Special Focus: Centers and Sites

**Background:** City College of San Francisco integrates and delivers student services at its centers/sites/neighborhood campuses through the structures of its departments and units. According to CCSF Office of Research and Planning, in 2011, 41% of CCSF students were first enrolled in Noncredit classes. Also, the centers/sites/neighborhoods campuses make a significant revenue contribution to the College because both Credit and Noncredit are offered at most campuses and generate funds from various sources of revenues --- i.e., apportionment, grants, foundation grants. Additionally, the centers introduce many students to Credit studies; 29% of Credit students have Noncredit experience at City College.

Also, according to census data, San Francisco has 100,000 residents living under the federal poverty line. Sites/centers/campuses provide essential services to these disadvantaged students who are not easily served centrally. These students are severely under-resourced in some or all of the following ways: extremely low income, extremely low English skills, education under 8th grade level, lack of ability to use computers and the internet, lack of access to transportation. Many students at neighborhood campuses are family wage earners who lack the time and resources required to travel to the main campus. By serving these students, they become more successful as employees, students and San Francisco citizens. This success helps CCSF meet its mission.

Given the references to centers and sites throughout the ACCJC Recommendations, the Interim Chancellor formed a “special focus” workgroup (“Workgroup 15”) to look specifically at issues concerning CCSF centers and sites. The goal of the workgroup since August 2012 has been to analyze and assess the issues regarding centers and sites as referenced in the accreditation recommendations and to identify and collect data necessary for a fiscal and programmatic analysis of them.

The references to centers appears in several of the Recommendations, primarily in Recommendation 1 (Mission), Recommendation 2 (Effective Planning Process), Recommendation 5 (Student Services), Recommendation 8 (Physical Resources), and Recommendation 10 (Financial Planning), and it was felt that the work would be better coordinated and more effective if addressed by a single group. Workgroup 15 members include the Chancellor in addition to administrators, staff, faculty, and student representatives.

The following is a list of centers that the committee has focused on:

- Airport
- Castro/Valencia
- Chinatown/North Beach
- Civic Center
- Downtown
Historical Issue of Nomenclature:

The terms centers and campuses will be used interchangeably here. There is a historical and political issue affecting the labeling of what are normally called educational centers at other colleges, but have been called campuses at CCSF. Several faculty have complained in Board meetings and other college venues about the change made of nomenclature from campuses to centers for the above locations. Some perceive the change as an attempt to silo these parts of the college into educational centers separate from the college, instead of co-equal campuses of the college. They are concerned about downgrading the status of students and employees there, ironically, at a time when the state is gaining a renewed appreciation of the value of decentralized noncredit under CCC, in response to changes in California’s diverse adult population and its educational needs.

In 1991 the SFCCD Centers Division essentially ceased existing locally as a separate entity and the component centers were integrated into the College itself as “campuses,” an in-house designation differing from state terminology but championing the new respect for their role. Both credit and noncredit were to be offered at the campuses. Faculty were no longer supervised by center directors but by department chairs. There is strong feeling among many faculty that any return to the earlier organization would be a step backward and that an internal use of the term “centers” (while found acceptable to use in communication with CCC) could be interpreted as a signal of heading in an undesirable policy direction. There are also other faculty and other employees who do not have a strong feeling about the matter or who prefer the change to the term “centers,” better matching the State designation.

Update:

Since August, members of the group have met and engaged in the following activities, which has begun the process of allowing them to complete a programmatic analysis of each center:

- Centers defined
- Foundation Grants reviewed
- Real estate value assessed
- Data regarding program and course offerings/sections per center collected
- Student data by center collected (including zip codes)
To date, the committee has also reviewed other information about the cost and productivity of each Center. These data have been in a variety of formats with a range of information. Since the goal is to create a cohesive plan in a standardized format that can give CCSF and external stakeholders a programmatic analysis of and operational costs for each center, a template was provided to each Dean to collect data deemed relevant for analysis and the final report. This information should be provided to the workgroup before the end of the year.

The workgroup also needs to understand the productivity potential for each center and, therefore, needs a solid understanding of Center Utilization/Capacity of each center. These data are not easily gathered right now, but it will be necessary to gather them before the analysis and final report are complete.

In related workgroup studies, Workgroup 5 (Student Services) has focused on planning steps to conduct a comprehensive review and assessment of all student support services across the entire District, including the main campus and all centers. This effort is specific to the task identified in Recommendation 5 for the College to communicate plans for delivery and prioritization of student services regardless of location but also pertains to the work being completed in Workgroup 15.

A calendar and specific steps were finalized at Workgroup 5’s September 26, 2012 meeting. Preliminary discussion and planning are focused on a process to ensure the development of guiding principles to identify needed support services; a definitive process designed to engage students and all student services personnel, including faculty, classified staff, and administrators; and a process to conduct needs and cost analyses of the delivery of services.

The review and assessment will provide opportunity for input from all constituent groups through focus groups co-facilitated led by administrators and faculty within Student Services and Academic Affairs. Findings and recommendations resulting from the review and assessment will be presented to the accreditation steering committee in early Spring 2013 and will inform the future plans for instructional and student services at all the CCSF centers.

In other related matters, Workgroup 8 (Physical Resources) has been examining the costs of ownership associated with the District’s physical resources. To understand how the annual budget items pertained to District facilities and maintenance, the workgroup reviewed the College’s annual budget and major chart of accounts. This review revealed several challenges related to center based budgeting, confirming that the College has not had a practice of allocating or expending money by campus/center.

In light of this challenge, Workgroup 8 looked to other college models for facilities/physical plant plans. Through consensus, the workgroup felt that the College would benefit from developing and implementing a Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) model for its campus and centers. In reviewing documents from Santa Monica College, Workgroup 8 found a model that incorporated principles based on the Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA) staffing standards. It was decided that APPA staffing standards could be utilized by the College to determine appropriate levels of staffing in Buildings and Grounds, Facilities, Custodial services and the like. This TCO Model will be used in Workgroup 15’s efforts to analyze center’s costs.
Finally, Workgroup 7 (Human Resources) is currently looking at the level of administrative and staff support for centers beyond the Ocean Campus and will report back during the early 2013 timeframe.

Several concrete steps have already been made concerning CCSF sites. The Board approved three recommendations related to site closures on September 27, 2012. The first was to consolidate the course offerings that had been offered at the Castro site (approximately 20-25 sections) to other centers throughout the city. The Castro site was located at a junior high school that operated as a College site in the evening. This move will allow the classes to be offered in a more appropriate facility for higher education and provide cost savings from cancellation of rent and reduction of staff time needed to oversee the facility.

Coincidentally, these classrooms contain District-owned furniture that was desperately needed at other sites in order to increase classroom capacity and increase productivity. The College ceased buying new desks/chairs several years ago, and some faculty have indicated a willingness to accept additional students in their classes if more chairs were available.

Similar to the first recommendation regarding the Castro site, the second recommendation was to relocate classes currently offered at the two Park Presidio sites to other centers.

The third recommendation was to immediately begin the process of pursuing options for generating revenue from the 33 Gough Street property. This property is in a prime location for development, located one block off of Market Street. The facility does not receive a Foundation Grant and houses fiscal and administrative staff. The goal is to relocate those staff to other District-owned property.

Organizational changes to help streamline the reporting structure of the Centers have also been already made: three interim Vice Chancellors reverted to their previous status, two as Deans and one as Associate Vice Chancellor. The administrators responsible for centers resided within both Academic Affairs and Student Development, which created reporting inefficiencies. The new structure will streamline reporting lines and create greater cost efficiencies as the College continues to work on the organizational structure for the layers beneath the Vice Chancellors.

Contributions, Considerations, Context: Neighborhood Campuses Fulfilling the Mission of the College

In the 1994 Self-Study for Evaluation, CCSF was asked by the ACCJC to examine whether it wanted to continue its relatively decentralized mode of delivering educational services throughout the City, or whether it would be preferable to further centralize the delivery of services. At that time, after review of the relevant facts, the decision was made locally that CCSF could best serve the public through its structure of multiple educational centers, which CCSF had been referring to as campuses, until recently, in order to emphasize their importance to the college and their inclusion of both credit and noncredit. That decision was reported to the Commission in the recommendation response of the 2000 Self Study for Accreditation and that response to the recommendation was accepted by ACCJC.

Public satisfaction with the decentralized services that CCSF offers was recently made very apparent in the successful opening of the new Chinatown Campus, attended by numerous elected leaders from throughout the City, and by the 73% approval of the parcel tax by the electorate. There are many reasons for this public satisfaction with the structure of the institution.
As mentioned above, the neighborhood campuses serve students who are under-resourced and disadvantaged in many ways. In addition, it has become increasingly clear that CCSF's neighborhood locations serve a key economic purpose in workforce development. Silicon Valley and nearby San Francisco are economic powerhouses for California in times of economic growth. Workers pour in from around the country and around the world to join those already in the area. (San Francisco's population grows by in-migration from other areas, not by births. 87% of the residents are aged 18 and older.)

In an effort to catch the wave of employment or ride higher on it, many of San Francisco's workers seek to make themselves more competitive by acquiring additional skills and knowledge at CCSF. They are attracted to the easy access and convenience of neighborhood campuses that they can access before or after their work and family responsibilities. When the economic wave has lulled and the economy enters a period of contraction, many of the workers who remain strive to make the most of their time by preparing at CCSF for the next opportunity.

The neighborhood campuses continue to attract somewhat different demographics. In noncredit even more than in credit, the percentage of students of color served is extremely high, and the vast majority are served at neighborhood campuses. The students at the campuses tend to be somewhat older than the credit students typically served at Ocean, but that varies by campus and by credit/noncredit offerings. Credit students at the neighborhood campuses earn higher GPAs in all ethnic groups than at the main campus—age and program offerings enter into that, but it has been well documented in the past that students experience good success at the campuses and, on the whole, express a high level of satisfaction with services historically offered in the community.

Noncredit programs offered at the campuses fall within most of the missions of the college including some missions identified as priorities, such as basic skills. Whatever subject they study, noncredit students typically improve their learning skills and gain knowledge relevant to civic engagement, health, ethics, technology, job search, parenting, and respect for diversity. Therefore, CCSF noncredit programs help reduce crime, dependency, taxpayer-borne health costs, and other social costs, strengthening San Franciscans' abilities to be independent and self-supporting contributors to their community and society.

One of the highest demand programs at the College is ESL, annually serving about twice as many headcount in its credit and noncredit as any of the large credit departments. Immigrants may be reluctant or unable to travel much outside their own neighborhoods, so decentralized educational and student services are very useful in meeting their needs. Many of the noncredit/credit ESL students take noncredit/credit courses in other departments, so there is a multiplier effect from the 23,000 annual ESL headcount.

Meeting the local need for ESL, Transitional Studies, Career Technical Education (noncredit Business includes basic computer use) and other popular offerings at our campuses brings in tens of millions of dollars to the college and community in enhanced apportionment funding, facilities funding, and federal WIA grants. It supports the 45% of San Franciscans who speak a language other than English at home, the 87% who are aged 18+ (higher than the state average of 75%), and the 12% who live below the federal poverty line. It supports the needs of local industries such as tourism and hospitality, which need workers for our service economy who can
San Francisco has achieved a lower unemployment rate---6.5%--- than in some of the other Bay Area counties and the high participation rate of CCSF---typically in the 7.5-8% range--- has undoubtedly made a positive contribution to employment locally.

About 60% of associate degree earners have taken noncredit courses in the past, so noncredit courses taken at the campuses or at Ocean become a point of entry or a means to increased success in credit. As entry points for students who may not have considered college before, these noncredit offerings help to diversify access and strengthen our credit programs.

In the fiscal sense, noncredit enrollment, often at neighborhood campuses, is also a prudent way for CCSF to diversify its apportionment types and student population, protecting against downturns that affect credit enrollment and noncredit differently. Noncredit offers the possibility of adding appreciably to FTES within the semester. As opposed to putting all eggs into one basket, a diversity of apportionment types adds an element of stability to the revenues coming into the college.

For Spring 2013, faculty, classified staff, administration and students at our campuses have all pitched in to build noncredit enrollment at this time of great peril for the college, in the hopes that a strong level of noncredit enrollment will partially offset losses in credit enrollment, perhaps due to unfavorable publicity and strong employment. Many volunteer hours have been dedicated by students and employees who love our college and its campuses. So far, the results of this enrollment push are very encouraging. Noncredit seems stronger than in previous semesters and credit declines have been moderated. Legislative changes and policy changes at the state and federal levels, such as DACA, Deferred Action on Childhood Arrivals, are also boosting noncredit. Anticipated changes now being discussed in immigration law are expected to involve an educational component that will likely result in increased demand for noncredit at CCSF campuses.

Enrollment pushes in noncredit have been so successful that student leadership is starting to complain that due to the increased class sizes in noncredit, students are unable to get the assistance they need to be successful. On their part, faculty have taken on the increased workload at a time of pay cuts in the understanding that the higher class size is not permanent and pedagogically desirable, but is only a way of dealing with the fiscal crisis in the short term. Starting the semester at maximum capacity in noncredit may be of benefit to all because attrition will occur and overenrollment leaves room for that.

However, continuing at maximum capacity for the whole semester, which is in essence far above cap in many sections, is not workable as a regular policy and represents a break from past practice on faculty workload. A similar problem is the change from leveled noncredit to multilevel noncredit now offered at some campuses in order to increase class size in the short term, even though in the past, multilevel noncredit ESL sections have been less successful in retaining students. Some faculty charge that “productivity” is being increased at some cost to the level of quality instruction provided historically.

Despite the fiscal crisis, the campus structure at CCSF is particularly significant and valued at this moment when the state as a whole is looking at its delivery of adult education services and how the delivery of necessary services has failed in many communities. K-12 districts have needed to divert adult education funds in order to continue to serve their main function of grades K-12. As a result, this has become a key moment statewide in the takeover of adult education
functions, in many communities administered under K-12 districts, by the California Community Colleges.

In San Francisco, this assumption of the adult education function under CCSF occurred several decades ago. As in many other innovative movements, CCSF has been in the vanguard with its San Francisco Model of integrated credit and noncredit. CCSF took an important leadership role in instituting enhanced noncredit apportionment statewide and laying groundwork for this transition of adult education to CCC on a statewide level. Our faculty at the campuses continue to help lead the effort for a successful and smooth transition for students and faculty statewide. Additionally, employees and students from our CCSF campuses play leadership roles in districtwide, local, state, national and international organizations addressing technology implementation, international literacy, accountability measures, public education advocacy, and countless other issues of social and educational importance.

This high profile has been made possible by the fact that in the CCSF institutional culture, campuses and their human resources and students are viewed in an integrated manner, not as peripheral or satellite-like. The college has done the necessary work since 1991 to make that happen. Providing decentralized services to the various communities of San Francisco is an ongoing core commitment of the institution. It is precisely that commitment which has in the past given us an extraordinarily high participation rate, yielding great benefit to San Francisco and its surrounding area.

EVALUATION:

The workgroup made good progress towards assembling data for an analysis of the productivity of each campus. The focus of the group spent more time and made more progress on efficiency and fiscal analysis than on the other goal of programmatic analysis. At the September 6 meeting, deans provided data on populations served and courses offered but the format of their input varied widely and it became difficult to follow up and analyze the data. The workgroup has relied primarily on quantitative data up to this point, although additional qualitative data has been incorporated through constituency input to this section. Student services at the campuses received more attention from the workgroup than instructional programs and student success at the campuses, though all of these will need to be part of the larger discussion and context moving forward. The workgroup discussed improving planning and data gathering at the campuses, but had less discussion about how to integrate that research and planning with other collegewide research and planning relevant to activities at all of the campuses collectively and individually.

In order for CCSF to carry out its mission and to ensure that its campuses are correctly utilized and assessed for optimal services to the community, it is essential that college planning be integrated and comprehensive. In the recent past, this has not always been the case. There have been serious gaps in the continuity of the planning process, such as the lack of an Education Master Plan update, which affected the campuses. The college did not have a formal Enrollment Management Plan or Staffing Plan, which would have been very helpful with regard to
productivity of the campuses and meeting the challenges of staffing and oversight in a decentralized structure.

A good amount of dialog on certain issues in noncredit or relating to the campuses arose during review of the show cause draft. Some of these issues can be referred to other workgroups. These include textbook affordability/loan issues, need for a printed schedule for use with noncredit students, routine multilanguage marketing for noncredit courses, and the desirability of issuing real certificates instead of unrecorded or virtual certificates for completion of noncredit course sequences. These and similar issues are important to examine but are probably not within somewhat narrower purview of this workgroup.

That said, the question of efficiency received a good amount of the workgroup's attention, whereas effectiveness and equity at the campuses have had less discussion and will need more workgroup attention in the future.

WORKGROUP 15 MEETING SUMMARY:

Workgroup 15 has met five times since August. Below is a summary of the material covered in each meeting.

During the first meeting, on August 17, 2012, members introduced themselves and the Chancellor explained the initial charge of the workgroup. Members reviewed the many references to centers and sites found within the recommendations. The workgroup focused on further defining its charge, exploring possible activities, and identifying the kinds of information necessary to conduct an analysis of CCSF’s centers and sites. The Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration provided an overview of the types of centers and sites the college utilizes, e.g. Category A (College and Centers that receive Foundation Grants), Category B (leased sites, no foundation grants and pay significant rent), Category C (leased sites, no foundation grant, pay very little amount of rent), Category D (owned sites).

On September 6, 2012, the Deans of the centers and sites provided background information and reports about each of their centers, including what sections are offered, programs and/or departments represented, how many faculty teach, how many staff work there, hours of operation, how space is used and what student populations are served. They presented their information in different formats with varying levels of detail.

At the October 29 meeting, several topics were discussed to further investigate the finances and management of resources for each center:

FCMAT Findings and Analysis—The group discussed the plan to develop accounting protocols and criteria to evaluate and change descriptions of off-campus locations and to account for expenditures to figure out real costs. The group reviewed FCMAT data concerning the foundation grant funds for the Ocean Campus and state-approved centers and the costs for rent, utilities and enrollment.

Course Sections/FTES/Productivity per Center—The committee discussed the data that Pam Mery handed out concerning section count by center and FTES, including:
a. What neighborhoods students attending come from for each center.

The committee discussed the data that Pam Mery provided about student attendance at each center by neighborhood zip code to help determine how students would be effected if CCSF decided to close certain centers. The group discussed the data and whether students cluster around a center or if they go to a program they are interested in no matter where it is held. Is there a unique draw to each center?

b. Center Utilization/Productivity—The group discussed how to track center capacity and determined that the group needed more information about center utilization when looking at the possibility of consolidation of classes. Currently, there is no centralized place to get this information. Peter Goldstein and JoAnne Low are gathering the utilization information for the centers for the January 2013 meeting.

c. Total Cost of Operation draft—Dean Bell passed out a physical resources report outlining what it would cost to run a center. There wasn’t enough data to determine what it currently costs to run each center. The group agreed that they needed to figure out the current staffing and facility costs per center to determine a baseline figure, including rent, utilities, staff and other budget items.

At the end of the meeting, Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman asked the deans to identify a baseline of these costs in a cost estimate template that she was going to provide to them. The group would have a standardized format for each center to more accurately understand and analyze the data. The workgroup would review the data in these templates at the next meeting.

At the November 13 meeting, Center Deans were present to discuss the costs associated with their Centers and to share the cost estimate template. The group underlined the need to understand cost issues associated with centers template to make it simpler to ID these costs. The Deans shared their experience about using the template to reflect current costs, including:

- questions about faculty split assignments
- the fact that faculty assignments do not necessarily reflect productivity due to the cost difference among faculty
- a confusion over the combination of 11–12 FTEF and FTES data with the 12–13 costs data. The group did agree that using last year’s budget data would not the most relevant approach. An example of this is that the current staffing for the new Chinatown center is much different from the old Chinatown center.
- the need for more direction on what the program will be at each site to be viable
- that it was a tedious exercise

There was discussion about the purpose for the completing the cost estimates. The response was that there was a need to have more informed discussions on centers and their productivity. The intention of the template was not to be exact since data change but to start with a standard format for comparison purposes.

There was consensus that an average faculty cost would be easier to use to complete the template. Peter Goldstein said that he would provide the average costs per FTEF (full time and part time combined) for 11–12; other costs used in the template should be actual costs for 12–13.
At the December 4 meeting, the workgroup discussed each of the Center’s updated templates and raised questions concerning which average faculty cost should be used and how to determine benefit costs for staff. The templates were approaching a standardized form, but Deans were asked to refine the work one more time for the final meeting of the year on December 10.

At the December 10 meeting, the workgroup reviewed the most recent cost estimates from each Center. The group also discussed some of the remaining challenges, such as the fact that the Banner system is not completely accurate, which makes it difficult to find exact information.

Another challenge has to do with grant accounting. Grants are complicated and are infused throughout the district. They are often used to grow departments. And they are awarded to programs, not centers. However, there isn’t a grant accounting office.

In addition, going forward CCSF will have to consider how to allocate the cost of many items that are currently not charged clearly to each operational unit. This includes hardware, software, librarians, police, and other staff. In the future, the system should be set up to include the assignment by center and should be available through accounting.

Pam Mory discussed site utilization information and told the group that CCSF will be purchasing Argos, software that will help with planning and implementation, and should be able to help with site utilization. This software should be up and running by February 2013. This software should help with creating efficiencies and alternative scheduling methods.

Some of the issues that the group would like to resolve with systematic enrollment management and site utilization software came up during the conversation, including:

- How to make sure the class capacity is always current
- How to show those classes that don’t make the minimum class size
- How to compare enrollment first day, at census, and at the end of the semester
- How to handle non-credit, which is currently done by hand on paper. How do you account for students in a Par period? Right now, this is currently done by counting headcount by hand every day (Downtown Center), which wastes personnel time. Some suggested that CCSF should move towards electronic Par reporting.
- How to measure short-term classes in credit (The group determined that it was not high on the list of concerns)

The current student services utilization software has the ability to create electronic education plans and complete degree auditing. However, students do not have access to their education plans or degree audit. The group thought it important that students should have access to that.

At the end of the meeting, with the Center deans agreeing to provide a final cost estimate to Gohar by December 19 so that she could use them for the Accreditation Report. In turn, Gohar will convene the group early in 2013 to begin the analysis of the Center data and to then write the recommendations.

NEXT STEPS:

Further work on the campuses needs to be well integrated into the work on the Education Master Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, the Student Development Plan, the Technology Plan, the...
Staffing Plan, and the Enrollment Management Plan and the implementation of these plans, as well as the Annual and Strategic Plans, and the Program Review for each center or campus. Adequate, accurate data is much needed in order to support planning for the neighborhood campuses and the rest of the college. The Noncredit Student Survey, which was scheduled to occur in 2011 but was postponed, will need to be done. A survey of noncredit student goals also needs to be started in Fall 2013, either separately or as part of the noncredit survey.

In addition, the following needs to be gathered by Workgroup 15 in order to complete a report that provides a fiscal and programmatic analysis of CCSF’s centers:

- All center data from standardized template collected, reviewed and analyzed
- Human Resources allocation examined
- Standardized template of center utilization/productivity collected
- Standardized template of center utilization/productivity analyzed
- Quantitative and qualitative data gathered in standard format relating to students, courses, and programs as these relate to the mission of the College
- Consideration of the proximity to alternative locations/transportation
- An educational master plan section for each center
- An enrollment plan for each center
- Any facilities and technology plans for the centers
- An up-to-date program review of each center
- Student and faculty concerns about class size, multilevel sections, and retention/success should be explored and assessed in conjunction with productivity goals
- List of options for cost-effectively, efficiently, effectively, and equitably serving students

The workgroup should provide input on the development and implementation of college plans (such as those listed above) regarding total cost of operation, productivity, enrollment management, campus program review, educational planning and scheduling, staffing and oversight.

- Consideration of the proximity to alternative locations/transportation
- A business plan for each center
- List of options for more cost-effectively and efficiently serving students generated (for example: consolidation, elimination, property sales, property leases, etc.)

Challenges to Managing Centers:
The group should also recommend ways the college can provide Deans the tools that will help them better manage going forward, including how to:

- Implement Total Cost of Operation Model
- Measure cost/productivity
- Accurately do Enrollment Management
- Create a more systematic planning process at each center
- Manage employees and class sections, including:
  - Employees whose managers are absent from the center
  - Creating clarity about who evaluates classified employees
  - Providing a feedback loop concerning employee performance
  - Scheduling employees under their purview
  - Scheduling classes

**Final Report:**
Given that many factors within the other Recommendations will affect the analysis of this workgroup (e.g., administrative structure, staffing plans, financial decisions, and board direction), this analysis is to a certain extent dependent upon the outcomes of other decisions. The ultimate outcome of this will be recommendations for a comprehensive set of options for providing services to the community that, within resources available, are designed to be optimally effective, efficient, and equitable. for serving students as cost-effectively and efficiently as possible.

**List of Policies Referenced in the Standards**
1. Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education
2. Policy on Principles of Good Practice in Overseas International Education Programs for Non-U.S. Nationals
3. Policy on Transfer of Credit; Policy on Award of Credit
4. Policy on Closing an Institution.
5-6. Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations.
5-7. Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems.