Reviewing the Community Learning Center:

An Educational Center of the MiraCosta Community College District

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

FEBRUARY 2003 | COMMISSION REPORT 03-03

Summary

This report reviews the proposal by the MiraCosta Community College District to receive official recognition as an educational center for its Community Education Center, an existing facility located in the City of Oceanside. This new educational center, which was built entirely with district funds, will provide learning opportunities for the rapidly growing population of the area, particularly those in disadvantaged areas with needs for instruction in English as a Second Language, and basic skills education.

The Commission approved this report at its meeting on February 4, 2003. It has been be added to the Commission's Internet website -- www.cpec.ca.gov -- and will be 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.

Reviewing the Community Learning Center

An Educational Center of the MiraCosta 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

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
1303 J Street ◆ Suite 500 ◆ Sacramento, California 95814-2938

COMMISSION REPORT 03-03
PUBLISHED FEBRUARY 2003

This report, like other publications of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 03-03 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

Contents

Page	Section
1	**ONE Conclusions and Recommendations**
1	Conclusions
4	Recommendation
5	**TWO Background to the Proposal**
5	Statutory and Administrative Requirements
5	Origins of the Proposal
9	Review by the Board of Governors
10	Contents of the Analysis
11	**THREE Analysis of the Proposal**
11	Overview of the Commission's Review Guidelines
11	General Description and Overview
11	Enrollment Projections
13	Alternatives
14	Academic Planning and Program Justification
15	Student Services and Outreach
15	Support and Capital Outlay Projections
16	Geographic and Physical Accessibility
16	Effects on Other Institutions
17	Environmental Impact

18 Economic Efficiency

19 Appendices

Appendix A: Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational and Joint-Use Centers

Appendix B: Board of Governors' Agenda Item 4.6

Appendix C: Letter to Walt Reno (COCCC) from Mary Heim (DRU)

References

Displays

Page	*Display*	
6	1	Map of the MiraCosta Community College District
7	2	Exterior Photograph of the Community Learning Center
8	3	Interior Photographs of the Community Learning Center
12	4	Actual and Projected Enrollment for the MiraCosta CCD Community Learning Center
16	5	Community Learning Center Support Budget, 2001-02 and 2005-06

1 Conclusions and Recommendations

IN THIS REPORT, the Commission considers the request by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (BOG) and the MiraCosta Community College District (MCCD) to approve the District's proposal to secure approval for the Community Learning Center in Oceanside. The proposal has been evaluated using the Commission's recently revised *Guidelines: The Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational and Joint-Use Center* (CPEC, 2002b).

The MiraCosta CCD occupies the northern coastal region of San Diego County. Traditionally an affluent resort area with an overwhelmingly White population, the area in recent years has become far more diverse with strong immigration from both Central and South America, and many Asian nations. As a result, many of the residents of the region today are deficient in English language skills, a situation that prompted the District to introduce numerous courses in English as a Second Language, most offered originally at the Adult Learning Center in Oceanside.

When that facility became overcrowded, and the perception grew that it was also substandard, the District decided to relocate to larger and more accommodating facilities. This led to purchase of a small shopping center (7.6 acres), and a renovation/construction project that has now become the Community Learning Center, all at a cost to the District of about $8 million.

With this first phase of the project complete, the District is looking ahead to Phases II and III. Phase II will be the sole financial responsibility of the Oceanside Unified School District, but the MiraCosta District plans to use State funding for Phase III, which is scheduled to cost between $5 and $8 million. Understanding the long lead times that are inevitable with the State capital outlay process, the District is seeking approval of the Community Learning Center as an official State approved Educational Center at this time. Such recognition will permit the submission of various applications for funding that probably will not be approved for several years.

Conclusions

The Commission's overall conclusion is that the Community Learning Center (CLC) of the MiraCosta Community College District has met the requirements of the Commission's *Guidelines: The Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational and Joint-Use Centers* (CPEC, 2002b) and that it should be approved as an official educational center with eligibility to compete for capital outlay funding in the future.

This overall conclusion is supported by the following specific conclusions as they relate to the criteria in the *Guidelines*.

1. General Description and Overview

   The District's Needs Study contained sufficient information to satisfy this criterion. The data submitted included both general and detailed maps of the District, information on transportation corridors, demographics, and the location of nearby educational institutions.

2. Enrollment Projections

   The enrollment projection approved by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance, when compared to the enrollment data supplied by the District, suggests that the Community Learning Center has a current enrollment of about 500 full-time-equivalent students (FTES) at the present time. The available data also suggest that the northern San Diego county region served by the District is experiencing rapid growth, which should produce considerably greater enrollments at the center in future years. Further, the demographically driven growth curve may be enhanced further as new and renovated facilities come on line, and as program offerings expand.

3. Alternatives

   When an educational center already exists, the Commission cannot enter into a process of deciding among three or four different possible locations or programming choices. All that is possible is a determination of whether the District's planning was reasonable and prudent, or so flawed both conceptually and operationally that it would be inadvisable to spend State money on its expansion. In the case at hand, the Commission believes the District was entirely responsible in its choice of the current site, that the CLC is serving the community well, and that it is entitled to compete in the future for additional funding.

4. Academic Planning and Program Justification

   The Community Learning Center is fundamentally an adult education center that performs many of the functions normally executed by high school districts, particularly the provision of courses in English as a Second Language. As such, there is no regular academic plan in the ordinary sense of that term, one that would describe courses and programs leading to a variety of degrees and certificates. In spite of this, the District has adequately described all of the CLC's programs, and suggested that the subsequent development of an academic master plan for the center will provide greater detail and coherent planning as the second and third phases of the center are developed and completed. Accordingly, the Commission believes that this criterion has been met to the maximum extent possible.

5. Student Services and Outreach

   The needs study provided very little information on this subject. Accordingly, the Commission withholds judgment on this criterion until further information is obtained.

6. Support and Capital Outlay Projections

   The District has complied adequately with this criterion by submitting both its current support budget, and its capital outlay projections for future years. Greater detail on the capital side is included in the District's Five-Year Plan, which was also submitted. The Commission feels the District has met the requirements of this criterion.

7. Geographic and Physical Accessibility

   The District chose the location of the Community Learning Center wisely. It has very close access to nearby freeways and public transportation, and has ample parking at the facility itself. The Commission believes that this criterion has been completely satisfied.

8. Effects on Other Institutions

   Because the Community Learning Center is such a specialized facility, with a very limited curriculum, there is little chance of conflict with other institutions in the region. Letters of support have been received from neighboring institutions, and there is no opposition to center status from any quarter. The only reservation was expressed by the San Diego Community College District, which would like to see the Board of Governors give a higher priority to existing campuses than to centers. Nevertheless, the Commission believes the District has completed with this criterion to the maximum extent possible.

9. Environmental Impact

   Since the Community Learning Center occupied an existing shopping center, there were few environmental impacts that had not already been considered. Accordingly, the District sought a Negative Declaration for the property, which was filed on August 23, 1999. Accordingly, this criterion has been satisfied.

10. Economic Efficiency

    The proposal for the Community Learning Center is precisely the type the Commission would like to see repeated in the future. Not only is there close cooperation with neighboring community college districts and California State University, San Marcos, the center is actually a joint venture with the Oceanside Unified School District. In addition, with the State of California only being requested to sup-

ply 20-30 percent of the capital funding, this project ranks high on the scale of fiscal efficiency from the State's viewpoint.

Recommendation The Community Learning Center of the MiraCosta Community College District should be approved as a permanent educational center, and become immediately eligible for State capital outlay and support budget funding.

2 Background to the Proposal

Statutory and administrative requirements

Sections 66902(2a) and 66903(5) of the *Education Code* provide 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 expands on that general charge as follows:

> 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 college institutions, 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.

Pursuant to this legislation, in 1975 the Commission developed a series of guidelines and procedures for the review of new campus and off-campus center proposals and then revised them in 1978, 1982, 1990, 1992, and most recently in April 2002 under the title of *Guidelines: The Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational and Joint-Use Centers* (CPEC: 1975, 1978, 1982, 1990, 1992, and 2002). As most recently revised, these guidelines require a three-stage process of notification and application for approval (See Appendix A). The first stage consists of a "Preliminary Notice," which is nothing more than a district's or system's indication that it is considering a new facility, or the conversion of an existing one. If plans continue, the district then submits a "Letter of Intent to Expand" (LOI) to both the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (BOG) and the Commission that must include some preliminary information including an early enrollment projection, a statement of intentions, maps, a resolution of the governing board, and related items. In response, both agencies must review the letter and respond within 60 days. If those reviews are favorable, the district proceeds with development of a Needs Study, which most contain detailed information on enrollments, alternatives, student outreach, accessibility, and other matters, all of which are discussed in considerable detail in Part 3 of this report. Within 60 days of receipt of the Needs Study, the Commission's Executive Director must certify that the documentation is complete or incomplete. Once that certification is complete, the Commission must act on the proposal within six months, provided it has been approved first by the Board of Governors.

Origins of the proposal

The MiraCosta Community College District lies along the coastal region of rapidly growing northern San Diego County. Display 1 shows a map

of the District, which stretches from Del Mar and Rancho Santa Fe in the south to Oceanside and Camp Pendleton in the north. The Palomar Community College District lies directly to the east, with California State University, San Marcos only a few miles away.

DISPLAY 1 *Map of the Mira Costa Community College District, Showing Mira Costa College, the San Elijo Center, the Community Learning Center (CLC), and Surrounding Features*

The District was founded in 1934, and currently enrolls about 12,000 students at its main campus – MiraCosta College in Oceanside – and the San Elijo Center in Cardiff by the Sea. In addition to these two relatively mature facilities – the San Elijo Center was formally approved by the Commission in March of 1985 – the District has also maintained an Adult Learning Center (ALC) since 1975 that has been devoted almost entirely to community service courses, although various non-credit courses have been available for the past ten years.

As noted above, San Diego is one of the fastest growing regions of the State. According to the Department of Finance's Demographic Research Unit, the population of the cities within the District will grow from 264,729 in 1990 to 427,780 in 2020, an increase of 61.6% in 30 years, or 1.6 percent per year, compounded. That growth has already led to a relocation of the ALC. As the District noted in its Needs Study:

> In 1988, the District made the decision to relocate the ALC programs to a District owned permanent center in downtown Oceanside. Replacement of the ALC was necessary because steady enrollment growth had resulted in serious overcrowding, limitations in the number of class sessions, and waiting lists for high demand

> classes. As an added concern, student attrition became a problem. Moreover, it was determined that the leased facility could not be expanded and modified to meet Field Act Quality standards which allow the scheduling of credit courses. (Keithley, 2001b, p. 6)

As a result of this decision, the District decided on a three phase development of a permanent center that it named the Community Learning Center. The process involved the purchase of a 7.6 acre shopping center in downtown Oceanside that was then converted – in part by renovation and in part by new construction – into the new facility, all at a cost of $8,821,000 in District borrowed funds. The result was Phase I of the project, a 25,734 assignable square foot (ASF) facility that included 22 multi-use classrooms, 6 laboratories, and one multi-purpose assembly room. A separate free-standing building was remodeled for the North San Diego County Small Business Center funded by the California Trade and Commerce Agency. At present the Phase I effort includes the full range in types of community college offerings, including continuing education, community service, credit, non-credit, and even contract education with some local businesses in the area.

According to the District, Phase I will be able to accommodate up to 500 full-time-equivalent students (FTES). Displays 2 and 3 show photographs of the center.

DISPLAY 2 Exterior Photograph of the Community Learning Center

MiraCosta College - Community Learning Center
LR Design Associates - Architects

Phase II of the project will be built by the Oceanside Unified School District through funding received by passage of a local bond issue in 2000. This phase will add another 20,000 ASF to the facility at a cost of about $8 million, and will consist primarily of the Academy of Business and Technology. It is envisioned to include various specialized technology laboratories as well as individual and collaborative work spaces. It is planned to house 400 11th and 12th grade students from the District who will be given dual enrollments as community college students.

Phase II will also involve extensive cooperation between the MiraCosta CCD and the Oceanside USD, as the CCD makes classroom space available between 12-5 p.m. Monday through Thursday and all day Friday. Once Phase II is completed, both districts will share spaces in each phase through various cooperative agreements.

DISPLAY 3 Interior Photographs of the Community Learning Center

Phase III is proposed to be a two-story facility with another 20,000 ASF, with an anticipated completion date of 2007-08. Unlike the first two phases, however, which have been or will be built entirely with local funds, Phase III is projected to be financed, in part, with State funds. According to the District's May 1, 2000 Five-Year Plan, $135,000 in Planning funds will be requested from the State in 2005-06, $4,114,000 in Working Drawings/Construction funds in 2006-07, and $650,000 in Equipment funds for 2007-08. This final phase is intended to house primarily credit classes, including a liberal arts core, plus various offerings in high technology, the sciences, mathematics, and business. There are also tentative plans to involve both California State University, San Marcos, and the University of California, San Diego.

The Needs Study also lists a large number of potential opportunities to enhance and diversify the CLC's enrollments and curriculum. Among those mentioned are the planned construction of a major pharmaceutical plant (IDEC Pharmaceuticals Corp.); various expansions of hotel, restaurant, and tourism facilities; and expansions of community health facilities. Other business must inevitably follow to support the rapid population growth projected for the region. Further, there are numerous local government plans to improve public infrastructure (sometimes in concert with State and Federal authorities) that should have the effect of revitalizing some of the poorer neighborhoods in Eastside, Crown Heights, and Mesa Margarita. MiraCosta's strong emphasis on English as a Second Language programs will also have the effect of mainstreaming many of the newly arrived residents of the region whose first languages are Spanish or any of a number of Asian languages.

Review by the Board of Governors

As noted above, the Commission's Guidelines require the submission of a Letter of Intent (LOI), which if approved by both the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, and the Executive Director of the Commission, permits the district to proceed with development of a Needs Study. In the case at hand, although the LOI was submitted on September 19, 2000, it was never approved by either agency. There are a number of reasons for these oversights, including the untimely death of the district's consultant, and severe personnel reductions at the Commission.

In spite of this difficulty, work proceeded on the Needs Study, which was approved by the Board of Governors on January 14, 2002 (See the BOG Agenda Item in Appendix B).

In the Board of Governor's agenda item, the strong regional growth in northern San Diego county was noted, along with the fact that the District has long provided many of the adult and continuing education courses that are routinely offered by public high schools. The report also included an enrollment projection indicating that the District was at the 500 FTES threshold for center approval, with significant growth envisioned for the years ahead.

The Board was clearly convinced not only of the growth potential for the center, but also that much of its emphasis would be directed to serving disadvantaged students. As its report noted:

> The district sees the large Hispanic population in the downtown area as having a severe need for adult education and community college services. Sixty-seven percent of the adults in the Crown Heights area of Oceanside have a sixth grade education or less and ninety-three percent of the adults have not completed high school. In the Eastside area of Oceanside, seventy-one percent of the adults have not completed high school. Given these figures and the unwillingness of the adults in the central city area to go to the main campus, just seven miles away, to obtain college services, the district has elected to come to the neighborhoods with the services and the Community Learning Center is their primary means for providing those services. (BOG, 2002a)

The Board of Governors approved MiraCosta CCD Community Learning Center on January 14, 2002.

Content of the analysis

The Analysis of the proposed Community Learning Center appears in the next section of this report. It is reviewed in accordance with all of the Commissions criteria contained in its newly revised guidelines (CPEC, 2002b), with primary emphasis given to the enrollment projections, the consideration of alternatives, service to the disadvantaged, and economic efficiency. The Commission's conclusions and recommendation are contained in Part One of this report.

3 Analysis of the Proposal

Overview of the Commission's review guidelines

The Commission's *Guidelines* impose a number of requirements on governing boards that propose the establishment of new institutions of higher education, or who seek official recognition of existing facilities. In the case at hand, an educational center that is already operating and in existence, the goal of both the District and the Board of Governors is to acquire an official sanction that will permit the MiraCosta Community College District to compete for capital outlay funding with other districts, and even with other systems. Recognition of a center or a college does not entitle a district or system to any funding, it merely offers the opportunity to engage in the process. Any educational center that does not have official status is automatically disqualified for State capital funding.

The *Guidelines* include ten criteria under which all proposals for official education center status must qualify. These criteria are intended to be somewhat flexible in their application, since no two proposals are ever identical, and since almost all seem to involve unique circumstances that require some departure from the temptation to interpret the criteria rigidly. The primary objective is not to provide an inflexible analysis of each criterion, but to consider each proposal as a totality, since virtually every one ever reviewed by the Commission will invariably exhibit both strengths and weaknesses. Ultimately, the Commission seeks to render a judgment on any center's viability as measured by enrollments, advisability in view of alternatives, accessibility at a reasonable level, and ability to provide needed services to a population of potential students that has identifiable needs. Almost all centers that can meet such tests as these will be approved.

General description and overview

The MiraCosta CCD has developed several documents that represent full compliance with this criterion. The first is the Needs Assessment itself, which was completed on February 20, 2001 by a private consulting firm (Keithley, 2001b). This somewhat voluminous document contains both written and pictorial material that describes how and why the old Adult Learning Center was replaced, how the new facility was built and with what funds, who the center serves, its location in the District and in the community, and its academic vision for the future. In addition, the Needs Study includes demographic information for San Diego County, and several of the cities within the District and near the center. These will be discussed further below in the section on "Student services and outreach."

Enrollment projections

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 prepar-

ing 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.

This criterion contains several important provisions, and includes by reference the requirement that an education center maintain an enrollment of 500 Fall term full-time-equivalent students (FTES). In addition, there must be a ten-year projection developed by the Department of Finance's Demographic Research Unit (DRU) that must demonstrate the center's viability. For community colleges, enrollment projections should be presented in terms of Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH), headcount enrollment, and FTES.

Display 4 shows the enrollment projection approved by DRU. The actual letter of approval is included as Appendix C. In this projection, enrollment shows continual growth from 1,338 in 1994 to 2,376 in 2010, which represents an annual growth rate of 3.6 percent per year. This represents a rate somewhat slower than the growth experienced since 1994, which is somewhat surprising, since the existence of new facilities in a central location often results in higher attendance than might have been forecast for a previous, and less attractive, facility. The Demographic Research Unit has also included WSCH and WSCH/Enrollment totals that may be overly conservative. The WSCH/Enrollment ratio is listed at 3.2 for 1994, and then rises to 3.8 by the out year of the projection in 2010. Given three related considerations, this seems understated. The first element is that the ALC, and now the CLC, are primarily non-credit operations. The second is that non-credit WSCH/Enrollment in the District as a whole is listed at 4.74 in the Needs Study. The third feature concerns educational centers generally, where

DISPLAY 4 Actual and Projected Enrollment for the Mira Mira Costa CCD Community Learning Center

Year (Fall Term)	Fall Term Total Enrollment	WSCH[1] per Enrollment	Annual Average WSCH[1]	FTES[2]
Actual				
1994	1,338	3.2	4,339	289.3
1995	1,519	3.2	4,788	319.2
1996	1,434	3.6	5,169	344.6
1997	1,465	3.5	5,110	340.7
1998	1,753	3.2	5,591	372.7
1999	1,479	3.8	5,555	370.3
2000	1,785	3.8	6,872	458.1
2001	1,837	3.8	7,071	471.4
Projected				
2002	1,890	3.8	7,276	485.1
2003	1,945	3.8	7,487	499.1
2004	2,001	3.9	7,705	513.7
2005	2,059	3.9	7,928	528.5
2006	2,119	3.8	8,158	543.9
2007	2,180	3.9	8,394	559.6
2008	2,244	3.8	8,638	575.9
2009	2,309	3.8	8,888	592.5
2010	2,376	3.8	9,146	609.7

1. Weekly Student Contact Hours.
2. Full-Time Equivalent Students

Source: Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit

WSCH per enrollment generally ranges between 4.0 and 5.0 on a statewide basis.

The DRU projection, however, still makes it clear that the CLC is a viable operation. Applying a normal divisor of 15 to the current and projected WSCH totals reveals 471.4 FTES as of Fall 2001. This is projected to grow to 528 FTES by 2005 and 610 FTES by 2010. These do seem to be conservative numbers, as the District believes that the center already has an enrollment in excess of 500. The difference can be explained in part by some counting of adult education or community services courses inside or outside of the totals, by differences in the reporting of contact hours, and by differences in the term considered (Fall Term, Annual Average, etc.). It is not in dispute, however, that the center as currently constituted is either just below the threshold or just above it. Nor is it in dispute that the center is growing, and that the addition of Phase II and Phase III structures will turn it into a considerable urban campus for the District. Accordingly, the Commission believes the enrollment criterion has been satisfied.

Alternatives

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. Overall, the system proposing the new institution must demonstrate substantial analytical integrity with regard to the site selection process.

When a center that already exists seeks official recognition, the consideration of alternatives is necessarily limited. Fundamentally, they are reduced to two: approval of the center where it is located; or denial of official center status on the grounds that the location or other factors is so fundamentally flawed that it would be imprudent to invest further State dollars in its expansion or renovation.

It is also helpful to the Commission's consideration of the proposal if the District can demonstrate that its choices were thoughtfully derived, and the result of a solid planning effort. Such an effort seems to have been in place in this case.

When it became clear that the Adult Learning Center, due to overcrowding and substandard facilities, could no longer serve the population that desired its services, the District began a search for a new location. District planners did not want to move far from the existing location near Interstate 5, since that would have created difficulties for the low-income students who were attending. Accordingly, they examined locations within a mile of the existing center, and in 1997, found four that appeared to be viable.

Seven criteria were applied to each of the four sites: location; acquisition price; site size and potential for development; utilities development; parking; public transportation services; and environmental factors. The site finally selected – formerly the Big Bear Market Shopping Center – lies adjacent to I-5, contained the largest amount of land (7.6 acres), had ample access to public transportation (there is a bus stop in front of the center), could be obtained at a reasonable price ($2.3 million), had full utility services, plentiful parking, and no noteworthy environmental issues.

It is clear that the District did consider alternatives before it purchased the current site, and equally clear that the site chosen has many advantages, both in comparison to the old site, and in absolute terms.

Academic planning and program justification

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.

This criterion requires a description of degree programs and course offerings, plus the center's academic/occupational organization. In this regard, it should be noted that the Community Learning Center is not a typical community college educational center in one very important respect. Most centers emphasize traditional core curricula and have only a small share devoted to non-credit offerings. The CLC is overwhelmingly non-credit, with most of its activities devoted to English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction designed to serve the non- or limited-English speaking population that resides in the area. The ESL curriculum is extensive, offering seven different levels of instruction, with students assigned based on a placement test. The higher levels of reading comprehension, writing skills, vocabulary, and reference skills are designed to advance students to regular English courses offered for credit.

The CLC also offers an Adult High School Diploma program designed for students 18 years of age and older who desire to pass the GED exam. Classes in this program are offered in math, American government, English/reading, literature/composition, economics and science, U.S. history, world history/geography, and fine arts.

The Older Adults program is primarily in the community service category, and includes offerings in art, creative writing, Tai Chi Chuan, body conditioning, self-awareness, and computer skills.

The Adults with Disabilities program offers a variety of courses for both the physically and mentally challenged adult. The courses are designed to maintain cognitive and social skills.

The Cisco Networking Academy is a four-semester occupation program designed to qualify students as Cisco Certified Networking Associates (CCNA). The program is in high demand since it can lead to salaries of up to $52,000 per year. The CLC intends to expand this program further to include training for high level Cisco certificates, including the Cisco Certified Networking Professional (CCNP), and the Cisco Certified Internetworking Expert (CCIE). Students may take the courses in this program on either a credit or non-credit basis.

Although there is no formal academic master plan for the CLC per se – there is a comprehensive plan for the District as a whole – the District indicates that its future plans will include a greater emphasis on both credit courses and occupational subjects. In the past year, the District indicated that it offered credit courses in English, ESL, Speech/Communications, Child Development, and Cisco Systems (CCNA and CCNP). They add that the number of credit courses should double in 2002-03.

The organizational structure for the Center, and its relationship to the District as a whole, was shown in an organizational chart appended to the District's Academic Master Plan. It notes that the center is administered by a Dean of Continuing Education, which is normal and appropriate for an educational center. The Dean reports to the Vice-President for Instructional Services, who reports to the Superintendent/President.

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.

The Needs Study contains very little information about student services in the Community Learning Center, other than to note that there is a student services office at which students and potential student can secure information that may be useful to them. Throughout the report, however, there is a constant emphasis on serving disadvantaged students in particular, and that a major element of the center's mission is outreach to the community in general, and to the lower income and non-English speaking population in particular. As of this writing, Commission staff had not visited the center and spoken with the staff. As a result, information is limited at the present time. The next draft of this report will include further information on this subject.

Support and capital outlay 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.

As noted, the Community Learning Center is an ongoing operation, and as such, its operational budget is a known quantity. In 2001-02, its budget was reported in the District's Needs Study as shown in Display 5. The capital outlay budget consists of three phases, with Phase I having been competed entirely with District funds in the amount of $8,000,000. Phase II is to be constructed with funds from the Oceanside Unified School District in 2002-03 through 2004-05 at a cost of another $8,000,000 and will include the addition of 20,000 assignable square feet.

DISPLAY 5 Community Learning Center Support Budget, 2001-02 and 2005-06

2001-02 Fiscal Year (Actual)	
Beginning Balance	$ 3,803,063
Revenues	45,880,269
Expenditures[1]	42,298,369
Operating Balance	$ 3,581.900
Ending Balance	$ 7,384,963
2005-06 Fiscal Year (Projected)	
Beginning Balance	$ 4,507,730
Revenues	54,383,274
Expenditures[1]	51,164,880
Operating Balance	$ 3,218,394
Ending Balance	$ 7,726,124

[1] Includes District Capital Outlay Expenses

Phase III is to be constructed with $8,000,000 in State funds, although the current five year plan currently anticipates only the expenditure of $4,899,000 from Sacramento. Although final plans for the third phase of the center are far from complete, it is certainly possible that any shortfall in funding will be made up by local funds. Phase III is expected to be completed in 2006-07.

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.

As can be noted from the map of the District (Display 1), the Community Learning Center occupies a very central location within the District. It is only two blocks from Interstate 5, about a half mile from State Highway 76, and about 3 miles from State Highway 78, which is the main corridor to both Palomar College and California State University, San Marcos. There is ample public transportation with a North County Transit District bus stop at the site. Other features include nearby access to the Coaster rail line (commuter service to San Diego), the MetroLink commuter rail service to Orange and Los Angeles Counties, and even Amtrak service. For those who drive, there is ample free parking at the site for several hundred cars, as well as a park-and-ride facility just over a mile away.

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 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.

The MiraCosta CCD has consulted widely with other jurisdictions. Letters of support have been received from the San Diego Community College District; Palomar College; California State University, San Marcos; the South Orange County Community College District; the Oceanside Unified School District; and the City of Oceanside. There is no known opposition, although the Superintendent of the San Diego Community College District did argue that the Board of Governors should "adopt a clear policy directing the State Chancellor's Office to give priority to the funding of facilities for existing accredited colleges." This may be a reference to the frustration the District feels over its inability to secure funding to fully build out Miramar College.

In other respects, because the Community Learning Center is something of a specialized institution with an emphasis on non-credit instruction in general, and English as a Second Language in particular, there is little danger that its academic plan will conflict with other institutions in the region. Even when the number of credit offerings increases, it is anticipated that most will be in the academic core (liberal studies, etc.) that is offered by all community colleges in the State. Further, the rapid population growth in the region creates the strong likelihood that academic course shortages will probably be a far greater problem than course duplication.

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.

At the present time, environmental impact is not a concern, since the District occupied and renovated an existing shopping center concerning which all applicable environmental regulations had already been satisfied. However, the District did file a Negative Declaration with the City of Oceanside pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This declaration was filed on August 23, 1999. In addition, the Mayor of Oceanside noted that numerous civic improvements are currently in process:

> The City is installing improvements along Mission Avenue in conjunction with construction of the CLC, including improvements to

> traffic conditions, increased pedestrian safety, new commercial enterprises and upgraded infrastructure and utilities. The City Council has approved funding to develop a new child care center across from the CLC and has actively supported improvements and community development programs in neighborhoods close to the CLC site. (Johnson, 2001a)

According to the Needs Study:

> For Phases II and III, the District will prepare a Mitigated Negative Declaration. The document will address potentially significant traffic and circulation impacts and identify appropriate mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. The analysis will address the environmental effects at build out.

Since there is no formal EIR to review -- only the Negative Declaration -- there are no issues with regard to this criterion.

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 borne 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.

Few proposals for educational centers have exhibited as much cooperative and collaborative effort as the Community Learning Center. The District and CLC have strong alliances with the Oceanside Unified School District, the Palomar Community College District, the City of Oceanside, numerous community organizations, and a number of business concerns, not the least of which is Cisco Systems. In addition, while the total project is expected to cost nearly $25 million once all three phases are completed, the State of California is being requested to support only between $5 and $8 million, or 20-32 percent. All of the remainder is to be the responsibility of either the MiraCosta CCD or the Oceanside USD, plus other financial contributions to the center's surrounding infrastructure by the City of Oceanside.

Appendix A

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"

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
1303 J Street ◆ Suite 500 ◆ Sacramento, California 95814-2938

COMMISSION REPORT 02-6
PUBLISHED APRIL 2002

This report, like other publications of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 02-6 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

1 Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational and Joint-Use Centers

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.

Commission Responsibilities and Authority Regarding New Campuses and Centers

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.

Brief history of the review process

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.

Policy assumptions used in developing the guidelines

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:

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.*

Definitions

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.

Projects subject to Commission review

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.

Stages in the review process

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.

2 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.

3 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 demonstrate~~d~~ 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.

4 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.

5 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 system wide 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.

Appendix B

Board of Governors
California Community Colleges
January 14-15, 2002

MIRACOSTA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT REQUEST TO APPROVE THE COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTER AS AN EDUCATIONAL CENTER

4.6

ACTION PENDING

Committee on: *Budget and Finance*
Robert L. Moore, Chair

Presentation: *Patrick J. Lenz*
Executive Vice Chancellor

Issue

This item presents a request from the MiraCosta Community College District to approve the Community Learning Center in Oceanside as a new educational center pursuant to Section 55828 of Title 5, *California Code of Regulations.* Community college districts seek state approval of educational centers to be eligible to receive state capital outlay funds.

Background

The MiraCosta Community College District was established in 1934 and serves the cities of Oceanside, Carlsbad, Encinitas, and other coastal communities in Northern San Diego County. In addition to college courses and services to achieve transfer or vocational education goals, the district provides adult education services that in other locales are sometimes provided by high schools and unified school districts. The district has had a long-term commitment to the community in this area dating back to 1976 when the district separated from the unified school districts and became the sole provider of these services in the area. Over time, this commitment to adult education has transformed noncredit instruction into a significant part of the district's total educational effort. Recent figures show that the district total annualized enrollment in noncredit instruction in 2000-01 equaled 5,277 students or 31 percent of the district's total enrollment, and generated 1,057 Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) or 14.7 percent of the district's total FTES.

In its Five-Year Plan, the district formally identifies three locations where it offers instruction, but it has provided noncredit adult education in the region for the last 25 years in as many as 37

different neighborhood locations mostly in the communities of Oceanside and Carlsbad. Even with these numerous locations, the district tends to concentrate its noncredit effort in one location, as more than 46 percent of the total noncredit FTES is generated by a single site in Oceanside. The primary site for noncredit instruction, until the Fall of 2000, was in leased facilities called the Adult Learning Center. Two years prior to that date, the district saw that it would outgrow its leased facilities and decided to build a permanent facility using local financing. That replacement facility opened its doors in September 2000 and is called the Community Learning Center.

Analysis

The Board of Governors reviews and approves new community college and educational centers. After the Board grants its approval, a request for state approval is transmitted to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) in a two-step process to obtain its review and approval. Only after both the Board of Governors and CPEC approve a new community college or educational center is a site considered approved by the state and eligible to be included in a state request for capital outlay funds.

The review of new sites is guided by Board regulations and by CPEC guidelines. CPEC is discussing changes to its site approval guidelines that redefine when a site is considered large enough to seek state approval and the nature of the information that needs to be provided for review. Given that this request for approval may need to fulfill the new CPEC guidelines, the review being performed by Chancellor's Office staff takes into consideration the Board regulations and the current and proposed CPEC guidelines.

Any request to approve a new college or educational center in accordance with Board of Governors regulations needs to discuss the following aspects of a site and its programs and services:

- Current facilities and expected enrollment growth,
- The needs and preferences of the surrounding area,
- Objectives of the proposed site and the expected program growth,
- Alternative delivery systems considered prior to requesting approval of the new site or the conversion of the existing site.

Districts submit this information to the Chancellor's Office through a Letter of Intent, a Needs Assessment and a district letter requesting approval. Letters of Intent initially notify the Chancellor's Office of the basic aspects of a proposed new site. If multiple sites were under consideration as the new site, the Letter of Intent would communicate the basic ability of all potential sites to function as educational institutions. A Letter of Intent is also used to notify the Board of Governors of a district's desire to convert an approved educational center to a community college.

A Needs Assessment provides extensive detail on a proposed new site and clarifies aspects of a proposal not explained in a Letter of Intent. The Needs Assessment addresses the requirements of the state regulations and CPEC Guidelines and identifies, among others, the objective of the new site. For example, a new site may seek to function as a comprehensive center providing a wide range of instructional programs and services or as a focused instructional center that provides extensive education in a limited number of program areas. The Regional Safety Training Center, now under development at Windsor in Northern California, is one such focused center that is designed to train law enforcement officers. In contrast, the Educational Center at Lompoc is a comprehensive center with a wide range of instructional programs. The Needs Assessment also provides information about the area served by the new site and alternatives considered prior to requesting approval of the new site.

The district letter requesting approval of a new site, while not specifically identified as a required element of a request for approval, is commonly used to address aspects of a proposal, such as community support for the new site, not covered in the Letter of Intent or the Needs Assessment.

Current Facilities and Expected Enrollment Growth

The Community Learning Center in Oceanside is a focused center that concentrates on providing noncredit instruction in adult high school and the English as a Second Language programs and, to a lesser extent, credit and noncredit instruction in a Computer Network Certificate program. Plans are to expand services into other instructional areas in both credit and noncredit programs as additional space is made available and enrollment increases. The center will, eventually, increase its ability to generate high school credit and college credit attendance, and has the potential to become more comprehensive as it expands facilities and course offerings. The site will continue to function primarily as an instructional facility that assists adults with seeking the basic skills that would enable them to succeed in college. For example, the center will expand its credit course offerings to eleven courses in the Spring of 2002.

For a community college site to be considered for state approval as an educational center or as a college, it must be able to function as a postsecondary educational institution and be of sufficient size to warrant state approval. Specifically, a state-approved site must comply with local zoning ordinances and cannot be located in an area that interferes with the operation of airport approach and takeoff patterns. Roads and walkways leading to the site must be capable of handling the normal traffic flow common with educational institutions without placing the students in jeopardy or interfering with environmental restrictions and local noise ordinances. The site must be capable of generating at least 500 FTES and must achieve this level of attendance by the third year of operation. If a location proposed for state approval is not presently generating 500 FTES, the district may seek approval for the site if they can demonstrate that current instructional efforts in the neighborhood of the proposed new site have attendance levels and enrollment growth rates capable of generating the 500 FTES minimum by the third year after state approval. The 500 FTES minimum by the third year of operation also means that initial facilities for any new site must be constructed at local expense without the commitment of state capital outlay funds, as with the current demand for state capital outlay resources it can take at least seven years for a new site to obtain state capital outlay funding. *(Note: A proposed change*

in CPEC guidelines is being considered that would raise the minimum attendance level for new community college educational centers from 500 annualized FTE by the third year of operation to 500 FTES in the most recently completed Fall Term prior to state approval. This change removes the opportunity to use annual FTES figures and project FTES for a three year period to calculate the 500 minimum FTES levels.)

The Mira Costa Community College District built the Oceanside Community Learning Center at local expense and, although it is larger than the previously-leased facility, is exploring plans to expand the facility in three phases. Phase 1, a 25,745 assignable square foot facility, opened a year ago last September. Seventy-five percent of the floor space in the new building is dedicated to lecture and lab rooms. The remaining rooms are a public meeting room and reception area, office areas, a small vending machine area and a small bookstore. Based upon the community college space standards, the Phase 1 facility now in operation at the site is capable of generating more FTES than the 500 FTES minimum for new educational centers. Phase 2 is planned as a High School of Academy of Business and Technology to be built by the Oceanside Unified School District with local funds and possibly some K-12 state bond funds, and is designed as an alternative to traditional high school. High school students attending the site will have the opportunity to enroll in both high school and college credit courses. The construction of Phase 2 will in essence convert the site to a multi-segmental location with both high school and lower division college courses available at the same site. Phase 3 will expand the community colleges educational programs and services by providing instructional rooms for a broad range of college credit and noncredit courses. Phase 3 is proposed to be state funded and is estimated by the district to cost approximately $8 million.

Because the Community Learning Center has been open for just twelve months, actual enrollment and attendance figures for only one year on the site are available. Given its close proximity to the previous location of the Adult Learning Center, the district advocates that we can project future enrollment at the new site based upon the experience of the previous site. We agree with this premise. District projections show that the enrollment and FTES served by the site will continue to grow at a reasonable rate. Existing Board regulations require that a new site serve 500 FTES by the third year of operation following state approval. As can be seen by Table 1, the Community Learning Center has reached that 500 FTES (annualized) threshold and is projected to maintain that level of enrollment and attendance with slight growth in future years.[1]

[1] The enrollment projections are now under review by the Department of Finance.

Table 1
Mira Costa Community College District
Community Learning Center
Annualized Enrollment and FTES
(Sum of Credit and Noncredit)

Adult Learning Center		
Year	**Enrollment**	**FTES**
1994-95	3,617	315
1995-96	4,010	351
1996-97	4,141	387
1997-98	4,035	381
1998-99	4,551	414
1999-00	4,126	425
Community Learning Center		
2000-01	4,751	506
2001-02	4,889	522
2003-04	5,031	568
2004-05	5,176	585
2005-06	5,327	602
2006-07	5,481	619

Current CPEC guidelines require that a new site generate 500 annualized FTES by the third year of operation, as do the Board regulations; however, one interpretation of those guidelines only allows the reporting of credit instruction. The Community Learning Center does not presently generate 500 *credit* FTES and is not expected to generate that level of credit attendance in the foreseeable future. Over 90 percent of the attendance generated by the site in 2000-01 was for noncredit instruction. The proposed CPEC guidelines, now under consideration for adoption, require that a new site serve 500 Fall Term FTES (either credit or noncredit) in its first year of operation and that there be an expectation that such enrollment and attendance continue or expand in the future. Like many other community college districts, MiraCosta Community College District combines its summer term attendance with the Fall term for reporting purposes. Table 2 shows that the Fall term enrollment and attendance served by the Community Learning Center exceeded the 500 FTES minimum set by the proposed guidelines in 2000-01 and is projected to continue to exceed that minimum threshold in future years. Spring term enrollment and attendance at the site tends to exceed the Fall term levels and also exceeds the 500 FTES minimum level.

Table 2
MiraCosta Community College District
Community Learning Center
Fall Term Enrollment and FTES
(Sum of Credit and Noncredit)[2]

Adult Learning Center		
Year	**Enrollment**	**FTES**
1994-95	2,018	308
1995-96	2,258	355
1996-97	2,313	393
1997-98	2,341	400
1998-99	2,674	440
1999-00	2,470	447
Community Learning Center		
2000-01	2,548	527
2001-02	2,622	542
2003-04	2,698	558
2004-05	2,776	574
2005-06	2,857	591
2006-07	2,940	608

Assessment of Needs and Preferences

Title 5, *California Code of Regulations*, section 55829, defines the assessment of needs and preferences as characteristics of individuals served or to be served, enrollment demands in the service area, involvement of nearby secondary and postsecondary institutions in the service area, community support or opposition to the proposal, and labor market demands and local preferences for specific programs and services.

The city of Oceanside has seen tremendous growth in its Hispanic community in recent years and growth is expected to continue in the foreseeable future. In 1990, Hispanics made up 21 percent of the population of San Diego County and 23 percent of the population in the city of Oceanside. By the year 2000, Hispanics had grown to 24.8 percent of the county population and 29.3 percent of the city population. This growth is more pronounced in the two neighborhoods near the Community Learning Center. The Eastside community is estimated at 82 percent Hispanic and Crown Heights is estimated at 93 percent Hispanic.

In 1999, an organization formed to improve the overall health of Eastside, Crown Heights and the Mesa Margarita neighborhoods conducted a survey and found that residents in these areas wanted more English as a Second Language (ESL), job training and high school GED classes as well as more parenting classes and after-school tutoring programs for children. The Community Learning Center is attempting to address adults needs for ESL, job training and GED courses.

[2] Data includes summer term enrollment and attendance information consistent with district reporting practices.

Cities and educational institutions supportive of MiraCosta's efforts to seek state approval for the Community Learning Center in Oceanside include the city of Oceanside and Oceanside Unified School District, both of which are discussing further collaboration with the district at the site. The California State University at San Marcos, 17 miles from the center, and the Palomar Community College District, in San Marcos, 15 miles from the center, are supportive of state approval. The San Diego Community College District is aware of the proposal, but because all state approved sites compete equally for capital outlay funds, would not voice its support for the proposal until the Board of Governors adopts a policy of priority funding for facilities for existing accredited institutions such as the San Diego Miramar College, 32 miles from the center, that have been waiting for numerous years for additional facilities.

Serving the Disadvantaged

The district sees the large Hispanic population in the downtown area as having a severe need for adult education and community college services. Sixty-seven percent of the adults in the Crown Heights area of Oceanside have a sixth grade education or less and ninety-three percent of the adults have not completed high school. In the Eastside area of Oceanside, seventy-one percent of the adults have not completed high school. Given these figures and the unwillingness of the adults in the central city area to go to the main campus, just seven miles away, to obtain college services, the district has elected to come to the neighborhoods with the services and the Community Learning Center is their primary means for providing those services. Providing high school equivalency education is an important role of the Community Learning Center, but is not generally included when determining whether a site serves a sufficient number of students to meet the minimum enrollment threshold for state approval. The enrollment information presented earlier only includes the postsecondary enrollment and attendance data and does not include attendance generated by the high school equivalency courses offered at the Community Learning Center.

Identification of Objectives

Programs and services at a site need to be directed to the identified objectives of the community to be served by the new center. To create this relationship between community needs and educational programs, the educational needs and preferences of the community must be identified in sufficient detail to enable proper identification and must be sufficiently specific so that the district board may evaluate whether needs and preferences are met.

The objectives of the Community Learning Center are to assist non-English speaking adults to transition to and function successfully in our society and, if their educational goals include obtaining a community college or higher degree, to assist in their successful transition to the two-year or four-year degree granting institution. To that end, the district relocated the English as a Second Language program from the Adult Learning Center and has expanded it as it relates to the ethnic community in and around the central city area of Oceanside. Other programs offered at the new center that are in close association with the ESL program are the Adult High School Diploma program and Adult Basic Education program offered at the site. These two programs are designed to address the basic education needs of adults who do not yet have sufficient educational expertise to be successful in school, let alone in a community college

credit instructional setting. Other programs that have recently been added to the center are the Cisco Certified Network Associate and the Cisco Network Professional programs that are designed to train adults so that they may be immediately employable in those capacities.

Phase 2 of the center is designed to establish an alternative high school which prepares students for immediate employment. This facility may be used by the community college after the high school day, but specific details are still under development. In Phase 3, the district hopes to expand the center's capabilities to include additional college credit courses and those transitional courses that will assist students to succeed in college. With these objectives, the district will need to use non-typical measures to identify student success. For example, even though they do not go on to college, many students will be considered successes if they are functioning more effectively in society after having completed the Adult High School, ESL or the Cisco Networking programs at the new center.

Examination of Feasible Alternative Delivery Systems

Title 5, *California Code of Regulations*, section 55831 requires a district, as part of the request for approval of a new site, to examine feasible delivery system alternatives for providing the intended programs and services. It is incumbent that the selected alternative provides individuals in the service area access to programs and services with content and quality, and be a cost-effective alternative. Depending on the delivery system proposed, alternatives considered must include increased utilization of existing district resources, formation of a new site (an outreach operation, educational center or college) and the use of media such as television, computer-assisted instruction or programmed learning packages.

Due to the district's recognition that it had to be located in the Oceanside community to be effective, there is no discussion in the Needs Assessment of the possibility of expanding facilities at either the main Campus or the San Elijo Center or to use non-traditional ways to provide services to this population. The only alternatives the district considered when seeking alternatives to the leased site was to examine four locations in downtown Oceanside. Only sites located in downtown Oceanside were considered because, according to staff at the center, the students to be served do not seem to be willing or able to leave their neighborhoods to seek educational services. Experience at the previous Adult Learning Center showed the district that there was a large demand in the area for their services.

Fiscal Implications of the New Educational Center

The existing facility is already included in the district space inventory, and the sum of local revenue and student fees exceeds the calculation of general state apportionment so approving the site will not impact state apportionment calculations. The only potential impact is in the area of capital outlay. The second building in the complex, Phase 2, an $8 million vocational education building, is to be built by Oceanside Unified School District and is not expected to use community college capital outlay funds, but could draw upon state capital outlay funds for unified school districts. Phase 3, an $8 million instructional building, is designed to be a community college facility and the district will likely request state funding once the site has been approved. At that time, the new center could compete with other approved locations for capital

outlay funding.

Conclusion

This item is presented to the Board for initial review and comment. The enrollment projections noted in this item have not been approved by the Department of Finance Demographic Research Unit, which is required before the Board of Governors may act on the item. Therefore, this item will not return to the Board for action until the projections have been approved by the Department of Finance. At the present time, a recommendation for action is anticipated at the March 2002 Board meeting.

Prepared by: *Walt Reno, Specialist*
Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit

Appendix C

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

GRAY DAVIS, GOVERNOR

915 L STREET ■ SACRAMENTO CA ■ 95814-3706 ■ WWW.DOF.CA.GOV

December 21, 2001

Walt Reno, Specialist
Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit
Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges
1102 Q Street, 4th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Walt:

The Demographic Research Unit has reviewed and approves the following enrollment projection for the MiraCosta Community College District's Community Learning Center:

MiraCosta Community College District
Community Learning Center Enrollment Projection

	Fall Total Enrollment	WSCH/ Enrollment	Annual Average WSCH
1994	1,338	3.2	4,339
1995	1,519	3.2	4,788
1996	1,434	3.6	5,169
1997	1,465	3.5	5,110
1998	1,753	3.2	5,591
1999	1,479	3.8	5,555
2000	1,785	3.8	6,872
2001	1,837	3.8	7,071
2002	1,890	3.8	7,276
2003	1,945	3.8	7,487
2004	2,001	3.9	7,705
2005	2,059	3.9	7,928
2006	2,119	3.8	8,158
2007	2,180	3.9	8,394
2008	2,244	3.8	8,638
2009	2,309	3.8	8,888
2010	2,376	3.8	9,146

We extend our best wishes for the success of the center.

Sincerely,

Mary Heim

Mary Heim, Chief
Demographic Research Unit
Department of Finance

cc: Wayne F. Keithley, Keithley Consulting Group
Patricia Jeffery, Placemakers, Keithley Consulting Group
Edwin Coate, MiraCosta Community College District
Fred Harris, Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
Gil Velazquez, California Postsecondary Education Commission