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STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

In preparation for submitting this midterm report, the college solicited information and evidence from the following individuals: Janice Silver, Co-Chair of the Educational Planning Committee and Shared Governance Task Force; Maury Pearl, Dean of Institutional Research, Planning and Information Technology and Co-Chair of Technology; Pat Flood Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator, Dr. Angela Echeverri, Academic Senate President; Joe Ramirez, Vice President of Student Services, and Co-Chair of the Student Support Services Committee and College Council; Leslie Milke, Co-Chair of College Council, Shared Governance Task Force, and Budget and Planning Committee; Dr. Karen Hoefel, Vice President of Administrative Services and Co-Chair of Budget and Planning and Facilities Committees; Walter Bortman, Facilities Co-Chair; Alma Johnson-Hawkins, Vice President of Academic Affairs and Educational Planning Committee Co-Chair; Nadia Swerdlow, Academic Affairs Dean; David Jordan, Technology Co-Chair; Vilma Bernal, Professional Development Co-Chair; Deborah Kaye, District Accreditation Liaison; Gary Colombo, Vice Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness, and Dr. Judith Valles, College President. The narrative was edited and the final report compiled by Pat Flood and Angela Echeverri, Faculty Accreditation Co-Chairs for the self study.

The report was reviewed and approved by the college Academic Senate on February 18, 2010 and by the College Council, the college’s primary shared governance body, on February 18, 2010.
On February 24, 2010, the Board of Trustees’ Committee on Planning and Student Success heard a presentation from the college and approved the Midterm Report.

All of the Board members received copies of the report prior to the meeting.

__________________________________________________

Dr. Judith Valles, President, Los Angeles Mission College
RESPONSES TO TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS AND THE COMMISSION ACTION LETTER

Recommendation 1: Campus Relationships
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.2, IV.2.a, IV.3, IV.5).

As reported in the Los Angeles Mission College 2008 Accreditation Progress Report (1.1), after receiving the accreditation team’s final evaluation report in July 2007, a leadership retreat was held July 27 to review and plan strategies to address the college’s response to the recommendations (1.2). Areas that were discussed included strategic goal development, program review (unit assessment) and planning, and the linkage of program review to college educational strategic goals and resources, shared governance, and the college fiscal outlook and issues.

In September of 2007, the Academic Senate invited all interested faculty to participate in an accreditation steering committee meeting to discuss how best to respond to the accreditation recommendations and to develop action plans (1.3). The recommendations were divided into three major areas: collegiality and shared governance, planning and accountability, and student learning outcomes and assessment. Task forces were formed for each area. The Collegiality and Shared Governance Task Force members were asked to do research and to provide suggested language for a code of conduct statement. Several task force members proposed language for the statement, and early drafts were circulated widely.

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 (1.4). 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 (1.5). 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.

Other accomplishments and highlights of the 2007 campus-wide retreat are listed below:

- The role of the Shared Governance Task Force and the process for writing the charters for all shared governance committees was discussed.
- During a Planning and Accountability breakout, a draft of the new template for program review (unit assessment) was presented and the components were discussed along with
how to integrate the process with budget and planning to improve institutional effectiveness. The group agreed that the template which was developed for the academic units could be easily modified for non-instructional units. Time frames for the unit effectiveness review and operational planning were discussed and suggestions made to align these two processes. It was further recommended that the Educational Planning, Student Services, Facilities, and Budget and Planning Committees begin to develop timelines for collecting, organizing, and prioritizing resource requests to align with the operational planning calendar.

- An update as to the progress on Student Learning Outcomes was presented. The importance of accelerating this process was emphasized and handouts were distributed to assist in developing SLOs, assessments, and rubrics. A presentation was given on eLumen, a database program to assist with SLOs and assessment. A handout from the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) concerning the role of SLOs in faculty evaluation was distributed.

The College Code of Conduct was presented to the Academic Senate at its November 1 meeting (1.6) and approved at the December 6, 2007 meeting (1.7) with minor modifications. It was approved unanimously by the College Council at its December 20, 2007 meeting (1.8) 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 (1.9). While violations to this code have not occurred since its approval, any staff member displaying unprofessional and or uncivil behavior could be referred to human resources for violating District standards of professionalism as delineated in LACCD Personnel Guide policies B474 and B476 (1.10). In order to ensure that this information is regularly shared with all constituent groups within the educational community, the Code of Conduct and the Shared Governance Committee Charters have been posted on the college website.

A change in the campus e-mail policy was also instituted during the summer of 2007 which restricted distributing e-mail messages to the entire campus without prior approval from an administrator (1.11). This change eliminated the practice of sending blanket e-mails to attack or criticize decisions or individuals. In addition, the college president on multiple occasions made it very clear that there would be zero tolerance for inappropriate e-mails, public comments, and behavior. In the three years that have transpired since the 2007 self study, campus climate and collegiality have improved in a sustainable and significant manner.

**Evidence:**
1.1 Los Angeles Mission College (LAMC) 2008 Accreditation Progress Report
1.2 LAMC Leadership Retreat PowerPoint presentation, July 27, 2007
1.3 Accreditation Steering Committee meeting agenda, September 25, 2007
1.4 LAMC Retreat Agenda and Minutes, October 5, 2007
1.5 LAMC Code of Conduct
1.6 Academic Senate Minutes November 1, 2007
1.7 Academic Senate Minutes December 6, 2007
1.8 College Council Minutes December 20, 2007
1.9 College Council Minutes September 17, 2009
Recommendation 2: College Governance
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).

As reported in the Los Angeles Mission College 2009 Accreditation Follow-up Report (2.1), 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 shared governance 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. (See Chart 1.)

During 2008 and 2009 the shared governance committees met on a regular basis. Committee charters, agendas, and minutes are posted on the college website (2.1, 2.2, 2.3). The standing committees submit monthly reports to the College Council (2.2). The College Council meets the third Thursday of each month and is co-chaired by an administrator and a faculty member. Committees submit recommendations to College Council as necessary, which are then voted upon by the Council and are forwarded to the President for final decision before implementation. The membership of College Council includes representatives from all major constituency groups: administrators, faculty, classified staff, and students (2.3). The co-chairs of the six
standing committees are members of College Council; each standing committee has one administrative co-chair and one faculty or staff co-chair. All faculty appointments to the standing committees are made either by the Academic Senate or AFT. College Council and all the standing committees have regular meeting times and places and established memberships. All meetings are open to the public and student representation is encouraged.

Table 1: Los Angeles Mission College Shared Governance Committees with Meeting Times and Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Regular Meeting Time and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Council</td>
<td>Third Thursday at 1:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Center Room 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Planning</td>
<td>First Thursday at 12:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Center Room 2 or 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Planning</td>
<td>First and Third Mondays at 1:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Center Room 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support Services</td>
<td>Third Tuesday at 1:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Services Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Second and Fourth Wednesdays at 12:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative Studies Building Room 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Staff Development</td>
<td>First Thursday at 12:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative Studies Building Room 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Planning</td>
<td>Second Thursday at 12:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSB Conference Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Functions: In the fall of 2007, the Shared Governance Task Force made recommendations to College Council defining the charge, function, and membership of the shared governance committees. Each committee developed a charter based on these recommendations, which was approved by College Council. The charters specify the following areas of responsibility of each committee.

College Council:
- Review, revise and approve college mission and goals and recommend that the College President send them to the LACCD Board of Trustees 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 member constituents.
• Provide recommendations to the college president on college matters and through the College President to the District on District matters.
• Oversee college responses to all accreditation recommendations.

Budget and Planning Committee
• Develop budget procedures, policies, guidelines and timelines.
• Regularly report to College Council on current budget status and when necessary, the need to reduce expenditures.
• Review and prioritize budget and funding requests.
• Make budgetary recommendations to balance the budget.
• Oversee the development of college responses to all budget and planning related accreditation recommendations.
• Develop benchmarks for the evaluation and assessment of budget expenditures.

Educational Planning Committee
• Develop, update and oversee the implementation of the Educational Master Plan.
• Oversee Program Review (Unit Assessment) and SLO development in Academic areas.
• Integrate results of Program Reviews into the Educational Master Plan.
• Oversee the college responses to any educationally related accreditation recommendations.
• Oversee viability review of educational programs.
• Oversee planning, implementation and assessment of all academic areas including: Credit, Noncredit, Specially Funded Programs, Basic Skills, and Distance Education.
• Develop prioritization criteria for the allocation of instructional resources.
• Prioritize and make recommendations to the Budget and Planning Committee for the allocation of resources to the academic units.
• Receive and prioritize requests for Instructional Equipment funds and forward recommendations to the Budget and Planning Committee.

Student Support Services Committee
• Make recommendations to facilitate the Enrollment Management process.
• Review and evaluate the campus-wide student services that are provided to LAMC’s student population.
• Review and evaluate all student activities related to the purpose of the committee.
• Develop benchmarks for the evaluation and assessment of enrollment growth and student satisfaction.
• Review the Student Services Program Review process.

Technology Committee
• Develop, update, and oversee the implementation of the Technology Master Plan.
 • Study, review, advise, and recommend policies and procedures relating to institutional technology.
• Provide a structure and process for identifying and evaluating emerging technologies for possible benefit to the college.
• Identify, prioritize, and review technology needs with regard to network infrastructure, staffing, funding, and equipment capacities.
• Ensure compliance with accessibility standards for all students, including those with disabilities.
• Coordinate with Shared Governance and other college standing committees.

Professional and Staff Development Committee
• Provide faculty, administration, and classified staff the opportunity to maximize their professional and personal development through a planned program of activities and resources that support the mission and goals of the college (Staff Development Plan 8/5/97).
• Ensure that opportunities for professional growth are made available to faculty, staff and administrators under the guidelines of AB 1725.(Ed. Code 87150)
• Responsible for training and professional development of staff, classified, and faculty.

Facilities Planning Committee
- Oversee college facilities planning.
- Review college facilities master plan and educational master plan for consistency.
- Recommend new facilities projects.
- Review and make recommendations on the college’s scheduled maintenance program (SMP process).
- Recommend SLOs and facilities management Program Review (previously called unit assessment) measures.
- Review college facilities use policies and procedures.
- Assist in the development of facilities maintenance standards, staffing requirements, and quality control for all college facilities.
- Review projects and make recommendations on priorities for bond funded facilities.
- Stay apprised of Work Environment Committee recommendations to College Council.

As a result of the shared governance committee evaluations (see Recommendation 3 below), which are performed twice a year at the end of the spring and fall semesters, the charters have been revised as needed to further refine the areas of responsibility of each committee.

Evidence:
2.1 Los Angeles Mission College Accreditation Follow-up Report
2.2 www.lamission.edu
2.2 Charters of shared governance committees

Recommendation 3: Evaluation and Effectiveness of Governance Committees
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).
As reported in the Los Angeles Mission College 2009 Accreditation Follow-up Report (2.1), in May of 2007 the College Council established the Shared Governance Task Force to oversee the new shared governance committees and monitor their effectiveness and integrity (3.1). 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 (3.2) and recommended that the six standing committees reporting to College Council perform a yearly self-evaluation beginning in spring 2008 (3.3). The self-evaluation was completed during the spring semester 2008 and 2009 (3.4). The Shared Governance Task Force reviewed the self-evaluations and provided a written summary at the May 2008 and May 2009 College Council meetings (3.5).

Table 2: Summary of Two Self-Evaluations by Los Angeles Mission College Shared Governance Committees (Performed in 2008 and 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Planning</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Planning</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support Services</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>Partially/Yes</td>
<td>None listed/Goals in development</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>Partially/Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Staff Development</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>Partially/Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Planning</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Partially</td>
<td>Yes/Charter under review</td>
<td>Yes/Membership under review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the spring of 2008, most of the committees were meeting on a regular basis and had full memberships. The majority of the committees had begun to prioritize their goals based on their charters and had begun to accomplish some of these goals. However, it took some of the committees a few months to establish a full regular membership due in part to several faculty retirements, transfers, and leaves. By 2008 all of the committees had full memberships according to the charter guidelines.

Based on the self-evaluation performed in May 2008, a number of recommendations were made by the task force at the May 2008 College Council meeting. The recommendations and their status are summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Governance Task Force Recommendations (May, 2008 and May 2009)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete Program Review (Unit Assessments) for all other units on campus in the next year to ultimately establish a clear link between budget and planning. This will better enable the Budget and Planning Committee to fully incorporate budget allocation processes.</td>
<td>Completion dates of Program Reviews: Academic, Spring 08; Student Services, Winter 09; Administrative Services, Spring 09.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a regular meeting of the co-chairs of all the shared governance committees. This will assist in understanding the relationships among the committees. Currently the linkages between the shared governance committees are not clearly delineated.</td>
<td>Since Fall 2008, committee co-chairs have met monthly before College Council meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each committee should continue to be vigilant in monitoring memberships. The replacement or reappointments of the one-year terms should be completed by June 15.</td>
<td>AFT and Senate appointments are made every June or as vacancies arise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Council should be responsible for monthly committee updates to the campus community indicating any action items that have been adopted by College Council.</td>
<td>College President and administration have held monthly Town Hall Meetings since Fall 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Co-Chair of College Council should be in place before the beginning of July of 2008.</td>
<td>A faculty co-chair was elected in Summer 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Council should also prepare a self-evaluation of this past year to be placed in the task force files.</td>
<td>Completed January 2009.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the committee self-evaluations were completed in May 2008, the need for additional information on the effectiveness of the committees became apparent. As a result, in the fall of 2008 the Shared Governance Task Force developed a comprehensive external evaluation instrument (3.6) to be completed by teams of two individuals not sitting on the committees being evaluated. The evaluation instrument was presented and discussed at the November and December 2008 College Council meetings (3.7). The evaluation teams reviewed each committee’s minutes, agendas, and charters and cross referenced this information with College Council minutes and the College Strategic Plan. The first part of the evaluation examined the frequency of meetings, member participation, and reports and recommendations to College Council. The second part of the evaluation included the following questions and information.

1. Is the committee charter posted on the campus website?
2. Are agendas distributed 72 hours in advance of meeting?
3. List the major discussion and information items (Attach additional sheets if necessary).
4. List action items.
5. List recommendations to College Council, Budget and Planning, or some other body. What were the outcomes? (Approved, Pending, or other)
6. Are committee actions and recommendations consistent with the college strategic plan? (Specify how—which goals and objectives are addressed?)
7. Are committee actions and recommendations consistent with the committee’s charter?
8. Based on this evaluation, does the committee charter need to be reviewed?
9. What are some of the committee challenges?
10. Commendations and recommendations:

The two-member teams completed their first round of committee evaluations in January 2009 (3.8), and the Shared Governance Task Force met to formulate preliminary recommendations to increase the effectiveness of the governance process. These recommendations were submitted to College Council on February 5, 2009 (3.9) and were placed on the agenda for the regular February 19 College Council meeting. 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. Below is a table summarizing the external evaluations for 2008 and a written summary for each committee. External evaluations for 2009 are in progress and will be completed spring 2010.

Table 4: Summary of External Evaluations of Los Angeles Mission College Shared Governance Committees (Performed in December, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Number of Meetings in 2008</th>
<th>Average Number of Members per Meeting</th>
<th>Average Number of Attendees per Meeting</th>
<th>Regular Reports to College Council</th>
<th>Recommendations or Action Items to College Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Council</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Planning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Planning</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Staff</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College Council** elected a faculty co-chair in August 2008. The committee met nine times in 2008 and ten times in 2009. The Council received monthly reports from all six standing
committees, as well as the SLO Coordinator, Accreditation Co-Chairs, Work Environment Committee, Shared Governance Task Force, Campus Project Manager, and the College President. The Council also received and acted upon recommendations from the Educational Planning and Budget and Planning Committees. Major discussion and information items included facility and technology updates, accreditation, Student Learning Outcomes, Basic Skills Initiative, Program Review, ASO activities, the College Strategic Plan, and the Budget and Planning Document. The College Council held a leadership retreat in August 2008 (3.10) at which the framework for the College Strategic Plan was developed. The College Council action items included approval of instructional equipment funds, the Strategic Plan, January 15, 2009 (3.11, 3.12) the Budget and Planning Document (3.13), and the Basic Skills Matrix (3.14).

The Budget and Planning Committee met seven times in 2008 and nine times in 2009. The co-chairs reported regularly to College Council. The committee members participated in the Program Review validation process of the academic units. The committee reviewed requests for additional funds that were part of the Program Review process and made recommendations on allocations which were subsequently approved by the Council and the College President. This is an example of a clear linkage between the planning and budget processes. They also requested and received budget presentations from categorical and specially funded programs. Important discussion items included development of a process for approving new grant proposals and institutionalization of the Math Center currently funded by a Title V grant. The committee developed a comprehensive Budget and Planning document which was presented to the Academic Senate and approved by College Council in December 2008 (3.13).

The Educational Planning Committee (EPC) met twenty times in 2008 and eighteen times in 2009. The co-chairs reported regularly to College Council. Some of the major discussion items included the update of the Educational Master Plan, departmental reorganization, Student Learning Outcomes, accreditation, the College Strategic Plan, revision of AA Degrees, institutionalization of the Math Center, enrollment management, faculty hiring, instructional equipment funds, Basic Skills Initiative, Career Technical Education (CTE) innovation fund for vocational programs, the Budget and Planning document, and Program Review and the validation process of academic areas. The following department chairs gave Program Review presentations beginning in the fall of 2008: Life Sciences, Physical Sciences, Business and Law, English, Professional Studies, and Social Sciences. Validation, approval, and responses to academic Program Reviews were completed during the fall 2008. The remaining seven departments made presentations in 2009: Arts, Health, and P.E.; Developmental Communications; ESL; Learning Resource Center; Library; Math and Computer Science; and Chicano Studies and Foreign Languages.

The EPC approved the following action items: Basic Skills Planning Matrices, revision and approval of compliant AA Degree, the reorganization of the Natural Sciences Department into Life Sciences and Physical Sciences, and the update of the Educational Master Plan (EMP). In the external evaluation the committee received commendations for its excellent participation, attendance, and organization, addressing a wide range of academic issues, being action oriented, and developing a meaningful program review process which is tied to institutional planning. The committee also was very successful in providing a collegial and objective forum in which to discuss the reorganization of academic departments.
The Facilities Committee met seven times in 2008 and three times in 2009. They reported to College Council. The main information and discussion items were the status of campus construction projects; campus policies on smoking, posting materials, and handicapped parking; security and fire system updates; the Facilities Master Plan; the Administrative Services survey; and the online Program Review for Administrative Services. They also received reports from the Work Environment Committee. There were no formal action items or recommendations made to College Council. The external evaluation of this committee resulted in a recommendation to modify the membership and the charter to ensure that it has a broader representation and a more active faculty role in planning of facilities. The approval of Bond Measure J in November 2008 underscored the need to link facilities and educational planning more strongly.

The Professional and Staff Development Committee met eight times during 2008 and ten times during 2009. They reported regularly to College Council. The current faculty co-chair started in January of 2008. The committee planned numerous campus-wide events including various workshops for faculty and staff on instructional technology, basic skills, health, and professionalism. They organized the annual Springfest, the Fall Opening Day (Flex) program, and the holiday party. They also discussed the process for recording professional development (Flex) hours. Finally the committee coordinated two very successful Faculty Academies for the new probationary instructors hired in 2008 and 2009.

Student Support Services met five times during 2008 and four times in 2009. They reported to College Council. The major discussion and information items included the Student Services Program Review process, student activities (Welcome Day, College Fair, Senior Day, and Career Day), online orientation, and a District-wide student services survey. The committee was involved in planning the program review process for all student services areas, which was completed in spring 2009. No formal recommendations were made to College Council.

Technology Committee met thirteen times during 2008 and twelve times in 2009. They reported regularly to College Council. The major discussion items included instructional software, online instruction, technology upgrade projects, faculty and staff portal presentations, library technology resources, training of faculty and staff, tutoring, District student technology survey, literacy and information competency survey, smart classrooms, and updating the college technology plan. In October through December of 2008 the committee completed a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) analysis for several areas of the campus (3.15). The purpose of the SWOT analysis was to help develop an update for the campus technology plan. They made recommendations to College Council and the Academic Senate about online course management systems.

In conclusion, the Los Angeles Mission College shared governance committees have been meeting and reporting to College Council on a regular basis. Some of the committees, such as Budget and Planning and Educational Planning, made recommendations to College Council which resulted in actions taken. Other committees served mainly as information or planning bodies and did not submit formal recommendations to College Council. While faculty, staff, and administrator participation in the shared governance committees was very good, most committees had limited student representation. The Shared Governance Task Force will
continue to monitor the effectiveness of each committee on an ongoing basis. Self-evaluations will take place every spring semester, and external evaluations will occur at the end of each fall. These evaluations will serve as the basis for recommendations for improvement of the shared governance process.

A second round of external shared governance committee evaluations is being completed for the 2009 calendar year. The results of those evaluations will be compiled and presented to College Council in the spring of 2010.

**Evidence:**
3.1 College Council meeting minutes, May 22, 2007
3.2 Shared Governance Committee Self-Evaluation Form
3.3 College Council meeting minutes, December 20, 2007
3.4 College Council minutes, April 17 and May 15 2008, and May 2009
3.5 Shared Governance Committee Self-Evaluation Summary
3.6 Shared Governance Task Force External Evaluation Instrument
3.7 College Council meeting minutes, November and December 2008
3.8 Shared Governance Task Force External Evaluation of Shared Governance Committees, January 2009
3.9 College Council meeting minutes, February 5, 2009
3.10 College Council leadership retreat, August 2008
3.11 College Council meeting minutes, January 15, 2009
3.12 LAMC College Strategic Plan
3.13 LAMC Budget and Planning Document
3.14 Basic Skills Planning Matrix
3.15 Technology Committee SWOT analyses

**Recommendation 4: Planning**
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.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).

As reported in the Los Angeles Mission College 2008 Accreditation Progress Report (1.1), 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. A college leadership workshop held in summer 2007 (4.1) sought to align college strategic goals with those of the LACCD and California Community College system office. The task force examined the role of shared governance committees in the resource allocation process, and then
restructured and simplified the program review model (4.2) so as to link outcome measures to each of the college goals. Finally, the task force developed an implementation timeline with academic program review beginning in fall 2007. Program review for academic disciplines opened on November 12, 2007 and closed on January 31, 2008; 95 percent of the academic units submitted their program reviews by the due date. Non-instructional units completed their program reviews during the spring 2009 timeframe.

The restructured program review model for academic units consists of four components: the unit effectiveness review, the curriculum review, the student learning outcome review, and the instructional equipment and supply request section. (Non-instructional units do not complete a curriculum review.) In consultation with the appropriate shared governance oversight committees (EPC for academic disciplines, Student Services Committee for student services units and Facilities Committee for selected administrative services areas), effectiveness measures were developed for each college strategic goal. In the effectiveness component, units review and analyze five-year trend data on a particular measure and its relationship to a college-wide or other comparative measure. They then develop objectives or initiatives to advance the college goal or address issues that were identified in the review. The unit plan, consisting of all the objectives developed by the unit, is monitored and updated on an annual basis and comprehensively evaluated over a three-year period. To simplify the distribution and collection of information and ensure maximum compliance, the new program review model utilizes a web-based graphical interface for delivering and displaying data and for collecting responses from each unit. The unit effectiveness review contains prompts that request information on the status of student learning outcome (SLO) development, assessment, and implementation. The college is currently exploring web-based systems for SLO management.

In the college’s shared governance framework, shown in Chart 2 (4.3), the linkage between resource allocation and planning is based on the unit planning process. Shared governance oversight committees are responsible for validating the information and prioritizing resource requests made through the unit plan. For example, in the case of the EPC, resource requests accompanying unit objectives are prioritized and then forwarded as a recommendation to the Academic Affairs Division for inclusion as a tentative budget request. The goal of the Budget and Planning Committee is to recommend annual college priorities (in line with college strategic goals), identify the allocation of funds across major college operational divisions, and suggest which college-wide resources should fund these priorities. Once priorities are set and resources identified, final division budgets are submitted for approval to the College Council and forwarded as recommendations to the College President.

The college uses unit planning as the primary process for developing resource requests. This movement represents a significant change from the former resource system, which was characterized by a multiplicity of request processes (e.g., State Instructional Equipment/Block Grant, Career Technical Education, Hiring Prioritization). An additional module was developed for the college’s academic program review model which was used to collect instructional equipment and supply requests. To achieve a tie-in to unit planning, these requests were linked to unit plan objectives. As a pilot project, in February-March 2008, the EPC and Budget and Planning Committees reviewed, prioritized, and funded requests from this system using block grant and other available funds.
Chart 2: LAMC Shared Governance Committee Resource Allocation Process

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. Since the college’s operational budget plan is determined by the district budget calendar, the college unit planning and shared governance activities were set to conform to this framework. The district requires colleges to conduct their operational planning during the December to March timeframe; therefore, budget prioritizations of shared governance committees must be completed by December so that resource requests can be incorporated into the initial phase of budget preparation. The college program review/unit assessment process is scheduled to occur in the fall semester of each academic year to allow budget decisions to take place the following spring semester.
The college believes that it has developed and implemented changes to both its program review/unit assessment system and shared governance model which will ensure the linkage of planning to resource allocation and budget development. This has involved work by a number of shared governance task forces and committees. The college recognizes that this system involves a complex set of relationships; the process and procedures developed have been tested and continually fine-tuned. The college is committed to open and regular communication and a flexible approach to problem-solving so as to ensure the success of this major change in institutional behavior.

**Evidence:**
4.1 College Leadership Workshop July 27, 2007  
4.2 Program Review/Unit Assessment Template  
4.3 LAMC Budget and Planning Document, 2008

**Recommendation 5: Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment**
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 a semi-annual Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment report (5.1) has been prepared. The results of the reports are summarized in the table below (5.2).

| TABLE 5: LOS ANGELES MISSION COLLEGE COMPARISON OF SLOA ACADEMIC UNIT PROGRESS MAY 2007 TO JANUARY 2010 |
|--------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Defined SLOs | 25% | 51% | 61% | 76% | 89% |
| Defined Assessments | 22% | 50% | 59% | 75% | 89% |
| Evaluation of Assessments | 0.2% | 15% | 20% | 39% | 45% |
| Changes Implemented | 0.2% | 9% | 14% | 34% | 40% |

As can be seen from these results, the faculty of Los Angeles Mission College have been actively completing 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 complete SLOs and assessments. A wide variety of assessment instruments are being used to measure student achievement of SLOs.
The fifteen Student Services divisions have identified SAO/SLO performance indicators and assessment timelines. Most of the assessments began in the 2008-2009 academic year. All outcomes and assessments are linked to college Institutional SLOs which were established in 2002. A diversity of evaluation instruments are planned such as surveys (Counseling, Career, Orientation, Transfer), comparison with state statistics, e.g. the Desired Results Developmental Profiles from the California Department of Education, annual performance reports and comparison of figures with previous year’s reports; number of applications, website hits, retention, transfer rates; number of students who complete a Student Educational Plan, Financial Aid applications, etc. (5.3).

The Division of Administrative Services has developed nine Service Area Outcomes/SLOs in support of student learning (5.4).

A Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Web page was developed during the spring semester 2007 and is regularly updated (5.5). The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee was formed and began meeting in September 2007 and met bi-weekly throughout 2007-2008 (5.6). The SLOA committee wrote an SLOAC mission statement (5.7), shared SLOA information, assisted other faculty members and Student Services personnel with writing SLOs and Service Area Outcomes, and evaluated two SLO software programs to assist with managing SLOs and assessment: eLumen and Waypoint. As a result of research into both programs, it was decided not to purchase an SLO management database program at this time but rather to work with our institutional researcher and IT Department to develop an in-house program to track and map SLO assessments for all courses, programs, degrees, and Institutional SLOs.

In October and November 2007, the SLO Coordinator worked with LAMC’s Dean of Research and Planning to incorporate SLOs in the revised online Program Review/Unit Assessment template (5.8), which was distributed to all academic units beginning in 2007. SLO and assessment reports have also been incorporated in the student support and administrative support program reviews. The SLO Coordinator and the SLO Coordinator assistant attend bi-monthly Curriculum Committee meetings and Student Learning Outcomes and plans for assessment have been included as part of the Course Outline of Record since spring semester 2008.

The administration at Los Angeles Mission College has recognized the importance of student learning outcomes and assessment and has provided support in a variety of ways. At the beginning of 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, the Council of Instruction (chairs’ council) and semi-annual reports to the College Council.

An SLOA timetable and action plan (5.9) has been developed to complete the initial process of developing student learning outcomes and assessment for all disciplines, programs, degrees, student services, and assessment of Institutional SLOs, and it is posted on the SLO website (5.5). All faculty include one to three student learning outcomes in their course syllabi.
Department chairs are working with their discipline faculty to complete their program and degree SLOs and to complete their course level SLO assessments. In the 2010-2011 academic year, the college will begin assessing the Institutional SLOs. The college will compare its educational performance with its educational purposes and expectations, linking professional and staff development activities and basic skills courses and activities with planned and assessed student outcomes. The long-term goal is to include program outcomes in the College Catalog to enable students, administrators, and the public to assess Los Angeles Mission College offerings. Progress toward intended goals will continue to be monitored, evaluated, and refined to meet the needs of the academic community Los Angeles Mission College serves.

**Evidence:**
5.1 SLOA Annual Report 2007
5.2 SLOA Report, January 2008
5.3 Student Service SAOs/SLOs Reports
5.4 Administrative Services Service Area Outcomes/SLOs
5.5 SLOA webpage [www.lamission.edu/slo](http://www.lamission.edu/slo)
5.6 Minutes of SLOA Committee meetings, fall 2007
5.7 SLOA Committee Mission Statement
5.8 Program Review/Unit Assessment template
5.9 SLOA Timetable and Action Plan

**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).

As reported in the Los Angeles Mission College 2008 Accreditation Progress Report (1.1), district-wide decentralization has led to an evolution of the framework in which enrollment management activities occur. This structure is characterized by both joint college-district collaboration and a delineation of college-district responsibilities. 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 via the college president 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.

Since FTES are the basis of college revenue, and under or over production of FTES has district-wide fiscal implications, mechanisms have been developed to facilitate collaboration between the college and district on the college’s enrollment and budget plan. There are bi-annual meetings, involving the college administration and the District’s fiscal and attendance accounting divisions to review FTES projections and budget status. In addition, quarterly budget and enrollment
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updates are prepared by the college and discussed at the District Budget Committee, a district-wide governance committee that is advisory to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees. To reduce costs, there have been efforts to clarify and better coordinate college-district marketing. In addition, in 2006-07, a district-wide project was undertaken to develop a “common template” for college websites so that they would have a consistent look and ease of navigation.

To improve intra-college coordination of enrollment management activities, the college has recently formed an Enrollment Management Team (EMT) as an additional mechanism to facilitate enrollment planning. The EMT, which developed as an outgrowth of the college’s shared governance Educational Planning Committee, provides input and recommendations concerning schedule planning (the number and distribution of class offerings, FTEF and class size management, time-blocks, class limits, and cancellation criteria). The scope of its activities also includes examination of recruitment/outreach strategies, marketing activities, and student services that impact college enrollment. The EMT and the Council of Instruction (a committee composed of department chairs) are advisory to the vice-president of Academic Affairs and together serve to broaden and strengthen the information and feedback channels in the enrollment management process.

District-wide decentralization is a process that the District Office and campuses have been implementing for the past five years. 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. The District Office intra-net has extensive documentation on policies and procedures about the authority and responsibility for various processes. Both classified and certificated hiring processes are documented on the District website. 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 (6.1), 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 plan for the near future. On-going enhancements and new features are being developed, based on a planning agenda that the District Technology Committee oversees. This committee is represented by vice presidents, district office IT leadership and campus IT managers. The District Administrative Council is composed of campus vice presidents for administrative services and District Office division directors. This council meets monthly to address campus/district office administrative systems and responsibilities. The District Budget Committee, composed of the college presidents, vice presidents, District Office personnel and labor units, meets monthly to address district-wide budget matters and financial planning projections.

As new procedures are decentralized and implemented at the college level, the campus website is updated with applicable forms, procedures and/or links to the District Office intranet (6.2). The college will continue to monitor new processes and document these systems and responsibilities.
The District Office continues its participation in hiring new staff by posting new job announcements on its website, receiving applications for all classified positions, developing interest pools for certificated faculty and administrative positions, verifying applicant qualifications, rating in newly hired staff, and confirming that the prospective new hire is eligible and a job offer can be made. The process of hiring classified staff is under the purview of the Personnel Commission whereas the hiring of certificated employees rests with the Selection Unit of the Human Resources Division.

The Personnel Commission administers merit system exams and establishes a ranked list of qualified applicants. The District Human Resources Office determines the contents of the hiring packets which are processed by the campus personnel office and then cleared by the District Human Resources Office. Classified positions are posted by the District Human Resources Office, and applicants send their materials to the Personnel Commission where they are housed. Campuses must contact the Personnel Commission in order to fill a vacancy. The campus must establish a selection committee that meets District guidelines, and under supervision of an Equal Employment Officer (Compliance Officer), the top three ranks of candidates must be invited to interview for the position. All interview materials are secured in the Compliance Office.

The decision to fill a certificated faculty or administrative position is made at the campus, but approval to fill the position must be granted by the Human Resources Office. The process for filling certificated positions is conducted by a selection committee under the supervision of an Equal Employment Officer (Compliance Officer) adhering to District and campus policies.

A selection committee is established and responsible for conducting the hiring process in accordance with the local hiring policy established on the campus. Applications for tenure track positions are sent to the office of the appropriate vice president. A selection committee reviews the applications and selects candidates to be interviewed. The selection committee will conduct the preliminary interviews and forward candidates to the President who makes a final decision. All the materials from the presidential final interview are forwarded to the District Human Resources Office to be reviewed and verified so that a job offer can be made by the President. All remaining interview materials are stored in a secure location designated by the appropriate vice president. Applications for long-term substitute or resumes for adjunct positions are sent to the department chair. The applications for long-term positions are stored in the same location as the applications for tenure track positions, and the resumes for adjunct positions are retained by the department chair.

**Evidence:**
6.1 Los Angeles Community College District Human Resources Guides
6.2 LAMC website: [www.lamission.edu](http://www.lamission.edu)
RESPONSES TO DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS

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 (Standard III.A.1.c).

The incorporation of SLOs into faculty evaluations was addressed during negotiations for the 2008-2011 collective bargaining agreement. On the evaluation form (Appendix C) (D1.1), the following criterion was added under Professional Responsibilities:

(For All Faculty) Participates in the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (for classroom faculty, includes approved SLOs on class syllabi)

In order to more fully clarify the responsibilities of faculty in regard to this item, a Contract Interpretation was agreed to by the district and the union in spring 2009 (D1.2). It spells out the following duties and clarifies the responsible parties:

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 college, 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]

The contract interpretation further explains that adjunct faculty may participate in discipline or department activities to create SLOs and establish assessments but are not required to do so. It states that adjuncts may request compensation in advance under provisions in the contract for payment for ancillary activities.

To provide guidance on specific ways for individual colleges to address the standard, the district established a joint Faculty Evaluation Task Force in spring 2006 comprised of members of the District Academic Senate (DAS) and the AFT College Faculty Guild. The report issued by the Task Force offered several recommendations for colleges to follow, involving a model for incorporating SLOs in faculty evaluations by linking them to the long-term professional development goals of individual faculty. In the proposed model, the comprehensive faculty evaluation process included a self-assessment of the faculty member’s professional development activities, an assessment of contributions to campus-wide and departmental SLO assessment and improvement, and a statement of goals and action plans. These goals would support overarching college goals and objectives (D1.3).
The suggestions are best practices that may be adopted by colleges at the local level. Faculty at each college have been encouraged to discuss ways to institute these recommendations by working with the colleges’ academic senates in consultation with their Faculty Guild chapters.

**Evidence:**
D1.1 LACCD-AFT College Faculty Guild Collective Bargaining Agreement, 2008-11
D1.2 Contract Interpretation on SLOs in Faculty Evaluation
D1.3 LACCD Faculty Evaluation F report

**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 its Board of Trustees, to begin pre-funding a portion of its unfunded obligation. The District annually directs 1.92% of the previous fiscal year’s fulltime employee payroll into an irrevocable trust, managed through CalPERS. In addition, an amount equivalent to the District’s annual Medicare D refund is also diverted from the District’s operating budget into the trust. In 2007, Governor Schwarzenegger’s Commission on Public Employee Post-Employment Benefits issued a report in which the LACCD’s prefunding plan was cited as a best practice (D2.1).

As of December 31, 2009, the balance in the trust was $17,728,778.09 (D2.2).

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. After a great deal of research and discussion, the JLMBC voted and the Board approved the move to health care plans administered by CalPERS, to take effect January 1, 2010 (D2.3). Because of the significantly lower retiree benefit costs under CalPERS, the district expects to reduce its GASB obligation by roughly $100 million or more. A new actuarial study is currently being undertaken by the District. When the results of this study are finalized in spring 2010, the exact amount of the reduction in District liability will be known.

The decision to move the district’s health care plans to CalPERS was an important step to help to control spiraling health care costs and reduce the district’s post-retirement obligation. Reducing the District’s post-retirement healthcare liability by approximately $100 million demonstrates the LACCD’s clear commitment to monitoring this issue. When the results of the new actuarial study are reported later this spring, the District will again reassess the adequacy of its annual contribution.

**Evidence**
D2.1 Funding Pensions & Retiree Health Care for Public Employees, a report of the Public Employees Post-Employment Benefits Commission (see p. 169-173)
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 (Standard IV.B.1.g).

To respond to this recommendation, 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 (D3.1). As it has done every year before the spring semester, the board conducts a self-evaluation on 20 general areas and scores its performance (D3.2). At the same time, it establishes new goals for the following year (D3.3).

In response to the need to increase both follow-through and accountability at the district level, at its annual retreat on January 20, 2010, the LACCD Board of Trustees adopted a newly-devised District Effectiveness Review Cycle (D3.4). This five-stage annual district planning and accountability cycle was designed to achieve the following:

- Assure that District-level strategic goals are implemented and monitored;
- Synchronize the Board’s annual goal setting process with the traditional academic calendar;
- Align annual Board goals with those of the Chancellor, college presidents, and District Senior Staff; and
- Establish a regular process for college Institutional Effectiveness reporting that aligns with the Board’s District Strategic Plan reports, the Board’s annual ARCC AB 1417 review, and its annual self assessment process.
The cycle will begin with the publication of new Board goals following the Board’s annual goal-setting retreat on July 14, 2010 (D3.5). It is expected that this effectiveness cycle will increase the Board’s ability to monitor district-wide progress on all district-level strategic goals and Board priorities and that this new accountability process will help guide district-level decision making.

**Evidence:**
D3.1  Board Rule 2301.10  
D3.2  Board of Trustees’ Annual Goals Self Assessment  
D3.3  Board of Trustees’ Annual Goals  
D3.4  District Effectiveness Review Cycle  
D3.5  Board Effectiveness Review Calendar

**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 (Standard IV.B.1.j).**

To address this recommendation regarding the evaluation of college presidents, the district HR division drafted a formal written policy, the Performance Evaluation Process for College Presidents (D4.1), 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 that are used (D4.2).

To address this recommendation regarding the chancellor’s evaluation process, the Chancellor’s Office issued a directive that spells out the procedure that has been and continues to be followed (D4.3). The board, using the General Counsel as staff, conducts the evaluation of the chancellor, whose contract includes a provision for an annual evaluation. Each year, the board reviews its previous evaluation and directs the General Counsel regarding the process for the current year. In most years, the board solicits input from various constituencies, typically including the college presidents, district senior staff, the academic senate presidents, and union representatives. To achieve this, the General Counsel’s Office sends out a data collection form (D4.4) to evaluate the chancellor’s performance on a number of criteria and elicit comments, which are submitted anonymously. Postcards are sent to confirm that these forms have been received. All of this material is provided to the trustees.

The chancellor typically prepares a written self-evaluation based upon his stated goals, which is given to the board.

The trustees submit their own appraisals on an evaluation form (D4.5). These are collected and sent to a designated trustee to be summarized or to the General Counsel for consolidation. The trustees then discuss the matter in closed session, and a designated trustee prepares a final draft for the full board’s review. The trustees then meet with the chancellor and provide the final written document. Beginning in July 2010, the evaluation processes for the Chancellor and the
college presidents will be integrated with the Board’s newly adopted District Effectiveness Review Cycle.

Evidence:
D4.1 Performance Evaluation Process for College Presidents
D4.2 Presidential Evaluation Packet
D4.3 Chancellor’s Directive #122 on chancellor evaluation
D4.4 Chancellor Evaluation Data Collection Instrument
D4.5 Chancellor Evaluation form

RESPONSES TO COMMISSION CONCERNS

Commission Concern 1. The commission requests that Los Angeles Mission College demonstrate at the time of the Progress Report that it is in compliance with Eligibility Requirement 5 which states, “The institution has sufficient staff with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support its mission and purpose.”

As reported in the Los Angeles Mission College 2008 Accreditation Progress Report (1.1), the Los Angeles Community College District Board of Trustees reappointed Mr. Ernest Moreno for the 2007 – 2008 academic year as the Chief Executive Officer of Los Angeles Mission College. During this period, he participated on the selection committee for the permanent president. The selection committee completed the process, and the Board of Trustees appointed a new president, Judith Valles, in February, 2008. President Valles began her tenure on April 1, 2008. The selection process for a permanent Vice President of Academic Affairs was concluded in the spring of 2008 when Alma Johnson-Hawkins, former Dean of Academic Affairs was selected for the position.

The continuity and stability of administrative leadership has been and continues to be a high priority. At this point in time, all senior administrators are permanently assigned. As the college has continued to grow in enrollment, the administrative staff has increased in response to the need for additional administrative services. In the fall of 2007 an Acting Associate Dean of Non Credit and other special academic programs was hired. In the spring 2008 semester, a second Acting Associate Dean of Academic Affairs was hired. In the fall of 2009, two more deans were hired to fill vacancies caused by a retirement and restructuring of the Division of Academic Affairs.

Commission Concern 2: Eligibility Requirement 19—Accountability
The Commission requires that the College demonstrate in the Progress Report that it is in compliance with Eligibility Requirement 19 which requires that “The institution systematically evaluates and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes, including assessment of student learning outcomes. The institution provides evidence of planning for improvement of institutional structures and processes, student achievement of educational goals, and student learning. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding improvement through an
ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation.”

As reported in the Los Angeles Mission College 2009 Accreditation Follow-up Report (2.1), the college has addressed this recommendation by taking action in several areas:

- Revitalizing the shared governance committees and establishing a task force responsible for the systematic evaluation of the shared governance process.
- Developing a College Strategic Plan (SMP) (C2.1).
- Updating the Educational Master Plan (C2.2) and Technology Plan (C2.3).
- Funding a position for an SLO coordinator who reports regularly to College Council, the Academic Senate, Council of Instruction, and the Educational Planning Committee.
- Developing an online program review process for instructional and non-instructional areas.
- Linking the program review process to a budget allocation process by including a resource allocation request component as part of Program Review.
- Posting accreditation materials on the college website and placing them on file in the college library to make them available to the public.

The governance committees and their evaluations have been addressed earlier in this document. The college has integrated the shared governance system into planning processes. The college’s shared governance committees have been involved in updating college plans. For example, in spring 2008 the college’s Educational Planning Committee (EPC) initiated a process for conducting an annual review and updating of the college’s Educational Master Plan (EMP). The EPC is following an annual cycle for this review, utilizing information from the program review process as well as external and internal environmental scanning. Additionally, in fall 2008 the college’s Technology Committee conducted a SWOT analysis of campus academic, student support, and administrative offices and functions (C2.4). The outcomes of this analysis together with student and staff survey information (C2.5) are being used to revise and update the college’s Technology Plan.

The College Council recognized the need to provide overall direction and focus to its planning efforts and developed a Strategic Master Plan (SMP) in fall 2008. This process began with a strategic planning workshop, held in summer 2007, to develop college-wide strategic goals (C2.6). The workshop included the college administrators and faculty and staff leadership and focused on development of college-wide strategic goals and ensuring alignment with the recently developed strategic goals of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) (C2.7) and the California Community College System Office. In addition, College Council held a retreat in summer 2008 at which the strategic goals were updated and further developed (C2.8). The resulting strategic plan includes goals, objectives, timelines, and associated action plans for the 2008-09 academic year. Following a review and feedback process in fall 2008 during which the SMP was posted on the college website, presented to the Academic Senate, and reviewed by the college’s principal shared governance committees (Budget and Planning and Educational Planning Committees), the SMP was approved by the College Council on January 15, 2009 (C2.9). The College Council also recognized the need to regularly update the SMP and moved to hold an annual retreat to achieve this purpose. Additionally, in spring-summer 2008 the college conducted an inventory of its progress toward achieving District-wide strategic goals (C2.7).
This information was reported to the District’s Office of Institutional Effectiveness and formed the basis of a report on the LACCD Strategic Plan (C2.10).

Moreover, in fall 2008 the college’s Budget and Planning Committee updated, clarified, and formalized the framework for college planning and resource allocation processes and the role of shared governance within these processes and developed a Budget and Planning document. This document has been critically discussed by shared governance committees, the Academic Senate, and college administration and approved by College Council on December 18, 2008 (C2.11, C2.12).

Recognizing the need for the systematic assessment of student achievement of educational goals, the college has funded a position for a Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Coordinator since 2006 and an SLO assistant since fall 2008. The SLO Coordinator prepares semi-annual reports on the status of implementation and assessment of SLOs. These reports are posted on the college’s website so that they are accessible to the college community and public at large (C2.13). In 2008-2009 the college has been very active in developing and assessing SLOs. SLOs are required to be on all course syllabi and participation in the SLO process became part of the faculty evaluation process beginning spring semester 2009. SLOs are also required on all updates of Course Outlines of Record (C2.14) and the updates are posted on the Curriculum webpage (C2.15). A timeline has been developed and posted on the SLO webpage for completion of all SLO assessments by 2012, including course, certificate, program, degree, and Institutional SLO assessments.

Department chairs have been spearheading the SLO effort for their disciplines and faculty cooperation has been very strong. The college’s stated goal is to complete 15-20 percent of course SLO assessments in a discipline each semester. Monthly SLO updates are given at meetings of the Educational Planning Committee, Academic Senate, the Council of Instruction (chair’s council) and semi-annual reports are given to the College Council. A cycle of course SLO assessments has been established and results of assessments are being used to improve student learning and instruction.

The SLO Coordinator is working with the college’s web developer to design an SLO online program to simplify the recording and tabulating of the college’s SLOs and assessments. Similar to the online program review assessment used for the academic, student services, and administrative units, the online SLO program will be a repository for all student learning outcome and assessment materials which will be easily accessible to all faculty, staff, administrators, and the public.

The Office of Research and Planning and the EPC Program Review Task Force revised and developed an online Program Review instrument, which was distributed to the academic units in fall of 2007 (C2.16). During fall 2008 the online Program Review instrument was further developed and distributed to all non-instructional units (Student Services and Administrative Services) (C2.17). By March 2009, the college’s Student Services and Administrative Services divisions completed program reviews and developed unit plans using the online model. Using the updated planning framework, the college is incorporating resource requests from its completed college-wide program review into the operational planning/budget process for 2009-
10. Program review findings are being used to report on objectives within the college’s Strategic Master Plan and to identify focus areas for future college planning through the shared governance process.

The Educational Planning Committee (EPC) worked with the Budget and Planning Committee to develop an academic Program Review validation process, which has been used to allocate resources for the purpose of guiding the college through the continual process of strategic educational planning that includes a systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation and re-evaluation. The EPC has worked with Student Services to develop a similar validation process for the non-instructional areas. This process illustrates the college’s commitment and ability to ensure a firm linkage of planning to resource allocation.

**Evidence:**
C2.1 LAMC Strategic Plan (SMP)
C2.2 LAMC Educational Master Plan
C2.3 LAMC Technology Plan
C2.4 LAMC Technology Committee SWOT analysis
C2.5 LAMC Student and Staff Survey
C2.6 LAMC Strategic Goals
C2.7 LACCD Strategic Goals
C2.8 LAMC Retreat, Summer 2008.
C2.9 College Council minutes, January 15, 2009
C2.10 LACCD Strategic Plan
C2.11 Academic Senate minutes, December 4, 2008
C2.12 College Council minutes, December 18, 2008
C2.13 LAMC SLOs website: www.lamission.edu/slo
C2.14 LAMC Course Outline of Record
C2.15 LAMC Curriculum Website: www.lamission.edu/slo
C2.16 LAMC Academic Units Program Review instrument
C2.17 LAMC Non-instructional Units Program Review instrument (Student Services and Administrative Services)
RESPONSES TO SELF-IDENTIFIED ISSUES (PLANNING AGENDAS)

1. The institution will formalize a process for the periodic review and revision of the mission statement by fall 2007.

The current mission statement was developed in 2004 (1.1) as part of the Educational Master Plan, approved by LAMC Senate and College Council in 2005, and Board of Trustees in 2006. The statement is revisited on a yearly basis at the annual College Council retreat. The statement was last revised at the College Council Retreat in August, 2009 (1.2). The proposed changes will be presented to the campus community in the spring of 2010 for discussion at various venues including town hall meetings, the Academic Senate, the Educational Master Planning committee, and the College Council.

Evidence:
1.1 LAMC Mission Statement 2004
1.2 LAMC Draft Revised Mission Statement 2009

2. Through collegial consultation, the Academic Senate and College Council will adopt a revised governance structure by spring of 2007 to strengthen broad-based institutional planning that leads to the continuous improvement of student learning and dialogue.

After a year of open forums and discussions on the functions and effectiveness of the shared governance committees established in 2002, the committees were restructured in 2007. The new shared governance committees, as shown earlier in Chart 1, are Budget and Planning, Educational Planning, Facilities Planning, Professional Development, Student Support Services, and Technology. Each committee has representatives from administration, faculty, classified, students, the Academic Senate and the Faculty Guild (2.1).

By the fall of 2007, all the shared governance committees were actively meeting (2.1), had established their memberships, had elected co-chairs, and developed their charters (2.2). The Shared Governance Task Force that was established by the College Council in May of 2007 has continued to oversee the shared governance committees.

During 2008 the shared governance committees met on a regular basis. Committee charters, agendas, and minutes are posted on the college website (2.1, 2.2). The standing committees submit monthly reports to the College Council (2.3, 2.4). The College Council meets the third Thursday of each month and is co-chaired by an administrator and a faculty member. Committees submit recommendations to College Council as necessary, which are then voted upon by the Council and are forwarded to the President for final decision before implementation. The membership of College Council includes representatives from all major constituency groups: administrators, faculty, classified staff, and students (2.2). The co-chairs of the six standing committees are also members of College Council; each standing committee has one administrative co-chair and one faculty or staff co-chair. All faculty appointments to the standing committees are made either by the Academic Senate or AFT. College Council and all the standing committees have regular meeting times and places and established memberships. All meetings are open to the public and student representation is encouraged. These committees have worked to strengthen institutional planning and support student learning.
Evidence:
2.1 Minutes of shared governance committee meetings
2.2 Charters of shared governance committees
2.3 College Council minutes
2.4 Agendas and minutes of shared governance committee meetings

3. By spring 2008 under the new college governance system, the unit assessment form will be revised by the proposed college planning committees (Educational Planning, Facilities, and Student Services) to incorporate the current college goals and measurable objectives as identified in the 2005 Educational Master Plan.

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. A college leadership workshop held in summer 2007 (3.1) sought to align college strategic goals with those of the LACCD and California Community College system office. The task force examined the role of shared governance committees in the resource allocation process, and then restructured and simplified the program review (unit assessment) model (3.2) so as to link outcome measures to each of the college goals. Finally, the task force developed an implementation timeline with academic program review beginning in fall 2007. Non-instructional units completed program review during 2008-09.

The restructured program review/unit assessment model for academic units consists of four components: the unit effectiveness review, the curriculum review, the student learning outcome review, and the instructional equipment and supply request section. (Non-instructional units do not complete a curriculum review.) In consultation with the appropriate shared governance oversight committees (EPC for academic disciplines, Student Services Committee for student services units and Facilities Committee for selected administrative services areas), effectiveness measures were developed for each college strategic goal. In the effectiveness component, units review and analyze five-year trend data on a particular measure and its relationship to a college-wide or other comparative measure. They then develop objectives or initiatives to advance the college goal or address issues that were identified in the review. The unit plan, consisting of all the objectives developed by the unit, is monitored and updated on an annual basis. Units conduct comprehensive program review every three-years.

The college’s Educational Planning Committee (EPC) conducted another comprehensive review of the instructional program review model in summer 2009 (3.3). The committee made a series of recommendations for improvements in data elements, prompts, navigation and reporting in nearly every section of the model. The recommendations were based on input received by the EPC through its validation process and from a review of the college’s current Educational Master Plan. Not all these recommendations could be implemented beginning in fall 2009 because of the relatively short time frame needed before the beginning of the new cycle of comprehensive
program review (fall 2009). The remaining recommendations will be implemented beginning with the fall 2010 round of instructional program review. The non-instructional program review model is currently being reviewed by both administrative and student service units (3.4). Recommendations for changes or improvements will be implemented in the next round of program review for these units (fall 2010).

Evidence:
3.1 College Leadership Workshop July 27, 2007
3.2 Program Review/Unit Assessment Template
3.3 LAMC Academic Units Program Review instrument
3.4 LAMC Non-instructional Units Program Review instrument (Student Services and Administrative Services)

4. By spring 2008, the College Council will develop a strategic plan, prioritize institutional needs and goals, approve measurable objectives, facilitate their achievement and link the unit assessment outcomes to the resource allocation process.

The College Council recognized the need to provide overall direction and focus to its planning efforts and drafted a Strategic Master Plan (SMP) in fall 2008. This process began with a strategic planning workshop, held in summer 2007, to develop college-wide strategic goals (4.1). The workshop included the college administrators and faculty and staff leadership and focused on development of college-wide strategic goals and ensuring alignment with the recently developed strategic goals of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) (4.2) and the California Community College System Office. College Council held a follow-up retreat in summer 2008 at which the strategic goals were updated and further developed (4.3). The SMP was posted on the college website, presented to the Academic Senate, and reviewed by the college’s principal shared governance committees (Budget and Planning and Educational Planning Committees) and was approved by the College Council on January 15, 2009 (4.4).

The College Council acknowledged the need to regularly update the SMP and moved to hold an annual retreat to achieve this purpose. The SMP was most recently updated at the College Council Annual Retreat in August 2009 and approved by the Council in November of 2009 (4.5, 4.6). The resulting strategic plan includes goals, objectives, timelines, and associated action plans.

Using the updated planning framework, the college incorporated resource requests from its completed college-wide program review into the operational planning/budget process for 2009-10. Program review findings are used to report on objectives within the college’s Strategic Master Plan and to identify focus areas for future college planning through the shared governance process.

The Educational Planning Committee (EPC) worked with the Budget and Planning Committee to develop an academic Program Review validation process, which was used to allocate resources with the purpose of guiding the college through the continual process of strategic educational planning that includes a systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation and re-evaluation. Student Services and Administrative Services conducted a similar validation
process for the non-instructional areas. The requests for resources in the program review were used to develop the operational plan. This process illustrates the college’s commitment and ability to ensure a firm linkage of planning to resource allocation.

**Evidence:**
4.1 LAMC-wide Strategic Goals
4.2 LACCD Strategic Goals
4.3 LAMC Retreat, Summer 2008.
4.4 College Council minutes, January 15, 2009
4.5 LACCD Strategic Plan
4.6 College Council Minutes, November, 2009

5. The SLO coordinator will develop a central location for student learning outcomes information which will be regularly updated and accessible through the college web page by fall 2007.

The SLO Coordinator prepares semi-annual reports on the status of implementation and assessment of SLOs. These reports are posted on the college’s SLO website so that they are accessible to the college community and public at large (5.1). SLOs are also required on all updates of Course Outlines of Record (5.2) and the updates are posted on the Curriculum webpage (5.3). A timeline has been developed and posted on the SLO webpage for completion of all SLO assessments by 2012, including course, certificate, program, degree, and Institutional SLO assessments.

Additionally, Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment progress is reported annually as part of the online Program Review process for all academic, student service, and administrative service areas.

After extensive evaluation of existing SLO data management systems, the college decided to develop an in-house system for financial reasons. The SLO Coordinator has been working with the college’s web developer to develop a system for recording and tabulating SLOs and assessments. Similar to the online program review assessment used for the academic, student services, and administrative units, the online SLO program will be a repository for all student learning outcome and assessment materials which will be easily accessible to all faculty, staff, administrators, and the public.

**Evidence:**
5.1 LAMC SLOs website: [www.lamission.edu/slo](http://www.lamission.edu/slo)
5.2 LAMC Course Outline of Record
5.3 LAMC Curriculum Website: [www.lamission.edu/slo](http://www.lamission.edu/slo)

6. All academic disciplines and departments at Los Angeles Mission College will have completed the unit assessment process within the 2006-2007 academic year to meet district guidelines.

The Office of Research and Planning and the Educational Planning Committee (EPC) Program
Review Task Force revised and developed an online Program Review instrument, which was distributed to the academic units in fall of 2007 (6.1). All department chairs submitted written reports and made presentations to the Educational Planning Committee during the 2008-09 academic year. The EPC made commendations and recommendations to all academic units, which were posted on the committee’s website (6.2). After the first round of evaluations, the EPC decided to stagger the next round of comprehensive program reviews on a three-year cycle. In the fall of 2009, the EPC selected five departments to undergo the next round of comprehensive program reviews (6.3) which were completed by 12/31/09. These five departments are scheduled to present their findings to the EPC during the spring of 2010.

**Evidence:**
6.1 LAMC Academic Units Program Review instrument  
6.2 [www.lamission.edu/eduplanning](http://www.lamission.edu/eduplanning)  
6.3 Educational Planning Committee (EPC) Minutes June 22, 2009

7. **The college will revise its unit assessment process to more fully utilize institutional research in identifying student learning needs, offering responsive programs, assessing student achievement and using the assessment results as the basis for program improvement and creation of student learning outcomes by fall 2008.**

The program review process for instructional and non-instructional units was revised between 2007 and 2009 to more fully use institutional research (see Planning Agenda # 3). Since then, all college units— instructional, student services, and administrative— have gone through a complete cycle of program review/unit assessment. The college’s program review system and accompanying validation process has served as the principal means for assessing student achievement, educational programs, and student and administrative services. The instructional program review model was updated to incorporate data elements to examine student success in online and off-campus programs. As a result of the instructional program review process, recommendations for program improvement were made by the academic units as well as by the EPC. The assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) is an important part of this process and helps drive program improvement.

8. **All active courses will have identified student learning outcomes by spring 2008 and will have gone through at least one round of assessment by spring semester 2009.**

Although our initial deadlines were ambitious, the college has made considerable progress in accomplishing this goal as illustrated in the charts below.
TABLE 6: COMPARISON OF SLOA PROGRESS
ACADEMIC AREAS, COURSE LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison of SLOA Progress Academic Areas – Course Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses with Defined SLOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHART 4: SLOA ACADEMIC PROGRESS – COURSE LEVEL

As can be seen from the above chart, almost 90 percent of all courses now have Student Learning Outcomes and 45 percent of these have assessed outcomes. As a result of these assessments, most all of these courses have implemented modifications for improvement.

Eighty percent of the academic programs have student learning outcomes and many program assessments are being planned for this academic year. Assessment of certificates and degrees are planned for the following year. The college is well on its way to meeting the 2012 deadline for establishment and assessment of its student learning outcomes.

9. The unit assessment and unit plan process will be fully implemented and completed by spring 2007 for all Student Services units.
During fall 2008 the revised Program Review instrument was distributed to all Student Services units (9.1). By March 2009, the college’s Student Services division had completed their program reviews and developed unit plans using the online system. The validation process was completed by fall 2009. Using the updated planning framework, the college incorporated resource requests from its completed college-wide program review into the operational planning/budget process for 2009-10. Program review findings are being used to report on objectives within the college’s Strategic Master Plan and to identify focus areas for future college planning through the shared governance process. Student Services will begin a new staggered cycle of comprehensive Program Review in fall 2010.

**Evidence:**
9.1 LAMC Non-instructional Units Program Review instrument (Student Services and Administrative Services)

10. **To assess quality of service, by spring 2007, Student Services will develop an annual survey for all related areas of Student Support Services.**

Annual surveys have been accomplished by yearly point-of-service surveys for the areas of counseling and admissions and records (10.1). Additionally, district-wide comprehensive student surveys have been administered on a biennial basis; the most recent was conducted in fall 2009 (10.2). The district surveys assess satisfaction with a number of student service areas. Results of the latest student survey will be utilized by student service units in their next comprehensive program review. Prior student survey data was used by student service units to evaluate unit effectiveness and determine needed improvements. All other areas of Student Services are currently developing point-of-service surveys which will be administered in spring of 2010. Survey results will be used to make improvements to service delivery beginning fall of 2010.

**Evidence:**
10.1 Point-of-Service Surveys for Counseling and Admissions and Records
10.2 District Student Survey 2009

11. **By spring 2007, Los Angeles Mission College will create a catalog task force to review and update catalog information, ensure catalog accuracy, facilitate final approval and expedite printing.**

The LAMC Catalog Committee includes the Chair of the Curriculum Committee, the Articulation Officer, a Student Services Representative, the catalog and schedule assistant, and a dean of Academic Affairs. The committee consults with the vice president of Academic Affairs as needed and regularly invites representatives from graphic design, marketing, institutional research and other areas.

For the 2009-2010 catalog this group focused on curriculum issues and will continue to do so through 2010-11. In previous years catalog drafts were reviewed and updated by department heads, which resulted in changes that were not reviewed by the campus curriculum committee. Through careful review of each discipline and course for the 2009-10 catalog, the committee identified a number of inaccuracies in degree requirements, pre-requisites and co-requisites, and certificate requirements. Necessary corrections were made through the appropriate curriculum
process. In addition, nearly 250 courses, degree programs and certificates will be updated by March 1, 2010 to represent current transferability requirements.

In order to ensure that future changes are properly reviewed, the catalog and schedule assistant attends Curriculum Committee meetings, and only she and the dean overseeing curriculum can authorize changes to the catalog, preventing unauthorized changes by department heads. Finally, courses with expired outlines of record will not be offered until they are updated consistent with college guidelines. Final approval of any discipline section in the catalog is contingent upon compliance with all curriculum guidelines.

Curriculum integrity was and continues to be the primary focus of the Catalog and Curriculum Committees. Other campus practices and alternative delivery systems for the 2010-11 catalog are being reviewed such as Compact Disks (CDs), online formats, and flash drives. Costs and usage are being analyzed. Guidelines for distribution have been put into place and catalogs are now monitored by Student Services. The bulk of catalogs are reserved for outreach, new students, and for counselor use when catalog rights are being established for any one student. The Catalog Committee will continue to analyze the catalog production costs and is reviewing the feasibility of moving to a two-year catalog as of 2011-12.

12. Based on surveys and unit assessments to be conducted by Student Services to assess student needs, by fall 2007 the college will provide improved services and accessibility to the Transfer Center, Career Center, and the Student Health Services Center.

Based on the information provided by surveys conducted during the fall 2008 and spring 2009 semesters by the Counseling Department, the Transfer Center has been completely reorganized. With the assistance of the Title V and Teacher Prep Programs, the Transfer Center was staffed in the spring of 2009 with a full-time counselor and two part-time workers. This has provided increased access to the Transfer Center. The Career Center, which had been non-operational for the past two years, was reassigned to the Transfer Center in the fall of 2009 and will be operational beginning the spring 2010 semester. The Transfer Center was moved next to the President’s Office, a more accessible location on campus in January 2010. The Transfer Center will also house the Career Center. Students now have access to approximately twelve computers where they can review transfer and career information. The new area has space for the Title V Counselor, who has been serving as the full-time Transfer Counselor, as well as space for college representatives. In March 2010, interviews will be held to hire a full-time Transfer Counselor funded out of general funds.

The Student Health Center has been able to provide additional services, such as Personal/Crisis Counseling, and extended hours due to increased funding from mandatory Health Fees for all students.

Beginning in the fall of 2009, the Office of Student Services, the Counseling Department, and five academic departments initiated a pilot Academic Advisor program. This pilot will lead to increased departmental involvement and will provide students with additional faculty advisement in several academic areas.
13. With the cooperation of all other programs/departments that offer counseling services, the Division of Student Services will develop student surveys to evaluate the effectiveness of its delivery and services to students. This will be accomplished by mid-spring 2007.

As mentioned earlier, the Counseling Department administers point-of-service surveys on a regular basis. Since the fall of 2006, the Counseling Department has gone through major changes. Hours of availability were extended to include more evening hours, better tracking of student appointments with SARS Grid, monitoring of student records, revised counselors’ schedules, revision of seniority list, and tighter counseling accountability. These changes have resulted in more students being advised, even though there were fewer counselors than in the previous academic year. Other improvements that have taken place include increased updating of student files, improved accuracy of advisement, more students being advised by full-time counselors rather than adjunct counselors, and a more student-friendly environment.

Currently, the Counseling Department is improving the delivery of online counseling. Plans are in motion to purchase additional services that will enhance online counseling. In addition, an online orientation for new LAMC students has been developed which will be implemented in the spring 2010 semester.

In spring of 2009, DSP&S administered student surveys to all its students and staff in the DSP&S Department and in its counseling classes.

14. The Educational Planning Committee will determine the appropriate level of base-line services, including space, for the library and other learning support services by spring 2008.

The Educational Planning Committee advised the Library and Learning Center in May 2009 to develop a plan to address service needs including staff and facilities. The Library is working with a user group and architect on a facilities renovation project. Because of budget fluctuations, baseline services have not been identified for library services yet; however, they are addressed each year by Academic Affairs during the operational budget planning cycle. In retrospect, it has become clear that the role of EPC is not to determine the level of base-line services but to support and advocate for the financial resources necessary to provide the baseline services. Space and service needs will be derived from data that includes comprehensive program review outcomes as well as Title 5 library space standards.

15. The library and other learning support areas will complete unit assessments by fall 2008.

The Learning Center and Library review and assess their programs on an ongoing basis. Both presented a formal review and assessment to the Educational Planning Committee in May 2009 (15.1). They are currently reviewing and revising the institution’s program review template for learning support services to better reflect their program services and needs.
**Evidence:**
15.1 EPC minutes, May 2009

16. **The Academic Senate in consultation with the AFT will develop a process to incorporate the effectiveness of achieving student learning outcomes into faculty evaluations in accordance with the recommendations by the joint AFT/DAS task force on Faculty Evaluations spring 2008.**

The issue of incorporating SLOs into faculty evaluations was addressed during contract negotiations in the spring of 2008. On the evaluation form (Appendix C) of the collective bargaining agreement (16.1), the following criterion was added under Professional Responsibilities:

(For All Faculty) Participates in the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (for classroom faculty, includes approved SLOs on class syllabi).

In spring 2006, the District established a Faculty Evaluation Task Force to bring together members of the District Academic Senate (DAS) and the AFT College Faculty Guild to provide the colleges with guidance in fulfilling this standard. The task force was comprised of the DAS president, two college senate presidents and two senate members, three Guild chapter presidents and its executive secretary, and the Chancellor’s Liaison (currently the Vice Chancellor for Institutional Effectiveness). After reviewing the collective bargaining agreement and determining that its provisions did not preclude consideration of student learning outcomes in the evaluation process, the group issued a report with several recommendations (16.2).

The recommendations involve a model for incorporating student learning outcomes in faculty evaluations by linking them to the long-term professional development goals of individual faculty. This approach “closes the loop” of institutional improvement by connecting faculty development activities to college-wide efforts to improve student learning. In the proposed model, the comprehensive faculty evaluation process would include a self-assessment of the faculty member’s professional development activities, an assessment of contributions to campus-wide and departmental SLO assessment and improvement, and a clear statement of future goals and action plans. These personal goals support and link to overarching college goals and objectives.

In spring of 2009 Los Angeles Mission College began including in the comprehensive faculty evaluation process a self-assessment of the faculty member’s professional development activities, an assessment of contributions to campus-wide and departmental SLO assessment and improvement, and a clear statement of future goals and action plans.

**Evidence:**

17. **The college will establish a Facilities Planning Committee within the new shared governance framework to oversee the implementation of the campus Facilities Master Plan**
to assure effective utilization and continuing quality of its physical resources by spring 2008.

In September 2007, a Facilities Planning Committee was established to oversee the implementation of the recently adopted campus facilities master plan (17.1). The committee structure and membership were based upon the template for all shared governance committees. After several meetings of the facilities planning committee, it was determined that the breadth and scope of campus facilities master planning was not well represented in this structure. At the March 19, 2009 meeting of College Council, the role of the Facilities Planning Committee was revised and the work of the oversight of the facilities master plan was assumed by the College Council (17.3).

**Evidence:**
17.1 LAMC Facilities Master Plan
17.2 College Council Minutes, March 19, 2009
17.3 Bond Project Shared Governance and Consultation, February 19, 2009

18. The College Facilities Department will complete the unit assessment process by fall 2008.

During fall 2008 the online program review instrument was further developed and distributed to all non-instructional units (18.1). By March 2009, the college’s Administrative Services units completed program reviews and developed unit plans using the online model and are in the process of updating the program review instrument by spring 2010. Using the updated planning framework, the college is incorporating resource requests from its completed college-wide program review into the operational planning/budget process for 2009-10. Program review findings are being used to report on objectives within the college’s Strategic Master Plan and to identify focus areas for future college planning through the shared governance process.

**Evidence:**
18.1 LAMC Non-instructional Units Program Review instrument

19. To identify the technology needs on campus, the Technology Committee and the Information Technology Department will revise the Technology Master Plan by spring 2008 to ensure its integration with institutional planning.

The Technology Committee is currently developing a new Technology Master Plan. This process started in summer 2009 as it was realized that the revisions needed to the previous plan were too substantial and that the pace of technological changes was so rapid as to warrant a complete re-write of the current plan. The new plan is currently in draft form and is the principal agenda item at Technology Committee meetings in the 2009-10 academic year. In order to ensure the integration of technology planning with institutional planning, the current College Strategic Plan incorporates technology goals.

20. The Information Technology Department will complete a unit assessment to evaluate the effective use of technology resources on campus by spring 2007.
The Information Technology department and the college’s Technology Committee have worked closely to evaluate and plan for future technology needs. During the 2008-09 academic year, the college’s Technology Committee evaluated the current Technology Master Plan and began the process of writing a new Master Plan. In addition, the Information Technology Department completed its program review and unit plan in spring 2009. The program review examined several dimensions of the unit’s operations and utilized recent survey results to assess the department’s effectiveness in serving the needs of the college’s academic and instructional support units. Unit plan objectives were also developed and have been included in the Technology Master Plan.

The analysis in the Information Technology Department program review emphasized the need to improve support for college technology in the teaching-learning environment as a result of the college’s recent growth, future expansion plans, and greater utilization of technology on campus. The IT department proposed an additional staff position to address this priority. This specialized position would support all aspects of data network communications including local area networks, wireless networks, wide area networks, communication with remote sites, satellite locations, firewalls, intrusion detection and prevention systems, video conferencing, IP telephony, problem solving, and network security.

A major effort of the District Technology Committee is the development of technology standards which will apply to all colleges in the district. These standards will help the colleges by allowing for consistency in technology infrastructure design for all new buildings and modernization of existing buildings. In addition, the long to intermediate term effect will be to reduce maintenance and support costs and promote intra-District optimization of staffing and district-wide systems.

21. The college will revise its governance structure and establish a college-wide Budget and Planning Committee to integrate financial and institutional planning and to link goals and objectives to resource allocation.

A shared governance committee responsible for college-wide budget and planning was established in September 2007 to facilitate the integration of financial and institutional planning and link goals and objectives to resource allocation. The Budget and Planning Committee is charged as follows:

- Develop budget procedures, policies, guidelines and timelines.
- Regularly report to College Council on current budget status and when necessary, the need to reduce expenditures.
- Review and prioritize budget and funding requests.
- Make budgetary recommendations to balance the budget.
- Oversee the development of college responses to all budget and planning related accreditation recommendations.
- Develop benchmarks for the evaluation and assessment of budget expenditures.

Beginning in fall 2008, a budget template (21.1) was developed to provide a framework to link goals and objectives to resource allocation. Goals and objectives are established through the program review and unit planning process. In fall 2009, the budget template was further
developed to simplify the collection of financial data and the integration of the unit planning goals and objectives. All department heads and budget managers attended training sessions to assist in the understanding of the process, the technical requirements, and the budget planning calendar.

All operational units performed an annual update of their unit plans in fall 2009. Updated unit plan objectives and resource requests based on them are being used in the development of the college’s operational budget for 2010-11.

To establish division priorities, the vice president of Academic Affairs meets with the deans to review the division goals, which are linked to the strategic goals, establish procedural guidelines for the division, and review the budget planning instructions. The primary goal is to ensure consistency in assessing the over base requests and develop a prioritized list of all resources requested within the division. The vice president collaborates with department chairs and program directors to prioritize requests for resources that will allow for continuing improvements in their programs. Her role is to monitor program review, program planning, and resource allocation to support program improvement.

The deans work closely with the department chairs/program directors. First they review the departmental goals to determine if they align with the division and college goals. The dean works with the department chairs and program directors as they assess their programs and seeks to facilitate the acquisition of resources to support their stated goals.

The deans prepare a prioritized list of requests from all departments and programs under their supervision. These lists follow the operational plan format with one additional category.

- **Tier One**: Essential; program would be negatively impacted if not funded
- **Tier Two**: Critical to ongoing programs
- **Tier Three**: Non-essential
- **Wish List Items**: Non-prioritized requests

Following this prioritization, the vice president meets with the deans for further discussion and the development of a single list that includes all requests. Once the single list is developed, it is shared with all department chairs and directors who have an opportunity to meet with the vice president and the supervising dean for further discussion if they feel that a particular request should have been prioritized differently.

The vice president then forwards the prioritized list to the Budget and Planning Committee for consideration.

**Evidence:**
21.1 Budget and Planning Template

22. The college will develop institutional priorities and a participatory budget planning process that integrates resource allocation with enrollment management strategies and unit assessment data.
The college has developed a planning and budget process as outlined in the following excerpt from the Budget and Planning document developed in 2008 (22.1):

**What is the college planning cycle?**
The college planning cycle is the set of activities undertaken annually to develop and update college strategic goals and develop operational plans to achieve those goals.

**How does the college planning cycle work? What is the calendar for conducting planning at LAMC?**
In July-August of each year, College Council reviews area plans considering objectives that have or have not been met, external environmental factors, District initiatives, and revises the strategic plan. In addition, it sets forth annual focus areas or strategic directions, which guide the unit planning process in the coming year.

Each fall semester unit plans are updated to account for strategic directions set by College Council and to report progress on objectives (attained, revised, deleted). Evaluation of unit plans occurs as required by the time-frame of the objective, some of which may be multi-year. Area plans are revised and updated based on the unit plan updates.

With input from the shared governance committees, resource requests in area plans are prioritized and submitted through the appropriate resource allocation approval path (See Chart 2, above under Recommendation #4). Approved requests are incorporated into the college’s annual operational plan (proposed budget).

**How are shared governance committees involved in college planning?**
All units belong to one of the principal college divisions (Academic Affairs, Student Services, Administrative Services, President’s Office). Area or division plans are the collection/aggregation of individual unit plans. Area plans are administered by the college division head (usually vice-president) and shared governance committees provide input to these plans through their involvement with the program review process. Shared governance committees validate information from program reviews and recommend priorities to division managers in the formulation of area plans.

**What is the role of the Budget and Planning Committee in college planning?**
The Budget and Planning Committee has a unique role in the shared governance process. This committee brings a college-wide perspective to the planning process and engages in the following activities:

- Makes funding recommendations concerning resource requests derived from division plans.
- Receives budget-related information, including State and District budget updates, and conveys the information to constituents and College Council.
- Reports to constituents and College Council on progress made in the resource allocation processes for new faculty, new classified staff, new equipment purchases, budget augmentations, and space allocation.
• Recommends the allocation of available discretionary funds for budget augmentations according to the prioritized list (formerly known as “Request for Resources Over Base”) provided by the managers of the college divisions.

• Brings a college-wide perspective in reviewing the fiscal aspects of operationalizing the college’s strategic objectives and directions

• Is knowledgeable about the type and amount of college funding sources and recommends funding sources to best fund resource requests designed to attain strategic objectives.

• Recognizes secondary effects resulting from the funding of a prioritized project and suggest solutions to the secondary effects.

• Recommends ways by which multi-year projects can obtain sustained resources needed for a multi-year effort.

• Discusses college-wide issues that could have budgetary implications.

• Reviews SFP grant proposals and expenditure plans to ensure consistency with college goals and expenditure priorities.

**Evidence:**
22.1 Budget and Planning Document, 2008

23. The college Budget Committee will work with the administration and the College Council to develop a strategy to address the existing fiscal deficit by spring 2007.

Since fiscal year 2006/07, enrollment has been increasing steadily due to improvements in college recruiting, scheduling, and online education. The college’s Academic Affairs division plans offerings to meet student needs and to achieve FTES targets. FTES and average class size data is regularly analyzed and used as a basis for planning future class schedules and hourly rate expenditures. Academic Affairs tracks class offerings to ensure that classes offered will allow students to obtain required courses for their majors and to meet graduation and transfer requirements. High and low demand disciplines are continuously monitored so as to ensure that classes meet enrollment goals. For the past two fiscal years, the college ended with positive balances since growth incentives and funds were provided through state funding and district-wide reserves. In fact, over the past four years, instructional costs per FTES have declined by 10.1%, administrative costs per FTES have declined by 13% and administrative costs as a percentage of total costs have declined by 1.5%. The college has achieved a high level of instructional efficiency and will continue to monitor productivity. As a result of the increase in efficiencies, the college had positive ending balances in fiscal years 2007-08 and 2008-09 (23.1).
TABLE 7: COLLEGE EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS
2006-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
<td>-$522,672</td>
<td>$330,418</td>
<td>$501,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/FTES</td>
<td>$4,567</td>
<td>$4,306</td>
<td>$4,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Class Size</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Carrying Forward</td>
<td>-$2,034,392</td>
<td>-$1,530,486</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Budget and Planning Committee is regularly informed of the college’s fiscal position and has recommended strategies to address fiscal problems at the campus level. These strategies have involved a review of the expenditure plans of the college’s Specially Funded Programs to identify potential funding sources outside of the college’s basic program and assess consistency with college strategic goals. The committee has also recommended cost control strategies (such as personnel and supply account freezes) and has been a principal discussion forum for exploring the fiscal impacts of reductions in categorical program budgets and projected staffing changes associated with the college’s new/expanded facilities.

Evidence:
23.1 LAMC Effectiveness Report 2009

24. All college Business Services units will complete the unit assessment process by fall 2007.

All college Business Services units completed the program review process in spring 2009. One of the changes that has resulted from this process is an increase in campus accountability and control being applied to the Specially Funded Programs (SFPs), leading to lower likelihood of incurring year-end deficits. The Budget and Planning Committee has stepped up efforts to understand and monitor the expenditure plans of these programs. In addition, administrative services has conducted workshops to improve budget control and make more appropriate contributions to college operations such as expenditure transfers to these programs.

Improvements were made by the Business Office in collaboration with IT to provide a new print card for printing services for students in the Learning Resource Center. A new Student Services and Administration building scheduled to be completed in 2014 will provide an expanded service area in the Business Office for students to pay fees, obtain student identification cards and purchase parking permits. The bookstore has expanded the online textbook services and is working with publishers to expand the textbook buy-back program to assist students with the increasing cost of textbooks. Improved levels of services to students, such as shorter wait times and faster cashiering services, will be provided in the new bookstore complex scheduled to open in spring 2011. Reprographics and the Mailroom were recently renovated to provide improved copy and mail services and added self service options to faculty and staff.

25. The College Council will develop processes for the regular and systematic evaluation of the effectiveness and integrity of its shared governance committees by fall 2008.
The college has developed a very thorough and rigorous process for the systematic evaluation of the effectiveness and integrity of its shared governance committees. The process consists of two separate evaluations; one conducted by each committee (self-evaluation) during the spring semester and a second evaluation conducted by two-member teams during the winter. This process has been described in detail under Recommendation 3.
UPDATE ON SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE PROPOSALS IN PROGRESS, PENDING, OR PLANNED

Since the Accreditation Site Visit in March 2007, many more faculty have received training in online pedagogy and use of course management systems. The curriculum committee has approved several additional courses for delivery in the distance education modality.

In November 2009, the Distance Education Committee reviewed the number of courses approved for distance education. In December, the Distance Education Committee presented a report to the Educational Planning Committee on the growth of distance education at the college. Based upon student demand, increasing faculty interest and the increasing number of classes approved for delivery in a distance education format, the Distance Education Committee informed the Educational Planning Committee that the college should begin the process of preparing a Substantive Change Proposal to plan for future growth in online classes, certificates and possible degrees.