



**ACCREDITING  
COMMISSION  
for COMMUNITY and  
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

*Western Association  
of Schools and Colleges*

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD  
SUITE 204  
NOVATO, CA 94949  
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234  
FAX: (415) 506-0238  
E-MAIL: [accjc@accjc.org](mailto:accjc@accjc.org)  
[www.accjc.org](http://www.accjc.org)

Chairperson  
SHERRILL L. AMADOR  
Public Member

Vice Chairperson  
STEVEN KINSELLA  
Administration

President  
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President  
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD

Vice President  
KRISTA JOHNS

Vice President  
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President  
JOHN NIXON

Associate Vice President  
NORVAL WELLSFRY

July 3, 2013

Dr. Monte Perez  
President  
Los Angeles Mission College  
13356 Eldridge Avenue  
Sylmar, CA 91342

Dear President Perez:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting June 5-7, 2013, considered the Self Evaluation Report of Los Angeles Mission College, the report of the External Evaluation Team that visited the College March 18-21, 2013, the presentation made by college representatives, and the additional materials submitted.

The Commission acted to issue **Warning** and require Los Angeles Mission College to correct the deficiencies noted. The College is required to complete a **Follow-Up Report**<sup>1</sup> by **March 15, 2014**, demonstrating resolution of the deficiencies in meeting Accreditation Standards noted in College Recommendations 1-14 and Eligibility Requirements 10, 14 and 20. The Report will be followed by a visit of Commission representatives.

Warning is issued when the Commission finds that an institution has pursued a course deviating from the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards or Commission policies to an extent that gives concern to the Commission. The Commission may require an institution to correct its deficiencies, refrain from certain activities, or initiate certain activities. The Commission will specify the time within which the institution must resolve deficiencies, and may require additional reports and evaluation visits. During the warning period, reaffirmation is delayed, but the institution remains accredited and will be reaffirmed when the issues giving rise to the warning are fully resolved and the institution is removed from warning.

The Follow-Up Report of March 2014 should demonstrate that the institution has fully addressed the recommendations noted below, completely resolved the noted deficiencies, and now meets all Eligibility Requirements (ERs), Accreditation Standards and recommendations identified in the External Evaluation Team Report.

***Recommendation #1***

To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college develop and institute a formal process utilizing its established governance and decision making processes for reviewing its mission on a regular basis and making revisions as necessary. (I.A.3)

Dr. Monte Perez  
Los Angeles Mission College  
July 3, 2013

***Recommendation #2***

To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college assess the achievement and learning outcomes for each of the past five years by programs and the college, set standards for student success including student achievement and student learning, accelerate its efforts to assess outcomes in all courses, programs, degrees and certificates and assess how findings have led to improved student learning and the achievement of the college mission, and widely distribute the results so they may be used as the basis for all constituent groups to engage in self-reflective dialog about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes. (I.B; II.A; II.B; I.B.2; I.B.6; II.A.1.c; II.A.2; ER 10)

With regard to ER 10, the Self Evaluation Report stated, “at least one outcome for each course, certificate, and program has been assessed.” The team’s review of the College’s online SLO management system, however, indicated that this was not accurate. A number of courses across the curriculum have yet to enter any assessments for their stated SLOs.

***Recommendation #3***

To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college develop and implement a comprehensive program of research and evaluation to support the assessment of student, program and institutional learning outcomes, and program review; support ongoing engagement in a collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes; and support collection and analyses of data related to the needs and goals of its diverse student populations. (I.A.1; I.B.1; I.B.2; I.B.6; II.A.1.a; II.A.1.c; II.A.2; II.A.2.d; II.A.2.f)

***Recommendation #4***

To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college develop and implement a plan for Distance Education that includes an evaluation of Distance Education for alignment with the needs of the college's intended student population, an assessment of the quality of instruction and compliance with US Department of Education regulations, infrastructure to support online teaching and learning, and a systematic assessment of student learning and achievement outcomes in order to ascertain how well students are learning in distance education courses. Such a plan should be integrated with other college planning efforts and linked to the resource allocation process. (I.B.1; I.B.2; I.B.4; I.B.5; I.B.7; II.A.1; II.A.2; II.A.3; II.A.6; II.A.7; II.A.8; and II.B.3.c)

***Recommendation #5***

To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college adopt mechanisms for assessing: student learning styles and needs, the alignment of instructional delivery and pedagogical approaches with student learning styles and needs, and how instructional delivery and pedagogical approaches are related to achievement of student learning outcomes. (II.A.2.d)

Dr. Monte Perez  
Los Angeles Mission College  
July 3, 2013

***Recommendation #6***

To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college develop a set of metrics and performance standards to better monitor the effectiveness of its planning and resource allocation decisions in achieving improvements in student learning. (I.A.1; II.A.1; and II.A.2.f)

***Recommendation #7***

To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college undertake an overall assessment of its student support service offerings to determine the full scope of services it needs to offer to meet the diverse needs of its students as well as all federal and state requirements. The assessment should also determine the level of staffing needed to deliver an acceptable level of services based on its budgeted student enrollment, and develop the resources needed to employ the staff required to deliver the planned services. (II.B.1; ER 14)

With regard to ER 14, the College has left positions unfilled and allowed serious gaps in student services in the wake of budget reductions. Student Support Services staffing has not been sufficient to provide services to students for lengthy periods. Further, the team found a lack of action steps for how to offer services at an acceptable level as required by the Standards.

***Recommendation #8***

To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college develop and make available to visiting teams a report of student complaints/grievances that details the date of the complaint/ grievance, the name of the individual filing the complaint/grievance, the nature of the complaint/grievance, the disposition of the complaint/grievance, and the date of the disposition. The report should cover a five year period and be updated annually. (II.B; II.B.2.c; II.B.3.a; II.B.4; ER 20)

***Recommendation #9***

To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college ensure that all student support programs, including counseling for distance education students, are actively engaged in the program review and outcomes assessment process to determine how they contribute to the institutional student learning outcomes. All of the student services programs and services should complete a full cycle of review and assessment which includes gathering of data, analysis of data, implementation of program changes for improvement and the re-evaluation of implemented improvements. (II.B.3; II.B.3.c; and II.B.4)

***Recommendation #10***

To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college assess how effective the collegiality efforts have been in promoting a productive collegial workplace, how it subscribes to, advocates, and demonstrates integrity in the treatment of all employees, and then implement improvements based on the outcomes of the assessments. It also should complete the code of conduct approval process, and demonstrate that the college is upholding its code of conduct. (III.A.1.d; III.A.4.c)

Dr. Monte Perez  
Los Angeles Mission College  
July 3, 2013

***Recommendation #11***

To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college integrate human resources planning into its institutional planning in order to maintain a sufficient number of qualified faculty, staff, and administrators to support the college's mission, purposes and programs. (III.A.2; III.A.6)

***Recommendation #12***

To improve its established budget development practices, the team recommends the college determine the cost of maintaining and periodically replacing the technology acquired through grant funding and factor those costs into their planning and budgeting process. (III.C.1.c; III.C.2; III.D.1.d)

***Recommendation #13***

To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college provide appropriate training to staff on the proper documentation procedures identified in the audit for: "To Be Arranged" (TBA) courses, eligibility verification for college categorical programs, and verification of census reporting documents. The college also must establish internal controls to ensure that audit findings are resolved prior to the subsequent audit. (III.D.2.a; III.D.2.d; III.D.2.e)

***Recommendation #14***

To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college undertake an evaluation of its collegial governance and decision-making processes, as well as the overall effectiveness of the current administrative structure, and that it widely communicate the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement. (IV.A.5; IV.B.2.a)

I wish to inform you that under U.S. Department of Education regulations, institutions out of compliance with Standards or on sanction are expected to correct deficiencies within a two-year period or the Commission must take action to terminate accreditation. Los Angeles Mission College must correct the deficiencies in meeting Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards noted in recommendations above no later than March 15, 2015, or the Commission will be required to take adverse action.

The External Evaluation Report provides details of the team's findings with regard to each Eligibility Requirement and Accreditation Standard and should be read carefully and used to understand the team's findings. The recommendations contained in the External Evaluation Team Report represent the best advice of the peer evaluation team at the time of the visit, but may not describe all that is necessary to come into compliance.

Institutions are expected to take all actions necessary to comply with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies.

The Commission wishes to remind you that while an institution may concur or disagree with any part of the report, the College is expected to use the External Evaluation Report to improve educational programs and services and to resolve issues identified by the Commission.

Dr. Monte Perez  
Los Angeles Mission College  
July 3, 2013

The College conducted an educational quality and institutional effectiveness review as part of its self evaluation. The Commission suggests that the plans for improvement of the institution included in its Self Evaluation Report be used to support the continuing improvement of Los Angeles Mission College.

A **final copy** of the External Evaluation Report is attached. Additional copies may now be duplicated. The Commission requires you to give the Evaluation Report and this letter dissemination to your College staff and to those who were signatories of your College Self Evaluation Report. This group should include the campus leadership, the Chancellor, and the Board of Trustees.

The Commission also requires that the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, the External Evaluation Report, and this Commission action letter be made available to students and the public by placing a copy on the College website. *Please note that in response to public interest in disclosure, the Commission now requires institutions to post accreditation information on a page no farther than one click from the institution's home page.* If you would like an electronic copy of the External Evaluation Report, please contact Commission staff.

Finally, ACCJC staff is available to assist the College with consultation and advice on the recommendations identified above. Please do not hesitate to contact us.

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express continuing interest in the institution's educational quality and students' success. Professional self-regulation is the most effective means of assuring integrity, effectiveness and educational quality.

Sincerely,



Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.  
President

BAB/tl

cc: Mr. Daniel Villanueva, Accreditation Liaison Officer  
Dr. Adriana Barrera, Interim Chancellor, Los Angeles Community College District  
President, Board of Trustees, Los Angeles Community College District  
Mr. Michael T. Rota, Retired Chancellor, Honolulu Community College, Team Chair

Enclosure

---

<sup>1</sup> Institutions preparing and submitting Midterm Reports, Follow-Up Reports, and Special Reports to the Commission should review Guidelines for the Preparation of Reports to the Commission. The Guidelines contain the background, requirements, and format for each type of report and presents sample cover pages and certification pages. The Guidelines are available on the ACCJC website under College Reports to ACCJC at: (<http://www.accjc.org/college-reports-accjc>).