an ongoing training program for board development, including new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The BOT has established policies and procedures for ongoing training for board development including new member orientation. This commitment to ongoing board development, including new trustee orientation and board study sessions, is established in BP/AP 2740 ([IV.C.9-1](#); [IV.C.9-2](#)). AP 2740 clearly lays out the process by which board candidates (prior to election) may be oriented to the District, and it addresses the education of the student trustee. Each August, the student trustee attends the statewide student trustee orientation sponsored by the CCLC.

An ongoing part of trustee education has been CCLC and Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) conferences. In 2014/15, two trustees attended the January 23–25 CCLC conference, which offered new trustee training as well as board chair training. Also in spring 2015, one trustee attended the ACCT meeting. New trustee orientation activities attended by the newly elected trustees included the CCLC new trustee conference in January 2015 as well as the ACCT New and Experienced Trustees Governance Leadership Institute in August 2015. Additionally, nearly all trustees as well as the student trustee attended the Governance Institute for Student Success (2013 in Long Beach and 2015 in El Cajon, California). This intensive, ACCT-sponsored training is designed to help trustees set an environment and tone for enhancing student outcomes and achievement. Finally, six trustees also attended the ACCT Conference in San Diego in October 2015, and the newly elected board president and student trustee attended the CCLC conference in January 2016. Most recently, a trustee attended the CCLC transfer conference in spring 2016, and the student trustee attended the statewide student trustee meeting. In addition, the board president attended a board chair training session and met with state legislators as part of the San Diego-Imperial County Community College Association (SDICCCA) delegation in January of 2015 and 2016.

The MiraCosta College superintendent/president's office provides each new trustee with a Student Services Division Primer, census and enrollment data, and a notebook of information consisting of the following:

- MiraCosta College at a Glance information sheet
- San Diego and Imperial Counties Community Colleges Association At a Glance information sheet
- Community College League of California Fast Facts information sheet
- Board of trustees annual goals
- Superintendent/president annual goals
- Board policies/administrative procedures 1000 and 2000 chapters
- District organizational charts
- MiraCosta College Foundation newsletter, The *MiraCostan* (latest edition)
- MiraCosta College Foundation annual report.

In addition to regularly scheduled conference attendance, the BOT has had periodic study sessions conducted by national experts or by staff. These included a legal training conducted by Laura Schulkind (2013) of Liebert Cassidy Whitmore and training conducted by Dr. George Boggs, President Emeritus of the American Association of Community Colleges (January 14, 2015), on understanding the board's role in accreditation as well as the roles and responsibilities of board members in leading the institution. Additionally, Dr. Cindra Smith has conducted a work session on board-superintendent/president relations ([IV.C.9-3](#)) and also on visioning for the future ([IV.C.9-4](#)).

The BOT has a mechanism for providing continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office. BP 2100: Board Elections clarifies that elections for trustees should occur every two years on even numbered years. Approximately half of the trustees are elected every two years for a term of four years with terms starting on the first Friday in December following the November election. The terms of trustees are staggered so that approximately one half of the trustee are elected at each trustee election to ensure continuity in leadership of the District. Trustees are elected by specified areas of the District and only by registered voters of the same area. If a vacancy should occur, Board Policy 2110 ([IV.C.9-5](#)) specifies the actions that may be taken to call for a special election or provisional appointment. This procedure was recently used to provisionally appoint a trustee in Area 4 in April 2015.

Analysis and Evaluation

MiraCosta has an effective means of ensuring BOT continuity and for providing new trustee and ongoing trustee professional development and growth opportunities. Trustee training may begin with candidates and continues for newly elected trustees through established conferences and specified discussions about roles, responsibilities, organizational structure,

and campus tours. Finally, trustees are encouraged to attend local, state, and national conferences, and ongoing board workshops are held to keep board members informed and engaged in discussions on specific topics pertinent to the College.

The College has established policies and procedures to ensure continuity of board leadership through staggering of board elections and ongoing trustee training. Approximately one-half of the seven-member board is scheduled to be elected at each trustee election, which occurs every two years on even numbered years.

The College meets Standard IV.C.9.

Evidence

- IV.C.9-1 BP 2740: Board Education
- IV.C.9-2 AP 2740: Board Education
- IV.C.9-3 BOT/CEO Roles, BOT Workshop, 2-28-15
- IV.C.9-4 Board Visioning, BOT Agenda, 8-26-15
- IV.C.9-5 BP 2110: Vacancies on the Board

IV.C.10 Board policies and/or bylaws clearly establish a process for board evaluation. The evaluation assesses the board's effectiveness in promoting and sustaining academic quality and institutional effectiveness. The governing board regularly evaluates its practices and performance, including full participation in board training, and makes public the results. The results are used to improve board performance, academic quality, and institutional effectiveness.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

BP/AP 2745 clearly establish a process for annual board evaluation and goal setting ([IV.C.10-1](#)). The annual evaluation consists of each board member's assessment and a compilation of the assessment that is discussed by the trustees. The BOT may also choose to solicit feedback from College constituents in an anonymous survey.

In addition to its annual assessment of its effectiveness in promoting academic quality and institutional effectiveness, the BOT assesses progress toward established board goals. The results of this evaluation are discussed in a scheduled retreat, and the results of the evaluation are used to set future goals and board priorities to improve the board's performance as well as to improve the institution's academic quality and effectiveness. The results are published as part of public BOT minutes ([IV.C.10-2](#); [IV.C.10-3](#); [IV.A.7-1](#)).

The BOT utilized information from its 2014 evaluation to design a workshop held January 14, 2015 (by Dr. George Boggs) to focus on the board's role in accreditation and also February 28, 2015 (by Dr. Cindra Smith) to discuss areas where improvements were needed in board/superintendent/president roles and communication.

The BOT's goals for the coming year are established based upon the evaluation results and discussion as well as important matters before the College. For 2015/16, the goals of the board included the following:

- Maintaining full accreditation status by monitoring progress on the College's preparation and by following the expectations in Standard IV related to the board's role and responsibilities.
- Preparing for long-term facilities needs and funding by ensuring an established timetable is generated along with a comprehensive master plan update, an information strategy, and a means to evaluate the scope and timing of a potential bond in 2016.
- Supporting efforts to increase student success and completion rates through Achieving the Dream and other scalable programs.
- Supporting activities to make MiraCosta College a model for inclusion and diversity.

These goals indicate the board's keen interest in supporting the accreditation, fiscal, and physical needs of the College and in ensuring a focus on student outcomes and achievement as well as equity and inclusion efforts.

Analysis and Evaluation

The MiraCosta BOT has an established policy and procedure for assessing its effectiveness as a board through individual reflection, group discussion, and constituent feedback. This process is articulated in BP 2745 and documented in workshop minutes. The results of the annual evaluations are used to improve board performance, academic quality, and institutional effectiveness and to set future goals.

The College meets Standard IV.C.10.

Evidence

- IV.A.7-1 BOT Self Evaluation and Constituent Feedback Template
- IV.C.10-1 BP 2745: Board Self Evaluation
- IV.C.10-2 Board Evaluation, BOT Agenda, 6-11-14
- IV.C.10-3 Board Evaluation, BOT Agenda, 6-13-15

IV.C.11 The governing board upholds a code of ethics and conflict of interest policy, and individual board members adhere to the code. The board has a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code and implements it when necessary. A majority of the board members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. Board member interests are disclosed and do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution. (ER 7)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The BOT has established a code of ethics ([I.C.8-2](#)) and a conflict of interest ([I.C.14-1](#)) policy. Trustees are asked to review the code of ethics and standards of practice once per year and to certify, through signature, that they have reviewed the code and relevant BPs. Additionally, BOT members are prohibited from using public resources for personal use in BP 2717 ([IV.C.11-1](#)). BP 2715: Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice establishes the standards of ethical behavior for trustees to act within to ensure the board's obligation to the College's primary mission, and it includes references to time spent on BOT duties, voting based on fact, representation of the District as a whole, confidentiality, and professional development.

BP 2715 also refers to BP 3050: Institutional Code of Ethics ([I.C.8-1](#)), which defines ethics and establishes appropriate behavioral norms in the context of the institution, profession, colleagues, and the student.

BP 2715 clarifies the process used to investigate if a trustee has been in violation of the code of ethics by way of an ad hoc ethics committee appointed by the board president and vice president. Following investigation, the consequences of a violation are to be determined by the BOT and may include any sanction which the board deems appropriate. There have been no violations of board policy within the last accreditation cycle.

Finally, BP 2720 prohibits the violation of public meeting laws by prohibiting the simultaneous or serial sharing related to BOT matters in such a way as to circumvent the public deliberation process ([IV.C.11-2](#)).

None of the seven trustees has employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. BOT members are not to have any financial interest in matters of contract considered before the board. Board members are also required to declare any remote interest in a contract in public session and are prohibited from debate or influence on the matter. BOT members are also required to disclose financial interests in annual form 700 filings as specified in BP 2710 and are not allowed to accept gifts in any year over the

prevailing gift limitation. BP 2714: Gift Ban clarifies the process used when tickets to important community events are provided to the agency from outside organizations, including the MiraCosta College Foundation ([III.A.13-5](#)).

The BOT reviewed its code of ethics/standards of practice policy at its regularly scheduled December 2014 meeting; all trustees signed the code of ethics at the scheduled budget workshop on January 4, 2015 and again during the organizational meeting on December 9, 2015. Board member interests are disclosed and do not interfere with impartiality of governing board members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution.

Analysis and Evaluation

The MiraCosta BOT has well established policies and procedures to ensure that board members act with the highest ethical standards and represent with honest conviction the best interest of the District and the residents of the College. The BOT has established a code of ethics and standards of practice through policy that also establishes an investigative process and the right of the board to sanction or take other appropriate actions as required if a violation occurs. The code of ethics and standards of practice policy are reviewed annually and signed by each board member at the start of each calendar year.

The College meets Standard IV.C.11 and Eligibility Requirement 7.

Evidence

- I.C.8-1 BP 3050: Institutional Code of Ethics
- I.C.8-2 BP 2715: Code of Ethics-Standards of Practice
- I.C.14-1 BP 2710: Conflict of Interest
- III.A.13-5 BP 2714: Gift Ban
- IV.C.11-1 BP 2717: Personal Use of Public Resources
- IV.C.11-2 BP 2720: Communications Among Board Members

IV.C.12 The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to the CEO to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds the CEO accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Through BP 2430 ([IN-6](#)), the BOT delegates full responsibility and authority to the superintendent/president to implement and administer board policies without interference and holds her responsible for the operations of the District. The associated administrative procedure ([IV.B.1-1](#)) allows the superintendent/president to interpret policy and to act in the absence of policy. It also makes clear that the superintendent/president is to ensure compliance with all applicable laws and to perform all job duties and goals set forth as a result of the superintendent/president evaluation ([III.A.5-8](#); [III.A.5-9](#)).

BP 2410 designates the BOT's role in establishing BPs that are defined as statements of intent by the board ([I.B.7-1](#)). The AP ([I.B.7-2](#)) establishes the processes used by the College to create or revise policies and administrative procedures in accordance with board policies. The AP defines the roles for committees, councils, the College Council, and the superintendent/president in establishing administrative procedures.

The BOT president and vice president collaboratively establish board agendas with the superintendent/president and also set expectations about the kinds of reports, presentations, and workshops that would benefit the board in fulfilling its role. Through regular reports on accreditation, student success, program innovations, and the data dashboard, including student outcome and achievement metrics, the BOT is able to regularly focus on and monitor progress in these important areas.

The BOT annually receives feedback on progress toward the board's goals, mission, policies, planning, and board-CEO relations. Additionally, the evaluation includes information about the board's fiduciary responsibility and human relations, board leadership, and education. Within the section of the BOT's annual evaluation termed "board-CEO relations," an item allows the board to reflect upon, and the campus community to respond to, the delegation of duties to the superintendent/president ([IV.A.7-1](#)).

Analysis and Evaluation

The BOT, through policy, has delegated to the superintendent/president the authority to interpret and implement board policy and to establish procedures for implementing the policies. This delegation is clearly defined in BP 2430 and 2410. Additionally, the board holds the superintendent responsible through evaluation and goal setting as defined in