
I.B. ASSURING ACADEMIC QUALITY AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

**In order to avoid redundancy and be as concise as possible, the College created a Glossary located in the Appendix explaining the processes and structures of the institution, such as Program Review. These processes and structures referenced in the report are noted with asterisks which are explained in greater detail in the Glossary.*

Academic Quality

I.B.1

The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial dialog about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- The College engages in sustained, substantive, and collegial dialog about student outcomes and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement through numerous venues and events such as department and discipline meetings; Student Learning Outcome (SLO) and Program Learning Outcome (PLO) summits and assessment retreats; department chairs' SLO/PLO Summary Reports; broad-based communications at LOAC* (Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee); disaggregated Institutional Learning Outcomes reports; workshops and discussions on quantitative and qualitative measures of student success; Program Review* unit discussions, analysis of disaggregated data, validations, and campus reports; an annual review of institution-set standards*(ISS); annual reports on their units' performance by each Vice President; an annual report to the LACCD Board of Trustees regarding the College's performance on the student achievement outcome measures; the annual College Council review of Strategic Master Plan (SMP) performance measures; and Curriculum* Committee discussions on the inclusion of meaningful SLOs in the development or revision of course outlines (I.B.1-1 through I.B.1-17, see also Standard I.B.3).
- The College's participation in the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) and Achieving the Dream (AtD) – a national initiative focused on helping low-income and minority community college students to complete their education – provides two additional avenues for dialog supporting the College's quest for equity in access and success for its diverse populations. All efforts aimed at identifying and addressing inequities in student access and success are organized in conjunction and compliance with the College's Student Equity Plan (SEP). The current SEP was approved in fall 2014 and is updated annually. The College's Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) website also hosts disaggregated student achievement and ISS* data, and links to LAMC's Student Success Scorecard. The latter contains disaggregated data on remedial instruction, job training programs, retention of students, and graduation and completion rates (I.B.1-18 through I.B.1-21).
- Academic quality is ensured through substantive and collegial dialog as part of the Program Review* process and integrated with budget development. Curriculum quality is monitored and discussed by the Curriculum Committee, the Academic

Senate, discipline faculty, department chairs, academic deans, and the Vice President of Academic Affairs. Additionally, the faculty evaluation process ensures the delivery of high quality academic instruction and offers further opportunities for discussions on student learning and achievement (I.B.1-22 through I.B.1-24).

- Dialog about institutional effectiveness occurs in the regular meetings of the College's shared governance committees and is monitored by the Shared Governance Oversight Committee (SGOC). Each shared governance committee prepares an annual self-evaluation, and SGOC conducts an additional external evaluation of each committee. Based on this review, SGOC prepares a final report that consists of commendations and recommendations for the committees. These final reports are submitted to College Council and posted on the SGOC website. At its annual fall retreat, College Council evaluates the institution's progress on the SMP, identifies areas of focus for the coming year, and evaluates college processes (I.B.1-25 through I.B.1-29).

Analysis and Evaluation:

Dialog on SLOs and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement regularly occurs through numerous venues and events, including fall and spring Flex Days, department/discipline meetings, annual SLO Summits, conferences/outside events, Eagle's Nest* activities, shared governance committee meetings, and LACCD District meetings and events. Results of SLO assessments are also shared through various reports, such as the department chairs' semi-annual SLO/PLO Summary Reports, the Mission Learning Report*, and ILO assessment reports, all of which are discussed by LOAC* and other committees on campus. The process of updating/initiating new curriculum also includes discussion of associated learning outcomes at all levels (I.B.1-1 through I.B.1-10), (I.B.1-17), and (I.B.1-30 through 32).

The College has developed institution-set standards* (ISS) for six measures of student achievement; these are evaluated on an annual basis. The Program Review* process also involves the evaluation of student achievement data and incorporates the institution-set standards*, as appropriate, for programmatic improvement. The College publishes these and other student outcome measures through its annual reports to the Board of Trustees, the SMP performance measures inventory and update, the Mission Learning Report*, and on the OIE website (I.B.1-11), (I.B.1-12), (I.B.1-14), (I.B.1-16), (I.B.1-21), (I.B.1-31), (I.B.1-33), (I.B.1-34).

Program Review* screens incorporate disaggregated data per discipline to help identify disproportionately impacted (DI) groups. Furthermore, the Student Equity Plan underlines achievement gaps at the institutional level and facilitates the decision-making process on how to best bridge these gaps. The College's AtD and Basic Skills Initiative groups also review outcomes and devise plans to assist disproportionately impacted populations. Last but not least, the College is increasingly incorporating disaggregated student data in its strategic planning functions (I.B.1-18 through I.B.1-20), (I.B.1-34), (I.B.1-35).

Academic quality is further assured through discussions amongst faculty, staff, administrators, and committees during annual and comprehensive Program Reviews* and validation, Curriculum* review, and regular faculty evaluations (I.B.1-10), (I.B.1-13), (I.B.1-22), (I.B.1-24).

Finally, sustained collegial dialog about institutional effectiveness takes place through regular meetings of the College's shared governance committees and the evaluation of their effectiveness. Aspects of institutional effectiveness are also assessed at the annual College Council retreats (I.B.1-25 through I.B.29).

Los Angeles Mission College meets this standard.

LIST OF EVIDENCE

- I.B.1-1 [Example Discipline Meeting Minutes](#)
- I.B.1-2 [SLO Summit Agendas – 2013, 2014, 2015](#)
- I.B.1-3 [PLO Assessment Retreat Agenda](#)
- I.B.1-4 [Department Chairs' SLO/PLO Summary Reports](#)
- I.B.1-5 [LOAC Agendas and Minutes](#)
- I.B.1-6 [Report on Disaggregated ILO Data](#)
- I.B.1-7 [Information Competency ILO Report](#)
- I.B.1-8 [Eagle's Nest Workshop on Student Success – 4/23/2015](#)
- I.B.1-9 [Flex Day Presentation on How to Access Institutional Data](#)
- I.B.1-10 [Comprehensive Program Review Reports and Responses](#)
- I.B.1-11 [Process for Evaluation and Improvement of the Institution-Set Standards for Student Achievement](#)
- I.B.1-12 [Academic Senate Subcommittee Minutes – 12/9/2014](#)
- I.B.1-13 [VPs' Annual Unit Reports](#)
- I.B.1-14 [Annual College Institutional Effectiveness Reports to the Board of Trustees](#)
- I.B.1-15 [College Council Fall 2015 Retreat Minutes – 8/28/2015](#)
- I.B.1-16 [College Council Fall 2015 Retreat 2013-2018 Strategic Master Plan Performance Measures Update](#)
- I.B.1-17 [Curriculum Committee Agendas and Minutes on including SLOs in course outlines](#)
- I.B.1-18 [Essential Skills Committee website](#)
- I.B.1-19 [Achieving the Dream Committee website](#)
- I.B.1-20 [Student Equity Plan website](#)
- I.B.1-21 [OIE website](#)
- I.B.1-22 [Curriculum Committee Charter](#)
- I.B.1-23 [Academic Senate Charter](#)
- I.B.1-24 [Faculty Evaluation Process](#)
- I.B.1-25 [SGOC Charter](#)
- I.B.1-26 [See I.B.1-15, page 2](#)
- I.B.1-27 [SGOC website with Posted Reports](#)
- I.B.1-28 [See I.B.1-16](#)
- I.B.1-29 [LAMC Strategic Priorities for 2015-2016 Identified at College Council Fall 2015 Retreat](#)
- I.B.1-30 [Fall 2014 Student Learning Differences Follow-Up Survey, page 7](#)
- I.B.1-31 [2014 Mission Learning Report](#)

-
- I.B.1-32 [ILO Assessments and Reports](#)
 - I.B.1-33 [2015 Institution-Set Standards Data](#)
 - I.B.1-34 [Program Review Screenshots](#)
 - I.B.1-35 [2013-2018 LAMC Strategic Master Plan](#)

I.B.2

The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. (ER 11)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- The College has defined SLOs for all its courses and assessed 100 percent of its active courses (i.e., those offered within the last two years). All SLOs are reassessed at least once every three years, and all assessment results since 2011 are posted on the SLO online system (I.B.2-1 through I.B.2-3).
- All programs have defined PLOs, which are published in the College catalog, and 100 percent of those have been assessed. Department chairs either generate “roll-up” assessments* for PLOs based on the related course SLO assessments or assess them via surveys, interviews, and/or portfolios of students’ cumulative work. The PLO assessment schedule is reviewed and updated every semester (I.B.2-1), (I.B.2-4), (I.B.2-5).
- The College’s seven ILOs* have been assessed a number of times using student surveys, authentic assessments, and ILO roll-up assessments. The fall 2014 LACCD Student Survey contained questions related to five of the College’s ILOs. Data were disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, age, income level, first generation status, and number of units completed. The results and recommendations from the assessments have been discussed at LOAC* (I.B.2-6 through I.B.2-8).
- Benchmarks for student success have been established for each SLO/PLO/ILO (I.B.2-8).
- Many SLO assessments lead to recommendations for improvement. In such cases, faculty are required to report the outcomes resulting from such revisions. For example, the Art 101 Survey of Art History I courses implemented SLO improvements where students were given more opportunities for in-class assignments, including peer review and group work to sharpen their critical thinking skills and reflect upon broader understandings of visual culture. Students in groups wrote and revised their thesis statements and provided a visual analysis as evidence for an argument. Group statements were produced and reviewed by the entire classes which had led to a greater familiarity with steps involved in assessing and critically evaluating a work of art. Overall, students have become more adept at employing stronger rhetorical strategies in written work and their grasp of historical context has improved. (I.B.2-10), (I.B.2-11).
- College policy ensures that all faculty members engage in the outcomes assessment process and meet all required timelines. Faculty are also evaluated on their participation in the SLO assessment cycle (I.B.2-12), (I.B.2-13).
- Student Support Services units assess their Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) and SLOs at least every three years. SAOs were revised in 2013-2014, assessed in 2014-2015, and are currently undergoing revisions. Each Student Support Services unit has also expanded its area outcomes to include at least one SLO (I.B.2-14).
- Learning Support Services (library and Learning Resource Center) participate in the assessment process and assess their SLOs and SAOs on a three-year cycle (I.B.2-15).

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College has defined, published and institutionalized assessment of all its SLOs/PLOs/ILOs and SAOs; it also conducts meaningful discussions about the results, plans for improvement, and implements improvements as they are warranted. Course and program assessments are posted on the SLO Online System and summarized in each semester's department chair reports and in Program Review*. The Mission Learning Report* contains a summary of the College's progress in assessing learning outcomes at all levels (I.B.2-1 through I.B.2-8) and (I.B.2-12 through I.B.2-19).

Los Angeles Mission College meets the standard.

LIST OF EVIDENCE

- I.B.2-1 [SLO/PLO/ILO Assessments and Reports](#)
- I.B.2-2 [SLO Assessment Plan](#)
- I.B.2-3 [SLO Assessment Schedule](#)
- I.B.2-4 [Screenshot of College Catalog PLOs](#)
- I.B.2-5 [PLO Master Assessment Schedule](#)
- I.B.2-6 [ILO Assessments and Reports](#)
- I.B.2-7 [Report on Disaggregated ILO Data](#)
- I.B.2-8 [ILO Master Assessment Schedule](#)
- I.B.2-9 [Screenshot of SLO System screen for setting benchmarks for SLOs/PLOs/ILOs](#)
- I.B.2-10 [Screenshot of SLO System "follow-up" screen where faculty report outcomes of revisions](#)
- I.B.2-11 [Follow-Up Art History SLO Assessment](#)
- I.B.2-12 [SLO/PLO Assessment Policy](#)
- I.B.2-13 [Faculty Contract Language on Participation in the SLO Assessment Cycle](#)
- I.B.2-14 [Student Service Area Outcomes website](#)
- I.B.2-15 [Learning Support Services Assessment Reports](#)
- I.B.2-16 [LOAC Agendas and Minutes](#)
- I.B.2-17 [Department Chairs' SLO/PLO Summary Reports](#)
- I.B.2-18 [Screenshot of SLO and Assessment Update screen in Program Review](#)
- I.B.2-19 [2014 Mission Learning Report](#)

I.B.3

The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information. (ER11)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- The College has established institution-set standards* (ISSs) for successful course completion, course retention, fall-to-fall persistence, degree completion, certificate completion, and transfer. These ISSs are used to gauge the College's performance and results are shared with the campus community (I.B.3-1 through I.B.3-22).

-
- The Academic Senate, using disaggregated College and comparative state- and District-level data, annually measures the College’s performance against the ISSs, issues recommendations regarding the standards themselves, and suggests actions for continuous improvement in student achievement. These recommendations are reviewed by both the Council of Instruction and Educational Planning Committee, and College Council members take them into account when setting the College’s annual priorities (I.B.3-11 through I.B.3-19) and (I.B.3-23 through I.B.3-26).
 - Academic departments review and assess their achievement data during Program Review*, and compare them to the ISSs* and program-level standards. In addition, disciplines evaluate their levels of performance in relation to the ISSs, develop strategies and/or interventions for improvement in the achievement outcomes, and assess the effectiveness of any implemented strategies and interventions (I.B.3-27 through I.B.3-29).
 - Job placement data for Career Technical Education (CTE) programs, obtained through the Perkins IV CTE Core Indicators Report and disaggregated with respect to gender and special student populations, are reviewed at least once a year at CTE meetings (I.B.3-30), (I.B.3-31).
 - The expected measure of performance, or Institution-Set Standard* for job placement rates for completers of each program is set by the College to be 90 percent of the “performance goal” established by the state for each year. For example, for the 2012-2013 CTE cohorts in the 2015-2016 Core Indicator Report, the job placement performance goal set by the state was 65.8 percent, and thus the standard for job placement rates for each program was set by the College at 90 percent of this goal, or 59 percent (I.B.3-31).

Analysis and Evaluation:

A subcommittee of the Academic Senate annually analyzes the College’s overall performance on the ISSs*. The subcommittee’s findings and recommendations are subsequently submitted to the Council of Instruction, EPC*, the Academic Senate, and College Council and published in the annual Mission Learning Report*. Furthermore, these findings are used in institution-wide planning, the revision of the mission, and in setting annual institutional priorities and improvement plans. For example, based in part on the recommendations from the ISSs’ analysis, College Council determined the top College priorities for 2015-2016 to be the acceleration of degree and certificate completion, and an increase in transfers to four-year colleges. To support these goals, the College set to enhance student support services and formed a taskforce to determine specific action plans and to oversee their implementation (I.B.3-12), (I.B.3-14 through I.B.3-19), (I.B.3-21), (I.B.3-23), (I.B.3-25), (I.B.3-26).

More generally, disciplines and programs evaluate student achievement performance and make associated resource requests through Program Review* to bring about improvements. Job placement rates and performance expectations and goals are reviewed annually by CTE programs (I.B.3-27 through I.B.3-31).

The College uses a variety of tools to regularly and broadly communicate the results of these analyses and discussions; these include written reports (e.g., the annual Mission Learning Report*),

web-based communications, meetings, and other campus events such as College Council retreats and town hall meetings (I.B.3-16 through I.B.3-18), (I.B.3-20 through I.B.3-23), (I.B.3-25).

Los Angeles Mission College meets this standard.

LIST OF EVIDENCE

- I.B.3-1 [ASC Research and Evaluation Theme Team Minutes – 7/15/2013](#)
- I.B.3-2 [Institution-Set Standards Data Summary – Fall 2013](#)
- I.B.3-3 [Council of Instruction Minutes – 11/6/2013](#)
- I.B.3-4 [Institution-Set Standards for EPC Review](#)
- I.B.3-5 [EPC Minutes – 11/18/2013 and 12/2/2013](#)
- I.B.3-6 [Institution-Set Standards for Academic Senate Approval](#)
- I.B.3-7 [Academic Senate Minutes – 12/5/2013](#)
- I.B.3-8 [Institution-Set Standards for College Council Approval](#)
- I.B.3-9 [College Council Minutes – 12/19/2013, page 4 under “Academic Senate”](#)
- I.B.3-10 [President’s Approval of Institution-Set Standards](#)
- I.B.3-11 [Research Advisory Task Force Minutes – 2/25/2014, item 5](#)
- I.B.3-12 [Process for Evaluation and Improvement of the Institution-Set Standards for Student Achievement](#)
- I.B.3-13 [College Council Minutes – 3/20/2014, pages 2-3 and 5](#)
- I.B.3-14 [Institution-Set Standards: LAMC Data Packet and state and District Comparison – Fall 2014](#)
- I.B.3-15 [Academic Senate Subcommittee Minutes – 12/9/2014](#)
- I.B.3-16 [Council of Instruction Minutes – 3/4/2015](#)
- I.B.3-17 [EPC Minutes – 3/16/2015](#)
- I.B.3-18 [College Council Minutes – 6/18/2015, page 3](#)
- I.B.3-19 [Institution-Set Standards: LAMC Data Packet and state and District Comparison – Fall 2015](#)
- I.B.3-20 [Spring 2014 LAMC Town Hall Meeting Presentation, pages 16-23](#)
- I.B.3-21 [2014 Mission Learning Report](#)
- I.B.3-22 [Institution-Set Standards Links on OIE website](#)
- I.B.3-23 [College Council Fall 2015 Retreat Minutes – 8/28/2015](#)
- I.B.3-24 [College Council Fall 2015 Retreat 2013-2018 Strategic Master Plan Performance Measures Update](#)
- I.B.3-25 [College Council Fall 2015 Retreat Recommendations for Priority Setting Handout, page 2](#)
- I.B.3-26 [LAMC Strategic Priorities for 2015-2016 Identified at College Council Fall 2015 Retreat](#)
- I.B.3-27 [Academic Program Review System Updates – Spring 2014, pages 4-7](#)
- I.B.3-28 [Academic Program Review System Updates – Spring 2015, pages 1-4](#)
- I.B.3-29 [Example Completed Program Review](#)
- I.B.3-30 [CTE Meeting Agenda – 3/10/2015](#)
- I.B.3-31 [Example Perkins IV CTE Core Indicator Employment Report for 2015-2016](#)

I.B.4

The institution uses assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- Assessment data constitute the foundation for Program Review*, learning outcomes assessment cycles, the ISSs*, the College’s Strategic Master Plan (SMP) and the implementation of Student Equity plans (I.B.4-1 through I.B.4-5), (I.B.4-13).
- Institutional processes are planned, evaluated, streamlined, and improved during regular cycles by the Program Review Oversight Committee* (PROC), the Strategic Enrollment Management Committee, LOAC*, the Student Equity Committee, and College Council at its annual retreats, and via the ISSs* review process (I.B.4-6 through I.B.4-11).
- Resource requests originate in Program Review* and their associated objectives must be linked to SMP goals, two of which are directly tied to student learning and/or achievement. Furthermore, there is a checkbox on the Program Review objectives screen to indicate whether an improvement objective (and any associated resource requests) is tied to improving SLO/PLO/SAO assessment results in that program – this information is taken into account in resource allocation decisions so as to achieve improvements in student learning (I.B.4-12), (I.B.4-13).
- Student and faculty/staff annual surveys provide assessment data for institutional planning processes that support student learning and achievement (I.B.4-14).

Analysis and Evaluation:

The Program Review* process requires all units to analyze and address student success and learning outcomes. To further assist disproportionately impacted groups, the Student Equity Committee examines disaggregated data across a variety of metrics and annually updates the Student Equity Plan (I.B.4-1), (I.B.4-2), (I.B.4-5), (I.B.4-9).

The College uses the guidelines of the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan (SEMP) in making decisions regarding course and program offerings to best serve the student population while achieving a robust FTES. Retention, persistence, degrees obtained, and transfer rates were all used in formulating the SEMP. The SEMP is aligned with both the Educational Master Plan* (EMP) as well as the SMP (I.B.4-15).

All of the College’s master plans and shared governance committees provide structure and processes to guide decision making and resource allocation for continual improvement in student learning and achievement. Funding requests are tied to achievement and learning outcome data as contextualized in Program Review* (I.B.4-1), (I.B.4-12), (I.B.4-16).

Los Angeles Mission College meets this standard.

LIST OF EVIDENCE

I.B.4-1 [Program Review Screenshots](#)

I.B.4-2 [Comprehensive Program Review Reports and Responses](#)

-
- I.B.4-3 [SLO, PLO and ILO Assessment Reports](#)
 - I.B.4-4 [2015 Institution - Set Standards Data](#)
 - I.B.4-5 [Student Equity Plan](#)
 - I.B.4-6 [Program Review Oversight Committee Agendas and Minutes](#)
 - I.B.4-7 [Strategic Enrollment Management Committee example minutes](#)
 - I.B.4-8 [LOAC Agendas and Minutes](#)
 - I.B.4-9 [Student Equity Committee Example Minutes](#)
 - I.B.4-10 [College Council Retreat Minutes](#)
 - I.B.4-11 [Process for Evaluation and Improvement of Institution-Set Standards for Student Achievement](#)
 - I.B.4-12 [Screenshot of Program Review screen for objectives and for resource requests](#)
 - I.B.4-13 [2013-2018 Strategic Master Plan](#)
 - I.B.4-14 [Student and Faculty/Staff Surveys \(see: LACCD District-wide Student Survey, LAMC Supplemental Student Services Survey, LAMC Faculty/Staff Survey, LAMC Student Survey\)](#)
 - I.B.4-15 [Strategic Enrollment Management Plan](#)
 - I.B.4-16 [College Planning Documents and Shared Governance Committees website](#)

Institutional Effectiveness

I.B.5

The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- The Program Review* process provides a comprehensive mechanism to gauge student achievement, evaluate student learning outcomes, and assess unit goals and objectives. Because all planning objectives originating in Program Review are linked to at least one of the Strategic Master Plan (SMP) goals, which are in turn derived from the College's Mission, the institution assesses the accomplishment of its mission through this annual evaluation process. In order to synthesize all of the Program Review assessment information into an evaluation at the institutional level, the PROC* developed a process whereby the Vice President of each College division summarizes that division's annual unit assessments into a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) report to PROC. PROC then synthesizes the information from the Vice Presidents' reports into an institution-level report to College Council, which identifies common themes and recommendations for institutional improvement. College Council takes these recommendations into account when setting the College's annual priorities (I.B.5-1 through I.B.5-10).
- The College Mission is further supported by the annual assessment of College performance on the ISSs*, the six college-wide SMP goals' performance outcomes, and the District Strategic Plan (DSP) performance objectives (I.B.5-8 through I.B.5-18).
- Learning outcomes at the course and program levels are directly tied to Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) which, in turn, are based on the College's Mission.

According to results of an assessment that used student survey data to assess four of the College's ILOs, students who had completed more units at LAMC felt they had more improvement on the ILOs compared to students who had completed less units, and the LOAC interpreted this as evidence that the institution is accomplishing its mission. Learning outcomes at all levels are re-assessed at least every three years (I.B.5-4), (I.B.5-19 through I.B.5-25).

- Assessment of SLOs and PLOs may also directly support the College's Mission. For example, part of the College's Mission is to "Ensure that students...prepare for successful careers in the workplace." In the class Multimedia 201 (Digital Editing), the SLO assessment resulted in having students keep a calendar of their production workflow. Students in turn completed the milestones within the allocated times and demonstrated an increase in the quality and professionalism of their work, and made use of the tools in all subsequent projects, including those in other classes (I.B.5-26).
- Quantitative and qualitative data are collected via annual student surveys for students in all program types and modes of delivery, and the results are disaggregated by student characteristics and delivery mode (I.B.5-27).
- Each program receives data in Program Review on student enrollment, success, and retention, which are disaggregated by demographic groups, mode of delivery, and time of day. The data are analyzed by each discipline, and objectives and resource requests may be developed based on gaps (I.B.5-28).
- Disaggregated data from the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) website also provides data by program type (basic skills, CTE, transfer, and general education) and delivery mode (I.B.5-29).
- The OIE* provides reports of success and retention rates for courses offered via online and/or hybrid formats compared to the success and retention rates for their face-to-face counterparts. These data are analyzed by the Distance Education* (DE) Committee (I.B.5-30), (I.B.5-31).
- See Standard I.B.6 for discussion of disaggregation of student learning outcomes data.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The institution monitors the fulfillment of its mission through its proprietary Program Review system*, the Vice Presidents' annual SWOT reports, assessment of College performance on the ISSs, SLO/PLO/ILO assessments, and the systematic evaluation of the goals and objectives stated in its Strategic Master Plan and the District Strategic Plan. Processes are in place so that improvements can be recommended to the appropriate parties when performance is found to fall short of expectations, and the College Council takes this information into account when setting annual College priorities in fulfillment of the College Mission (I.B.5-1 through I.B.5-26).

Quantitative and qualitative student survey data, Program Review data, and data in stand-alone reports further allow for analysis by program type and mode of delivery (I.B.5-27 through I.B.5-31).

Los Angeles Mission College meets this standard.

LIST OF EVIDENCE

- I.B.5-1 [Program Review Screenshots](#)
- I.B.5-2 [Screenshot of Program Review screen for objectives](#)
- I.B.5-3 [Comprehensive Program Review Reports and Responses](#)
- I.B.5-4 [LAMC Mission Statement](#)
- I.B.5-5 [Vice Presidents SWOT Reports to PROC](#)
- I.B.5-6 [PROC Report to College Council: Institution-wide Program Review Themes](#)
- I.B.5-7 [College Council Minutes 5/21/2015, page 3](#)
- I.B.5-8 [College Council Fall 2015 Retreat Minutes 8/28/2015](#)
- I.B.5-9 [College Council Fall 2015 Retreat Recommendations for Priority Setting Handout](#)
- I.B.5-10 [LAMC Strategic Priorities for 2015-2016 Identified at College Council Fall 2015 Retreat](#)
- I.B.5-11 [Process for Evaluation and Improvement of the Institution-Set Standards for Student Achievement](#)
- I.B.5-12 [Institution-Set Standards: LAMC Data Packet and state and District Comparison – Fall 2014](#)
- I.B.5-13 [Institution-Set Standards: LAMC Data Packet and state and District Comparison – Fall 2015](#)
- I.B.5-14 [Academic Senate Subcommittee Minutes 12/9/2014](#)
- I.B.5-15 [2014 Mission Learning Report](#)
- I.B.5-16 [2013-2018 LAMC Strategic Master Plan, Appendix 4](#)
- I.B.5-17 [College Council Fall 2015 Retreat 2014-2018 Strategic Master Plan Performance Measures Update](#)
- I.B.5-18 [Annual College Institutional Effectiveness Reports](#)
- I.B.5-19 [Institutional Learning Outcomes](#)
- I.B.5-20 [Screenshots showing how SLOs and PLOs are linked to ILOs](#)
- I.B.5-21 [Report on Disaggregated ILO Data](#)
- I.B.5-22 [LOAC Minutes 4/28/2015, item 6](#)
- I.B.5-23 [SLO Assessment Schedule](#)
- I.B.5-24 [PLO Master Assessment Schedule](#)
- I.B.5-25 [ILO Master Assessment Schedule](#)
- I.B.5-26 [Screenshot Showing SLO Assessment Related to College Mission](#)
- I.B.5-27 [Annual Student Surveys \(see: LACCD District-wide Student Survey-On-Campus and Distance Education Survey Results; LAMC Supplemental Student Services Survey\)](#)
- I.B.5-28 [Program Review screenshots of disaggregated data](#)
- I.B.5-29 [Example CCCCO Data Report by Program Type and Delivery Mode](#)
- I.B.5-30 [DE Success and Retention Comparison Report](#)
- I.B.5-31 [DE Program Three-Year Plan, pages 7-8](#)

I.B.6

The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- In fall 2014, the College revised its Student Equity Plan (SEP) to align itself with state mandates, and it evaluates and updates this plan on an annual basis. The SEP uses data to determine gaps in indicators of access and success (i.e., course success, basic skills progression, degree/certificate completion, and transfer) for subpopulations of students based on gender and ethnicity as well as, disability, veteran, foster youth, and income status. The Student Equity Committee formulates goals and activities to close the identified gaps (including identification of responsible parties, expected outcomes, and timelines), allocates resources accordingly, and evaluates the status of activities and expected outcomes. Programs receiving Student Equity funds are also asked to report on the status and success of equity activities annually in Program Review (I.B.6-1 through I.B.6-3).
- Data on enrollment, success, and retention are disaggregated in the annual Program Review screens by student age, gender, ethnicity, and primary language and by the time of day/mode of delivery in which the courses are offered. The data are analyzed by each discipline, and objectives and resource requests may be developed based on identified gaps. CTE programs, in particular, adhere to all data gathering requirements in accordance with the Federal Perkins program (I.B.6-4), (I.B.6-5).
- The STEM program regularly analyzes disaggregated achievement data to track its progress among disproportionately impacted groups (I.B.6-6), (I.B.6-7).
- Disaggregated survey data (based on student demographics and characteristics such as first-generation status and number of units completed) have been analyzed and reported by the OIE* and evaluated by LOAC* for five of the College's seven ILOs. Each ILO is also assessed individually by collecting authentic assessment data that are disaggregated and analyzed (I.B.6-8 through I.B.6-11).

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College uses disaggregated data to reduce performance gaps in a variety of ways. A main mechanism for identifying and addressing performance gaps is through the College's SEP. In addition, the STEM program has developed and implemented strategies to mitigate performance gaps for Hispanic students in STEM subject areas. The analysis of disaggregated data also helps to identify the needs of special populations in CTE programs and to ensure access and success for disproportionately impacted students (I.B.6-1 through I.B.6-7).

The College has also begun to analyze disaggregated learning outcome data, and it has incorporated this type of analysis into all of its authentic ILO assessments. Plans are also in place to disaggregate SLO, PLO, and ILO assessment results by sub-populations of students in the online SLO system, which already has the capacity and functionality for these types of analyses. Because data in the online SLO system are recorded by student ID number, all

that is required is programming to link the student ID numbers to the student demographic information from the student information system. The SLO Coordinators, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, Research Analyst, and IT Department have already met to discuss the necessary programming enhancements, which are expected to be completed by fall 2016 (I.B.6-8 through I.B.6-10), (I.B.6-12), (I.B.6-13).

While the College's ability to disaggregate data is fairly advanced and is expanding, it should increase training sessions in data analysis techniques for department chairs, vice chairs, and other interested faculty and staff.

Los Angeles Mission College meets the standard.

LIST OF EVIDENCE

- I.B.6-1 [2014 Student Equity Plan](#)
- I.B.6-2 [LAMC Student Equity Plan website](#)
- I.B.6-3 [Screenshot of Student Equity funds question in Program Review](#)
- I.B.6-4 [Program Review screenshots of disaggregated data](#)
- I.B.6-5 [CTE Perkins IV Report website](#) – see also [I.B.3-31](#)
- I.B.6-6 [LAMC STEM Narrative](#)
- I.B.6-7 [STEM 2014 Annual Performance Report, page 3-4, and 9-10](#)
- I.B.6-8 [Report on Disaggregated ILO Data](#)
- I.B.6-9 [LOAC Minutes 4/28/2015](#)
- I.B.6-10 [ILO Assessment Reports](#)
- I.B.6-11 [ILO Master Assessment Schedule](#)
- I.B.6-12 [Screenshot of Online SLO System showing assessment results recorded by student ID](#)
- I.B.6-13 [LOAC Minutes – 9/23/2015](#)

I.B.7

The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- All areas of the College, including academic programs, student and learning support services, and administrative units, undergo Program Review* to review and analyze their effectiveness (I.B.7-1).
- The Program Review Oversight Committee* (PROC) establishes, evaluates, continuously improves, and revises the Program Review policies and practices across the three College divisions (I.B.7-2).
- Outcome assessments, consisting of SLOs, PLOs, ILOs, and SAOs (service area outcomes) for instructional programs, student and learning support services, and

administrative services, provide an additional mechanism for all units to assess their effectiveness (I.B.7-3).

- Policies and practices pertaining to instructional programs and learning support services are established and evaluated under the purview of the Senate, shared governance and other committees, and the Office of Academic Affairs. EPC* (the Educational Planning Committee), LOAC* (the Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee), DE* (the Distance Education Committee), and SEM (the Strategic Enrollment Management Committee) are tasked respectively with the planning and evaluation of academic programs; overseeing and improving assessment practices; evaluating and implementing processes for distance education courses, and reviewing enrollment trends and establishing policies and practices to meet student needs (I.B.7-4 through I.B.7-9).
- To further ensure academic quality, the Curriculum Committee oversees, evaluates, and recommends “policies concerning curriculum, general education, graduation requirements, occupational certificate requirements, transfer requirements, academic standards, and related matters” in keeping with District and State policies, in addition to its core work in evaluating and approving course and program curriculum (I.B.7-10).
- An ad hoc Program Viability* committee may be formed by the Senate to assist in evaluating the adoption of a new program, discipline or department, or to conduct a study on substantial modifications to or discontinuance of an existing program. This process takes into consideration the program’s relation to the College’s Mission as one of the factors upon which to base its decision (I.B.7-11).
- Policies and practices pertaining to student services programs, established by the SSSC (Student Support Services Committee) are routinely evaluated through SAO assessments (I.B.7-12), (I.B.7-13).
- Policies and practices pertaining to administrative services programs and resource management are also evaluated through SAO assessments. The Budget and Planning Committee (BPC), the Technology Committee, and the Facilities Planning Committee are tasked respectively with budget and strategic planning and developing evaluation criteria within the budgeting and resource allocation process; overseeing, evaluating, and proposing technology policies; and evaluating and advising College Council regarding facilities planning (I.B.7-14 through I.B.7-16).
- Annual campus wide faculty/staff and student surveys are utilized to support the assessment of collegial governance and decision-making processes, institutional effectiveness, campus climate, student needs, and services provided to students, faculty, and staff. Survey results are used as a basis for college wide and programmatic improvement (via Program Review*) of policies and practices. To gain a more comprehensive understanding of survey results, the campus also utilizes focus groups with faculty/staff and students. The results of these evaluations have led to specific changes in College practices to support continuous improvement. For example, in order to improve campus communication and shared governance awareness, the campus community is now continuously kept aware of major campus activities and proceedings via emails from the College President (I.B.7-17 through I.B.7-21).
- The Shared Governance Oversight Committee (SGOC) annually evaluates the functions

of each of the shared governance committees and establishes shared governance policies and practices. The SGOC meets monthly to ensure that all committees are abiding by their charters, are aligned with the College Mission, and are actively participating in the process of planning and decision-making. At the end of each spring term, each shared governance committee completes an annual self-evaluation form. One question in the evaluation specifically asks the committee for suggestions on how to improve the College's shared governance process. The SGOC reviews each committee's complete self-evaluation and makes recommendations for improvement, and it also provides a summary report to College Council based on all of the committees' self-evaluations (I.B.7-22), (I.B.7-23).

Analysis and Evaluation:

Through various mechanisms and committees, the College regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all units to assure academic quality and alignment with its mission. Regular self-evaluation processes include Program Review*, faculty/staff and student surveys, focus groups, Vice Presidents' reports to PROC*, and governance committee self-evaluations. In addition, on the academic side, College Council and the Academic Senate are both active in evaluating policies and practices, and are assisted by the Office of Academic Affairs, the EPC, and other committees. In non-academic areas, College Council is assisted by Student Services and Administrative Services, and committees in those areas (I.B.7-1 through I.B.7-25).

Below are some recent examples of how regular evaluation of policies and practices via some of the mechanisms described above resulted in changes to improve academic quality and student achievement in accomplishment of the College's Mission:

- In fall 2013, recognizing the need to incorporate planned improvements in student outcomes into the resource request prioritization process, the BPC established the Rubric Task Force to review and revise the College's Overbase Request Rubric used to prioritize resource requests. What ultimately resulted was an enhanced process, established in 2014, that incorporated six new questions that each division must answer about each of the resource requests it submits to BPC for consideration. Furthermore, based on its analysis of the resource allocation model at the fall 2015 College Council Retreat, the College Council saw a need for a feedback mechanism such that each division that receives a resource based upon its answers to the new questions in the rubric will be required to illustrate the effects the resource had on improvement of SLO/SAO results, student achievement outcomes, and/or pursuit of the College's Strategic Master Plan goals and/or the program's objectives. Based on this feedback, BPC will be able to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of the resource allocation process in improving student learning and achievement and advancing the College's goals, objectives, and mission (I.B.7-26 through I.B.7-28).
- A change in policy/practice took place based on PROC's review of the Program Review and resource allocation timeline. It was found that division leadership did not feel they had enough time to thoroughly review their units' Program Reviews and provide substantial feedback, and campus constituents wanted more input into the prioritization of resource requests coming out of each division's annual Program Reviews. Thus,

in fall 2013, PROC proposed and the College Council approved a recommendation to move the College's annual Program Review update cycle to take place in the spring semester (rather than the fall semester) starting in spring 2014. This new timeline allows more time for each division's programs/units to reflect on their performance and project their needs farther in advance, and it allows more time for division leadership to perform Program Review evaluation and validation, to provide feedback, and to prioritize budget requests with proper input (I.B.7-29), (I.B.7-30).

- The restructuring of the Professional Studies department and the transfer of some of its disciplines to other departments in fall 2015 stemmed from the department's spring 2014 comprehensive Program Review and the Senate's Viability Study*. These changes were made to improve academic quality in these disciplines by having them placed under departments which better reflect faculty expertise in those areas. The effects of these changes will be evaluated by EPC* during the next cycle of comprehensive Program Review* (I.B.7-31), (I.B.7-32).

Los Angeles Mission College meets this standard.

LIST OF EVIDENCE

- I.B.7-1 [LAMC Program Review Structure Chart](#)
- I.B.7-2 [PROC Charter, Agendas, and Minutes](#)
- I.B.7-3 [Outcomes Assessments and Reports website](#)
- I.B.7-4 [Academic Senate website](#)
- I.B.7-5 [EPC Charter, Agendas, and Minutes](#)
- I.B.7-6 [LOAC Charter, Agendas, and Minutes](#)
- I.B.7-7 [DE Charge, Agendas, and Minutes](#)
- I.B.7-8 [SEM Example Minutes](#)
- I.B.7-9 [Strategic Enrollment Management Plan](#)
- I.B.7-10 [Curriculum Committee Charter, Agendas, and Minutes](#)
- I.B.7-11 [Program Viability Review Process](#)
- I.B.7-12 [Student Support Services Committee website](#)
- I.B.7-13 [Student Service Area Outcomes \(SSAO\) Assessment website](#)
- I.B.7-14 [Budget and Planning Committee Charter, Agendas, and Minutes](#)
- I.B.7-15 [Technology Committee Charter, Agendas, and Minutes](#)
- I.B.7-16 [Facilities Planning Committee Charter, Agendas, and Minutes](#)
- I.B.7-17 [Annual Faculty/Staff and Student Surveys](#)
- I.B.7-18 [Fall 2014 Focus Group Information](#)
- I.B.7-19 Fall 2014 Focus Group Summaries – [Classified](#), [Supervisors](#), [Faculty](#), and [Department Chairs](#)
- I.B.7-20 [Email from College President summarizing College Council Recommendations based on Fall 2014 Focus Groups](#)
- I.B.7-21 [Selected Informational Emails from College President](#)
- I.B.7-22 [SGOC Charter, Agendas and Minutes](#)
- I.B.7-23 [SGOC website with Posted Reports](#)

-
- I.B.7-24 [Vice Presidents' SWOT Reports to PROC](#)
 - I.B.7-25 [PROC Report to College Council: Institution-wide Program Review Themes](#)
 - I.B.7-26 [B&P Minutes establishing Rubric Task Force](#)
 - I.B.7-27 [Rubric with 6 new questions for resource requests](#)
 - I.B.7-28 [College Council Fall 2015 Retreat Minutes – 8/28/2015](#)
 - I.B.7-29 [PROC Minutes on changing PR timeline](#)
 - I.B.7-30 [College Council Minutes reflecting approval of change in PR timeline – 12/19/2013, page 2](#)
 - I.B.7-31 Professional Studies Spring 2014 CPR [Report](#) and [Response](#)
 - I.B.7-32 [Senate Department Reorganization Study Report](#)

I.B.8

The institution broadly communicates the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- The College leadership regularly disseminates information via the following venues:
 - Annual College Effectiveness Report to the LACCD Board of Trustees regarding the College's performance on the student outcome measures in the District Strategic Plan (DSP) (I.B.8-1).
 - The annual Mission Learning Report*, which documents the College's overall progress in improving student achievement and student learning at all levels through the outcomes cycle. The report is discussed in committee meetings and is posted on both the SLO and Institutional Effectiveness websites (I.B.8-2 through I.B.8-4).
 - Annual College Council Retreats serve to evaluate progress on Strategic Master Plan goals, identify strengths and weaknesses, and prioritize areas of focus for the next academic year (I.B.8-5).
 - Evaluation and assessment information updates on Flex Day, Spring into Spring, SLO Summits/Retreats, and town hall meetings (I.B.8-6 through I.B.8-9).
 - Annual performance report on the ISS*s at the Council of Instruction, EPC*, Academic Senate, and College Council (I.B.8-10 through I.B.8-14).
 - Annual strength/weaknesses/opportunities/threats (SWOT) analysis of the College's three divisions (instruction, student services, and administrative services) based on the major themes found in each division's Program Reviews. The SWOT reports are shared with PROC*, which synthesizes the information into an institution-level report. This report is used by College Council in setting annual College priorities (I.B.8-15 through I.B.8-20).
- The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE*) collects and provides assessment and evaluation data which are made public on the College website via static and interactive reports (I.B.8-21).
- Assessment and evaluation data collected on learning and service area outcomes assessment, comprehensive Program Review* reports and validations, and all accreditation-related information are also prominently posted on the College's website (I.B.8-22 through I.B.8-25).

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College broadly communicates the results of its assessments and evaluations both internally and to the public. This information is disseminated through campus events, committee and town hall meetings, reports to the Board of Trustees, Program Review* reports, the Mission Learning Report*, and the College website.

Los Angeles Mission College meets this standard.

LIST OF EVIDENCE

- I.B.8-1 [College Institutional Effectiveness Reports](#)
- I.B.8-2 [2014 Mission Learning Report](#)
- I.B.8-3 [Mission Learning Report Link on OIE website](#)
- I.B.8-4 [Mission Learning Report Link on SLO website](#)
- I.B.8-5 [College Council Retreat Agendas and Minutes](#)
- I.B.8-6 [Flex Day Agendas](#)
- I.B.8-7 [Spring into Spring Agendas](#)
- I.B.8-8 [SLO Summits](#)
- I.B.8-9 [Town Hall Meeting Videos and Presentations](#)
- I.B.8-10 [Academic Senate Subcommittee Minutes – 12/9/2014](#)
- I.B.8-11 [Council of Instruction Minutes – 3/4/2015](#)
- I.B.8-12 [EPC Minutes – 3/16/2015](#)
- I.B.8-13 [Academic Senate Minutes – 6/4/2015, page 6, 7th bullet](#)
- I.B.8-14 [College Council Minutes – 6/18/2015, page 3](#)
- I.B.8-15 [Vice Presidents’ SWOT Reports to PROC](#)
- I.B.8-16 [PROC Report to College Council: Institution-wide Program Review Themes](#)
- I.B.8-17 [College Council Minutes – 5/21/2015, page 3](#)
- I.B.8-18 [College Council Fall 2015 Retreat Minutes – 8/28/2015](#)
- I.B.8-19 [College Council Fall 2015 Retreat Recommendations for Priority Setting Handout, page 1](#)
- I.B.8-20 [LAMC Strategic Priorities for 2015-2016 Identified at College Council Fall 2015 Retreat](#)
- I.B.8-21 [OIE website](#)
- I.B.8-22 [SLO Assessments and Reports website](#)
- I.B.8-23 [EPC CPR Reports and Validations](#)
- I.B.8-24 [SSSC CPR Reports and Validations](#)
- I.B.8-25 [Accreditation website](#)

I.B.9

The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short-

and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources. (ER19)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Continuous and systematic evaluation of the College's success in accomplishing its mission and improving institutional effectiveness and academic quality occurs across the institution. Such evaluation informs a continuous, broad-based planning process:

- OIE* serves as the center for research and evaluation at the College and is actively involved in the implementation and continuous improvement of a comprehensive, systematic program of research, evaluation, and assessment of College processes and effectiveness at all levels (I.B.9-1), (I.B.9-2).
- Program Review* (PR) serves as the primary instrument for program-level evaluation, short- and long-term planning, and allocation of human, physical, technology, and financial resources. It is a campus-wide process aimed at improvement of institutional effectiveness, academic quality, and accomplishment of the College Mission Statement (I.B.9-3).
 - The College's PR cycle includes both annual reports and in-depth comprehensive reports every three years. Each program or unit completes an annual self-evaluation based on evidence, including student academic and/or unit performance, outcomes assessment, changes designed to improve student learning (based on prior years' outcomes assessments), and improvements in student learning as a result of the changes made (I.B.9-4).
 - Each program develops objectives in PR to improve its own effectiveness based on its self-evaluation, each of which must be aligned with one or more of the College's strategic goals, which, in turn, are aligned with the College Mission Statement (I.B.9-5).
 - The annual Program Reviews are examined and evaluated by the appropriate division's deans and/or Vice President, who then provide feedback to the chairs/supervisors (I.B.9-6).
 - In addition, the Vice President of each College division summarizes that division's annual PR unit assessments into an overall SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) report to PROC*. PROC then synthesizes the information from the Vice Presidents' reports into an institution-level report to College Council, which identifies common themes and recommendations for institutional improvement. College Council takes these recommendations into account when setting the College's annual priorities (I.B.9-7 through I.B.9-12).
 - Every three years, programs/units complete a more in-depth Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) and validation process. Academic disciplines must complete a three-year plan for improvement as part of their CPR. Upon completion, each program's/unit's performance and planning are discussed with the Educational Planning Committee (for academic disciplines) or Student Support Services Committee (for the student services division). Those committees then submit a formal response, including recommendations and commendations, to each program/unit. PROC* has been in discussions about a format/process for CPR in the Administrative Services division as well (I.B.9-13 through I.B.9-19).
 - Program Review* is the initial step in requesting the allocation of financial resources as well as the primary avenue whereby resource allocations are directly

ted to planning. All new requests for funding (whether for educational programs, support services, or human, physical, technological, or other financial resources) must originate in PR and be tied to a PR objective. The budget requests made in Program Review are prioritized by the appropriate administrative division and are then reviewed by the relevant shared governance committee before being forwarded to the Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) for final prioritization (which uses an established process for prioritization) and recommendation to College Council (I.B.9-3), (I.B.9-20 through I.B.9-23).

- Each program/unit can request the short- and long-range human resources needed (including faculty, staff, and administrative) to better provide service and enhance institutional effectiveness in PR. Requests for faculty hires also go through review and prioritization by the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee (I.B.9-20), (I.B.9-24 through I.B.9-26).
- The College reviews its physical resource needs on an annual basis through the Facilities Planning Committee and via PR. Requests for increased space, additional equipment, and/or other physical resources are considered during these reviews and are prioritized by means of the resource allocation process. The scheduled maintenance and Five-Year Construction Plan (SMSR 5YP) is updated annually and guides the multi-year facilities maintenance program (I.B.9-20), (I.B.9-27), (I.B.9-28).
- New technology funding requests also must originate in PR. Funding requests are guided by the Technology Master Plan and the Technology Replacement Plan (which includes a comprehensive set of budgetary recommendations for technology that is acquired through both grant funding and the College's general fund) which includes the short- and long-term costs to maintain, upgrade, and support the College's technology infrastructure (I.B.9-20), (I.B.9-29), (I.B.9-30).
- The College also engages in campus-wide evaluation and planning on a regular basis through its master plans and other plans/activities as required by the State (e.g., Student Equity Plan, Student Success and Support Program Plan) and external initiatives (e.g., Achieving the Dream). The shared governance and other committees responsible for these plans provide a direct avenue for all constituents to voice opinions and provide recommendations on the College's planning processes (I.B.9-31 through I.B.9-35).
- College Council Retreats provide a venue to evaluate the College's overall performance by reviewing the various master plans and data on the Strategic Master Plan (SMP) performance measures. College Council subsequently recommends steps to improve institutional effectiveness (I.B.9-12), (I.B.9-36).

Analysis and Evaluation:

LAMC's campus-wide Program Review* (PR) process enables the College to monitor the implementation of program/unit objectives, evaluate contributions made toward meeting the College strategic goals, and evaluate institutional progress in improving student learning and achievement. This is an important way in which the College maintains institutional effectiveness and quality and plans for short- and long-range needs. PR is also the main mechanism by which requests for technology, physical resources, personnel, and other financial resources are made, and these requests

go through a thorough prioritization process in each division before final prioritization by the BPC and recommendation to College Council. Resource requests are prioritized to most effectively benefit students and support their learning. In this way, this integrated process of Program Review, planning, and resource allocation supports attainment of the College Mission Statement, which is focused on student success (I.B.9-3 through I.B.9-5) and (I.B.9-13 through I.B.9-23).

Broad-based evaluation and planning also occurs in shared governance and other committees and is supported by the OIE*. All campus constituents are represented on the College's shared governance committees. Furthermore, the committee structure at the College provides a direct avenue for campus members to participate in planning processes (I.B.9-1), (I.B.9-2), (I.B.9-31).

The College's various planning documents, such as its master plans and plans supporting particular initiatives, are aligned with the SMP, address the institution's short- and long-term needs in specific areas, and help guide how funds allotted to those areas are spent. These plans are reviewed and evaluated on a regular basis. The annual College Council retreat provides an opportunity to evaluate these plans in the context of the College's Mission and strategic priorities (I.B.9-28), (I.B.9-31 through I.B.9-36).

Planning processes at the College are sound but their implementation could be improved upon. Specifically, the alignment of the multitude of planning documents with the College's SMP has proved to be a challenge and has caused confusion across the campus. Indeed, according to the LAMC Fall 2014 Faculty/Staff Survey, less than half of respondents (45 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that "The College's planning and resource allocation process is clearly defined," and another 36 percent of respondents selected "neither agree nor disagree" for this statement, perhaps reflecting their lack of knowledge and/or awareness in this area (I.B.9-37). The consolidation of some plans into one document would simplify the overall planning process, allow for improved integration across the three divisions of the College, and facilitate the evaluation of the efficacy of resource allocations as they relate to student achievement and success. Furthermore, the complexity of the College's current planning processes and timelines have made alignment to each other and to Accreditation Standards challenging. (This topic will be further explored in the Quality Focus Essay.)

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Beginning in spring 2016, the College will improve the integration of its planning processes and documents as described in the QFE.

In addition, beginning in spring 2017, the Budget and Planning Committee will integrate assessment of the effectiveness of allocated resources by requiring all fund recipients to conduct and submit an evaluation on the efficacy of the expenditures in meeting the objectives of the program. This evaluative process will help close the loop on integrated planning.

Los Angeles Mission College meets this standard.

LIST OF EVIDENCE

- I.B.9-1 [OIE Website](#)
- I.B.9-2 [OIE Research Calendar](#)
- I.B.9-3 [Annual Program Review Cycle Diagram](#)
- I.B.9-4 [Selected Program Review Examples](#)
- I.B.9-5 [Program Review Template for Creating a Program Objective](#)
- I.B.9-6 [Deans' Program Review SWOT Analyses](#)
- I.B.9-7 [Vice Presidents' SWOT Reports to PROC](#)
- I.B.9-8 [PROC Report to College Council: Institution-wide Program Review Themes](#)
- I.B.9-9 [College Council Minutes – 5/21/2015, page 3](#)
- I.B.9-10 [College Council Fall 2015 Retreat Minutes – 8/28/2015](#)
- I.B.9-11 [College Council Fall 2015 Retreat Recommendations for Priority Setting Handout, page 1](#)
- I.B.9-12 [LAMC Strategic Priorities for 2015-2016 Identified at College Council Fall 2015 Retreat](#)
- I.B.9-13 [Academic CPR Cycle 2013-2016](#)
- I.B.9-14 [Academic CPR Validation Rubric](#)
- I.B.9-15 [EPC CPR Reports and Validations](#)
- I.B.9-16 [Student Services 3-Year CPR Cycle Chart](#)
- I.B.9-17 [Student Services CPR Validation Rubric](#)
- I.B.9-18 [Student Services CPR Reports and Validations](#)
- I.B.9-19 [PROC minutes reflecting discussion of Admin. Services CPRs](#)
- I.B.9-20 [Program Review Template for Creating a Resource Request](#)
- I.B.9-21 [Resource Request Rubric for Prioritization by B&P Committee](#)
- I.B.9-22 [B&P Committee Overbase Request Prioritization Tally Sheet](#)
- I.B.9-23 [College Council Action Item on Overbase Rankings](#)
- I.B.9-24 [Program Review Screen on Staffing](#)
- I.B.9-25 [FHPC Application](#)
- I.B.9-26 [FHPC Ranking Criteria](#)
- I.B.9-27 [Facilities Planning Committee Website](#)
- I.B.9-28 [SMSR Five-Year Plan](#)
- I.B.9-29 [Technology Master Plan](#)
- I.B.9-30 [Technology Replacement Plan](#)
- I.B.9-31 [College Planning Documents website with links to Master Plans](#)
- I.B.9-32 [Student Equity Plan](#)
- I.B.9-33 [Student Success and Support Program Plan](#)
- I.B.9-34 [Essential Skills Committee Website](#)
- I.B.9-35 [Achieving the Dream Committee Website](#)
- I.B.9-36 [College Council Retreat Agendas and Minutes](#)
- I.B.9-37 [LAMC Fall 2014 Faculty/Staff Survey Results, page 15](#)