EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

Los Angeles Mission College

13356 Eldridge Avenue

Sylmar, California 91352

A Confidential Report Prepared for the Accrediting Commission

For Community and Junior Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited

Los Angeles Mission College

March 11 through 14, 2013

Mr. Michael T. Rota, Team Chair

Los Angeles Mission College
Visiting Team Roster

Mr. Michael Rota (Chair)
Retired Chancellor
Honolulu Community College

Dr. John al-Amin
Vice Chancellor, Administrative Services
Contra Costa Community College District

Ms. Yolanda Bellisimo
Professor, Social Sciences
College of Marin

Dr. May Chen
Vice President of Student Services
Berkeley City College

Dr. Caroline Durdella
Director Research, Planning, and
Accreditation
Saddleback College

Dr. Jerry Saviano (Assistant)
Professor of English
Honolulu Community College

Ms. Sheryl Gessford
Dean, Natomas Education Center
American River College

Ms. Dena Martin
Librarian
Woodland Community College

Dr. Denise Noldon
President
Contra Costa College

Dr. Thea Trimble
Science Faculty
College of the Sequoias

Summary of the Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION:	Los Angeles Mission College
DATES OF THE VISIT:	March 11 through 14, 2013
TEAM CHAIR:	Mr. Michael T. Rota

A nine-member accreditation team visited the Los Angeles Mission College from March 11-14, 2013 for the purpose of evaluating how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes, analyzing how well the college is meeting the Commission's standards and selected federal regulations, and providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement. The team submitted recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the status of the college.

In preparation for the visit team members attended an all-day training sessions conducted by the ACC JC staff, read Commission materials prepared for visiting teams team members, and read the colleges self-evaluation report that was available on the college website well in advance of the visit. The team also reviewed recommendations from the 2007 visiting team and assessed the various forms of evidence provided by the institution. That evidence was available on the college website for which the team had complete access well in advance of the visit, and a paper form in the team's work room at the college.

Prior to the visit the team members completed written evaluations of the institution self-evaluation report and begin identifying areas for further investigation. During the visit the team met with well over 100 individuals including faculty, staff, administrators, community members and students. Team members also met with the District Chancellor, district staff, and members of the Board of Trustees. All members of the of the LAMC community were welcoming and open with the visiting team with regards to practices, procedures and information necessary for the team to conduct its work in an expeditious manner.

The college self-evaluation report is a sizable document that covers all of the Standards. However, after the original document was prepared there were revisions to the Standards and a supplemental document was prepared to reflect those changes and delivered to the team at the start of the visit. The self-evaluation report and all of the supporting documents are posted on the college's website and easily accessible by members of the visiting team and the general public. The college and the district were well prepared for the visit, making written documentation available that mirrored electronic documentation posted on the website. The college made available technical support to the team during the visit, and the team was able to access all of the necessary documents including online courses during its visit. The college made support staff available to the team on campus throughout the visit and provided technical resources to the

team at the hotel so the team's work could continue even off-campus. The team appreciated the meals and refreshments provided during its visit to the college.

The college has had a recent history of internal strife and bullying behavior that many people attribute to the high rate of administrative turnover at the college. The college has had five presidents over the last nine years as well as a number of other administrative changes. The current president was appointed to the position in May 2011. The 2007 comprehensive evaluation visit resulted in a recommendation designed to establish policies to "encourage institutional leaders to work together collegially. While the college met the recommendations from that visit, the unfortunate behavior it was designed to eliminate reappeared in 2011.

Since the 2007 visit, the college experienced budget reductions along with the administrative turnover that have resulted in a number of critical positions going unfilled. These vacancies have hampered the college's ability to collect and report to student achievement data necessary to sustain a robust dialogue that would lead to improved learning and student achievement. The college also was unable to provide the full range of student support services expected by the standards. Recent improvements in the fiscal position of the district as well as modifications to the funding formula have resulted in additional resources coming to the college. The team believes these additional resources will allow the college to attain the staffing necessary to meet the standards.

The college did not provide the required longitudinal data on student achievement by programs or the institution as a whole. In addition, the college has not yet set standards for performance as required by federal regulation and therefore the team was unable to determine whether the institution is functioning at a level consistent with its mission or making improvements in student achievement or student learning. Following a review of the college's file of student grievances, the team was unable to determine if the college was in compliance with Commission standards or federal requirements. A systematic overhaul of the record keeping and reporting of student grievances is essential.

The team encourages the institution to develop more thorough understanding of the ACCJC **Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness** particularly with regard to institutional effectiveness in program review and the assessment of student learning. While the basic components of these elements are in place the absence of a rigorous dialogue that leads to improvement has not yet been established as a fundamental mode of operation at the college. The college is not yet functioning at the proficient level in these two areas as is the current expectation of the Commission.

Due to a substantial district bond fund the college has been able to construct new classroom and laboratory facilities. The design of these new facilities blend well with the residential neighborhood in which the college is located. When the major construction is completed in the next few years the new facilities will completely replace the temporary buildings that have housed the faculty staff and students since moving to the current location in 1991, and the community, faculty, staff, and students will have a campus that will make everyone proud.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2013 Visiting Team

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)

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)

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).

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)

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)

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)

Accreditation Evaluation Report for

Los Angeles Mission College

March 11-14, 2013

Introduction

Los Angeles Mission College is currently located on 33 acres in the community of Sylmar, close to the city of San Fernando in the Northeast San Fernando Valley. The College was established in 1975 and for its first 16 years offered classes in scattered storefronts and leased facilities throughout the city of San Fernando and surrounding communities including Granada Hills, Lake View Terrace, Pacoima, Sepulveda, Sylmar, Sun Valley, Sunland, Tujunga, and Mission Hills. The College also served students from neighboring communities such as North Hollywood, Panorama City, Van Nuys, and Burbank. Northeast San Fernando communities have many hardships with low educational attainment, low income, high unemployment, and a majority of students who are first-generation college students.

In 1991 the new permanent campus was completed on a 22-acre site in Sylmar and the College experienced a surge in enrollments and a resulting higher visibility in the community. In 2007 the College acquired 11 additional acres, which expanded its footprint to its existing size. In its transition from storefront beginnings in 1975 to today's modern campus, the college has benefitted from the district construction bond initiative, with new facilities replacing all of the portables built when the college consolidated on its current site.

The College provides lower-division general education, associate degree programs, Career Technical Education, certificates, transfer education, basic skills and developmental education, noncredit instruction, counseling, and community services and education. Over the past 37 years, the College has offered numerous workforce development programs, empowered immigrants through language and citizenship programs, enabled thousands to transition through the continuum of education linking high school, college, and the workforce, and graduated many of today's community leaders in business and civic affairs.

LAMC is located in an established residential neighborhood comprised of a significant Hispanic American population that is politically active. The local Hispanic organization claims a significant role in electing public officials at both the county and state level and influencing the establishment of the college, its move to its current location, and supporting the development of the current institution. The college with it significant Hispanic enrollment has been designated as a Hispanic serving institution by the US Department of Education.

When the college was established in 1975 it had faculty assigned to each of the five different locations in which it operates. When the institution was established at its current site the move joined together the five distinctly separate faculties and staff into a single campus. These five different groups had distinctly different ideas about the operation of the college, differences that appear to persist to today.

The college self-evaluation report is a sizable document that covers all of the Standards. However, after the original document was prepared there were revisions to the Standards and a supplemental document was prepared to reflect those changes and delivered to the team at the start of the visit. The self-evaluation report and all of the supporting documents are posted on the college's website and easily accessible by members of the visiting team and the general public. The college was well prepared for the visit, making written documentation available that mirrored electronic documentation posted on the website. The college made available technical support to the team during the visit, and the team was able to access all of the necessary documents including online courses during its visit. The college made support staff available to the team on campus throughout the visit and provided technical resources to the team at the hotel so the team's work could continue even off-campus. The team appreciated the meals and refreshments provided during its visit to the college.

The college has had a recent history of internal strife and bullying behavior that many people attribute to the high rate of administrative turnover at the college. The college has had five presidents over the last nine years as well as a number of other administrative changes. The current president was appointed to the position in May 2011. The 2007 comprehensive evaluation visit resulted in a recommendation designed to establish policies to "encourage institutional leaders to work together collegially. While the college met the recommendations from that visit, the unfortunate behavior it was designed to eliminate reappeared in 2011.

In an unprecedented move the leadership of the six unions in the district representing faculty and staff came together in a union leadership summit. They made a commitment and pledge to move toward a more collegial and productive campus climate at Los Angeles Mission College. This pledge was signed by the leaders of the six unions, the college president, and the district Chancellor on December 4, 2012. The pledge commits the union membership to the following:

- to *keep an open mind and put prejudgments aside when communicating with others;*
- *to be mindful of our actions and statements and the effect these have on others;*
- *to resolve differences in a respectful manner, through open dialogue;*
- *to speak out when witnessing bullying and to let it be known that this type of behavior is not tolerated;*
- *to refrain from sending harassing, intimidating and/or threatening messages through electronic mail or other means as stated in district E-76 regulation; and*
- *to follow respectful email etiquette and to say "no" to group emails that harbor vicious attacks on colleagues by replying, "No, this is unacceptable," and quote the district policy.*

The Pledge concluded, "Finally, we request that all members of the Mission College family be held accountable for bullying behavior."

While the pledge makes a strong statement of intended behavior, not everyone on campus has yet incorporated that behavior into daily practice. During the visit several team members experienced the intensity of the divisions facing the campus, divisions which prevent the college from achieving its full potential.

Evaluation of Institutional Response to Previous Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Campus Relationships (2007)
The College is making progress in the development of institutional processes that assure inclusive and collaborative governance. To assure the sustainability of these efforts, the College must clarify and codify institutional relationships. The team recommends that the College establish clearly written policies that encourage institutional leaders to work together collegially and to regularly share these policies with all constituent groups within the educational community (Standards I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.4 III.A.4, IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3, IV.A.5).

A campus wide retreat was held in October of 2007 to provide a forum for a broader discussion of the accreditation recommendations and plans for responding to them; 48 faculty and staff members attended. There was a breakout session during the retreat to discuss the proposed language for the Code of Conduct Statement. The participants agreed on a statement condensed from the original draft. The Code of Conduct included language that stated that *those representing or acting on behalf of the College have a responsibility to conduct themselves in a manner that will maintain civility*. The code encourages institutional leaders to work together collegially by promoting conflict resolution, respect, fairness, and a commitment to student success and learning. At the end of the retreat, the document was presented to all the participants, and subsequently was distributed to the campus community via e-mail.

The College Code of Conduct was approved by the Academic Senate at its December, 2007 meeting with minor modifications. It was approved unanimously by the College Council at its December, 2007 meeting and was incorporated in the charters of the shared governance committees as part of the membership responsibilities. The College Council reaffirmed the College Code of Conduct at its September, 2009 meeting. All College shared governance committees have incorporated the following language about the College Code of Conduct into their charters: "Committee members are obligated to comply with the College Code of Conduct."

In 2011-2012 campus climate became difficult once again. In spring 2011 the Vice President of Academic Affairs sent an e-mail of resignation to the campus; however, this was subsequently withdrawn. This was followed by a recall attempt against the faculty union leadership. Tensions within the Associated Students Organization resulted in an impeachment attempt against the ASO President. These events were followed by student and community protests over the budget cuts, attacks against certain administrators and faculty members, departmental conflicts, and a recall attempt against the Academic Senate leadership. The
College has addressed these challenges through a variety of interventions including an investigation by the District Diversity Office, mediation, conflict resolution workshops, and a union sponsored Anti-Bullyism pledge campaign. While the college has addressed the recommendation, there are still issues with bullying that will be discussed later in the report. The college partially meets the Standards.

Recommendation 2: College Governance (2007)
It is commendable that the College crafted and approved a new governance model. However, the model is untested and will require a commitment to the tenets of participatory governance to make it successful and useful to the College decision-making process. The team recommends that the areas of responsibility be defined to clarify the outcomes of any given governance process (Standard IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3).

The Shared Governance Task Force that was established by the College Council in May of 2007 has continued to oversee the shared governance committees. The six shared governance standing committees that report and make recommendations to College Council are the Budget and Planning Committee, Educational Planning Committee, Facilities Planning Committee, Professional and Staff Development Committee, Student Support Services Committee, and Technology Committee. The six shared governance committees have met on a regular basis since the last Comprehensive visit. Committee charters, agendas, and minutes are posted on the College Web site.

In the fall of 2007, the Shared Governance Task Force made recommendations to the College Council for defining the charge, function, and membership of the six shared governance committees. Each committee developed a charter based on these recommendations, which was approved by the College Council. The charters specify the membership and areas of responsibility of each committee. As a result of regular shared governance committee evaluations, which are performed twice a year, the charters have been revised as needed to further refine the areas of responsibility of each committee. The college has addressed the recommendation and meets the Standards.

Recommendation 3: Evaluation and Effectiveness of Governance Committees (2007)
The team recommends that the College Council implement the regular and systematic evaluation of the effectiveness and integrity of its collaborative governance committees by fall 2008 (Standard IV.A.5).

The College Council established the Shared Governance Task Force to oversee the new shared governance committees and monitor their effectiveness and integrity. The Shared Governance Task Force began meeting in June 2007 and developed a template for the shared governance committee charters including the purpose, membership, authorization, goals and objectives, reporting system, membership responsibility and code of conduct.

The Shared Governance Task Force has continued to oversee the shared governance committees. In December 2007 the Shared Governance Task Force distributed a committee self-evaluation form and recommended that the six standing committees reporting to College Council perform a yearly self-evaluation beginning in spring 2008. The self-evaluation is completed during the spring semester. Since 2008, the Shared Governance Task Force has reviewed the self-evaluations and provided a written summary to the College Council on an annual basis. This assessment led to a new process being adopted.

In the fall of 2008 the Shared Governance Task Force developed a comprehensive external evaluation instrument to be completed by teams of two individuals not sitting on the committees

being evaluated. Based on the external evaluations, it became clear that some committees were very effective. These committees met regularly, meetings were well attended, they had agenda items that were consistent with their charters and the College Strategic Plan, and they made recommendations to College Council that resulted in decisions based on shared governance. Other committees functioned primarily as forums for information, discussion, and planning. Several of these committees were involved in planning college wide activities such as training workshops, student events, and campus policies; while they reported regularly to College Council, they did not bring action items forward. These external evaluations are conducted on an annual basis. The college has addressed this recommendation. However, as will be discussed later in the report (IV.A.5), while the individual committees have been assessed, there has not been a global assessment of the governance process to include administration. Therefore, the college partially meets the Standard.

Recommendation 4: Planning (2007)
The team recommends that the College wide unit assessment (Program Review) effort should be revitalized. The cyclical approach to unit assessment, if systematically implemented, should align the College budgeting process with the planning process. The College should define a clear link between budgeting, enrollment planning, staffing, instructional equipment, technology, and facility maintenance (Standards I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7, III.A., III.A.6, III.B, III.B.2, III.B.2.a,b, III.C, III.C.1.a, III.C, III.C.2, III.D, III.D, III.D.1.a,b,c,d, III.D.3).

The College has redesigned and streamlined the Program Review (unit assessment) process so as to align the College planning, resource allocation, and budget preparation processes. In summer 2007, a task force of the College's Educational Planning Committee (EPC) met to re-examine and strengthen the linkages between planning and resource allocation. The task force adopted the approach that the resource allocation process should be directly linked to the advancement of the College's strategic goals, which are focal points of the unit planning and assessment process. The task force developed an implementation timeline with academic Program Review beginning in fall 2007. The first year, 95 percent of the academic units submitted their Program Reviews by the spring 2008 due date. Non-instructional units completed their Program Reviews during spring 2009. Since that time, the College has conducted comprehensive Program Reviews every three years and Program Review updates every year for both instructional and non-instructional units.

The College uses the Program Review process as the primary vehicle or method for developing resource requests. This movement represents a significant change from the former resource allocation system, which was characterized by a multiplicity of request processes. The timing of resource requests through the unit planning process is designed to coincide with the College's operational budget preparation cycle so that resource requests can be incorporated into the next year's operational budget.

The College Council serves as the main body for college planning. Annual retreats are held to set college goals and objectives. These goals and objectives include enrollment planning, staffing and equipment needs, budget issues, and facilities improvements. Program review requests, which document needs in each of these areas, are forwarded to the appropriate Vice Presidents for review and approval. Approved resource requests are forwarded to the College Council for

recommendation to the college President. The college has addressed the recommendation and partially meets the Standards.

Recommendation 5: Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment (2007)
Although the College has made some progress in defining the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) at the course and degree level, the College should accelerate efforts to complete the development and inclusion of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle in all courses, college programs, and services (Standards I.B, I.B.1, II.A.1.a,c, II.A.2.a,b,e,f,g,h,i, II.A.3, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.1.c).

Since the accreditation evaluation team's visit in March 2007, Los Angeles Mission College has stepped up the process to complete the development and inclusion of student learning outcomes and assessment in all courses, college programs, and services. Since May of 2007 an annual Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment report has been prepared.

The current District faculty union contract obligates the faculty members to participate in the development and assessment of student learning outcomes and to make appropriate adjustments in courses and programs on the basis of those assessments. The faculty of Los Angeles Mission College have been actively assessing course SLOs. Faculty, in general, have been very cooperative, and the chairs of the departments have worked closely with both their full-time and adjunct faculty to define SLOs, develop realistic and measurable assessments and criteria for evaluation, and make curricular improvements as a result of the assessments. A wide variety of assessment instruments are being used to measure student achievement of SLOs.

A Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Web page was developed during the spring semester 2007 and is regularly updated. The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee was formed, began meeting in September 2007, and met bi-weekly throughout 2007-2008. The SLOA Committee wrote an SLOA mission statement, shared SLOA information, assisted other faculty members and Student Services personnel with writing SLOs and Service Area Outcomes. LAMC's institutional researcher and IT Department developed an in-house program to track and map SLO assessments for all courses, programs, degrees, and Institutional SLOs. Since fall of 2010, all SLOs and assessments are recorded using this online system.

In the spring semester 2007, a Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator position was established with 50 percent reassigned time, which was increased in the fall 2007 semester to 60 percent. In fall 2008, the SLO Coordinator was joined by an SLO assistant, and the 60 percent reassigned time was redistributed 40/20. The SLO Coordinator gives monthly progress reports to the Educational Planning Committee, the Academic Senate, and the Council of Instruction.

Clearly the college has accelerated its efforts as called for in the 2007 report and therefore has addressed the recommendation. However, the college has not completed the implementation of the cycle of assessment and has not shown evidence that ILO assessment is used in making improvements or in making resource allocation decisions as is required to meet the Standards. This issue will be a topic of discussion and analysis later in the report.

Recommendation 6: District wide Decentralization

In anticipation of the full implementation of the district wide decentralization plans, the College should strengthen and clarify the administrative systems and responsibility for enrollment management, finance, and human resources (Standards II.B, II.B.3.c,d,e, III.A.2, III.A.3, III.A.6, III.D.1.a,b,c,d, III.D.3, IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a,b,c,d,e,g).

District wide decentralization is a process that the District Office and campuses have been implementing for the past five years. This process has led to an evolution of the framework in which enrollment management, finance, and human resources activities occur. The current structure is characterized by both joint college-district collaboration and a delineation of college-district responsibilities. These responsibilities are detailed in a district published functional map that covers more than 300 processes.

As the fiscal and administrative agent for the LACCD, the District Office's (DO) budget and attendance accounting divisions receive information from state fiscal authority regarding district funding and apportionment revenues. These units, in collaboration with both the Chancellor's Cabinet and the District Budget Committee, develop total district and college specific FTES targets. These targets are transmitted to the College and are an important element in developing the College's enrollment strategy for the academic year. The components of this strategy include plans for student recruitment and outreach, marketing, and the number and distribution of course offerings over the academic year. The District holds colleges responsible for attainment of assigned enrollment/FTES targets. To improve intra-college coordination of enrollment management activities, the College has formed an Enrollment Management Team (EMT) as an additional mechanism to facilitate enrollment planning.

The administrative systems, particularly SAP Finance and Procurement, have been implemented and operational for the past four years. Since the go-live on these modules, many procedures and responsibilities have been established at both the campus and district-level. SAP/HR has been operational for over three years and many of the features of the HR module, including manager's desktop and employee evaluations are being implemented at this time. The HR Council, which is represented by campus presidents, vice presidents, and district office human resources staff, has created extensive documentation, entitled HR Guides, which outlines all of the district/campus policies and procedures for human resource management. Two additional modules, budget planning and asset management, are included in the District Technology Department's implementation plan. The college has addressed this recommendation, and meets the Standards.

District Recommendation 1:
The team recommends that the District should provide leadership in supporting the progress toward incorporating achievement of stated student learning outcomes as a component of faculty evaluation (III.A.1.c).

As reported by the college, the incorporation of SLOs into faculty obligations and evaluation was taken on part of the negotiations for the 2008-2011 collective bargaining agreement. On examination of the faculty evaluation form (Appendix C – 2011-2014), the following was found under Professional Responsibilities for all faculty:

1. Writing SLOs and establishing assessment tools/rubrics [disciplines or departments]

2. Including the officially approved course SLOs on course syllabi [all faculty]

3. Incorporating approved SLOs in teaching [all faculty]

4. Providing the instructor with a copy (electronic or hard copy) of the course outline and any officially approved SLOs [department chairs]

5. Determining a process for officially approving SLOs [determined by the College and usually jointly agreed to by the faculty in a discipline or department and the College's academic senate]

6. Conducting SLO assessments in assigned classes and using the results to make appropriate changes in instruction to improve student learning [all faculty]

This is evidence of leadership among the administration and the faculty union that is expected to result in a systematic move toward the development, use and assessment of SLOs across all the colleges in the district. This recommendation has been fully addressed and the Standard is met.

District Recommendation 2
The team recommends that the College should closely monitor in future years the success of the District's plan for addressing retiree health benefit liability to assure that out-year obligations are met without significant impact on the financial health of the institution (Standard III.D.1.c).

The LACCD took significant steps to address the issue of its unfunded liability for retiree health care in fall 2006 by negotiating an agreement, approved by the District's six unions and the Board of Trustees, to begin pre-funding a portion of its unfunded obligation. The District annually directs 1.92 percent of the previous fiscal year's full-time employee payroll into an irrevocable trust, managed through CalPERS. In addition, an amount equivalent to the District's annual Medicare D refund is diverted from the District's operating budget into the trust. As of June 30, 2012, the balance in the trust was $39,751,541 and its Fair Market Value was $41,694,651. In 2009, facing a state budget crisis and enormous increases in health benefit costs, the District's Joint Labor-Management Benefits Committee (JLMBC) took action to reduce the cost of health care coverage for both active and retired employees. The Board approved the move to health care plans administered by CalPERS, which took effect January 1, 2010. Because of the significantly lower retiree benefit costs under CalPERS, the District was able to reduce its GASB obligation by $97 million. This recommendation has been addressed and the Standard is met.

District Recommendation 3:
The team recommends that the Board of Trustees should complete the self-evaluation process by discussing and developing a set of board goals to respond to any issues identified in their self-evaluation. The Board should institutionalize the goal setting and measuring of accomplishments as part of the self-evaluation process (IV.B.1.g).

The Board of Trustees adopted a board rule on October 17, 2007 that established the setting of board goals as part of its annual process of self-evaluation. At its annual retreats, the Board scores its performance, reporting on its self-assessment and the summarized evaluations of constituency representatives who sit at the resource table during board meetings. The Board

establishes new goals for the following year, both to address District priorities as well as any issues that have arisen as a result of the self-evaluation.

In 2010 the Board adopted a District Effectiveness Review Cycle, which aligns annual Board and CEO goals with District Strategic Plan (DSP) goals. The annual cycle includes Board evaluation, Board retreats, college activities in support of goals, institutional effectiveness reports, and District effectiveness reports that align with the DSP. . This recommendation has been addressed and the Standard is met.

District Recommendation 4:
Although in practice the evaluation of the College presidents and district chancellor occurs on a regular basis and is an inclusive process, the team recommends that the district develop a written policy that clearly defines the evaluation process (IV.B.1.j).

The District's HR division drafted a formal written policy, the Performance Evaluation Process for College Presidents, which clearly spells out the evaluation process that has been and continues to be followed. The description is now included in the packet with the evaluation forms used.

To address this recommendation regarding the chancellor's evaluation, the Chancellor's Office issued a directive (Chancellor's Directive #122) that spells out the procedure that has been and continues to be followed. The Board solicits input from constituencies and collects data to evaluate performance on a number of criteria. In July 2010, the evaluation processes for the Chancellor and the College presidents were integrated into the Board's newly adopted District Effectiveness Review Cycle. This recommendation has been addressed and the Standard is met.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

1. Authority: Los Angeles Mission College (LAMC) is one of 113 public, two-year community colleges authorized to operate by the state of California and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. It is governed by the Board of Trustees of the Los Angeles Community College District. As part of the Los Angeles Community College District, Los Angeles Mission College is governed by a locally elected, seven-member board of trustees. Los Angeles Mission College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. LAMC received its initial accreditation in 1975. Los Angeles Mission College is authorized to operate as a public education institution and to award degrees by the State of California. The college meets this requirement.

2. Mission: LAMC's educational mission is clearly defined and specifically states the College's commitment to achieving student learning. The previous mission statement was approved by College Council and the Board of Trustees on July 26, 2006. The mission statement was reviewed in 2012, and a revised mission statement was approved by the Board of Trustees on October 17, 2012. The mission statement is annually reviewed by the College at the College Council Retreat to ensure that it is current and aligns with the core mission of California Community Colleges. The Mission Statement is published in the annual College Catalog, the Schedule of Classes, on the College Web site and is widely distributed throughout the College. The mission statement guides the six-year planning and assessment cycle and resource allocation process. The college meets this requirement.

3. Governing Board: The Board of Trustees (BOT) is responsible for the educational quality, institutional integrity, and financial stability of the District and ensures the fulfillment of the mission of the nine Los Angeles Community Colleges, as established in the Board Philosophy, Mission, Roles, and Responsibilities. The Board is an independent policy-making body and adheres to its Conflict of Interest Policy (Board Policy Chapter XIV - 14000). Board members have no personal financial interests of any kind in the district or its colleges. The Board of Trustees is composed of seven members who are elected at large by the voters within the boundaries of the Los Angeles Community College District and one student member who is elected annually by the eligible, currently enrolled student voters of the District. The college meets this requirement.

4. Chief Executive Officer: The Chief Executive Officer was selected in the spring of 2011 as the President of the College and reports directly to the Chancellor of the Los Angeles Community College District. LACCD policies delegate to the president the requisite authority to administer appropriate district policies. The college meets this requirement.

5. Administrative Capacity: The College employs nine administrators and five classified managers to support the College mission and purpose. All administrators and classified managers were selected through an open and competitive process based on educational background and experience in accordance with Los Angeles Community College District hiring policies.

Sufficient staffing has been assured by the budget approved by the Board of Trustees. The college meets this requirement.

6. Operational Status: Los Angeles Mission College is a comprehensive college that meets the varied educational needs of its community. It serves a diverse student body of about 10,000 students. LAMC offers educational opportunities in Career Technical Programs as well as academic programs that prepare students for transfer to public and private institutions of higher learning and/or entry into the workforce. The College awarded 470 degrees and 238 certificates in the 2011-2012 academic year. The college meets this requirement.

7. Degrees: Los Angeles Mission College offers courses in 54 disciplines. The College offers 55 associate degree programs and 40 certificates. The majority of the College's courses are degree applicable; others provide opportunities in basic skills education. The majority of students, 37.3 percent, officially state their goal is to transfer to a four-year college or university. The college meets this requirement.

8. Educational Programs: Los Angeles Mission College's degree programs are aligned with its mission, based on recognized higher education fields of study, and sufficient in content and length. The College offers three associate degree options including two plans for associate degrees with specific majors, some aligning with the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC), and a third option for a Transfer Associate Degree in Liberal Studies. Each of the associate degrees are at least two academic years in length and are based upon recognized higher education fields of study. The college meets this requirement.

9. Academic Credit: Academic credit is awarded in semester units, based on the Carnegie Unit value system. For each 16-18 hours of lecture each semester, one unit credit is granted; for each 32-36 hours of laboratory with homework each semester, one unit of credit is granted; for each 48-54 hours of laboratory work without homework each semester, one unit credit is granted. To meet the full range of student needs, the College schedules for-credit classes in 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 16-week semesters. All classes meet for the required number of hours. Information on the definition of units, grading system, transfer of credit, and units by course is provided in the College catalog. The credit awarded for each course and the time that the course meets per week for a 16-week semester is specified in the Schedule of Classes. The college meets this requirement.

10. Student Learning and Achievement: Los Angeles Mission College has defined Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for all courses and programs. It publicizes its Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ILOs) in the College Catalog. Program Learning Outcomes and their assessment are also posted on the College's online SLO management system available to all chairs, vice chairs, directors, administrators, and faculty and are integrated with the Program Review online system. The Self Evaluation states that "at least one outcome for each course, certificate, and program has been assessed." Examination of the online module indicates that this statement is not accurate. A number of courses across the curriculum have yet to enter any assessments for any of their stated SLOs. The college partially meets this requirement.

11. General Education: All degree and certificate programs require from 18 to 31 units of general education to ensure breadth of knowledge and to promote intellectual inquiry. As part of the general education requirements, students are also expected to demonstrate competency in writing, reading and computational skills in order to receive a certificate or degree. Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) are stated in the College Catalog and posted online. The college meets this requirement.

12. Academic Freedom: The Los Angeles College Academic Senate Faculty Ethics Statement delineates the primary responsibility of faculty members to support one another and their students in seeking and stating the truth as they see it. The statement emphasizes respect for both students and colleagues in pursuit of academic inquiry and scholarly standards. It acknowledges that faculty members have the rights and obligations of all citizens but also notes that faculty should avoid creating the impression they speak for the College when they speak or act as private citizens. Faculty and students are encouraged to test all knowledge appropriate to a discipline or area of study. Faculty and students, regardless of mode of delivery, are expected to adhere to college, district, and state guidelines regarding academic freedom. The college meets this requirement.

13. Faculty: The College employs approximately 84 full-time and 248 adjunct faculty members. Faculty are hired in accordance with state minimum qualifications set by the district. Faculty are required to participate on college committees, hold office hours, assist with the development of SLOs, participate in assessments of SLOs and the Program Review process. The number of full-time faculty is sufficient in size and experience to support the mission and the College's educational programs. Specific duties and responsibilities for full-time faculty are included in the Academic Senate Faculty Ethics Statement, the College's Governance Agreement, which includes the responsibility for developing and reviewing curriculum and assessing learning, and in the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the District and the Los Angeles College Faculty Guild. The college meets this requirement.

14. Student Services: The College provides a wide range of student services that support student learning and development in support of the College mission. These services include assistance in the admissions application process, assessment for placement in English and math, orientation for new and returning students, counseling services, assistance for students with academic and physical disabilities, financial assistance through state and federal grants, loans, and scholarships; health services; child care; tutorial services; and workshops. Additional services from other resources, including specially funded programs such as Title III, the Science, Technology, Engineering, Math (STEM) grant, TRIO, EOP&S, and Matriculation, provide support in meeting the academic needs of LAMC students. The College has experienced budget reductions over the past several years that have resulted in positions being unfilled and serious gaps in student services. The college partially meets this requirement. Please refer to the discussion at Standard II.B.

15. Admissions: Los Angeles Mission College is an open-admission institution serving all students who wish to pursue an education as described in the College Mission Statement. The College admits any person with a high school diploma or its equivalent, persons who are 18 years of age or older, persons who are determined to be capable of benefitting from the

instruction offered, and K-12 students under special circumstances. Admission eligibility policies are listed in the Schedule of Classes, the Catalog, and posted on the College website. The college meets this requirement.

16. Information and Learning Resources: The Library and Learning Resources Center is located in a 35,430 square foot shared facility which houses computer labs, and the Writing for Success and Science Success Center. The Library provides material in print and electronic formats to support course work and to meet student needs. The Learning Resource Center (LRC) provides faculty support, library workshops, and tutorial services for students in response to diverse needs and offers a variety of instructional approaches. The LRC is wired to accommodate 206 computers available for student use. In addition to these resources, there are eight computer laboratory classrooms wired to accommodate 232 computers that support discipline-specific instructional programs including the Computer Applications and Office Technology Center, Computer Science Information Technology Lab, Child Development Resource Center, Multimedia Lab, and the Math Center. The college meets this requirement.

17. Financial Resources: Each year the College prepares a financial operations plan to assess the need for financial resources in critical operations. The previous fiscal year's (FY 2011-2012) allocation was $24,887,882. The FY 2012-2013 budget is $22.9 million. The College and the District rely on enrollment to generate new revenues to cover cost of expenditures. The weak economic condition of the state budget has resulted in significant workload reductions. In an effort to sustain long-term financial stability, the District implemented a new funding model in FY 2012-2013. The new budget allocation model coupled with robust financial planning and identification of new revenue streams provides the College with adequate and long-term resources for institutional effectiveness and financial stability. The college meets this requirement.

18. Financial Accountability: The Los Angeles Community College District conducts annual fiscal audits by an external Certified Public Accountant. The Board of Trustees reviews these audit reports annually in public sessions and discusses management responses to any exception. The District files audit reports with the Los Angeles County Office of Education, the State Chancellor's Office, and any other public agencies as required. Los Angeles Mission College is not audited as a separate entity. In FY 2010-2011 the College operated with a carryover balance in excess of $1,000,000 which was used to cover expenditures incurred in FY 2011-2012. The college meets this requirement.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation: Los Angeles Mission College adopted its Strategic Master Plan in 2008-2009, and it is updated annually by the College Council. The plan outlines priorities, goals, mission/vision, and value statements. The College has established institutional planning processes to provide for the development of the College through the integration of all planning and procedures such as Program Review and Student Learning Outcome assessment. Los Angeles Mission College has developed the following integrated planning documents: Strategic Master Plan, Educational Master Plan, Technology Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Strategic Enrollment Management Plan, Student Services Plan, and is working on a Safety and Evacuation Plan. Each of these plans contains objectives and calls for regular review and updating. The college meets this requirement.

20. Public Information: Los Angeles Mission College displays its Catalog and Schedule of Classes online. These documents, along with other publications, publicize accurate and current information about the College's mission, goals, admission requirements, and procedures; academic calendar and program length; rules and regulations affecting students, programs, courses; distance education; degrees and certificates offered and graduation requirements; costs and refund polices; available learning resources; grievance procedures; names and academic credentials of faculty and administrators; names of members of the Board of Trustees; and all other items pertinent to attending the institution. In addition, the 2012-2013 Catalog contains information regarding filing complaints with the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. The college records of complaints/grievances is incomplete and poorly organized, the team was unable to determine if the college resolved all student issues received through the complaints/grievances process The college partially meets this requirement. See the discussion under Standard II.B.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission: Adherence to state regulations and to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior College's eligibility requirements standards and policies is ensured by Los Angeles Mission College and the Los Angeles Community College District. The College describes itself identically to all its accrediting agencies, communicates changes and status, and discloses required information to all accrediting bodies. All disclosures by the College are complete, accurate, and honest. The College maintains contact with the Commission through its Accreditation Liaison Officer. The Commission has reported that it has not received any public complaints against LAMC during the period since its last Comprehensive Evaluation Visit. The college meets this requirement.

STANDARD I
Institutional Mission and effectiveness

A. Mission

General Observations:
Los Angeles Mission College has an updated mission statement which is presented in multiple parts (mission, vision, values, and theme). The college mission reflects the desire of the college to be a comprehensive community college; i.e. to provide transfer, career, and basic skills education. In addition, the college identifies its student population as "diverse communities." The College Council, with representation from all college constituencies, oversees the review of the mission statement which occurs annually at the College Council Retreat. Most recently the mission statement was reviewed in 2010 (when no changes were made) and again in 2012 when the statement was reviewed and updated to the current statement.

The LAMC mission statement follows:

"Los Angeles Mission College is committed to the success of our students. The College provides accessible, affordable, high-quality learning opportunities in a culturally and intellectually supportive environment by

- Ensuring that students successfully transfer to four-year institutions, prepare for successful careers in the workplace, and improve their basic skills;
- Encouraging students to become critical thinkers and lifelong learners;
- Providing services and programs that improve the lives of the diverse communities we serve."

The college has used data related to its service area, student demographics, and course taking patterns to further refine its mission and develop its learning programs and services. As well, the college mission statement is focused on student achievement outcomes; e.g. the mission statement states a desire for students to "successfully transfer, prepare for successful careers in the workplace, and improve their basic skills." (I.A.1)

LAMC has recently adopted a new Mission for the college. The Self-evaluation identifies the College Council of having the responsibility to review the mission statement at its annual retreat. (I.A.3)

Findings and Evidence:
There is evidence to support that campus-wide dialogue takes place with respect to reviewing and revising the mission statement in general and for review and approval of language changes; however, there is little evidence to support that deeper campus-wide dialogue has taken place with respect to the relevance of the mission statement to student learning.

In reviewing the minutes of the College Council Retreats from 2007-2012, the minutes reflect that twice, in 2009 and 2010, the Mission was discussed during the retreat. Similar reviews of minutes for the Academic Senate and the Educational Planning Committee found no evidence of

any regular review or discussion of the Mission of LAMC by those committees. College Council minutes (May 17, 2012) indicate that the current revision of the Mission Statement was produced by the Accreditation Steering Committee. A survey of college constituencies was then conducted over the summer of 2012 as to their preferences between two different Mission Statements (Academic Senate Minutes September 6, 2012). However, there is no evidence in any minutes that there was a clear path through the established governance committees that resulted in the adoption of motions endorsing this revision of the Mission, or that the revisions dealt in anyway with the relevance of the mission to student learning. While the institution has an established process for review of its mission statement and for gathering and incorporating the interests of key constituent groups, there is no evidence to support how the institution goes about deciding whether revisions to the mission statement are necessary, appropriate, and relevant to student learning.

Despite the lack of evidence to support deeper dialogue surrounding the relevance of the mission statement to student learning, the mission statement does contain evidence of a commitment to student achievement outcomes. The statements in the mission statement dealing with student achievement, specifically the desire to promote transfer, prepare for successful careers, and improve basic skills underscore the college commitment to a comprehensive community college mission and to promoting student learning through achievement.

The mission statement was reviewed by the college in spring 2012 and approved by the Board of Trustees on October 17, 2012. The College reports that the mission statement is reviewed annually at the College Council Retreat and, when changes are proposed college-wide input is gathered through surveying campus stakeholders. The mission statement is published in the College Catalog. The College prints the mission statement on bookmarks that are distributed widely.

Based on the available evidence, LAMC only partially meets this standard. While the mission statement has been reviewed, there does not appear to be an established process for regular review of the mission statement utilizing the institution's governance and decision-making processes.

The mission statement is incorporated into all aspects of institutional planning and is a part of the Strategic Master Plan and the Educational Master Plan as well as the planning processes for enrollment management, technology, human resources, and facilities. Adherence to the mission is monitored and reviewed through the Program Review process.

Conclusion:

There was no evidence of a systematic process for assessing the effectiveness of the review of the mission statement or the way that it is developed, approved, and communicated. As communicated in the self-evaluation, it appears as though the only means of doing this is through a survey where respondents are asked to approve the language that will be used in the mission statement, there is no evidence in any minutes that there was a clear path through the established governance committees that resulted in the adoption of motions endorsing this revision of the Mission. The college only partially meets standard I.A.1.

The LACCD Board approved the current mission in the fall of 2012. The College meets Standard I.A.2.

The mission of LAMC has been reviewed, but not on a regular basis and has not utilized established governance and decision-making processes. Therefore LAMC does not fully meet standard A.I.3.

The mission is widely published and used in institutional planning and decision making, the College meets Standard I.A.4.

Recommendation

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)

STANDARD I
Institutional Mission and effectiveness

B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations:
The Self-Evaluation report provided global summary information of the college service area, longitudinal student enrollment data selected student demographic characteristics, and longitudinal student achievement data, including: course completion, transfers to California public universities, and degrees and certificates awarded. It provided no summary information on student learning attainment, and did not provide any institution-set standards.

LAMC has a planning process that is inclusive and integrated. Planning, review and evaluation is tied to resource allocation. Charts and other documents outlining the various planning processes are available on the college web site and have wide distribution.

Opportunities for college-wide dialogue regarding planning are numerous. Six shared governance committees, reporting through the Shared Governance Task Force to the College Council discuss and make recommendations on issues impacting the college. Multiple governance groups represent their membership on college committees.

The planning processes at LAMC are integrated and cyclical. Annual planning begins with Program Review at the unit level. This is followed by a clear resource allocation prioritization process. Planning is closely ties to the mission, vision and core values. The cycles for Program Review and Strategic Planning intersect.

The college strategic plan is informed by the Educational Master Plan, the Enrollment Management Plan, the Technology Master Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, and the Student Services Master Plan. The Strategic Plan is reviewed through the Program Review Process, Curriculum Review, SLO, SAO, and all planning documents related to each of the components of the plan. Following the review process, goals and priorities are developed. This leads to implementation followed by annual review prior to development of the Strategic Plan for the following year.

There appears to be little evidence that the institution sets measurable goals to improve its effectiveness. It appears as though the college is not involved in any form of benchmarking activities; ~~or~~ deep dialogue about learning and achievement standards or the degree to which the college achieves its mission as operationalized in its strategic and operational planning does not occur. There is evidence that the institution and programs examine data, however, there is no evidence that the data are examined in a way that would lead to conclusions about the degree to which the college achieves its mission. There is also very little evidence of re-evaluation of improvement plans.

Since 2010 the college has developed and implemented an institution-wide ongoing and integrated planning process. The process follows a pre-set cycle and includes the budgeting of resources. Shared governance committees are inclusive of college constituent groups. There are appropriate committees related to program review, outcomes assessment, planning, and resource allocation. Shared governance committees provide feedback related to student learning and achievement and this feedback is recorded in the program reviews. Prompts for the assessment of student learning are integrated into the program review template.

The planning process is discussed in a variety of shared governance committees and in Town Hall meetings led by the College President. Construction and Bond discussions are held with the Citizen's Oversight Committee. The LAMC Weekly Newsletter, presidential communiques and monthly emails from the district keep the college community informed of planning progress.

Although the Office of Institutional Research is currently understaffed, the minimal staff completes systematic assessments and collects a range of quantitative and qualitative data that is sent to relevant committees. The majority of the data is recorded on the College website. However, there appears to be a lack of data analysis, either at the college or program level, related to mission, institutional effectiveness, and improvement of student learning and achievement.

Beyond surveying committee participants regarding their perceptions and satisfaction of committee performance, there was little evidence to support quality assurance in the area of effectiveness of ongoing planning and resource allocation processes. In general, surveys of committee performance were related to committee functionality rather than effectiveness of a process. For example, questions on the survey dealt with whether minutes and agendas were posted and communicated in a timely fashion, etc. There was little or no evidence present that would indicate that the college was actively engaged in a systematic program designed to directly assess the effectiveness of its processes and develop recommendations that would lead to improvements in the processes beyond posting minutes and agendas in a timely fashion.

Moreover, there is no process in place whatsoever to adequately assess institutional and other research efforts as they relate to informing the college about its effectiveness. Because the college has made some effort in surveying its constituents about committee functionality, the college partially meets this standard.

The college has a planning process that is integrated and cyclical. Annual planning begins at the unit level with the annual update of the Program Review. (A comprehensive Program Review is completed every three years.) This is followed by a resource allocation prioritization process involving instructional and non-instructional programs. The process for planning and resource allocation was introduced in 2009 and subsequent modifications to it have been made.

Findings and Evidence:

The absence of longitudinal student achievement and learning data at the program and institutional level as well as institution-set standards has made it impossible for the visiting team to determine the appropriateness of its performance, and for the college to determine its success in meeting its mission. (I.B, II.A, II.B)

Planning begins at the unit level with Program Review. The process is on-line and involves broad-based discussion/dialogue at the faculty/staff level. The Program Review is shared with a series of committees and is forwarded through the shared governance task force to the College Council. New since the last team visit, the process is well understood by all contingency groups.

In addition to department and shared governance committee review, the College holds Town Hall meetings and Forums to communicate with the campus community. In spite of the efforts to provide information, results of the fall 2011 faculty and staff survey report that some individuals (50% of the Classified staff) from across the college do not feel that they have an equitable voice in decision making. However, the same survey indicates strong agreement (72%) that the College President communicates effectively with the college.

In accord with the Commission's Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part I: Program Review, LAMC demonstrates that program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement. The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness. In addition, the results of program review are used to continually refine and improve practices resulting in appropriate improvements and in student achievement and learning. This is documented by the chart of LAMC INTEGRATED PLANNING PROCESSES and in the reports that inform the Strategic Plan.

In accord with the Commission's Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part II: Planning, the institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning. There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust, and pervasive; data are collected and widely distributed and used throughout the institution. However, there appears to be a lack of analysis of data.

The College has the policy infrastructure in place to support its efforts to monitor and dialogue about effectiveness. Both the self-evaluation and the evidence provided illustrate that there are appropriate committees related to program review, outcomes assessment, planning, and resource allocation. Moreover, the committee structure demonstrates the appropriate linkages and integration identified and expected in the standard. Necessary dialogue takes place across the web of shared governance committees related to student learning and achievement and is brought forward and shared through the primary shared governance committee – College Council – where resource allocation decisions are discussed. The program review process appears to be on a regular cycle and assessment of student learning is integrated into the program review process.

However, both the Institutional Effectiveness report and program review documents reveal that the college in general as well as many programs and services express a lack of understanding surrounding analysis of student performance data for the purpose of goal setting and how to synthesize data and assessment results to develop interventions that will result in improvements in achievement and learning outcomes.

There is evidence in the planning documents to support the fact that the college sets broad general goals and expends effort toward achieving those goals. The goals contained in its planning documents are primarily focused on operations and developing infrastructure; there is little evidence that the college is attempting to connect their operational effort and learning interventions to specific student outcomes. There was no evidence contained in the college planning documents associated with key performance indicators or performance standards that would lead to the conclusion that the college was actively engaged in assessing the outcomes of its efforts, the degree to which it achieve its planning objectives, and ultimately its mission.

Although a process is in place for assessing progress toward stated goals, the college has not fully completed the cycle of evaluation planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation.

A structure is in place to support the various programs' efforts to analyze and interpret data and some evidence exists to support that the college uses quantitative data. However, this data is incomplete and lacks support for in-depth analysis. Evidence does not exist to support that data are used to re-evaluate programs or determine if specific interventions had the desired effect.

A prompt in both the instructional and non-instructional reviews asks for assessment results that relate to specific outcomes. Respondents are asked to explain if a specific intervention had the desired outcome and what data was used to make the determination. In most cases, the prompt was left blank.

The planning process has been in place for several cycles, it does not appear to be involve the majority of the college faculty and staff. The fall 2011 faculty and staff survey indicates that about half of those responding to the survey feel they have a voice in the college's planning process, although it is not clear what the differences were among the respondent groups.

While course SLOs exist for 100% of courses, and they are published and used in decision making, this appears less so for program and degree/certificate SLOs, which were only recently added to the process (after Feb 2012). Less evidence exist for the assessment and use of results from these SLOs. As a result, the process was accelerated but a full and robust cycle has not been completed.

The Program Review is the initial planning document for requesting resource allocation. All requests must align with one or more of the College's main strategic goals. In spring 2012, a

task force was established to assist with budget reduction strategies. Effective student participation in planning has been challenging.

The College posts its annual IPEDS and ARCC reports on the Institutional Effectiveness Web site. Since 2010, SLO assessment results have been collected and posted on a website that is easily accessible. SLO's are a part of the Course Outlines of Record. All SLOs are mapped to Program Learning Outcomes in addition to Institutional Learning Outcomes.

The program review process and allocation decisions include SLO assessment and assessment results are communicated to appropriate constituencies. Course SLOs are mapped to PLO and ILOs and a method for evaluating the outcomes exists.

The college committee structure demonstrates the appropriate linkages and integration identified and expected in the standard. Necessary dialogue takes place across the web of shared governance committees related to student learning and achievement and is brought forward and shared through the primary shared governance committee – College Council – where resource allocation decisions are discussed. The program review process appears to be on a regular cycle and assessment of student learning is integrated into the program review process.

However, the program review process does not involve the full participation of all units. Evidence exists that some instructional and non-instructional program reviews are incomplete and some non-instructional program reviews are not completed. In the Self-Study Report LAMC identified an actionable improvement plan to "by spring 2014 the College Council will utilize the newly established Program Review Oversight Committee to ensure standardization and evaluate the effectiveness of the Program Review process across all campus division."

Further, evidence does not exist to substantiate claims that there is a systematic review of the effectiveness of the model. On-campus interviews suggested that this was a function of College Council at its fall meeting but this is not substantiated in the October 2012 College Council minutes.

Conclusions:

LAMC has not provided evidence of longitudinal student achievement and learning data at the program and institutional level, and has not developed institution-set standards. The college does not meet standard I.B.

There is evidence that programs are looking at the data set provided, however, the program review documents reveal that many programs express a lack of understanding surrounding student performance data and how to synthesize data and assessment results to develop interventions that will result in improvements in achievement and learning outcomes. LAMC partially meets Standard I.B.1.

There appears to be significant gaps in the institution's ability to assess how well learning is occurring and how effective it is in achieving its mission. The institution also appears to have

issues related to developing and sustaining ongoing, systematic evaluation in order to refine their processes and improve student learning and achievement. There appears to be no performance standards in place to monitor progress as it relates to student achievement and learning and the dialogue surrounding learning and achievement data appears to be focused on engagement with the process (e.g. number of courses and programs with SLOs and assessments) rather than focused on the meaning of results for programmatic improvement.

Additionally, as was also identified in the self-evaluation, the necessary and appropriate resources to support the Institutional Effectiveness function have not been allocated for several years. It will not be possible for the institution to develop its analytic capacity to support the improvement of educational quality, assess its effectiveness, monitor the effectiveness of its programs and services, and continuously improve without adequate resources to support this function. The college does not meet standard I.B.2

Overall, the institution has the processes and a committee structure in place to produce, support, and measure student learning and institutional effectiveness. The program review process has been revitalized; there is evidence that the institution has made progress in the areas of outcomes assessment, and that results of program review and outcomes assessments are integrated with resource allocation. The College provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input and revision, and allocates resources; however, when examining committee documents and other exhibits related to outcomes assessment, program review, and institutional effectiveness, it was clear that the depth and quality of the analyses and dialogue necessary to achieve institutional improvement was spotty and often absent. Notably missing from the exhibits is evidence of deep analysis, synthesis of data, and dialogue related to standards of performance at the institutional, program, and course level. Within the program review documents, there appeared to be no deep discussions of data for the purpose of program improvement and the program review data sets provided to each of the instructional programs were so general that they were not likely to be useful beyond simple descriptions of performance across an entire discipline over time. There was no evidence of an effort to understand how well different student groups perform and achieve; the only comparisons related to performance were historical and aggregated at the discipline level. The institution will need to better develop its: capacity for data analysis, understanding of data analysis techniques and comparisons, consistency of reporting regarding the meaning of analysis, and provide evidence of a deeper dialogue about data and its meaning in order to achieve the continuous quality improvement standard set forth by the Standards. The college only partially meets Standards I.B.3, I.B.4, and I.B.5.

Beyond surveying members of committees, there appears to be no real evidence of a systematic effort to improve institutional effectiveness, including institutional and other research efforts. Because the college is engaged in some effort to assure the effectiveness of its planning and resource allocation activities, the college partially meets standard I.B.6.

The lack of resources committed to institutional effectiveness contributes to the institution's failure to achieve compliance in developing a broad based, collective understanding of the meaning of evidence, data, and research to improve institutional effectiveness, ongoing and systematic evaluation, planning, and resource allocation. The college partially meets Standard I.B.7.

Recommendations

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)

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)

STANDARD II
Student Learning Programs and Services

A. Instructional Programs

General Observations:

The college Self Evaluation describes an institution that provides a varied curriculum to meet the needs of its students. The curriculum is aligned with the college mission. Currently, the college offers 52 associate degree programs, 19 certificates, and 21 skill certificates. In addition, 7 associate degrees programs and 2 certificates are due to begin in fall 2013.

The Self Evaluation identifies a variety of sources of data used to assess the educational needs of its students. These sources include internal data in the form of student surveys, assessment data of SLOs, attainment of degrees, certificate and transfer data, and information from program reviews. External sources of data that were cited by the Self Evaluation include data from local high schools, income data, and demographic information from its communities.

The Self Evaluation highlights a breadth of modes of instruction offered by different programs at LAMC. The instructors are responsible for determining the appropriate methods of instruction. The curriculum approval process includes description of teaching methods. Course that are offered as distance education are required to submit a separate application for approval to offer the course in this mode.

The Self Evaluation states that all courses, programs, degrees and certificates at LAMC have identified student learning outcomes. Assessments of these learning outcomes are at different levels of attainment with course level outcomes being the most advanced. The college has also identified seven Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs).

Los Angeles Mission College faculty use a variety of delivery systems and modes to serve its diverse student body. Online classes have grown considerably over the last ten years to meet the current and future needs of students. Since 2000, the percentage of online classes at LAMC has ranged from 1.2% in 2000-01 to 9.9% in 2008-09. The quality of online and hybrid classes is ensured through a rigorous instructor certification requirement to teach online and a review of the course shell as part of the approval process. The online and hybrid classes meet the USDE definition of distance education; they make use of course management systems that require student to use a secure login and password.

Course offerings are aligned with the mission of the California Community Colleges, the LACCD mission and strategic plan, and the college mission and strategic plan. Additionally, quality is monitored by requiring each program to complete a comprehensive program review every three years which includes assessment of student learning outcomes. Program reviews are also updated annually to insure quality and to identify any annual instructional and resource needs. Quality of curriculum is also ensured through the curriculum review process. New courses and changes to existing courses are reviewed and approved by the faculty curriculum committee; and there is a Dean with oversight responsibilities. Existing courses are also

regularly reviewed by the Curriculum Committee, at a minimum of every six years, to ensure relevancy.

The Self Evaluation identifies the roles of faculty in developing courses, programs, learning outcomes, and standards for competency. Evidence of the primary role of faculty is found in Curriculum Committee minutes, published curriculum processes and Academic Senate minutes. Additionally, for the Career Technical Education (CTE) programs, advisory boards provide regular and substantial input to CTE faculty regarding course and program content. Degree and completion pathways are specified in the college catalog and learning is evaluated through the outcomes assessment process and through the program review process.

The Self Evaluation identifies the roles of faculty in developing courses, programs, learning outcomes, and standards for competency. Evidence of the primary role of faculty is found in Curriculum Committee minutes, published curriculum processes and Academic Senate minutes. Additionally, for the CTE programs, advisory boards provide regular and substantial input to CTE faculty regarding course and program content. Breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, and time to completion are developed by faculty and accomplished through the curriculum review and approval process, with appropriate input of advisory groups, and in accordance with articulation agreements with major transfer partners and industry expertise. Quality is assured through the curriculum review and approval process and monitored through the outcomes assessment and program review process.

There appears to be evidence that multiple ways of assessing student learning are in place and utilized by faculty members. The college evaluates its courses and programs through three primary mechanisms: curricular review, program review, and outcomes assessment. Program review requires departments to respond to prompts related to relevancy, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and planning and resource allocation. All programs participate in a comprehensive review which occurs on a three year cycle. In addition, all programs are required to examine and annually update their plans for the purpose of needs identification and resource allocation. This is evidenced in the Self Evaluation, online systems, and through dialogue with key committee stakeholders.

Programs utilize the following types of data in their reviews: achievement data, enrollment data, and retention data. In addition there is a link to curriculum. Programs are asked to comment on their courses and the context of courses within programs.

Program review data and outcomes assessment data are analyzed to identify learning and programmatic resource needs. The results of the analyses and the identification of needs percolate up and are used in the institutional planning and budgeting processes.

The institution has an established, ongoing integrated planning process which is linked to resource allocation. Planning appears to be grassroots in nature; and accomplished through the linked efforts of outcomes assessment, program review, and resource requests. These needs then make their way up to institutional planning and resource allocation processes, which take place in the Budget and Planning committee and the College Council.

The college uses several tests to place students into courses in the math, English, and ESL areas. Test validation and analyses for cultural and linguistic bias as well as disproportionate impact are conducted prior to adoption of placement instruments. Additionally, test cut scores are also monitored in collaboration with the faculty.

Academic credit is awarded based upon approved course curriculum. Student learning outcomes are identified and approved by the faculty within the disciplines through the Curriculum Committee. The curriculum committee is faculty driven and monitored with administrative oversight.

Degrees and certificates are awarded based upon approved course and program curriculum. Student learning outcomes for courses are identified and approved by the faculty within the disciplines through the Curriculum Committee; program outcomes are derived from course outcomes and are selected by consensus of discipline faculty in consultation as needed with the student learning outcomes coordinators. The curriculum committee as well as the student learning outcomes group is faculty driven and monitored with administrative oversight. Dialogue about expected learning outcomes for degrees and certificates occurs in a several venues: the Curriculum Committee, the Student Learning outcomes group, the Educational Planning Committee, the Budget and Planning Committee, and at the annual assessment retreat and College Council retreats.

As stipulated and communicated in the college catalog, faculty have developed general education requirements in accordance with articulation agreements with major transfer partners – California State University and the University of California. Student learning outcomes for general education are linked to broad based institutional outcomes associated with each of the major content and methods areas associated with general education. Degree requirements mirror the corresponding course expectations in content and methods areas associated with the general education curriculum.

The college requires students to take a variety of general education courses for degree requirements that, in addition to, assessing their Institutional Learning Outcomes ensure the capability for students to become a productive individual and lifelong learner.

The college requires students to take a variety of general education courses for degree requirements that, in addition to assessing their Institutional Learning Outcomes, ensure the capability for students to become a productive individual and lifelong learner.

All of the college's degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core.

Students who complete vocational and occupational degrees and certificates demonstrate competencies identified through advisory committees that include industry professionals and faculty to ensure they meet industry standards or prepared for certification examinations.

Student surveys and college policy and procedures ensure students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses, programs, and transfer policies. The course catalog includes degree and certificate descriptions that include purpose,

content, course requirements, and Student Learning Outcomes. Students indicate they receive accurate syllabi with learning objectives that are followed.

Transfer policies are available in the catalog. Discipline faculty review incoming credits to determine equivalency. The articulation office develops agreements with various college and universities. Students can complete general education requirements that will transfer to the University of California system and California State University System. There are Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) agreements with five University of California campuses.

The college has a Program Viability Review process that assures academic needs of students are considered when programs are eliminated or significantly changed. Currently, there are two programs in need of program viability, PACE and Engineering. PACE was suspended by the college president at the recommendation of the VPAA. With accommodations for students in the program at that time. As part of the college's actionable improvement plans, a review of the viability of PACE is scheduled to be completed June 30, 2013. A PACE Viability Review Committee, organized by the Education Planning Committee is currently working on this report.

The college represents itself clearly and accurately through its catalog, class schedules, faculty, staff and student handbooks, procedural manuals, flyers, brochures, bulletins and the college website. The college catalog is reviewed and updated annually and is uploaded to the college website. A catalog working group is tasked with reviewing catalog changes and verifying catalog information for accuracy.

The college communicates its expectation that faculty will distinguish between personal conviction and professional views through the AFT College Guild Article 4 agreement. The Academic Senate approved a Faculty Ethics Statement, which contains principles of academic freedom and responsibility including respect for student rights. In the 2011 survey, 65% of faculty and staff have a clear understanding of college policies relating to academic freedom. In the 2012 student survey, over 88% of student respondents agreed or strongly agreed that, "instructors distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in class."

Student grievance procedures and standards of student conduct and disciplinary action are published in the class schedule and in the college catalog. Policies and procedures are in place for defining actions that warrant disciplinary action. In the 2012 student survey, over 90% of student respondents agreed or strongly agreed that, "the policies and penalties for cheating are provided and are followed."

The college adopted a code of conduct that is posted on the web site and appears in the catalog. The college subscribes to an employee Code of Conduct that is posted on the district web site. The college is a non-sectarian institution and does not seek to instill specific beliefs or worldviews.

Findings and Evidence:

The college's mission is a central part of the curriculum planning process with a requirement that new programs provide details on how it will support the college's mission. The curriculum processes have established cycles to ensure curriculum remains current and relevant. The

curriculum processes are administered by the Curriculum Committee which has been expanded to include representatives from all academic departments.

While the addition of a Curriculum Dean was designed to strengthen the oversight of the processes and assist the college in ensuring timely review of Course Outlines of Record (COR), this position has been vacant for approximately 8 months. The curriculum technical review includes reviews by the Articulation Officer, the Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator, and the Library Chair.

The college utilizes data in researching the educational needs of its students. The sources of data are varied, include internal and external data, and include quantitative and qualitative data. (II.A.1.a) While the Self Evaluation states that the Office of Institutional Effectiveness provides support for the college in these endeavors, the lack of staffing of this office has been problematic over the last several years.

The Self Evaluation states that data is used within the Program Review process in order to evaluate the specific programmatic needs of its students. In reviewing comprehensive program review documents it is clear that the majority of programs do not do so. In a review of 14 comprehensive program review documents, 5 were found to have included any evaluation of available data. The yearly unit updates to Program Review contain data that are reviewed by the department chairs. Interviews with faculty and administrators responsible for writing this section of the Self Evaluation revealed that Department Chairs have concerns regarding their ability to use data effectively and have requested additional training. These interviews also revealed that Deans have access to data and may discuss the data with the department chairs, but there is no evidence as to how widespread this practice is or how effective it is at identifying the educational needs of students.

- On balance, there appears to be no evidence that dialogue related to student learning outcomes, achievement of outcomes benchmarks, and the relationship of pedagogical approaches to improvements in student learning is widespread across the faculty.

The curriculum approval process requires that methods of instruction for courses be identified in the CORs. This ensures that the Curriculum Committee reviews and approves these methods as a part of the overall course approval. There is a separate distance learning approval process that must be satisfied in order to offer any course in a distance education format. Until January, 2013, this request consisted of asking the submitting faculty to briefly describe why the course should be offered in a distance format. There is no evidence presented as to the discussions or criteria the Distance Education Committee or the Curriculum Committee utilized in reviewing these requests. As of January 2013, new forms and processes for approval of distance education have been placed in the Distance Education Committee website. However, these forms and processes are not currently on the Curriculum Committee website. Clearly, no existing courses offered through distance education have gone through this expanded documentation and approval requirements. The Self Evaluation stated the college utilized a uniform on-line shell for courses, MOODLE. The Distance Education Committee had developed an evaluation rubric for this course shell. Previously, it was the committee's charge to evaluate the on-line shell for all

courses. Through contract negotiations, this function is now a responsibility of department chairs. There is no evidence presented explaining the criteria used by the chairs or how their review will ensure integrity of instruction across disciplines.

The Self Evaluation provides evidence that the college has compared the efficacy of on-line courses compared to face-to-face courses in regards to student success and student retention. While the percentages of student success and retention were consistently, and in some cases substantially, higher than those of face-to face-classes, it is difficult to draw any meaningful conclusions from this data. The data combines purely online courses and hybrid course. In addition, the data is a comparison of aggregate data from all courses taught at LAMC. The data does not compare data from online courses to data from the same course taught face to face. In the yearly unit updates, departments are presented with some data that is disaggregated at least with respect to discipline as to student success. This data looks at discipline success rates for day, evening, weekend and distance education (where applicable). In reviewing this data, the success rates of online and face to face courses within the discipline are more similar and vary in which instructional method produced the highest success rates (II.A.1.b).

The Self Evaluation states that the college has made substantial progress in identifying SLOs at the course level since the last accreditation cycle. The college has instituted an online SLO Assessment process that facilitates the process of assessment and houses the results of these assessments. This web-based assessment module was developed at the college and has been in place since 2010. This module allows the examination of all assessments that have been entered into the system over the years since its inception. The Self Evaluation states that "at least one outcome for each course, certificate, and program has been assessed." Examination of the online module indicates that this statement is not accurate. A number of courses across the curriculum have yet to enter any assessments for any of their stated SLOs.

Department chairs are required to submit a yearly report outlining the assessment progress in their courses. However, there appears to be no mechanism to ensure plans for assessments are enacted. Review of the SLO web site indicates that the vast majority of courses at the college has assessed only one SLO.

Identification of learning outcomes for programs, degrees, and certificates have been completed. The assessment levels for the programs, degrees and certificates are at a lower level of attainment. The Self Evaluation states that as of 2011-2012 92% had identified learning outcomes and only 35% had assessments of outcomes. The college projects that by end of 2012-2013 all assessments will have been conducted in all programs. In discussion with the SLO Coordinator, this projection is based on the decision to change the assessment protocol for programs, degrees and certificates. Currently, these outcomes assessments were stand-alone assessments specifically designed for the program outcomes. As of fall 2012, the decision has been made to utilize course level outcomes as a basis for assessing the program level learning outcomes.

The Self Evaluation provides some evidence of changes that have been implemented based on the assessments of the course SLOs. Review of the SLO assessment web site identified

additional instances of changes made as a result of assessments. These changes included changes to pedagogy, changes to the assessment, and changes to the learning outcomes themselves. There is no clear evidence to indicate if these changes have in turn led to greater attainment of the learning outcomes.

The college has begun to assess the adopted ILOs. The college attempted to assess the ILOs by utilizing student surveys in fall 2011 and spring 2012. These surveys asked the students to identify how well the institution helped them in their development in the ILOs. The college has reviewed the data and has established seven work groups (one per ILO) to develop and implement assessments of the ILOs. During the development of course-level SLOs in the curriculum process, SLOs are linked to ILOs. No evidence is presented that these links to the ILOs are used by the college to assess the ILOs.

There was little evidence beyond an interview with the Educational Planning Committee and the Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator that instructors and departments use collective assessment techniques to discuss strengths and weaknesses of course content and teaching methodologies in order to achieve improvement in student learning. There was consensus that departments use departmental meetings to dialogue regarding course and program assessments but there was no evidence of departmental minutes or standardized reports developed to demonstrate that regular dialogue surrounding results was occurring and to facilitate improvements consistently across the department. Moreover, the discussions of assessments and student learning appeared to be contained at the program level and there was no evidence of widespread dialogue surrounding the use of benchmarks to develop and target program interventions. The planning process is cyclical and is linked to program review and resource allocation. The planning and resource allocation linkages are, however, relatively new to the campus. As a result, the complete cycle of evaluation, improvements, implementation, and re-evaluation has not been completely accomplished. Currently, there is evidence to support that the phases of evaluation, improvement planning and implementation has occurred. The college appears to have not "closed the loop" on it planning cycle.

In general, the procedures in place have resulted in courses and programs assessing student learning and dialoguing about results at the department level. The process of identifying student learning outcomes and assessing those outcomes is faculty driven with participation from other administrators as appropriate.

Student learning outcomes are in place for each course, certificate, and degree program. The organization of the outcomes assessment design is course based; with faculty selecting from a set of critical course outcomes from a collection of courses within a program to develop a set of program learning outcomes.

There are established processes in place to approve and administer courses and programs. Individual faculty, the curriculum committee and relevant CTE advisory groups and regional advisory groups are charged with reviewing curriculum, sets of courses, and programs. This is done in accordance with established state regulations. Additionally, the college has in place its Educational Planning Committee, charged with program review responsibilities, and its Student

Learning Outcomes group, charged with outcomes assessment. Because the curriculum review and approval, program review, and outcomes assessment processes are faculty driven, disciplinary expertise is inherent in the system of review and evaluation.

There is a mechanism contained within the online student learning outcomes system for instructors to input their recommended changes in order to facilitate learning improvements. This dialogue and entry, however, centers more on changes to course content rather than pedagogical approaches.

Evidence of dialogue is apparent in the minutes of the Curriculum Committee as well as in the online documents associated with program review and outcomes assessment.

Programmatically, there is evidence that departments use results from basic analyses of achievement data and learning outcomes data to recommend programmatic improvements. For the most part, there is evidence that these improvement plans are largely content based.

The planning process is cyclical and is linked to program review and resource allocation. The planning and resource allocation linkages are, however, relatively new to the campus. As a result, the complete cycle of evaluation, improvements, implementation, and re-evaluation has not been completely accomplished. Currently, there is evidence to support that the phases of evaluation, improvement planning and implementation has occurred. The college appears to have not "closed the loop" on it planning cycle.

Data are largely made available to the campus community through the program review process. Departments are presented with a basic dataset to use for analysis of their program achievement outcomes. Additionally, other measures of achievement are also used institutionally as part of annual planning processes.

Essentially, because the college has not filled its positions in the area of Institutional Effectiveness, the data are provided but largely not analyzed. In addition, faculty report that they could use some help understanding, interpreting, and making meaning from the data. They expressed hope that increased staffing in the institutional effectiveness area will be able to build analytical and interpretative capacity among the faculty.

Dialogue about expected learning outcomes for degrees and certificates occurs in a several venues: the Curriculum Committee, the Student Learning outcomes group, the Educational Planning Committee, the Budget and Planning Committee, and at the annual assessment retreat and College Council retreats. However, the degree to which students are able to apply their knowledge to subsequent courses or endeavors has yet to be assessed by the college.

Findings and Evidence

A Curriculum Dean was hired in 2009 and in 2009-2010 the dean streamlined and centralized a procedure to ensure greater accuracy for the schedule and catalog. That position is currently vacant.

Based upon the evidence presented and conversations with key stakeholders, it appears as though the college has not had deep discussions surrounding pedagogy and its relationship to student

learning needs and outcomes. If these are present, they have not been formally documented. As a consequence, the college has not investigated the effectiveness of its instructional methodologies (II.A.1.b).

There is some analysis of distance education outcomes that take place within the program review process; however, these are limited to examination of aggregated student success rates in distance education compared to those in traditional classes. The information is aggregated at the discipline level and therefore it is impossible to determine whether there are differential success rates for this mode of delivery that present themselves for specific groups of students or courses, making it difficult to implement effective changes from the results. (II.A.2.d).

Course Outlines of Record (COR) are carefully reviewed to ensure that the SLOs listed are aligned with the course description, course objectives, and reflect expected minimum competencies. The COR also identifies the unit credit awarded for lecture and laboratory courses based on the Carnegie Rule and State of California Title 5 regulations, which define one unit of credit as 18 hours of standard lecture, or 36 hours of lab with homework, or 54 hours of lab without homework. Since 2009, all CORs are submitted through the Electronic Curriculum Development (ECD) system. (II.A.2.h).

All courses and programs, including general education, include comprehensive learning outcomes student must complete to become lifelong learners (II.A.3.b). The college assesses its Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). The ILOs also feed into to program and course specific outcomes to ensure students attain these goals. Curriculum oversight, program development, and surveys are used to measure how effective students are in meeting these goals. Surveys show students feels they are learning the skills identified in the ILOs. An assessment retreat is held yearly so faculty can discuss what they have learned from these assessment efforts and what can be done to improve students learning and assessment of the ILOs.

All courses and programs, including general education, include comprehensive learning outcomes so students recognize what it means to be an ethnical human being and effective citizen (II.A.3.c). The college assesses its Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). The ILOs also feed into program and course specific outcomes to ensure students attain these goals. Curriculum oversight, program development, and surveys are used to measure how effective students are in meeting these goals. Surveys show students feels they are learning the skills identified in the ILOs. An assessment retreat is held yearly so faculty can discuss what they have learned from these assessment efforts and what can be done to improve students learning and assessment of the ILOs.

All degree programs include general education in addition to focused study in at least one area of inquiry or an established interdisciplinary core (II.A.4).

Vocational and occupational degrees and certificates ensure students can demonstrate technical and professional competencies through a proposal process that must include core indicators for the discipline (II.A.5). Departments and advisory committees use external and internal data for a board required biennial review to ensure the programs meet labor market demands and demonstrate effectiveness as measured by employment and/or completion success of its students.

Surveys provide additional data and some programs can easily track student success in licensure and certification. To obtain this same tracking information for programs that do not have a formalized method of tracking of graduates, the college is participating in a State Chancellor's Office pilot project that will gather employment data on students who completed degrees and certificates (or left the college).

College publications provide students with clear and accurate information about educational course and programs and transfer policies (II.A.6). The college concentrated efforts to clean up the catalog by revising program changes only after they have been formally approved and articulation information verified. The deans of Academic Affairs and faculty leaders involved with curriculum and articulation oversee the catalog. The catalog describes degrees and certificates by including information on their purpose, content, requirements, and Student Learning Outcomes.

The catalog includes transfer of credit policies that outline the process for LAMC to accept credit from other institutions (II.A.6.a). The college has articulation agreements appropriate to its mission to ensure students seeking transfer to other institutions can do so. The articulation office works with discipline faculty to initiate and maintain articulation agreements. Student surveys indicate that over 90% of students receive syllabi that are followed and that publications, including schedules and catalogs, reflect policies and procedures.

Academic Senate officers, in interviews, were concerned that the June, 2012 elimination of the PACE program did not give PACE students sufficient time to make appropriate arrangements for completing the program. The Senate officers claimed that the district has a policy that allows for the elimination of a program for up to one year before a viability study must be conducted. This was not in the evidence. However, the perception is that this process has been used to suspend programs without shared governance or Senate discussion and faculty see this as unilateral decision-making by the administration and that this method of eliminating programs leave students unsure of the future of the program and unsure of their ability to complete the program.

The Educational Planning Committee is currently reviewing the Program Viability process and will make recommendations for improvement to the Academic Senate.

Conclusions:

LMAC has demonstrated that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity. The college meets Standard II.A.1.

The college has identified and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its communities. The institution relies upon research and analysis from a variety of sources to identify student learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes. The college meets Standard II.A.1.a,

Based upon the evidence presented and conversations with key stakeholders, it appears as though the college has not had deep discussions surrounding pedagogy and its relationship to student learning needs and outcomes. The college does not meet Standard II.A.1.b.

The college has identified learning outcomes for courses, degrees and certificates, and the institution as a whole. However, the assessments of the outcomes at all levels are not complete and assessments of those outcomes have not been conducted in all courses, programs, degrees and certificates. Where assessments do exist, there is evidence that assessments have led to improvements. The college does not meet Standard II.A.1.c.

The evaluative mechanisms surrounding program quality and improvement are not fully developed in ways that would allow faculty to have deep discussion about student learning and achievement and the ways in which learning and achievement could be improved. The LAMC only partially meets Standard II.A.2.

LAMC uses established procedures to design, identify learning outcomes for, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. The institution recognizes the central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs. The college meets Standard II.A.2.a.

The college relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution regularly assesses student progress towards achieving those outcomes. The college meets Standard II.A.2.b.

High-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs at the college. The college meets Standard II.A.2.c.

The team was unable to find evidence of any research activity related to student learning styles and how learning styles of students aligned with educational delivery modes. Additionally, there was no analysis or discussion in the outcomes assessment online system or in the program review system related to common teaching methodologies and their relationship to student outcomes. The college does not meet Standard II.A.2.d.

LAMC evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans. The college meets Standard II.A.2.e.

There does not appear to be widespread collective understanding of the meaning of data for the purpose of developing educational interventions and linking those to programmatic improvements in student learning outcomes. The college needs to elaborate the current data set used in the program review process and work to develop analytical capacity among faculty and staff in order to achieve more meaningful dialogue and connections between data analysis, research results, and educational practice. The college has not yet closed the loop in its planning cycle, the institution does not meet Standard II.A.2.f.

When the college uses departmental course and/or program examinations, it validates their effectiveness in measuring student learning and minimizes test biases. The college meets Standard II.A.2.g.

LAMC awards credit based on student achievement of the course's stated learning outcomes. The college does not convert clock hours to credit hours. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education. The college meets Standard II.A.2.h.

LAMC awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program's stated learning outcomes. The college meets Standard II.A.2.i.

All academic and vocational degree programs at LAMC have a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy that is clearly stated in its catalog. The college relies on the expertise of its faculty to determine the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum by examining the stated learning outcomes for the course. The college meets Standard II.A.3.

General education at LAMC has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it, including: An understanding of the basic content and methodology of the major areas of knowledge: areas include the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. The college meets Standard II.A.3.a.

General education at LAMC has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it, including: A capability to be a productive individual and life-long learner: skills include oral and written communication, information competency, computer literacy, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis/logical thinking, and the ability to acquire knowledge through a variety of means. The college meets Standard II.A.3.b.

General education at LAMC has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it, including: A recognition of what it means to be an ethical human being and effective citizen: qualities include an appreciation of ethical principles; civility and interpersonal skills; respect for cultural diversity; historical and aesthetic sensitivity; and the willingness to assume civic, political, and social responsibilities locally, nationally, and globally. The college meets Standard II.A.3.c.

At LAMC, all degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. The college meets Standard II.A.4.

At LAMC, students completing vocational and occupational certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment and other applicable standards and are prepared for external licensure and certification. The college meets Standard II.A.5.

LAMC assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. The institution describes its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies

learning objectives consistent with those in the colleges officially approved course outline. The college meets Standard II.A.6.

LAMC makes available to its students a clearly stated transfer-of-credit policy. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the college certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. The college has developed articulation agreements as appropriate to its mission. The college meets Standard II.A.6.a.

In order to fully meet this standard, the college must review its Program Viability process to ensure students can complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption. The college partially meets Standard II.A.6.b.

LAMC represents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through its catalogs, statements, and publications, including those presented in electronic formats. It regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations about its mission, programs, and services. The college meets Standard II.A.6.c.

LAMC uses and makes public governing board-adopted policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or worldviews. These policies make clear the institution's commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge. The college meets Standard II.A.7.

LAMC faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively. The college meets Standard II.A.7.a.

LAMC establishes and publishes clear expectations concerning student academic honesty and the consequences for dishonesty. The college meets Standard II.A.7.b.

LAMC gives clear notice of codes of conduct for staff, faculty, administrators, and students, including statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty or student handbooks. The college meets Standard II.A.7.c.

LAMC does not offer any curricula in foreign locations; therefore, Standard II.A.8 is not applicable.

Recommendations

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).

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).

STANDARD II
Student Learning Programs and Services

B. Student Support Services

General Observations:

Consistent with its mission, the College establishes and publishes widely its Admission Eligibility in the College Catalog on paper and online. The College recruits and admits diverse students from both in and outside of its immediately service areas. Student support services address the identified needs of students and enhance a supportive learning environment for its students in general. In addition, the College offers enhanced services to targeted student populations with special needs, while these support programs are supported by federal grants and/or state categorical funds, with mandatory college match when applies. Student support services are designed to assist students in addressing their concerns for access, progress, learning, and success. Evaluation methods have been developed and established to measure the effectiveness of these services.

The College lists, online and on paper, its student support services including admissions and records, Associated Students, Assessment and Orientation/Matriculation, Child Development Center, Counseling, DSP&S, EOPS/CARE, Financial Aid, International Student Services, Transfer and Career Center services, Veteran Affairs, Health Center, CalWORKs, Title V and Title III grants funded services. Different support services are offered on campus at different levels, with some services more sufficient and effective than others.

The College provides online and on paper a catalog for its constituencies with precise and accurate information, including all general information, requirements, and major policies affecting students. Information included in the Catalog is current since that it appears that the College updates and publishes its Catalog annually with the more recent version designed for 2012-13.

The College publishes Student Grievance Procedures including appeal process, online and on paper in its Catalog, and in both English and Spanish. Student Grievance Procedures is also published in Schedule of Classes. The information is clear, precise, and comprehensive. Distance Education Student Complaints, Procedures, Policies and Resolution are also published online for distance education students' use.

LAMC serves a population of students who are the beneficiaries of an array of programs and services designed to meet the needs of a diverse student population. Student needs largely reflect a population for whom English is not the first language of a majority of the student population. Their self-evaluation provides a thorough description of the programs and services offered by the institution and they clearly seek out, through non-state and District funded resources, many opportunities to provide a wide range of services to their student population.

As reported by the college, Los Angeles Mission College has had to adjust the services provided to all students. Budget cuts, particularly to categorical programs, have resulted in reductions in hours of operation and personnel, and have affected the number of students served. For example,

in 2010-2011, prior to the budget cuts, LAMC's EOP&S Program served over 1,000 students. In fall 2012, EOP&S served approximately 600 students. Furthermore, the Child Development Center has had to drastically reduce services for child care due to the significant budget cuts to all Specially Funded Programs.

General information included in the Catalog is edited and verified by campus programs, departments, and responsible areas each year. The Dean of Academic Affairs is responsible for ensuring that all information is collected and updated for publication in the College Catalog. A Catalog Task Force, comprised of the Dean of Academic Affairs, Academic Affairs Secretary, the Curriculum Chair, the Articulation Officer, and the Scheduler meets several times each year and is responsible for ensuring that curriculum and policy changes are updated in the Catalog.

Findings and Evidence:

The College determines that admitted students being able to benefit from its programs by requiring them to follow The Application and Matriculation Process: A Step-By-Step Guide, and understand and accept Student Agreement – Matriculation. The information is well applied to admissions policies and procedures and published online and on paper.

While college-wide discussions regarding student access, progress, learning, and success occurs frequently and on-going, the support services have not been consistent, regular, and sufficient, due to budget reductions and other challenges that the College have experienced.

Several innovative services have been initiated by Counseling Department under the leadership of its department chair, including the enhancement of online counseling, the implementation of online orientation, and the development of discipline faculty advising. Several newly acquired grants, e.g., Achieving the Dream, also begin to enable the College to improve its online access and delivery for some services (rosters, E-Tran, imaging, email advising). The Transfer Center services have been improved by updating and upgrading the Transfer website that is now full of useful information to facilitate student transfer.

Although all student support services are described in college publications online and on paper, e.g., Catalog, and partially in Schedule of Classes, the College needs to further assure the quality of all of its published support services. During the budget challenging period, the College made some progress in assuring the quality in some areas, but not all. For example, the College has recently made progress on providing improved services in Transfer and Career Center, Health Services, and DSP&S

It is evident that on the whole, the Student Support Services have not had sufficient human resources to provide services to students for lengthy periods. While several positions are left vacant, there seems to be a lack of plan as to how to offer services at an acceptable level as required by the Standards. As a result, for example, the number of students with disabilities receiving support services by the college dropped from more than 400 three years ago down to 112. Recently the number has increased to just above 200. The college personnel also indicated that it is hard for students to receive other vital services, such as tutoring

It is urgent for the College to develop and implement plans to assure the quality of student support services and demonstrate that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, support student learning and enhance achievement of its mission (II.B.1).

The 2012-13 Catalog provides information this is current, complete, clear, easy to understand, easy to use, and relatively well-structured. It contains all the elements required by the Standards. The Catalog is reviewed for accuracy and currency by a Catalog Committee with members serving as liaisons on other related college committees. Through communications and collaboration with various college-wide committees, the Catalog Committee members ensure that the information in its publications is current, complete, clear, and easily accessible to students, prospective students, and the public. The catalog information on the college website is identical to the printed version, since it is a pdf version of the printed copy. When policies are not included in the catalog, information could be found on the college and/or the district websites and it is easily accessible (II.B.2).

The Commission reported to the team that it had not received any complaints against LAMC. Upon the team's request, the College provided its records of student complaints/grievances to the team for review. Based on information received, the records are incomplete with many issues unresolved, or unknown about the result. In addition, the nature of complaints is not always adequately described. The follow-up information often only indicates that the student was referred to another person or spoke with someone else without mentioning if the issues were resolved. Some students on campus publically expressed dissatisfaction with lack of timely closure to their complaints. The most frequent complaints are made against services provided by Financial Aid and DSP&S (II.B.3.a, II.B.4).

Overall the institution has the processes in place to support the identification of the learning needs of its student population and conducts analyses to assess how well it is meeting those needs. There is a program review process in place and there is variable participation and engagement in that process. The College should ensure that its efforts to identify the learning support needs of students are being met by staff and faculty who are knowledgeable about what programs and services, are available to students, and are collaborating on a regular basis to improve student achievement (II.B.3.a).

The college follows the placement test validation practices and policies set forth by the California Community College Chancellor's Office. These processes set forth the guidelines with respect to reviewing exams for cultural and linguistic bias, content and consequential validity, minimizes disproportionate impact, and establishes statistical standards for designating cut scores for placement and establishing pre-requisite courses (II.B.3.e).

Students participate in clubs and organizations and students are encouraged to be active participants in student governance through participation on committees. The institution, through its program review process in student services, evaluates its counseling function which includes academic advising. Results of programmatic evaluations are discussed at counseling department meetings and at the Student Support Services Committee meetings. There is evidence contained within the program review and outcomes assessment process that results are used to support

program development and refine program delivery. However, there appears to be a limited effort to accommodate the online counseling needs of students. It is unclear the extent to which the effort in the area of online counseling is sufficient to serve the existing online student population because there is no evidence of evaluation of the effectiveness of online counseling or advising. This issue was validated through examination of program review documents and interviews with members of the counseling department. There is no evidence of effort to assess and evaluate the effectiveness of online counseling and advising (II.B.4).

The College has created a system that supports the ongoing review and assessment of service area outcomes. There is an online program review reporting tool that easily walks one through the steps for conducting unit assessments, reporting survey research results and information gleaned from annual unit assessment and program review is used to improve programs and services. Program staff and faculty engage each other in dialogue, albeit this appears to happen unevenly across these programs, and work together to determine how to best utilize financial resources to meet the needs of students and promote successful outcomes.

However, an examination of the material in the online program review and outcomes assessment systems revealed that the level of engagement with outcomes assessment and use of results for improved service delivery and program development was variable. Some programs appeared not to have collected any outcomes assessment data while others had collected data, analyzed results, and recommended improvements to service delivery. Additionally, there is little evidence to support that the evaluation of the ways in which student support services contribute to student learning outcomes is in place and occurring. There is evidence that service area outcomes assessment occurs, although it is uneven across the entirety of student service programs (II.B.4).

There is evidence that the college has an established program review process in place and each of the student support services areas has identified service area outcomes. Results from program review and assessments are used by some programs to further develop programs and refine service delivery. Strengths and weaknesses in existing programs and services are identified through the assessment of service area outcomes and through the program review process.

The College's program review process now in place has provided a means of integrating planning and budgeting so that resources may be used to effectively support students and meet operational and staffing needs. The lack of adequate services for students leads to a conclusion that staffing levels may be inadequate for certain programs. Recent hires in Admissions and Records, Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSP&S), counseling, Extended Opportunities Programs and Services (EOP&S) and the Transfer Center will assist in providing equitable services to all students but as is the case of some of these historical staffing patterns, compliance with regulatory requirements may prove to be a challenge if staffing inequities are not addressed (II.B.4).

Student support programs at LAMC have provided numerous pathways for student participation if students are attending classes on campus. While there are a number of programs to support students, it is unclear that there is a cohesive strategy to get students to the programs that might be best suited to serve them. Staff members and faculty in some services programs collaborate

with each other through the Student Support Services Committee but there are not formal mechanisms in place to connect students to the myriad services available to students of for staff to work collaboratively across programs. As issues arise trying to meet the learning support needs of students, the College is encouraged to develop a means of coordination so that students are able to get the support they need.

While there are a number of programs to support students on both the instruction and services sides of the institution although it is unclear that there is a clear and consistent, and coordinated effort to get students to the programs that might be best suited to serve them. There is a need to provide better communication among programs so that students are directed to those programs and services that increases the likelihood of their success. The coordination between programs may also help fill gaps in services caused by reductions in staffing.

Online services for students are inconsistent across student support programs. There are programs that offer some online services while others have only limited available online services for students. This is problematic for those students who may seek services while also taking classes in an online environment. Counseling services are limited to email while services provided by Admissions and Records and financial aid have more online services available to students.

Moving forward, the college will need to ensure that all student services programs are actively engaged in a systematic process and cycle of gathering assessment data and analyzing that data for the purpose of program improvement. Additionally, an assessment of the adequacy of online student support services, particularly in the counseling area will need to be established and occur as part of the Counseling or Distance Education program review and outcomes assessment process. Finally, the college will need to move beyond assessing service area outcomes and begin to develop ways to assess how the student services programs contribute to the stated student learning outcomes of the institution.

Conclusions:

It is evident that the Student Support Services have not had sufficient human resources providing services to students for lengthy periods. In addition, while several positions are left vacant, there seems to be a lack of plan as to how to offer services at an acceptable level as required by the Standards. Unfortunately, support for some student populations is does not appear to be offered in an equitable manner

Online services for students are inconsistent across student support programs. There are programs that offer some online services while others have only limited available online services for students. This is problematic for those students who may seek services while also taking classes in an online environment. Counseling services are limited to email while services provided by Admissions and Records and financial aid have more online services available to students.

The College needs to enhance its record keeping of student complaints/grievances regularly and in a comprehensive manner. The College needs to improve its record keeping and maintenance

regarding student complaints/grievances regularly. The record should provide a clear description of the nature of the complaints and any resolution or a lack of resolution reached. The team was unable to determine if the college resolved all student issues received through the complaints/grievances process, especially in Financial Aid and DSP&S areas. The College does not meet Standard II.B.1 and partially meets ER-20.

LAMC provides a catalog both in paper and online for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information. The information provided contains all the required elements. The college meets Standard II.B.2.

Given the recent history of budget cuts that resulted in significant support service gaps and uneven availability of services, the college partially meets Standards II.B.3 II.B.3.a. and ER-14.

Given the recent history of budget cuts that resulted in significant support service gaps and uneven availability of services, the college partially meets Standard II.B.3.b.

Given the recent history of budget cuts that resulted in significant support service gaps and uneven availability of services, the college partially meets Standard II.B.3.c.

The institution designs and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity. The college meets Standard II.B.3.d.

The college regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases. The college meets Standard II.B.3.e.

LAMC maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records. The college meets Standard II.B.3.f.

The college (1) has uneven engagement and participation in the program review and outcomes assessment process for the purpose of program improvement, and (2) there is no evidence to support how the student services programs contributes to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The college does not meet Standard II.B.4.

Recommendations

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)

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).

STANDARD II
Student Learning Programs and Services

C. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations:

The Self Evaluation demonstrates that students are provided learning support by the Library and the Learning Center as well as program-specific resources. The services include the library, tutoring, computer labs and program-specific student resources.

The library utilizes three methods to identify needed resources: faculty requests, student requests and the curriculum approval process. The Learning Center identifies needed resources in a less formal manner, inviting faculty to make suggestions. Program-specific learning support services rely on program faculty to identify the needs of their students.

LAMC has identified information competency as an institutional learning outcome and defines information competency as the ability to find, evaluate, use and communicate information in all its various formats. The Library, the Learning Center and the program-specific learning support services provide instruction in diverse areas of information competency. These include library courses, workshops, tutoring sessions, and web-based activities. In addition, courses in academic departments have identified aspects of information competency as a stated learning outcome for their course.

The Library provides access to its resources 53 hours per week, Monday through Saturday. The Learning Center provides access to its resources and services 32 hours per week, Monday through Thursday. Both the Library and the Learning Center provide access to students through their respective websites. This access includes resource databases, tutorials, online videos and other learning support materials. Program-specific resources are available for varying amounts of time based on the availability of staff, ranging from 22 hours per week (EOP&S tutors) up to 70 hours per week (Law tutors).

The Learning Center and Library have effective maintenance and security and there are security cameras in use throughout the campus. Program review allows the Library and learning support to request needs they have for effective maintenance.

The college does rely on external services that support Library and learning support services, such as databases and software providers. These are evaluated on a regular basis. The self-study also includes information on external agencies DSPS relied on to support LAMC students. The board approves the contracts for these services and the Personnel Commission monitors services for interpreters and captioning.

Library and learning support evaluated their services through formal college processes, such as program reviews, in addition to other internal methods (such as evaluation of tutoring sessions, library workshops, etc.) and external methods (such as input from collaboration with individual faculty and the newly formed Library and Learning Center advisory committee).

Findings and Evidence:

The Self Evaluation details the services offered by the Library and Learning Center in support of student learning at LAMC. In addition, a number of program-specific student resources are outlined and discussed including those provided by Disabled Students Programs and Services, Computer Applications and Office Technologies Center, Computer Science-Information Technology Lab, Multimedia Students, Extended Opportunity Program and Services, Child Development Resource Center, and TRIO/Student Support Services.

The Library provides access to numerous resources including books, text books, e-books, periodicals, an online reference collection, and research data bases. Many of these resources are available to students through the Library web page. The Learning Center provides specialized tutoring centers including the Academic Success Center (writing and reading) and the Science Success Center. They also provide tutoring for several Math courses. The Learning Center provides access to computers in their Computer Commons and the Learning Lab. Their web page also provides links to additional web-based resources and online tutorials for students.

The program-specific learning support resources supply students with access to tutoring, computers with internet access and appropriate software, reference books, and text books. The Self Evaluation details the services offered by the Library and Learning Center are supportive of student learning at LAMC. In addition, a number of program-specific student resources are outlined and discussed including those provided by Disabled Students Programs and Services, Computer Applications and Office Technologies Center, Computer Science-Information Technology Lab, Multimedia Students, Extended Opportunity Program and Services, Child Development Resource Center, and TRIO/Student Support Services.

The program-specific learning support resources supply students with access to tutoring, computers with internet access and appropriate software, reference books, and text books.

Survey results indicate that students are utilizing the learning support services and that they are satisfied with those services. The survey of faculty indicated that a nearly even split of those ~~that~~ who thought there was sufficient and consistent financial support for the information and learning resources with 37% agreeing and 32% disagreeing. The Self Evaluation notes the continuing challenge of space and financial resources to adequately supply library resources to students. This challenge was noted in the previous accreditation report and the previous Self Evaluation. The utilization of grant funds to supply library and learning support services has provided the college with additional resources. The Self Evaluation identifies action plans for acquiring additional funds for library to address its on-going space, equipment and financial needs; however, no plans are presented to ensure the on-going support of Learning Center resources.

Faculty, including librarians, and curriculum guide the process of selecting and maintaining resources for student learning in the library. The library addendum to each Course Outline of Record (COR) is an effective way to obtain relevant faculty input and ensure that course and program needs are addressed. Results of a faculty survey show 51% agreement that the "library resources are up-to-date in my academic interest area," with only 10% disagreement.

The Learning Center recently initiated a request to form an advisory committee with faculty representatives from across the college, staff and students. This advisory committee would assist the Learning Center in identifying needed resources and in assessing the effectiveness of resources provided by the center.

The technology resources utilized by the Library, the Learning Center and the program-specific computer labs are maintained by the college's IT staff. The Self Evaluation identifies ongoing issues related to software compatibility issues and needed computer upgrades. Some program-specific computer labs have access to other funding sources and have maintained their currency.

The Library provides training in information competency in the form of workshops tailored to the needs of the particular course. The Library also has a for-credit Library Research course. The Self Evaluation states that attendance at its workshops has dwindled and is currently only viable for those workshops required by a particular course. The Library has also provided an online version of the workshop for students to access. The Self Evaluation states that assessments of student learning of information competency occur in the form of assignments during the workshops and by the use of student surveys. The Library has not performed any assessments of the student learning outcomes in their credit courses according to the SLO Assessment website.

The Learning Center provides information competency training in the form of workshops through the Academic Success Center and the Science Success Center. There is no evidence that there are assessments of these efforts.

Information competency is addressed in 239 course level SLOs. The Self Evaluation provides no evidence of the extent to which these course level SLOs have been assessed and describes only the English course practice of requiring a paper to be evaluated utilizing a standard rubric. Examination of this rubric does not demonstrate how information competency is being evaluated.

LAMC has identified a need to assess the Information Competency ILO on a campus-wide basis. In order to accomplish this LAMC has reestablished an Information Competency Task Force. It is unclear why LAMC is not able to determine the level of competency by reviewing the course assessments related to information competency. There is no evidence that the college has attempted this examination of existing data.

LAMC provides adequate access to its library and learning support services including evening and Saturday hours (Library). The access to tutoring in the Learning Center is limited and is identified in the Self Evaluation. They have been able to expand student access by providing online access to tutorials and other materials.

Access to Learning Center resources may become compromised once grant funds are expended. The same is true for the Library databases. Without dedicated funding, these resources may be at risk.

Law enforcement personnel, maintenance personnel, and IT personnel, work in tandem to maintain and secure library and learning support services (II.C.1.d). The Self Evaluation

identifies deficiencies in maintenance and security of the library and learning resources. There are deficiencies relate to a lack of funding to replace security gates, connect panic buttons, resolve a leaking roof, and student tutors, but the college has a plan to address those issues. The maintenance of computer and technology resources is managed by the Information Technology staff and appears to be adequate. The Technology Master Plan shows computers have been upgraded in the Library and learning support areas between 2007 and 2009.

There are a number of identified collaborations employed by the college to provide library and learning support services (II.C.1.e.). These include formal agreements (databases, software maintenance, software updates, and equipment maintenance). There is also an informal agreement between the nine colleges of the Los Angeles Community College District to lend and borrow books. Program review, curriculum processes, surveys, usage data, and informal collaborations among faculty determine the selection, maintenance, and usefulness of library and learning support resources (II.c.1.e).

All library and learning support programs complete program review, SLO assessments, and assess other data to evaluate and improve services for students (II.C.2). The Learning Center requested an advisory board to better assess its services and to more effectively collaborate with discipline faculty outside of the formal process the college uses (such as program review). The advisory committee recently held its first meeting, which also included the Library. The Multimedia Studies program consults with CTE advisory members. Results from all these assessment (which includes input from faculty and students) had led to changes in resources and services (such as changes to hours, workshops, communication, software, etc.).

Examination of the program reviews demonstrates that these programs are evaluating their services and assessing their support of student learning. Student surveys and informal invitations to faculty to collaborate are additional ways learning support services evaluate needs and effectiveness. Discipline faculty also evaluates the library collection through the curriculum process with the library addendum to the Course Outline of Records.

Conclusions:

LAMC meets this standard by providing its students with sufficient library and learning support services. The college will be challenged when the grant monies expire that are currently funding learning support services. The college needs to plan to institutionalize these support services when grant monies are no longer available. LAMC meets Standard II.C.1.

The Self Evaluation and the evidence indicates that the college meets this standard. There exists strong links between the Library and the departments it serves. The Learning Center support services are linked to student needs as identified by faculty. There are identified ongoing issues related to maintaining adequate and current technology resources for the Library, the Learning Center and the program-specific computer labs. LAMC meets Standard II.C.1.a.

LAMC meets the standard of providing training in information competency. Information competency is identified as an ILO; however, the college has not systematically assessed student attainment of this outcome and has not investigated existing assessment results in the course-level outcomes related to information competency. The college meets Standard II.C.1.b.

LAMC provides its students with adequate access to its Library and Learning support services. However, their ability to continue to provide this access may be at risk unless sufficient institutionalization of expenditures on these services is undertaken by the college. The college meets this standard II.C.1.c.

LMAC provides effective maintenance and security for its library and other learning support services. The college meets Standard (II.C.1.d).

The college has several contracts with other sources for library and other learning support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution's intended purposes, are easily accessible, and utilized. The performance of these services is evaluated on a regular basis. The college meets Standard II.C.1.e.

LAMC evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The college uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement. The college meets Standard II.C.2.

Recommendations

None

STANDARD III
Resources

A. Human Resources

General Observations:

Employees of Los Angeles Mission College are categorized into three distinct groups: academic, classified, and unclassified. Academic positions include certificated administrators (8) and faculty – full-time (84) and part-time (248). Classified staff positions (150) include managers, supervisors, classified administrators, clerical, technical, and trades employees. Unclassified positions (203) include, but are not limited to, student employees, recreation employees, community services teachers, and professional experts. The selection procedures for all employees hired at LAMC follow the guidelines as provided by the Los Angeles Community College District. The District Board of Trustees and the Personnel Commission ensure that all of the state requirements and district policies regarding hiring and minimum qualifications are met. The District Human Resources Division reviews announcements and specifications before the job announcement is posted to ensure conformity with federal, state, local, and district regulations.

Human resources policies and procedures exist at both district- and college-levels. Hiring policies are outlined for each employee group. Policy and processes are clearly described and largely understood by faculty and staff, as suggested by Faculty and Staff Survey.

Personnel policies and procedures are established and published at both college and district levels. Along with job descriptions related to institutional mission and goals, information regarding criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selections of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Criteria for selection of faculty are clearly stated with faculty playing a significant role in selection of new faculty.

The College assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically. Written criteria for evaluating all personnel are established and published on both district and college website. The College has many procedures and agreements to evaluate all personnel. However, some faculty and staff feel leadership positions are not effectively evaluated.

As of 2007, the college has a Code of Conduct that addresses issues of civility and integrity. Disciplinary actions can result from violations of the Code of Conduct. Professional ethics are also addressed in the District Board Rules and classified employees adhere to the s of Conduct in the Personnel Commission's Employee Handbook. The Code of Conduct Statement was approved by the Academic Senate December 6, 2007 but there is no indication that the College Council approved the Senate version of the statement or that the statement was signed by the college President and the President of the Academic Senate.

The Academic Senate makes recommendations to the President who, in consultation with the chancellor, makes the final determination as to how many full-time faculty will be hired each year. The process involves the program reviews, the Faculty Hiring Prioritization through the

Academic Senate, and the budget and planning process. The college has a full-time to part-time faculty ratio of 58%.

Employees have access to established personnel policies and procedures, but the college had not analyzed the employee survey data to determine if any action needs to be taken to make improvements to access, development, or administration of personnel policies and procedures.

Personnel files are kept in secure locations with limited access. Employees are informed of their right to access these records.

The college shows concerns for equity and diversity though it's hiring, discrimination complaint process and sexual harassment complaint processes in addition to a district diversity committee and college Professional and Staff Development Committee that contributes to teaching understanding for issues of equity and diversity.

The college's policies and procedures along with educational opportunities through various committees support its diverse personnel.

The college has process in place to ensure equity and diversity in accord with its mission.

The college has made excellent progress with increasing the integrity in the treatment of all employees. Although progress has been made, the college must be diligent to maintain the progress made in spite of leadership changes.

The Professional and Staff Development Committee plans, offers, and evaluates a series of professional development workshops and on line training. Along with the calendar of activities, evaluations (both self and external) are posted on the website. The Professional and Staff Development Committee is a shared governance committee and reports monthly to the College Council.

In addition to the activities sponsored/presented by the Professional and Staff Development Committee, the College supports faculty attendance at conferences and workshops. Tuition reimbursement may also be available.

Program review allows each department to analyze and request human resources and the District Allocation Model was reviewed and modified to provide additional staffing (III.A.6). The college's process of instructional planning (program review) includes human resources planning by allowing faculty to document needs and having the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee rank the requests before forwarding it to the College President for final approval.

Findings and Evidence:

While the College follows published Human Resources policy and procedures as methods to assure the qualifications for each position that are closely matched to specific programmatic needs, the College needs to further assure that the personnel qualification guarantees the integrity of programs and services. Although the published information paints a clear picture about various district policies and procedures, there are obvious gaps in staffing when these procedures are practiced, for example, vital student support services, including the duties in DSP&S and Transfer and Career Center were not effectively performed ~~either,~~ while the positions were left vacant for several years. All duties of these positions play vital role in student access and success that is the core of the College Mission. Human resource planning is not yet fully integrated with institutional planning. (III.A, III.A.1)

The College follows Personnel policies and procedures, including minimum qualification, knowledge and experiences in the subject matter, and using the established hiring criteria. Faculty members participate as members of hiring committees. Candidate pools are created by checking on and verifying applicant's qualifications at the college and/or the district levels. Regarding faculty hiring, the College includes a demonstration of teaching as part of the interviews, while criteria of evaluating "effective teaching" in its hiring process is included and rated by all interview team members. In addition, scholarship and potential contribution to the college mission are also included and evaluated during the interview process. The openings are posted online at the LACCD website and broadly and nationally. Qualified candidates from all over the nation have come forward to apply for the positions. Interview via Skype has become a common method of screening process. The College has been working with the District HR to assure that hiring procedures are constantly applied and followed through. While the College has been following closely Human Resources policies in hiring full-time personnel, hiring standards and procedures for part-time and adjunct members have also been improved. (III.A.1.a.)

The college and district publishes clear information on the selection of personnel. Faculty members have a significant role in requesting faculty positions via program review/faculty staffing processes and hiring committees. Human Resources verify qualifications before making an offer of employment. Processes to ensure integrity and quality of the college are also seen in hiring procedures for administrators and classified staff. All employees have written policies and procedures that include encouragement for staff development and improvement. (III.A.1.a)

The College uses Student and Faculty and Staff surveys to measure the impact of Human Resources related policies, plans, activities, and implementations. Findings from the surveys are designed to provide feedback to the College for improvement. Survey findings indicate that 25% of faculty and staff do not believe Human Resources is developing policies and procedures that are clear and equitable, 29% think processes do not ensure qualified personnel, and 17% do not feel equity and diversity is demonstrated though personnel policy and procedures. Regarding personnel evaluation, 29% of faculty and staff believe campus leadership lacks coherent and effective evaluation, especially for college President and vice presidents. The College needs to develop and implement effective plans to utilize findings from assessments as the foundation to improve college policies and practices regarding Human Resources. (III.A.1.a, III.A.1.b.)

The College assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically as stated. The College establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned, duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Since the College has been having long-term issues in campus relationships, the College has further developed and confirmed a College Code of Conduct. Although "any staff members displaying unprofessional and or uncivil behavior may be referred to District HR Office for violating LACCD Personnel Guide policies B474 and B476," it is unclear if the Code has been formally adopted or incorporated into Human Resources policies as part of evaluation criteria. Whether evaluations ~~would~~ lead to improvement of job performance is unclear as well. Since there is a close connection between personnel and institutional effectiveness and improvement, the College needs to develop and implement an aggressive plan to ensure that, through hiring and evaluation, it has sufficient staff in quality, in quantity, and in diversity to assist the College in achieving its stated student learning outcomes and to improve institutional effectiveness. (III.A, III.A.1.a, III.A.1.b, and III.A.1.d)

Based on the faculty contract and a contract interpretation from 2009, the evaluation process measures if faculty members participate in the SLO process, including whether they use the results of SLO assessment to make changes in their classes, but does not include a method to evaluate how effective faculty members are in producing the identified Student Learning Outcomes results.

In a 2011 Faculty and Staff Survey, 65% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the college promotes high ethical standards.

In spite of this, the college has faced serious challenges with interpersonal conflicts, a lack of collegiality, and tensions among various campus groups. These issues have been addressed through a series of interventions and a campus climate summary report is pending. Interventions are ongoing. However conflicts continue. Two departments– Counseling and Child Development-- have gone through mediation and in interviews members of the faculty Senate stressed that faculty still feel harassed and targeted and that the administration is not doing enough to prevent the targeting.

Hires for non-faculty positions are determined by budget constraints, past practice and needs expressed through the governance process. Given the number of resignations, the new buildings that require additional staffing, and budget constraints on hiring, the college considers itself understaffed. However, the college does not have a staffing study or a staffing projection plan to provide guidance for determining adequate staffing levels.

Administrative resignations over the past two years left a number of administrative positions unfilled or administrators doubling up on positions. Staff and administrators, through interviews, expressed concern about work on assessment and program review not being completed, about some administrators suffering from "burn-out" and about new administrators as a group lacking "institutional history." In addition, several faculty leaders voiced concerns about administrators leaving as a result of being targeted by a politically motivated group of "Chicano" faculty and administrators.

Collective bargaining allows for an opportunity for the institution to review their personnel policies and procedures with additional policies developed or maintained by the board and the district Personnel Commission. Collective bargaining agreements and various district guidance (board policies and other personnel guides) are publicized on the website. District Office Compliance Officers investigate personnel complaints and work to resolve issues in addition to unions provide assistance when their members feel their contractual obligations have been violated (III.A.3.a). Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) officers assist in keeping the selection process fair for all prospective employees. Survey data shows that 25% of faculty and staff feel that the college does not have clearly written and equitability administered human resources policies and procedures (50% of faculty and staff feel that they do with another 25% not choosing either answers). The college has not formally analyzed the results of the survey to determine what, if any, action needs to be taken to accept, increase, or decrease the number of employees completing the survey or how the employees feel about administration of policies and procedures. The employees interviewed felt that the policies and procedures are equally administered and easy for all employees to access although the college never analyzed the survey data to determine if any action needs to be taken to make employees more aware of policies and procedures to gather input to make the process more effective.

The college securely maintains confidential records in print and electronic formats that employees can access online or by request (III.A.3.b). Paper copies of personnel files are kept in locked cabinets with access limited to a specific group of identified employees whose duties involve needing the records. Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) officers also assist in keeping prospective employees records confidential by with confidentiality agreements.

The college demonstrates concern for issues of equity and diversity through board rules and other policy and procedures, such as their Non-Discrimination Policy (III.A.4 and III.A.4.a). DSPS and District Office of Diversity programs provide additional services to support diversity as well as the Student Equity Plan (III.A.4.b). The district also analyzes hiring data to ensure laws are followed and there is not any adverse impact against any racial or gender group (III.A.4.b). The District Compliance Officers and Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) representative contribute to maintaining fair employment procedures (III.A.4 and III.A.4.a). Additionally, the district provides training, policies, and procedures for anti-sexual harassment and anti-discrimination efforts.

The college personnel policies and procedures ensure diverse personnel from the beginning of the hiring process by targeting different publications to advertise positions. Equal Opportunity Officers and Compliance Officers are key to ensuring the hiring process gives all who applied equal opportunity. The college's cultural activities, District Diversity Program, and Faculty and Staff Development Committee also contribute to supporting diverse personnel by offering activities and workshops to promote a positive workplace. The college has an established process for resolving discrimination and sexual harassment complaints.

The college, as part of the hiring process, requires an "Evidence of Effort Report" that assesses how effective the hiring committee was in contributing to equity and diversity prior to offer of

employment being made by the district. This data is analyzed to ensure no impact against any racial or gender groups is realized as part of the hiring process.

In order to demonstrate integrity of treatment to all employees and students, the college has worked to address campus climate issues by employing the use of mediators, broadening the mission statement to better acknowledge the diverse communities they serve, launching an Anti-Bullyism and Pro-Collegiality campaign, and holding town halls meetings hosted by the College President (III.A.4.c).

The college has procedures for employees to have issues regarding discrimination and sexual harassment addressed. The Faculty Guild contract includes an article that states the board and the union will "strive to promote a collegial and non-hostile work place for all district employees" and faculty concerns regarding hostility in the workplace must include an investigation and remediation by the appropriate administrator. Faculty Guild leadership believes that article ~~5~~ has been an effective method to increase integrity in the treatment of faculty.

One of the methods for addressing the campus climate issue was for the six unions to work together to discuss collegiality at a self-scheduled Union Leadership Summit. The meeting resulted in the six unions representing all employee groups agreeing to a collegiality pledge. The signed petition was presented to the President and Chancellor who also signed the document.

Workshops on identifying and stopping bullying have been scheduled on campus and efforts to invite additional speakers on collegiality topics are continuing. The Union Leadership Summit group continues to meet.

Survey data shows 56% of faculty and staff f members feel they are satisfied with the procedures available to resolve problems they may have with the college (22% disagreed), which is little over half of the employees feeling confident issues can be resolved. Additionally, 50% of faculty and staff members feel policies and procedures are equitability administered. The college has not analyzed the survey data to determine if any action should be taken based on the survey results. Interviews with employees indicated they are concerned that campus climate may become an issue again. The college will need to monitor the~~ir~~ efforts to continue to demonstrate integrity of employee treatment regardless of leadership changes.

Faculty and staff are informed of professional development opportunities through the Faculty and Staff Development Committee website and emails. Faculty professional development activities are verified by a FLEX Coordinator who reports this data to the CCCCO.

In fall 2009 LAMC was awarded a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) Title V grant to encourage collaboration and to augment professional and staff development activities. The LAMC Foundation, the President's Office, the District Employee Assistance Program, and the Associated Students Organization underwrites some professional and staff development activities.

Results of the fall 2011 Faculty and Staff Survey show that 74% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that "the professional development programs offered to employees reflect work-related needs and interests."

The College is considering the creation of a separate Classified Staff Development Committee.

The Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee may receive requests from department chairs (through Program Review), the Education Planning Committee, the Academic Senate, or the Vice Presidents. Requests for faculty positions are prioritized, and through the Academic Senate, forwarded to the President. Requests for Classified positions are submitted by the appropriate vice president to the President.

LACCD may provide hiring directives that supersede the Program Review or College identified staffing needs.

Conclusion:

LAMC assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support their programs and services. The College meets Standard III.A.1.

At LAMC criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority. Criteria for selection of faculty include knowledge of the subject matter or service to be performed (as determined by individuals with discipline expertise), effective teaching, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Institutional faculty play a significant role in selection of new faculty. The college meets Standard III.A.1.a.

LAMC assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. The college meets Standard III.A.1.b.

Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes. The college meets Standard III.A.1.c.

College has drafted a College Code of Conduct. Although "any staff members displaying unprofessional and or uncivil behavior may be referred to District HR Office for violating LACCD Personnel Guide policies B474 and B476," it is unclear if the LAMC Code has been formally adopted. The college does not meet Standard III.A.1.d.

Administrative resignations over the past two years left a number of administrative positions unfilled or administrators doubling up on positions. Staff and administrators, through interviews, expressed concern about work on assessment and program review not being completed, concern about some administrators suffering from "burn-out" or new administrators as a group lacking "institutional history." The college does not meet Standard III.A.2.

The LAMC and the District systematically develops personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered. The college meets Standard III.A.3.

LAMC establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures. The college meets Standard III.A.3.a.

The college provides for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law. The college meets Standard III.A.3.b.

LAMC demonstrates through policies and practices an appropriate understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity. The college meet Standard III.A.4.

LAMC creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel. The college meets Standard III.A.4.a.

The college regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission. The college meets Standard III.A.4.b.

Despite the efforts of the union leadership, the college President, and the district Chancellor who came together in the Union Leadership Summit and signed a pledge to "move toward a more collegial and productive campus climate at Los Angeles Mission College," there are still reported incidents of bullying behavior involving faculty, staff, and students. The college does not meet Standard III.A.4.c.

The Professional and Staff Development Committee has had no annual budget since 2004. However, the Committee continues to provide a program that meets the needs of faculty and staff. The college meets Standard III.A.5.

The college has had a number of personnel vacancies that have impacted its ability to deliver critical services. The college does not meet Standard III.A.6.

Recommendations

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)

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.)

STANDARD III
Resources

B. Physical Resources

General Observations:

Los Angeles Mission College was founded in 1975, and prior to 1991, was located in various storefronts throughout the northeast San Fernando Valley. The college moved to its permanent 22 acre campus in Sylmar in 1991. The original campus consisted of three permanent buildings, which were the college Instructional Administration building, the Campus Center, and the College Services Building. A fourth building was added in 1996, the Library and Learning Resource Center. In 2007, the college expanded its footprint and purchased a 11 acre parcel of land 0.3 miles east of the main campus. The East Campus opened in 2011. All structures have been built to meet the projected enrollment and program needs stated in the college Facilities Master Plan. The college contracts with the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department to provide security for all of its sites.

The college has sufficient physical resources to meet its current student demand, but continues to develop further resources for growth. The college uses its Facilities Master Plan to drive building expansion and renovation, consistent with the Educational Master Plan and Technology Plan. Since its last accreditation visit, the college has added a parking structure, two parking lots, and four new instructional buildings, including an East Campus complex, and now have more than 530,000 square feet of instructional and support service facilities between the Main and East campuses. The college built these new facilities to meet program and class size needs, using voter approved bond funds. An up-to-date building list, bond construction projects, land acquisition records, and costs and/or estimated costs at completion, are well recorded.

The college has an active participatory governance structure with several committees that make recommendations to the College Council on facility planning.

The college has a structured facility planning process that assesses facility needs, including ADA access. New buildings have been constructed with appropriate paths of travel and accessibility for disabled students.

The college engages in active facilities planning. They also consider space utilization, survey results, and program and service needs when assessing facilities and equipment needs.

Long range planning addresses anticipated program and service needs. Outstanding ADA issues need to be completed. Total cost of ownership principles are included by college administration in facilities planning.

College planning involves all relevant constituent groups and the program review process is designed to forward facility requests to the Facilities Planning Committee.

Findings and Evidence:

The District Risk Management department performs regular assessments of the college buildings

and is responsible to make recommendations regarding campus safety. The college also has a Work Environment Committee that works with the Plant Facilities Unit, the Facilities Planning Committee, and the College Council to discuss and make recommendations on campus safety. The college Facilities Master Plan is revised to reflect the conditions of college facilities, and include plans to repair and renovate existing buildings, as well as demolish and construct new buildings to address campus and building safety. (III.B.1)

Data from the Facility Utilization Space Inventory Options Net (FUSION) report is used to identify and evaluate current and future facility needs. Room capacity and student demand data is used to help determine facility needs, and the results of its Student, Faculty & Staff survey assesses the adequacy, maintenance, and safety of campus facilities. Future needs identified by the college consist of a Media Arts Performance Center, a Central Energy Plant, and a Student Services/Administration Building. The college indicates that it no longer leases off-campus space, but does offer classes at local high schools. Off-campus sites are under the control of the Los Angeles Unified School District, with safety services provided by the Los Angeles Police Department. (III.B.1)

The Facilities Department issues an annual survey to faculty, staff and students to evaluate the services provided. The annual program review process evaluates future facility and equipment needs. Needs reflected on program plans are reviewed by the college Vice Presidents, who prioritize and submit requests for funding through the budget planning process. Requests for equipment as well as facility improvements are addressed through this type of process. The College Council reviews requests for equipment and facilities, submitting their recommendations to the college President. The college indicates that priority funding is provided to purchase equipment that is unsafe, out of compliance with state or federal law, or if it is obsolete. (III.B.1)

The College Curriculum Committee and the Distance Education Committee work with the Information Technology and Facilities departments to recommend and make improvements to distance education infrastructure. Equipment purchases are subject to available funding at the college, recommendation from the College Council, and approval by the college President. (III.B.1)

The College considers the needs of programs and services when developing and maintaining its physical resources through coordination and communication among Enrollment Management Committee, Facilities Planning Committee, Curriculum Committee, and Distance Education Committee. (III.B.1.a)

The college process begins with program plans and review. In these plans, departments and units indicate their facility and equipment needs. Information from program plans and reviews are forwarded to one of several committees, which include the Work Environment Committee, Facilities Planning Committee, and the College Council. The College Council discusses, ranks requests, and makes recommendations on campus facility and equipment needs. The college evaluates its use of physical resources through the annual student, staff, and faculty survey process. (III.B.1.a)

The Self Evaluation Report and on-site evidence support the assertion that the program review

process is the major avenue for the determination of facility needs, which includes service and program improvements, and equipment replacement and maintenance. The college evaluates the effectiveness of college facilities and equipment through surveying its faculty, staff, and students. Survey participants indicate that they view the college physical resource planning process as integrated with institutional planning. The college community is also well aware of the impact of the new construction and facility planning, and they provide positive feedback to the college. The survey instrument and its distribution however, should be reviewed annually in order to gain deeper perspective from students, staff and faculty and to increase participation in this process. Other evaluation methodologies may facilitate the gathering of data for effective physical resource planning. (III.B.1.a)

The college effectively uses its physical resources by strategically scheduling its classes, developing and implementing facility rental programs, constructing and maintaining green buildings, and inviting the entire college community through a well-developed fee based structure to use its facilities, e.g., health and fitness center. (III.B.1.a)

To ensure that facilities adequately support programs and services, the college evaluates facility needs through program review and annual program updates. Requests for increased space, facility improvements, and scheduled maintenance are reviewed and prioritized by the college Facilities and Planning Committee Task Force, and college administration. (III.B.1.b)

Long range capital plans are reflected in the college Facilities Master Plan. To address the total cost of ownership of new facilities, the District increased the college allocation to hire additional staffing to maintain the new facilities. However, it is unclear how the college will absorb any other new costs from additional and pending construction. (III.B.1.b)

Additionally, the college is currently using bond funds to meet scheduled maintenance needs for its older buildings. As this is not an ongoing, sustainable revenue source, the college will need to incorporate this into their budget planning model before this funding is depleted. (III.B.1.b)

Lastly, while new construction s address current ADA requirements and are spacious, inviting, and state of the art, projects for ADA deficiencies identified in the college ADA Transition Plan have not been completed. (III.B.1.b)

The college uses annual survey instruments to assess the use of the facilities. Program Reviews are also used to determine facilities use and space needs. The results from the survey are used to make recommendations for improvement, with facilities and equipment requests reviewed by the college Vice Presidents. Requests are prioritized and included as part of the college planning process. Approved facility requests are included in the Five Year Facilities and Construction Plan, Educational Master Plan, and Facilities Master Plan. (III.B.2)

Physical resource planning begins at the department and program level with program review and annual budget planning. Facility needs are reviewed annually and space needs are identified through the Work Environment Committee, the Educational Planning Committee, or the Facility Planning Committee. The College Council reviews and recommends college facility requests. Approved requests are included in facilities planning documents. (III.B.2.a)

Total cost of ownership principles are considered by the District and college in deciding whether to construct new buildings or renovate older structures. Staffing needs, equipment, maintenance, and utilities costs are considered when assessing new building needs. District staff confirmed that the budget allocation model provides funding to address the square footage of each college, staff needed to maintain facilities, and utility costs. Facilities plans are reviewed to ensure that college construction does not expand to a point where the college cannot financially sustain operations. (III.B.2.a)

Capital projects are proposed consistent with needs identified through program reviews and the Educational Master Plan. These planning documents, which reflect campus goals and needs, are used to guide the Facilities Master Plan for the college. Plans to resolve ADA issues have been planned in Campus Modernization Plan 1, but held up as a result of open project applications with the Division of the State Architect. The college should resolve these issues timely in order to address the remedies detailed in the ADA Transition Plan. (III.B.2.a)

The college uses annual survey instruments and program reviews to help drive decision making and facilities planning for the college. Upon approval of facility needs requests through the college participatory governance process, the Facilities department includes new proposed facilities in the Facilities Master Plan. Updates to the Facilities Master Plan reflect changing program and service needs. (III.B.2.b)

Conclusion:

The college provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services. The college meets Standard III.B.1.

The college/district plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources to that assure effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services. The college meets Standard III.B.1.a.

LAMC assures that physical resources are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment. The college meets Standard III.B.1.b. However, the college should work immediately with the Division of the State Architect to resolve outstanding project application numbers with college projects so that they can begin work on campus ADA improvements.

LAMC plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account. The college meets Standard III.B.2.

Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment. The college meets Standard III.B.2.a.

Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. LAMC systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement. The college meets Standard III.B.2.b.

Recommendations
None

STANDARD III
Resources

C. Technology Resources

General Observations:

The College has been using its technology resources to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning, with room for improvement. To meet the needs of students, faculty and staff, the College has conducted several major operational systems upgrades (i.e. VOIP, cabling, and mass notification systems). Wireless capabilities have been expanded all over the college. Several learning platforms have been adopted for distance learning, and workshops have been provided to support faculty use of these new tools. Survey data have been positive regarding the maintenance, and upgrade and replacement of technical resources. 85% of faculty and staff who participated in the Survey indicated positively that both hardware and software at the college helps faculty and staff effectively perform their duties. However, the college lacks the resources to provide training for all faculty in order to ensure the total integration of technical innovations in teaching methods. Specifically, the college needs a dedicated training facility to provide the much needed training. In addition, the college needs to identify and secure funding to implement its documented computer replacement plan.

The college Technology Plan, which was approved in fall 2010, is integrated into the college Strategic Master Plan, the Educational Master Plan, and it is aligned with the District Technology Strategic Master Plan.

There are sufficient avenues for college personnel to bring forward technology needs, including training requirements. Trainings are offered as needed, although survey results indicate that faculty and staff would like more training. In addition, efforts have occurred at the college and the district levels to enhance and ensure that sufficient technology resources are available on campus.

The college has been successful in maintaining, upgrading and expanding its SMART classrooms by using specially funded programs and Bond funds. There is a plan to convert all classrooms to SMART technology. The Technology Plan reflects timelines for the replacement of equipment and technology.

The college indicates that they have made upgrades and replaced infrastructure and equipment beginning in 2007, completing this work in 2008. They have kept fiber optic, copper, and coaxial cables up to date with District s, and have purchased technology equipment with needed warranties and product support. Bond funds were used to support these efforts.

Technology effectiveness is assessed through program review and the through the creation of the Technology Master Plan. Student input is included and plans are made at the program level (through program review) as well as the institutional level (through the Technology Master Plan).

Findings and Evidence:

The College makes decisions about technology services, facilities, hardware and software through Program Review, along with active participatory governance Technology Committee. This helps the college determine technology needs, so they can enhance, expand, and improve technology access for students, faculty and staff. (III.C.1)

The goals and objectives of technology resources development and maintenance are developed through the participatory governance process. The college assesses and evaluates the effectiveness of its technology in meeting its range of need through several major avenues. While program review process being the main avenue, suggestions arrive through discussions made during department meetings and college-wide retreats. Survey findings and on-campus dialogue indicate that the college has adequately supported technology. (III.C.1)

The college has implemented numerous software and hardware upgrades, using program reviews and survey data to drive decision making. The college appears to effectively meet its technology needs, but having some challenges keeping up with their proposed 3-year upgrade schedule and maintenance. In addition, the college is currently using grant funding to support the cost of their mass notification system upgrade. It may be necessary for the College to identify an ongoing funding source for the upgrade if it is to continue past September 2014. (III.C.1.a)

The College provides technology accommodations to support the college's distance learning programs and courses. The online and hybrid classes make use of course management systems that require student to use a secure login and password. Additionally, the college has an adequate backup plan for disaster recovery, privacy and security. The backup is stored off-site at Los Angeles Harbor College. (III.C.1.a)

The college assesses the need for technology training and provides it as needed. Informal and formal training is provided to students, faculty, and staff on the various software applications provided by the college. Through its internal space utilization planning process, the college uses seven college sites to provide training. From the survey information provided however, a dedicated training center, space permitting, may need to be considered by the college. This would be in lieu of utilizing other computer centers that are dedicated to other college programs. (III.C.1.b)

Survey findings also indicate that college faculty and staff believe that the training and technical support provided is appropriate and effective. The surveys are conducted during odd years. Survey results indicate that the needed training has been available with 66% survey respondents in agreement and 68% stated that technology training offered was in high quality. (III.C.1.b.)

The college has used special funds and grant funding to support their technology efforts. They need to incorporate the replacement costs of this new technology into their established planning and budget masking process. (III.C.1.c)

The college indicates that all critical data (i.e., email, student databases, and website content storage) is routinely backed-up and stored at the Harbor College data center. The college has also added a Secondary Data Center and a fiber optic ring for the main campus. These improvements provide necessary redundancy and disaster recovery in the case of an emergency. All buildings on the main campus are connected to the primary data center by the redundant fiber optic ring and infrastructure equipment is protected with an annual service agreement. (III.C.1.c)

Program Reviews and annual assessments, which include technology requests for distance education, are completed at the end of each year by units, departments, and programs. Requests for technology are sent to the college Budget and Planning Committee for review, and if approved, are sent to the College Council. The College Council sends the final recommended requests for funding to the college President for approval. (III.C.1.d)

The college integrates technology planning and assessment of technology with institutional planning though a number of processes. The college ensures its technology decisions are based on the results of evaluation of program and service needs through participatory governance, such as the Technology Committee. The Technology Committee creates the technology plan based on input from faculty members (III.C.2).

The Academic Senate, Educational Planning Committee, and College Council approved the most recent Technology Master Plan (2010-2015). The Technology Plan's mission includes ensuring technology will improve teaching and learning, ensure students and employees have abilities to use technology, and ensure the environment is conducive to learning. (III.C.2)

Program review allows each program or service to request specific technology needs that reflect curriculum or student needs. Department chairs and division deans prioritize the requests from program reviews before being forwarded to the Budget and Planning Committee for final prioritization then the College Council. All shared governance committees, such as the Technology Committee, evaluate their own committee's work and processes at the end of each year to improve effectiveness. (III.C.2)

Students are satisfied with technological resources provided for them to complete coursework and are asked periodically through surveys. Employees also participate in surveys, which show they feel the resources are effectively meeting their needs. (III.C.2)

Conclusion:

LAMC assures that any technology support it provides is designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, college-wide communications, research, and operational systems. The college meets Standard III.C.1.

Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the LAMC. The college meets Standard III.C.1.a.

The college provides quality training in the effective application of its information technology to students and personnel. The college meets Standard III.C.1.b.

LAMC systematically plans, acquires, maintains, and upgrades or replaces technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs. The college meets Standard III.C.1.c.

The distribution and utilization of technology resources support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of its programs and services. The college meets Standard III.C.1.d.

Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution assesses the effective use of technology resources and uses the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement. The college has used special funds and grant funding to support their technology efforts including technology enhancements and infrastructure upgrades. However, they have not indicated how they will fund technology needs when their non-General Fund resources are depleted. To improve their practice they need to incorporate the replacement costs of this new technology into their established planning and budget making process. The college meets Standard III.C.2.

Recommendation

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)

STANDARD III
Resources

D. Financial Resources

General Observations:
The college has effectively been able to generate year end savings for the past five fiscal years. They have also been able to utilize the participatory governance process to review budget resource requests.

The college holds an annual retreat in August of each year. All members of the various constituent groups participate in this meeting. A review of the college mission and past year goals and objectives are reviewed. New goals and objectives are set consistent with the college mission.

The college provides hard copies of budget and fiscal information as well as financial presentations are made by college budget staff. The college President also provides budget information received from the District office.

The college reviews its short-term program and service needs, and ~~are~~ is aware of ~~their~~ long-term program and service liabilities. Additional planning will need to be done by the college to identify funding for ongoing technological and program service needs.

College planning involves several participatory governance groups. These groups actively participate in financial planning and budget development. All constituencies are a part of this process.

There have been some minor issues with internal controls relating to the timeliness of its corrective actions. The college should take steps to ensure that findings are addressed within a year.

Audit and financial information is provided from the Office of Administrative Services to college constituent groups as needed for budget planning and review purposes. College departments that receive audit findings are notified by district and/or college fiscal staff to resolve issues.

The college receives the majority of its funds from state general fund apportionment revenue. The college also is able to generate revenue from auxiliary services, such as facilities rental and bookstore operations. The college has also been able to generate carry over funds for the past three fiscal years.

The annual audit reviews the college's compliance with federal and state funding programs. These review includes the college financial aid and grant programs. Unfortunately, the college has received some past audit findings on internal controls within financial management.

The annual audit addresses all college funds, which includes special funds, bond funds, and grant funds.

The college has generated a positive reserve balance since the 2007-08 fiscal year. Past year ending balances however, have been much higher that what is projected for this fiscal year.

The college uses committees established through the participatory governance process to assess the financial resources that are available for use by the college.

Planning for and allocating appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations, including Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations.is a District responsibility. In fall 2006, employee unions agreed to contribute fund 1.92% of their annual salaries towards pre-funding of retiree health care liabilities. (III.D.3.c)

The District had their last two actuarial studies performed on July 1, 2009 and July 1, 2011. (III.D.3.d)

The college has not incurred any local debt. (III.D.3.e)

The college Financial Aid office participates in several federal aid programs which include the Pell Grant Program, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant program, federal work study, Perkins Loan program, Direct Loan program, Cal Grant program, a Chafee Grant, a Child Development Grant program, and the Board of Governors Fee Waiver program.

The college has several agreements with local educational agencies to provide classes. They also have an agreement with the state to provide Child Care Services.

The college has an annual audit performed by an external auditor to assess financial controls and financial management. College participatory governance groups also perform self-evaluations to assess performance.

The college has established a planning process that incorporates all of its constituencies through various participatory governance committees.

Findings and Evidence:
The college budget for FY 2012-13 is $26.7 million. This level of funding is sufficient to fund the college's expected expenditures for the year and still generate a positive ending balance. Finances of the college are managed by the Office of the Vice President of Administrative Services, with oversight from the college President. (III.D)

The college holds an annual retreat to set college goals and priorities. These goals and priorities are used to assist in the development of the college budget. College resource needs and projected revenues are reviewed by the Budget Planning Committee, which sends budget allocation requests to the College Council for review. The College Council forwards the annual budget to

the college President for review and approval. Annual resources are allocated to ensure the fiscal solvency of the college. (III.D)

The college indicates that annual planning begins in August of each year. At the summer retreat, college members establish goals and objectives for the following year, and evaluate any items that will impact the current year. Financial goals and plans that support college goals are agreed upon. Financial planning information for the college is shared at various participatory governance meetings, is made available on the web, and financial reports are provided at district-wide and college budget meetings. (III.D.1.a)

Members of participatory governance groups receive up to date financial information to assist with institutional planning efforts. The college operational plan provides detailed information on the resources needs to support student learning and achievement. Funding and resource allocation priorities are recommended from the college Planning and Budget Committee. Priorities are set based upon the mission and goals of the college. Information on District reserves, anticipated revenues, state policies and procedures is also used with college information to guide institutional planning. (III.D.1.b)

The college reviews its long-term obligations and is aware of funds needed to address their program and service needs. The college Planning and Budget Committee helps set priorities for future funding needs. District obligations for retiree health benefits are budgeted for appropriately and the District has set up a trust fund to address this long-term liability. (III.D.1.c)

The college Budget and Planning Committee, as well as the College Council, is constituted with members from all employee groups, as well as students. Faculty, staff, and administrators all have the opportunity to participate in this process. Budget development and planning information is made available on the college website, as well as hard copies of financial documents are available in the Office of Administrative Services. (III.D.1.d)

The college develops a budget plan each year that outlines the college priorities and the level of programs and services that will be provided during the upcoming operational year. The college budget planning process incorporates various participatory governance committees, which include the Budget and Planning Committee and the College Council. (III.D.2.a)

The audit reports for the District have been unqualified reports. This means the audit was complete and financial documents were researched thoroughly. Unqualified audits analyze internal systems of control, as well as the details in the financial documents. Unfortunately, the audits for the past two years indicate there have been material weaknesses and significant deficiencies in relation to internal controls at the college due to its inability to implement corrective actions prior to the subsequent audit, which can have a direct or indirect effect on the financial management of the college. (III.D.2.a)

As a part of the financial documents sampled, the college received several audit findings in 2010-11. One finding was for incorrect charges for a bond project, inaccurate census reporting; a finding that was also reported in 2009-10, failure to properly document a concurrent enrollment student, no required attendance rosters for TBA classes, and lack of eligibility verification, or

student contact documentation, for students in three special programs. In 2011-12, the college received findings related to census reporting, course announcements for TBA classes, eligibility verification for a special program, and missing course outline requirements. Issues noted in census reporting, TBA documentation, and student program eligibility for the DSP&S program from 2010-11, was noted as partially resolved in 2011-12. (III.D.2.a)

College budget information is prepared monthly and quarterly, with results shared amongst the District Budget Committee, College Council, and the Academic Senate. This information is available at the college library, posted on the web, and hard copies are located in the Office of Administrative Services. The college uses this information for budget planning, development, and financial management. (III.D.2.b)

The ending balance for the college has been $972,270 in 2009-10, $1,413,901 in 2010-11, and $229,405 in 2011-12. This amount has been sufficient to assist the college with meeting fiscal challenges in 2011-12. The college will need to evaluate how they can maintain ending balances consistent with past years. (III.D.2.c)

The college has several auxiliary ventures to generate additional revenue. The college generates revenue from activities related to facilities rental, catering services, and the Student Bookstore. The college indicates that they will set aside $45,000 from these revenues to assist the college in an emergency. Additionally, the District manages a 5% contingency fund of approximately $23.4 million that can assist the college, if needed. The District also issues Taxpayer Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRANS), if needed, to address cash flow. (III.D.2.c)

The college receives its funding through a District allocation formula. This allocation is based upon college full time equivalent students, minimum administrative staffing, transition funding, and maintenance and operations costs. Cash flow difficulties are addressed through use of the college unrestricted general fund reserve balance. (III.D.2.c)

The District carries $500,000 to $25,000,000 in general liability coverage, coverage for wrongful employment acts, and for worker's compensation claims. Limits for each reflect a maximum of $25,000,000 per occurrence. (III.D.2.c)

The District Governing Board has adopted business policies and procedures to provide direction for business and financial transactions at each college. At the college, the Vice-President of Administrative Services has the direct responsibility for managing the human, physical, technological, and financial resources of the college consistent with these policies and procedures. College financial staff provides regular review of financial transactions to ensure compliance with these policies and procedures. (III.D.2.d)

The college has an annual audit of general funds, as well as special funds. The college is also required to submit annual reports to federal and state agencies, dependent on the program requirements for special or grant funds received by the college. (III.D.2.e)

The college is projecting a positive ending balance for the 2012-13 fiscal year of $134,385. For the 2011-12 fiscal year, the ending balance was $229,405. (III.D.3.a)

The college indicates that budget planning process is done annually and begins at the annual college planning retreat. Discussion from the retreat is used to provide updates to the college Strategic Master Plan. (III.D.3.b)

The college Vice President of Administrative Services provides regular financial reports to the college President as well as to college participatory governance committees. This information is used to make program adjustments and well as assess the effective use of college resources. (III.D.3.b)

Program reviews also provide data for college planning to evaluate the number of students served, as well as program and service needs. Student, Faculty and Staff Surveys are also done annually to evaluate the use of college resources. (III.D.3.b)

The District has established an irrevocable trust to fund its post- employment benefits. As of the June 30, 2012, Audit Report, the Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability for the District was $559,203,000. As of June 30, 2012, the District has set aside $35.5 million in a trust fund, with the fair value of the trust at $41 million. The District fully funds their annual required contribution to their annual OPEB cost using a "pay as you go" basis. (III.D.3.c)

The District has contracted for an actuarial study to assess its post-employment benefits liability in 2009 and 2011. (III.D.3.d)

The college does not currently have any locally incurred debt either through a Certificate of Participation (COPS) or other negotiable debt instrument. The District however, on February 28, 2013, issued $80,000,000 in Taxpayer Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRANS) to assist with 2012-13 fiscal year obligations. (III.D.3.e)

The official report from the National Student Loan Data System reflect default rates of 12.9% in 2010, 9.2% in 2009, and 9.3% in 2008. In 2009, schools are to receive two-year and three-year cohort rates until 2014, when they will then receive three-year cohort default rates. The data report did not reflect the two-year default rate for 2011 or 2012. Published default rates greater than the 30% threshold that would require the college to establish a default prevention task force. The college does however, provide pre-loan counseling to students seeking to utilize this financial aid option. (III.D.3.f)

The college has contract agreements that allow the college to provide classes with the Los Angeles Unified School District. They also have an agreement with the state to provide child care services. Both service agreements services are consistent with the mission and goals of the college. These contracts are managed by college administration. (III.D.3.g)

The college has an annual external audit to review financial management practices and internal controls. Findings on practices and controls are provided as appropriate. (III.D.3.h)

Additionally, the College Council performs an annual self-evaluation of its meetings, as well as it reviews the performance of other college participatory governance groups. The college

indicates that the College Council provides recommendations to each group, as needed, in order to improve effectiveness. The college also conducts an annual planning retreat to discuss financial planning and college effectiveness. (III.D.3.h)

Institutional plans are driven by department /program plans and program review. Annual survey instruments are also used to determine program and service needs. College participatory governance groups, such as the Budget and Planning Committee and the College Council, use this information and data to set priorities for resources needs and funding. Priorities to govern resource allocation are defined by the Budget and Planning Committee each year, with a matrix system used to rank requests. This ranking system ensures that critical needs are met, as well as items that address stability and sustainability guidelines. This planning process is multi-functional and can be used in times of growth, as well as periods of reduction.

Conclusion:

The LAMC uses mission and goals as the foundation for financial planning; the college meets Standard III.D.

Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning. The college meets Standard III.D.1.a.

Institutional planning reflects realistic assessment of financial resource available. The college meets Standard III.D.1.b.

The College/District considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies and plans for payment of liabilities and future obligations. The college meets Standard III.D.1.c.

LAMC has clearly defined guidelines and processes for financial planning that it follows in its budget development; all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets. The college has used special funds and grant funding to support their technology efforts; however, they have not indicated how they will fund technology needs when their non-General Fund resources are depleted. The college partially meets Standard III.D.1.d.

The past two audit reports reflect recurring issues with internal controls that appear to remain unresolved. As internal controls are essential in financial management, the college does not meet Standards III.D.2.a, III.D.2.d, and III.D.2.e.

College/District responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately. The college meets Standard III.D.2.b

Appropriate financial information is provided throughout the college; it meets Standard III.D.2.c.

The college/district has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, they have appropriate risk management processes, and contingency plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences. The college meets Standard III.D.3.a.

The college/district practices effective oversight of its finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets. The college meets Standard III.D.3.b.

The LACC District plans for and allocates appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations, including Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations. The District/college meets Standard III.D.3.c.

The LACC District has a plan to determine Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) is prepared, as required by appropriate accounting standards. The District/college meets Standard III.D.3.d.

The LAMC has not incurred any local debt. The college meets Standard III.D.3.e.

LAMC monitors and manages student loan default rates, revenue streams, and assets to ensure compliance with federal requirements. The college meets Standard III.D.3.f.

Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the LAMC, governed by college/district policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the college. The college meets Standard III.D.3.g.

The college/district regularly evaluates its financial management processes, and the results of the evaluation are used to improve financial management systems. The college meets Standard III.D.3.h.

Fiscal Resource Planning is integrated with institutional planning. The college systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis of improvement for the institution. The college meets Standard III.D.4.

Recommendation

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)

STANDARD IV
Leadership and Governance

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations:
The college has established a system that allows for leadership to be in evidence throughout the organization and to strive for continuous improvement of the institution. Through participation in shared governance, faculty and staff are encouraged to participate in leadership through committee work and constituency representation opportunities. Through membership on shared governance committees, faculty, staff and students have the ability to engage in dialogue about significant educational matters, budgets, and planning.

The College's current shared governance structure has been in place since 2007. The College Council is the umbrella group for shared governance and the principal body that makes recommendations to the College President. The College Council is charged with overseeing the coordination and development of institutional planning through shared governance committees. It oversees the development of planning documents, procedures, policies, guidelines, and evaluation criteria for reviewing the College's mission and goals, establishing college priorities and reviewing the progress and effectiveness of shared governance committees. The membership of the College Council includes administrators, elected co-chairs of the six shared governance committees, the Academic Senate President (or designee), the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) Chapter Chair (or designee), representatives from the four classified staff collective bargaining units on campus, and an Associated Students Organization representative.

Numerous documents describe responsibilities and authority of the faculty and academic administrators in curricular and other educational matters including the collective bargaining agreement (requires all full-time faculty to serve on at least one committee); the charters for the shared governance and Senate committees, College Council, and Shared Governance Task Force; the LAMC Academic Senate Constitution; the District Academic Senate Constitution, the Curriculum Manual, LACCD Administrative Regulations, LACCD Board Policies, and the Shared Governance Agreement between the Academic Senate and College President.

The agreement between the Academic Senate and College President states that the President will rely primarily on the Senate for recommendations on the following academic and professional matters:
1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses with disciplines
2. Degree and certificate requirements
3. Grading policies
4. Educational program development
5. Program Review processes for academic areas
6. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success
7. College governance structures as related to faculty roles
8. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes including
a. Facilitating the Accreditation Committee

b. Approving the final report
9. Policies for faculty professional development activities
10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development
11. Other professional and academic matters as mutually agreed upon

Los Angeles Mission College relies on its faculty, Academic Senate, academic administrators, and various faculty structures for recommendations about its student learning programs and services. Faculty and academic administrators make recommendations about the instructional programs through the Academic Senate, Educational Planning Committee, Program Review process, online SLO assessment system, Curriculum Committee, Essential Skills Committee, shared governance committees, Council of Instruction, and College Council.
One recent challenge facing the College regarding this area has been the lack of consistent administrative staffing in Academic Affairs during most of 2012. The Vice President of Academic Affairs resigned in June 2012 and a six-month process ensued to obtain a permanent replacement. During this time period, a Dean of Academic Affairs served as the administrator in charge while still performing her other responsibilities as a dean. The new Vice President began his tenure in January 2013. Additionally, two Deans of Academic Affairs were on leave for several months during 2012.

The college has developed and instituted mechanisms for communication, dialogue, and decision-making. In addition to the governance process, the college also uses town hall meetings, the website, an online newsletter, and the campus free speech area to facilitate communication. College Council reaffirmed the College Code of Conduct in 2009. (pg 34). Unfortunately, some at the College feel that there is a lack of leadership in effectively addressing concerns about student-faculty relations.

The College has shown its integrity with the accreditation process over the past visits. It have prepared all requests for reports and documents including special visits, interim and midterm reports. It has prepared self-evaluations, self-studies and substantive change reports and responded to requirements for public disclosure.

The self-evaluation highlights the progress the College has made in developing its shared governance framework, but it has not developed a formal process for measuring the effectiveness of this model. Individual units have not developed a means of evaluating their program review and annual unit planning processes.

Findings and Evidence:
Opportunities for participation in decision-making at LAMC help faculty, staff, and managers feel empowered and connected to setting an agenda for innovation and improvement. There are formal processes for committee work outlined in charters for each shared governance committee. Evidence of effective engagement in discussion of significant college matters are found in minutes of committee meetings. The online process for annual unit assessments and program review is available to each unit on campus and reports are posted for review by the college community. The program review process encourages staff, faculty and administrators to use data and research to show how they are striving to meet the needs of students and improve overall institutional effectiveness. This process serves as the primary means for the institution to

measure institutional effectiveness and this process is a part of dialogue that occurs within units and across the college. (IV.A.1)

The college's mission statement communicates ~~their~~ commitment to the success of their students and is published in the college catalog (annually), schedule of classes (each semester) and on the college's website. The mission statement reflects the colleges intent to provide quality educational programs to the communities they serve.

The published charter of the College Council describes its role as overseeing and coordinating the development of institutional planning through shared governance committees and includes the development of procedures, policies, guidelines and evaluation criteria for reviewing the college's mission and goals, establishing college priorities and reviewing the progress and effectiveness of shared governance committees. It provides recommendations to the College president on college matters and through the College president to the District on District matters. (IV.A.2)

The objectives of the Council are:

- Review, revise and approve college mission and goals and recommend that College president send them to Board for approval;
- Oversee timeline and assessment criteria for all unit plans;
- Define annual college priorities that reflect the goals of the college and the assessment of college unit plans;
- Coordinate and evaluate the effectiveness of College Council and the six advisory shared governance committees: Budget and Planning, Educational Planning, Facilities Planning, Student Services, Professional and Staff Development and Technology;
- Receive, review, evaluate and act upon reports and recommendations to the College president from Shared Governance Committees;
- Respond to requests from the president to study and make recommendations regarding a concern;
- Define and implement communication mechanisms to regularly communicate meeting schedules, agendas and status of recommendations, policies and procedures to the college community, including College Council members' constituents;
- Provide recommendations to the College president on college matters and through the College president to the District on District matters; and
- Oversee college responses to all accreditation recommendations

Voting members include: Administrative and elected Co-Chair of each of the shared governance committees (12), Academic Senate President or designee (1), AFT Chapter Chair or designee (1) Classified Representatives (4) One ASO representative (1). (IV.A.3)

The fall 2011 Faculty and Staff Survey results indicate that most respondents agree that faculty and the Academic Senate have an adequate role in matters relating to educational programs (Table 4). A majority of individuals surveyed agreed with the following statements: "*Faculty have an equitable role in governing, planning, budgeting and policy-making bodies*" (57%);

"Faculty have an equitable voice in matters relating to educational programs" (60%), and *"The institution relies upon its faculty and the Academic Senate for recommendations about student learning and instructional programs and services"* (63%).

The fall 2011 Faculty and Staff Survey results indicate that most respondents agree that faculty and the Academic Senate have an adequate role in matters relating to educational programs (Table 4). A majority of individuals surveyed agreed with the following statements: *"Faculty have an equitable role in governing, planning, budgeting and policy-making bodies"* (57%); *"Faculty have an equitable voice in matters relating to educational programs"* (60%), and *"The institution relies upon its faculty and the Academic Senate for recommendations about student learning and instructional programs and services"* (63%).

Yet, the college has gone through periods of difficulty with student and community protests, attacks against specific faculty and administrators, recall attempts, and conflicts within departments. As noted in the self-evaluation, this has hindered the college's ability to work together for the common good.

These conditions have prompted the college to respond to a negative campus climate with interventions. Outside mediation has been used to address complaints about harassment or perceived harassment; CFT and AFT participated in anti-bullying workshops; and workshops on conflict resolution and communication were held, and college constituents signed a "Collegiality Pledge". The college plans to continue these efforts through a Civility Project. Continued strengthening of the governance process is recognized by the college as a component of improving campus climate.

The College's past history involvement with the Accrediting Commission serves as proof of its intention to meet requirements of the Accrediting Commission and other external agencies. The College has made progress on meeting most if not all of its earlier recommendations. (IV.A.4)

The College has also shown that it met requirements related to compliance to USDE regulations with respect to gainful employment requirements and student loan default tracking.

The College must develop a process to evaluate its shared governance and decision-making processes, and the contribution of this work to continuous improvement in institutional effectiveness and academic quality. The results of this evaluation must be communicated widely and discussed across the college community. The College should make every effort to improve upon the process should the results of the evaluation warrant it. While there is evidence that the College Council has evaluated the committee structure, a process to evaluate the overall shared governance and decision-making processes has not been developed. (IV.A.5)

Conclusion:

LAMC leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic

participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation. The College meets Standard I.A.

The college has implemented a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and committees. The college meets Standard IV A.2.

LAMC faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions. The college meets Standard IV-A.2.a.

The college relies on its academic senate, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services. The college meets Standard IV A.2.b.

Through established governance policies, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution's constituencies. The college meets Standard IV.A.3.

The college advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self-evaluation and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission. The college meets Standard IV.A.4.

While the College has evaluated the functioning of each of the committees that are involved in the governance and decision-making process, it has not yet undertaken an overall assessment of the integrity and effectiveness of the collective efforts. The college does not meet Standard IV.A.5.

Recommendation

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)

STANDARD IV
Leadership and Governance

B. Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations:

The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) comprises nine related colleges, each of which is directly answerable to a seven-member board of trustees elected for four-year terms district wide by voters in the city of Los Angeles and in neighboring cities without their own community college districts. Board meetings are held year-round at the District's central office downtown and at each of the nine college campuses during the academic year. In compliance with state law, all meetings are publicized at least 72 hours in advance and are open to the public. The Board meets twice a month. Special meetings are sometimes called to handle business that cannot be dealt with at regular meetings. After a closed session, a public session is held to allow members of the community, employees, and students an opportunity to address the Board about their concerns.

The Board has an established role in setting and updating policies in order to ensure the effective operation of the District. Oversight of the College's educational programs and services is accomplished by means of board rules and administrative regulations that establish Standards for graduation, set policies for curriculum development and approval, and detail the faculty's central role in educational matters in accordance with the District's stated mission. The Board must also approve or reject all changes to the curriculum that are brought before it from the District's Office of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness.

The Board sets goals and provides a sense of direction for the Colleges through the District Strategic Plan (DSP). Part of overall planning efforts, the plan is derived from goals set by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. In spring 2011, the District began a comprehensive district-wide strategic planning process to guide the District from 2012 to 2017. More than 40 focus groups, including input from faculty, students, staff, and administrators, were held in fall 2011 at each college to identify district-wide strengths and weaknesses and offer suggestions for priorities and strategies, and in spring 2012, input was again solicited. Vision 2017 was approved by the Board in December 2012.

The Board monitors the educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity of LACCD programs through the following standing committees:

- The Institutional Effectiveness Committee addresses educational effectiveness, student achievement, and educational programs. It oversees the Colleges' accreditation self-evaluation efforts and requires annual college reports on progress made to reach strategic planning goals, including outcome measures and progress on the District's Core Indicators of Institutional Effectiveness.
- The Finance and Audit Committee recommends the tentative budget and annual audits for general operations of the District and the bond program and reviews financial reports, internal audits, bond financing issues, revenue-generating plans, public/private partnerships, and other financial matters.

- The Legislative Committee makes recommendations on legislative initiatives to benefit the District, reviews proposed state and federal legislation, evaluates lobbying efforts, and considers other related matters.
- The Capital Construction Committee provides policy guidance, oversight of the bond program, and approval of master plans and environmental impact reports.
- The Student Affairs Committee considers all matters that impact student life, including the teaching and learning environment, co-curricular and extracurricular activities, student services, etc.

The Board is responsible for monitoring all aspects of District and college finances. An independent audit of the District's and the Colleges' financial statements and accounting practices is made annually by an outside agency. The Board, the College presidents, and the public are provided periodic updates and presentations regarding the LACCD's financial condition. The Board ensures the financial integrity of the District by approving an annual budget, reviewing its annual independent audit, and requiring at a minimum 5% reserve. The Board is directly responsible for guaranteeing the Colleges' financial health by requiring quarterly reports from the College presidents on their budgets and FTES targets. The Board is responsible for overseeing compliance with all federal, state, and local policies related to student financial aid and other fiscal programs through LACCD administrative offices.

The duties and responsibilities of the board are defined externally by State Education Code, Section 70902, and internally by board rules. The Chancellor and General Counsel also play an important role in monitoring board responsibilities. The bylaws and policies are published on the District's website.

The process for the adoption of board rules (policies) and the administrative regulations that support them (how to implement the policies) are outlined in a Chancellor's Office directive. Board rules are adopted by the Board of Trustees, and Administrative Regulations are issued under the authority of the Chancellor. In addition, the District adopts other procedures, such as its Business Procedures Manual and Chancellor's Directives, to establish consistent Standards.

In 2007, the board adopted a regulation stipulating the process for the cyclical, automatic review of all policies and regulations. Rules and regulations are assigned by category to subject matter experts every three years. If they are in need of revision, the appropriate staff member prepares changes. To ensure compliance, the Office of General Counsel developed a form that requires the responsible ESC administrator to indicate the outcome of the review (i.e., no changes recommended at this time, changes recommended, or proposed changes vetted with the appropriate shared governance group). The form must be signed and dated before being returned to the General Counsel. Since April 9, 2010, the Board has adopted 11 new board rules and updated 34 existing ones. The Board relies on the Chancellor, the College presidents, and ESC executive and senior staff to ensure that all rules and regulations are implemented uniformly and effectively across the District.

In 2007, the Board adopted a formal policy for the orientation of new board members. It has also developed procedures for the orientation of student trustees. In July of 2011, when the two newest board members were elected, each participated in a nine hour orientation held on three

separate days (IV.B-24). These orientations included information about Accreditation Standards and ACCJC expectations that trustees be involved in all aspects of accreditation.

The Board's formal policy on self-evaluation was adopted in 1995, and for 10 years, the Board used a checklist to evaluate its overall effectiveness. In June 2005, the Board amended its process, expanding it to also include additional feedback from college presidents, District senior staff, and union and academic senate representatives, who regularly sit at the resource table during board meetings. Using this revised process, the Board conducts annual self-evaluations. The most recent self-evaluation took place in January 2013 with the results presented at a Board meeting.

In 2007 the Board adopted a Board Rule to set goals as part of its annual self-evaluation. In 2010 the Board adopted a District Effectiveness Review Cycle, which aligns annual Board and CEO goals with DSP goals. The annual cycle includes Board evaluation, Board retreats, college activities in support of goals, institutional effectiveness reports, and District effectiveness reports that align with the DSP. At its retreats, the Board assesses District priorities and discusses processes for addressing them.

In response to a recommendation received from the Commission in June 2012, professional development training was held at two fall 2012 retreats to help Board members distinguish their responsibilities from those of the Chancellor, understand their roles in setting policy, and develop goals and objectives to address items noted in their evaluation.

The Board adopted a Statement of Ethical Values and Code of Ethical Conduct in 2005 that requires each member to adhere to values of honesty, integrity, reliability, and loyalty. With input from District legal counsel, in 2007 it established procedures for sanctioning board members in case of ethics violations.

To ensure that they are knowledgeable about the accreditation process, trustees learn about Accreditation Standards at retreats and meetings. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee monitors the accreditation self-evaluation process by receiving regular reports and reviewing the Colleges' comprehensive self-evaluation, midterm, and follow-up reports. During the current Comprehensive Evaluation visit, three Board members met jointly with representatives from the three visiting teams, and responded to questions.

The Board employs the chancellor and gives him/her full authority and responsibility to oversee the operation of the District. The hiring of a chancellor starts with board action authorizing the HR Division to launch a search. After a chancellor is selected, a policy outlines procedures for his/her annual evaluation. The Board solicits input from constituencies and collects data to evaluate performance on a number of criteria. The most recent evaluation of the current Chancellor, hired in August 2010, was conducted in October 2012. The current chancellor has announced his intention to retire effective June 30, 2013.

One of the Chancellor's duties is to conduct regular evaluations of the College presidents and make recommendations to the Board on the renewal of their contracts. The process for this comprehensive evaluation, which has been in place since 2002, is facilitated by the Deputy

Chancellor's Office. College presidents undergo evaluations at least every three years. They are conducted by District HR and include feedback from all segments of the campus community. In addition, every year the College presidents meet with the Chancellor to update their annual goals.

As identified in the organizational chart reflecting the administrative structure of the College, the College President is engaged in all aspects of the College's efforts to achieve its mission. The recent addition of the Vice President of Academic Affairs has provided the College President with a full cabinet for the first time in his tenure. The regularly scheduled meetings with the President's Cabinet, the President's Council, the senior management team, provide opportunities for the President to provide leadership in the planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel along with assessing institutional effectiveness.

The President is fully engaged is all aspects of organizing an administrative structure that will provide adequate oversight for Los Angeles Mission College. Recently, he filled the last position in the senior administrative team that will now reflect, for the first time under his oversight, a fully staffed complement of senior leadership. The current challenge is to now guide this effort with all senior leadership in place and effectively delegate authority to the senior leadership. The president has, through his encouragement of open communication with the administrative team, shifted the appropriate duties of each vice president to their respective teams.

The President, through the shared governance process and regular meetings with the academic senate and faculty guild, and classified staff leadership has in place a process that influences the college-wide dialogue at an annual retreat where the strategic goals of the college are reviewed, including reviewing evidence on the progress made on improving teaching and learning (as part of the College's strategic master plan). The annual program review and unit assessment cycles start the process of institutional review of the college's values, goals, and priorities and are informed by data gathered by surveys, focus groups and data gathered from district research sources.

At the College's annual retreat, the shared governance co-chairs meet to review the state of the college and begin the process of vetting requests for resources. They ensure that the annual plans submitted by the respective programs and departments have sufficiently integrated their plans to budget requests.

The President is in regular communication with respective authorities, the governing board, and those involved with state and local regulatory oversight of programs offered by the College. He provides assurance that these policies and institutional practices align with institutional mission and college policies.

The President presides over the budget process to assure that institutional costs are covered based on the District allocation and any other revenue generated by the College. This has been particularly difficult due to budget cuts by the state and District. The President fully engages in efforts to monitor College expenditures and works closely with District staff to review the College budget on a quarterly basis. The College has done well managing its finances in spite of the tough budget climate.

The President has made great efforts to regularly attend events and promote the College in the community. The current staffing at the management level will enable him to do more community outreach on behalf of the College. He is working on improving the image of the College in the community in order to increase enrollment. He has met with local church leadership, K-12 administrators, and become active in a number of community organizations and boards. He has also established a President's Advisory Board with members of the aforementioned groups.

In 1999, the Board of Trustees adopted a policy of partial administrative decentralization, which shifted additional responsibility and accountability for planning and decision making to the local college level. Since the adoption of this principle, the District and the Colleges have worked to clarify and delineate operational responsibilities.

The District has been actively engaged in addressing this Standard since it participated in the ACCJC's Multi-College Pilot Program in 1999. Several generations of functional maps delineating the mutually-defined operational roles and responsibilities of the District system and the Colleges have been produced. The 165-page 2013 Functional Map contains descriptions of board and committee roles, functions and membership of 56 district-wide governance and administrative committees, a definition of the District/college relationship, a grid of service outcomes detailing the functions of each division and administrative unit and outlining its relationship with its college counterparts, and flow charts showing administrative processes.

The District's Educational Service Center (ESC) offers an array of support services, the main ones involving instructional and student services support, institutional research, human resources, business services (including contracts and risk management), financial services (budget and accounting), legal services, public relations and marketing, facilities planning (including oversight of the construction program), and information technology. Collaborative procedures between the District and the Colleges include the budget allocation model, submission of state MIS data, and implementation of board rules. Each college, through its own budget allocation process, determines specific operational and educational priorities.

Following a year-long review, the District amend the current allocation model to one with minimum base funding. The new model has two phases:

- Phase I increases the Colleges' basic allocation to include minimum administrative staffing and maintenance and operations (M&O) costs.
- Phase II calls for the ECDBC to study the remaining allocation agenda for allocation changes that identify college needs (including M&O), provide funding for colleges to deliver equitable access for students, and ensure that colleges are provided with sufficient funding to maintain quality instruction and student services.

The District is continuing to review budget allocation issues as the new model is implemented.

To ensure sound fiscal management and provide a process to monitor and evaluate their financial health, all nine colleges follow standards of good practice that include the development of an

annual financial plan, quarterly status reports, the requirement to set aside a 1% reserve, and the obligation to balance the College's budget.

The Chancellor gives the College presidents the authority to administer their responsibilities at the Colleges without interference. Monthly Cabinet meetings are held to keep the College presidents apprised of District policies. Through a regular evaluation process that includes clear grades for effectiveness in key areas, the Chancellor holds college presidents accountable for the effective functioning of their colleges.

The District has several vehicles for communicating with the Colleges. It provides reports pertaining to such areas as finance, personnel, and demographics. It maintains several databases which allow personnel to access information related to college operations as well as employee and student information.

In response to 2009 ACCJC recommendations, the District implemented a new cyclical process for self-evaluation that resulted in two assessments: a survey to assess district/college role delineation, and a survey to assess district wide participatory governance. Both assessments resulted in reports and action plans for improved practice.

Findings and Evidence:
The Board represents the interests of a broad range of constituencies. An independent policymaking body, its members are elected at large across one of the most demographically diverse urban areas in the U.S.

Board members work together collaboratively to support the interests of the District. The trustees take an active role in advocating for the Colleges and the students served and in defending the Colleges from undue interference. (IV.B.1.a.)

Since the District began to partially decentralize in 1999, District administrators, the Council of Academic Affairs (comprised of the VPs), and the District Academic Senate have worked to streamline procedures for the approval of academic programs and courses. As part of this effort, administrative regulations have been revised to decentralize the curriculum approval process and empower local college faculty. In addition, the District has adopted a series of board rules mandating Program Review, biennial review of vocational programs, program viability review, and program discontinuance processes at the College level.

Annual college strategic planning reviews allow the Board to play a more direct role in assuring that the Colleges and the District are in sync by requiring the Colleges to demonstrate how their goals align with the District's. These reviews give the Board the opportunity to hold the Colleges publicly accountable for meeting quality assurance Standards associated with their educational master plans and strategic planning efforts.

The District established a single point of contact at each college to collect and review responses, beginning with the assignment of a lead to take charge of each action, the setting of corrective actions with a timeline for implementation, and a request for documentation to prove that the corrective actions took place. This centralization of reporting has made the District more

responsive to the audit findings. In September 2012, the District held an Accreditation Summit with 70 administrators and two Academic Senate representatives. The session focused on audit findings, corrective action plans, and responsibility for the resolution of these audit findings.

With a seven member Board, while there is no formal guarantee of continuity of leadership, the staggering of board elections does provide some consistency. The fact that incumbents are frequently re-elected to their positions has provided a measure of continuity to governance that has resulted in a strong record of improved governance practice since the 2007 Comprehensive Evaluation visit. Following the recent election, two (and possibly three) new Board members will replace long-term trustees. The new Board members take office July 1, 2013. This change, coupled with the retirement of the current Chancellor, has the potential to interrupt the substantial progress made at the district leadership level unless the remaining trustees work together with their new members to implement the vision of excellence embodied in their current planning and practices.

As a result of a self-evaluation, the Board streamlined the number of standing committees from seven to four. The adoption of an annual review cycle has increased the Board's ability to monitor progress on strategic goals and Board priorities to guide district-level decision making. It has allowed the Board to synchronize annual goal setting with the academic calendar and ensure that institutional effectiveness reports align with strategic plan reports, and the self-assessment process.

The Board has a clear code of ethics and a process in place for sanctioning behavior that violates the code.

The meetings held with the respective management teams and the meetings with College constituency leadership provide evidence that the President engages in a leadership role and has primary responsibility for assessing institutional effectiveness. Communiques to the College community such as videos (Monte's minute), and information shared at College Council and the Annual Report on Institutional Effectiveness along with documented minutes of meetings provide evidence that the president is proving leadership over these efforts. Institutional effectiveness is evaluated through a series of documented processes including college-wide action plans, program review, program review annual updates, Student Learning Outcomes and Service Area outcomes, student success initiatives, and the shared governance bodies. The president ~~of~~ effectively controls the college budget after taking into account the recommendations of the College Council and the review of external data such as state and federal budget forecasts and allocations provided by the District.

The Faculty and Staff Survey, Leadership and Governance section reported for fall 2011 indicated that close to sixty percent (59.5) of respondents indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed with the item, *"The College president provides effective leadership."*

The organization has undergone significant changes in leadership since the last accreditation visit. While the team is now fully staffed, there will need to be a full evaluation of the effectiveness of the current administrative structure now that it is fully staffed.

The annual unit assessment and program review process provides a means to ensure that a collegial process is in place to identify priorities for making major decisions at the College. This process ensures that educational planning is joined with resource allocation using data to inform decisions that are made. Efforts must be made by the President to ensure that these processes are evaluated in order to determine their ability to ensure that the efforts undertaken ensure institutional effectiveness.

The president provides regular communication updates through reports at college meetings with senior management and shared governance committees. He regularly reviews committee reports and monitors actions of programs and committees responsible for ensuring that these Standards and policies are met. He provides guidance to those who may not be in compliance when necessary and keeps up with communications from the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees.

The President regularly monitors the budgets and works closely with the senior management and District staff to ensure that spending is in line with available budget.

In 2009, the District Planning Committee (DPC) created a two-year project that culminated in a full assessment and revision of the functional map and engaged faculty, staff, administrative, and student leaders in a dialogue about the roles and responsibilities of the Colleges and the District. The outcomes of that assessment were for improvements to the district/college processes. (IV.3)

The extensive efforts involved in revising the functional map and the current process mapping project for the new SIS have greatly improved the understanding of roles and responsibilities across the District. (IV.3.a)

The District's ongoing self-analysis has resulted in recommendations for the refinement of functions. Involving input from all nine colleges, survey results have led to the establishment of clear outcomes for all LACCD administrative offices, which are being used to measure the effectiveness of support services. (IV.B.3.b.)

The District has been regularly reviewing and adjusting its budget allocations to ensure the Colleges can operate and support their programs and services, for example, giving supplemental funding to the four smaller colleges, including LAMC. (IV.B.3.c.)

The District's maintenance of a reserve of at least 5% has proven to be a prudent policy. In June 2012, the Board directed the CFO to set aside a 5% general reserve and an additional 5% contingency reserve, which has allowed the District to minimize the impact of cuts to college operations resulting from the State's financial crisis. (IV.B.3.d.)

Decentralization and delegation gives the presidents the authority to make key decisions, but they are also held directly accountable for their actions. (IV.B.3.e.)

The Chancellor, who took office in 2010, made a commitment to improving the flow of information between the District and the Colleges. The Chancellor's Office issues frequent bulletins to all employees at the Colleges with budget updates and relevant information, including resolutions passed by the Board. (IV.B.3.f.)

The comprehensive assessment efforts led to the creation of the new LACCD District/College Governance and Functions Handbook, which clearly establishes District roles of authority and responsibility and helps leaders navigate district wide governance and decision making processes more effectively. The District's follow-up regimen is improving district-level governance and decision-making processes by ensuring that ongoing efforts lead to continuous improvement. (IV.B.3.g.)

Conclusion:
The LACC District has a governing board that has established policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the district. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system. The LACCD has met Standard IV.B.1

The LACCD board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure. The LACCD has met Standard IV.B.1.a.

The board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them. The LACCD has met Standard IV.B.1.b.

The LACCD board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity. The LACCD has met Standard IV.B.1.c.

The LACCD publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures. The LACCD has met Standard IV.B.1.d.

The board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary. The LACCD has met Standard IV.B.1.e.

The board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It provides for continuity of board membership through staggered terms of office. The LACCD has met Standard IV.B.1.f.

The board's self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws. The LACCD has met Standard IV.B.1.g.

The board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code. The LACCD has met Standard IV.B.1.h.

The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process. The LACCD has met Standard IV.B.1.i.

The board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the LACCD Chancellor. The board delegates full responsibility and authority to him to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him accountable for the operation of the district. The board has established a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges. The LACCD has met Standard IV.B.1.j.

The President has primary responsibility for the quality of LAMC. He provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness. The college has met Standard IV.B.2.

While the new administrative team has been in place a short period of time, it is important that there be a process developed that will yield a formal evaluative process to assess the overall effectiveness of the current administrative structure as per the Standard. The college has partially met Standard IV.B.2.a.

The President guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment. The college has met Standard IV.B.2.b.

The President assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies. The college has met Standard IV.B.2.c.

The President effectively controls budget and expenditures. The college has met Standard IV.B.2.d.

The President works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution. The college has met Standard IV.B.2.e.

The LACCD provides primary leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district and provides support for the effective operation of the colleges. It has established clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system and acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board. The district has met Standard IV.B.3.

The LACCD has clearly delineated and communicate the operational responsibilities and functions of the district from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice. The district has met Standard IV.B.3.a.

The district provides effective services that support the colleges in their missions and functions. The district has met Standard IV.B.3.b.

The district provides fair distribution of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations of the colleges. The district has met Standard IV.B.3.c.

The district effectively controls its expenditures. The district has met Standard IV.B.3.d.

The Chancellor gives full responsibility and authority to the presidents of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district policies without interference and holds them accountable for the operation of the colleges. The district has met Standard IV.B.3.e.

The district acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board. The district and the colleges use effective methods of communication, and they exchange information in a timely manner. The district has met Standard IV.B.3.f.

The district regularly evaluates district/system role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals. The district widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement. The college has met Standard IV.B.3.g.

Recommendations

None