

**Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Tuesday, November 24, 2009
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm
A218C
Minutes**

PRESENT: A. Serban (Chair), I. Alarcon, O. Arellano, L. Auchincloss, P. Bishop, J. Friedlander, T. Garey, A. Garfinkel, M. Guillen, K. Molloy, K. Monda, D. Nevins, C. Salazar, J. Sullivan

ABSENT: S. Ehrlich, N. Ridgell

GUESTS: P. Butler, K. McLellan, K. O'Connor, H. Reed, A. Scharper, J. Shapiro, M. Spaventa, L. Stark, L. Vasquez, M. Wright

1. Approval of minutes from the November 3, 2009 CPC meetings.

All were in favor of accepting the minutes after several corrections were mentioned and acknowledged. No one was opposed, no one abstained.

Information Items

2. Full-time Faculty Obligation Fall 2009 Final and Fall 2010 Projected (attachments)
 - a. Superintendent/President Serban referred to the attached memo from the Chancellor's Office that stated that the Board of Governors did waive the Full-time Faculty Obligation for 2010. Serban continued to report on where the college stands in terms of the Full-time Faculty Obligation, FTES, workload reduction, and the reduction of sections in Fall 2009 and Spring 2010.
3. State Budget Update Nov 18, 2009
 - a. Superintendent/President Serban reported that the attached budget update had more informative detail than a previous update from the League. Serban stated that since this report is self-explanatory, she would not go over it; however, it is bleak as it can be at this point. Academic Senate President Alarcon observed that it is the same as last year, but with no one time solutions.
4. Estimated Employer PERS Contribution
 - a. Vice President Sullivan reported from this handout that states what the additional charges the District will be responsible for paying into PERS for the next three years. Sullivan stated that our PERS contribution rate, in round numbers, is about \$100,000 for

every ½% increase. He explained this further in detail saying it is a significant issue, especially since there are other areas the general fund money must cover.

Discussion Items

5. Updated Draft of Interim Educational Master Plan 2009-11
 - a. Executive VP Friedlander said that he is formally introducing the plan into the review process through our governance mechanisms in order to finalize it. Friedlander pointed out the main difference in the plan from what was previously discussed is the section entitled: ***Implications for the College to consider in its Planning Processes***. Friedlander gave an overview of the list of ten implications that the college needs to be aware of, to think about, discuss and to use as a guide in informing the next three year College Plan. This was discussed in detail.
 - b. The next step is to determine the time line that will lead this plan to our Board for approval.
 - c. There was further discussion about how to deal with the fact that the information extracted from the program reviews is no longer up-to-date in the Appendix. The latest program review information was not available until recently. The first 16 pages remain relevant, but the Appendix is not. This can easily be rectified if need be.
 - d. Serban and Friedlander clarified that this is the interim Education Master Plan that is actually augmenting the current College Plan in the area of how budgeting relates Facilities to Instructional programs and Student Support Issues.
 - e. Several suggestions were made about how to approach the program review information and how the Master Plan will be formatted, then the timeline was determined. After many ideas were presented and discussed, the timeline was set. The Interim Master Plan needs be ready to be presented to the Board at the March 11, 2010 Study Session.

6. Funding for Categorical Programs 2010-11 and beyond.
 - a. Superintendent/President Serban clarified that this is the beginning of several meetings to discuss funding categorical programs and stressed that there will be no decisions made at this time. Serban stated that today's discussion and information gathering will be from only a few of the Categorical Programs: Matriculation-Credit, DSPS, EOPS/CARE.
 - b. Superintendent/President Serban started with a recap of what has happened with categorical funding and reviewed information from the "slides" on the hand-out. The bottom line is that the reduction in State funding to all of our categorical programs is at 46%.
 - c. Serban stated that the slide summary of Categorical Funding for 2010-11 is proposed by the programs. This slide shows what was previously allocated from the General Fund and Additional General Fund money requested to run the programs which is a request for a total of \$1.3 million for the three programs which is what it would take to run these three programs at the same level they were run in 2009 – 10. This is a significant increase from what normally these programs have been given from the General Fund.

- d. Superintendent/President Serban reiterated that at this meeting the information will be presented, reviewed and questioned with the goal of understanding what is being asked for. Serban went on to say that at the December 1st meeting we need to start the conversation again about the minimum level of reserve that the college absolutely must maintain. Serban reiterated what CSEA President Auchincloss brought up at the last meeting: there needs to be a full picture of these various items that require General Fund Support from reserves. Serban requested that the CPC members have a relative understanding of the need versus what we have and what we can afford. Serban stated in the end we will be forced to make some hard choices and that not everything will be fully supported. She stated that this is not an all or nothing approach, but a somewhere in the middle approach.
- e. Superintendent/President Serban said that representatives from the three Programs funded by categorical funding will report on what they can reduce for 2010 – 11, what each program needs from the general fund and each area’s perspective of the consequences if they were not funded at the level they request.
- f. Director of EOPS/CARE, Marsha Wright reported from the EOPS handout. Wright stated that the EOPS staff spoke with the EOPS students to discern what services were most essential for them.
 - i. Wright reported that a number of areas had been scaled back including office hours.
 - ii. Book Grants, Tutoring, and Counseling/Advising were reported to be the most important in the eyes of the students.
 - iii. Childcare is an on-going challenge for single parents and EOPS is looking to the Foundation for support in that area. The students are paying 10% of their child care charges, which has resulted in a positive outcome as it makes the participating students more accountable. Wright stated that they have not dropped units, are completing their classes and doing better, plus their progress reports are looking better.
 - iv. The students reported to the EOPS staff that their greatest need for financial support is for their books. Wright reported that most of these students live below poverty level, even with financial aid. Wright reported what the Book Grant budget was last year, \$175,000 was cut from this year’s budget and changed how the book grants are awarded.
 - v. Wright reported that in order for EOPS to survive and provide core services with this reduced budget, is to reduce the number of students by 39.66%. That means EOPS will serve approximately 750 - 800 students instead of 1260 for 2010-11. Wright enumerated the consequences of doing that.
 - vi. Wright then answered questions regarding the Foundation contributions, what that money covers, plus clarification of numbers and how many students are served.
- g. Director of DSPS, Dr. Jan Shapiro gave an overview of DSPS history, the legal requirements, the critical number of staff to increased student ratio and the federally

mandated duties. Shapiro stated that the main reason for such an increase in the flux of students is basically the current economic situation. Shapiro reported from the handout: "Draft proposed 2010-2011 budget for DSPS".

- i. Most of the DSPS money is budgeted into nine full-time and two 60%-time salaries and the rest of the budget is designated for direct services for the students.
 - ii. The consequences of the cuts beyond what we have already cut, \$104,000, will jeopardize the college's legal compliance with ADA unless someone else picks up the work. If DSPS is not there, then the faculty has to take it on, leaving the college open to grievances which will cost even more money.
 - iii. Enumerated where the \$104,946 cuts were from.
 - iv. Superintendent/President Serban asked how other colleges are dealing with the categorical budget cuts, particularly in DSPS. Dr. Shapiro reported that other colleges started cutting services earlier, resulting in many students dropping out because they are not getting accommodations. It is a significant issue at a lot of campuses as to whether they will be able to stay in compliance with the Federal Mandates. Academic Senate Faculty Member Garey asked about the cost implications to the college if we fall out of compliance. Dr. Shapiro stated that since this program started at the college in 1977, there has never been a grievance with the office of Civil Rights. The costs would be huge as we all know the cost of attorneys. Executive VP Friedlander stated that the community colleges have requested more information from the Vice Chancellor of Student Services for specific guidance for what colleges can do in order to avoid legal issues regarding the Federal Mandates. The Vice Chancellor's office is consulting with the US Department of Education for more clarification. Dr. Shapiro stated that because this is such a serious legal issue, perhaps there will be a change made at the state level. Shapiro reported that the Student Senate Vice President of Senate Affairs, Atty Garfinkle wrote and submitted a resolution to the SS CCC to suggest and recommend to the Statewide Academic Senate, the Chancellor's Office and the Board of Governors that since the American Disabilities Act is an unfunded Federal Mandate that the Federal Government back-fill anything that the State cannot pay.
- h. Dean Keith McLellan reported from the Draft of Proposed 2010 – 2011 Budget for Credit Matriculation. McLellan pointed out details of the categorical allocation, the cuts, the savings and the department proposal for back-fill and reasons for it. McLellan then reported from the Credit Matriculation Planning Budget 2010-2011 narrative. McLellan stated that they are asking for \$9,000 more dollars in total budget compared to 2009-10 because of the requirement that they must provide these services with permanent employees as opposed to hourly employees, plus a bill for software that will come due next year. McLellan stated that they have cut where they could without having significant impacts on not just matriculation, but also the college. Matriculation serves all students. McLellan pointed out that it is not who matriculation serves, but how well

the college serves and in what area. McLellan spoke from his outline of seven components: Assessment, Orientation, Counseling/Advising, Follow-up, Pre-Requisite Management, Document Imaging, and Payroll Taxes for Hourlies, what the consequences would be if they did not get the general fund back-fill being requested: \$305,983. Certain aspects of each component were discussed and points to consider, plus other sources of funding were brought up.

7. Resource Requests Identified in Program Reviews (attachments). Superintendent/President Serban stated that she sent the Program Review spreadsheets to CPC members to look over and then requested that since, given the budget uncertainty and the reductions already in place, there will be no new full-time positions added next year, there is no need to rank the staffing requests. Serban stated that the focus needs to be on ranking facilities and equipment requests.
8. Criteria for Ranking Resource Requests Identified in Program Reviews (attachment). This will be discussed at a future meeting.

Academic Senate Member Garey made a motion to adjourn. Academic Senate Member Nevins seconded. Superintendent/President Serban adjourned the meeting.

Next meeting: Tuesday, December 1, 3:00-4:30pm A218C

**Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Tuesday, December 1, 2009
3:00 pm – 4:00 pm
A218C
Minutes**

PRESENT: A. Serban (Chair), I. Alarcon, L. Auchincloss, P. Bishop, S. Ehrlich, R. Else, J. Friedlander, T. Garey, A. Garfinkel, M. Guillen, K. Molloy, K. Monda, C. Salazar, J. Sullivan

ABSENT: O. Arellano, D. Nevins, N. Ridgell

GUESTS: K. McLellan, K. O'Connor, B. Partee, H. Reed, A. Scharper, J. Shapiro, M. Spaventa, L. Stark, M. Wright

Call to Order

1. Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order. Serban stated that due to the Thanksgiving Holiday the minutes from the Nov 24 meeting are not ready. They will be brought to the next meeting for approval.
2. Superintendent/President Serban formally welcomed Robert Else, the new Senior Director of Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning. He is a non-voting member of CPC and a resource for CPC.

Information Items

1. Williams-Corbett Foundation Funded a Grant for \$22,500 for the Partnership for Student Success/Gateway Program; Verizon Gave Another Grant for MESA for \$12,000.
 - a. Superintendent/President Serban stated that these two grants will make a difference in many students' lives.
 - i. The money from the Williams-Corbett Foundation will help Partnership for Student Success/Gateway Program. The funds need to be spent by this time next year.
 - ii. Verizon has given money for the MESA Program three years in a row. Superintendent/President Serban reminded CPC Members that the Mesa Coordinator position has been back-filled by General Fund money and Foundation money in the past. The Foundation for Santa Barbara City College has raised \$130,000 for MESA for 2009 – 10 and 2010 – 11. Serban reported further on the details of the funding of MESA. Because of the money raised by the Foundation, this year the position is fully

funded. In 2010-11, the coordinator position needs about \$10,000 from the general fund and Serban stated that given the efforts made through fundraising and the importance of the MESA program, we need to fund the remaining amount for 2010-11 from the general fund. The Foundation may raise the additional \$10,000 needed.

- iii. Serban stated that the decision to make a financial commitment to the MESA program coordinator position needs to be made by the end of January. At this time, it is on the table for CPC members to think about as there are many competing needs. Serban enumerated the reasons it is important to fund this position: 1. There is evidence of growth and success of this program which will be reported at the next CPC meeting, Dec 15th. 2. It is difficult to qualify for MESA money from the State, many colleges are still on the waiting list to become a MESA school. It took the college quite some time to qualify. 3. Local business have committed large sums of money to the Foundation for MESA, and for the college not to support this program would send a very bad message to the community. 4. The fact that the Foundation raised \$130,000 for MESA alone for 2009-10 and 2010-11 shows a significant effort and achievement, especially when at this time, fundraising is so difficult.
- iv. There was further discussion about the details of the \$10,000 that would cover the deficit for 2010 – 11 and the fact that it is now a national priority to increase the number of students who get degrees in Mathematics, Engineering and Science with an emphasis on underrepresented populations who usually pursue degrees in these fields.

2. Distance Education Workgroup (attachments).

- a. Superintendent/President Serban stated that she attached information about the Distance Education Workgroup to inform CPC members. The deliverables of this group will be discussed at CPC.
- b. Executive Vice President Friedlander spoke about how critically important distance education is at this point in time, how it accounts for 10% of the college's FTES and how in SBCC's College Plan it is stated that the college wants to go from a 6 to 12 totally online degree certificates. Friedlander spoke of the lessons learned from the HIT/CIM Program which is totally online.
- c. There was further discussion about Hybrid Classes, what percentage of total online classes is the college aiming for, the current demand for online classes in the private sector, the number of colleges and high schools with graduation requirements to take at least one online course because it has proven to be the kind of skill beneficial to student success.

3. Accreditation Visiting Team Evaluation Report Now Posted on College Web Site:
http://www.sbcc.edu/accreditation/files/Accreditation_Visit_Evaluation_Report_Nov2009.pdf
 - a. Superintendent/President Serban asked that the CPC members read the Accreditation Visiting Team Evaluation Report. The report and recommendations will be discussed during the spring semester. Serban stated that the official letter from ACJC regarding the college's accreditation should be received by the end of January.

Discussion Items

4. Considerations for Budget Development for 2010-11
 - a. Minimum Level of General Fund Reserves – Superintendent/President Serban stated that February 2010 will be the time when the definite commitments for building the 10 – 11 budgets need to be made. The General Fund Reserves at the end of 2008 – 09 were discussed and what was included and not included in that amount. Other questions were answered relating to the status of the Worker's Compensation Fund, the JPA (Joint Powers Authority), the fact that we are no longer self insured, the GASB (Government Accounting Standards Board) 45 obligation, further information on Fund 41 cost centers, endowments and other areas of the college accounts and budgeting. There were questions, answers and discussions regarding the consequences of the \$20 billion State deficit and what it means in terms of deferred payments to the college, and the fact that, fortunately, due to prudent fiscal management, our college did not have to borrow money and pay the high interest rates.
 - b. Minimum Level of Transfers into the Equipment and Construction Funds.
 - i. Superintendent/President Serban reminded the members that in 2008 – 09, \$500,000 was transferred into the Equipment Fund and in 2009 – 10 nothing was transferred in to the Equipment Fund. In normal years, we transferred at least \$1.5 million per year into the Equipment Fund. Serban stated that due to budget constraints, computers have not been replaced on a three or four cycle, as we used to, but rather on a 5-year cycle and that it is imperative that the college not go beyond the 5-year cycle for a variety of reasons. The reasons are: 1) up-to-date equipment including software is important for student success, 2) maintenance becomes expensive and 3) it would really take us backward significantly compared to the progress that we have made with the college. VP Bishop gave a "ballpark" figure for the cost of replacing computers on a 5 year cycle and that amount, \$600,000, Superintendent/President Serban suggested must to be transferred into the Equipment Fund. Additionally, money for replacement of non-computer equipment needs to be transferred as well.

- ii. Superintendent/President Serban reported the amounts requested from the Program Review Equipment Technology and non-Technology spreadsheets: a total of \$2.5 million.
 - iii. Superintendent/President Serban reported that only \$600,000 for 2009 – 10 was transferred into the Construction Fund, down from \$2 million/year that was transferred in prior years. This is partially due to the fact that Measure V funds have been utilized for some of the deferred maintenance projects that otherwise, in prior years, the college would have had to save money to make them happen. Serban reported that the \$600,000 was the minimum required for ongoing maintenance (which cannot legally be paid for with bond money) such as: pipes breaking, ceiling leaks, etc. that happen too frequently because of our aging infrastructure.
 - iv. Serban stated that the minimum amount the college needs to transfer into the Equipment fund is \$600,000 as well as \$600,000 into the Construction Fund. Further questions and discussions continued regarding daily on-going maintenance issues, legal use of Measure V money, and routine and non-routine replacement requests. The next step is to get the compilation of information regarding the non-routine replacement requests for the next CPC Meeting to understand where we are with that part.
- c. Other Costs/Programs Funded from General Fund Reserves
- i. Superintendent/President Serban stated that we need to have further discussions about categorical program costs that need to be funded from the General Fund Reserves, as well as the Partnership for Student Success and the increasing costs for the PERS contribution from employer that will increase each year. For 2010-11 the additional cost for the college is \$100,000 compared to 2009-10, for 2011-12 the additional cost is \$300,000 compared to 2009-10 and by 2012-13, the additional cost will be \$500,000 compared to 2009-10. Serban stated that there are some other costs that are unknowns that we need to discuss and be prepared for.
 - ii. Since there is no stability of funding through the state, things can get worse at any moment, so it is important to maintain a level of reserve that gives us a safety net like the one that has helped us be as stable as we are fiscally now. Serban stated that the additional \$4 million saved at the end of 2008-09 were the result of taking measures and actions to make it happen and the college needs to continue to be vigilant about it.
 - iii. The 5% required contingency fund: \$4.8 million is not even ½ of what it takes to pay a month's worth of salaries, benefits and fixed costs, should the school be hit with a significant reduction or with significant delays in funding.

5. Continued Discussion of Funding for Categorical Programs 2010-11 and Beyond –
Andreea Serban, Jack Friedlander, Joe Sullivan
 - a. Administrative Relief for Categorical Programs through 2012-13 (attachment)
 - b. Core Services to be Maintained and Maintenance Levels

Upon motion by Academic Senate Member T. Garey, seconded by VP P. Bishop, the meeting was adjourned

Next meetings: Tuesday, December 15, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C
Tuesday, January 26, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C

**Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Schedule of meetings Spring 2010**

All meetings are scheduled for 3:00-4:30pm in A218C unless otherwise noted

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

Tuesday, February 2, 2010

Tuesday, February 23, 2010

No meeting on March, 2010 – Superintendent/President Serban is chairing accreditation team visit at MiraCosta College during the first week of March

Tuesday, March 16, 2010

Tuesday, March 23, 2010 – **Proposed new meeting to replace the meeting on March 2**

Tuesday, April 6, 2010

Tuesday, April 20, 2010

Tuesday, May 4, 2010

Tuesday, May 18, 2010

ACCJC NEWS

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Fall 2009

Integrated Planning to Implement College Quality Improvement

Member institutions have been seeking more explanation of the ACCJC's requirement for **Integrated Planning**. Standard I.B.3 requires that institutions "assess progress toward achieving stated goals and make decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, **Integrated Planning**, resource allocation, implementation and re-evaluation." While many member colleges have developed sound means of evaluating institutional quality, some still lack the ability to make systemic plans for needed or desired changes, and keep the institution's work focused on implementing those planned changes.

At the simplest level, plans describe the pathway from a current institutional quality, condition, or outcome, to an envisioned quality, condition or outcome at some defined future date. Plans are the promise to change and to do something differently. They require institutional commitments of attention and resources if they are to be achieved. Beset by the requirements of various agencies (e.g., state systems, accreditors, bond or fundraising

Plans are the promise to change and to do something differently. They require institutional commitments of attention and resources if they are to be achieved.

campaigns) for different kinds of plans (strategic planning, tactical planning, enrollment planning, budget planning), institutions often have multiple plans, each targeting some part of institutional behavior but lacking alignment and cohesion to the other plans the institution has developed. Sometimes, the groups of individuals that develop various institutional planning documents are not aware of how their plan will fit with institutional priorities, but are simply hoping the existence of a plan will stimulate the institutional commitment. The result is institution-wide confusion about priorities, competition for institutional resources, and

failure to achieve important changes that the institution has identified as needed or desirable. Another result can be a distain among college constituencies toward both evaluation and planning activities.

When integrating plans and planning processes, a college must have a point in its decision-making process whereby it considers all of its plans, determines how to align them and which ones it will commit to, determines the sequence in which they might best be achieved, sets priorities, and allocates resources and responsibilities to achieve the needed changes by determined dates. Not all change-oriented actions need to be taken at the institutional level - many plans for change can be carried out at a departmental or unit level. Nevertheless, the institution needs to know about and make necessary commitments of resources to all the plans for improvement it has decided to advance. (The example of a new college library that stood empty for years because the institution had not planned to equip it comes to mind here.)

Integrated planning is neither top-down nor bottom-up; it is an interactive process in which an institution, through its governance processes, thoughtfully uses its values and vision to set priorities and deploy its resources and energies to achieve institutional changes and improvements at various levels of the organization in response to current or anticipated conditions. When institutions take a holistic, integrated approach to planning, they can find opportunities to combine and leverage plans, maximize effective use of resources as well as create more effective sequences for making changes. They may also find contradictions that need resolution - sometimes by the re-formulation or abandonment of some of the plans that were made. Actions determined through integrated planning bring the purpose of program review and evaluation alive and enable an institution to improve educational quality. ♦

ACCJC NEWS

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Summer 2009

Program Review and Institutional Quality

Program Review, which is required by the Higher Education Act that was passed in 1965, amended several times, and just renewed in fall 2008, is intended to engage colleges in a careful evaluation of how effective their educational and student support programs are, and how well students are succeeding. Colleges must use information gleaned from such on-going evaluation to make improvements to educational quality and student success.

Accreditation is higher education's system of quality assurance through self-regulation. Higher education is one of the few professions that is privileged to be self-regulating. Associated with this privilege is a belief that higher education professionals will care about, and will best know what to do about, improving student outcomes. A professional interest in maximizing student success is fundamental to the profession of college educators. Individual faculty members are often dedicated to assessing the effectiveness of their own courses in order to improve student outcomes, but program review is designed to engage the broader educational program and the institution in focusing on student success.

Educational Programs refers to the sequence of courses leading to a degree or certificate, such as the "liberal arts/transfer program" or the "nursing program," or the sequence of courses or learning activities leading to intellectual mastery, such as the Basic Skills course sequence leading to college readiness, the lifelong learning course sequence that enhances career and job skill set, etc.

Student Support Programs refers to non-instructional services, such as advising, counseling, learning resources, financial aid, tutoring, mentoring, etc., that facilitate student success and provide strategies for students to overcome the varied factors in life that may disrupt their education and reduce their success.

"The accreditation requirement that colleges review the quality of their programs and the student outcomes that result, and that colleges work to improve quality and student success, is the only acceptable response to the trust students and the public place in institutions that are accredited."

Student Success means the students' completion of a course of study (course sequence, a certificate, a degree) and movement to the progression of steps fundamental to their goals: job placement, passing the licensure exam, transfer to a four-year institution, or just success in life. Smaller steps on the path to program completion can also be important measures for some programs -- successful course completion, movement to the next course in a sequence, completion of general education requirements -- as attention to these measures gives an institution information about where students are successful (or unsuccessful) at finishing programs. These interim indicators also provide measures of student success for the many students who don't seek to complete degrees and certificates. The Commission's terminology for these measures of success is "student achievement."

In addition to the idea of "completion" of the course, course sequence, certificate or degree, student success is also measured by what students have learned - can they demonstrate knowledge by applying it, pass a standardized examination, perform the tasks a job requires, manage their time effectively, communicate clearly and effectively, etc. The Commission's terminology for this form of student success is "student learning outcomes."

Program Review, continued from page 1

The 2002 Standards of Accreditation ask colleges to identify intended student learning outcomes at the course, program and degree/certificate levels and to assess the degree to which students are learning.

Analyses of learning assessment data are meant to be added to program review so that institutions can examine and work to improve student achievement and student learning - both vital components of student success.

Students entrust their lives and their futures to the colleges they attend. They enter higher education expecting to learn, to obtain knowledge and skills that will improve their lives, and to earn the credentials that will allow them to move forward, personally, economically, and socially. The accreditation requirement that colleges review the quality of their programs and the student outcomes that result, and that colleges work to improve quality and student success, is the only acceptable response to the trust students and the public place in institutions that are accredited.

Pressure on institutions to improve student success will not subside. As evident from many speeches and comments on education in the United States, President Obama's agenda for higher education is to achieve many more college graduates by 2020 and to increase student "success." Staff appointed to the Department of Education, including Secretary Arne Duncan and Undersecretary Martha Kanter, refer to the agenda of the Obama administration as emphasizing student success and institutional accountability for student outcomes. Furthermore, the national higher education community is focusing more on measuring student outcomes and using the results to improve institutional effectiveness and student success.

The ACCJC requires its member institutions to develop and maintain the practice of regular and careful self-assessment and improvement (where needed) of educational quality and institutional effectiveness. Program review is central to institutional quality. ♦