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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To be written once report is approved
Chapter 1: Introduction

Los Angeles Valley College was founded on September 12, 1949 to meet the educational needs of the growing population of the San Fernando Valley during the 1940s and early 1950s. Los Angeles Valley College is located in the south-eastern quarter of the San Fernando Valley in Valley Glen, at the intersection of Fulton and Burbank Avenues. Enrollment in the fall 2008 term was 18,436 headcount students.

The College completed its Educational Master Plan in June 2008. As a result of that effort as well as other related research, the College sought to determine if opening educational sites would be appropriate for future investment as a means of providing greater access and opportunities for its service area population. This report is the result of that investigation and serves as an integral component of the overall Educational Master Plan.

As part of its master planning process, LA Valley College adopted new mission and vision statements. These statements guided the educational site planning process and will inform site operations.

Mission Statement

Los Angeles Valley College is a comprehensive community college located in the center of the San Fernando Valley. The College serves the community by providing transfer, degree, career-technical, foundational, transitional and continuing education programs in an attractive and accessible learning environment that fosters student success. Embedded in these programs are the greater goals of critical thinking and life-long learning which are necessary for success in the workplace and for advancing one’s education, personal development and quality of life.

The Los Angeles Valley College faculty and staff are dedicated to helping students be successful. They emphasize excellence in teaching and providing a variety of support services that are designed to meet students where they are and help them reach their personal and professional goals. Beyond the classroom, the College provides for students a variety of co-curricular activities that serve to create a rich campus life experience.

Los Angeles Valley College advances the economic development of the region
through programs, services and partnerships that address continuing and emerging employer needs in a diverse set of industries, including one of the largest concentrations of entertainment studios in the world.

Los Angeles Valley College hosts numerous cultural and athletic events throughout the year and serves as home to the San Fernando Valley Historical Museum.

The campus has a park-like quality, with a rich variety of trees selected by its founding faculty. As a result, the campus itself serves as a laboratory for learning and gives the College a special appreciation for the environment and issues of sustainability.

Vision Statement
Los Angeles Valley College serves the community as a leader in instructional excellence, facilitating the success of its diverse students, developing critical thinkers and life-long learners, and contributing to the economic and cultural vitality of the San Fernando Valley and beyond.

Educational Sites: What They Are and What They Do
Historically, community colleges have focused on building easily-accessible campuses where they can conveniently serve constituent populations. In many areas, this has necessitated extensive parking lots and large tracts of land. But with awareness of the need to develop more sustainable communities, the limited availability of land, and the challenges of transportation in large segments of the population, colleges have pursued a strategy of creating educational sites throughout their service areas as a way to make education more accessible and relevant to their constituents as well as to increase their enrollment opportunities.

Community colleges across California and the country have thus used the establishment of educational sites to build a bridge between a specific community or population and the college’s programs and services. These educational sites are used to extend the college’s reach, increase enrollment, and better serve area constituents.
It is common practice for community colleges to start with a limited selection of programs and courses at their educational sites. Most often, colleges aim for controlled growth and development and, as awareness of and interest in a site increases, add courses and programs based on demand.

*State-Sanctioned Educational Centers*

As an educational site grows, a college might consider pursuing the Educational Center designation. The State of California has set certain benchmarks that a community college must meet in order to qualify to apply for this State-sanctioned status. In order to be eligible to apply for the Educational Center designation, an off-campus site must enroll 500 FTES annually among other criteria (See Appendices A and B). If granted Educational Center status, a College becomes eligible to compete for State capital outlay funding to support the physical growth and development of the Center.

In order to receive ongoing budgetary support for operations, an Educational Center must enroll 1,000 FTES annually. According to the current Title 5 regulations, the 1,000 FTES threshold equates to $1 million in funding for a college.
Chapter 2: Strategic Research

The Strategic Research conducted for this project was broken into two primary activities – the External Scan and the Internal Scan. In the External Scan, these activities included analyses of:

- Data from the recent Kosmont Companies study of the Los Angeles Community College District
- General Characteristics of the Panorama City and Burbank communities
- Demographic data from the 2000 Census and recent administrations of the American Community Survey
- Interviews with external constituents
- Employment Projections
- Relevant research reports and data on economic development, changes in the population, etc.

In the Internal Scan, these activities included analyses of:

- Interviews with internal constituents
- 2008 Los Angeles Valley College Educational Master Plan

The findings of this research are presented in the following pages.
External Scan: Kosmont Data

The Los Angeles Community College District contains nine colleges and divides its territory into specific service areas for each of those educational entities. As part of its ongoing evaluation of services, the District periodically assesses the appropriateness of support for its overall population. One finding in a recent study of LACCD conducted by the Kosmont Companies determined that there were particularly large concentrations of underserved constituents in different parts of the District’s territory. Within the LA Valley College service area, they identified two primary concentrations of underserved individuals – one in Panorama City and one in Burbank.

This educational site analysis study focused on these two areas and was concerned with the perceived demand and viability of off-campus operations in one or both of these communities.
External Scan: General Characteristics of Panorama City
Panorama City, a neighborhood located in the City of Los Angeles, was developed as a planned community whose economic health was originally tied to a large General Motors assembly plant. The community is a mixture of single-family houses and low-rise apartment buildings.

In the Panorama City and immediately adjacent areas, there are approximately 12 proprietary schools (See Appendix C) that offer courses and programs similar to those offered at LA Valley College.

External Scan: General Characteristics of Burbank
Burbank, a city in Los Angeles County, is the home of many media and entertainment companies and their production facilities. Burbank includes five different United States postal service zip codes. Where Panorama City is a part of
the City of Los Angeles, Burbank is its own city and as such has its own government and elected officials.

Both Burbank and Panorama City were selected for study in this project because they were identified by the Kosmont Companies as communities in need of more focused attention from LA Valley College.

**External Scan: Demographic Research – Panorama City and Burbank**

For the purpose of this demographic analysis, Burbank is defined as consisting of five zip codes - 91501, 91502, 91504, 91505 and 91506. Panorama City is defined...
as consisting of one zip code, 91402. Los Angeles Valley College is located in zip code 91401 and is included in this analysis for comparison.

**Age and Racial/Ethnic Identity**

There are approximately 108,000 residents in Burbank and approximately 72,000 residents in Panorama City. Sixty-six percent of Burbank residents and 61% of Panorama City residents are between 18 and 64 years old. In Panorama City, 75% of residents are Latino, 11% are Asian or Pacific Islander, and 9% are White. In Burbank, 26% are Latino, 10% Asian or Pacific Islander, and 58% White.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Panorama City (91402)</th>
<th>Van Nuys (91401)</th>
<th>Burbank (5 zip codes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-64</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: United Way of Greater Los Angeles; Census 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Panorama City (91402)</th>
<th>Van Nuys (91401)</th>
<th>Burbank (5 zip codes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Other</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: United Way of Greater Los Angeles; Census 2000

**Educational Attainment and Annual Household Income**

Among residents 18 years of age and older, 64% in Panorama City hold a high school diploma or less as their highest educational attainment, 14% have attended some college, and 21% have either an Associate, Bachelor, or Graduate Degree. In
Burbank, 38% of the population has no college education, 25% have some college, and 37% have received an Associate Degree or higher. This equates to a little less than 27,000 individuals in Panorama City and 29,400 in Burbank aged 18 and older with no college experience.

Similar to most other statistical studies, household income fairly consistently reflects the general trend in educational attainment with 50% of the households in Panorama City reporting an annual income of less than $35,000 compared to 34% in Burbank. Translated into the number of individuals in these communities, approximately 24,000 adults aged 18 and over in Panorama City live in households with a total annual income of less than $35,000 while in Burbank approximately 29,000 people earn that same amount annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Panorama City (91402)</th>
<th>Van Nuys (91401)</th>
<th>Burbank (5 zip codes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Than H.S.</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Diploma</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>64%</strong></td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
<td><strong>38%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: United Way of Greater Los Angeles; Census 2000
### Annual Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Household Income</th>
<th>Panorama City (91402)</th>
<th>Van Nuys (91401)</th>
<th>Burbank (5 zip codes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $15,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$34,999</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong> (under $35,000)</td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
<td><strong>46%</strong></td>
<td><strong>34%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$49,999</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000+</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: United Way of Greater Los Angeles; Census 2000

### Language Spoken at Home

Reflecting the varied ethnic composition of the Panorama City, Van Nuys, and Burbank communities are the primary languages spoken at home. Residents of Panorama City report a greater percentage of Spanish spoken at home – 64% - compared to 21% in Burbank. In Burbank, English predominates in 57% of the homes compared to 20% in Panorama City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Panorama City (91402)</th>
<th>Van Nuys (91401)</th>
<th>Burbank (5 zip codes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pac Islander</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European (not Eng/Spanish)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: United Way of Greater Los Angeles; Census 2000

The sizable Philippine population in Panorama City contributes to the 11% Asian/Pacific Islander number.
In both Panorama City and Burbank, a case can be made that there are very significant population groups that could benefit economically from greater access to educational programs. This finding is further borne out by noticing the large number of for-profit educational institutions that have established operations in these areas indicating a substantial market for their services.

*External Scan: Interviews*

The STRATUS team interviewed in person and over the phone approximately 35 government, education, business, and community leaders for this project.

*External Scan: Interviews – Panorama City*

Panorama City boasts a new, active Neighborhood Council interested in improving educational and other opportunities for local residents. The area is also home to a newly-formed Business Improvement District (BID) that stands to receive $4.5 million in community redevelopment money for streetscape and other local improvements. Panorama City is home to a number of active, effective community service groups such as Meeting Every Need with Dignity (MEND), Casa Esperanza, and the Volunteers of America.

The population in Panorama City is young and diverse. There exists in the community a strong interest in redeveloping the area, and community members see the addition of a Valley College site as a welcome partner.

Generally speaking, Panorama City lacks a “college-going culture”. While graduating from college may be a goal of residents in the area, gaining access to college and being successful in college-level studies is perceived to be out of reach for many. Rather, going to college is perceived as being for people who are different than those who live in Panorama City.

To be successful in Panorama City, LA Valley College would be well advised to mount a grassroots, community-based marketing campaign, interfacing with community members in their places of worship, on the job, and in other public
arenas. The College should focus its courses and programs on developing skills applicable to the workforce and helping people to best translate what they learn in school into a fruitful career.

In addition to workforce development, the College should concentrate its curriculum on:

- Emerging fields such as those that train individuals to work in “green” jobs
- Remediation courses such as basic skills Math and English
- English as a Second Language courses, or courses that focus on the development of language and communication skills
- Courses that prepare individuals to work in any number of jobs in growth areas including healthcare, business, and childcare
- General education courses that will begin to prepare students for transfer to a 4-year college or university
- Courses that help individuals better manage their personal finances

Other areas of opportunity in Panorama City include a market for adult education and leisure courses. Also, offering as full a complement of Student Support Services as is feasible will be necessary for the site’s survival.

**External Scan: Interviews - Burbank**

Interviews with representatives from Burbank indicated a strong civic interest in locating an educational site for LA Valley College within the Burbank city limits. Burbank is a geographically-accessible city inhabited by a “college-minded” population. Community representatives indicated that there were strong potentials for partnerships and involvement with area businesses, entertainment unions, local public high schools, the Burbank Adult School (See Appendix D), and Woodbury University, all of which would greatly benefit the population of Valley College’s service area.

Initially, the College would be well advised to focus its programs and services in Burbank on the Media Arts and General Education. While the educational site
grows, adding courses in Credit ESL, Non-Credit Vocation Education, Extension, and Community Services Enterprise Programs would be a wise approach.

The possibility of locating an educational site in Burbank has been under consideration for many years, and it is generally perceived by community representatives as a very appropriate and welcomed undertaking. The Burbank Educational Site would have a strong level of support from the city government as well. Since many students from the Burbank community have traditionally attended Glendale College, there would be a critical need for effective marketing to support this endeavor.

**Internal Scan: Interviews – Los Angeles Valley College Faculty, Staff, and Administrators**

Even in light of the current budgetary situation for the College and the State of California in general, the STRATUS team found extensive support for establishing off-campus sites in both Panorama City and Burbank among the faculty, staff, and administrators at the College. The existence of Proposition J bond funding for acquisition of off-campus sites was recognized as a strong benefit and incentive.

**Educational Master Plan**

Planning for the development of educational sites was spawned in part by the completion of the most recent LA Valley College Educational Master Plan (EMP). Completed in June 2008, the plan created a road map for where the College wants to be and devised strategies to help reach those goals. It also provides means to measure success along the way. The EMP assists in decision-making, links budget and planning, and connects the different planning activities taking place at the College.

The EMP involved all areas of the campus community working together employing extensive strategic research to develop a new mission, vision, core commitments, goals, objectives, and strategies. As such, it serves for the near future as the foundational document for all subsequent planning efforts at the College.
The LA Valley College Educational Master Plan has 4 goals:
- Increase student retention, persistence, and success
- Increase student access
- Enhance academic programs and services to meet student needs
- Enhance institutional effectiveness

These goals contain 21 specific objectives and numerous strategies.

The EMP informs the Facility Master Plan and other college planning activities including planning for the utilization of bond funds for physical planning and construction.

As mentioned above, the establishment of educational sites can assist the College in working on all four of its goals by expanding educational opportunities to potential new students and investing in its role as a community servant. In this process it can be reasonably assumed that opening an off-campus educational site has the potential to enhance student success while enhancing the overall effectiveness of the institution. Establishment of new sites was also envisioned as a possibility within the recently-passed Proposition J construction bond funds which allocated $5 million to the acquisition of appropriate space for this function.

**Chapter 3. Educational Site Recommendations**

The following Educational Site Recommendations are intended to provide a “road map” for LA Valley College as it moves toward opening its off-campus educational sites in Panorama City and Burbank. The recommendations are presented in distinct time allotments meant to guide decision making about when to introduce different programs and services in the two selected communities. The time frames are:
- Short Term – 0 to 2 years
- Medium Term – 3 to 5 years
- Long Term – 6+ years
Note that these time frames begin once the College has procured and prepared the facilities that will be used to house its courses, programs, and services. In other words, year 0 begins when the College decides that it is ready to begin offering courses at the sites.

*Transportation*

Two key considerations in selecting an existing facility or suitable location for building the off-campus educational sites are proximity to transit lines and an adequate supply of on-site parking. Establishing a shuttle service between sites would serve to facilitate the movement of students, staff, faculty, and supplies and nearly eliminate the need for individuals to transport themselves from one point to another. One approximate route map could be:
Recommendations: Panorama City Educational Site

General Considerations
In the beginning, the Panorama City Educational Site should be focused on courses and programs in:

- English as a Second Language
- Non-Credit Vocational Education
- General Education
- Career Technical Education, and
- Extension.

As enrollments grow, courses and programs will be added as outlined below. Eventually, students would be able to complete selected Certificate programs at the Panorama City Educational Site where students interested in an Associate Degree or transfer would move to the main campus for additional coursework.

Location
Locating the Panorama City Educational Site within the newly-established Business Improvement District (BID) and as near as possible to public transit (Metrolink and bus lines) is advisable. Partnering with area businesses and allowing students easy access to transportation and other amenities such as food service will prove valuable to the site’s success.

Community Advisory Group
Establishing a Community Advisory Group to assist in guiding the growth of the educational site will be essential to the college’s success. Individuals asked to be part of the Community Advisory Group should represent the business, education, community, and economic leaders of the northeast and greater San Fernando Valley. These partnerships would help the college to become a trusted member of the community and build alliances to better serve its constituents. Also, this group could provide easy access to the many and varied active community organizations through which the College could market its programs and services.
Marketing
It is advisable that LAVC undertake an appropriately-targeted, i.e. bilingual, marketing and outreach program when spreading the word about the Panorama City site. This would ensure that information about the availability of courses and programs at the new site informs the intended audience and that information about interest in or demand for specific courses and/or programs is communicated from the community back to the College’s administration. Investing in this marketing effort should begin as soon as possible and certainly before the Panorama City site is established. This would allow for time to generate interest and awareness of the site and its programs and to permit potential students sufficient lead time for appropriate personal planning to facilitate their enrollment.

Childcare
Connecting students to low cost or, if possible, free childcare would be paramount to the site’s success. It is envisioned that this care would be outsourced to a local provider rather than supplied directly by the College. This aspect of the College’s operation in Panorama City will directly impact its success as many potential students need flexible, affordable childcare in order to attend college.

Business Services
Because there will be a need for cash transactions at the Panorama City site, it will be necessary to set up a system through which financial transactions can be handled on site. This will necessitate an on-site business officer on a rotating basis, at minimum.

Space
If developed as planned, the Panorama City Educational Site would generate approximately 185-220 class sections per year in the medium term. A reasonable scheduling system could accommodate 15 or more class sections in one classroom during the course of one week, translating into a requirement for 12 standard classrooms plus one large classroom. It is proposed that 2 additional standard classrooms be set aside for priority scheduling for Workforce Development and
Extension programs. As such, it is estimated that the following spaces would be needed for the medium term:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Rooms</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Stations/Room</th>
<th>ASF/Room</th>
<th>ASF/Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Standard Classrooms</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>16,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Large Class/Meeting Room (Divisible)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Computer Lab (Non-Class Lab)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Computer Class Lab (Schedulable)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General (Quiet) Study Area</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Group Study Area</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Gathering Area/Student Lounge (including tables &amp; chairs, outlets, vending services)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Faculty Office/Conference Rooms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tutoring/Conference Rooms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Controlled Access Storage (1 with Service Window)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site Administrator Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rotating Staff Offices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Security Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Business Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administration Reception/Work Area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administrative Conference room</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assessment Suite</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Office Suite-Extension</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Office Suite-Workforce Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Library Satellite</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Study Labs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assignable Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>34,945</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning/Short Term ASF Need (60%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Gross Square Feet (Medium Term)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48,617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Short Term (0 to 2 years)

Courses and Programs
LA Valley College should begin its Panorama City operation by relocating its non-credit ESL courses being taught currently at Panorama High School to the new site thereby reducing overall cost including rental fees and human resource demands.

In the short term, LA Valley College should offer the courses listed below at its Panorama City Educational Site.

English as a Second Language (ESL)
The College currently offers non-credit ESL courses at Panorama High School. Those courses should be moved to the new educational site and offered throughout day, evening, and weekend hours. Specific courses to be offered include:

- ESL 6CE
- ESL 7CE
- ESL 8CE
- ESL Civics 12CE
- Other courses to complete an ESL series, as necessary

Workforce Development - Job Training
Offering local residents the opportunity to develop a specific skill in a short-term program with the goal of improved employability should be one of the primary aims of the educational site in Panorama City. Job Training programs to offer at the site include:

- Healthcare Career Advancement Academy
- Workforce Readiness Programs
  - Customer Service
  - Computers in the Workplace
  - Blueprint for Workplace Success (pending State approval)
  - Thirty Ways to Shine (pending State approval)
  - Microcomputer Literacy (pending State approval)
General Studies
Additionally, providing a few courses that would appeal to those planning to earn an Associate Degree and/or to transfer could build enrollment at the site.

- Personal Development 1: Introduction to College
- Personal Development 4: Career Planning
- Basic Skills Math, e.g. Math 105 or Math 112
- Basic Skills English, e.g. English 21 or English 33
- Sociology, e.g. Sociology 1: Introduction to Sociology
- Psychology, e.g. Psychology 1: Introduction to Psychology
- Chicano Studies, e.g. Chicano Studies 2 or Chicano Studies 7

Career Technical Education
Offering introductory courses in different Career Technical Education areas such as Child Development, Computer Applications and Office Technology (CAOT), and Computer Science would be both popular and relevant at the site.

- Child Development, e.g. Child Development 1: Child Growth and Development
- Computer Applications and Office Technology, e.g. CAOT 2: Computer Keyboarding 2
- Computer Sciences, e.g. Computer Science 802: Introduction to Computer Science.

Extension
As the research above indicated, there is a great need in Panorama City and the greater Los Angeles area for well-trained individuals in certain fields including healthcare and legal services. Offering the programs below at the Panorama City Educational Site could serve to train individuals in the community for solid careers in these areas. While some may view these programs as too expensive to be viable at the community site, they are in fact much more affordable than the for-profit options discussed in the previous chapter and presented in Appendix C. The programs to be offered in Panorama City are:

- Paralegal
- Pharmacy Technician
• Clinical Medical Assistant
• Human Resources Academy

Academic Support and Student Services
Providing academic support and student services to best meet the needs of students enrolled at the educational site will be key to their success. While it would be ideal to allow access to the full complement of the College’s services at the center’s inception, it is advisable to start with rotating services.

Rotating Services
The services listed below would be offered on a rotating schedule at the site. Services would be scheduled as to facilitate the sharing of office space. For example, the counselor and Admissions and Records staff member would be on site at different times so that they could both work out of the same physical office space.

• Counseling: A counselor would work on site two days per week or, perhaps, for four half days per week.
• Admissions and Records: One Admissions and Records professional would travel to the site on a weekly basis to assist students with admissions processes. S/he would be responsible for transporting admissions-related forms between the main campus and the site for processing.
• Financial Aid: One Financial Aid professional would visit the educational site on a weekly basis to assist individuals with financial aid processes and forms. S/he would be responsible for transporting financial aid-related forms between the site and the main campus for processing.
• Bookstore: Books and supplies required for courses offered at the site would be made available to students in a temporary on-site bookstore. Bookstore staff members would bring materials to the site on a regular schedule to make books and supplies available for purchase.
• Tutoring: Students trained to work as math, writing, and language tutors would hold office hours at the educational site under the supervision of a faculty member. Individual tutoring lab directors on the main campus would
be responsible for scheduling tutors at the site as well as ensuring faculty supervision, and tutors would rotate through the site on a regular weekly schedule.

- DSP&S, CalWorks, EOP&S, Assessment, and other specialized programs: Representatives from these programs would visit the site on an as-needed basis – perhaps once weekly to start – to address students’ needs.
- Business Office and Services

**Permanent Spaces/Services**

- Computer Lab: The computer lab would be open for students taking online courses, for homework or study purposes, and for general computer access. The site administrator’s office would be connected to the computer lab as to provide some monitoring of this space.
- Study/Lounge: The lounge space would be available for students to meet, do homework, and relax. It would be equipped with basic vending machines, including one with school supplies such as Scantron sheets.

**Additional Site Services**

Additional services required to run the site in the short term include:

- Security: The educational site should be physically configured for controlled access and be served at all times by a professional security guard.
- Transportation: As mentioned above, the College should provide a shuttle service between the educational site and the main campus as well as provide for discounted mass transit passes.

**Staffing**

In the beginning, the site would be staffed primarily with part-time professionals (See Appendix E). The proposed staffing structure is:

**Full Time**

- Site Administrator: The site should be run by a full-time professional charged with all aspects of site management. This person would work closely
with campus resources and be held responsible for ensuring that students enrolled at the site get access to the programs and services they need.

- **Security:** The site must employ a full-time security guard who would be charged with maintaining the safety of the building, parking lot, and exterior grounds.

**Part Time**

- **Faculty:** Courses at the educational site will be taught primarily by adjunct faculty members. If scheduling permits, it is possible that a few faculty members who teach full-time would be asked to teach at the educational site on a rotating basis.

- **Counseling, Tutoring, Admissions and Records, Financial Aid, Bookstore, Technical Support, and Business Officer:** The services provided by these individuals are described above.

- **Maintenance and Operations**

**Assessment**

As the educational site grows and develops, the College will assess its progress, examine its enrollments, and make adjustments as necessary to stay focused on its goal for the site.

**Medium Term (3 to 5 years)**

**Courses and Programs**

Based on enrollments, demand, and performance assessment, growing the educational program at the site by adding sections of selected courses and programs housed there is advisable. These courses and programs include:

- ESL, both non-credit and credit courses
- Non-Credit Vocational Education
- Career Technical Education
- Workforce Development
- Extension
Foundational Skills

Ultimately, the College would like to encourage students enrolled at the educational sites to move beyond off-campus offerings and to the main campus. The foundational skills program should be configured in a way that encourages individuals to move through basic skills courses to eventually enroll in college-level work, e.g. Math 125 and English 101 at a minimum. As such, the College should invest heavily in growing its foundational skills offerings at the site.

General Studies

The College should grow its General Studies courses at the Panorama City Educational Site. It should add courses in a variety of areas such as:

- Administration of Justice
- Computer Applications and Office Technology
- Computer Science
- Commercial Music
- Music
- Business (Banking, Finance, etc.)
- Psychology
- Art
- Sociology
- Assorted courses in assorted disciplines that meet the IGETC and CSU transfer requirements

Child Development

Full programs in Child Development should be offered at the Panorama City site. Students should be able to start and finish the coursework required for a skills certificate in select Child Development programs.

Academic Support and Student Services

Growing the academic support and student services to keep pace with site enrollment will be crucial to its continued success.
Permanent Services and Spaces

- Counseling: A counselor would work at the site and be available to students on a full-time basis.
- Tutoring: A full complement of tutoring services would be offered at the site.
- Computer Lab
- Study/Lounge

Rotating Services

In the medium term, some academic support and students services would continue to be offered on a rotating schedule where others would become permanent at the Panorama City site. As with the short-term plan above, staff members providing service on a rotating basis would share space where permanent services would maintain permanent space.

- Admissions and Records and Financial Aid: The Admissions and Records and Financial Aid services would continue to be offered on a rotating basis.
- Bookstore: The bulk of the materials needed to participate in the courses and programs offered at the site would continue to be made available on a rotating basis. However, the bookstore would make regularly available via a service window items such as Scantron sheets for testing.
- DSP&S, CalWorks, EOP&S, Assessment, and other specialized programs: Representatives from these programs would visit the site on an as-needed basis to address students’ needs.
- Business Office and Services

Site Services

The site services appearing under the short-term listing above would be maintained and grown as demanded by increased enrollment at the site.

Staffing

Full Time

- Site Administrator – The site should continue to be run by a full-time professional who is charged with all aspects of site management. This
person would work closely with campus resources and be held responsible for ensuring that students enrolled at the site get access to the programs and services they need.

- **Security** – The site must employ a full-time security guard who would be charged with maintaining the safety of the building, parking lot, and other exterior grounds.
- **Counselor** - A counselor would provide comprehensive academic advising at the site and be available to students on a full-time basis.
- **Tutoring Coordinator** – A tutoring coordinator would work full-time at the site and supervise all tutoring functions including selecting, training and scheduling tutors, maintaining the lab, and offering a full complement of tutoring services.
- **Maintenance and Operations**

**Part Time**

- Faculty
- Admissions and Records, Financial Aid, Bookstore, Technical Support, Business Officer
- DSP&S, CalWorks, EOP&S, other specialized staff

**Assessment**

As the educational site grows and develops, the College will assess its progress, examine its enrollments and make adjustments as necessary to stay focused on its goal for the site.

**Long Term (6+ years)**

**Courses and Programs**

Given additional research and assessment, it is advisable that the College offer in the long term at the Panorama City Educational Site a blend of Career Technical Education, Job Training, General Education, and Extension courses. Ideally, students would be able to start and finish a number of CTE, Job Training, and
Extension courses at the site, but would still move to the main campus to complete Associate Degree requirements or to prepare for transfer.

**Academic Support and Student Services**
Growing the academic support and student services to keep pace with site enrollment will be crucial to its continued success.

**Permanent Services and Spaces**
- Counseling
- Tutoring: Growth in the tutoring program will likely require it to be split by discipline.
- Admissions and Records and Financial Aid: The Admission and Records and Financial Aid services would be offered on-site on a full-time basis.
- Bookstore: Books and supplies required for the courses being offered at the site would be made available full time.
- DSP&S staff and services would be made available full time, if needed.
- Computer Lab
- Study/Lounge

**Rotating Services**
In the long term, some academic support and students services would continue to be offered on a rotating schedule where others would become permanent at the Panorama City site. As with the short-term plan, rotating services would share space where the permanent services would maintain permanent space.

- CalWorks, EOP&S, and other specialized programs: Representatives from these programs would visit the site on an as-needed basis to address students’ needs.

**Site Services**
Site services listed above would be maintained and grown as demanded by enrollment increases.
Staffing

Full Time
- Site Administrator
- Administrative Assistant
- Security
- Counselor
- Tutoring Manager: A tutoring manager would oversee all tutoring functions including selecting, training and scheduling tutors, maintaining the lab, and offering a full complement of tutoring services.
- Tutoring Assistant: The tutoring assistant would be responsible for assisting the tutoring manager with running all aspects of the tutoring program.
- Maintenance and Operations
- Faculty
- Admissions & Records, Financial Aid, Bookstore, Tech Support, DSP&S (if necessary)
- Maintenance and Operations

Part Time
- Faculty
- CalWorks, EOP&S, and other specialized staff

Applying for State-Sanctioned Educational Center Status

Given the current interest and demand for services and programs in the Panorama City community, it is likely that the College will experience enrollments that will put it in a position to apply for State-sanctioned Educational Center status within the first 3 to 5 years of the site’s existence. This will depend, of course, on the College’s sustained marketing efforts, careful assessment, and continued planning.
Recommendations: Burbank Educational Site

General Considerations
In the beginning, the Burbank Educational Site would focus on the Media Arts and General Education. As enrollments grow, courses and programs will be added as outlined below. Eventually, students would be able to complete selected certificate programs at the Burbank Educational Site while students interested in earning an Associate Degree or to transfer would move to the Valley College main campus for additional coursework.

Location
Locating the Burbank Educational Site in downtown Burbank and as near as possible to public transit (Metrolink and bus lines) is advisable. Locating in this area and partnering with area businesses including food service while allowing students easy access to transportation will prove valuable to the site’s success.

Community Advisory Group
Establishing a Community Advisory Group to assist in guiding the growth of the educational site will be essential. Individuals asked to be part of the Community Advisory Group should represent the business, union, education, community and economic leaders of Burbank and the greater San Fernando Valley. Education and government leaders in Burbank are enthused about the prospect of hosting a site in the area, so asking for their ongoing support on an advisory board would likely be well received.

Being mindful of the curriculum being offered at the Garfield Campus of Glendale College (See Appendix F) would help to ensure that the Burbank Educational Site offers courses and programs that are unique in that geographic region.

Partnerships
Establishing an early partnership with the Burbank Adult School to ensure that the College’s courses and programs complement existing community services will be essential. Also, partnering with local labor unions such as the International Alliance
of Theatrical Stage Employees, Moving Picture Technicians, Artists and Allied Crafts (IATSE) to get access to entertainment industry internships and jobs as well as encourage union members to enroll in the site’s courses and programs will benefit the College and its students.

Marketing
Making community members and Burbank’s sizable workforce aware of the College’s presence in the community is essential to attracting enrollment to the new educational site. Investing in this marketing effort should begin as soon as possible and certainly before the Burbank site is established. This would allow for time to generate interest and awareness of the site and its programs and to permit potential students sufficient lead time for appropriate personal planning.

Business Services
Because it is likely that there will be a need for handing cash transactions at the Burbank site, it will be necessary to set up a system through which this can occur. This will necessitate an on-site business officer on a rotating basis, at minimum.

Space
If developed as planned, the Burbank Education Site would focus on the Media Arts and related areas. It would generate approximately 145 to 165 class sections per year in the medium term and would require additional specialized lab space. A reasonable scheduling system could accommodate fifteen (15) or more class sections in a room during the course of one week. This would translate into a requirement for 9 standard classrooms plus one large classroom. It is estimated that the following spaces would be needed for the medium term:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Rooms</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Stations/Room</th>
<th>ASF/Room</th>
<th>ASF/Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Standard Classrooms</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>10,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Large Class/Meeting Room (Divisible)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Computer Lab (Non-Class Lab)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Computer Class Lab (Schedulable)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General (Quiet) Study Area</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Group Study Area</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Gathering Area/Student Lounge (including tables &amp; chairs, outlets, vending services)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Faculty Office/Conference Rooms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tutoring/Conference Rooms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Controlled Access Storage (1 with Service Window)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site Administrator Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rotating Staff Offices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Security Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Business Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administration Reception/Work Area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administrative Conference room</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assessment Suite</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Media Arts Editing Labs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Media Arts Recording Studio/Screening Room (including Special Acoustic Isolation)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recording Control / Projection Studio</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Drawing / Animation Studio</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Library Satellite</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Study Labs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assignable Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>27,455</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beginning/Short Term ASF Need (60%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Gross Square Feet (Medium Term)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38,197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Short Term (0 to 2 years)

Courses and Programs

Media Arts
In the short term, the Burbank Educational Site would focus on offering on courses and programs in the Media Arts. To start, these courses would be offered on site:

- Broadcasting 1, Broadcasting 25, Broadcasting 26
- Media Arts 100
- Cinema 105, Cinema 107

General Studies
Additionally, providing courses that would appeal to those planning to earn an Associate Degree and/or to transfer would build enrollment at the Burbank site.

- Personal Development 1: Introduction to College
- Personal Development 4: Career Planning
- Basic Skills Math, e.g. Math 105 or Math 112
- Basic Skills English, e.g. English 21 or English 33
- Sociology, e.g. Sociology 1: Introduction to Sociology
- Psychology, e.g. Psychology 1: Introduction to Psychology
- Other selected GE courses

Academic Support and Student Services
Providing academic support and student services to best meet the needs of students enrolled at the educational site will be a key to their success. While it would be ideal allow access to the full complement of Valley College’s services at the center’s inception, it is advisable to start with rotating services.

Rotating Services
The services listed below would be offered on-site on a rotating schedule. Services would be scheduled as to facilitate the sharing of office space, e.g. the Counselor and Admissions and Records staff member would work on site at different times in shared office space.
• Counseling: A counselor would work on site one day per week or, perhaps, for two half days per week.
• Admissions and Records: One Admissions and Records professional would travel to the site on a weekly basis to assist students with admissions processes. S/he would be responsible for transporting admissions-related forms between the educational site and the main campus for processing.
• Financial Aid: One Financial Aid professional would visit the educational site on a weekly basis to assist individuals with the financial aid processes and forms. S/he would be responsible for transporting financial aid-related forms between the main campus and the site for processing.
• Bookstore: Books and supplies required for the courses being offered at the site would be made available at the beginning of each term or series of courses.
• Tutoring: Students trained to work as math, writing, and language tutors would hold office hours at the educational site under the supervision of a faculty member. Individual tutoring lab directors on the main campus would be responsible for scheduling tutors at the site as well as ensuring faculty supervision, and tutors would rotate through the site on a regular weekly schedule.
• DSP&S, CalWorks, EOP&S, Assessment, and other specialized programs: Representatives from these programs would visit the site on an as-needed basis – perhaps once weekly to start – to address students’ needs.

Permanent Spaces/Services

• Computer Lab: The lab would be open for students taking online courses, for homework or study purposes, and for general computer access. The site administrator’s office would be connected to the computer lab as to provide some monitoring of this space.
• Study/Lounge: The lounge space would be available for students to meet, do homework, and relax. It would be equipped with basic vending machines, including one dispensing basic school supplies and Scantron forms for testing.
Site Services
Additional services required to run the site in the short term include:

- Security: The educational site should be physically configured for controlled access served at all times by a professional security guard.
- Transportation: The College should provide a shuttle service between the Burbank Educational Site and the main campus as well as provide for discounted mass transit passes.
- Maintenance and Operations

Staffing
In the beginning, the site would be staffed primarily with part-time professionals (See Appendix G). The proposed staffing structure is:

Full Time

- Site Administrator – The site should be run by a full-time professional who is charged with all aspects of site management. This person would work closely with campus resources and be held responsible for ensuring that students enrolled at the site get access to the programs and services they need.
- Security – The site must employ a full-time professional security guard who would be charged with maintaining the safety of the building, parking lot, and grounds.

Part Time

- Faculty – Courses at the educational site will be taught primarily by adjunct faculty members. If scheduling permits, it is possible that a few faculty members who teach full-time would be asked to teach at the educational site on a rotating basis.
- Counseling, Tutoring, Admissions and Records, Financial Aid, Bookstore, Technical Support – The services provided by these individuals are described above.
- Maintenance and Operations
Assessment
Throughout each time period outlined in this memo, the College should assess its progress, examine its enrollments, and make adjustments as necessary to stay focused on its goals for the Burbank Educational Site.

Medium Term (3 to 5 years)

As part of its medium-term goals, the College would turn its attention to developing partnerships to grow the Burbank site. These include:

- Explore a partnership with Woodbury University to provide general education and entry-level courses to select majors such as graphic design. Using the existing Woodbury model as a guide (Woodbury architecture and a San Diego-area community college), devise a partnership in which Valley College students could automatically matriculate into selected Woodbury programs upon completing their general studies and introductory coursework.

- Grow the partnership with the Burbank Adult School to ensure that courses, programs, and services offered at the Burbank facility continue to complement those offered through the Adult School.

- Form partnerships with entertainment industry unions such as IATSE to gain access to internship and job opportunities for Media Arts and other interested students as well as to encourage working professional to take courses at the Burbank site.

Courses and Programs
In the medium term, the College would consider offering a wider range of courses and programs at its Burbank educational site.
Media Arts
In additional to the courses listed in the previous section, the College would look to add courses as to make it possible to start and finish the Occupational Certificate Requirements in Media Arts at the Burbank site. This would involve offering courses in the Directing, Screenwriting, Producing, and Post-Producing areas. Ideally, students’ experiences in the Media Arts at the Burbank site would encourage them to continue their education at the main campus.

General Studies
Adding General Education courses that would continue to best serve those planning to earn an Associate Degree and/or to transfer to a 4-year institution would build enrollment at the site. Courses in any number of disciplines from the sciences to math and foreign language could work, depending on student demand and ongoing College research.

Job Training
In the medium term, the College should plan to introduce specialized training for employees in the entertainment industry. Courses might include computer software or other advanced skills training.

Community Programs
Because Burbank has an active older population, LAVC would consider offering some lifelong learning courses at the Burbank site in the medium term. The courses could range in topic from basic computer skills to dance courses to advanced software. To be a good community partner, these courses should complement the existing courses at Burbank Adult School and those offered through the Burbank Parks and Recreation Department.

Academic Support and Student Services
Growing the academic support and student services to keep pace with site enrollment will be crucial to the College’s continued success.
Permanent Services and Spaces

- Counseling: A counselor would work at the site and be available to students on a full-time basis.
- Tutoring: A full complement of tutoring services would be offered at the site.
- Computer Lab
- Study/Lounge

Rotating Services

While some services would become permanent in the medium term, some academic support and student services would continue to be offered on a rotating schedule. As with the short-term plan, rotating services would share space where permanent services would maintain permanent space.

- Admissions and Records and Financial Aid: The Admissions and Records and Financial Aid services would continue to be offered on a rotating basis.
- Bookstore: The bulk of the materials needed to participate in the courses and programs offered at the site would continue to be made available on a rotating basis. However, the bookstore would make regularly available via a service window items such as Scantron sheets for testing.
- DSP&S, CalWorks, EOP&S, Assessment, and other specialized programs: Representatives from these programs would visit the site on an as-needed basis to address students’ needs.

Site Services

Site services listed above would be maintained and grown as demanded by enrollment increases.

Staffing

As in the short-term plan, staffing the site would be handled by both full- and part-time professionals.
Full Time

- Site Administrator – The site should continue to be run by a full-time professional who is charged with all aspects of site management. This person would work closely with campus resources and be held responsible for ensuring that students enrolled at the site get access to the programs and services they need.

- Security – The site must employ a full-time security guard who would be charged with maintaining the safety of the building, parking lot, and grounds.

- Counselor - A counselor would provide comprehensive academic advising at the site and be available to students on a full-time basis.

- Tutoring Coordinator – A tutoring coordinator would work full-time at the site and supervise all tutoring functions including selecting, training and scheduling tutors, maintaining the lab, and offering a full complement of tutoring services.

- Maintenance and Operations

Part Time

- Faculty

- Admissions and Records, Financial Aid, Bookstore, Technical Support, Assessment

- DSP&S, CalWorks, EOP&S, other specialized staff

Assessment

Throughout each time period outlined in this memo, the College should assess its progress, examine its enrollments, and make adjustments as necessary to stay focused on its targets.

**Long Term (6+ years)**

Courses and Programs

Given additional research and assessment, it is advisable that the College offer a blend of General Education, lifelong learning, and other courses and programs in the long term. Ideally, students would be able to start and finish a number of
programs at the site, but would still move to the main campus to complete Associate Degree requirements or to prepare for transfer.

It may be worthwhile to investigate the feasibility of locating the College’s Institute for Developing Entertainment Arts and Studies (IDEAS) activities at the Burbank site.

**Academic Support and Student Services**
Growing the academic support and student services to keep pace with site enrollment will be crucial to its continued success.

**Permanent Services and Spaces**
- Counseling
- Tutoring: A full complement of tutoring services would be offered at the Burbank site. Growth in the tutoring program will likely require it be split by discipline in the long term.
- Admissions and Records: The Admissions and Records services would be offered full time.
- Financial Aid: The Financial Aid services would be offered full time.
- Bookstore: Books and supplies required for the courses being offered at the site would be made available full time.
- DSP&S staff and services would be made available full time, if needed.
- Computer Lab
- Study/Lounge

**Rotating Services**
In the long term, some academic support and students services would continue to be offered on a rotating schedule where others would become permanent at the Burbank site. As with the short-term plan, rotating services would share space where the permanent services would maintain permanent space.
• CalWorks, EOP&S, Assessment, and other specialized programs: Representatives from these programs would visit the site on an as-needed basis to address students’ needs.

Site Services
Site services listed above would be maintained and grown as demanded by enrollment increases.

Staffing
Full Time
• Site Administrator
• Administrative Assistant
• Security
• Counselor
• Tutoring Coordinator: A tutoring manager would oversee all tutoring functions including selecting, training, and scheduling tutors and maintaining the lab(s).
• Tutoring Assistant: The tutoring assistant would assist the Tutoring Coordinator in managing all aspects of the tutoring program.
• Maintenance and Operations
• Faculty
• Admissions & Records, Financial Aid, Bookstore, Tech Support, DSP&S (if necessary)
• Maintenance and Operations

Part Time
• Faculty
• CalWorks, EOP&S, Assessment, and other specialized staff

Applying for State-sanctioned Center Status

Given the current interest and demand for services and programs in the Burbank community, it is likely that the College will be in a position to apply for State-
sanctioned Educational Center status within the first 3 to 5 years of the Burbank site’s existence. This will depend, of course, on the College’s sustained marketing efforts, careful assessment, and continued planning.
Chapter 4. Expected Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES)

Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) in this particular use is a statistic that takes the number of credit hours and estimates an equivalent number of students if they were all taking a standard, full-time class load. It is based on the Weekly Student Contact Hours for class meetings times the number of weeks (17.5) and divided by a constant (525). As an example, a 5-hour class with 40 students generates 200 WSCH (the FTES calculation is therefore: 200 WSCH x 17.5 weeks / 525 = 6.67 FTES). Community colleges are funded based on WSCH and FTES. Consequently, generation of WSCH and FTES depend on enrolling students in classes, but can be generated regardless of whether or not the class grants academic credit, thus large non-credit courses such as ESL can be expected to generate significant FTES.

**Expected FTES: Panorama City Educational Site**

*Short Term*

The LA Valley College Panorama City Educational Site is expected to initially focus on training students to master basic or college preparatory language and math skills and to provide a number of opportunities for short-term certificates and credentials. Non-credit ESL courses would be a prominent initial offering for generating FTES. A limited number of general education courses would also be offered as a means of introducing students to college-level subjects.

In addition to ESL, basic skills math and English, and some general education courses, many of the Computer Applications and Office Technology (CAOT), Child Development, and the newly-developed Customer Services classes would be offered (especially where they lead to certificates).

Based on the FTES generated from similar on-campus programs, a fairly rich initial offering as described above of between 125 and 150 class sections averaging 35 students each could be expected to generate between 530 and 630 FTES.
Extension courses and Workforce Development programs would also be expected to be very well-received in the Panorama City market, meriting both some administrative office space and priority scheduling in two classrooms (see chart on page 24 for recommendation on types and amounts of space at this site).

Medium to Long Term
Because of the high population density in the Panorama City area, this site has the potential for rapid expansion, especially in general education courses. Working in a greater number of traditional college-type programs (as well as other basic educational courses depending on demand) could be expected to permit the Panorama City site to offer within five years between 185 and 220 class sections averaging 40 students each. If enrollment efficiencies increase as anticipated and the section offerings increase as envisioned, the Panorama City site could generate between 900 and 1,075 FTES in that time frame.

Once the site generates 1,000 FTES on an annual basis, it would be eligible to apply for additional permanent funding advantages (See Appendix A and Appendix B).

Expected FTES: Burbank Educational Site

Short Term
The proposed Burbank Educational Site is focused primarily on Media Arts and related courses. Other recommended course offering at this site include Basic Skills English and math, credit ESL, and general education.

Based on the FTES generated from similar on-campus programs, a fairly rich initial offering as described above of between 100 and 120 class sections averaging 35 students each could be expected to generate between 425 and 510 FTES.

Medium to Long Term
The medium to long term prospects in Burbank would also generate additional demand calling for 145 to 165 class sections averaging 40 students each within five
years. If expansion proceeds as in this scenario, the Burbank site could be generating 700 to 800 FTES on an annual basis.

Burbank too has the potential to exceed 1,000 FTES per year and thus become eligible to apply for additional permanent funding, but it may take slightly longer due to the particular mix of courses that would be offered.
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Summary

Among the statutory responsibilities of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is the review of proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers of the State’s public higher education institutions.

The Commission has periodically reviewed and revised its guidelines for reviewing these proposals in order to streamline and clarify the review and approval process.

The Commission adopted these new guidelines at its April 8, 2002, meeting. This report has been added to the Commission’s Internet website -- www.cpec.ca.gov -- and is now electronically accessible to the general public. Additional copies of this and other Commission reports may also be obtained by e-mail at PublicationRequest@cpec.ca.gov; or by writing the Commission at 1303 J Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, Ca. 95814-2938; or by telephone at (916) 322-9268.
Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational and Joint-Use Centers

A Revision of the Commission’s 1992 “Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational Centers”
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Introduction

The State of California requires new public institutions of higher education to be reviewed by the California Postsecondary Education Commission prior to their establishment. The purpose of the State’s review process is to help ensure that new university and college campuses and off-campus centers develop in accordance with statewide needs and priorities and to ensure that State capital outlay funds will be wisely spent. California law requires the California Postsecondary Education Commission to advise the Legislature and the governor regarding the need for and location of new public higher education institutions and requires sites for new campuses or educational centers to be recommended by the Commission prior to their acquisition or authorization.

This document establishes the State's process for the review of proposed university campuses, community colleges, and educational centers. The Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational and Joint-Use Centers provides campus planners and executives with a framework for planning new institutions and an outline for the development of proposals requiring review.

The Commission's role in overseeing the orderly growth of California's public higher education can be traced to the inception of the State's Master Plan for Higher Education. This document assigned to the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and to its predecessor, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, the responsibility for advising the Legislature about the need for new college and university campuses and off-campus centers. While the governor and the Legislature maintain the ultimate authority to fund such new institutions, they have relied on the Commission's analysis and recommendations in making such decisions. The Commission's function as a statewide planning and coordinating agency for higher education makes it uniquely qualified to provide independent analysis of the costs and benefits of proposed projects and it has played an important role in ensuring that new campuses develop as viable, high quality institutions.
Section 66903(e) of the California Education Code states that the California Postsecondary Education Commission shall "advise the Legislature and the Governor regarding the need for, and location of, new institutions and campuses of public higher education." Section 66904 of the Education Code expresses the intent of the Legislature that the sites for new institutions or branches of public postsecondary education will not be authorized or acquired unless recommended by the Commission:

It is the intent of the Legislature that sites for new institutions or branches of the University of California and the California State University, and the classes of off-campus centers as the Commission shall determine, shall not be authorized or acquired unless recommended by the Commission.

It is further the intent of the Legislature that California Community Colleges shall not receive State funds for acquisition of sites or construction of new institutions, branches or off-campus centers unless recommended by the Commission. Acquisition or construction of non-State funded community colleges, branches and off-campus centers, and proposals for acquisition or construction shall be reported to and may be reviewed and commented upon by the Commission.

Education Code Section 89002 applies specifically to the California State University (CSU) and specifies that construction of authorized campuses shall commence only upon resolution of the CSU trustees and approval by the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

The review process

The State’s review process not only helps to ensure that new campuses and off-campus centers develop in accordance with statewide needs and segmental long-range planning goals, but also helps to ensure that State capital outlay funds will be wisely spent.

Proposals submitted for review by the Commission also involve review by system executive offices and State control agencies. Each review plays an important role in ensuring that the proposed institution meets specific needs, will be financially viable, will offer high quality educational services, and will have enrollments sufficient to sustain the project in the long-term.

System executive offices must approve proposals before they are submitted to the Commission for review. The Commission will not review proposals that have not been endorsed by the system governing body or its executive. Proposals involving State capital outlay or operating funds also require review by the Department of Finance through the Budget Change Proposal process, although it is important to note that Commission approval of a new institution creates only an eligibility to compete for State capital outlay funding - not an entitlement - regardless of
whether that funding comes from a statewide bond issue, the General Fund, or some other State source. Requests for funding related to planning, developing, or constructing new campuses or educational centers may not be supported by the Department of Finance prior to review by the Commission.

The statutes that support the Commission’s guidelines have a long and consistent history dating back to the development of the Master Plan for Higher Education in California in 1960. Section 66903(e) has remained essentially unchanged since the Donahoe Act created the Commission's predecessor agency, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, in 1961. That legislation gave the Council several specific responsibilities, including the review of new programs, the collection of data and information regarding higher education, and of greatest interest to these guidelines, the regulation of physical growth. In this way, the Legislature could receive advice from the Council - and subsequently the Commission - regarding the expenditure of scarce capital outlay resources.

Prior to 1974, the Coordinating Council provided broad advice on long-range planning matters, and "the need for and location of new institutions" of higher education. The Council conducted statewide planning studies, examined enrollment growth and fiscal resources, and suggested not only the number of new campuses that might be required in future years, but also the general locations where they might be built. These statewide planning assessments were contained in a series of reports referred to as the "additional center studies" (CPEC 99-2). The Coordinating Council engaged in this broad, long-range planning responsibility independently of any proposal for a specific new campus or educational center.

When the California Postsecondary Education Commission was established in 1974, the Legislature specified a stronger role for the Commission with regard to its responsibility to advise the governor and the Legislature about the need for and location of new institutions. The intent language of Education Code Section 66904 gave the Commission a stronger role in overseeing the growth of California's public postsecondary institutions and gave the Commission more direct responsibility to review specific proposals from each of the three public systems.

Since the Donahoe Act was passed, the Commission's quasi-regulatory responsibilities have been formalized by the guidelines contained in this document. These guidelines do not directly affect the Commission's responsibility to review new academic programs, which is often undertaken independently of the review of new institutions.

The Commission first adopted policies relating to the review of proposed campuses and educational centers in 1975. The Commission revised those policies in 1978 and 1982. The most recent revision to those policies occurred in 1992 and is contained in the Commission's publication,
Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational Centers (CPEC, 92-18). The guidelines specify the proposals subject to Commission review, the criteria for reviewing proposals, the schedule to be followed by the three public systems when submitting proposals, and specify the contents required of a Needs Study. The guidelines define the criteria by which Commission staff members analyze new campus proposals, focusing particularly on the issues of enrollment demand, geographic location and access, programmatic alternatives, projected costs, potential impacts on the surrounding community, and neighboring institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy assumptions used in developing the guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The following policy assumptions are central to the development of the guidelines that the Commission uses in reviewing proposals for new campuses and educational centers:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. It is State policy that each resident of California who has the capacity and motivation to benefit from higher education will have the opportunity to enroll in an institution of higher education. The California Community Colleges shall continue to be accessible to all persons at least 18 years of age who can benefit from the instruction offered, regardless of district boundaries. The California State University and the University of California shall continue to be accessible to first-time freshmen among the pool of students eligible according to Master Plan eligibility guidelines. Master Plan guidelines on undergraduate admission priorities will continue to be: (a) continuing undergraduates in good standing; (b) California residents who are successful transfers from California public community colleges; (c) California residents entering at the freshman or sophomore level; and (d) residents of other states or foreign countries.

2. The differentiation of function among the systems with regard to institutional mission shall continue to be as defined by the State's Master Plan for Higher Education.

3. The University of California plans and develops its campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of statewide need.

4. The California State University plans and develops its campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of statewide needs and special regional considerations.

5. The California Community Colleges plan and develop their campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of local needs.

6. Planned enrollment capacities are established for and observed by all campuses of public postsecondary education. These capacities are determined on the basis of statewide and institutional economies, community and campus environment, physical limitations on campus size, program requirements and student enrollment levels, and internal or
ganization. Planned enrollment capacities are established by the governing boards of community college districts (and reviewed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges), the Trustees of the California State University, and the Regents of the University of California.

7. California’s independent institutions, while not directly affected by the guidelines, are considered an integral component of California’s system of higher education and offer a viable educational opportunity for many Californians.

8. Needs Studies developed pursuant to Letters of Intent submitted to the Commission prior to April 10, 2002, shall be prepared in accordance with the informational requirements specified in the August 1992 edition of the Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational and Joint-Use Centers.

As used in these guidelines, "institution" refers to an educational center, a community college, a university campus, or a joint-use educational center but not an off-campus center operation or a joint-use center operation. Once approved by the Commission, institutions are eligible to compete for State capital outlay funding through the State’s budget change proposal process. For the purposes of these guidelines, the following definitions shall apply:

**Grandfathered Institution (all systems):** A “Grandfathered Institution” is a community college, a university campus, or an educational center operated by a community college district, the California State University, or the University of California that has been formerly recognized by the Commission as an approved location in previously published reports. Each grandfathered location must have continuously enrolled students since its approval by the Commission. Locations approved by the Commission prior to the effective date of these guidelines shall continue to be eligible for State capital outlay funding.

**Off-campus Center Operation (all systems):** An off-campus operation is an enterprise, operated away from a community college or university campus established to meet the educational needs of a local population, which offers postsecondary education courses supported by State funds, but which serves a student population of less than 500 Fall-Term FTES at a single location.

**Educational Center (California Community Colleges):** An educational center is a Commission approved off-campus operation owned or leased by the parent district and administered by a parent community college. An educational center offers instructional programs leading (but not limited to) to certificates or degrees conferred by the parent institution. An approved educational center must enroll a minimum of 500 Fall term FTES in the most recently completed Fall-term prior to the approval of
the Commission and maintain an on-site administration (typically headed by a dean or director, but not a president, chancellor, or superintendent).

The Commission recognizes community college educational centers offering both credit and noncredit instructional programs that advance the State’s economic development and accordingly, community college districts may seek approval of such educational centers if they serve the required enrollment levels specified above. The noncredit instructional services provided at such educational centers must be consistent with the authorized instructional offerings specified in the California Education Code Sections 70900 through 78271 and Sections 78400 through 88551. Community college educational centers offering only community services courses as defined in Section 78300 of the California Education Code shall not qualify for Commission review.

**Educational Center (The California State University):** An educational center is an off-campus enterprise owned or leased by the Trustees and administered by a parent State University campus. An educational center will normally offer courses and programs only at the upper-division and/or graduate levels, however the center may offer lower division courses under exceptional circumstances, and only in collaboration with a community college, or by special permission of the Commission. Certificates or degrees earned must be conferred by the parent institution. An educational center must enroll a minimum of 500 Fall-term FTES and maintain an on-site administration (typically headed by a dean or director, but not by a president). Educational operations in other countries, states, and the District of Columbia shall not be regarded as educational centers for the purposes of these guidelines, unless State funding is used.

**Educational Center (University of California):** An educational center is an off-campus enterprise owned or leased by the Regents and administered by a parent University campus. The center will normally offer courses and programs only at the upper division and/or graduate levels, but may offer lower division courses under exceptional circumstances, and only in collaboration with a community college, or by special permission of the Commission. An educational center must enroll a minimum of 500 Fall-Term FTES and maintain an on-site administration (typically headed by a dean or director, but not by a chancellor). Certificates or degrees earned must be conferred by the parent institution. Organized Research Units (ORU’s) and the Northern and Southern Regional Library Facilities shall not be regarded as educational centers. Educational operations in other countries, states, and the District of Columbia shall not be regarded as educational centers unless State funding is used.

**Community College (California Community Colleges):** A regionally accredited, degree and certificate granting institution offering a full complement of lower-division programs and services, usually at a single campus location owned by the district. A community college must enroll a minimum of 1,000 Fall-term FTES in the most recently completed Fall-
term prior to the approval by the Commission. A community college that has been converted from an educational center must have 1,000 Fall-term FTES. A community college must have its own freestanding administration headed by a President and support services, and be capable of passing accreditation by its fifth year of operation.

**University Campus (University of California and The California State University):** A regionally accredited, degree-granting institution offering a full complement of services and programs at the lower division, upper division, and graduate levels, usually at a single campus location owned by the Regents or the Trustees. A university campus must enroll a minimum of 3,000 Fall-Term FTES within five years of the date classes are first offered if it is a new institution. A university campus that has been converted from an educational center must have 3,000 FTES within five years of the opening date. A university campus will have its own freestanding administration headed by a president or chancellor.

**Joint-use Center Operation (all systems):** A joint-use center operation is an enterprise operated away from a community college or university campus where facilities and operations are shared by two or more of the following segments: California Community Colleges, the California State University, the University of California, California public high schools, and Independent California Colleges and Universities. A joint-use center operation serves the educational needs of a local population and enrolls a student population of less than 500 Fall-term FTES. Joint-use center operations may be established on sites operated by participating segments. For example, a California State University campus may construct or remodel facilities at a site operated by a community college for purposes of establishing a joint-use center operation.

Joint-use center operations shall not be subject to review by the Commission. However, a joint-use center operation that enrolls more than 200 Fall-term FTES must submit a Preliminary Notice as defined on page 34 of the Guidelines.

**Joint-use Educational Center:** A public higher education enterprise where facilities and operations are shared by two or more of the following segments: California Community Colleges, The California State University, the University of California, California public high schools, and Independent California Colleges and Universities. A joint-use educational center may seek programs of study that are subject to all normal review processes of the California Postsecondary Education Commission. Joint-use educational centers may be owned or leased, but administrative responsibility must be exercised by one of the three public systems of higher education. Regardless of operational control, a joint-use educational center must enroll a minimum of 500 Fall-term FTES in the most recently completed Fall-term prior to the approval by the Commission.
The following transactions are subject to review by the Commission:

- Proposals for establishing a new university or community college campus
- Proposals for converting an educational center to a university or community college campus
- Proposals for establishing a university or community college educational center
- Proposals for converting an off-campus operation to an educational center
- Proposals for joint-use educational centers.

The Commission may review and comment on other projects consistent with its overall State planning and coordination role.

The Commission's review process is organized in three phases. The first occurs when an institution or system advises the Commission, through a "Preliminary Notice" that it is engaging a planning process that may include the development of one or more institutions in specified regions. The second occurs when the system notifies the Commission of a specific need for and intention to expand educational services in a given area. This "Letter of Intent" stage permits the Commission to recommend against a proposal or provide advice before the system engages in significant planning and development activities and signals the point at which systems may be eligible to compete for funding to assist in programmatic planning efforts. The third stage of the review process involves a “Needs Study”, in which the system submits a formal proposal that provides findings from a comprehensive needs analysis for the project.

At the conclusion of the review process, the Commission forwards its recommendations to the Office of the Governor, the Legislature, and the system executive office.
New University or Community College Campuses

The process for each public higher education system to establish a new university or community college campus, as defined in the definitions section of the guidelines, is as follows:

1. Preliminary Notice

At such time as a public higher education system, including a community college district, begins a planning process to establish a new community college or university campus, the governing board of the system or district shall forward to the Commission a Preliminary Notice of the planning activities. This Preliminary Notice shall indicate:

- The general location of the proposed new institution,
- The type of institution under consideration and the estimated timeframe for its development,
- The estimated enrollment of the institution at its opening and within five years of operation,
- A tentative five-year capital outlay plan, and
- A copy of the agenda item wherein the new site is discussed by the local district (California Community College) or statewide governing board (University of California or California State University), if any.

A Preliminary Notice represents an informational process, and does not require formal consideration or approval by the Commission.

2. Letter of Intent

New University of California or State University Campuses

Not less than five years prior to the time it expects its first capital outlay appropriation for the new university campus, the University of California Regents or the California State University Trustees should submit a Letter of Intent meeting the requirements below, to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst).

A complete Letter of Intent for a new university campus must contain the following information:
♦ A preliminary 10-year enrollment projection (headcount and FTES) for the new university campus (from the campus's opening date), developed by the systemwide central office. The systemwide central office may seek the advice of the Demographic Research Unit (DRU) in developing the projection, but DRU approval is not required at this stage.

♦ The geographic location of the proposed campus in terms as specific as possible. A brief description of each site under consideration should be included.

♦ The identification of neighboring public and independent institutions in the area in which the proposed university campus is to be located.

♦ Maps of the area in which the proposed university campus is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, road and highway configurations, airports and any other features of interest.

♦ A time schedule for development of the campus, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, intermediate, and final build out stages.

♦ A tentative five-year capital outlay budget beginning with the date of the first capital outlay appropriation.

♦ A copy of the resolution by the Regents or the Trustees authorizing the new campus.

The Executive Director of the Commission shall respond to the chief executive officer, in writing, no later than 60 days following submission of a complete Letter of Intent to the Commission. The Executive Director may raise concerns about shortcomings or limitations in the Letter of Intent that need to be addressed in the planning process. If the plans appear to be reasonable, the Commission's Executive Director will advise the systemwide chief executive officer to proceed with development plans.

*New California Community Colleges:*

A Letter of Intent provides an overview of the district plans regarding a new community college and explains, in general terms, how the facility’s programs and services relate to other approved locations in the district. Not less than two years before it expects its first capital outlay appropriation for a new community college, the community college district should submit a Letter of Intent meeting the requirements below, to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (with copies to the Commission, Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst). Upon completing its review, the Board of Governors, or the Chancellor, if so delegated by the Board, will forward its recommendation to the Commission, with copies to the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst. The Commission will not act on a Letter of Intent submitted by a local community college.
district prior to its approval by the Board of Governors or the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges.

A Letter of Intent for a new community college must contain the following information:

♦ A preliminary 10-year enrollment projection of enrollment headcount and FTES attendance for the new community college (from the college's opening date), developed by the district and/or the Chancellor's Office. The district and/or the Chancellor's Office is encouraged to seek the advice of the Demographic Research Unit (DRU) in developing the projection, but DRU approval is not required at this stage.

♦ The geographic location of the new community college in terms as specific as possible. A brief description of each site under consideration should be included.

♦ The identification of neighboring public and independent institutions in the area in which the proposed community college is to be located.

♦ Maps of the area in which the proposed new community college is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, road and highway configurations, airports, and any other features of interest.

♦ A time schedule for development of the new community college, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, intermediate, and final build out stages.

♦ A copy of the district's most recent five-year capital construction plan.

♦ A tentative five-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation (State and local).

♦ A copy of the resolution by the district governing board authorizing the new community college.

The Commission Executive Director shall respond to the Chancellor, in writing, no later than 60 days following submission of the completed Letter of Intent to the Commission. The Commission Executive Director may in this process raise concerns about shortcomings or limitations in the Letter of Intent that need to be addressed in the planning process. If the plans appear to be reasonable, the Commission's Executive Director will advise the Chancellor that the district should move forward with further development plans.
3. Needs Study

The purpose of a Needs Study is to demonstrate need for the proposed college or university campus at the location identified. A Needs Study is considered complete only when it fully addresses each of the criteria listed below.

3.1 General Description and Overview

An opening section that includes: A general description of the proposal, a physical description of the site, and a social and demographic analysis of the surrounding area. Data describing the socioeconomic profile of the area or region should be included, with income levels and racial/ethnic categorizations provided. Inclusion of various descriptive charts, tables, or other displays is encouraged.

3.2 Enrollment projections

♦ Enrollment projections must be sufficient to justify the establishment of the new campus. For a proposed new community college or university campus, enrollment projections for the first ten years of operation (from opening date) must be provided.

♦ The Demographic Research Unit (DRU) of the Department of Finance must approve enrollment projections. As the designated demographic agency for the State, the DRU has the statutory responsibility for preparing systemwide enrollment projections. For a proposed new institution, the DRU will approve all projections of undergraduate enrollment developed by a systemwide central office of one of the public systems or by the community college district proposing the new institution. Enrollment projections developed by a local community college district must be approved by the Chancellor's Office. Upon request, the DRU shall provide the system with advice and instructions on the preparation of enrollment projections.

♦ Undergraduate enrollment and attendance projections for a new institution shall be presented in terms of Fall-Term headcount and Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES). Enrollment projections for California Community Colleges should also include Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH) and WSCH per headcount student.

♦ A discussion of the extent to which, in quantitative terms, the proposed campus will increase systemwide or district capacity and help meet statewide and regional enrollment demand.

♦ Graduate and professional student enrollment projections shall be prepared by the system office proposing the new institution. In preparing these projections, the specific methodology and/or ra-
tionale generating the projections, an analysis of supply and demand for graduate education, and the need for new graduate and professional degrees must be provided.

♦ For a new University of California campus, statewide enrollment projected for the University should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing University campuses and educational centers. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the University system, compelling statewide needs for the establishment of the new university campus must be demonstrated.

♦ For a new California State University campus, statewide enrollment projected for the State University system should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing State University campuses and educational centers. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the system, compelling regional needs must be demonstrated.

♦ For a new community college campus, enrollment projected for the district proposing the college should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges and centers. Compelling regional or local need must be demonstrated if the district enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges or centers.

3.3 Alternatives

♦ Proposals for new institutions should address at least the following:

(1) the impact of not establishing a new campus;
(2) the possibility of establishing an educational center instead of a university or college campus;
(3) the expansion of existing institutions within the region;
(4) the increased utilization of existing institutions, particularly in the afternoons and evenings, and during the summer months;
(5) the shared use of existing or new facilities and programs with other postsecondary education institutions, in the same or other public systems or independent institutions;
(6) the use of nontraditional instructional delivery modes such as television, computerized instruction, instruction over the Internet, and other "distributed education" modes and techniques; and
(7) financing the institution through private fund raising or donations of land or facilities.
A cost-benefit analysis of alternative sites, including a consideration of alternative sites for the new institution, must be articulated and documented. This criterion may be satisfied by the Environmental Impact Report, provided it contains a comprehensive analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative sites. Overall, the proposal must demonstrate substantial analytical integrity with regard to the site selection process.

Where a four-year system, or a community college district, already owns - or will have received as a donation - the site on which a new institution is proposed to be located, and has not considered other sites, a strong justification for "sole-sourcing" the site in question must be included. Options to be discussed should include the sale of a donated site, with the resulting revenue used to purchase a better site, or an alternative delivery system such as a collaboration with another public or private institution or organization.

3.4 Academic Planning and Program Justification

The proposal must include a preliminary description of the proposed academic degree programs, along with a description of the proposed academic organizational structure. This description must demonstrate conformity with the Commission’s academic program review guidelines and with such State goals as access, quality, intersegmental cooperation, and the diversification of students, faculty, administration, and staff.

The Needs Study must show evidence of a process leading to full institutional accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and provide an estimated timeline for attaining accreditation by WASC within a reasonable period of time following the opening of the campus.

3.5 Student Services and Outreach

The proposal for the new institution must include a description of the student services planned for the new campus including student financial aid, advising, counseling, testing, tutoring, educational opportunity programs, compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and outreach services to historically underrepresented groups and how these programs will be sustained over time.

3.6 Support and Capital Outlay Budget Projections

The proposal must include a 10-year capital outlay projection that includes the total Assigned Square Feet (ASF) anticipated to be
required for each year of the projection period, with estimates of the average cost per ASF.

- The proposal must include a five-year projection of anticipated support costs including administration, academic programs (including occupational/vocational as appropriate), academic support, and other standard expense elements.

### 3.7 Geographic and Physical Accessibility

- The proposal must include a plan for student, faculty, and staff transportation to the proposed campus and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Reasonable commuting times must be demonstrated.

- Plans for student and faculty housing, including projections of needed on-campus residential facilities should be included if appropriate.

### 3.8 Effects on Other Institutions

- The proposal must provide evidence that other systems, institutions, and the community in which the new institution is to be located were consulted during the planning process, especially at the time that alternatives to expansion were explored. Strong local, regional, and/or statewide interest in the proposed facility must be demonstrated by letters of support from responsible agencies, groups, and individuals.

- The proposal must identify the potential impact of the new facility on existing and projected enrollments in neighboring institutions of its own and other systems.

- The establishment of a new community college must not reduce existing and projected enrollments in adjacent community colleges either within the district proposing the new community college, or in adjacent districts, to a level that will damage their economy of operation, or create excess enrollment capacity at these institutions, or lead to an unnecessary duplication of programs.

### 3.9 Environmental Impact

The proposal must show evidence that the system or district is engaged in a process leading to an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), pursuant to Section 21080.09 of the Public Resources Code. The proposal must include a discussion of any potentially significant environmental effects of the proposed campus. The proposal must include
a discussion of the seismic and safety conditions of the site and the site-specific and cumulative impacts of full build-out of the proposed campus. Upon request, the system governing board shall provide the Postsecondary Education Commission with detailed sections of the Draft or Final EIR.

3.10 Economic Efficiency

The Commission encourages economic efficiency and gives priority to new institutions where the State of California is relieved of all or part of the financial burden. When such proposals include gifts of land, construction costs, or equipment, a higher priority shall be granted to such projects than to projects where all costs are born by the State, assuming all other criteria listed above are satisfied. A similar priority shall be given to collaborative efforts in underserved regional areas of the State as determined by the Commission.

The Commission Executive Director shall certify to the system chief executive officer, in writing and within 60 days, that it is complete, or that it requires further input, elaboration, or adjustment. If it is incomplete, the Commission Executive Director shall indicate the specific deficiencies involved. When the Commission Executive Director has certified that all necessary materials for the Needs Study have been received, the Commission has 12 months to take final action to approve or disapprove the new institution.

Once the Commission has taken action on the proposal, its Executive Director will notify the system executive officer, appropriate legislative committee chairs, the Department of Finance, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst.
The Conversion of an Educational Center to a University or Community College Campus

EDUCATIONAL CENTERS generally offer a limited complement of academic programs that serve the needs of a community. Many student services, such as outreach efforts, disability support services, counseling, etc., are not fully supported. At lower enrollment levels, there are usually too few students to generate enough demand for these services. As enrollment levels increase, however, demand for support services and expanded academic programs also increase. The conversion of an educational center to a university or community college campus usually occurs at a point in time in which there is sufficient demand to justify the expansion of educational and support services, and enrollments are adequate to support the costs of a freestanding administration.

The process for each public higher education system to convert an educational center to a university or community college campus is as follows:

1. Preliminary Notice

At such time as a public higher education system, including a community college district, begins a planning process to establish a new community college or university campus, the governing board of the system or district shall forward to the Commission a Preliminary Notice of the planning activities. This Preliminary Notice shall indicate:

- The general location of the proposed new institution,
- The type of institution under consideration and the estimated timeframe for its development,
- The estimated enrollment of the institution at its opening and within five years of operation,
- A tentative five-year capital outlay plan, and
- A copy of the agenda item wherein the new site is discussed by the local district (California Community College) or statewide governing board (University of California or California State University), if any.

A Preliminary Notice represents an informational process, and does not require formal consideration or approval by the Commission.
2. Letter of Intent

University of California or State University:

Not less than three years prior to the time it expects to convert an educational center to a university campus, the University of California Regents or the California State University Trustees should submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a Letter of Intent.

The Letter of Intent for the conversion of an educational center to a university campus should contain the following information:

♦ A 10-year enrollment history (headcount and FTES) of the educational center, or the complete enrollment history, if the center has been in operation for less than 10 years.

♦ A preliminary 10-year enrollment projection (headcount and FTES) for the new campus (from the campus's opening date), developed by the system office. The system office may seek the advice of the Demographic Research Unit (DRU) in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage.

♦ Maps of the area in which the proposed university campus is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, road and highway configurations and any other features of interest.

♦ A time schedule for converting the educational center and for developing the new university campus, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, intermediate, and final build out stages.

♦ A tentative five-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation for the new university campus.

♦ The identification of neighboring public and independent institutions in the area in which the proposed university is to be located.

♦ A copy of the resolution by the Regents or the Trustees authorizing conversion of the educational center to a university campus.

The Commission Executive Director shall respond to the chief executive officer, in writing, no later than 60 days following submission of the completed Letter of Intent to the Commission.

The Commission's Executive Director will advise the system chief executive officer to move forward with site acquisition or to develop plans. The Commission Executive Director may in this process raise concerns about shortcomings or limitations in the Letter of Intent that need to be addressed in the planning process. If the Commission Executive Director is unable to approve the Letter of Intent as submitted, he or she shall indicate to the chief executive officer the specific reasons why the Letter of
Intent is incomplete prior to notifying the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst.

California Community Colleges:

Not less than two years prior to the time it expects to convert an educational center to a community college campus, a district should submit a Letter of Intent (with copies to the Commission, Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) to the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges. Upon completing its review, the Board of Governors, or the Chancellor, if so delegated by the Board, will forward its recommendation to the Postsecondary Education Commission. The Commission will act on a Letter of Intent only after it has been approved by Board of Governors or the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges.

The Letter of Intent to convert an educational center to a community college campus should contain the following information:

- A 10-year enrollment and attendance history (headcount and FTES) of the educational center, or the complete enrollment history, if the center has been in operation for less than 10 years.
- A preliminary 10-year enrollment and attendance projection (headcount and FTES) for the proposed campus (from the campus’s opening date), developed by the district or the Chancellor’s Office. The Chancellor’s Office may seek the advice of the Demographic Research Unit (DRU) in developing the projection.
- Maps of the area of the proposed campus indicating population densities, topography, and road and highway configurations and any other features of interest.
- A time schedule for converting the educational center and for developing the campus, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, intermediate, and final build out stages.
- A tentative five-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation for the proposed campus.
- The identification of neighboring public and independent institutions in the area in which the proposed campus is to be located.
- A copy of the letter from the Chancellor’s Office approving the Letter of Intent.

The Commission Executive Director shall respond to the Chancellor, in writing, no later than 60 days following submission of the completed Letter of Intent to the Commission. If the plans appear to be reasonable, the Commission’s Executive Director will advise the Chancellor to move forward with site acquisition or further development plans. The Commission Executive Director may in this process raise concerns about short-
comings or limitations in the Letter of Intent that need to be addressed in the planning process. If the Executive Director is unable to approve the Letter of Intent as submitted, he or she shall indicate to the chief executive officer the specific reasons why the Letter of Intent is incomplete.

3. Needs Study

The Needs Study provides the findings from a comprehensive needs analysis for the project. The purpose of a Needs Study is to provide evidence of the need for and location of new institutions and campuses of public higher education. A Needs Study is considered complete only when it fully addresses each of the criteria listed below.

Upon receipt of a Needs Study, the Executive Director shall certify to the systemwide chief executive officer, in writing and within 60 days, that it is complete, or that it requires additional information. If it is incomplete, the Executive Director shall indicate the specific deficiencies involved. When the Commission Executive Director has certified that all necessary materials for the Needs Study have been received, the Commission, within 12 months, will approve or disapprove the new institution.

The Commission Executive Director will notify the system executive officer, appropriate legislative committee chairs, the Department of Finance, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst.

A Needs Study for the conversion of an educational center to a university or community college campus should contain the following information:

3.1 General Description and Overview

The opening section of the Needs Study must include: A general description of the proposal, a brief history of the center, a physical description of the site, and a social and demographic analysis of the surrounding area. Data describing the socioeconomic profile of the area or region should be included, with income levels and racial/ethnic categorizations provided. Inclusion of various charts, tables, or other displays is encouraged.

3.2 Enrollment Projections

- Enrollment projections must be sufficient to justify the establishment of the new campus. For a proposed new community college or university campus, enrollment projections for the first ten years of operation (from opening date) must be provided.

- The Demographic Research Unit (DRU) of the Department of Finance must approve enrollment projections. As the designated demographic agency for the State, the DRU has the statutory responsibility for preparing systemwide enrollment projections. For a proposed new institution, the DRU will approve all projections
of undergraduate enrollment developed by a system office of one of the public systems proposing the new institution. Enrollment projections developed by a local community college district must be approved by the Chancellor's Office. Upon request, the DRU shall provide the system with advice and instructions on the preparation of enrollment projections.

♦ Undergraduate enrollment and attendance projections for a new institution shall be presented in terms of Fall-Term headcount and Fall-Term Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES). Enrollment projections for California Community Colleges should also include Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH) and WSCH per headcount student.

♦ A discussion of the extent to which, in quantitative terms, the proposed campus will increase systemwide or district capacity and help meet statewide and regional enrollment demand.

♦ The educational center's previous enrollment history, or the previous 10 year's history (whichever is less) must also be provided.

♦ Graduate and professional student enrollment projections shall be prepared by the system office proposing the new institution. In preparing these projections, the specific methodology and/or rationale generating the projections, an analysis of supply and demand for graduate education, and the need for new graduate and professional degrees must be provided.

♦ For a new University of California campus, statewide enrollment projected for the University should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing University campuses and educational centers. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the University system, compelling statewide and/or regional needs for the establishment of the new university campus must be demonstrated.

♦ For a new California State University campus, statewide enrollment projected for the State University system should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing State University campuses and educational centers. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the system, compelling regional needs must be demonstrated.

♦ For a new community college campus, enrollment projected for the district proposing the college should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges and centers. Compelling regional or local need must be demonstrated if the district enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges or centers.
3.3 Alternatives

♦ Proposals for new institutions should address at least the following alternatives:

(1) the possibility of maintaining an educational center instead of a university or college campus;
(2) the expansion of existing institutions within the region;
(3) the increased utilization of existing institutions, particularly in the afternoons and evenings, and during the summer months;
(4) the shared use of existing or new facilities and programs with other postsecondary education institutions, in the same or other public systems or independent institutions;
(5) the use of nontraditional modes of instructional delivery such as television, computerized instruction, instruction over the Internet, and other "distributed education" modes and techniques; and
(6) private fund raising or donations of land or facilities for the proposed new institution.

♦ A cost-benefit analysis of alternatives, including a consideration of alternative sites for the new institution, must be articulated and documented. This criterion may be satisfied by the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), provided it contains a comprehensive analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative sites. Overall, the system proposing the new institution must demonstrated substantial analytical integrity with regard to the site selection process.

♦ Where a four-year system, or a community college district, already owns - or will have received as a donation - the site on which a new institution is proposed to be located, and has not considered other sites, a strong justification for "sole-sourcing" the site in question must be included. Options to be discussed should include the sale of the site, with the resulting revenue used to purchase a better site, or an alternative delivery system such as a collaboration with another public or private institution or organization.

3.4 Academic Planning and Program Justification

♦ The proposal must include a preliminary description of the proposed academic degree programs, along with a description of the proposed academic organizational structure. This description must demonstrate conformity with the Commission’s academic
program review guidelines and with such State goals as access, quality, intersegmental cooperation, and the diversification of students, faculty, administration, and staff.

♦ The Needs Study must show evidence of a process leading to full institutional accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and provide an estimated timeline for attaining accreditation by WASC within a reasonable period of time following approval of the institution.

### 3.5 Student Services and Outreach

The proposal for the new institution must include a description of the student services planned for the new campus including student financial aid, advising, counseling, testing, tutoring, educational opportunity programs, compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and outreach services to historically underrepresented groups and how these programs will be sustained over time.

### 3.6 Support and Capital Outlay Budget Projections

♦ The proposal must include a 10-year capital outlay projection that includes the total Assigned Square Feet (ASF) anticipated to be required for each year of the projection period, with estimates of the average cost per ASF.

♦ The proposal must include a five-year projection of anticipated support costs including administration, academic programs (including occupational/vocational as appropriate), academic support, and other standard expense elements.

### 3.7 Geographic and Physical Accessibility

♦ The proposal must include a plan for student, faculty, and staff transportation to the proposed campus and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Reasonable commuting times must be demonstrated.

♦ Plans for student and faculty housing, including projections of needed on-campus residential facilities should be included if appropriate.

### 3.8 Effects on Other Institutions

♦ Provide evidence that other systems, institutions, and the community in which the new institution is to be located were consulted during the planning process, especially at the time that alternatives to expansion are explored. Strong local, regional, and/or state-
wide interest in the proposed facility must be demonstrated by letters of support from responsible agencies, groups, and individuals.

♦ The conversion of an educational center to a university campus must take into consideration the impact of the expansion on existing and projected enrollments in neighboring institutions of its own and other systems.

♦ The conversion of an educational center to a community college must not reduce existing and projected enrollments in adjacent community colleges either within the district proposing the new community college, or in adjacent districts, to a level that will damage their economy of operation, or create excess enrollment capacity at these institutions, or lead to an unnecessary duplication of programs.

3.9 Environmental Impact

The proposal must include a copy of the Summary Draft or Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the site or the project. The system board shall provide the Commission with detailed sections of the Draft or Final EIR upon request.

3.10 Economic Efficiency

The Commission encourages economic efficiency and gives priority to new institutions where the State of California is relieved of all or part of the financial burden. When such proposals include gifts of land, construction costs, or equipment, a higher priority shall be granted to such projects than to projects where all costs are born by the State, assuming all other criteria listed above are satisfied. A similar priority shall be given to new campuses that engage in collaborative efforts with other segments to expand educational access in underserved regions of the State as determined by the Commission.
University or Community College
Educational Centers

THE PROCESS for each public higher education system to establish a new educational center, as defined in the definitions section of the guidelines, is as follows:

1. Preliminary Notice

At such time as a public higher education system, including a community college district, begins a planning process to establish a new educational center, a new community college, or a new university campus, or to convert an educational center to a community college or university campus, the governing board of the system or district shall forward to the Commission a Preliminary Notice of the planning event. This notice shall indicate only the general location of the proposed new institution, the type of institution under consideration, the estimated enrollment size of the institution at its opening and within five years of operation, and a copy of the agenda item discussed by the local district or system governing board, if any. A Preliminary Notice shall represent only an informational process, and will not require formal consideration or approval by the Commission.

2. Letter of Intent

University of California and the California State University

Not less than two years prior to the time it expects the first capital outlay appropriation for the new educational center, the University of California Regents or the California State University Trustees should submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a Letter of Intent.

A Letter of Intent to establish a new educational center should contain the following information:

- A preliminary five-year enrollment and attendance projection (headcount and FTES) for the new educational center (from the center's opening date), developed by the system office, including itemization of all upper-division and graduate enrollments. The system office may seek the advice of the Demographic Research
Unit (DRU) in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage.

♦ When converting an off-campus operational center to an educational center, the enrollment history of the off-campus operation.

♦ The geographic location of the new educational center in terms as specific as possible. A brief description of each site under consideration should be included.

♦ Maps of the area in which the proposed educational center is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, road and highway configurations and any other features of interest.

♦ A time schedule for development of the new educational center, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, intermediate, and final build out stages.

♦ A tentative five-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation.

♦ A copy of the resolution by the Regents or the Trustees authorizing the new educational center.

♦ The identification of neighboring public and independent institutions in the area in which the proposed university campus is to be located.

The Commission Executive Director shall respond to the chief executive officer, in writing, no later than 60 days following submission of the completed Letter of Intent to the Commission. If the plans appear to be reasonable, the Commission’s Executive Director will advise the system chief executive officer to move forward with site acquisition or further development plans. The Commission Executive Director may in this process raise concerns about shortcomings or limitations in the Letter of Intent that need to be addressed in the planning process.

If the Commission Executive Director is unable to approve the Letter of Intent as submitted, he or she shall, within 30 days, indicate to the chief executive officer the specific reasons why the Letter of Intent is incomplete.

*California Community Colleges*

Not less than two years prior to the time it expects to convert an off-campus center operation to a community college educational center, a district should submit a Letter of Intent (with copies to the Commission, Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) to the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges. Upon completing its review, the Board of Governors, or the Chancellor, if so delegated by the Board, will forward its recommendation to the Commission, with copies to the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst.
A Letter of Intent to establish a new community college educational center should contain the following information:

- A preliminary five-year enrollment projection and attendance (headcount and FTES) for the new educational center (from the center's opening date), developed by the district and/or the Chancellor's Office. The Chancellor's Office may seek the advice of the Demographic Research Unit (DRU) in developing the projection, but DRU approval is not required at this stage.

- When converting an off-campus operational center to an educational center, the enrollment history of the off-campus operation.

- The location of the new educational center in terms as specific as possible. A brief description of each site under consideration should be included.

- Maps of the area in which the proposed educational center is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, road and highway configurations and any other features of interest.

- A copy of the district's most recent five-year capital construction plan.

- A time schedule for development of the new educational center, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, intermediate, and final build out stages.

- A tentative five-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation.

- A copy of the resolution by the district governing board authorizing the new educational center.

- The identification of neighboring public and independent institutions in the area in which the proposed campus is to be located.

The Commission Executive Director shall respond to the chief executive officer, in writing, no later than 60 days following submission of the completed Letter of Intent to the Commission. If the plans appear to be reasonable, the Commission's Executive Director will advise the system chief executive officer to move forward with site acquisition or further development plans. The Executive Director may in this process raise concerns about shortcomings or limitations in the Letter of Intent that need to be addressed in the planning process. If the Executive Director is unable to approve the Letter of Intent as submitted, he or she shall, within 30 days, indicate to the chief executive officer the specific reasons why the Letter of Intent is incomplete. The Executive Director of the Commission will act on a Letter of Intent only after it has been approved by Board of Governors or the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges.
3. Needs Study

The Needs Study provides the findings from a comprehensive needs analysis for the project. The purpose of a Needs Study is to provide evidence of the need for and location of new institutions and campuses of public higher education. A Needs Study is considered complete only when it fully addresses each of the criteria listed below.

3.1 General description and overview

The opening section of the Needs Study must include: A general description of the proposal, a physical description of the site, and a social and demographic analysis of the surrounding area. Data describing the socioeconomic profile of the area or region should be included, with income levels and racial/ethnic categorizations provided. Inclusion of various descriptive charts, tables, or other displays is encouraged.

3.2 Enrollment projections

♦ Enrollment projections must be sufficient to justify the establishment of the educational center. For a proposed new community college or university campus, enrollment projections for the first ten years of operation (from opening date) must be provided.

♦ The Demographic Research Unit (DRU) of the Department of Finance must approve enrollment projections. As the designated demographic agency for the State, the DRU has the statutory responsibility for preparing systemwide enrollment projections. For a proposed new institution, the DRU will approve all projections of undergraduate enrollment developed by a system office of one of the public systems proposing the new institution. Enrollment projections developed by a local community college district must be approved by the Chancellor's Office. Upon request, the DRU shall provide the system with advice and instructions on the preparation of enrollment projections.

♦ Undergraduate enrollment projections and attendance for a new institution shall be presented in terms of Fall-Term headcount and Fall-Term Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES). Enrollment projections for California Community Colleges should also include Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH) and WSCH per headcount student.

♦ Graduate and professional student enrollment projections shall be prepared by the system office proposing the new institution. In preparing these projections, the specific methodology and/or rationale generating the projections, an analysis of supply and de-
mand for graduate education, and the need for new graduate and professional degrees must be provided.

♦ For a new University of California center, statewide enrollment projected for the University should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing University campuses and educational centers. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the University system, compelling statewide and/or regional needs for the establishment of the new educational center must be demonstrated.

♦ For a new California State University center, statewide enrollment projected for the State University system should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing State University campuses and educational centers. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the system, compelling regional needs for the center must be demonstrated.

♦ For a new community college center, enrollment projected for the district proposing the college should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges and centers. If the district enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges or centers, compelling regional or local need must be demonstrated.

3.3 Alternatives

♦ Proposals for new institutions should address at least the following alternatives:

(1) the expansion of existing institutions within the region;

(2) the increased utilization of existing institutions, particularly in the afternoons and evenings, and during the summer months;

(3) the shared use of existing or new facilities and programs with other postsecondary education institutions, in the same or other public systems or independent institutions;

(4) the use of nontraditional modes of instructional delivery such as television, computerized instruction, instruction over the Internet, and other "distributed education" modes and techniques; and

(5) private fund raising or donations of land or facilities for the proposed new institution.

♦ A cost-benefit analysis of alternatives, including a consideration of alternative sites for the new institution, must be articulated and documented. This criterion may be satisfied by the Environ-
mental Impact Report, provided it contains a comprehensive analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative sites. Overall, the system proposing the new institution must demonstrate substantial analytical integrity with regard to the site selection process.

♦ Where a four-year system, or a community college district, already owns - or will have received as a donation - the site on which a new institution is proposed to be located, and has not considered other sites, a strong justification for "sole-sourcing" the site in question must be included. Options to be discussed should include the sale of the site, with the resulting revenue used to purchase a better site, or an alternative delivery system such as a collaboration with another public or private institution or organization.

3.4 Academic Planning and Program Justification

♦ For University educational centers, a preliminary description of the proposed academic degree programs must be included, along with a description of the center's proposed academic organization. The description must demonstrate conformity with such State goals as access, quality, intersegmental cooperation, and diversification of students, faculty, administration, and staff.

♦ For a community college educational center, a preliminary description of the proposed academic degree and/or certificate programs must be included, together with a list of all course offerings, whether or not they are part of a degree or certificate track. A description of the center's academic/occupational organization must be included. These descriptions must demonstrate conformity with such State goals as access, quality, intersegmental cooperation, and diversification of students, faculty, administration, and staff.

3.5 Student Services and Outreach

The proposal for the new institution must include a description of the student services planned for the new campus including student financial aid, advising, counseling, testing, tutoring, educational opportunity programs, compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and outreach services to historically underrepresented groups.

3.6 Support and Capital Outlay Budget Projections

♦ Proposals for educational centers must include a five-year capital outlay projection that includes the total Assigned Square Feet
(ASF) anticipated to be required for each year of the projection period, with estimates of the average cost per ASF.

♦ The proposal must include a five-year projection of anticipated support costs including administration, academic programs (including occupational/vocational as appropriate), academic support, and other standard expense elements. The number of Personnel Years (PY) should be indicated.

3.7 Geographic and Physical Accessibility

♦ The proposal must include a plan for student, faculty, and staff transportation to the proposed campus and compliance with the American Disability Act. Reasonable commuting times must be demonstrated.

♦ Plans for student and faculty housing, including projections of needed on-campus residential facilities should be included if appropriate.

3.8 Effects on Other Institutions

♦ Other systems, institutions, and the community in which the new institution is to be located should be consulted during the planning process, especially at the time that alternatives to expansion are explored. Strong local, regional, and/or statewide interest in the proposed facility must be demonstrated by letters of support from responsible agencies, groups, and individuals.

♦ The establishment of a new university center must take into consideration the impact of a new facility on existing and projected enrollments at neighboring institutions of its own and other systems.

♦ The establishment of a new community college educational center must not reduce existing and projected enrollments in adjacent community colleges either within the district proposing the new community college, or in adjacent districts, to a level that will damage their economy of operation, or create excess enrollment capacity at these institutions, or lead to an unnecessary duplication of programs.

3.9 Environmental Impact

The proposal must include a copy of the Summary Draft or Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the site or the project. The system governing board shall provide the Commission with detailed sections of the Draft or Final EIR upon request.
3.10 Economic Efficiency

The Commission encourages economic efficiency and gives priority to new institutions where the State of California is relieved of all or part of the financial burden. When such proposals include gifts of land, construction costs, or equipment, a higher priority shall be granted to such projects than to projects where all costs are born by the State, assuming all other criteria listed above are satisfied. A similar priority shall be given to a new proposed center that engages in collaborative efforts with other segments to expand educational access in underserved regions of the State as determined by the Commission.

Upon receipt of a Needs Study, the Commission Executive Director shall certify to the system chief executive officer, in writing and within 60 days, that it is complete, or that it requires additional information. If it is incomplete, the Executive Director shall indicate the specific deficiencies involved. When the Executive Director has certified that all necessary materials for the Needs Study have been received, the Commission, within 6 months, will approve or disapprove the new institution.

Once the Commission has taken action on the proposal, its Executive Director will notify the systemwide executive officer, appropriate legislative committee chairs, the Department of Finance, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst.
Joint-Use Educational Centers

Preamble

Demographic changes, economic conditions, educational reforms, and progress in preparing students for postsecondary education are all factors that are converging to produce substantial increases in demand for higher education in California. Between 1998 and 2010, this demand—generally referred to as “Tidal Wave II”—is estimated to result in an increase of more than 714,000 students seeking enrollment at all levels of public higher education. The Commission, in its recent report, Providing for Progress: California Higher Education Enrollment Demand and Resources in the 21st Century (CPEC 00-1), estimated that California would need to spend $1.5 billion annually over the next 10 to 12 years for the existing physical plant and enrollment growth.

The Commission recognizes that this spending plan is a challenge, particularly in an era of state budget reductions. The explosive growth in demand for higher education and limited budgets are straining California’s system of public higher education. These pressures present an opportunity for the State’s higher education segments to encourage and implement cooperative, intersegmental approaches to providing access to higher education.

Joint-use educational centers are a viable policy alternative for accommodating enrollment growth with limited resources. As far back as 1990, the Commission, in its long-range planning report - Higher Education at the Crossroads: Planning for the Twenty-First Century (CPEC 90-1)-strongly encouraged the development of collaborative, joint-use facilities in meeting the educational needs of California’s diverse populations.

The educational needs of students should serve as the overall goal in establishing joint-use centers. The Commission therefore supports the following goals:

- **Promote a seamless system of higher education services:** Sharing facilities between two or more segments could substantially ease the flow of students from one segment to another, potentially increasing transfer rates.

- **Expand access to higher education in underserved or fast-growth regions of the state:** Joint-use educational centers increase opportunities for a university education to be available to place-bound students who are often from historically underrepresented socio-economic groups. With this principle in mind, the Commission acknowledges that existing State-supported community college off-campus centers provide a significant opportunity for collaborative
ventures with public and independent universities to expand university programs throughout California.

- **Improve regional economic development opportunities**: The Commission recognizes the nexus between access to a university education and a region’s economic development. Joint-use educational centers can advance this linkage.

- **Encourage capital outlay cost savings to participating segments**: By encouraging the pooling of capital outlay resources between two or more education segments, joint-use educational centers can contain State capital outlay costs. These potential cost savings will stretch scarce state capital outlay funds.

- **Advance the efficient utilization of physical facilities**: Joint-use facilities have the potential to achieve higher levels of utilization than single purpose facilities. A jointly used classroom can yield utilization efficiencies by providing access throughout the day to both full-time and part-time students.

- **Expand the variety of academic programs offered in a single location**: Joint-use educational centers that include community colleges and universities increase the depth and breadth of the academic programs offered in a single location. This benefits both the educational needs of the students and the labor market needs of regional economies.

**Joint-use Educational Centers Subject to Review by the Commission**:

Joint-use Educational centers subject to the review and approval of the Commission are those that:

1. Meet the definitional requirements of a joint-use center specified on page 6 and 7 of the guidelines; and

2. Advance one or more goals articulated in the Preamble; and

3. Have the support of the participating systems.

1. **Preliminary Notice**

A Preliminary Notice must be submitted at such time as a public higher education segment, including a community college district, engages with another education institution to establish a joint-use center. The governing board of the system or district or the president, chancellor, or district superintendent participating in the collaborative shall forward the Preliminary Notice to the Commission, with copies to the Office of the Legislative Analyst and Department of Finance.
This notice shall:

- Identify the participating educational institutions;
- Indicate the general location of the proposed collaborative facility;
- Provide the actual and estimated enrollment size of the collaborative facility over the next five years of operation;
- Provide the estimated total state capital outlay funds required for the development of the collaborative facility; and
- Include a copy of the agenda item discussed by the local district or statewide governing board, if any, with action taken by the governing body.

A Preliminary Notice shall represent only an informational process, and will not require formal consideration or approval by the Commission.

The Commission Executive Director shall respond to the chief executive officers, in writing, following the submission of the Preliminary Notice. If the preliminary plan appears reasonable, the Commission’s Executive Director shall advise the chief executive officers of the systems and institutions to move forward with development plans and the submission of a formal proposal. If the Commission Executive Director is unable to approve the Preliminary Notice as submitted, he or she shall indicate to the chief executive officers the specific reasons why the Preliminary Notice is incomplete.

2. **Letter of Intent**

Not less than two years prior to the time the first capital outlay appropriation would be needed for the proposed joint-use educational centers, the appropriate governing boards should submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a Letter of Intent. Proposals for joint-use educational centers involving one or more California community colleges must also be submitted to the California Community College Chancellor’s Office for review.

A Letter of Intent to seek approval for joint-use should contain the following information:

- A brief overview of the need for and goals of the proposed joint-use educational center, including a description of the nature of the collaboration between the educational segments involved in the partnership.
• An enrollment history and a preliminary five-year enrollment projection (headcount and FTES) for the proposed joint-use educational center (from the projected opening date), developed by the systemwide central office, including an itemization of all lower-division, upper-division and graduate enrollments. The systemwide central office may seek the advice of the Demographic Research Unit (DRU) in developing the projection, but DRU approval is not required at this stage.

• The geographic location of the proposed joint-use educational center in terms as specific as possible.

• A brief description of each alternative site under consideration, if appropriate.

• Maps of the area in which the proposed joint-use educational center is located or is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, and road and highway configurations and access.

• A time schedule for the development of the new joint-use educational centers, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the early, intermediate, and final build out stages.

• A tentative five-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation.

• A copy of resolutions by the appropriate governing boards authorizing the proposed institution.

The Commission Executive Director shall respond to the chief executive officers, in writing, no later than 60 days following submission of the completed Letter of Intent to the Commission. If the plans appear to be reasonable, the Commission's Executive Director will advise the systemwide chief executive officers to move forward with site acquisition, if appropriate, or further development plans. The Executive Director may in this process raise concerns about shortcomings or limitations in the Letter of Intent that need to be addressed in the planning process.

If the Commission Executive Director is unable to approve the Letter of Intent as submitted, he or she shall, within 30 days, indicate to the chief executive officer the specific reasons why the Letter of Intent is incomplete prior to notifying the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst.

3. Joint-use Educational Center Proposal

A Proposal for the establishment of a joint use educational center should contain the following information:
3.1 General description and overview

This section should include: a general description of the collaborative, a physical description of the site, and a social and demographic analysis of the surrounding area. Data describing the socioeconomic profile of the area or region should be included, with income levels and racial/ethnic categorizations provided. Inclusion of charts, tables, or other displays is encouraged.

3.2 Enrollment projections

- Enrollment projections must be sufficient to justify the establishment of the joint-use educational center. Enrollment projections for the first ten years of operation (from opening date) must be provided. A description of the methodologies used in the allocation of Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) between the participating systems must be included.

- The Demographic Research Unit (DRU) of the Department of Finance must approve the enrollment projections. As the designated demographic agency for the State, the DRU has the statutory responsibility for preparing systemwide enrollment projections. Upon request, the DRU shall provide the system with advice and instructions on the preparation of enrollment projections.

- Undergraduate enrollment projections for the proposed institution shall be presented in terms of Fall-Term headcount and Fall-Term Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES). Enrollment projections for California Community Colleges should also include Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH) and WSCH per headcount student.

- Graduate and professional student enrollment projections shall be prepared by the systemwide central office proposing the new institution. The systemwide central office participating in the joint use center shall prepare graduate and professional student enrollment projections. In preparing these projections, the specific methodology and/or rationale generating the projections, an analysis of supply and demand for graduate education, and the need for new graduate and professional degrees must be provided.

- Enrollments projected for the proposed joint-use center should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of the participating public institutions participating in the collaboration. If the enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the parent institutions, compelling regional needs for the proposed institution must be demonstrated.
• For a new community college joint-use center, enrollments projected for the district proposing the joint use center should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges and centers. If the district enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges or centers, compelling regional or local need must be demonstrated.

3.3 Alternatives

• Proposals for new joint-use educational centers should address at least the following alternatives:

1. The feasibility of establishing an educational center instead of a joint-use educational center;

2. The expansion of existing institutions within the region;

3. The increased utilization of existing institutions, particularly in the afternoons and evenings, and during the summer months;

4. The use of nontraditional modes of instructional delivery such as television, computerized instruction, instruction over the Internet, and other distributed education modes and techniques; and

5. Private fund raising or donations of land or facilities for the proposed new institution.

• A cost-benefit analysis of alternatives, including a consideration of alternative sites for the joint-use, must be articulated and documented. This criterion may be satisfied by the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), provided it contains a comprehensive analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative sites. Overall, the system proposing the joint use center must demonstrate substantial analytical integrity with regard to the site selection process.

• Where a four-year system, or a community college district, already owns - or will have received as a donation - the site on which a new joint-use is proposed to be located, and has not considered other sites, a strong justification for "sole-sourcing" the site in question must be included. Options to be discussed should include the sale of the site, with the resulting revenue used to purchase a better site, or an alternative delivery system such as a collaboration with another public or private institution or organization.
3.4 Academic Planning and Program Justification

- A description of the proposed academic degree programs must be included, along with a description of the joint-use educational center’s proposed academic organization and the nature of the articulation, including administrative relationships, between the participating postsecondary education institutions. The description must demonstrate congruence with the Commission’s academic program review guidelines and with such State goals as access, quality, intersegmental cooperation, and diversification of students, faculty, administration, and staff.

- If the academic plan includes the offering of certificate programs, provide a preliminary description of such programs, together with a list of all course offerings, whether or not they are part of a degree or certificate track. A description of the center's academic/occupational organization must be included. These descriptions must demonstrate conformity with such State goals as access, quality, intersegmental cooperation, and diversification of students, faculty, administration, and staff.

3.5 Student Services and Outreach

A description of the student services planned for the new joint-use educational center including student financial aid, advising, counseling, testing, tutoring, educational opportunity programs, compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and outreach services to historically underrepresented groups.

3.6 Support and Capital Outlay Budget Projections

- Provide a five-year capital outlay projection that includes the total Assigned Square Feet (ASF) anticipated to be required for each year of the projection period, with estimates of the average cost per ASF.

- Include a five-year projection of anticipated support costs including administration, academic programs (including occupational/vocational as appropriate), academic support, and other standard expense elements. The number of Personnel Years (PY) should be indicated.

- Provide a statement of agreement between the institutions concerning which institution will submit the capital request if an independent state fund source is not defined.
3.7 Geographic and Physical Accessibility

The proposal must include a plan for student, faculty, and staff transportation to the proposed campus or existing site. Reasonable commuting times must be demonstrated. Plans for student and faculty housing, including projections of needed on-campus residential facilities should be included if appropriate.

3.8 Effects on Other Institutions

- Other systems, institutions, and the community in which the joint-use educational center is to be located should be consulted during the planning process, especially at the time that alternatives to expansion are explored. Strong local, regional, and/or statewide interest in the proposed facility must be demonstrated by letters of support from responsible agencies, groups, and individuals. The establishment of a joint-use center must take into consideration the impact of a new facility on existing and projected enrollments at neighboring institutions of its own and other systems.

- The establishment of a new community college joint-use educational center must not reduce existing and projected enrollments in adjacent community colleges either within the district proposing the new community college, or in adjacent districts, to a level that will damage their economy of operation, or create excess enrollment capacity at these institutions, or lead to an unnecessary duplication of programs.

3.9 Environmental Impact

The proposal must include a copy of the Summary Draft or Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the site or the project. The statewide governing board shall provide the Commission with detailed sections of the Draft or Final EIR upon request.

3.10 Economic Efficiency

Since it is in the best interests of the State to The Commission encourages maximum economy of operation, priority shall be given to proposals for new joint-use centers institutions where the State of California is relieved of all or part of the financial burden. When such proposals include gifts of land, construction costs, or equipment, a higher priority shall be granted to such projects than to projects where all costs are borne by the State, assuming all other criteria listed above are satisfied.
3.11 Collaborative Arrangements

The intersegmental nature of joint-use educational centers requires that each segment clearly articulate the respective responsibilities of each participating segment, including but not limited to:

1. The participating institution, state agency, or other entity that will own the joint-use facility and, if appropriate, which participating system(s) will lease the facilities;

2. The participating public system of higher education that will exercise operational control and responsibility of the facilities, including such responsibilities as building and grounds maintenance;

3. The financial arrangements between the participating segments for the development and operation of the joint-use facility. Arrangements describing the establishment and collection of student fees must be discussed.

4. The nature of curricular cooperation and faculty responsibilities between the participating institutions; and

5. The nature of cooperative arrangements to provide academic support services and student services to all students attending the proposed collaborative facility.

4. Proposal Review

The Executive Director of the Commission shall respond to the chief executive officers of the segments and institutions (with copies to the Office of the Legislative Analyst and Department of Finance), in writing and within 60 days, and shall comment on the reasonableness of the proposal. The Executive Director may, in this process, raise concerns about the limitations of the proposal and request additional information. When the Commission Executive Director certifies that all necessary materials for the proposal are complete, the Commission will have six months to take final action.

5. Commission Notification

After the Commission takes final action on the proposal, its Executive Director will notify the chief executive officers of the participating institutions and segments, appropriate legislative committee chairs, the Department of Finance, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst.
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Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational Centers

Introduction

Commission responsibilities and authority regarding new campuses and centers

Section 66904 of the California Education Code expresses the intent of the Legislature that the sites for new institutions or branches of public postsecondary education will not be authorized or acquired unless recommended by the Commission:

It is the intent of the Legislature that sites for new institutions or branches of the University of California and the California State University, and the classes of off-campus centers as the Commission shall determine, shall not be authorized or acquired unless recommended by the Commission.

It is further the intent of the Legislature that California community colleges shall not receive State funds for acquisition of sites or construction of new institutions, branches or off-campus centers unless recommended by the Commission. Acquisition or construction of non-State-funded community colleges, branches and off-campus centers, and proposals for acquisition or construction shall be reported to and may be reviewed and commented upon by the Commission.

Evolution and purpose of the guidelines

In order to carry out its given responsibilities in this area, the Commission adopted policies relating to the review of new campuses and centers in April 1975 and revised those policies in September 1978 and September 1982. Both the 1975 document and the two revisions outlined the Commission's basic assumptions under which the guidelines and procedures were developed and then specified the proposals subject to Commission review, the criteria for reviewing proposals, the schedule to be followed by the segments when submitting proposals, and the contents of the required "needs studies." In 1990, the Commission approved a substantive revision of what by then was called Guidelines for Review of Proposed Campuses and Off-Campus Centers (reproduced in Appendix A on pages 11-15). Through that revision, the Commission sought to incorporate a statewide planning agenda into the quasi-regulatory function the guidelines have always represented, and the result was a greater systemwide attention to statewide perspectives than had previously been in evidence. These new guidelines called for a statewide plan from each of the systems, then a "Letter of Intent" that identified a system's plans to create one or more new institutions, and finally, a formal needs study for the proposed new institution that would provide certain prescribed data elements and satisfy specific criteria. At each stage of this process, the Commission would be able to comment either positively or negatively, thereby ensuring that planning for a new campus or center would not proceed to a point where it could not be reversed should the evidence indicate the necessity for a reversal.

This three-stage review concept -- statewide plan, preliminary review, then final review -- appears to be fundamentally sound, but some clarifications of the 1990 document have nevertheless become essential, for several reasons:

- In those Guidelines, the Commission stated only briefly its requirements for a statewide plan and for letters of intent. These requirements warrant greater clarification, particularly regarding the need for inter-system cooperation, to assist the systems and community college districts in the development of proposals.

- The 1990 Guidelines assumed that a single set of procedures could be applied to all three public systems. In practice, this assumption was overly optimistic, and this 1992 revision more specifi-
cally recognizes the major functional differences among the three systems.

- The procedures for developing enrollment projections need to be altered to account for the curtailment of activities created by the severe staffing reductions at the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance, which have eliminated its ability to make special projections for community college districts and reduced its capacity to project graduate enrollments.

- The unprecedented number of proposals emanating from the community colleges, as well as the staff reductions experienced by the Commission, require a streamlining of the approval process. Consequently, certain timelines have been shortened, and all have been clarified as to the duration of review at each stage of the process.

- Over the years, the distinctions among several terms, such as “college,” “center,” and “institution,” have become unclear.

By 1992, experience with the 1990 procedures suggested that they needed revision in order to overcome these problems and accommodate the changed planning environment in California, particularly related to California’s diminished financial resources and growing college-age population.

Policy assumptions used in developing these guidelines

The following six policy assumptions are central to the development of the procedures and criteria that the Commission uses in reviewing proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers:

1. It is State policy that each resident of California who has the capacity and motivation to benefit from higher education will have the opportunity to enroll in an institution of higher education. The California Community Colleges shall continue to be accessible to all persons at least 18 years of age who can benefit from the instruction offered, regardless of district boundaries. The California State University and the University of California shall continue to be accessible to first-time freshmen among the pool of students eligible according to Master Plan eligibility guidelines. Master Plan guidelines on under-

graduate admission priorities will continue to be (1) continuing undergraduates in good standing, (2) California residents who are successful transfers from California public community colleges, (3) California residents entering at the freshman or sophomore level, and (4) residents of other states or foreign countries.

2. The differentiation of function among the systems with regard to institutional mission shall continue to be as defined by the State’s Master Plan for Higher Education.

3. The University of California plans and develops its campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of statewide need.

4. The California State University plans and develops its campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of statewide needs and special regional considerations.

5. The California Community Colleges plan and develop their campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of local needs.

6. Planned enrollment capacities are established for and observed by all campuses of public postsecondary education. These capacities are determined on the basis of statewide and institutional economies, community and campus environment, physical limitations on campus size, program requirements and student enrollment levels, and internal organization. Planned enrollment capacities are established by the governing boards of community college districts (and reviewed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the Trustees of the California State University, and the Regents of the University of California).

Definitions

For the purposes of these guidelines, the following definitions shall apply:

*Outreach Operation* (all systems): An outreach operation is an enterprise, operated away from a community college or university campus, in leased or donated facilities, which offers credit courses supported by State funds, and which serves a student...
population of less than 500 full-time-equivalent students (FTES) at a single location.

**Educational Center (California Community Colleges)** An educational center is an off-campus enterprise owned or leased by the parent district and administered by a parent college. The center must enroll a minimum of 500 full-time-equivalent students, maintain an on-site administration (typically headed by a dean or director, but not by a president, chancellor, or superintendent), and offer programs leading to certificates or degrees to be conferred by the parent institution.

**Educational Center (The California State University)** An educational center is an off-campus enterprise owned or leased by the Trustees and administered by a parent State University campus. The center must offer courses and programs only at the upper division and graduate levels, enroll a minimum of 500 full-time-equivalent students, maintain an on-site administration (typically headed by a dean or director, but not by a president), and offer certificates or degrees to be conferred by the parent institution. Educational facilities operated in other states and the District of Columbia shall not be regarded as educational centers for the purposes of these guidelines, unless State capital outlay funding is used for construction, renovation, or equipment.

**Educational Center (University of California)** An educational center is an off-campus enterprise owned or leased by the Regents and administered by a parent University campus. The center must offer courses and programs only at the upper division and graduate levels, enroll a minimum of 500 full-time-equivalent students, maintain an on-site administration (typically headed by a dean or director, but not by a chancellor), and offer certificates or degrees to be conferred by the parent institution. Organized Research Units (ORUs) and the Northern and Southern Regional Library Facilities shall not be regarded as educational centers. Educational facilities operated in other states and the District of Columbia shall not be regarded as educational centers unless State capital outlay funding is used for construction, renovation, or equipment.

**College (California Community Colleges)** A full-service, separately accredited, degree and certificate granting institution offering a full complement of lower-division programs and services, usually at a single campus location owned by the district; colleges enroll a minimum of 1,000 full-time-equivalent students. A college will have its own administration and be headed by a president or a chancellor.

**University Campus (University of California and The California State University)** A separately accredited, degree-granting institution offering programs at the lower division, upper division, and graduate levels, usually at a single campus location owned by the Regents or the Trustees. University campuses enroll a minimum of 1,000 full-time-equivalent students. A university campus will have its own administration and be headed by a president or chancellor.

**Institution (all three systems):** As used in these guidelines, “institution” refers to an educational center, a college, or a university campus, but not to an outreach operation.

**Projects subject to Commission review**

New institutions (educational centers, campuses, and colleges) are subject to review, while outreach operations are not. The Commission may, however, review and comment on other projects consistent with its overall State planning and coordination role.

**Stages in the review process**

Three stages of systemwide responsibility are involved in the process by which the Commission reviews proposals for new institutions. (1) the formulation of a long-range plan by each of the three public systems; (2) the submission of a “Letter of Intent to Expand” by the systemwide governing board, and (3) the submission of a “Needs Study” by the systemwide governing board. Each of these stages is discussed below.

1. **The systemwide long-range plan**

Plans for new institutions should be made by the
Regents, the Trustees, and the Board of Governors only after the adoption of a systemwide plan that addresses total statewide long-range growth needs, including the capacity of existing institutions to accommodate those needs. Each governing board should submit its statewide plan to the Commission for review and comment (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) before proceeding with plans for the acquisition or construction of new institutions. Each system must update its systemwide long-range plan every five years and submit it to the Commission for review and comment.

Each systemwide long-range plan should include the following elements:

- For all three public systems, a 15-year undergraduate enrollment projection for the system, presented in terms of both headcount and full-time-equivalent students (FTES). Such projections shall include a full explanation of all assumptions underlying them, consider the annual projections developed by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance, and explain any significant departures from those projections.

- For the University of California and the California State University, a systemwide 15-year graduate enrollment projection, presented with a full explanation of all assumptions underlying the projection.

- Each of the three public systems should provide evidence within the long-range plan of collaborative planning with California's other public systems, such as documentation of official contacts, meetings, correspondence, or other efforts to integrate its own planning with the planning efforts of the other public systems and with any independent colleges and universities in the area. The physical capacities of existing independent colleges and universities should be considered. If disagreements exist among the systems regarding such matters as enrollment projections or the scope, location, construction, or conversion of new facilities, the long-range plan should clearly state the nature of those disagreements.

- For all three public systems, the physical and planned enrollment capacity of each institution within the system. Physical capacity shall be determined by analyzing existing capacity space plus funded capacity projects. Planned enrollment capacity shall be the ultimate enrollment capacity of the institution as determined by the respective governing board of the system -- Regents, Trustees, or Board of Governors.

- For all three public systems, a development plan that includes the approximate opening dates (within a range of plus or minus two years) of all new institutions -- educational centers, community colleges, and university campuses, the approximate capacity of those institutions at opening and after five and ten years of operation, the geographic area in which each institution is to be located (region of the State for the University of California, county or city for the California State University, and district for community colleges), and whether a center is proposed to be converted into a community college or university campus within the 15-year period specified.

- A projection of the capital outlay cost (excluding bond interest) of any new institutions proposed to be built within the 15-year period specified, arrayed by capacity at various stages over the fifteen-year period (e.g., opening enrollment of 2,000 FTES; 5,000 FTES five years later, etc.), together with a statement of the assumptions used to develop the cost projection.

- A projection of the ongoing capital outlay cost (excluding bond interest) of existing institutions, arrayed by the cost of new space to accommodate enrollment growth, and the cost to renovate existing buildings and infrastructure, together with a statement of the assumptions used to develop the cost projection, and with maintenance costs included only if the type of maintenance involved is normally part of a system's capital outlay budget.

2. The "Letter of Intent to Expand"

New University Campuses. No less than five years prior to the time it expects its first capital outlay appropriation, the Regents or the Trustees should submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a "Letter of Intent to Expand." This letter should contain the following information.
A preliminary ten-year enrollment projection for the new university campus (from the campus’s opening date), developed by the systemwide central office, which should be consistent with the statewide projections developed annually by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance. The systemwide central office may seek the advice of the Unit in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage.

The geographic location of the new university campus (region of the State for the University of California and county or city for the California State University).

If the statewide plan envisions the construction or acquisition of more than one new institution, the reason for prioritizing the proposed university campus ahead of other new institutions should be specified.

A time schedule for development of the new university campus, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, final buildout, and intermediate stages.

A tentative ten-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation for the new university campus.

A copy of the resolution by the governing board authorizing conversion of the educational center to a university campus.

Maps of the area in which the proposed university campus is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, and road and highway configurations.

Conversion by the University of California or the California State University of an existing educational center to a university campus. No less than three years prior to the time it expects to enroll lower division students for the first time, the Regents or the Trustees should submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a “Letter of Intent to Expand.” This letter should contain the following information.

The complete enrollment history (headcount and full-time-equivalent students) or the previous ten years' history (whichever is less) of the educational center. A preliminary ten-year enrollment projection for the new university campus (from the campus’s opening date), developed by the systemwide central office, which should be consistent with the statewide projections developed annually by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance. The systemwide central office may seek the advice of the Unit in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage.

If the statewide plan envisions the construction or acquisition of other new institution(s), the reason for prioritizing the proposed university campus ahead of other new institutions should be specified.

A tentative ten-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation for the new university campus.

A copy of the resolution by the governing board authorizing conversion of the educational center to a university campus.

Maps of the area in which the proposed university campus is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, and road and highway configurations.

New educational centers of the University of California and the California State University. No less than two years prior to the time it expects its first capital outlay appropriation, the Regents or the Trustees should submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a “Letter of Intent to Expand.” This letter should contain the following information.

A preliminary five-year enrollment projection for the new educational center (from the center’s opening date), developed by the systemwide central office, which should be consistent with the statewide projections developed annually by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance. The systemwide central office may seek the advice of the Unit in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage.
The location of the new educational center in terms as specific as possible. An area not exceeding a few square miles in size should be identified.

If the statewide plan envisions the construction or acquisition of more than one new institution, the reasons for prioritizing the proposed educational center ahead of other new institutions should be specified.

A time schedule for development of the new educational center, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, final buildout, and intermediate stages.

A tentative ten-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation.

A copy of the resolution by the governing board authorizing the new educational center.

Maps of the area in which the proposed educational center is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, and road and highway configurations.

If the statewide plan envisions the construction or acquisition of more than one new institution within the 15-year term of the plan, the plan should prioritize the proposed new colleges in terms of three five-year intervals (near term, mid term, and long term). Priorities within each of the five-year periods of time shall be established through the Board of Governors five-year capital outlay planning process required by Supplemental Language to the 1989 Budget Act.

A time schedule for development of the new college, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, final buildout, and intermediate stages.

A tentative ten-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation.

A copy of the resolution by the Board of Governors authorizing the new college.

Maps of the area in which the proposed new college is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, and road and highway configurations.

New California Community Colleges No less than 36 months prior to the time it expects its first capital outlay appropriation, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a “Letter of Intent to Expand.” This letter should contain the following information:

A preliminary ten-year enrollment projection for the new college (from the college’s opening date), developed by the district and/or the Chancellor’s Office, which should be consistent with the statewide projections developed annually by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance. The Chancellor’s Office may seek the advice of the Unit in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage.

The location of the new college in terms as specific as possible, usually not exceeding a few square miles.

A copy of the district’s most recent five-year capital construction plan.

New California Community College educational centers No less than 18 months prior to the time it expects its first capital outlay appropriation, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a “Letter of Intent to Expand.” This letter should contain the following information:

A preliminary five-year enrollment projection for the new educational center (from the center’s opening date), developed by the district and/or the Chancellor’s Office, which should be consistent with the statewide projections developed annually by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance. The Chancellor’s Office may seek the advice of the Unit in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage.

The location of the new educational center in terms as specific as possible, usually not exceeding a few square miles.
A copy of the district's most recent five-year capital construction plan

If the statewide plan envisions the construction or acquisition of more than one new institution within the 15-year term of the plan, the plan should prioritize the proposed new centers in terms of three five-year intervals (near term, mid term, and long term). Priorities within each of the five-year periods of time shall be established through the Board of Governors five-year capital outlay planning process required by Supplemental Language to the 1989 Budget Act.

A time schedule for development of the new educational center, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, final buildout, and intermediate stages.

A tentative ten-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation.

A copy of the resolution by the Board of Governors authorizing the new educational center.

Maps of the area in which the proposed educational center is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, and road and highway configurations.

3 Commission response to the "Letter of Intent to Expand"

Once the "Letter of Intent to Expand" is received, Commission staff will review the enrollment projections and other data and information that serve as the basis for the proposed new institution. If the plans appear to be reasonable, the Commission's executive director will advise the systemwide chief executive officer to move forward with site acquisition or further development plans. The Executive Director may in this process raise concerns about defects in the Letter of Intent to Expand that need to be addressed in the planning process. If the Executive Director is unable to advise the chief executive officer to move forward with the expansion plan, he or she shall so state to the chief executive officer prior to notifying the Department of Finance and the Legislature of the basis for the negative recommendation. The Executive Director shall respond to the chief executive officer, in writing, no later than 60 days following submission of the Letter of Intent to Expand to the Commission.

4 Development of the "needs study"

Following the Executive Director's preliminary recommendation to move forward, the systemwide central offices shall proceed with the final process of identifying potential sites for the new institution. If property for the new institution is already owned by the system, alternative sites must be identified and considered in the manner required by the California Environmental Quality Act. So as to avoid redundancy in the preparation of information, all materials germane to the environmental impact report process shall be made available to the Commission at the same time that they are made available to the designated responsible agencies.

Upon approval of the environmental impact report by the lead agency, the systemwide central office shall forward the final environmental impact report for the site as well as the final needs study for the new institution to the Commission. The needs study must respond fully to each of the criteria outlined below, which collectively will constitute the basis on which the proposal for the new institution will be evaluated. The needs study shall be complete only upon receipt of the environmental impact report, the academic master plan, the special enrollment projection approved by the Demographic Research Unit, and complete responses to each of the criteria listed below.

5 Commission action

Once the Commission has received the completed needs study, the Executive Director shall certify the completeness of that Needs Study to the systemwide chief executive officer. The Commission shall take final action on any proposal for a new institution according to the following schedule.

New university campus
- University of California One Year
- The California State University One Year

New college
- California Community Colleges Six Months

New Educational Center
- University of California Six Months
- The California State University Six Months
California Community Colleges · Four Months

Once the Commission has taken action on the proposal, the Executive Director will notify the appropriate legislative committee chairs, the Department of Finance, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst.

Criteria for evaluating proposals

As stated in Sections 66903[2a] and 66903[5] of the Education Code, the Commission's responsibility is to determine "the need for and location of new institutions and campuses of public higher education." The criteria below follow that categorization:

Criteria related to need

1 Enrollment projections

11 Enrollment projections must be sufficient to justify the establishment of the "new institution," as that term is defined above. For a proposed new educational center, enrollment projections for each of the first five years of operation (from the center's opening date) must be provided. For a proposed new college or university campus, enrollment projections for each of the first ten years of operation (from the college's or campus's opening date) must be provided. When an existing educational center is proposed to be converted to a new college or university campus, the center's previous enrollment history, or the previous ten-year's history (whichever is less) must also be provided.

As the designated demographic agency for the State, the Demographic Research Unit has the statutory responsibility for preparing systemwide and district enrollment. For a proposed new institution, the Unit will approve all projections of undergraduate enrollment developed by a systemwide central office of one of the public systems or by the community college district proposing the new institution. The Unit shall provide the systems with advice and instructions on the preparation of enrollment projections. Community College projections shall be developed pursuant to the Unit's instructions, included as Appendix B of these guidelines on pages 17-34.

Undergraduate enrollment projections for new institutions of the University of California and the California State University shall be presented in terms of headcount and full-time-equivalent students (FTES). Lower-division enrollment projections for new institutions of the California Community Colleges shall be presented in terms of headcount students, Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCCH), and WSCCH per headcount student.

Graduate and professional student enrollment projections shall be prepared by the systemwide central office proposing the new institution. In preparing these projections, the specific methodology and/or rationale generating the projections, an analysis of supply and demand for graduate education, and the need for new graduate and professional degrees, must be provided.

12 For a new University of California campus, statewide enrollment projected for the University should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing University campuses and educational centers as defined in the systemwide long-range plan developed by the Regents pursuant to Item 1 of these guidelines. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the University system, compelling systemwide needs for the establishment of the new University campus must be demonstrated. In order for compelling statewide needs to be established, the University must demonstrate why these needs deserve priority attention over competing systemwide needs for both support and capital outlay funding.

13 For a new University of California educational center, statewide enrollment projected for the University should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing University campuses and educational centers as defined in the systemwide long-range plan developed by the Regents pursuant to Item 1 of these guidelines. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the University system, compelling systemwide needs for the establishment of the new educational center must be demonstrated. In order for compelling statewide needs to be established, the University must demonstrate why these needs deserve priority attention over competing needs in other sectors of the University for both support and capital outlay funding.

14 For a new California State University campus, statewide enrollment projected for the State
University system should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing State University campuses and educational centers as defined in the systemwide long-range plan developed by the Board of Trustees pursuant to Item 1 of these guidelines. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the system, compelling regional needs must be demonstrated. In order for compelling regional needs to be demonstrated, the system must specify why these regional needs deserve priority attention over competing needs in other sectors of the State University system for both support and capital outlay funding.

1.5 For a new California State University educational center, statewide enrollment projected for the State University system should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing State University campuses and educational centers as defined in the systemwide long-range plan developed by the Board of Trustees pursuant to Item 1 of these guidelines. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the State University system, compelling statewide or regional needs for the establishment of the new educational center must be demonstrated. In order for compelling statewide or regional needs to be established, the State University must demonstrate why these needs deserve priority attention over competing needs in other sectors of the University for both support and capital outlay funding.

1.6 For a new community college or educational center, enrollment projected for the district proposing the college or educational center should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges and educational centers. If the district enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges or educational centers, compelling regional or local needs must be demonstrated. The district shall demonstrate local needs by satisfying the requirements of the criteria specified in these guidelines. Regional and statewide needs shall be demonstrated by the Board of Governors through the long-range planning process.

2 Programmatically alternatives

2.1 Proposals for new institutions should address at least the following alternatives: (1) the possibility of establishing an educational center instead of a university campus or community college, (2) the expansion of existing institutions; (3) the increased utilization of existing institutions, particularly in the afternoons and evenings, and during the summer months, (4) the shared use of existing or new facilities and programs with other postsecondary education institutions, in the same or other public systems or independent institutions, (5) the use of nontraditional modes of instructional delivery, such as "colleges without walls" and distance learning through interactive television and computerized instruction, and (6) private fund raising or donations of land or facilities for the proposed new institution.

3 Serving the disadvantaged

3.1 The new institution must facilitate access for disadvantaged and historically underrepresented groups.

4 Academic planning and program justification

4.1 The programs projected for the new institution must be described and justified. An academic master plan, including a general sequence of program and degree level plans, and an institutional plan to implement such State goals as access, quality; intersegmental cooperation, and diversification of students, faculty, administration, and staff for the new institution, must be provided.

5 Consideration of needed funding

5.1 A cost analysis of both capital outlay estimates and projected support costs for the new institution, and possible options for alternative funding sources, must be provided.

Criteria related to location

6 Consideration of alternative sites

6.1 A cost-benefit analysis of alternatives, including a consideration of alternative sites for the new institution, must be articulated and documented. This criterion may be satisfied by the Environmental Impact Report, provided it contains a comprehensive analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative sites.
7. Geographic and physical accessibility

7.1 The physical, social, and demographic characteristics of the location and surrounding service areas for the new institution must be included.

7.2 There must be a plan for student, faculty, and staff transportation to the proposed location. Plans for student and faculty housing, including projections of needed on-campus residential facilities, should be included if appropriate. For locations that do not plan to maintain student on-campus residences, reasonable commuting time for students—defined generally as not exceeding a 30-45 minute automobile drive (including time to locate parking) for a majority of the residents of the service area—must be demonstrated.

8. Environmental and social impact

8.1 The proposal must include a copy of the final environmental impact report. To expedite the review process, the Commission should be provided all information related to the environmental impact report process as it becomes available to responsible agencies and the public.

9. Effects on other institutions

9.1 Other systems, institutions, and the community in which the new institution is to be located should be consulted during the planning process, especially at the time that alternatives to expansion are explored. Strong local, regional, and/or statewide interest in the proposed facility must be demonstrated by letters of support from responsible agencies, groups, and individuals.

9.2 The establishment of a new University of California or California State University campus or educational center must take into consideration the impact of a new facility on existing and projected enrollments in the neighboring institutions of its own and of other systems.

9.3 The establishment of a new community college must not reduce existing and projected enrollments in adjacent community colleges—either within the district proposing the new college or in adjacent districts—to a level that will damage their economy of operation, or create excess enrollment capacity at these institutions, or lead to an unnecessary duplication of programs.

Other considerations

10. Economic efficiency

10.1 Since it is in the best interests of the State to encourage maximum economy of operation, priority shall be given to proposals for new institutions where the State of California is relieved of all or part of the financial burden. When such proposals include gifts of land, construction costs, or equipment, a higher priority shall be granted to such projects than to projects where all costs are born by the State, assuming all other criteria listed above are satisfied.

10.2 A higher priority shall be given to projects involving intersegmental cooperation, provided the systems or institutions involved can demonstrate a financial saving or programmatic advantage to the State as a result of the cooperative effort.

Introduction

Commission responsibilities and authority regarding new campuses and centers

California Education Code Section 66904 expresses the intent of the Legislature that the sites for new institutions or branches of public postsecondary education will not be authorized or acquired unless recommended by the Commission.

It is the intent of the Legislature that sites for new institutions or branches of the University of California and the California State University, and the classes of off-campus centers as the commission shall determine, shall not be authorized or acquired unless recommended by the commission.

It is further the intent of the Legislature that California community colleges shall not receive state funds for acquisition of sites or construction of new institutions, branches or off-campus centers unless recommended by the commission. Acquisition or construction of non-state-funded community colleges, branches and off-campus centers, and proposals for acquisition or construction shall be reported to and may be reviewed and commented upon by the Commission.

Evolution and purpose of the guidelines

In order to carry out its given responsibilities in this area, the Commission in April 1975 adopted policies relating to the review of new campuses and centers and revised those policies in September 1978 and September 1982. Both the 1975 document and the two revisions outlined the Commission's basic assumptions under which the guidelines and procedures were developed and then specified the proposals subject to Commission review, the criteria for reviewing proposals, the schedule to be followed by the segments when submitting proposals, and the contents of the required "needs studies".

Reasons for the current revisions

By 1988, experience with the existing procedures suggested that they needed revision in order to accommodate the changed planning environment in California, particularly related to California's Environmental Quality Act and the environmental impact report (EIR) process, as well as to accommodate various provisions of the recently renewed Master Plan for Higher Education. In addition, California's postsecondary enrollment demand continues to increase, and as the public segments move forward with their long-range facilities plans, the time is particularly ripe for revising the existing guidelines. This revision is intended to (1) ensure that the public segments grow in an orderly and efficient manner and that they meet the State's policy objectives for postsecondary education under the Master Plan, (2) ensure proper and timely review by the State of segmental plans based on clearly stated criteria, and (3) assist the segments in determining the procedures that need to be followed to prepare and implement their expansion plans.

Policy assumptions used in developing these guidelines

The following six policy assumptions are central to the development of the procedures and criteria that the Commission uses in reviewing proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers.

1. It will continue to be State policy that each resident of California who has the capacity and motivation to benefit from higher education will have the opportunity to enroll in an institution of higher education. The California Community Colleges shall continue to be accessible to all persons at least 18 years of age who can benefit from the instruction offered, regardless of district boundaries. The California State University and the University of California shall continue to be accessible to first-time freshmen among the pool...
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of students eligible according to Master Plan eligibility guidelines. Master Plan guidelines on undergraduate admission priorities will continue to be (1) continuing undergraduates in good standing, (2) California residents who are successful transfers from California public community colleges, (3) California residents entering at the freshman or sophomore level, and (4) residents of other states or foreign countries.

2. The differentiation of function between the segments with regard to institutional mission shall continue to be as defined by the State's Master Plan for Higher Education.

3. The University of California plans and develops its campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of statewide need.

4. The California State University plans and develops its campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of statewide needs and special regional considerations.

5. The California Community Colleges plan and develop their campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of local needs.

6. Planned enrollment capacities are established for and observed by all campuses of public post-secondary education. These capacities are determined on the basis of statewide and institutional economies, community and campus environment, limitations on campus size, program requirements and student enrollment levels, and internal organization. Planned capacities are established by the governing boards of community college districts (and reviewed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges), the Trustees of the California State University, and the Regents of the University of California. These capacities, as well as the statewide procedures for setting these capacities, are subject to review and recommendation by the Commission provided in California Education Code Section 66903.

Projects subject to Commission review

The following types of projects are subject to review new campuses and permanent off-campus centers, major off-campus centers in leased facilities, and conversion of off-campus centers to full-service campuses. The Commission may also review and comment on other projects consistent with its overall State planning and coordination role.

Schedule for the review of new projects

The following timelines are meant to allow a reasonable amount of time for Commission review of plans at appropriate stages in the process. The Commission can accelerate its review of the process if it so chooses.

Unless otherwise specified, all three public post-secondary segments should endeavor to observe these timelines when proposing construction of a major new project subject to Commission review under these guidelines.

1. Plans for new campuses and permanent off-campus centers should be made by the segmental governing boards following their adoption of a systemwide planning framework designed to address total statewide segmental long-range growth needs, including the capacity of existing campuses and centers to accommodate those needs, and the development of new campuses and centers. This planning framework should be submitted to the Commission for review and comment before proceeding with plans for location and construction of new campuses.

2. Segments are requested to defer the selection of specific sites for new campuses or permanent off-campus centers until such time as they have informed the Commission of their general plans for expansion and received a recommendation from the Commission to proceed with further expansion activity. No later than one year prior to the date the segment expects to forward a final proposal for a new campus or center to the Commission, or 18 months prior to the time when it hopes
the Commission will forward its final recommendation about the facility to the Governor and Legislature, it is requested to transmit a letter of intent to expand to the Commission. The letter of intent should include, at minimum, the following information for the new campus: (1) preliminary projections of enrollment demand by age of student and level of instruction, (2) its general location, and (3) the basis on which the segment has determined that expansion in this area at this time is a systemwide priority in contrast to other potential segmental priorities. Other information that may be available that will be required at the time of the final needs study (see below, item 1-4) may also be submitted at this time.

3 Once the "letter of intent" is received, Commission staff will review the enrollment projections and other data and information that serve as the basis for the proposed new campus. This review will be done in consultation with staff from the Demographic Research Unit in the State Department of Finance, which is the agency statutorily responsible for demographic research and population projections. If the plans appear to be reasonable, the Commission will recommend that the segments move forward with their site acquisition or further development plans. The Commission may in this process raise concerns with the segments about defects in the plans that need to be addressed in the planning process. If the Commission is unable to recommend approval of moving forward with the expansion plans, it shall so state to the segmental governing board prior to notifying the Department of Finance and the Legislature of its analysis and the basis for its negative recommendation. The Commission shall consider the preliminary plan no later than 60 days following its submission to the Commission.

4 Following the Commission's preliminary recommendation to move forward, the segments are requested to proceed with the final process of identifying potential sites for the campus or permanent off-campus center. If property appropriate for the campus or center is already owned by the segment, alternative sites to that must be identified and considered in the manner required by the California Environmental Quality Act. So as to avoid redundancy in preparation of information, all materials that are germane to the environmental impact report process shall be made available to the Commission at the same time that it is made available to the designated responsible agencies.

5 Upon completion of the environmental review process and no more than six months prior to the time of expected final Commission approval of the proposed new campus, the segment shall forward the final environmental impact report for the site as well as the final needs study report for the campus or center to the Commission. The needs study report should address each of the criteria outlined below on which the proposal for the campus or center will be evaluated.

6 Once the Commission has received from the segment all materials necessary for evaluating the proposal, it shall certify the completeness of the application to the segment. The Commission shall take final action on proposals during the next six months. In reviewing the proposal, the Commission will seek approval of the enrollment projections by the Demographic Research Unit, unless the justification for expansion is primarily unrelated to meeting access demands. Once the Commission has taken action on the proposal, it will so notify both the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst.

Criteria for evaluating proposals

1 Enrollment projections

1.1 For new facilities that are planned to accommodate expanded enrollments, enrollment projections should be sufficient to justify the establishment of the campus or off-campus center. For the proposed new campus or center, enrollment projections for each of the first ten years of operation, and for the fifteenth and twentieth years, must be provided. When an existing off-campus center is proposed to be converted to a new campus, all previous enrollment experience must also be provided.

As the designated demographic agency for the State, the Demographic Research Unit has lead responsibility for preparing systemwide and district enrollment projections, as well as projections for specific
proposals. The Demographic Research Unit will prepare enrollment projections for all Community College proposals, and either the Demographic Research Unit population projections or K-12 enrollment estimates must be used as the basis for generating enrollment projections in any needs study prepared by the University of California or the California State University. For the two University segments, the Commission will request the Demographic Research Unit to review and approve demographically-driven enrollment projections prior to Commission consideration of the final proposal, unless the campus or permanent center is justified on academic, policy, or other criteria that do not relate strictly to enrollment demand.

For graduate/professional student enrollment estimates, the specific methodology and/or rationale generating the estimates, an analysis of supply of and demand for graduate education, and the need for new graduate and professional degrees, must be provided.

1.2 Statewide enrollment projected for the University of California should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing University campuses as defined in their long-range development plans. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the system, compelling statewide needs for the establishment of the new campus must be demonstrated.

1.3 Statewide enrollment projected for the California State University system should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing State University campuses as defined by their enrollment ceilings. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the system, compelling regional needs must be demonstrated. In order for compelling regional needs to be demonstrated, the segment must specify how these regional needs deserve priority attention over others in the State.

1.5 Enrollments projected for community college campuses must be within a reasonable commuting time of the campus, and should exceed the minimum size for a community college district established by legislation (1,000 units of average daily attendance [ADA] two years after opening).

2. Alternatives to new campuses or off-campus centers

2.1 Proposals for a new campus or off-campus center should address alternatives to establishment of new institutions, including (1) the possibility of establishing an off-campus center instead of a campus; (2) the expansion of existing campuses; (3) the increased utilization of existing campuses, such as year-round operation; (4) the increased use of existing facilities and programs in other postsecondary education segments; and (5) the use of nontraditional modes of instructional delivery, such as telecommunication and distance learning.

2.2 A cost-benefit analysis of alternatives, including alternative sites for the campus or center must be articulated and documented.

3. Serving the disadvantaged

The campus or center must facilitate access for the economically, educationally, socially, and physically disadvantaged.

4. Geographic and physical accessibility

The physical, social, and demographic characteristics of the location and surrounding service areas for the new campus or center must be included. There must be a plan for student, faculty, and staff transportation to the proposed location. Plans for student and faculty housing, including projections of needed on-campus residential facilities, should be included as appropriate. For locations which do not plan to maintain student on-campus residences, reasonable commuting time for students must be demonstrated.
5 Environmental and social impact

The proposal must include a copy of the environmental impact report. To expedite the review process, the Commission should be provided all information related to the environmental impact report process as it becomes available to responsible agencies and the public.

6 Effects on other institutions

6.1 Other segments, institutions, and the community in which the campus or center is to be located should be consulted during the planning process for the new facility, especially at the time that alternatives to expansion are explored. Strong local, regional, and/or statewide interest in the proposed facility must be demonstrated.

6.2 The establishment of a new University of California or California State University campus or center must take into consideration the impact of a new facility on existing and projected enrollments in the neighboring institutions of its own and of other segments.

6.3 The establishment of a new community college campus must not reduce existing and projected enrollments in adjacent community colleges -- either within the district proposing the new campus or in adjacent districts -- to a level that will damage their economy of operation, or create excess enrollment capacity at these institutions, or lead to an unnecessary duplication of programs.

7 Academic planning and program justification

The programs projected for the new campus must be described and justified. An academic master plan, including general sequence of program plans and degree level plans, and a campus plan to implement such State goals as access, quality, intersegmental cooperation, diversification of students, faculty, administration and staff for the new campus, must be provided. The proposal must include plans to provide an equitable learning environment for the recruitment, retention and success of historically underrepresented students.

8 Consideration of needed funding

A cost analysis of both capital outlay estimates and projected support costs for the new campus or permanent off-campus center, and possible options of alternative funding sources, must be provided.
GUIDE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

PROJECTION OF ENROLLMENT
AND ANNUAL AVERAGE WEEKLY STUDENT CONTACT HOURS
FOR NEW COLLEGES AND EDUCATIONAL CENTERS

Under California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) guidelines community college districts must provide enrollment projections for new colleges and educational centers. If state funding is required for a new institution the enrollment projections must be approved by the Demographic Research Unit (DRU), Department of Finance (DOF)

Districts may submit enrollment projections between September and January. Review will take place between October and February with a minimum of four weeks for review. If more enrollment projections are submitted than can be reviewed by DRU staff in the time available, projections will be prioritized by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, Facilities Planning Unit for DRU review

DRU staff are available on a limited basis to meet with districts during the development of a projection on issues such as data, projection methodology, and assumptions to assure conformity with the guidelines

A projection for a new institution must include the following data with all assumptions articulated and supported by documentation before DOF will approve the projection

Demographic Research Unit
Department of Finance
915 L Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-3701
(916) 322-4651
DATA

1. Site description

2. Opening date and description of the proposed curriculum as it is expected to develop over the projection period

This section must also address associated changes that can be expected in the ratios of full-time to part-time students, credit to noncredit students, day to evening students, and older to younger students. Also include a discussion of the impact of the proposed development on the programs currently in place in the district and on all neighboring colleges.

3. Population projections

Population projections from the local council of governments or county planning agency for (a) the county, (b) the district, and (c) the service area of the new institution, or for the geographic areas that best approximate those boundaries (for example, ZIP codes or census tracts) must be provided.

The district must document the source of the projections, including the date of their release and the levels of detail for which they are available (geographic detail, time intervals, and age/gender detail).

State Administrative Manual Sections 1101 and 1103 require that the population forecasts used in planning not exceed Department of Finance projections on a regional basis. If the population projections used by the district exceed the Department of Finance projections, they must be made consistent.

Although not required, it is recommended that the projections be controlled upward to the most recent Department of Finance population projections at the county level, if local population forecasts are below DOF.

If the local planning agencies and the local council of governments have no subcounty-level population projections, a letter from those agencies confirming that fact is required. In that case, the most recent Department of Finance county population projections may be used in combination with 1990 Census data by census tract to determine the proportion of the county population within the service area and within the district.

Population age 18 through 64 is to be used as the base for calculating participation rates and for projecting community college enrollment. It may be preferable to use greater detail by gender, ethnicity, and age (ages groups 18-24, 25-34, 35-64), if the population of the service area differs in composition from the remainder of the district’s population.
4. Service area and maps

The district must identify the primary service area of the new institution and provide a map showing the district and the service area borders in terms of the geographic boundaries used in the population projections (e.g., if the population projections are available by ZIP code, the district must define the service area in terms of ZIP codes and provide a ZIP code map of the district).

The service area must be justified by documented attendance patterns evident in the district's enrollment data and within a reasonable commute time. Population outside of the district's boundaries may be used in a projection only with the written approval of both the Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and CPEC.

A map illustrating roads and commute patterns in the area expected to generate students for the new institution must also be included.

5. Enrollment data

The district must provide unduplicated fall first-census enrollment for the most recent year consistent with its official fall first-census data reported by the Community Colleges Chancellor's Office cross-tabulated:

a) by residence of student by ZIP code, census tract, or other unit of geography consistent with the geographic divisions for which population projections are available, and

b) by location of attendance

A format example is attached (Form 1).

Note. All students, regardless of residence are included.

6. Historical data

The projection must provide a history of enrollment and annual average weekly student contact hours for day credit, evening credit, and noncredit categories for all current programs which will be absorbed by the new institution. Ten years of historical data are required for recognized educational centers; three years of historical data are required for outreach operations. For example, if an entire outreach operation (site 1) and one small program from a college (site 2) are to be moved to a proposed educational center, historical data (not projected data) must be provided for each site as well as for the remainder of the district. Sample worksheets are attached (Forms 2 and 3).

It is critical for approval of the projections that the enrollment and annual average WSCCH used in the projection be consistent with the district's official numbers reported by the Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. An explanation of the method of calculating annual average weekly student hours (WSCCH) follows.
7 Projection

Projections must meet the requirements of both the Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and CPEC. A recommended format is attached (Form 4).

CPEC's guidelines require the following:

For a proposed new education center, enrollment projections for each of the first five years of operation (from the center's opening date), must be provided. For a proposed new college or university campus, enrollment projections for each of the first ten years of operation (from the college's or campus's opening date) must be provided. When an existing educational center is proposed to be converted to a new college or university campus, the center's previous enrollment history, or the previous ten year's history (whichever is less) must also be provided.

8 Copy of "Letter of Intent to Expand" with attachments
Appendix B
ENROLLMENT DATA

Use Fall first-census UNDuplicated total enrollment by ZIP code by site (institution or outreach operation). Each site that will be moved to the new institution should be listed as well as the remainder of the district. Data for several small outreach operations in the service area may be grouped as one site if they are all similar and will be moved to the new institution. Grouped data must have a footnote listing the sites.

STUDENTS ATTENDING MORE THAN ONE INSTITUTION SHOULD BE COUNTED IN ONLY ONE INSTITUTION. If a significant number of students attend more than one institution, please note their total number, where they were counted, and which other institution they attend.

Facility

\[
\text{Site 1} + \text{Site 2} + \text{Remainder/Dist} = \text{Total District*}  \\
\text{(Include students enrolled in BOTH day and evening)}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZIPS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other ZIPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of ZIPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* District enrollment should match district enrollment reported on the Department of Finance report, "Projection of Fall Enrollment and Annual Average WSCH." Districts with more sites will need more data columns.
HISTORICAL ENROLLMENT DATA

Fall first-census UNDuplicated enrollment should be listed for each institution or outreach operation site that will be moved to the new institution, and for the remainder of the district. Data for several small outreach operations in the service area may be grouped consistent with Form 1.

Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and Years</th>
<th>Site 1</th>
<th>Site 2</th>
<th>Remainder/Dist.</th>
<th>Total District*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eve Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Columns should add to "Total District." "Total District" should match the Department of Finance report, "Projection of Fall Enrollment and Annual Average WSCH" for day credit, evening credit and noncredit categories. Districts with more sites will need more data columns.
HISTORICAL WSCH DATA
(Please see attached instruction sheet for calculation of WSCH)

Annual average WSCH should be listed for each institution or outreach operation site that will be moved to the new institution, and for the remainder of the district. Data for several small outreach operations in the service area may be grouped consistent with Form 1.

Facility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Site 1</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Site 2</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Remainder/Dist.</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>Total District*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evening Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Columns should add to "Total District." "Total District" should match the Department of Finance report, "Projection of Fall Enrollment and Annual Average WSCH" for day credit, evening credit and noncredit categories. Districts with more sites will need more data columns.
COMPUTATION OF ANNUAL AVERAGE WSCH FROM STUDENT CONTACT HOURS REPORT

The "Community Colleges Student Contact Hours" for the fiscal year, P-3, is prepared by the Chancellor's Office in August each year. This report contains Summer, Fall, Winter, and Spring WSCH data.

For all schools: Calculate the number of weeks in the academic year by dividing the number of term days by five.

Day credit. Add total hours for day daily census procedure courses and actual hours of attendance procedure courses. Divide that total by the number of weeks in the academic year and add it to the day mean of all weekly census procedure courses (first census WSCH for each term, divided by the number of terms).

Evening credit. Repeat the same procedure for extended day.

Noncredit. Noncredit is reported under actual hours of attendance procedure courses, noncredit courses. Divide the total noncredit hours by the number of weeks in the academic year.

Keep in mind that:

Summer intersession courses are never included in the calculations.

Computations are done at the campus level, then summed to the district level.

Computations for day credit and evening credit include work experience and independent study.

Student contact hours are the sum of hours for resident and nonresident students.

Demographic Research Unit
Department of Finance
915 L Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-3701
**EXAMPLE OF PROJECTION FOR A NEW EDUCATIONAL CENTER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Fall Term</th>
<th>DAY CREDIT</th>
<th>EVENING CREDIT</th>
<th>NON-CREDIT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New educational center scheduled to open Fall 1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Form 4

Appendix B
METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS

The following is a suggested method of developing enrollment projections for new institutions. Other methods may also be acceptable provided that they are (a) adequately documented with the requested data, (b) based upon official population projections, and (c) based upon reasonable, justified assumptions. If a method other than the suggested method is chosen, the district should discuss the method with DRU staff.

1. Match the student data with the population data. If the geography of the population data is not the same as the student data geography, then the two units of geography must be assigned as whole units or proportions of units to the proposed service area and to the remainder of the district. Maps and enrollment data provided by the district must clearly illustrate and support the assignment.

2. Calculate historical participation rates using enrollment data (from Data, step 5) and population (age 18 - 64 if possible). A participation rate is enrollment divided by population multiplied by 1000. Three sets of rates are needed:
   a) rates for the aggregated sites which will be incorporated by the new institution - divide total enrollment from those sites by the population of the proposed service area
   b) rates for the proposed service area - divide the total of all district students who reside within the service area boundaries by the population of the service area and
   c) rates for the remainder of the district - divide all district students minus the number of students residing in the service area (students in 2b) by the population of the remainder of the district (district population less proposed service area population)

Generally if the new institution will provide a credit program only, only credit enrollment is used in all the calculations.

3. To derive total enrollment for the years between the current year and the first year the new institution will be open, multiply the participation rate calculated in step 2a by the projected service area population for each year. This method assumes no significant changes in participation rate between the last year for which enrollment data are available and the opening of the new institution. This assumption may require variation based upon circumstances in the district (available space and resources, for example).

4. An assumption must be made at this point regarding the participation rate that will be reached in the service area after the new institution is open. Depending upon
how closely the new institution's curriculum resembles the course offerings available at other institutions in the district, and how closely the service area resembles the rest of the district, assume that the participation rate will reach 75% to 100% of the remainder of district participation rates. The participation rate for residents of the service area should not exceed the participation rate for the remainder of the district.

5. To project total enrollment for the new institution, calculate the difference between the participation rate for the proposed service area and the participation rate for the remainder of the district adjusted in step 4 \((2.5 \times 0.8) - 2.0\) Add this figure to the participation rate for the outreach and existing institutions which will be moved to the new institution (step 2.a). The result will be the participation rate for the new institution, once it is established. Normally this new participation rate is phased in over the first three years of operation. Total enrollment is the result of multiplying the projected population by the participation rate.

Note. Some students included in the calculation of step 2.b may attend classes elsewhere in the district. Generally, it is assumed that the participation of these students at other district facilities will remain constant throughout the projection, but this assumption may be adjusted depending upon the district's overall capacity and projected growth. For example, if the district's existing institutions can absorb more service area students, it may be appropriate to assume that they will serve a greater proportion. If, however, the district's institutions are already impacted and population growth in the remainder of the district will exceed the capacity of the district's existing facilities, then it may be appropriate to assume that a smaller proportion will be served by existing facilities once the new institution is opened.

6. The proportions of students in day credit, evening credit, and noncredit categories are to be based on the history of the programs being absorbed by the new institution, in line with the program description for the new institution, and applied to the projected enrollment total. Generally the proportions will not change until the new institution opens.

7. Project the annual average WSCH to enrollment ratios for each category, day credit, evening credit, and noncredit, reflecting the developments described in the curriculum explanation. Generally ratios are held constant until the new institution opens, then gradually increased to more closely resemble the district's ratios. The ratios for a center are normally lower than they are for a fully developed college.

8. Calculate annual average WSCH for the projection period by multiplying enrollments by the ratios developed in the previous step. This process must be repeated for day credit, evening credit, and noncredit, then summed to the total.
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California Postsecondary Education Commission


THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Office of the Governor to coordinate the efforts of California’s colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations on higher education issues.

**Members of the Commission**

As of April 2002, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

- Alan S. Arkatov, Los Angeles; Chair
- Carol Chandler, Selma; Vice Chair
- Lance Izumi, Sacramento
- Kyo "Paul" Jhin, Malibu
- Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr., San Francisco
- Evonne Seron Schulze, San Diego
- Olivia K. Singh, San Francisco
- Howard Welinsky, Burbank
- Melinda G. Wilson, Torrance

Representatives of the higher education systems are:

- Irwin S. Field, Beverly Hills; appointed by the Office of the Governor to represent the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities;
- Robert L. Moore, Shadow Hills; appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges;
- Susan Hammer, San Jose; appointed by the California State Board of Education;
- William D. Campbell, Newport Beach; appointed by the Trustees of the California State University; and
- Odessa P. Johnson, Modesto; appointed by the Regents of the University of California.

The two student representatives are:

- Rachel Shetka, Santa Barbara
- Vacant

Of the 16 Commission members, nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Office of the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. Five others represent the major systems of postsecondary education in California. Two student members are appointed by the Office of the Governor.

**Functions of the Commission**

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and the Office of the Governor to “assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs.”

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including community colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory body to the Legislature and Office of the Governor, the Commission performs specific duties of planning, evaluation, and coordination by cooperating with other State agencies and nongovernmental groups that perform those other governing, administrative, and assessment functions. The Commission does not govern or administer any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any colleges and universities.

**Operation of the Commission**

The Commission holds regular public meetings throughout the year at which it discusses and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school level in California. Requests to speak at a meeting may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request before the start of the meeting.

The Commission’s day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of Executive Director Warren H. Fox, Ph.D., who is appointed by the Commission.

Further information about the Commission and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1303 J Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, California 98514-2938; telephone (916) 445-7933; web site www.cpec.ca.gov.
Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational and Joint-Use Centers
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ONE of a series of reports published by the California Postsecondary Education Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Summaries of these reports are available on the Internet at http://www.cpec.ca.gov. Single copies may be obtained without charge from the Commission at 1303 J Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, California 95814-2938. Recent reports include:
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02-2 Needs Analysis for the West Hills College at Lemoore, West Hills Community College District: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to a Request from the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (February 2002)
02-3 Student Transfer in California Postsecondary Education (February 2002)
02-4 California Colleges and Universities, 2002: A Guide to California’s Degree-Granting Institutions and to Their Degree, Certificate, and Credential Programs (April 2002)
02-5 The California Postsecondary Education Commission’s Public Agenda: Priorities for Action (April 2002)
02-6 Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational and Joint-Use Centers (April 2002)
Appendix B: Proposed Revisions to the Commission’s Guidelines for Approval of Community College Centers (see next page)
Proposed Revisions to the Commission’s Guidelines for Approval of Community College Centers

Background

Legislation passed in 2006 established a new system for allocating state revenues to community college districts. The legislation required the California Community Colleges Board of Governors to develop criteria and standards in accordance with Title 5 State regulations. The standards pertain to instruction, teaching, student support services, and physical capacity. In May 2008, the Board of Governors adopted regulations to implement the new funding system. One provision calls for districts to receive General Fund apportionments based in part on the number of its state-approved educational centers.

At the Commission’s December 2008 meeting, staff presented recommendations for modifying criteria for approval of educational centers to be consistent with the Board of Governors’ revised Title 5 regulations. The recommendations pertain to the minimum enrollment threshold, provisional approval, conversion of a grandfathered center to a state-approved center for apportionment funding purposes, and exceptions to the guidelines.

Purpose of Educational Centers

Previous Commission reports highlighted the value and importance of educational centers. Foremost, they are a cost-effective way to meet increased student demand, as opposed to investing scarce capital dollars to build costly comprehensive public colleges and universities. Cost effectiveness can be accomplished by placing educational centers strategically in high population growth areas where the host district is at or near capacity and student demand is expected to increase substantially.

Educational centers also promote shared facility use and intersegmental collaboration. This enables the state and the public higher education systems to realize and sustain greater resource efficiencies. Educational centers have the potential to increase learning productivity because students can spend more time engaged in learning and less time traveling to and from a main campus. Public colleges and universities can also use educational centers to expand access in rural and remote areas. Rural centers are especially beneficial when community college districts are expected to serve a mix of rural, urban, and suburban populations in areas spanning numerous counties.
PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO GUIDELINES

Recommendation Regarding FTES Threshold for Community College Educational Centers

Effective April 1, 2009, a community college off-campus operation that seeks conversion to a state-approved educational center must enroll a minimum of 500 annual full-time equivalent students (FTES) during the year immediately preceding the district’s proposal submission.

Discussion

Current Commission guidelines require an off-campus operation to serve a minimum of 500 fall-term FTES before it can be recognized as a state-approved center and eligible to compete for state capital outlay funding. The Board of Governors threshold is nearly identical, except it requires at least 500 FTES annually.

The Commission's current threshold is based on fall-term FTES, with the expectation that a center serve 500 FTES annually. Staff recommends updating the enrollment requirement to reflect annual FTES enrollment, consistent with current Title 5 Regulations. FTES will continue to be calculated as the number of weekly student contact hours generated by a center during an academic year divided by 525 hours. An equivalent way of calculating FTES is by adding the credit and non-credit instructional units generated during the academic year divided by 30 (two semesters at 15 units per semester).

Recommendation Regarding Provisional Approval of Educational Centers

Provisional approval does not involve state capital outlay funds. Staff recommends that provisional approval remain solely at the discretion of the Board of Governors. The Commission requests the Chancellor’s Office to forward provisional proposals and accompanying documents for information purposes, discussion, and comment.

Discussion

The 2008 Title 5 regulations authorize the Board of Governors to grant provisional approval to a center if it is to be located in a high population growth area and if an enrollment analysis clearly shows that it would serve 500 FTES annually by the third year of operation. Current Commission guidelines do not contain criteria governing provisional approval.

The Commission received confirmation from the Chancellor’s Office that a provisionally approved educational center is not eligible to compete for state capital outlay funds until it generates 500 FTES annually and until the host district submits a final proposal and needs study that meets all the Commission’s review guidelines. The Commission believes that the state’s interest in the efficient and orderly use of scarce capital outlay funding is not compromised by the provisional approval review process. Therefore, staff should not expend limited resources to conduct formal reviews of provisional proposals. The Chancellor’s Office is requested to forward those proposals and accompanying documents to the Commission for information purposes and general comments.
Recommendation Regarding Converting a Grandfathered Center to a State-Approved Educational Center

Converting a grandfathered center as defined below to a state-approved educational center involves base apportionment funding rather than capital outlay funding. Staff recommend that approval should remain solely under the purview of the Board of Governors. The Chancellor’s Office is requested to forward conversion proposals and accompanying documents to the Commission for information purposes, discussion, and comment.

Discussion

The Commission defines a grandfathered center as a community college off-campus operation that:

- Is governed by a community college district
- Existed before the California Postsecondary Education Commission was created in 1974
- Was recognized as an approved grandfathered center by the Commission in its December 10, 1984, report to the State Legislature
- Has continuously enrolled students since the Commission's approval
- Served at least 100 FTES during 2005–06, or an average of at least 100 FTES for the three-year period from 2003–04 to 2006–07.

Locations approved by the Commission before April 2002 continue to be eligible for state capital outlay funding, as outlined in the 2002 report, Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational and Joint-Use Centers. (www.cpec.ca.gov/completereports/2002reports/02-06.pdf). State regulations establish revised conditions for increasing base funding for grandfathered centers. Title 5 §58771 states: “a grandfathered center’s base funding entitlement shall not be increased until the center is approved as an educational center in accordance with Section 55180.”

Recommendation Regarding Exceptions to the Commission’s FTES Threshold for Educational Centers

The Commission will continue to consider exceptions if the proposal is endorsed by the Board of Governors and if the host district is able and willing to make a substantial capital outlay investment from local bond funds. Also, a district’s needs study must provide a compelling case demonstrating that the level of FTES will be sufficient to make it a viable operation, worthy of state capital outlay funds.

Discussion

The Commission and the Board of Governors have exercised judgment and a limited degree of flexibility in determining exceptions to the FTES threshold although not explicitly required by Title 5 regulations. Some centers serving fewer than 500 FTES have been allowed to compete for state capital outlay funding. In such cases, community or regional educational, economic and labor market needs were carefully considered.
Appendix C: Proprietary Schools in and around Panorama City

The following is a list of proprietary schools in the Panorama City area:

**Adelente Career Institute**
Location: Van Nuys.
Certificates/Diplomas in HVAC Installation; Medical Billing/Insurance Claims; Pharmacy Technician; Physical Therapy Aide; Office and Accounting Skills
Costs: $9,975 for full-time HVAC Certification Course

**American Pacific College**
Location: Van Nuys
Certificates/Diplomas in Automobile Performance Technician; Automobile Performance/Electrical Service; Office and Bookkeeping Skills; Medical Office Claims; Computer Systems/Technical Support Specialist; and Computer Repair and Troubleshooting

**Anderson Medical Career College**
Locations: North Hollywood
Certificates/Diplomas in Vocational Nursing; Nursing Assistant; Home Health Aide; Rehabilitative Nursing Aide; Acute Care Aide.
Costs: $18,850 for full-time Vocational Nursing Program (1 year); $25,000 for part-time (2 years)

**Casa Loma College**
Locations: Van Nuys
Certificates/Diplomas: Vocational Nursing; MRI Technologist; Medical Assistant; Medical Billing/Coding; Emergency Management; Ultrasound Technologist; NCLEX (Nursing Exam) Preparation
Costs: TBA

**Coast Career Institute**
Locations: Van Nuys
Certificates/Diplomas: Cake Decorating; Floral Arrangements and Bridal Accessories; Optical Dispensing; Private Security Guard
Costs: Will only dispense tuition/cost information in personal interview on campus.

**International Career Development College**
Locations: Van Nuys
Associate Degrees: Paralegal Studies; Alcohol and Drug Counseling; Homeland Security.
Diplomas: Alcohol and Drug Counseling, Medical Assistant; Business/Legal Admin.; Dental Lab Technician; Physical Therapy Aide; Homeland Security; Graphic Web
Development; Massage Therapy; Networking Systems Technician; Pharmacy Technician
Costs: $37,000 for Associate Degree in Paralegal Studies, Homeland Security, and Alcohol & Drug Counseling (22 month course). $13,400 for Diploma in various programs.

Kaplan College
Locations: Many nationwide, including Panorama City campus.
Associate of Arts Degree: Criminal Justice
Diplomas: Allied Health (Medical Assistant; Medical Billing and Coding Specialist); Legal Administrative Assistant
Costs: Will not dispense tuition/cost information over the phone.

Marian College
Locations: Van Nuys
Certificates in Licensed Vocational Nursing; IV Therapy.
Costs: $22,000 (14 month course).

National Holistic Institute
Location: Encino
Certificate in Massage Therapy.
Costs: $14,000.

New Technology Training Institute
Location: Glendale
Certificates in Computer Support areas such as Cisco engineering certification; Microsoft engineering certification; Network and Systems engineering; Healthcare: Medical Assistant; Surgical Technician
Costs: Tuition/Cost information available through personal campus interview only.

United Education International College (UEI College)
Locations: Van Nuys
Associate of Applied Science: Business Management
Diplomas: Business Office Admin.; Computer Systems Technician; Criminal Justice; Dental Assistant; Massage Therapy; Medical Assistant; Medical Billing/Insurance Coding; Pharmacy Technician
Costs: Information provided only to applicant in person at financial aid office.

Western Beauty Institute
Locations: Panorama City
Certificates: Estheology; Nail Technology; Cosmetology.
Costs: Information provided only in personal interview on campus.
Appendix D: Burbank Adult School

Burbank Adult School
3811 Allen Avenue
Burbank, California


Courses offered at Burbank Adult School are divided into six areas which overlap in significant ways:

1. Community interest: Courses geared toward adults seeking personal enrichment and satisfaction; Summer 2009 courses include, for example, Affordable Ethics Dining in L.A.; Memoir and Short Story Writing; Music Appreciation; Stock Market Boot Camp; Painting; Dancing (Salsa); and Educational Travel Abroad (Mexico)

2. Immigrant Studies: Citizenship Exam Preparation combined with English as a Second Language

3. Adult Basic Education: free to any adult students with reading level at 6th grade or lower—focus is on literacy and rudimentary skills

4. Family literacy and Parent Education

5. High School Diploma/GED Preparation Classes: courses geared toward successful completion of the diploma or passing the GED exam


According to the Burbank Adult School website, it has been providing lifelong education in Burbank since 1928. Its three-pronged set of course offerings – adult enrichment; literacy, citizenship, other basic education and high school/GED classes; and business and technical training – seems long established and not likely to change significantly.
Appendix E: Staffing Grid, Panorama City Educational Site

The following table depicts the recommended staffing model for the Panorama City Educational Site. Details on these positions are found within the body of this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>Rotating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions &amp; Records</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Office</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWorks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Lab/IT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSP&amp;S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP&amp;S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Operations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Administrator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Glendale College, Garfield Campus

Glendale College, Garfield Campus
1122 E. Garfield Avenue
Glendale, California

The Garfield Campus was opened in 1994 and has since served as the College’s the hub for non-credit course offerings. With the passage of Measure G in 2002, expanding the Garfield Campus has been one of Glendale’s major aims. Measure G included $16 million devoted to the expansion of the Garfield campus.

Goal 5 of Glendale College’s Strategic Master Plan 2003-2009 is to “expand educational programs and services at the Garfield campus.” The strategies designed to promote this expansion include:

1) expanding continuing education (high school, GED, business, lifetime learning, and parenting skills) and community services education programs;
2) building a student-friendly, collegiate atmosphere on campus;
3) expanding student services on the Garfield Campus;
4) explore the addition of offering credit courses on the Garfield Campus.

The Garfield Campus Expansion
Work has begun on the Garfield Campus Project, according to the Measure G Bond Oversight Committee’s 2008-2009 Annual Report. Planned in the project are:

1. Construction of a 3-story, 42,000 square foot building which will house student services offices including Financial Aid, Disabled Student Services & Programs, and Student Orientation as well as additional classroom space;
2. Acquisition of other property sufficient to allow for creation of 90 new parking spaces and for a new Child Care Facility on Adams Street.

The Garfield Campus Project will increase instructional/other space on Garfield Campus by 23,000 assignable square feet (ASF), and increase instructional capacity on the Garfield Campus by 635 FTES (almost 70 percent increase).

The College expects to occupy and begin use of the new facilities in Fall 2011.

Past, Present, and Anticipated Course Offerings at the Garfield Campus
Presently, only non-credit courses are offered at the Garfield Campus. While various Glendale College documents cite possible offerings of credit classes on the Garfield campus, it is possible even following the completion of the expansion in 2011 the Garfield campus will still remain limited to its robust non-credit curricula.

The spring and summer 2009 courses offerings at the Garfield Campus are similar, except there are roughly one third fewer sections offered in Summer. They are divided into the following categories:

History, United States History, American Government, Economics, Psychology, English, Geography, Art History, Career Exploration

2. GED Lab/Preparation Courses;

3. English as a Second Language;

4. Sewing/Dressmaking/Quilting;

5. Lifetime Learning (including seminars offered in retirement homes): history, drama, health, aerobics, painting, sketching, film criticism, creative writing, etc.);

6. Business skills: filing, business math and writing, basic computer skills, keyboarding, customer service, etc.; and

7. Parenting skills, child care.

Glendale College Historical Credit and Non-credit Student Enrollments
Based on fall headcount enrollment for the past 25 years, the number of students participating in noncredit offerings has fluctuated—reaching a low of 5,800 in fall 1995 and peaking to 9,900 in fall 2000—while reaching a present rough average of 7,500 students. (http://research.glendale.cc.ca.us/html/campusprofile/enr-02-fal.html).

According to Glendale College’s Director of Institutional Research and Planning Edward Karpp’s 2007 report Students: Enrollments, Where They Come From, Who They Are, http://research.glendale.cc.ca.us/html/reports/index.html, nearly half of students enrolled in Non-credit classes are found in ESL courses. This aligns with
the information provided by Non-credit students: in 2007, nearly a third (31 percent) listed their main goal of non-credit study as developing Basic Skills in English/ESL or Math.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GCC Noncredit Student Information: Student Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills in English/ESL or Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Development/Personal Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma/GED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer/Associate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided/Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GCC Noncredit Student Information: Percentage of Students Enrolled in Each Noncredit Department

| Noncredit ESL                              | 49% |
| Noncredit Business                         | 18% |
| Lifelong Learning                          | 14% |
| Developmental Skills Lab                    | 11% |
| Parent Education                           | 10% |
| Other                                      | 1%  |
**Appendix G: Staffing Grid, Burbank Educational Site**

The following table depicts the recommended staffing model for the Burbank Educational Site. Details on these positions are found within the body of this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burbank Educational Site</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>Rotating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions &amp; Records</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Office</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWorks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Lab/IT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSP&amp;S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP&amp;S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Operations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Administrator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Los Angeles Community College District, Administrative Regulation B-21

The following regulation is established to identify the essential elements as a prerequisite for the District’s purchase, lease-purchase or lease longer than three years of real property for the benefit of the District.

I. Evaluation

A. Documentation - The College President shall be responsible for documenting the following:

1. the rationale for considering the location and services;

2. a market study should be conducted to evaluate the demographics of the target market, the competition, including sister colleges, and the need for the program.

B. Notification

1. If it is a lease or offsite location for less than three years, then the College’s Vice President of Academic Affairs must review it with the Council of Academic Affairs.

   a. The Council of Academic Affairs shall advise whether the proposed site/program competes with another LACCD institution.

   b. If there is competition with another LACCD institution, the College Presidents shall attempt to resolve the matter. If they cannot, the Chancellor shall make an appropriate determination.
2. If it is an acquisition, lease-purchase or lease longer than three years, the College President must notify the Chancellor.

   a. The Chancellor will review the matter with the Cabinet, and determine when the matter should be reviewed with the Board.

C. Viability

   1. The College President is responsible for ensuring that a comprehensive evaluation of the economics, including enrollment projections, is conducted.

   2. The College President is responsible for ensuring that the viability study has been reviewed and approved by the Cabinet, or the Cabinet and the Board, as determined by the Chancellor.

   3. The College President is responsible for ensuring that before a real estate broker is engaged or solicited for assistance, Board approval should be obtained. To the extent that there is a desire to reserve purchase or lease rights, options may be negotiated with Board approval.

D. Preliminary Business Review

   1. The Facilities Planning and Development Department shall obtain and review a title report early in the transaction to identify title and lien issues; obtain a land survey and ALTA extended coverage title insurance to locate and protect against easements and encroachments.

   2. The Business Services Division will obtain an appraisal, performed by an MAI-certified or equivalent appraiser, to ensure that the price is fair and reasonable for the District.

II. Business Review and Financial Commitments

   A. The Controller shall be responsible for reviewing the method of financing, the cost of that financing, the timing for acceptance of title or possession, and the timing for making payments.

   B. The College President is responsible for pursuing the processes for obtaining State approval for an “educational center.”

   C. The Facilities Planning and Development Department shall evaluate local zoning and subdivision control issues, which may apply to activities and facilities outside the educational curriculum, e.g., commercial enterprises.
D. The Facilities Planning and Development Department shall review or arrange for appropriate architectural or engineering review of structures for compliance with the Field Act, or identify an appropriate exception; plans and specifications for new buildings must go through the Division of the State Architect.

E. The Facilities Planning and Development Department shall ensure that the facility is accessible for disabled persons, in accordance with applicable building codes.

F. The Facilities Planning and Development Department shall be responsible for ensuring the facility has been reviewed for appropriate safety conditions.

G. The Facilities Planning and Development Department shall review the use of the property for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act. This may require an Environmental Impact Report, a Negative Declaration or a Categorical Exemption, public hearings and notices, and findings by the Board.

H. Environmental insurance must be obtained for any property acquisition. The College President or designee shall work with the Risk Manager to place the insurance.

I. The Facilities Planning and Development Department must identify and address any particular issues associated with the site. For example, if the property owner is not amenable to negotiations and condemnation is contemplated, special costs and considerations will have to be weighed.

III. Due Diligence Responsibilities

A. The Facilities Planning and Development Department shall arrange for an appropriate Environmental Site Assessment for man-made and natural toxicity issues, as well as any applicable State agency review.

B. The Facilities Planning and Development Department shall be responsible for reviewing or arranging for appropriate review of whether the property is located within a flood plain.

C. In addition to the requirements contained herein regarding purchasing real property, if a College is considering acquiring a site or sites for the purpose of constructing a school building as defined by Education Code section 81130.5, these additional requirements must be satisfied:

1. The College President shall work with the Facilities and Planning Department to have the site(s) thoroughly investigated to evaluate all
factors affecting the public interest and whether it is economically feasible to construct on this site, which includes, but is not limited to, the raw land cost.

2. If the site is either located within a special studies zone as identified on a map by the State Geologist pursuant to Public Resources Code section 2621 et seq., or within an area designated as geologically hazardous as provided in Government Code section 65302(g), or if the estimated cost to reconstruct or alter or add to a building which alters structure elements exceeds $20,000.00, the investigation shall include geological and soil engineering studies to assess the nature of the site and potential for earthquake or other geological hazard damage. The study shall also evaluate the location of the site with respect to population, transportation, water supply, waste disposal facilities, utilities, traffic hazards, surface drainage conditions and other factors affecting the costs of the total project. The cost of geological and soil engineering studies may be treated as a capital expenditure.

3. This investigation is not necessary if the site or sites have been subject to adequate prior studies and the College has access to this information.

4. A copy of each investigative report shall be submitted to the Board of Governors and the Department of General Services.

5. The Facilities, Planning and Development Department is responsible for ascertaining whether the Department of General Services requires geological or soil engineering studies for the construction or alteration of any building on a site not located within a special studies zone.

6. If a proposed site or an existing site where a proposed addition will be made is within two miles of an airport runway or a runway proposed by an airport master plan, the Facilities, Planning and Development Department shall notify the Board of Governors in writing prior to acquiring title to the proposed property or prior to making additions to the existing property. No further action will be taken with respect to the site until such time that the Board of Governors has issued a report on the site and the requirements of Education Code section 81033 (c) and (d) have been satisfied.

IV. Use of Proposition A and Proposition AA Funds

A. If Proposition A funds are to be used, the College President must ensure that the property is reviewed by the Program Manager, the College Project Manager, and the Executive Director of Facilities Planning and Development.
B. The General Counsel will provide bond counsel with the site location, the applicable college and the proposed use in order to verify whether the use of Proposition A funds is legal.

C. A memorandum must be sent by the College President to the Chancellor confirming that the College’s shared governance processes have been consulted. The memorandum should confirm that the shared governance group supports the action and it’s timing relative to other projects, and that the support was based on a full understanding of the probable cost.

D. The College President is responsible for ensuring that the proposed site was anticipated as a use of the bond funds by the community.

V. Legal Processes

A. The General Counsel is responsible for assigning appropriate legal counsel.

B. Real Property Counsel must review the transaction for any special safety and legal considerations if the planned use involves significant participation by minors.

C. The Board may discuss real property in closed session only to provide direction to the real property negotiator(s). The College President shall schedule an appropriate time through the Office of General Counsel.

D. Public action must be taken by the Board to make the final decision. Closure of the sale shall not be performed until all due diligence has been performed.
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I. Introduction

This Substantive Change Manual is designed to assist institutions as they consider significant changes and to guide institutional reflection on the impact these changes have on the institution’s ability to continue to meet accreditations standards. The Manual is also intended to guide development of the Substantive Change Proposal, which the college produces to seek Commission review and approval of the change. In providing this information, the Commission hopes to clarify the meaning, intent, and process of substantive change.

II. Principles Underlying Substantive Change

The following principles underlie the purpose of substantive change:

*The Commission encourages change.* The Commission promotes educational innovation and experimentation that is responsible and appropriate to the institutional mission.

*The Commission requires change to improve the institution.* A primary purpose of accreditation is to promote institutional improvement. The accreditation standards require that institutions engage in an ongoing effort to improve their programs and services. The Commission recognizes that without application of fresh approaches to identified opportunities and problems, improvement cannot occur.

*The Commission anticipates that institutions will respond to evidence of the need for change.* Accreditation standards require that institutions engage in an ongoing process of evaluation, improvement, and reevaluation. Evaluation yields evidence of institutional performance that is often the stimulus for change.

*The Commission expects institutions to undertake change responsibly.* In order to maintain their integrity, institutions must guarantee the quality of their programs and services, even as they make changes.

*The Commission, through its substantive change process, ensures that institutions continue to meet accreditation standards.* The substantive change process requires evidence of institutional planning, resource commitment to the proposed change, and evidence that the institution’s condition following the change continues to meet accreditation standards, eligibility requirements, and Commission policies.

III. Rationale for Requiring Approval of Substantive Changes

The US Department of Education regulations require that accrediting agencies have adequate policies and procedures to ensure that any substantive changes to the edu-
cational mission, or programs of an institution, do not adversely affect the capacity of the institution to continue to meet ACCJC Accreditation Standards. Federal law mandates that accrediting agencies require institutions to obtain accreditor approval of a substantive change before it is included in the scope of the accreditation granted to the institution.

ACCJC’s Substantive Change Policy (Appendix A) is based in part on the regulations associated with the Higher Education Act of 1965 and its Amendments. The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges and other accrediting commissions, authorized by the U.S. Secretary of Education, are required to review certain types of substantive changes.

The accreditation of an institution is, in part, an affirmation that the institution has established conditions and procedures under which its mission and goals can be realized and that the institution can demonstrate accomplishment. When the Commission accredits an institution, or reaffirms its accreditation, it acts on the basis of conditions existing at the time of the Commission’s action. Because institutions are in continual processes of change, the Commission requires that substantive changes to the institution be evaluated and approved to ensure that accreditation standards are met. An institution seeks accreditation for approval by submitting a Substantive Change Proposal.

The substantive change review process provides the Commission a means for ensuring that a college maintains the educational quality and integrity of its programs and services, and that the substantive change is consistent with the institutional mission. 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 deficiencies have been addressed and the Commission has reaffirmed accreditation.

In all cases, substantive change requires prior Commission approval. In some cases, a visit is necessary to gather facts about the planned change (before a substantive change decision) or to confirm the impact of the change on the institution’s ability to meet standards (after a decision). Implementing a substantive change without prior Commission approval may result in a Commission decision to reevaluate the college’s accredited status.

IV. Changes the Commission Considers Substantive

Below is a list of seven conditions which typically require substantive change approval, accompanied by illustrations (not exhaustive) and key institutional considerations for each condition. Key considerations suggest points upon which the institution should focus the proposal. The proposal should address all of the required elements (A-H as described in “Required Format and Content of the Substantive Change Proposal” on page 14 in this Manual).
Conditions subject to prior substantive change review and approval by the Commission include:

**A. Change in Mission, Scope, or Name of the Institution**

A change in the purpose or character of the institution.

*Example:* Changing an institution’s private or public character, including changes in the denominational character of a religiously-affiliated institution.

*Key Considerations:* The mission statement is fundamental to determining the institution’s programs and services, its governance and decision-making processes, and its planning. An institution undertaking a change in purpose or scope would be likely to revise its mission statement. The resulting statement should define the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieve student learning.

A change in the degree level from that which was previously offered by the institution.

*Example:* Offering the third year of a program.

*Key Considerations:* In particular, the report must present evidence of the institution’s ability to provide courses consistent in quality and rigor with the standards.

*Example:* Offering a program at a degree level different from the two-year associate degree, e.g., a four-year, baccalaureate degree.

*Key Considerations:* An institution planning to offer baccalaureate degrees will fall under the jurisdiction of the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities (ACSCU) WASC. The first step in changing from ACCJC membership to ACSCU membership is approval of a substantive change.

Any change in the official name of the institution.

*Example:* An institution replaces its name with the name of its district or system.
Key considerations:
The proposal must present evidence that it has made proper notification of its change of name, including notifying the USDOE if the institution participates in federal financial aid programs. Any change in name must be consistent with the institution’s mission.

B. Change in the Nature of the Constituency Served

A change in the intended student population.

Example:
An institution offers courses or programs via online delivery intended to reach students not included in the student population described in the current institutional mission statement.

Key Considerations:
The proposal must present evidence that the college has reviewed its mission statement to determine whether the new population falls within its intended student population. A significant revision of the mission statement may be indicated. The institution should also consult the Distance Learning Manual for the principles that apply to good practice, and the Commission’s Policy on Distance Learning, Including Electronically Mediated Learning to ensure that it continues to meet accreditation standards.

The closure of an institution.

Example:
An institution ceases to offer all educational courses or programs.

Key Considerations:
Institutions planning closure must follow the Commission’s Policy on Closing an Institution. In particular, the proposal must present evidence that the institution has made appropriate arrangements for students to complete their programs of study and for transfer of student records to other institutions. The institution should also make arrangements for transfer of financial aid awards.

C. Change in the Location or Geographical Area Served

Offering courses or programs outside the geographic region currently served.

Example:
An institution offers and/or transports courses or programs to a new campus location, outside the community described in the current institutional mission
statement, or outside the WASC region, including international sites.

**Key Considerations:**
The evaluation of institutions that deliver education at a physical site in another region will be undertaken with the participation of the host regional accrediting commission. This will include the joint (home/host) review of off-campus sites in a host region against the accreditation standards of that region. Please see the *Interregional Policies on the Accreditation of Institutions Operating Across Regions*. An institution planning to establish a site outside of the U.S., designed to serve non-U.S. nationals, must follow *Principles of Good Practice in Overseas International Education Programs for Non-U.S. Nationals* and *Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations*. The proposal must present evidence that the institution will maintain sufficient control of the program, site, personnel, and policies to ensure continued compliance with accreditation standards and quality equivalent to the home campus.

**Establishing an additional location geographically apart from the main campus at which the institution offers at least 50% of an educational program.**

**Examples:**
An institution offers at least half of the courses required for an associate's degree or vocational certificate at a single off-campus location.

An institution transports, transfers, or duplicates at least half of the courses required for an associate’s degree or vocational certificate to a new location or site, geographically apart from the main campus, and different from or in addition to previously approved sites.

**Key Considerations:**
The proposal must present evidence of sufficient control over the site to assure the quality of programs and services. Students must have access to support services and learning resources appropriate to the programs offered at the location. The proposal must present evidence that the site meets accreditation standards for safety, security, and appropriateness for the institutional programs and services conducted at the site. The institution must also demonstrate its ability and commitment to meet the fiscal requirements of the additional location.

For purposes of compliance with federal recognition requirements, the Substantive Change Proposal constitutes the business plan for the establishment of a branch campus. The Commission requires a visit within six months of the start of operation at the new facility to verify that the institution has the person-
nel, facilities, and resources reported in the Substantive Change Proposal.

If the substantive change is to establish an additional branch campus location, 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.

Closing a location geographically apart from the main campus at which students were able to complete at least 50% of an educational program.

Example:
An institution closes a campus where students have been able to take at least half of the courses applicable to an associate’s degree.

Key Considerations:
Institutions planning closure of a site must follow the Commission’s Policy on Closing an Institution in the Accreditation Reference Handbook. Should the college wish to reopen the site, a second Substantive Change Proposal and visit will occur prior to reopening to verify that the institution has the personnel, facilities, and resources reported in the proposal. The proposal must present evidence of program quality consistent with accreditation standards.

D. Change in the Control of the Institution

Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the institution. The Commission requires a visit within six months of the change of status, form of control or ownership.

Example:
Sponsorship or ownership of a private institution changes.

Key Considerations:
The proposal must present evidence of the fiscal soundness of the entity acquiring or purchasing the institution. In the case of a private institution with a corporate and a governing board, the proposal must clearly state which body is responsible for policies; which body confirms that institutional practices are consistent with the board-approved institutional mission statement and policies; how these two bodies achieve these overlapping purposes; which body has ultimate authority for these operations; what the role of the president is; and how authority is vested and organized. Institutions planning this type of substantive change should refer to the Commission Policy on Institutions with Related Entities, in the Accreditation Reference Handbook.
Institutions undergoing changes in ownership, control and/or legal status are visited within six months of the implementation of the change to verify that the institution has the personnel, facilities, and resources reported in the Substantive Change Proposal.

**Example:**
A for-profit institution becomes a non-profit institution.

**Key Considerations:**
The proposal must present evidence of how the change will impact the financial stability of the institution and its ability to meet the standards for high-quality educational programs and services.

**Example:**
The district/system changes provision for administrative governance or other support services to one or more colleges.

**Key Considerations:**
The proposal must explain how the college(s) will address proposed changes in support services and how the proposed administrative structure will enable the college(s) to continue to meet accreditation standards.

**Merging with another institution.**

**Example:**
A comprehensive college assumes responsibility for the programs offered by a specialized institution.

**Key Considerations:**
The proposal must present evidence that the institutions have made appropriate transition arrangements for students.

**Contracting for the delivery of courses or programs in the name of the institution with a non-regionally accredited organization.**

**Example:**
An institution contracts with a commercial organization for that organization to provide courses or programs on behalf of the institution.

**Key Considerations:**
Institutions planning to contract with an organization to deliver, create, or provide courses or programs in the name of the institution or district/system must follow the Commission’s policy on *Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations*. The contract must guarantee the college
sufficient control to assure that the quality of the courses or programs meet all accreditation standards.

A change by a parent institution of one of its off-campus sites into a separate institution.

Example:
An institution with two campuses decides to split into two colleges, each independently capable of offering a two-year degree.

Key considerations:
If the change involves the formation of a separate institution from an off-campus center or branch campus, the institution must provide projected financial information for the parent institution of the proposed split. The focus of this proposal should be the anticipated impact of the change on the parent college. The new separate institution must begin the process for separate accreditation with an eligibility review.

E. Change in Courses or Programs or their Mode of Delivery that Represents a Significant Departure from Current Practice

Addition of a program or courses that represent a significant departure from an institution’s current programs or curriculum.

Examples:
An institution offers a program in a field requiring substantial new curriculum, faculty, equipment, or facilities, such as a program with a clinical component.

A specialized institution offers courses in a field requiring substantial new curriculum, faculty, equipment, or facilities.

Key Considerations:
Evidence supporting the need for the program should be presented in the proposal. The institution must ensure that sufficient fiscal resources are available to support the program and that the curriculum, faculty, equipment, and facilities meet accreditation standards. These program resources must be in place prior to submission of the Substantive Change Proposal. The college should consider the consistency between the proposed program and the institutional mission.

Addition of a new degree or vocational certificate program that represents a significant departure from an institution’s current programs.
Example:
An institution develops a new degree or vocational certificate program to be offered at the main campus or at any one of the approved institutional sites off campus.

**Key Considerations:**
The institution must ensure that the curriculum, faculty, equipment, and facilities meet accreditation standards. These resources must be in place prior to submission of the Substantive Change Proposal.

**Addition of courses that constitute 50% or more of a program offered through a mode of distance or electronic delivery.**

Example:
An institution offers courses that make up 50% or more of the credits required for a program through an instructional delivery that is new for the college.

**Key Considerations:**
The institution should consult the Distance Learning Manual and Commission Policy on Distance Learning, Including Electronically Mediated Learning for appropriate guidelines.

**F. Change in Credit Awarded**

An increase of 50% or more in the number of credit hours awarded for the successful completion of a program.

Example:
An institution changes a required 20 credit hours for a particular certificate to 30 credit hours.

**Key Considerations:**
Evidence supporting the need and benefit to students, and evidence of necessary resources should be in the proposal.

A change from clock hours to credit hours.

Example:
An institution changes the foundation for awarding credit from a 50-minute hour for each credit awarded to a calculation based on the Carnegie unit.

**Key Considerations:**
Evidence of positive impact for students and the institution, and evidence of necessary resources should be in the proposal.
G. Any Other Significant Change

The Commission reserves the right to request reports and visits to assess the effects of any change it deems to be a significant departure.

These changes, because they may affect the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the total institution, are subject to review prior to as well as subsequent to implementation. Institutions have reported loss of federal financial aid when substantive changes were not approved by regional accrediting bodies.

V. Substantive Change Review and Approval Process

A. The ACCJC Annual Report

Each year the Commission requires all ACCJC member institutions to submit an Annual Report. The Commission includes the Substantive Change Policy with the report form so that institutions can gauge whether they need to file a Substantive Change Proposal on any of the items in the Annual Report.

The Commission reviews information supplied by the colleges for potential substantive changes and notifies colleges if a Substantive Change Proposal is needed. The responsibility for initiating and completing the substantive change process lies with the institution. For those institutions undergoing a reaffirmation visit, the Commission also provides the chair of the comprehensive evaluation team copies of the college’s Annual Reports so that the team may check progress on potential substantive changes and report the status of such changes back to the Commission.

B. The Sequential Steps in a Substantive Change Review

The first step in the process for a substantive change review is to formally communicate to the Commission’s substantive change staff (via email or U.S. Postal Service) a description of the proposed change, the need for the change, and the anticipated effects. Early notification enables the staff to provide information and advice about the effect of the proposed change on the accredited status of the institution and to assist the college in preparing a complete proposal. Staff will also suggest to the institution areas of particular concern to the Committee on Substantive Change according to the type of change being proposed.

After reviewing the proposed change, Commission staff will determine whether or not it is indeed substantive. What might be a minor change for one institution may well be viewed as a major change for another. If the proposed change is determined to be substantive, the institution will be asked to complete a Substantive Change Proposal. When the proposal is determined to be a substantive
change please refer to the ACCJC Fee Schedule that each college receives annually for the Substantive Change Fee.

C. Timing of Proposal Submission

An accredited institution is expected to complete this process sufficiently in advance of a substantive change to permit approval before the change is instituted. Institutions which have been declared eligible for accreditation but have not yet achieved candidate or accredited status may not employ the substantive change approval process. Institutions scheduled for a Comprehensive Visit may not employ the substantive change approval process in the six-month period preceding the visit. (Please see “Rationale for Requiring Approval of Substantive Changes” for proposal submission timing as it relates to Commission accreditation sanctions, page 3.)

D. Preparing the Substantive Change Proposal

Once the college has established the need to prepare a Substantive Change Proposal, it should follow section VI of this Manual, “Required Format and Content of the Substantive Change Proposal” on page 15. Commission staff will assist the college by reviewing draft proposals for completeness and issues that may require further explanation or documentation. The draft proposal should include a table of contents with an appendix listing the documentation of appropriate evidence. Commission staff will schedule the institution for a review of the final proposal by the Committee on a first-come first-served basis.

The final proposal and a college catalog must be mailed, and one copy e-mailed, to the Commission office staff and the Committee members 30 days prior to the scheduled conference call meeting; staff will provide committee members’ mailing addresses and instructions for e-mailing or mailing to the Committee members. In each case, the institution remains responsible for the content of the proposal.

E. Committee on Substantive Change

The Commission has authorized a committee of Commissioners to review proposals and take formal actions on substantive changes. The Committee on Substantive Change may act to approve, defer, deny the change, or refer the proposed change to the entire Commission for action at either the January or June Commission meeting. The Committee may also request additional information about the change or visit the institution prior to taking any action. In addition, the Committee may require a follow-up report on the substantive change. The Committee on Substantive Change normally meets once a month during the academic year; it does not meet in January or June, when regular Commission meetings occur.
When the Committee on Substantive Change makes a determination regarding a substantive change, the Commission communicates the decision to the institution via e-mail within two weeks of the meeting, with a formal letter following within four weeks, and to the entire Commission at the next regular meeting. When a substantive change decision is made at the Commission meeting, the Commission notifies the institution of its action within 30 days of the decision. If a substantive change is denied, the letter will include reasons for the denial. In the event that the change is judged to have the potential to affect the institution broadly, the review process may be expanded to include the institution as a whole.

F. Appeal

If the institution wishes to appeal the decision of the 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.

G. Visits

Under federal requirements of recognized accrediting agencies, the Commission must visit the college within six months of the start of operations of certain substantive changes. The Commission must visit additional locations that offer 50% or more of a program to verify that the personnel, facilities, and resources claimed at the time of the Substantive Change Proposal are, in fact, present. Institutions undergoing changes in ownership, control, and/or legal status are visited within six months of the implementation of the change. 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 review may be required by the Commission. The Commission may also choose to visit additional locations, for example, when there is rapid growth in the number of such locations. The Commission requires institutions to absorb the costs of a site visit.

H. Institutional Follow-Up

The Commission may require institutions to submit follow-up reports on specific issues precipitated by the substantive change. These reports make it possible for the Commission to assess the impact of the change once it has been implemented. Requirements for these reports will be specified in the action letter approving the substantive change. These reports may be followed by a visit by Commission representatives.

While not ideal, should a substantive change review already be in progress in close proximity to the preparation of the self study report, the college should then include a description of the change and its status with the Commission.
(e.g., whether the Substantive Change Proposal is in draft form or under consideration by the Commission but not yet approved). Institutions should include updates of approved substantive changes in their next self study.

VI. Required Format and Content of the Substantive Change Proposal

Cover Sheet:
The cover sheet must include “Substantive Change Proposal,” the title of the substantive change, the name and address of the institution, the date of submission, and the name and title of the individual responsible for preparing the proposal.

Table of Contents:
The Table of Contents should have page numbers for the body of the proposal and should list supporting appended documentation of evidence.

The Substantive Change Proposal should include the following content where applicable:

A. A concise description of the proposed change and the reasons for it.
   • A brief description of the change.
   • Evidence of a clear relationship to the institution’s stated mission.
   • Discussion of the rationale for the change.

B. If the substantive change involves a new educational program, a description of the program to be offered including evidence that:
   • The educational purposes of the change are clear and appropriate.
   • All relevant Commission policies are addressed.
   • The proposed program meets accreditation standards related to Student Learning Programs and Services and Resources.

C. A description of the planning process which led to the request for the change, including:
   • How the change relates to the institution’s planning process and stated mission.
• The assessment of needs and resources which has taken place.

• The anticipated effect of the proposed change on the rest of the institution.

• A clear statement of the intended benefits that will result from the change.

• A description of the preparation and planning process for the change.

D. Evidence that the institution has analyzed and provided for adequate human, administrative, financial, and physical resources and processes necessary to initiate, maintain, and monitor the change and to assure that the activities undertaken are accomplished with acceptable quality, including:

• Evidence of sufficient and qualified faculty, management, and support staffing.

• Evidence of appropriate equipment and facilities, including adequate control over any off-campus site.

• Evidence of fiscal resources including the initial and long-term amount and sources of funding for the proposed change.

• Evidence of a plan for monitoring achievement of the desired outcomes of the proposed change.

E. Evidence that the institution has received all necessary internal or external approvals, including:

• A clear statement of what faculty, administrative, governing board, or regulatory agency approvals are needed, and evidence that they have been obtained.

• Evidence that any legal requirements have been met.

• Evidence of governing board action to approve the change and any budget supporting the change.

F. Evidence that each Eligibility Requirement will still be fulfilled related to 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 related to the change and that all relevant Commission policies are addressed. Any standards that are particularly impacted by the change should be addressed in detail.
There should be a description of the process for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness and learning outcomes expected through the proposed change.

H. Other information requested by Commission staff that is pertinent to the specific nature of the change. Depending on the nature of the proposed change, the Commission may ask for more detailed information to assist the staff and the Committee on Substantive Change in their reviews.

While the college is developing the Substantive Change Proposal, the Commission recommends sending a draft proposal to staff electronically. Feedback on the proposal will be provided electronically. Once the proposal is ready for review by the Committee on Substantive Change, Commission staff will direct the college to mail copies of the proposal and all supporting documentation to the ACCJC office and the Committee members.

VII. Follow-Up Visits

Visit after Substantive Change Approval of an Additional Location, Change in Ownership, Control, and/or Legal Status.

A Substantive Change Proposal approved by the Commission regarding development of an additional location or a change in ownership, control, and/or legal status requires a visit within six months of the beginning of operation. The Commission will schedule a one-day visit in collaboration with the institution. The visiting team will focus on the contents of the original Substantive Change Proposal and any updated information requested by Commission staff prior to the visit, as well as any stated concerns of the Committee on Substantive Change.

The visit will be conducted by one of the following: A member or members of the Commission staff; a member of the Commission staff and a member of the Committee on Substantive Change or other Commissioner. The size of the visiting team will be a function of the complexity and size of the site and proposed change. The staff member will serve as Chair of the team.

A draft report of the substantive change visit will be presented to the institution for any corrections of fact. A final visit report will be submitted to the institution, filed with the institution’s ACCJC records and reported to the Commission at its next meeting.
VIII. Tips for Preparing Proposals on Selected Substantive Changes

A. For a New Campus or Additional Location, the proposal should include the following:

- Projected date of the start of operations at the additional location.
- Distance from main campus.
- Evidence of need for the additional location.
- Description of how satisfaction of the need will be assessed.
- Evidence that the institution will maintain sufficient control of the location to guarantee that it meets accreditation standards.
- Evidence of official approval by the Governing Board.
- Evidence that the location will be ready to begin operation at the time of the substantive change approval.
- Evidence of sufficient fiscal and physical resources to support and sustain the additional location.
- Description of how the college will identify specific needs for services and resources of students at the additional location.
- Description of support services and learning resources available at the location.
- Description of how students will access services and resources if students are to rely on those services and resources at the main campus.
- Evidence of sufficient and qualified staff at the location, and description of processes for hiring and evaluating such staff.
- Description of the process for creating and revising curriculum for the location.
- Description of how programs at the location will be evaluated, including the achievement of student learning outcomes.
• Description of the involvement of staff and students at the location in institutional planning and decision-making.

Suggestions for documentation for a New Campus or Additional Location:

• Copy of the lease and/or floor plans.

• Operating budget and analysis of substantive change financial resources as they relate to the college budget.

• Pages from the class schedule indicating the address and classes offered at the location.

• Map showing main campus and additional location.

• Minutes of Board meeting showing action to approve the additional location.

• Organizational chart showing management structure for the additional location.

B. For a New Educational Program, some questions to assist in determining if changes in courses or programs constitute “significant departures:”

• Does the college mission statement need to be changed to include the proposed program?

• Does the college need to acquire, build, or modify facilities in order to accommodate the proposed program?

• Does the college need to acquire new equipment for the new program?

• Does the college need to arrange for outside clinical experience or apprenticeships for the program?

• How much of the existing curriculum will be included in the proposed program?

• How will the new curriculum differ from existing curriculum in terms of level, content, length, rigor, and credit? Will new prerequisite courses need to be added to the curriculum?

• How will existing general education requirements, as required by the standards, be sustained?
• How will the college meet the need to hire faculty with expertise not found within the current faculty membership, should the number of faculty need to increase?

• How will learning resources be augmented to support the program?

• How will student support services need to be added or adjusted?

For a **New Educational Program**, the proposal should include the following:

• Evidence that the new program is within the scope of the institutional mission.

• Description of the analysis undertaken to determine need for the new program.

• Evidence of official approval by the Governing Board.

• Evidence of sufficient fiscal and physical resources to support the new program.

• Evidence that the program is designed to meet student need.

• Description of how satisfaction of the need will be assessed.

• Description of how the program will be reviewed compared with other programs, including the achievement of student learning outcomes.

• Description of how expertise in this new field is to be acquired in order for a quality curriculum to be developed.

• Evidence of sufficient and qualified staff for the program, and description of processes for hiring and evaluating such staff.

• Description of the process for creating and revising curriculum for the program.

• Description of program course requirements.

• Description of student support services for the program.

• List of prerequisites and admission requirements.
Suggested documentation for New Educational Programs should include:

- Pages from the catalog, if appropriate.
- Course outlines.
- Chronology of development of the substantive change.
- Administrative organizational chart.
- Budget for the change, integration with college budget, plans for sustainability.
- Job descriptions showing qualifications for program faculty.

C. For a New Instructional Delivery Mode, the proposal should include:

- Description of the analysis undertaken to determine need for the new instructional delivery mode.
- Evidence of official approval by the Governing Board.
- Evidence of sufficient fiscal and physical resources to initiate and maintain the new delivery mode.
- Evidence that delivery systems and modes of instruction are designed to and do in fact meet student need.
- Description of how satisfaction of the need will be assessed.
- Description of how effectiveness of the delivery mode will be assessed; how the delivery mode will be reviewed compared with other modes.
- Description of student and faculty support for the mode of delivery.
- Plan for equipment acquisition and maintenance.
- Description of faculty training needed and implemented.
- Description of how mode is considered in curriculum development process.
- Evaluation of marketing efforts and evidence of their integrity.
• Evaluation of information provided to students regarding the new delivery mode (e.g., equipment requirements; access to help desk).

• Description of college accommodations for any requirements that students in distance learning courses come to campus.

D. Considerations for Distance Learning Programs:

Unexpected Growth

Recent history (2-5 year span) of Distance Learning on the campus
Increase in the number of courses offer on line
Increase in the number of faculty teaching online courses
Increase in the number of students taking online courses

Increasing Expectations

Institutional processes that impact student access and completion of on line programs: admissions, orientation, registration, advising, financial aid course delivery, communication with students, tutoring services graduation applications, transcript requests, student survey collection and analysis

Student Success Data

Class size
Student retention and withdrawal rates/data
Student course completion rates/data
Online pass rate compared with seat-time pass rate
Student data collection and analysis
Use of student data for improvement

Quality Assurances

Academic Integrity; course content between online and seat-time courses
Faculty online teaching capability
Student capability for online delivery
Faculty and student support services
Faculty and student learning assessment systems
Integration with institutional mission
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Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
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Substantive Change Policy
(Adopted October 1972, Revised January 1978, June 1991, June 1996,
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;
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 constitute 50% and/or more of a program and/or 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. (Please refer to Policy on Closure of Institutions.)

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 control of the institution**

   Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of an 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 in 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 which action on accredited status has been deferred by the Commission, may not employ the substantive change approval process.

**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.

**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 Proposal for review by the Commission’s Committee on Substantive Change.

*The Substantive Change Proposal should include the following:*

A concise description of the proposed change and the reasons for it.
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.

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.

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

Evidence that the institution has received all necessary internal or external approvals. The proposal should state clearly what faculty, administrative, governing board, or regulatory agency approvals are needed and evidence that any legal requirements have been met.

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.

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.

Other information requested by Commission staff that is pertinent to the specific nature of the change.

Commission Action:
Once the Substantive Change Proposal 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.

**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.

**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.

**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 that 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.
Appendix B

Brief Descriptions of Selected Policies

The Commission policies summarized below are particularly relevant to specific types of substantive changes such as conducting courses through new distance learning modes, contracting with other agencies for the delivery of educational programs, sharing functions with a related entity, and closing programs or colleges. These and other relevant policies are found in the Accreditation Reference Handbook, 2008.

In the Policy on Distance Learning, Including Electronically Mediated Learning the Commission recognizes that most institutions will make use of the growing range of systems for delivery of instruction, including various electronic means. The policy is based on principles of good practice to help assure that distance learning is characterized by the same concerns for quality, integrity, and effectiveness that apply to more traditional modes of instruction.

The policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations details the controls institutions must have in place when contracting with another entity to provide courses or programs. The policy provides guidance for contract content.

Policy on Institutions with Related Entities is intended to ensure that accreditors receive appropriate assurances and sufficient information and documentation to determine whether such institutions comply with Commission standards and policies. It addresses change of ownership and details the specific information that is needed in addition to substantive change or other policies.

Policy on Closing an Institution includes requirements of provisions for student completion of programs and transfer to other institutions, academic records, financial aid, faculty and staff, and completion of institutional financial obligations.

Interregional Policies on the Accreditation of Institutions Operating Across Regions are based upon the premises that the home region should be demonstrably accountable for its accreditation decisions affecting institutions operating in host regions and that the host region has a legitimate interest in the quality of institutions from other regions operating within its jurisdiction. These policies address the evaluation and procedures for accreditation of institutions operating interregionally.