RESPONSES TO 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS
RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE MOST RECENT EDUCATIONAL QUALITY AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW (2007)

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, after receiving the accreditation team’s final evaluation report, a leadership retreat was held in July 2007 to review and plan strategies to address the College’s response to the recommendations. 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. 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. There was a breakout session during the retreat to discuss the proposed language for the Code of Conduct Statement. The participants agreed on a statement condensed from the original draft. The Code of Conduct included language that stated that those representing or acting on behalf of the College have a responsibility to conduct themselves in a manner that will maintain civility. The code encourages institutional leaders to work together collegially by promoting conflict resolution, respect, fairness, and a commitment to student success and learning. At the end of the retreat, the document was presented to all the participants, and subsequently was distributed to the campus community via e-mail.

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 approved by the Academic Senate at its December, 2007 meeting with minor modifications. It was approved unanimously by the College Council at its December, 2007 meeting and was incorporated in the charters of the shared governance committees as part of the membership responsibilities. The College Council reaffirmed the College Code of Conduct at its September, 2009 meeting. All College shared governance committees have incorporated the following language about the College Code of Conduct into their charters: “Committee members are obligated to comply with the College Code of Conduct.” Any staff member displaying unprofessional and or uncivil behavior may be referred to Human Resources for violating District standards of professionalism as delineated in LACCD Personnel Guide policies B474 and B476. 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 Web site.

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. 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 five years following the 2007 recommendations, campus climate and collegiality improved in a sustainable and significant manner.

In 2011-2012 campus climate became difficult once again. The abrupt resignation of the Vice President of Academic Affairs was followed by a recall attempt against the faculty union leadership. Tensions within the Associated Students Organization resulted in an impeachment attempt against the ASO President. These events were followed by student and community protests over the budget cuts, attacks against certain administrators and faculty members, departmental conflicts, and a recall attempt against the Academic Senate leadership. The
College has addressed these challenges through a variety of interventions including an investigation by the District Diversity Office, mediation, conflict resolution workshops, and a union sponsored Anti-Bullying pledge campaign. The College also included several actionable improvement plans in this self evaluation report to address these issues.

**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 and 2010 Accreditation Midterm Report, the Shared Governance Task Force that was established by the College Council in May of 2007 has continued to oversee the shared governance committees. The six shared governance standing committees that report and make recommendations to College Council are the Budget and Planning Committee, Educational Planning Committee, Facilities Planning Committee, Professional and Staff Development Committee, Student Support Services Committee, and Technology Committee (For an illustration of LAMC’s Shared Governance Committee Structure, see Standard I.B.1, Chart 1). Additionally, College Council recently approved the establishment of a Program Review Oversight Committee to help standardize the Program Review process across all College divisions. The charter for Program Review Oversight Committee had not been finalized at the time this report was written.

The six shared governance committees have met on a regular basis since the last self study. Committee charters, agendas, and minutes are posted on the College Web site. Standing committees submit monthly reports to the College Council, which 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. The co-chairs of the 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 American Federation of Teachers (AFT) union leadership. College Council and all the standing committees have regular meeting times and places and established memberships (Table 1). All meetings are open to the public.
TABLE 1
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 Monday at 12:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Center Room 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the fall of 2007, the Shared Governance Task Force made recommendations to College Council defining the charge, function, and membership of the six shared governance committees. Each committee developed a charter based on these recommendations, which was approved by College Council. The charters specify the membership and areas of responsibility of each committee. As a result of regular shared governance committee evaluations (see Recommendation 3 below), which are performed twice a year, the charters have been revised as needed to further refine the areas of responsibility of each committee.

**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 and the 2010 Accreditation Midterm Report, 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. The Shared Governance Task Force began meeting in June 2007 and developed a template for the shared governance committee charters including the purpose, membership, authorization, goals and objectives, reporting system, membership responsibility and code of conduct.

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

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. Each committee performed a self evaluation in 2008 and 2009 (Table 2).

<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>

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 Table 3.

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 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. 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 Web site?
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:
INTRODUCTION

Los Angeles Mission College is currently implementing its Facilities Master Plan to address the needs of a growing student population. Since the last accreditation report, there have been several significant developments:

- Construction of the Media Arts Center is approximately 30 percent complete.
- The Child Development Studies program has been reestablished with the support of Proposition AA, and Measure J—designed to help the nine Los Angeles Community College Districts.
- The College has acquired 11 additional acres, which expanded its footprint to its existing size. From its humble storefront beginnings in 1975 to today's modern campus, the College has opened the doors to the city of San Fernando in the Northeast San Fernando Valley. The College was established to provide noncredit instruction, counseling, and community services and education. Over the past 37 years, the College has sought to unleash the potential of the community through innovative programs encouraging academic and personal growth.

The College has also made significant investments in facilities and programs. For example, the College has invested in the construction and expansion of the Health, Fitness, and Athletics Complex; the Culinary Arts Institute and Eagles' Landing Student Store; and the Center for Math and Science. In addition, the Media Arts Center is expected to be completed by June 2009. This will better enable the Budget and Planning Committee to fully incorporate budget allocation processes.

The two-member teams completed their first round of committee evaluations in January 2009, 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 in February, 2009 and were placed on the agenda for the regular February 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. These external evaluations are

<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>

TABLE 3
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY LOS ANGELES MISSION COLLEGE SHARED GOVERNANCE TASK FORCE, MAY 2008, MAY 2009

The two-member teams completed their first round of committee evaluations in January 2009, 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 in February, 2009 and were placed on the agenda for the regular February 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. These external evaluations are
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conducted on an annual basis. Table 4 summarizes the external evaluations for 2011-12 and a written summary for each committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Number of Meetings</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>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Planning</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Staff Development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Planning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 2008, 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 continues to monitor the effectiveness of each committee on an ongoing basis. Self-evaluations and external evaluations take place every year. The results of these evaluations are compiled and presented to College Council. These evaluations serve as the basis for recommendations for improvement of the shared governance process.

**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 2010 Accreditation Midterm Report, 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 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 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. The first year, 95 percent of the academic units submitted their Program Reviews by the spring 2008 due date. Non-instructional units completed their Program Reviews during spring 2009. Since this time, the College has conducted comprehensive Program Reviews every three years and Program Review updates every year for both instructional and non-instructional units.

In 2008-09 the College developed and implemented an online Program Review System. 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 (Educational Planning Committee for academic units, 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 has also developed a web-based system for the management of SLO assessments which is linked to the online Program Review System.

In the College’s shared governance framework, as shown in Standard I.B.2, Chart 2: Resource Allocation Approval Path, 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 the Program Review process as the primary process for developing resource requests. This movement represents a significant change from the former resource allocation system, which was characterized by a multiplicity of request processes (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.

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 time frame; therefore, budget prioritzations 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.

**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 an annual Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment report has been prepared. The results of the reports are summarized in Table 5.
As can be seen from these results, the faculty of Los Angeles Mission College have been actively assessing course SLOs. Faculty, in general, have been very cooperative, and the chairs of the departments have worked closely with both their full-time and adjunct faculty to define SLOs, develop realistic and measurable assessments and criteria for evaluation, and make curricular improvements as a result of the assessments. A wide variety of assessment instruments are being used to measure student achievement of SLOs.

All Student Services divisions have identified Service Area Outcome (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 2004. A diversity of evaluation instruments have been conducted 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, Web site hits, retention, transfer rates; number of students who complete a Student Educational Plan, Financial Aid applications, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course SLOs Defined</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined Assessments</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses with at least one SLO Assessed</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes Implemented</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Division of Administrative Services has developed Service Area Outcomes/SLOs in support of student learning and these have been incorporated into the Program Review comprehensive and annual update processes.

A Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Web page was developed during the spring semester 2007 and is regularly updated. The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee was formed, began meeting in September 2007, and met bi-weekly throughout 2007-2008. The SLOA Committee wrote an SLOA mission statement, shared SLOA information, assisted other faculty members and Student Services personnel with writing SLOs and Service Area Outcomes, 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 LAMC’s 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. This was
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successfully completed, and since fall of 2010, all SLOs and assessments are recorded using this online system.

In October and November 2007, the SLO Coordinator worked with LAMC’s Dean of institutional Effectiveness to incorporate SLOs into the revised online Program Review/Unit Assessment template, 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 Curriculum Committee meetings twice a month; 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, and the Council of Instruction (chairs’ council).

An SLOA timetable and action plan was developed to complete the 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 Web site. All faculty include one to three student learning outcomes in their course syllabi.

Department chairs worked closely with their discipline faculty to complete their degree and certificate SLOs and to complete their assessments. In the 2011 academic year, the College began assessing the Institutional SLOs. The College has compared 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. Beginning fall 2013 Program and certificate outcomes were listed 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.

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, 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 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 Web sites so that they would have a consistent look and ease of navigation.

To improve intra-college coordination of enrollment management activities, the College has formed an Enrollment Management Team (EMT) as an additional mechanism to facilitate enrollment planning. The 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 Web site.

SAP/HR has been operational for over three years and many of the features of the HR module, including manager’s desktop and employee evaluations are being implemented at this time. The HR Council, which is represented by campus presidents, vice presidents, and district office human resources staff, has created extensive documentation, entitled HR Guides, which outlines all of the district/campus policies and procedures for human resource management. Two
additional modules, budget planning and asset management, are included in the District Technology Department’s plan for the near future. Ongoing 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 Web site is updated with applicable forms, procedures and/or links to the District Office intranet. 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 Web site, 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

Responses to 2007 Recommendations
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.
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 (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), the following 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)

To more fully clarify the meaning of this statement, a contract interpretation was agreed to by the District and the faculty union in spring 2009, noting the following responsibilities:

1. Writing SLOs and establishing assessment tools/rubrics [disciplines or departments]
2. Including the officially approved course SLOs on course syllabi [all faculty]
3. Incorporating approved SLOs in teaching [all faculty]
4. Providing the instructor with a copy (electronic or hard copy) of the course outline and any officially approved SLOs [department chairs]
5. Determining a process for officially approving SLOs [determined by the College and usually jointly agreed to by the faculty in a discipline or department and the College’s academic senate]
6. Conducting SLO assessments in assigned classes and using the results to make appropriate changes in instruction to improve student learning [all faculty]

In addition, the District established a Student Learning Outcomes Advisory Council (SLOAC), which meets both in person and virtually to share best practices and strategies for SLO coordination and assessment, provide mutual support and reinforcement for the Colleges’ SLO Coordinators, optimize resources, and strengthen networking for problem-solving.

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

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

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

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. At its annual retreats, the Board scores its performance, reporting on its self-assessment and the summarized evaluations of constituency representatives who sit at the resource table during board meetings. The Board establishes new goals for the following year, both to address District priorities as well as any issues that have arisen as a result of the self-evaluation.

To increase follow-through and accountability at the District level, in 2010 the Board adopted a District Effectiveness Review Cycle, which aligns annual Board and CEO goals with District Strategic Plan (DSP) goals. The annual cycle includes Board evaluation, Board retreats, college activities in support of goals, institutional effectiveness reports, and District effectiveness reports that align with the DSP.

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

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

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