



ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
October 2, 2008
3:00 p.m. – SSV 151

To conform to the open meeting act, the public may attend open sessions

- 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
- 2. OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT**
- 3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
- 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. September 18, 2008 (attachment)
- 5. PRESENTATION**
 - a. Steps in State Funded Site Acquisitions – Dr. Fisher (attachments)
- 6. REPORTS (limited to 5 min. each)**
 - a. Honors Committee – Karen Lubick
 - b. Tenure Review – Jennifer Gross
 - c. Legislative Liaison – Glenn Haller
 - d. Distance Education Committee – Ed Beyer
- 7. ACTION ITEMS**
 - a. Basic Skills Action Plans – Diane Flores-Kagan
 - b. Distance Education Committee Membership Term Realignment – Ed Beyer
- 8. DISCUSSION**
 - a. Promoting Thoughtful Faculty Conversations about Grade Distribution Feedback
 - b. Academic Ranking
- 9. SENATE ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**
 - a. Appointments
 - Academic Ranking
 - Bonnell Curry – Assistant Professor
 - Luis Enriquez – Associate Professor
 - Sandra Robinson – Associate Professor
 - b. Announcements
 - Exemplary Award Call – submission deadline October 10, 2008
 - Regina-Stanbeck Diversity Award Call – submission deadline October 29, 2008
 - 2008 Fall Plenary Session – Los Angeles, CA – November 6 – 8, 2008
 - Hayward Award Call – submission deadline November 7, 2008
 - 2009 Accreditation Institute – San Jose, CA – January 23 – 25, 2009
 - 2009 Teaching Institute – San Jose, CA – February 20 – 22, 2009
 - 2009 Vocational Education Institute – Universal City, CA – March 12 – 14, 2009
 - 2009 Spring Plenary Session – Millbrae, CA - April 16 – 18, 2009
 - 2009 Leadership Institute – Lake Tahoe, CA – June 18 – 20, 2009
 - 2009 Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Institute – Anaheim, CA – July 8, 2009
 - 2009 Curriculum Institute – Anaheim, CA – July 9 – 11, 2009
- 10. ADJOURNMENT**

NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY

Antelope Valley College prohibits discrimination and harassment based on sex, gender, race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, cancer-related medical condition, or genetic predisposition. Upon request, we will consider reasonable accommodation to permit individuals with protected disabilities to (1) complete the employment or admission process, (b) perform

essential job functions, (c) enjoy benefits and privileges of similarly-situated individuals without disabilities, and (d) participate in instruction, programs, services, activities, or events.

Upon request, this agenda will be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with disabilities, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in a meeting should direct such request to Ms. Patricia A. Márquez Sandoval, Academic Senate President, at (661) 622-6306 (weekdays between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.) at least 48 hours before the meeting, if possible. Public records related to agenda items for open session are available for public inspection 72 hours prior to each regular meeting at the Antelope Valley College Academic Senate's Office, Administration Building, 3041 West Avenue K, Lancaster, California 93536.



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
October 2, 2008**

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Ms. Patricia A. Márquez Sandoval, Senate President, called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

2. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

- Ms. Márquez Sandoval announced the Area C meeting is to be held on October 25, 2008 at the Compton Community Educational Learning Center
- The cancellation of November 6, 2008 Senate meeting is currently being discussed given that Ms. Márquez Sandoval will be attending the Fall Plenary Session and Ms. Gloria Kastner will be on vacation.
- Strata Consultant, Henry Eimstad, will provide recommendations regarding ITS issues at the October 22, 2008, College Coordinating Council meeting.
- Currently, a call is out announcing the opportunity for faculty to submit letters of interest for the positions of Academic Senate President, AP&P and Distance Education Co-Chairs. The deadline to submit letters of interests is Friday, October 10, 2008.
- Mr. Alex Webster, Adjunct faculty, has been appointed Adjunct Senate Representative.
- Board of Trustee member, Steve Fox, demanded specific items be included as agenda items on the upcoming Board meeting. Ms. Márquez Sandoval read a letter sent by Steve Fox detailing his demands. She encouraged faculty members to attend the Board Meeting to voice and show their support of the district's commitment in establishing a Palmdale campus.

3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

- Mr. Ed Beyer stated he wanted to clear the air in regards to his resignation as Senate President Elect. The resignation had nothing to do with what occurred at the last Senate meeting. He read his letter of resignation which described his desire to focus his efforts on the campus Accreditation process. In addition, he reported his term as Distance Education Co-Chair expires as of June 30, 2008.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made and seconded to approve the September 18, 2008 Academic Senate Meeting minutes. Motion carried.

5. PRESENTATION

a. Steps in State Funded Site Acquisitions – Dr. Jackie Fisher (attachment)

Dr. Jackie Fisher presented an in depth report on the requirement needed to move the Palmdale site to Center status. He detailed at length the state guidelines and procedures necessary to obtain Center status for a Palmdale campus. He expressed the District's commitment to put as much funding as possible and resources to establish a Palmdale Campus. A lengthy question and answer period occurred between Dr. Fisher and Senators. Dr. Fisher responded to questions regarding recent news articles alleging the college has taken money required to build a Palmdale Campus and used it for projects on main campus. He reiterated the district's commitment to the communities of Antelope Valley and the need to adhere to the requirements set by the state establishing a Center for Palmdale. In addition, he stated the bond included a 4% inflation factor, but could have never anticipated a 40% increase in construction costs. Many colleges are in a similar position as AVC, one year after passing a bond. The district will move forward with the application process in hopes to meet

the upcoming funding cycle. Dr. Les Uhazy stated the District is showing commitment to the Antelope Valley by expanding programs and putting resources into the community.

6. REPORTS (limited to 5 min. each)

a. Honors Committee – Karen Lubick

Ms. Karen Lubick reported over the summer months she was busy fielding questions from interested students. The Honors Committee held its first committee meeting and has decided to revise Transfer Alliance Program (TAP) Certification language to specify students must have a cumulative grade point average of 3.2 by the end of the Intersession, to obtain certification. Students requesting certification last year did not meet TAP Certification criteria and the entrance percentage for the college declined. The committee decided to include a grade point average requirement in order to avoid the possibility of students unrealistically expecting to meet the criteria in one semester. Ms. Lubick announced there have been changes made to the Honors course schedule, due to recent changes made by the CSU and UC systems and the acceptance of AVC courses. The CSU system will no longer accept History 111 as a transferable course and will be removed as an acceptable course to meet the American Institution requirement. In addition, Astronomy 101 is no longer accepted as a transferable course to the UC system. Dr. Lee Grishman is currently working on determining transferable course requirements and will put it through the AP&P process for approval. The Honors Orientation will be held on October 20, 2008 from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. in the Boardroom (SSV 151). Ms. Lubick extended an invitation to all division faculty.

The campus Alpha Iota club is very busy and active. Elizabeth Soos is coordinating a Honors Ball on November 1, 2008 from 6:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. at the Antelope Valley Country Club. The event will be a formal affair – Black Tie optional. Tickets will be sold for \$55.00 per person. Faculty Alpha Iota Advisors are Harish Rao, Tom Graves, Mary Margaret McGuire, and Karen Lubick. Students are participating in various community outreach and fundraising events. The Honors Committee is currently discussing the possibility of offering mixed courses (50% Honors students – 50% general college students). The details of how the course would be offered still needs to be worked out, but faculty interested in offering a split course should contact Karen Lubick. Quartz Hill High School has extended an invitation to Ms. Lubick to present information regarding the Honors Program at the upcoming Parents Night. Dr. Robert Harris attended the annual Highland High School's College Night and was provided Honors Program Information for distribution to interested high school students. Ms. Lubick announced by next spring the committee is looking to establish a standardized Honors Option, so faculty and students are aware of the expectations of courses. Finally, Ms. Lubick reported new members have been appointment to the Honors Committee and she is very appreciative to have new willing participants on the committee, but was concerned that Charles Hood, Language Arts Faculty, is no longer a member and would like to request to have him reinstated. Ms. Márquez Sandoval stated that if there is a vacant position available on the committee, another call can be placed to the faculty.

b. Tenure Review – Jennifer Gross

Ms. Jennifer Gross announced there are seventy-three (73) active Tenure Committees. Thirty-six (36) of these committees required a change in membership due to retirements. The process to establishment committees has been smooth. Tenure orientations have been performed with a 100% attendance of committee members. By the end of the first week of the fall semester an adequate number of Senate Representatives had been achieved. Ms. Gross reported feedback has been received about new Tenure forms. The majority of the feedback indicated the forms create an easier process. Mr. Ted Younglove and Ms. Jennifer Gross have created student evaluations for online instructors. Online instructors have been

notified about the online evaluation process. Mr. Mike Wilmes and Ms. Jennifer Gross have established an online course review process. Proposed language revisions for the Student Evaluation Forms have been forwarded to Heidi Prescheler. The Student Evaluation process will allow students to type in their evaluations to alleviate concerns about faculty recognizing handwriting. Ms. Gross emphasized the importance for Senators to convey to division faculty the importance of peer evaluation so non-tenured faculty have necessary information to write self-report.

c. Legislative Liaison – Glenn Haller

Mr. Glenn Haller reported the budget information is still coming in and nothing has been definitively detailed. The preliminary information details backfilling COLA allotments and addresses the work force challenges. He announced as more information is obtained he would provide another detailed report. A lawsuit challenging AB540 – a regulation requiring residency to obtain financial assistance. Currently, federal law states any illegal immigrants cannot receive financial assistance, although state law allows for students who meet residency requirements regardless of immigration status to obtain financial assistance. There are approximately one-thousand (1,000) bills on the desk of the Governor. Many have been signed and others have been veto. Information is changing day by day. The Field Act (SB 588) was just signed and decreases the strict requirements for Community College buildings and will provide better access to alternate facilities for classes. An additional report will be provided at an upcoming Senate meeting.

d. Distance Education Committee (DEC) – Ed Beyer

Mr. Ed Beyer reported the committee is currently working on creating a ½ unit Distance Education Orientation course. They have also created an Accessibility workgroup to address current campus accessibility issues, and a Membership workgroup to address the membership needs of the committee and ensure the composition is representative of the campus community. In recent weeks, the Accrediting Commission sent a communication to colleges stating that Federal regulations are requiring colleges to authenticate students enrolled in online classes. In addition, online course content including third party resources must meet accessibility requirements. Accessibility is the responsibility of individual colleges and the DEC is diligently working to identifying courses needing to comply.

7. ACTION ITEMS

a. Basic Skills Action Plans

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Basic Skills Action Plans. Motion carried.

b. Distance Education Committee Membership Team Realignment – Ed Beyer

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Distance Education Committee term realignment and make two current positions a three-year term. Mr. Beyer reported the committee has five faculty positions and all are on the same term schedule, which creates a situation where the entire committee can turn over. The committee is recommending staggering two faculty positions to ensure there are members on the committee that have a historical perspective of committee work. Ms. Márquez Sandoval requested the names of the two faculty to be presented to the Senate for documentation and tracking purposes at the next Senate meeting. Motion carried.

8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Promoting Thoughtful Faculty Conversations about Grade Distribution Feedback

Ms. Márquez Sandoval stressed the importance of engaging in discussions about grade distribution and provide feedback on any particular parts of the publication. Discussion

information should be gathered throughout the fall semester and detailed discussion topics occurring within divisions should be forwarded to the Senate Office, so that information can be shared with Statewide Senate no later than mid spring semester.

b. Academic Ranking

Ms. Márquez Sandoval announced after reviewing some of the information gathered regarding the revision of Full-Time Academic Ranking process it was clear that there was still some need for discussion. From reviewing Los Angeles Valley and Rio Hondo Community Colleges, their procedures indicate ranking is based on achievements accomplished at their individual institutions and does not have affiliation to salary. Ms. Márquez Sandoval presented revision possibilities and stated if Senators agreed with the proposed revisions she would bring back as an action item on the next Senate agenda. Ms. Márquez Sandoval would forward an electronic copy of the revised document to Senators for further division discussion.

9. SENATE ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

a. Appointments

- Academic Ranking
 - Bonnell Curry – Assistant Professor
 - Luis Enriquez – Associate Professor
 - Sandra Robinson – Associate Professor

A motion was made and seconded to approve the above faculty appointments. Motion carried.

10. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the October 2, 2008 Senate meeting at 4:35 p.m. Motion carried.

<u>MEMBERS PRESENT</u>		
Ed Beyer	Patricia A. Márquez Sandoval	Kathy Moore
Debra Feickert	Sal Suarez	Harish Rao
Glenn Haller (proxy)	Susan Knapp	John Taylor
Jack Halliday	Scott Lee	Shunnon Thomas
Cynthia Kincaid	Ty Mettler	Dorothy Williams
<u>MEMBERS ABSENT</u>	<u>GUEST PRESENT</u>	
Frank Blua	Susan Lowry	Dr. Jackie Fisher
Carolyn Burrell	Candace Martin	Diane Flores-Kagan
Claude Gratton	Terry Rezek	Jennifer Gross
Lee Grishman	Sandra Robinson	Sharon Lowry
Sandra Hughes	Kenan Shahla	Karen Lubick
		Heidi Preschler
		Dr. Les Uhazy

Betty

Update on Palmdale Campus

First, let me provide a brief history on the development of a Palmdale campus site. In the early 1990s, Antelope Valley Community College District was offered a donation of 100 acres of land located at 47th Street East and Barrel Springs Road. During the late 1990s, the location of the proposed donated property was changed to 37th East and Avenue V and the size of the parcel reduced to 80 acres. From the late 1990s until 2007, college administrators and the Board of Trustees patiently waited for the promised donation to materialize so the district could establish a site for a permanent Palmdale campus. Three different home developers were unable to finalize an agreement with the land owner during this time period. In the fall of 2007, the Board of Trustees received correspondence from the last developer stating that the company was withdrawing its' agreement with the land owner. Thereafter, the Board of Trustees made the difficult decision to end the relationship with the prospective donor and search for a piece of property to purchase. Five parcels in the South Valley identified as feasible sites for a campus were presented to the Board of Trustees during fall of 2007. On February 28, 2008, Antelope Valley Community College District completed purchase of 60 acres located on the west side of 25th Street East, north of Pearblossom Highway, in Palmdale. By securing land, the district took one of the most important steps toward receiving approval and funding for a permanent college campus in Palmdale.

Prior to becoming a separate college, an educational site must first be approved as an official educational center by the California community colleges' Board of Governors. An educational center is defined in CCR T5 section 55827(b) as a "postsecondary operation established and administered by an existing college or district at a location away (20 miles or minutes travel time) from the parent institution. An educational center is an operation planned to continue for three or more years and expected to enroll over 500 (sustainable) full-time equivalent students (FTES) annually by the third year of operation. The center typically has an on-site administrator and may offer programs leading to certificates and/or degrees conferred by the parent institution." Last fall, the district reached the milestone of 500 FTES annually at the temporary facility located at 15th Street East and Palmdale Boulevard. At the end of the 2007-2008 academic year, total student enrollment for the Palmdale site was 502 FTES. For the fall semester of 2008, 360 FTES will be produced with a projection of more than 600 FTES annually.

With the acquisition of property and enrollment that meets the requirements for an educational center, Antelope Valley Community College District is now eligible to apply to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office for capital outlay funds for the development and construction of permanent buildings for a college.

There are four significant steps that must be completed simultaneously within the next year. The district must submit a "Letter of Intent" informing the Chancellor's Office of our plans to develop a specific state eligible site and a "Request for Approval" requesting formal recognition of a specific site (i.e., 25th Street Palmdale) as eligible for state capital

outlay funds. The district must also request approval of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (Western Association of Schools and Colleges) and California Postsecondary Education Commission. After the Palmdale site is approved as an official education center, the district will become eligible to receive capital outlay funds. Moreover, we will have passed the last milestone to becoming a separate college.

Dr. Jackie Fisher, Superintendent/President of Antelope Valley College, says that it is unfortunate that the promised donation never happened, but we are excited about now owning property in Palmdale for a future campus. He says "this time we are doing it right and will eventually have a campus in Palmdale." It takes time to jump through all the hoops required, but the outcome will be worth the wait.

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Substantive Change Policy

*(Adopted October 1972; Revised January 1978, June 1991, June 1996;
Edited October 1997; Revised January 2002; Edited June 2002; Edited August
2004)*

Background

Accreditation, a voluntary process of peer review dependent on recognized standards of good practice, is in part an affirmation that the institution :

- Has clearly defined objectives appropriate to higher education.
- Has established conditions under which the achievement of these objectives can reasonably be expected.
- Presents evidence that it is in fact accomplishing the objectives substantially.
- Is so organized, staffed, and supported that it can be expected to continue to do so; and demonstrates that it meets Commission standards, Eligibility Requirements, and policies.

The scope of an institution's accreditation covers everything done in its name.

Policy

A substantive change is a change which alters: the mission, scope, or name of the institution; the nature of the constituency served; the location or geographical area served; the control of the institution; the content of courses or programs to an extent which represents a significant departure from current curricula or the mode of delivery of a program so that the courses constituting 50% or more of a program are offered at a distance or through electronic delivery; or the credit awarded to courses or programs. Since it is the Commission's responsibility to determine the effect of a substantive change on the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the total institution, it is the Commission's policy that such changes must be approved by the Commission prior to implementation. When an institution proposes to make a change which is considered substantive, the change must be approved

according to the Substantive Change Approval Process. Upon successful review and approval, the institution's accreditation will be extended to areas affected by the change. Note that institutions scheduled for a Comprehensive Visit may not employ the substantive change approval process in the six month period preceding the visit. Also, when the Commission defers an action on accredited status or places an institution on a sanction such as Warning, Probation, or Show Cause, the Commission may defer consideration of any substantive change request until the conditions that caused the Commission to defer a decision on accredited status or to impose a sanction have been addressed and the Commission has reaffirmed accreditation.

The following changes are all substantive changes:

1. Change in mission, scope, or name of the institution.

- A change in the purpose or character of the institution.
- A change in the degree level from that which was previously offered by the institution.
- Any change in the official name of the institution.

2. Change in the nature of the constituency served.

- A change in the intended student clientele.
- Closure of an institution.

3. Change in the location or geographical area served.

- Offering courses or programs outside the geographic region currently served.
- Moving to a new location.
- Establishing an additional location geographically apart from the main campus, at which students can complete at least 50% of an educational program.
- Closing a location geographically apart from the main campus at which students can complete at least 50% of an educational program.

4. Change in the control of the institution.

- Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the institution.
- Merging with another institution.
- Contracting for the delivery of courses or programs in the name of the institution with a non-regionally accredited organization.
- A change by a parent institution of one of its off-campus sites into a separate institution.

5. Change in courses or programs or their mode of delivery that represents a significant departure from current practice.

- Addition of a program that represents a significant departure from an institution's current programs.
- Addition of courses that represent a significant departure from the current curricula of an institution.
- Addition of courses that constitute 50% or more of a program or 50% of the college's courses offered through a mode of distance or electronic delivery.

6. A change in credit awarded.

- An increase of 50% or more in the number of credit hours awarded for the successful completion of a program.
- A change from clock hours to credit hours.

Substantive Change Approval Process

Institutions wishing to effect a substantive change should follow these procedures. *Note that institutions which have been declared eligible for accreditation but have not yet achieved candidate or accredited status, institutions on sanction, and institutions for whom the action on accredited status has been deferred by the Commission, may not employ the substantive change approval process.*

1. Notify the Commission

The institution begins the Substantive Change approval process by notifying the Commission of the proposed change, the need for the

change, and the anticipated effects. Commission staff determine whether or not the proposed change is indeed substantive. Early notification enables the staff to provide information and advice about how the institution might best proceed through the Substantive Change process.

2. Preparing the Substantive Change Proposal

If the Commission staff determines that the proposed change is substantive in nature, the institution is asked to submit a Substantive Change Report for review by the Commission's Committee on Substantive Change.

The Substantive Change Proposal should include the following:

- A. A concise description of the proposed change and the reasons for it.
- B. A description of the educational program(s) to be offered and evidence that the educational purposes of the change are clear and appropriate if the substantive change involves a new educational program.
- C. A description of the planning process which led to the request for the change, how the change relates to the institution's stated mission, the assessment of needs and resources which has taken place, and the anticipated effect of the proposed change on the rest of the institution.
- D. Evidence that the institution has provided adequate human, management, financial, and physical resources and processes to initiate, maintain, and monitor the change and to assure that the activities undertaken are accomplished with acceptable quality. If the substantive change is to establish a branch campus, private institutions must include projected revenues and expenditures and cash flow at a branch campus. Public institutions, in keeping with the financial reporting requirements of their district, system, or governmental agency, must include financial information which allows for comparable analysis of the financial planning and management of a branch campus.

If the change involves the formation of a separate institution from an off-campus center or branch campus, the projected financial information must be provided for the parent institution of the pro-

posed split. The new separate institution must begin the process for separate accreditation.

- E. Evidence that the institution has received all necessary internal or external approvals. The report should state clearly what faculty, administrative, governing board, or regulatory agency approvals are needed and evidence that any legal requirements have been met.
 - F. Evidence that each Eligibility Requirement will still be fulfilled after the change. Any requirements that are particularly impacted by the change should be addressed in detail.
 - G. Evidence that each accreditation standard will still be fulfilled after the change and that all relevant Commission policies are addressed. Any standards that are particularly impacted by the change should be addressed in detail.
 - H. Other information requested by Commission staff that is pertinent to the specific nature of the change.
3. **Commission Action:** Once the Substantive Change Report is received by the Commission, it is reviewed by the Commission's Committee on Substantive Change, which has full authority to act. The Committee may approve or deny a substantive change request or return it to the institution for additional information. At its discretion, the Committee may refer the decision on the substantive change request to the entire Commission at its next meeting. Commission staff keep the institution informed as to the status of the substantive change request. The institution is notified of the Committee action within two weeks of the Committee meeting. Denial of the request will include reasons for the denial.
4. **Appeal:** If the institution wishes to appeal the decision of the Commission's Committee on Substantive Change, the appeal must be filed in writing and will be deliberated at the next meeting of the Commission. Members of the Committee on Substantive Change may participate in the discussion but will abstain from voting on the appeal.

5. Referral to the Commission

In the event a substantive change request has been referred to the Commission for consideration, the institution will be notified of Commission action within two weeks of the meeting at which action occurred. In the event that the change is judged to be of such magnitude as to potentially affect the candidate or accredited status of the institution, the review process for the substantive change may be expanded to include a review of the accreditation status of the institution and a visit.

6. Future Visits

Approved Substantive Changes should be addressed in the next comprehensive review of the institution. If the institution is not due for a comprehensive evaluation within two years of the approval of the Substantive Change, an on-site evaluation, or other measures as the Commission may determine, may be required. Costs for an on-site evaluation will be borne by the institution.

Note:

Off-campus centers, including branch campuses, which offer 50% or more of a program are subject to an on-site inspection within the first six months of establishment. Institutions undergoing changes in ownership, control, and/or legal status will be visited within six months of the implementation of the change.

The Commission reserves the right to request a report and visit to assess the effects of any Substantive Change it deems to be a very significant departure from the past, including a requirement to submit periodic prescribed reports and support special visit(s) by representatives of the Commission.

FACILITIES PLANNING MANUAL

Part E, Acquisitions

Chapter 10, Site Acquisitions for New College and Center Development

SECTION	PAGE
10.1 OVERVIEW	1
10.2 DEFINITIONS	2
10.3 ACQUISITIONS OF SITES WITH STATE APPROVAL OF FACILITIES TO BE REQUESTED IN THE FUTURE	3
10.4 SITE ACQUISITIONS MADE CONCURRENTLY WITH THE REQUEST TO APPROVE A SITE	5
10.5 STEPS IN STATE-FUNDED SITE ACQUISITIONS	6
10.6 STEPS TO APPROVE A NEW COLLEGE OR EDUCATIONAL CENTER	7
10.7 PRELIMINARY EVALUATIONS OF GROWTH AND FACILITIES	8
District Growth Potential	8
District Capacity	8
Regional Participation with Available Capacity	9
10.8 LETTER OF INTENT	9
10.9 ASSESSMENTS OF EDUCATIONAL AND FACILITY NEEDS	10
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS WHEN ANALYZING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS	10
OTHER INFORMATION NEEDED TO REQUEST APPROVAL OF A NEW SITE	11
10.10 OFFICIAL PROJECTIONS OF FUTURE ENROLLMENTS	12
10.11 THE REQUEST FOR APPROVAL	12
Assessment of Needs and Preferences	12
Identification of Objectives	13
Analysis of Alternative Delivery Systems	13

10.12	REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF A REQUEST FOR APPROVAL	14
10.13	CHECK LIST OF INFORMATION ITEMS	14

CAPITAL OUTLAY HANDBOOK

Part E, Acquisitions

Chapter 10, Site Acquisitions for New College and Center Development

10.1 OVERVIEW

To be eligible to receive State funding for capital outlay purposes, a site must be designated as a college or be an officially approved educational center.¹ These terms are explicitly defined later in this chapter. In a district's long-range plan, the acquisition of a specific site may be desirable far in advance of the approval process for becoming a college or an approved educational center.

This chapter describes the process for each of the following scenarios:

1. Acquisition of a site when the development of a college or an officially approved educational center will be requested at some future date.
2. Acquisition of a site simultaneously with the approval process for locating a college or educational center at that site.
3. Approval of a new college or educational center for a previously acquired, but presently undeveloped parcel.
4. Expansion or conversion of an outreach operation into an approved college or educational center.

All these scenarios have two significant steps: 1) The submission of a '*Letter of Intent*' informing the Chancellor's Office of the district's plans to develop a specific state-eligible site and 2) The development and approval of a '*Request for Approval*' asking for the formal recognition of a specific site as eligible for State capital outlay funds. Appendix F is a listing by district of sites eligible for state capital outlay funds.

¹ A site eligible for State capital outlay funds is not guaranteed an opportunity to receive such funds for the construction or modification of its facilities. The ability to use State capital outlay funds to develop any project, including new sites, is dependent upon many factors that exist when project proposals are approved including the amount and type of funds available and state-wide priorities that exist.

The difference between the four scenarios is the timing of the submissions and the information each submission contains, but all scenarios ultimately require the submission of similar information. The analysis of programs, services and facilities when educational program and facility plans are developed or revised is critical when seeking approval to develop a parcel or to expand an outreach operation with State funds; accordingly, the reader should be familiar with Chapter 2 on District Master Plans prior to reviewing this chapter.

10.2 DEFINITIONS

Community college locations, for purposes of inventorying sites for State capital outlay, are classified into colleges, campuses, educational centers, district offices, outreach operations, future sites and investment parcels. All categories, except outreach operations and investment parcels, are eligible, once approved by the Board of Governors and the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), to apply for State capital outlay funds.

CCR T5. §55827(a). College. As used in this chapter, 'college' means a degree-granting institution intended to provide instruction through the second year of college, including but not limited, to one or more of the following categories:

- (1) *standard collegiate courses for transfer to higher institutions;*
- (2) *vocational and technical fields leading to employment; or*
- (3) *general or liberal arts courses for which institution the district intends to obtain accreditation.*

CCR T5. §55827(b). Educational Center. As used in this chapter, 'educational center' means a postsecondary operation established and administered by an existing college or district at a location away from the campus of the parent institution. An educational center is an operation planned to continue for three or more years and expected to enroll over 500 FTES by the third year of operation. The center typically has an on-site administrator and may offer programs leading to certificates and/or degrees conferred by the parent institution.

A '*campus*' is like a college in most respects, but may not offer a full complement of programs or services and is combined with other campuses or a college into a single institution for accreditation purposes.

A '*district office*' is an administrative, generally non-instructional, facility at a location separate from a college or campus. They are most common in multi-campus districts where more than one college and/or campus is served by a single administrative staff.

An '*outreach operation*' is an off-campus enterprise administered by an existing college or district and offering courses in leased or owned facilities which have not been formally approved by the Board of Governors. It is often located in other government facilities, usually enrolls less than 500 FTES (approximately 1,000 headcount) and may

not be considered as having the potential to grow, over a period of time, into a college, campus or educational center. Outreach operations are combined with a college for accreditation and reporting purposes.

* A *'future site'* is a parcel of land acquired for future development and subsequently approved by the Board of Governors as eligible to receive State capital outlay funds to develop into a college or educational center.

An *'investment parcel'* is a piece of land acquired for future development or disposal at a profit depending upon district growth patterns, but the ultimate status of the parcel cannot now be determined. Given its undetermined status, it is not eligible to receive State capital outlay funds for development.

A *'Letter of Intent'* is formal correspondence sent to the Chancellor's Office and CPEC for review and approval which notifies concerned parties that a district elects to purchase or develop a site with the assistance of State capital outlay funds.

A *'Request for Approval'* is an agenda item reviewed by the Board of Governor's and CPEC and, if approved, authorizes a specific site as eligible to receive State capital outlay funds. State regulations stipulate that a Request for Approval shall contain:

1. An assessment of needs and preferences of the area to be served.
2. Identification of instructional and service objectives of the site.
3. An analysis of alternative delivery systems.

10.3 ACQUISITIONS OF SITES WITH STATE APPROVAL OF FACILITIES TO BE REQUESTED IN THE FUTURE

A district may acquire a site for future development through donation, exchange, purchase or some other means that excludes the use of State funds before enrollment necessitates development of facilities. A site acquired for investment purposes only does not need to be reviewed at the state level.

If a site is acquired for use in the future as a college or a State-approved educational center, regardless of the source of funds used to acquire a parcel or building site, a district is expected to work with the Chancellor's Office to ensure that the location and development potential of the site is compatible with state-wide development plan for higher education.

Before the district completes acquisition of a site for future development, it is advisable to provide the Chancellor's Office with the following information about the parcel:

1. Location, size, and access.
2. A proposed method for funding the acquisition.
3. Seismic concerns, if any.
4. Aircraft flight paths and railroad easements affecting the location.
5. Future development potential, both of the educational facility and in the surrounding area.
6. Restrictions on the use of the parcel, if any.
7. Other information affecting the use of the location as an educational facility such as infra-structure development needed, coastal use restrictions, hazardous materials present, and environmental limitations, such as an adjacent protected species area, that need to be considered.

The most common method used to inform the Chancellor's Office of an anticipated acquisition is through correspondence. The letter should be accompanied by site plans, Environmental Impact Reports, purchase/donation covenants and other such documents to provide the above information.

The information is reviewed by the Chancellor's Office and, if found consistent with State-wide long-term plans for community colleges, is transmitted to the CPEC for review regarding the site's consistency with long-term plans for all segments of higher education. Chancellor's Office staff keeps district staff apprised of conclusions reached regarding the parcel. **A district that acquires a parcel or building site without first obtaining concurrence that such a location is of sufficient size and characteristics to be compatible with State-level long-term plans may have to develop the location without State assistance.**

Under this scenario, correspondence informing the Chancellor's Office of the planned acquisition is sent possibly years before the Letter of Intent and the Request for Approval; hence, the correspondence may only address an area or parcel of land and not the educational programs and facility plans for the site. Educational and facility plans would need to be mentioned in a Letter of Intent and addressed in detail in a Request for Approval that the district would need to submit to the Board of Governors for review and approval before consideration of Initial and Final Project Proposals to develop the site using State funds.

10.4 SITE ACQUISITIONS MADE CONCURRENTLY WITH THE REQUEST TO APPROVE A SITE

The requirement that the acquisition of developing college and educational center sites be consistent with State-level long-term plans also holds true when development of the facilities is anticipated in the immediate future. If the district is proposing to acquire a parcel of land without the use of State funds and use State funds for the immediate development of facilities on that parcel, information requirements regarding the site are the same as those listed in Section 10.3 above.

If State funds are to be used for site acquisition in conjunction with the design and construction of facilities on the site, the information listed below in addition to the items listed in Section 10.3 needs to be submitted as part of the Request for Approval submitted to the Board of Governors:

8. An Environmental Impact Report, Negative Declaration or other CEQA report for the site.
9. Five-year (for a center site) or ten-year (for a college site) enrollment projections (Explained later in this chapter),
10. Educational and facility development plans for the new site (Explained later in this chapter).
11. Descriptions of the use, if any, to be made of existing facilities on the site.
12. Discussion of alternative sites considered and not chosen.
13. Justification for the chosen site.
14. A timely appraisal of the site made by individuals authorized by the Office of Real Estate and Design Services, State Department of General Services.

Under this scenario, information expected in the Letter of Intent and the Request for Approval would most likely be submitted into a single communication or a series of communications that would then be used to develop the Board of Governor's Agenda Item requesting approval of the site while simultaneously supporting an initial project proposal.

It is only after approval of the site by the Board of Governors and CPEC that the Final Project Proposal (explained in Chapter 5 of this handbook) may be submitted requesting State funds be made available to develop facilities on the site. While present policies do not require site acquisition to be combined with the other phases of capital improvement for funding purposes, Final Project Proposals for site acquisition only tend to be category "C", expansion projects, whereas a Final Project Proposal for site acquisition combined or coordinated with a project proposal that includes other phases of development (planning, working drawings, construction and equipment) is usually assigned the same funding priority as the construction phase.

10.5 STEPS IN STATE-FUNDED SITE ACQUISITIONS

1. Obtain the Board of Governors and the CPEC approvals to include the parcel or building location as a site eligible for State capital outlay funds. (Request for Approval)
2. Complete and obtain approval of a Final Project Proposal including the appropriation of funds by the Legislature and approved by the Governor.
3. Verify that the site selected for acquisition is within the parameters of the budget language.
4. Be certain the following are complete and documented: the seller's appraisal; plot maps; assessor's description; any easements; any hazardous waste or hazardous conditions; geotechnical evaluation of natural drainage, faults and slides; location on Alquist-Priolo state seismic maps; evaluation of alternative sites consistent with the guidelines published by CPEC, and any other pertinent information.
5. Determine through an initial environmental study if an Environmental Impact Report will be required and develop a schedule for conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Refer to Section 7.10 of this Handbook.
6. Select an appraiser approved by the Office of Real Estate and Design Services (OREDS) of the State Department of General Services.
7. If appropriate, obtain a final appraisal of fair market value of the site.
8. If appropriate, develop a cost estimate for relocation of owner(s) or tenant(s) in accordance with the State Relocation Act.
9. Submit a request to the Chancellor's Office for authority to acquire the property with:
 - A. Three copies of the final appraisal.
 - B. The time schedule for compliance with the CEQA.
 - C. The assessor's map.
 - D. The relocation plan and cost estimate.
10. If needed, the Chancellor's Office sends a letter to OREDS requesting formal approval of the appraisal and relocation plan. The letter cites the Budget Act appropriation. If approved, the Department of Finance is notified of the approval.
11. State Public Works Board reviews and approves the acquisition for the specific property appraised in accordance with the budget language. District cost for this service is recoverable in the budget act authority.

12. The State Public Works Board (SPWB) reviews and approves the acquisition.
13. Once the PWB approves the acquisition, the district is notified and directed to acquire the property.

Note: The Department of Finance will not review Final Project Proposals for design and construction funds until the site has been acquired.

10.6 STEPS TO APPROVE A NEW COLLEGE OR EDUCATIONAL CENTER

There are four basic steps to obtaining approval of new sites for State funding. The following steps apply both when parcels (not eligible for state funds) are initially developed and when active outreach operations are expanded or converted to new colleges or state-eligible educational centers:

1. Evaluate the growth potential in the district and the capability of the existing colleges, campuses, educational centers and outreach operations to absorb the growth.
2. Submit to the Chancellor's Office for review and approval a Letter of Intent specifying the district's plans to increase services into an area or areas presently not being served.
3. If the letter of intent is approved by the Chancellor and the CPEC Executive Director, update educational program and facility plans or assess the needs of programs, services, facilities and delivery methods for serving students from the under-served areas.
4. Prepare and submit to the Board of Governors a Request for Approval asking for formal recognition of a new college or educational center if development of a new college or center is the preferred alternative for serving the identified area(s).

10.7 PRELIMINARY EVALUATIONS OF GROWTH AND FACILITIES

The first step in determining the need for a State-approved college or center is for a district to evaluate the area's potential for enrollment growth and the ability of the district's existing and planned facilities to absorb that growth. Districts determine, given historical participation rates, whether or not projected enrollment growth can be fully accommodated by expanding or improving existing facilities. When colleges make Master Plans, this evaluation is part of the overall development of educational program and facility plans as explained in Chapter 2.

District Growth Potential

Districts evaluate growth potential by evaluating regional population growth and participation rates. To assist districts, the Chancellor's Office provides annual updates of State-wide and district-wide long-term enrollment projections. Using various indicators, districts determine the general areas within their regions that have the greatest influence on the district-wide enrollment trends. The preliminary analysis of regional population trends made at this time, however, is not as detailed as the official projection made after submission and acceptance of the Letter of Intent. The preliminary evaluation of enrollment is based upon supporting evidence such as secondary school enrollment projections, new housing starts, building permit applications, planning commission hearings, business openings or relocation and other such economic indicators that show growth in specific regions.

Besides enrollment trends, districts examine regional participation rates to determine if student demographics, commute times, traffic flow, access roads and geography unduly influence participation. In such circumstances, districts analyze how best to increase enrollments from the outlying areas. Evaluations of neighboring postsecondary institutions also may provide useful information on enrollment trends and participation rates.

District Capacity

Capacity ratios of instructional areas as well as support areas are evaluated to determine if conversion or additional development of an existing facility would be the preferred solution for increasing district capacity. Questions considered at this time are whether the existing sites are approaching capacity in all areas and whether the existing sites have additional opportunities to develop more usable space. Such opportunities may not exist if a site is land-locked or approaching Master Plan buildout.

Regional Participation with Available Capacity

With population shifts that have occurred in recent years, a district may find that it has lower regional participation rates than expected and its existing facilities are capable of serving larger enrollments. In such situations, the district will need to analyze reasons for the lower regional participation rates and seriously consider alternative delivery methods before it advocates expansion of facilities to outlying areas.

All aspects of a community college (management, faculty, staff and the neighboring community) work with local trustees to determine if the district is willing to accommodate the projected enrollment demands. A decision in favor of expanding services beyond the capacity of existing sites after Master Plan buildout would come to the Chancellor's Office in the form of a Letter of Intent.

10.8 LETTER OF INTENT

If a district predicts that enrollment will grow beyond the capacity of its existing and planned facilities, it needs to decide whether to expand its service capability at its active sites or to develop new facilities to handle the additional demand. Each alternative presents differing cost and policy implications. As a result, districts may elect to publicly discuss the alternatives. A Letter of Intent is not needed if a district elects to expand service capability on its existing sites or use non-state funds to develop outreach operations. **When a district elects to request state funds to develop a new site or convert an outreach operation to a college or educational center, a Letter of Intent needs to be sent to the Chancellor's Office and CPEC for review and approval.**

The Letter of Intent notifies the Chancellor's Office and CPEC that a district intends to develop a state-recognized site and requests authorization for further planning to develop data supporting such expansion. The Letter of Intent presents:

1. A general location of the planned facility including maps of the site.
2. An estimated time frame when it would be active.
3. Documentation evidencing the projected enrollment growth.
4. District's most recent Five-Year Construction Plan.
5. Explanations why delivery methods cannot be modified or existing facilities cannot be expanded to handle the projected enrollments.

The Chancellor's Office reviews and evaluates each Letter of Intent in terms of defined system-wide priorities and, if consistent with the Board of Governors' long-range plans for California Community Colleges, sends it to the CPEC for review and approval.² CPEC reviews the enrollment projections and other data accompanying the letter in consultation with the Department of Finance (DOF) and gives its recommendation to the Chancellor's Office which in turn notifies the district. If the district is informed that the State approves the Letter of Intent, it may proceed with further planning leading to the submission of a Request for Approval.

10.9 ASSESSMENTS OF EDUCATIONAL AND FACILITY NEEDS

Upon approval of a Letter of Intent, a district reviews its educational program and facility Master Plans and modifies them as needed to show the effect of the new site. New colleges and campuses Master Plans should address the first ten years of operation and new center Master Plans should address the first five years of operation. This update effort may require the collection of labor market information or public surveys to determine program and employer needs. Given that the development of distance learning is a high priority state-wide, modifications to educational program and facility Master Plans need to consider how a new site will use such technology.

Districts that have not prepared Master Plans and want to have the State approve new sites need to perform detailed assessments of local long-term needs both in terms of expected educational programs and supportive services and facilities necessary to provide those programs and services to the public. This assessment requires analysis of all aspects of the college.³

Special Considerations When Analyzing Educational Programs

Analyses of educational programs that follow the issuance of Letters of Intent involve all efforts of a college including transfer education, technical education and contract education. Districts may review historical enrollments to determine the types of courses students tend to take. They may make inquiries as to the types of degrees and

² If the site to be developed is not a site eligible to receive state funds or the development constitutes a significant departure from long-term plans, the request is subject to approval by the Board of Governors.

³ Refer to Chapter 2, College Master planning, for two methods for evaluating long-term needs when developing educational program and facility plans. Districts can use either of those methods or a combination of them to make detailed assessments of program, services and facility needs.

courses transfer students report to four-year institutions. They also may collect labor market information to identify major employers of the graduates, profile the types of skills needed by prospective employees, and coordinate the college programs with local industry.

Once community college districts profile the needed skills, they analyze their curriculums to determine changes needed. Analyses of current degrees and certificates offered are compared to the developing industries to determine the type of long-range modifications to make to curriculums. The emphasis of these analyses is to predict modifications that need to be made to curriculums over the long-term. This enables districts to consider viable options for delivering the material to the students and future facility needs.

Other Information Needed to Request Approval of a New Site

Districts need to prepare other information that will be used to augment the Request for Approval. This information includes:

1. Evaluations of alternative sites with a cost/benefit analysis of each site, if applicable.
2. Documentation of ownership of the selected site along with the applicable Environmental Impact Report⁴.
3. A time schedule for development of the site.
4. Maps with population densities, topography, road and highway configurations.
5. Endorsements or notices of opposition from local business leaders and neighboring colleges officials.
6. Educational and facilities specifications for the new site.
7. An evaluation of alternative funding sources for the facilities of the new site.
8. Identification of the district contact person(s).
9. Clearance from the Office of Aeronautics / Federal Aviation Authority regarding aircraft flight patterns.
10. Local board resolution authorizing the development of the new site and its related educational programs.

⁴ Refer to Section 6.10 for a discussion of Environmental Impact Reports and the California Environmental Quality Act.

10.10 OFFICIAL PROJECTIONS OF FUTURE ENROLLMENTS

Another aspect of the detailed assessment of needs is the official projection of enrollment performed at the local level. New colleges require ten-year projections of enrollment and new centers require five-year projections. Districts are to project their enrollment in accord with the Department of Finance Demographic Research Unit's publication titled "Guide for Community Colleges, Projection of Enrollment and Annual Average Weekly Student Contact Hours for New Colleges and Educational Centers." (See Appendix G.) Such a projection, once reviewed and approved by the Chancellor's Office, the CPEC and the Department of Finance, becomes the official projection for all future submittals for the new site. Given the importance of accurate projections, they should be completed just before the formal petition asking for a Request for Approval is submitted so that the projections more closely align with actual enrollment trends.

10.11 THE REQUEST FOR APPROVAL

Once the district has analyzed its programs and facilities, developed an official enrollment projection for the developing site, and provided supporting information to the Chancellor's Office, staff at the Chancellor's Office, in cooperation with district staff, prepare the formal Request for Approval for review by the Board of Governors. The *California Code of Regulations*, Title 5, Sections 55828(c) and 55829-55831 stipulate that a Request for Approval needs to contain:

1. An assessment of needs and preferences (CCR, Title 5, Section 55829).
2. Identification of Objectives (CCR, Title 5, Section 55830).
3. Analysis of Alternative Delivery Systems (CCR, Title 5, Section 55831).

Assessment of Needs and Preferences

An assessment of needs and preferences is defined in CCR, Title 5, Section 55829 as:

1. *Adequate identification of the community area and characteristics of individuals to be served.*
2. *Projections of potential enrollment demand in the service area that demonstrate significant unmet need, taking into account plans of nearby secondary and postsecondary institutions.*
3. *Evidence of significant community support and identification of possible community opposition.*
4. *Identification of preferences for community college programs and services on the part of individuals in the service area.*

5. *Identification, insofar as possible, of present and future labor market requirements for the proposed service area, a broader adjacent region, and the state.*
6. *A reconciliation of educational services with projected labor market requirements and community program preferences, if possible.*

Identification of Objectives

The identification of objectives is defined in CCR, Title 5, Section 55830 as:

1. *Proposed college or educational center programs and services must be directed to the identified educational needs and preferences of the community to be served.*
2. *Objectives of the proposed programs and services must be sufficiently specific that the district board may evaluate the success with which needs and preferences are met.*

Analysis of Alternative Delivery Systems

The analysis of alternative delivery systems is defined in CCR, Title 5, Section 55831 as:

1. *The proposed operation must be the most effective and equitable of feasible delivery system alternatives for providing intended programs and services.*
2. *The criteria for selecting the proposed delivery system must include:*
 - A. *Accessibility of programs and services to individuals in the services area.*
 - B. *Content and quality of programs and services.*
 - C. *Cost of programs and services.*
3. *Depending on the delivery system proposed, alternatives for providing the proposed programs and services must include, but need not be limited to:*
 - A. *Increased utilization of existing district resources.*
 - B. *Forming a new college, educational center, and/or outreach location.*
 - C. *Use of media such as television, computer-assisted instruction or programmed learning packages.*
4. *Alternative delivery systems considered must be adequately described, generally mutually exclusive, and limited to a manageable number to facilitate analysis and review.*

10.12 REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF A REQUEST FOR APPROVAL

The *California Code of Regulations*, Title 5, Sections 55828(d) and (e) define review objectives of the Chancellor's Office.

CCR T5. §55828. Responsibilities of the Chancellor's Office, Community College Districts and the Board of Governors.

(d) The Chancellor's Office shall review each proposed new college and new educational center and shall recommend approval or disapproval to the Board of Governors. The Chancellor's Office analysis of these proposals shall stress inter-district concerns and evaluation of the delivery system proposed.

(e) The Board of Governors shall approve or disapprove each new college or educational center and transmit its findings to the community college district initiating the proposal and to the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

The Board of Governors reviews each proposal requesting approval of a new site in public forums at which time interested people are given the opportunity to comment upon the Request for Approval.

As a the site is approved by the Board of Governors, the proposal is transmitted to CPEC for its formal review and approval. CPEC's primary concern is to verify that the development of each new site is consistent with the State-wide long-term Master Plan for higher education. Once the proposal is approved by CPEC, projects for developing a new site may be submitted in the same manner as any capital outlay project.

10.13 CHECK LIST OF INFORMATION ITEMS

The following pages provide a check list of the information needed for each step in the approval process.