

EVALUATION REPORT

**Los Angeles Mission College
13356 Eldridge Avenue
Sylmar, CA 91342-3244**

A Confidential Report Prepared for the
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Los Angeles Mission College on March 19 – 22, 2007

Dr. Kathleen O’Connell Hodge, Chair

**Los Angeles Mission College
Comprehensive Evaluation Visit Team Roster
March 19 – 22, 2007**

Dr. Kathleen O’Connell Hodge, Chair
President
Fullerton College

Ms. Carol Mattson
Dean, Academic Services
Fullerton College

Dr. R. David Chapel
Trustee
Rancho Santiago Community College District

Ms. Sylvia Thomas
Associate Vice Chancellor Instruction
Riverside Community College District

Dr. David Humphreys
Dean, Academic Affairs
Allen Hancock College

Dr. Frederick Trapp
Administrative Dean, Research/
Academic Services
Long Beach City College

Dr. Glen Kuck
Executive Director of Distributed Education
San Bernardino Community College District

Dr. Lori Waite
Dean of Counseling and Matriculation
Chaffey College

Summary of the Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION: Los Angeles Mission College

DATE OF VISIT: March 19 – 22, 2007

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Kathleen O’Connell Hodge
President, Fullerton College

A nine member accreditation team visited Los Angeles College from March 19-22, 2007 for the purposes of determining whether the institution continues to meet accreditation standards, evaluating how well the college is achieving its stated purposes, analyzing how the college is meeting the commission standards, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvements, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the accredited status of the college.

In preparation for the visit team members attended an all day team training session on February 13, 2007 conducted by AACJC, studied the Commission’s *Team Evaluator Manual* and *Guide to Evaluating Institutions*, and were divided into sub-groups according to the accreditation standards. Team members also carefully read the college’s self study (including the recommendations from the 2001 accreditation team) and related evidentiary documents provided by Los Angeles Mission College.

Prior to arriving on campus, each team member prepared written reactions to the Los Angeles Mission College self study and identified inquiries to be made during the visit. Prior to the visit team members e-mailed a list of district and college employees to be scheduled for interview appointments. The appointments were scheduled by the Los Angeles Mission College Accreditation Liaison Officer to the visiting team. Prior to the college site visit the team assembled on March 19, 2007 at the Los Angeles Community College District offices to meet with the District Chancellor; the Associate Vice Chancellor of Instruction, Student Services & Research; the District Chief Financial Officer; the Senior Associate Vice Chancellor of Human Resources; the Senior Vice Chancellor; the Executive Director of Facilities, Facilities Planning and Development; the Associate Vice Chancellor Strategic Planning & Accreditation Coordination; the District Academic Senate President; the Personnel Commissioner; and three Trustees. Following the five-hour meeting with the district staff, the team traveled approximately 40 miles to the hotel where the team reviewed their findings from the meeting with the district staff, reviewed assignments and written reports, and participated in an in-depth discussion of the elements of Los Angeles Mission College’s self study.

During the three-day visit, the team had conversations individually or in groups with 68 students, 92 members of the faculty, 48 college staff, one Board of Trustees member, and 38 administrators from the district and college. The team visited 25 classes, 11 laboratories, and four off-site locations. In addition, a total of approximately 50 people attended the two open forums, one held in the evening and one at noon to accommodate employee and student

schedules. The team appreciated the candor of the faculty, administrators, staff, and students throughout the visit.

The self study report was comprehensive, complete, and well written. All members of the Los Angeles Mission College governance team endorsed the self study. The team found the self study to be candid and an accurate representation of the strengths and challenges facing the college. The team room was well organized with supporting evidence labeled and filed in a user-friendly manner. The college was prepared and willing to respond to team member requests for additional information or evidence. The team found Los Angeles Mission College well prepared for the team visit.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2007 Team

The team crafted six recommendations for Los Angeles Mission College. Four additional recommendations specifically addressed to the district were added as the result of coordination and discussion among the three chairs.

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, I.B.6, I.B.7, IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3, IV.A.5).

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).

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).

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.1, III.D.1.a,b,c,d, III.D.3).

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,c,e,f,g,h,i, II.A.3, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.1.c).

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).

Recommendation 7: District Progress on SLOs

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).

Recommendation 8: District Plan for Retiree Health Benefit Liability

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).

Recommendation 9: Board of Trustees Self Evaluation Process

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).

Recommendation 10: Evaluation of College Presidents

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).

ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT FOR LOS ANGELES MISSION COLLEGE

Comprehensive Evaluation Visit March 19 – 22, 2007

INTRODUCTION

Los Angeles Mission College (LAMC) is a comprehensive California community college with an enrollment of 7,447. LAMC is located on 22 acres in the Northeast San Fernando Valley in the community of Sylmar and close to the city of San Fernando. It was established in 1975 and for its first 16 years offered classes in scattered storefronts and leased facilities throughout the city. In 1991 the new permanent campus was completed and the college experienced a surge in enrollments and a resulting higher visibility in the community. From humble storefront beginnings in 1975 to today's modern campus, the college has opened the doors to higher education for generations of students. From the beginning the college has sought to unleash the potential of the community through innovative programs encouraging academic and personal growth. The college is one of nine in the Los Angeles Community College District. The district encompasses 882 square miles serving nearly 108,000 students from a population base of nearly 5 million district residents located in the city of Los Angeles and several surrounding communities and unincorporated areas.

The college provides lower-division general education, AA and AS degree programs, occupational education, occupational certificates, transfer education, developmental education, counseling, and community services. Over the past 30 years the college has operated numerous workforce development programs, empowered immigrants through language and citizenship programs, enabled thousands to transition through the continuum of education linking high school, college, and the world of work, and graduated many of today's community leaders in business and civic affairs.

In 2001 and again in 2003, voters approved bond measures designed to help the nine Los Angeles Community College District campuses improve aging facilities and expand. Los Angeles Mission College now has in place a Master Plan to meet the needs of a growing enrollment. Since the last self study the college has completed the construction of the Collaborative Studies Building and will soon break ground for a new Child Development

Center (March 2007). Over the next decade, the “look” of Los Angeles Mission College will change dramatically with the addition of more classroom space, a fitness center, a media arts facility, a family and consumer studies building, a new child development center and additional parking.

The socioeconomic characteristics of the college’s service areas are predominantly Hispanic (64.5%), but also displays significant diversity, being 4.7% African-American, 8.0% Asian, and 20.7% White. In comparison the population in Los Angeles County is 44.6% Hispanic, 9.4% African-American, 11.8% Asian, and 30.9% White.

The primary service area is characterized by relatively lower levels of educational attainment in comparison to Los Angeles County as a whole. Over the period fall 1985 to fall 1995, college enrollment averaged 4,976 students. Upon moving to the new campus facility in 1991, enrollment increased to 7,272. Peak enrollment in the period fall 1991 to fall 1999 was 7,423 in fall 1992, with enrollment reaching its lowest level in fall 1995 with 5,502 students. From fall 1995 until fall 2002, the college experienced a period of increasing enrollment. The average annual growth rate in student headcount during this period was nearly 9% and peak enrollment was 8,966 students in fall 2002. Following the implementation of district policies to reduce unfunded full-time equivalent students (FTES), in fall 2003 enrollments began to decline. In fall 2006 preliminary credit headcount enrollment was 7,447. Trends in FTES over this period have displayed a similar pattern.

The ethnic composition of the student population has shifted slightly since fall 2000. The proportion of African-American students has declined slightly from 6.2% in fall 2000 to 5.2% in fall 2005, while the percentage of Asian students has increased from 6.0% to 7.7% over this same time period. The proportion of Hispanic students, the largest ethnic group, has varied slightly from year to year and averaged nearly 71% over the period fall 2000 to 2005.

On a headcount basis, the total faculty (including non-teaching faculty) at LAMC in fall 2006 consisted of 76 regular contract faculty and 238 adjunct faculty. The non-instructional staff was comprised of nine Administrators, five Classified Managers, 14 Classified Supervisors, 90 Technical/Clerical (including Confidential) employees, and 21 Crafts/Maintenance employees.

The college climate is student centered and welcoming. The team was informed of interpersonal conflict among limited numbers of faculty which resulted in an erosion of faculty participation in shared governance efforts to support student learning programs and

services or improve overall institutional effectiveness. However, a recent change in college leadership has resulted in a positive change in climate at the college.

Team Evaluation of Institutional Responses to 2001 Recommendations

The ten institutional recommendations prepared by the 2001 visiting team were addressed in the 2007 self-study report. The college's response to the ten recommendations has been in some cases recent and in most cases only partially successful. Chief among the shortcomings are failure to implement fully unit assessments and the development of an integrated cycle of assessment, planning, and allocation.

Recommendation #1

The team recommends that the college complete the approval process for the new mission statement and submit it to the Board of Trustees for approval. (Standard 1.1)

The college is in full compliance with this recommendation. The college completed the approval process for the new mission statement. The mission statement was submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval July, 2006.

Recommendation #2

The team recommends that the college carefully review its publications, particularly the college catalog, to eliminate confusing statements of programs, policies and procedures. (Standard 2.1)

The college response to this recommendation is complete. The college formed a catalog review task force under the leadership of the dean of academic affairs.

Recommendation #3

The team recommends the college complete the development of both the Assessment and Planning and Institutional Effectiveness processes and resolve how the old and new planning processes will co-exist during the transition period. (Standards 3.B.1, 3.B.2, 7.C.1)

The college response to this recommendation is incomplete. Despite initial efforts to implement change, the processes "broke down" and remains unfinished. The college needs to create a budget development model that accounts for resource allocations in enrollment management, technology, operations, personnel and support of recently decentralized functions. (See 2007 Recommendation 4)

Recommendation #4

The team recommends the college develop comprehensive plans in the areas of educational and student service programs, facilities, technology, and library acquisitions that are linked to resource allocations and tied to the new Assessment and Planning process. (Standards 3.B.3, 4.D.1, 5.10, 6.5, 6.7, 8.5)

The college response to this recommendation is incomplete, the college completed plans in all the areas defined by the 2001 team with the exception of student services. The completed plans do not link assessment to planning resource allocation processes. (See 2007 Recommendation 4)

Recommendation #5

The team recommends that the college expand the research function with adequate staffing and resources to fully support the newly designed planning process. (Standards 3.A.1, 3.A.2, 3.C.3, 10.C.1)

The college is to be commended for creating the research analyst position. Although permanent funding has been identified for the research analyst position, funding to support the demands of the research office is not adequate.

Recommendation #6

With the assistance of broad-based input, the college should develop an enrollment management plan that provides a framework for strategic growth. (Standard 4.A.1, A.2, A.3, A.4)

The college's response to this recommendation is incomplete. The college has developed a Facilities Master Plan and an Educational Master Plan, providing long-term guidance. Long and short-term planning mechanisms have yet to be fully integrated into the overall planning framework.

Recommendation #7

The team recommends that the college conduct a thorough analysis of classroom utilization during low use periods to meet increased student enrollment. (Standard 8.1)

The response to this recommendation is candid and complete. Initial steps to tie classroom utilization to the college Enrollment Management Committee have been taken. Institutional research data is available to assist in making decisions.

Recommendation #8

The team recommends that additional modifications to the budget allocation model be made that would provide equity to the formula that better meets the needs of the colleges and the district. The formula should be designed to address the economies of scale for the small colleges in the district. (Standard 9A)

The response to this recommendation is candid and complete. The District Budget Committee (DBC) has instituted a grant allocation procedure through which colleges ending the year with a deficit can request the intervention of the DBC Allocation Grant Task Force. Further, it is clear that this model continues to be revisited and the District has both convened task forces and employed outside consultants to review this issue. However, at the College level, there remains the need to develop a functional budgeting model.

Recommendation #9

The team recommends that the college continue to place a high priority on improving communication and consultation among the employee community and the district/college administration and actively foster and train staff and students to develop consistent participation in the governance committees and structures of the college. (Standards 7C.1, 7C.2, 10B.5, 10B.6, 10B.7, 10B.8, 10B.9, 10B.10, 10C.3, 10C.5)

The interim college president has increased efforts to form stronger links with the community and to address the expressed needs of the community. In addition, he has focused on stabilizing the administrative structure and supporting the development of a new shared governance model.

Although the college is to be commended for the collegial development of the new shared governance model and committee structure, it will need review after implementation. In the last two years there appears to be less participation by students and staff in the governance committees. (See 2007 Recommendation 3)

Recommendation #10

The team recommends that the college review the organizational structure to ensure that reporting relationships are both effective and efficient and in accordance with the college's mission statement. (Standard 10B.3)

The college's response to this recommendation is complete. The organization chart was revised in 2002.

Eligibility Requirements

1. **AUTHORITY**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College receives State approval of its programs/services and is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association for Schools and Colleges. The college is authorized to operate as an educational institution and to offer undergraduate education.

2. **MISSION**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College's Mission Statement is clearly defined. It was last revised and adopted by the Board of Trustees on July 26, 2007. The college's mission statement is included in the catalog and is posted on the college's website. The mission is appropriate to a degree-granting institution of higher education and its Southern California constituency.

3. **GOVERNING BOARD**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College has a functioning governing board responsible for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the institution and for ensuring that the institution's mission is being carried out. Its membership is sufficient in size and composition to fulfill all board responsibilities.

4. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College has a chief executive officer who is appointed by the governing board and whose primary responsibility is to the institution.

5. **ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College has an administrative staff that supports the necessary services for an institution of its size, mission, and purpose.

6. **OPERATING STATUS**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College is operational with students actively pursuing its degree programs.

7. **DEGREES**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College offer 46 Associate Degrees and 56 certificate programs and nearly 45 percent of credit students are enrolled in associate degree applicable courses.

8. **EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College's principle degree programs are congruent with its mission, are based on recognized higher education fields of study, and are of sufficient content and length.

9. **ACADEMIC CREDIT**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College awards academic credits based on generally accepted practices in degree granting institutions of higher education.

10. **STUDENT LEARNING AND ACHIEVEMENT**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College is working on listing student learning outcomes in all course outlines and programs of study leading to an associate degree, certificate, and programs of study leading to transfer.

11. **GENERAL EDUCATION**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and promote intellectual inquiry.

12. **ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College faculty and students are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as judged by the academic/educational community in general.

13. **FACULTY**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College employed 76 full-time and 238 part-time faculty members as of March 2007. The faculty members are qualified to conduct the institution's programs and meet State mandated minimum requirements.

14. **STUDENT SERVICES**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College provides for all of its students appropriate student services and develops programs consistent with student characteristics and the institutional mission.

15. **ADMISSIONS**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission that specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs.

16. **INFORMATION AND LEARNING RESOURCES**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College provides specific long term access to sufficient information and learning resources and services to support its mission and all of its educational programs.

17. **FINANCIAL RESOURCES**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College documents a funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to support student learning programs and services to improve institutional effectiveness and to assure financial stability.

18. **FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College annually undergoes and makes available an external financial audit by a certified public accountant.

19. **INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College provides basic planning for the development of the institution. It evaluates how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes. Planning processes, however, need to be integrated, consistent, and evaluated.

20. **PUBLIC INFORMATION**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College publishes in its catalog, class schedule, and other publications information concerning the college's purposes and objectives, admission requirements and procedures, rules and regulations affecting students, degrees offered, degree requirements, etc. In addition, the college distributes annual publications that focus on program accomplishments and student graduates.

21. **RELATIONS WITH THE ACCREDITING COMMISSION**

The team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College adheres to the eligibility requirements, standards and policies of ACCJC, describes itself in identical terms to all of its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accreditation status in a timely manner, and agrees to disclose information required by ACCJC to carry out its accrediting responsibilities.

EVALUATION OF LOS ANGELES MISSION COLLEGE USING ACCJC 2002 STANDARDS

Standard I Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

A. Mission

General Comments

This portion of the report details the evolutionary stages through which the college has transitioned relative to finding their voice and vision for their mission.

Findings and Evidence

The mission addresses the broad educational purposes of the college, emphasizing student learning and success, but the mission fails to define the intended student population (I.A.1).

The mission statement was updated and discussed as part of the development of the Educational Master Plan (EMP) in 2004. It was then approved by Academic Senate, the College Council and finally by the Board, July 2006. The latest mission statement is published in the 2006-2007 college catalog and on the college website. However, a variation (previous mission) is published on page 72 in the spring, 2007 class schedule (I.A.2).

Conclusions

The mission statement has been revised twice since 2000, with the latest revision approved by the Board in July 2006. However, the college acknowledges that the mission does not clearly define the intended student population.

Furthermore, it is not apparent that the college has formal plans to review the mission through the governance and decision making process or to revise it as necessary on a regular basis (I.A.1.3.4).

The planning agenda acknowledges that the college must formalize a process for regular review of the mission statement by fall 2007, indicating the college is in compliance with the provisions of this standard.

B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Comments

In 2005 the college adopted an Educational Master Plan (EMP) that contains a number of goals and action items with milestone dates at the conclusion of the document. It is not clear how these are incorporated into organizational structures and actions or how the results were/will be measured, evaluated and used to prompt improvements.

Recently the College Shared Governance Committees were restructured in part due to the new AFT contract that requires a Budget Committee and an Educational Plan Committee. While some acknowledge that the old college shared governance committee structure had of a goal of linking planning to budget, there appeared to be a need for a new organizational structure with more clarity. Given the fact that the restructure took place March 2007, there is no evidence at this time to indicate how it will improve institutional effectiveness.

With the restructuring of the College Shared Governance Committees, the Assessment and Planning Committee and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) are no longer active. The most recent IEC Chair indicated that the committee last met in 2005, and the most recent six-year cycle for unit assessments was incomplete. Currently, the planning, assessment, and resource allocation processes are not aligned. Conversations with staff indicate that the task of the new Educational Planning Committee will in part be to rethink unit assessments and take a comprehensive approach to program review and link planning to budget.

Findings and Evidence

There is evidence that contention at the college among groups has influenced and deterred collegial, self-reflective dialogue that could improve student learning and institutional processes. While the faculty contract requires that full-time faculty serve on one or more committees, this has not been enforced.

The Academic Senate President participated in a series of meetings to determine the committee composition and functions of a new Educational Planning Committee (EPC) with faculty and administration as co-chairs. The specific task of the EPC is yet to be determined, but generally the committee will help develop, update and oversee the implementation of the Educational Master Plan (EMP) (I.B.1.2.3.4).

The EPC will also determine the responsibility for evaluating unit assessments previously overseen by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, which last met in 2005. However, historically there has been a lack of participation in the unit assessment process planning. As of spring 2002, 35 out of 51 disciplines submitted a unit assessment. Conversations with faculty indicate that the IE unit planning was useful and informative, but once unit assessments were completed, the plans were shelved and not integrated into the campus planning or used as part of the budget allocation process, even though this connection was part of the original unit planning process. In cases where money was not required, faculty used the assessment results to make changes to curriculum, address tutoring needs, and proposed facility changes. Recently though, units were required to complete their assessments prior to submitting a request for block grant funding. The results were positive, increasing unit assessment submissions from various disciplines (I.B.3-6).

The Educational Planning Committee (EPC) now being created is expected to determine how to revitalize unit assessment (program review) and identify and assess Student Learning Outcomes. Committee members are expected to be selected in spring 2007, so it is too soon to see evidence of the EPC's effectiveness. The college will need to address the action items

listed in the EMP pertinent to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, which is no longer active due to the restructuring.

The college recently appointed a Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) coordinator to oversee the development of learning outcomes at the course and program level and to develop a SLO website. SLOs for general education have been adopted and are published in the college catalog. Some programs, mainly vocational in nature, have developed SLOs, and there are a few at the course level, some of which were drafted during and following a flex workshop which took place fall 2006.

The Los Angeles Community College District has a newly adopted District Strategic Plan which has been presented to college constituents. It is uncertain how and whether the college will consider and utilize the district goals in college planning since the college itself has not developed a long-term strategic plan. In 2005 the college approved an Educational Master Plan defining a series of goals including the management and coordination of course scheduling to increase the number of students completing certificates, degrees, and transfer requirements.

An Enrollment Management Committee (EMC) was established to develop actions and strategies to help meet the district's established FTES target for the college. The EMC discussed related enrollment topics including matriculation, orientation, outreach, and scheduling. Although Instructional Deans review and approve schedules proposed by the Department Chairs, there is no formal enrollment plan that would coordinate and integrate efforts to enhance enrollment and retention. Enrollment data is available on the Institutional Research and Technology Website at http://www.lamission.edu/research/enroll_man.html to help deans and department chairs analyze trends and monitor and maximize course offerings and enrollments. Currently the Dean of Research and Technology attends the Council of Instruction (Department Chair) meetings and meets with individuals to explain instructional measures as requested. Instructional Deans and the Dean of Research Planning and Technology work with the Department Chairs to help them understand the data and how it is applied to scheduling. Formal training has not been provided.

General Education Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) were established by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee in 2001, approved by the Academic Senate and are published in the college catalog on page two and three. Goals listed on page two in the college catalog were approved before the completion of the Educational Master Plan and are not the current college goals. As a result, the college has established a task force to discuss way to improve the catalog for content and accuracy. (I.B.2)

Overall, collegewide planning, resource allocation, and evaluation collapsed under economic stress, administrative changes, and strong and vocal differences on campus. Under the most recent college leadership, a new Shared Governance Committee Structure has been developed. The new structure was adopted March, 2007, so it is premature to assess how this will influence institutional effectiveness and decision making.

Since 2001 and until 2005, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee called for campuswide unit assessments. Unit assessment templates were prepared for Academic Disciplines and

Programs, Administrative Services, Student Services, the Library and Counseling, and the Dean of Research coordinated surveys and prepared data in preparation of the unit assessment process. According to some, unit assessments had potential but were ineffective because no direct tie to the budget allocation process existed. In 2006, Student Services completed an internal program review independent of the standard unit assessment process. A budget dedicated for student outreach was eliminated during a budget cut back. This year funds were identified in the Student Services budget for reactivating and expanding outreach efforts.

Through the Educational Master Plan (EMP), the college also made an attempt at setting institutional priorities. However, there is no evidence that the college linked the planning of the 2005 Educational Master Plan to budgeting decisions (I.B.3).

The old system for planning started with appropriate participation, except for students and part-time faculty. However, the planning process was launched without the benefit of a comprehensive, forward-looking college strategic plan. While linked to institutional goals authored in 2001, there were either weak or no mechanisms to link planning to budgeting or to integrate unit assessment (program review) to unit planning or other major functional planning activities at the college. Over time the Institutional Effectiveness, Assessment and Planning and Resource Allocation committees experienced significant attrition leading to the discontinuation of meetings. Further, there is no evidence that the process led to broad improvement of institutional effectiveness.

A planning agenda places the responsibility on the College Council to create a strategic plan, prioritize institutional needs and goals, create measurable objectives, and facilitate their achievement by linking unit assessment outcomes to the resource allocation process.

Few campus groups or constituents were aware of the unit assessments. Those have now been posted to the college website.

Funded by the Title V cooperative grant, a research analyst was hired to prepare and provide Institutional Effectiveness data. It is the intention of the grant that the position be institutionalized in its fifth year, but uncertain whether the college has committed to budgeting for the Research Analyst position. Much of the information provided in unit assessment data packages is now accessible through an interactive webpage located at lamission.edu/research. Collegewide data about Institutional Effectiveness and Enrollment Management are available on this webpage as well. Collectively they provide insights as to the performance of the college and indirectly communicate matters of quality assurance. However, the institutional information is not set in a context of broad institutional outcome measures or goals, and the responses to institutional goals and prompt questions found in the unit assessment documents are of uneven quality (I.B.5).

Both the self-study and interviews with several knowledgeable college personnel suggested that the data presently available may not be known to many and perhaps not used well in planning and decision-making processes. Additionally, there was acknowledgement that the

data packages previously used for unit assessments should be reexamined and streamlined so that they are useful to unit, planning, and decision making.

The SLO coordinator has created a central location for student learning outcomes and will place those on the <http://lamission.edu/slo> website. However, there is little assessment of student learning outcomes evidence that could be used to communicate matters of quality assurance within disciplines or programs and none at the institutional level.

In response to feedback, the Dean of Institutional Research, Planning and Technology streamlined the data packets for unit assessment. Some units used the assessment experience to make changes to offerings, scheduling, and services as well as requesting additional facilities.

There is no global process to review and modify planning and assessment processes (I.B.6). The planning agenda offered in the self-study does not speak to this standard of good practice. Rather it calls for a revision to the governance structure and the development of institutional priorities.

A new structure for planning and shared governance was released in March 2007 at the time of the team visit. The Educational Planning Committee is a central part of the new structure. The new appointments to the committee are scheduled to be approved by the Academic Senate in March 2007. The committee's role is to revise the program review process as well as define a process for developing comprehensive student learning outcomes at the course and program level. General education learning outcomes have been defined and are published in the college catalog.

The self-study asserts that there are several discrete functional planning processes that are not linked to the overall planning process at the institution. Student services and administrative offices had not completed assessments of services provided, and the results of the completed unit assessment in instruction were not linked to resource allocations. Inconsistent administrative leadership and eventual erosion of participation in committees were also cited as some of the barriers to effective planning and resource allocations. Interviews with campus leaders confirmed this conclusion but added that campus interpersonal relations and reluctance to adhere to agreed upon processes helped to undercut the success of the college planning and resource allocation processes which had been initiated in 2001 (I.B.7).

Conclusions

Through the four planning agendas associated with this standard, the college acknowledges its shortcomings and proposes to remedy them in the near future.

The college is not in compliance with the current accreditation standards and is most deficient on items I B.1, I B.2, I B.3, I B.4, I B.6, and I.B.7.

While there is a new shared governance committee structure poised for implementation as of March 2007, it remains to be seen if it can facilitate the good practices expressed in the provisions of standard one.

The team believes the college would benefit from ongoing and integrated planning and assessment activities to articulate intended student learning outcomes and frame institutional goals consistent with the mission. Insights from those activities could then be used to improve student learning, refine its key business processes and demonstrate institutional effectiveness. (See Recommendation 4)

Commendation

The Enrollment Management Committee evaluated course offerings, which resulted in a 12-week intersession and additional sections of high demand courses (I.B.2.3.4).

Standard II Student Learning Programs and Services

A. Instructional Programs

General Comments

Los Angeles Mission College (LAMC) provides a comprehensive curriculum to approximately 7,447 students who come from a number of surrounding communities. The make up of the students reflects a large percentage (68%) of students who are Hispanic. Attendance patterns reveal that more students attend evening classes (41%) than attend day only (28%) or day and evening classes combined (32%). Credit and non-credit instruction is offered on campus and at various off-site locations, including high schools, the Cultural Arts Center, and the Maclay Building. The curriculum provided is in conformity with the stated mission of the college providing courses and programs that lead to 46 AA degrees, 57 certificates, transfer, and workplace readiness (II.A.1, II.A.1.a).

A procedure for unit assessment was initiated in 2002 by Institutional Effectiveness. It was scheduled to occur on a six-year cycle and was intended to evaluate instructional program currency, teaching, and learning strategies. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning supported the instructional program units by supplying data and information on assessment methodologies. However, approximately two years after the assessments began, the process broke down for a number of reasons. At that time, 34 unit assessments (74%) were accepted, three needed to resubmit, and 13 were not submitted. In spring 2007 a new shared governance policy was adopted. It is anticipated that unit assessment will be reinitiated as a result. Within the 2006-2007 academic year, unit assessment is supposed to be completed for all academic disciplines and departments. Strategic planning and/or an institutional planning process is lacking. Budget cuts without consultation and lack of stability in leadership due to numerous changes in administrative staff, and strife among constituent groups were given as reasons that led to a lack of trust and participation and corresponding decline in unit assessment completion. All of this has hampered the planning process. In fact, there was little mention and no evidence that strategic planning is taking place in any meaningful way (II.A.1.a).

Instruction is presented to meet a variety of learning styles: lecture, labs, small group instruction, computer-assisted instruction and field experiences. Additionally, courses are offered in a variety of delivery modes including 29 distance education courses, and instructional television classes (ITV) which are offered in a blended format (online and video components and eight face-to-face meetings). A Distance Education Committee has developed a certification process for faculty and evaluative measures to determine students' satisfaction with online instruction. Finally, course work in many disciplines is offered through the Program for Accelerated College Education (PACE) (II.A.1.b., II.A.2.d).

SLOs are mentioned in numerous places throughout the standard, but a deadline to establish SLOs for all disciplines has passed unmet. Although some contradictory information regarding the progress in developing SLOs and assessment is presented, progress has been made in several areas. General Education outcomes at the degree level have been approved by the Academic Senate and Curriculum Committee and are noticed in the 2006-2007 Catalog. Progress at the course and program level varies by discipline; however, the vocational departments/disciplines have an understanding of SLOs and have made progress at both the course and program levels and are working on assessment. There is evidence that some dialogue has taken place. Workshops have been held, and a coordinator to oversee the development of SLOs was hired in spring 2006 (II.A.1.c, IIA.2.a, IIA.2.b).

The breadth and depth of college programs is demonstrated by the college offering 46 associate degrees, 32 certificates, 25 skill certificates and active courses in 55 different disciplines and 29 distance education courses. Since the last accreditation visit, the college discontinued offering Chinese, Addiction Studies and more recently Engineering. Sequencing of class offerings and scheduling are determined by faculty. Low enrolled sections are subject to cancellation and every class is not offered every semester (II.A.2.c).

Findings and Evidence

Apart from some minor inconsistencies, the college represented itself honestly and candidly throughout the self study, identifying issues and matters that need attention; however, for many, no planning agenda has been established. This is particularly the case in the area of planning, continued development of SLOs, and assessment at the course and program levels.

In November 2006, the LA Community College District conducted an extensive environmental scan. It is unclear how LAMC will use the information gathered to improve service and meet needs of its communities.

An Educational Master Plan (EMP) was developed in 2005 for the purpose of seeking improvement in student learning and success. Although the EMP identifies action items and timelines for goal completion, oversight and acceptance of the responsibility for addressing the action items is missing.

The 2005 EMP established a timeline for gradual implementation of SLOs for all disciplines and set November 2006 as the deadline for completion. The timeline has not been met although progress on SLOs is reported. The progress on assessment of SLOs is likewise gradual. Some vocational education areas have both course and program SLOs, but this is

not the norm across all disciplines. Workshops and training sessions have been held, and a coordinator to oversee SLO development was appointed in spring 2006 (II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b).

Curriculum development is well defined and begins with faculty. The Curriculum Committee is composed of representatives from each of the instructional units, the articulation officer, library representative and academic deans who serve as non-voting resource members. Locally-approved curriculum is forwarded to the Academic Senate and the district's curriculum Website for a 30-day vetting period before receiving final approval from the district Board of Trustees. The Curriculum Committee has also established a periodic review of all existing course outlines that is scheduled to occur in a six-year cycle. Currently, the majority of offerings have been reviewed within the last six years and most are posted to the curriculum Website (II.A.2.e., II.A.2.f).

Several disciplines are considering the use of departmental course and/or program examinations as a means of effectively measuring student learning. Currently, the Math Department has a common final for one of its courses. Cut-off scores have been established to ensure that required competencies are met. As exams are being developed in other areas, however, faculty should be working with the Office of Research to ensure that validation of effectiveness in measuring student learning is occurring. No documentation was presented to ensure that cut-scores are validated for placement exams or locally developed exams (II.A.2.g).

LAMC awards credit for courses based on student achievement and success in accomplishing course objectives and SLOs when they are present. Currently, course credit is awarded based on the assumption that completion of a course constitutes mastery of course objectives. Work needs to be done to complete SLOs and assessment measures to ensure that this standard is complete (II.A.2.h., II.A.2.i).

In 2005 a discrepancy in the reporting of non-credit apportionment by LAMC was detected by the State Controller's Office. As a result the college lost most of its non-credit apportionment. Since then, steps have been taken to correct deficiencies and rebuild the non-credit program (II.A.1).

Student services areas of the college (DSPS, EOPS, counseling) and occupational education programs (VTEA) conduct surveys to identify and evaluate student needs (spring 2006 Student Survey, LACCD). Results of placement exams have been used to determine the need for an expanded set of offerings pre-collegiate math and ESL. A student satisfaction survey exists for online courses. Students are asked to comment on the overall class and may offer specific changes to improve the course. An increasing number of courses in ethnic studies, for example Chicano Studies, have been offered to meet the needs of the diverse student body.

The Office of Institutional Research and Planning conducts research, compiles, and organizes data; however, the use of the available data has been inconsistent. There is no documentation that key stakeholders are trained in the use of data to make decisions. The previous accreditation team recommended that the college expand the research function and provide

adequate staff and resources. While the college created an analyst position in fall 2003, funded by a Title 5 grant, there have been delays in filling the position permanently. In the meantime, the research function continues to be the responsibility of the Dean of Planning whose title and responsibility have recently changed to Dean of Research, Planning, and Technology. The financial support for the research office has not been addressed systematically and funding remains an issue (II.A.1.a).

The Child Development program and Food Service Management (FSM) have both added bilingual classes (Spanish and English). This has been done to meet the needs of students. Bilingual support is available in many units.

LAMC offers 29 distance education (online and hybrid) courses in 34 sections. The Distance Education Committee in conjunction with the Curriculum Committee has developed a certification procedure for faculty who wish to teach online. Additionally, training classes are held for those interested in teaching online. The Distance Education Committee has developed two evaluative measures to determine students' satisfaction with online instruction, but there does not appear to be a way to evaluate the quality of online instruction nor a way to ensure that the course content of the distance education courses is aligned with the comparable face-to-face course. The Distance Education Committee recognizes a need to develop and implement an assessment process to ensure standardization of course content in online and hybrid classes with face-to-face classes. To that end, they are collaborating with Department Chairs and the Office of Academic Affairs to develop and implement an assessment process (II.A, II.A.1).

The college mission statement incorporates the educational philosophy and functions of a community college. It reflects the principles of general education as does the EMP and the general education student learning outcomes. The framework for general education is based on Title 5 requirements and California Education Code and corresponds to the requirements for completing the general education pattern of the University of California and California State University system and other colleges and universities. Students can meet the general education requirements by completing a variety of course offerings from five areas that demonstrate knowledge appropriate for college educated individuals. In addition to completing general education requirements, students must demonstrate competence in mathematics, reading, and written expression to earn a degree (II.A.3, II.A.3.a, II.A.3.b).

The college catalog lists an array of courses that address the issues of cultural diversity, ethics, interpersonal skills and political, civic and social responsibility. Evaluation of SLOs is necessary to assess whether these issues are being effectively addressed in existing course offerings (II.A.3.c).

LAMC offers 46 instructional programs that lead to an associate degree. In the catalog, several disciplines lay out a recommended major's sequence of courses delineating and describing a sequence progressing from broad introductory to more focused courses. The college continues to refine the manner in which it communicates clear and consistent information about programs to students (II.A.4, II.A.6).

Vocational programs are supposed to be reviewed every two years in accordance with Ed code, 78016, for compliance. The self study was contradictory regarding the exact cycle of review (two or six years). Occupational programs meet semi-annually with advisory committees. The VTEA Committee meets monthly to review program plans and activities and improvement of vocational programs. Unit assessment has taken place in the vocational areas and is used as the basis for allocating VTEA funds. Attendance and cooperation are reported as being excellent. And, as mentioned previously, the development of SLOs and assessment measures appears to be happening more consistently in the occupational areas (II.A.5., II.A.2.b).

The Office of Academic Affairs and department secretaries maintain copies of course syllabi each semester. While in many cases course syllabi include objectives which are the basis for student evaluation, the college is still working on a more comprehensive approach to incorporate SLOs in all course syllabi. A student handbook that contains essential information on financial aid, matriculation, assessment, orientation, counseling and other services as well as the student code of conduct is published and distributed annually. LAMC provides an up-to-date college catalog annually. A review of the catalog reveals that all required elements are included with the exception of the academic calendar, and it is provided in the schedule of classes. There have been issues regarding the timely publication and distribution of the schedule of classes. There were examples given of the schedule of classes arriving after the enrollment and registration process had begun. Again, no planning agenda was presented to address this concern (II.A.6).

Course work from LAMC can be transferred to four-year colleges and universities through a number of articulation agreements. Students may also follow IGETC, UC and CSU requirements. LAMC has Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) agreements with UCLA (TAP Honors), UCSC, UCI and UCSB. Transfer policies are published in the catalog and can be found on the Website. A regular faculty member receives reassigned time to oversee the Honors and PACE programs. The Transfer Center was staffed approximately half-time until July 2006 when a full-time counselor was employed to operate the Center, but the Articulation Office is understaffed with a part-time counselor handling this responsibility. No plan was given to address this area of concern (II.A.6.a).

In spring 2006, the Academic Senate and college president approved a Program Viability Review Process that establishes guidelines for the development of new programs, the improvement of existing programs, and the discontinuance of existing programs. To date, the process has not been implemented (II.A.6.b).

It has occasionally been the case that a disparity exists in the information provided in multiple sources (schedule of classes, catalog, and other college publications). As a first step to remedying this situation, a catalog committee has been formed under the leadership of a dean of academic affairs to revise and update the catalog. Part of the charge is to revise any incorrect information and to ensure consistency of course descriptions and pre-requisites with the official PNCRs (II.A.6.c).

Both the Academic Freedom Policy and the Faculty Ethics Statements are available in print and are noticed on the district Website. The student handbook includes the Student Code of Ethics which addresses the issue of academic honesty and consequences for dishonesty. This information is also noticed in the catalog and schedule of classes. District policies on academic honesty are in Board Rule 9803. As a California community college, LAMC does not require conformity to a specific code of conduct (II.A.7., II.A.7.a, II.A.7.b, II.A.7.c).

The college does not offer curricula in foreign locations (II.A.8).

Conclusions

Curriculum development is a faculty-driven process that is functioning well. The committee has developed a regular cycle of updating course outlines of record (PNCRs) that requires all course outlines to be updated on a six-year cycle. The Distance Education Committee has developed a certification program that is required of instructors who wish to teach in a distance education format and two student evaluative measures. Some progress has been made in the area of SLOs and assessment; however, more dialogue and concentrated effort should be devoted to completing SLOs and assessment plans for all courses and programs. These should become part of a regular and systematic cycle of assessment, evaluation and improvement. Similarly, attention should be refocused on reactivating the unit assessment process for all instructional and non-instructional units. Finally, a strategic planning process should be developed through a shared governance process that addresses strategic enrollment management, instructional programs and resource planning and allocation.

Areas related to student learning outcomes, assessment and planning have been identified as being issues that need attention and yet they remain, for the most part, largely unaddressed in any meaningful way in the planning agendas. There is little evidence of dialogue having taken place nor does data seem to inform decision making or planning. SLOs and appropriate assessment measures have not been developed for all courses. The planning agenda for II.A.2.a speaks to the intent of developing SLOs for all courses by spring 2008; however, a plan for engaging in the completion of an assessment plan is not referenced (II.A.2.a, II.A.2, e, II.A.2.i). The self-study makes statements, such as “Evaluation of student learning outcomes is necessary to assess whether or not these disciplines are effectively meeting the issues ...” therefore, a planning agenda to address this issue seems warranted (II.A.3.c).

Permanent staffing and funding to support research efforts remains an area of concern (IIA.1.a). As this was a recommendation from the previous self study, this area needs serious consideration. The college has presented an inconsistent and confusing summary of the efforts to develop SLOs. It is clear that this remains a work in progress with a revised timeline, extending the completion date from 2006 to 2008. Thus, the following sections remain unmet: IIA.2.a, IIA.2.b, IIA.2.e, IIA.2.h, IIA.2.i, IIA.3, II.A.6, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c.

The college has presented little if any evidence of dialogue or a clearly defined planning process. Thus, II.A.2.f. remains unmet. Likewise, there is no evidence that common exams or cut-scores are validated, IIA.2.g. Although the college updates both the schedule of

classes and catalogs and each is available online, failure to publish the schedule in a timely manner has made enrollment difficult for students (II.A.6).

Of equal concern is the large number of issues the college identifies in the self evaluation section, for which it does not provide any planning agenda (IIA.1.b, II.A.2.c, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.3.c, II.A.4, II.A.6). Finally, in one or more areas, the description provided does not properly respond to nor address the standard. II.A.3.c is one such area.

Commendations

There are a number of areas that can be commended:

- All curriculum forms have been updated and are accessible through the curriculum Website. A technical review subcommittee has been established. Within the past five years, two thirds of the courses have been revised, updated or archived. All approved course outlines are posted on the Web.
- To meet the needs of a diverse student body, the number of ethnic courses and sections of ESL and math courses has increased.
- The institution is increasing its efforts to reach out to the feeder high schools and is engaging middle and high school students through programs such as Gear Up and Tech Prep
- A certification procedure for faculty who wish to teach online classes has been established. Two evaluative measures to determine students' satisfaction with online instruction: an online student evaluation form and an online student satisfaction survey have been developed.
- Some occupational classes are taught in both Spanish and English. Bilingual support systems are also available in most units on campus.
- The CIS faculty and students have initiated a program to recycle computers and parts to the community and local schools. The public is invited to bring computers in for repair or configuration.
- A number of computers in the Library Learning Resource Center are designated for public access and can be used free of charge by members of the public. These are typically used by area high school students.
- The Institutional Research and Planning Website includes data on enrollment management, community demographics, institutional effectiveness and student enrollment and characteristics.

B. Student Support Services

General Comments

Los Angeles Mission College offers a variety of comprehensive student support services including the following: Admissions/Records, Associated Student Organization, Disabled Students Programs and Services, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services, Financial Aid and Scholarships, Student Health Center, Counseling to include guidance classes, orientation, assessment, registration, student activities, student employment assistance, and transfer assistance. A number of programs and services under Specially Funded Programs for 2005-2006, although they do not directly report to the Student Services division, are noteworthy in both breadth and scope: CalWORKS, Careers in Child Care Training,

Community Literacy Academy, Early Start to Emancipation Preparation, English Literacy and Citizenship Center, Family Child Care Homes Network, Foster/Kinship Care Education, Foundation for California Community Colleges (TANF) Gear-UP, Health Care Clerical Assistant Training, Independent Living Program, Kinship Education Preparation and Support, Team Research Approach in Laboratory Science, Tech Prep, Partnership for Safety and Permanence Model Approach to Partnership in Parenting, Teach Honor Respect Inform Vision Educate Family Development Network, Title V Math Assistance Program, Trade Adjustment Assistance, VTEA, Verizon Foundation and Workforce Investment Act. The Student Services offices are primarily housed in one building on campus, although other services are geographically located in close proximity in other buildings.

Student Service matriculation areas offer a convenient one-stop center with expanded hours of service, notably during “peak” registration periods. Many services can also be accessed online such as the application, registration, financial aid, and the schedule of classes. The enhancement of Web services has increased the number of ‘student-hits’ (IIB.3.a).

LAMC offers a variety of comprehensive student services and activities including the following: assessment, orientation, educational planning, admissions, ASO, DSPS, EOPS, financial aid, personal development courses, TRIO/SSS, Veterans, International Students, Job Placement, vocational services, and transfer assistance (II.B.1., II.B.3.a). Over 24 additional programs and services are offered in Specially Funded Programs (SEP) described in II.B.3.c. A separate facility for the Child Development Center is available for students and offers an a.m. and a p.m. program for students, staff, and the community.

The college publishes a catalog for its constituents with accurate and precise data. In fact, the Office of Academic Affairs has made concerted efforts to consistently review and improve its college catalog, class schedule, and the Website to accurately reflect current information, policies and procedures (II.B.2, II.B.2.a, II.B.2.b, II.B.2.c, II.B.2.d). Accessibility to Student Services is addressed by the Outreach Taskforce which focuses on enrollment of a wide range of potential students and access to services regardless of service location or delivery method (II.B.3, II.B.3.a). The college has numerous clubs and a student government organization which afford students a number of opportunities to engage in co-curricular opportunities and participate in a variety of cultural, community, and vocational opportunities. Additionally, a number of programs have been developed by the campus Diversity Committee to address issues of culture, ethnicity, gender, and civic engagement (II.B.3.b). The college suggests that student participation in the above mentioned opportunities and club membership is low.

The college regularly evaluates admissions processes and has implemented the California Community College online application format, CCCApply. As of the self-study writing, this process had yet to go live. The college uses multiple measures for placement of new students into appropriate courses and all assessment instruments are in accordance with Title 5 Regulation 78212 (b) (3). LAMC currently uses the College Board’s Accuplacer Online version to assess English, Reading and Math (II.B.3.e). The college does offer a prerequisite challenge process for students. This process is detailed in the schedule of classes. There is no mention of the Student Equity Plan, nor is this offered in the standard as evidence.

Findings and Evidence

The college has worked diligently in establishing consistent service hours for students. Evening students are accommodated, and focused attention has been dedicated to this population, particularly during peak periods with extended hours (IIB.3.a).

LAMC has implemented an early alert system to enhance and improve student success for all students, yet feedback as to the efficacy to this effort was sparse. The importance of this effort is clearly an institutional priority as outlined in the current Credit Matriculation Plan detailed in 2005. The self-study did not elaborate on how student records are securely maintained, the site visit and interviews with staff members confirmed that the college has satisfactory methods for maintaining student records and related documents (IIB.3.f).

The college's one-stop center layout was an effort made to improve student's access to institutional services for matriculation processes. Students are welcomed in an environment where a majority of services are conveniently available with friendly staff and outgoing student workers. The lobby area is provided with a number of kiosks, providing students with a quick overview of college services as well as information pertaining to registration and enrollment procedures. The college has offered a number of Student Satisfaction Surveys although delivery and dissemination have not been consistent. Results, however, have been favorable and reflect the institution's support of programs and services that support student success and appreciation of a diverse student body (II.B.I, II.B.3.c, II.B.2.d, II.B3.e, II.B.4). Although various units indicated they had begun developing Student learning outcomes, there is no specific collegewide effort to integrate student service with instruction, and there are a number of "silo" conversations. Through numerous interviews, there was mention of developing student learning outcomes, but no collaborative efforts were revealed. Clearly, there is a definite need for student services areas to conduct additional data gathering on the effectiveness of services, analyze the data gathered from a variety of sources, and begin to use these findings to address improvements (II.B.3, II.B.4).

Student Services has engaged in program review and would benefit with aligning itself with Academic Affairs in terms of modeling a standardized unit assessment format.

Conclusions

The self-study indicates efforts towards administration of an annual Student Satisfaction Survey, although it fails to address how it will use the results. Student Services have begun the identification of SLOs, although individual units attest that training, guidance and support has been minimal. It is unclear how Student Services plans on interfacing with Academic Affairs to integrate SLOs, let alone closing the loop utilizing assessment that will cultivate a culture and practice of continuous improvement. With the establishment of a systematic cycle of planning to assess the quality of service, Student Services needs the encouragement to move towards implementation of an annual survey to gather information that will yield this type of information and initiate a dialogue of meaningful and measurable student learning outcomes (II.B.1, II.B.3, and II.B.4). The division does not appear to be involved in the evaluation of student support services to assure they meet identified student needs (II.B.I, II.B.3, II.B.4).

The team believes the college would benefit from the development of a comprehensive Student Services strategic plan that is linked to the new governance planning process. It would be optimal if this is completed prior to the next planning cycle (II.B.1, II.B.3, II.B.3.b). (See Recommendation 4)

The team believes the college would benefit if the Student Services areas were to address student learning outcomes by implementing, at multiple levels, a comprehensive, formalized assessment plan that is grounded in a shared philosophy and fully engages all of student services and leads to ongoing improvement of student and learning support services (II.B.3.a, II.B.3.c, II.B.4). (See Recommendation 5)

C. Library and Learning Services

General Comments

Los Angeles Mission offers a wide range of library and learning support services. The Library and Learning Resource Center building houses the Library, the Learning Center, the Computer Commons, along with a number of offices, laboratories, and classrooms. The Library also has several individual study areas and group study rooms available for student use. The Library supports instructional programs through its collection of books, periodicals, videos and DVD collection, and a number of electronic databases (II.C.I). The self-study describes in depth configurations of the Library, Learning Center, Computer Applications/Office Technology Center, Computer Science Information Technology Lab, Multimedia Studies along with other Learning Support Services (i.e. The Math Center, DSPS High Tech Lab). The Library has been able to purchase and update its collections to a fairly adequate level, although the library budget and funding are noted as having been inconsistent, which has resulted in a number of periodical subscriptions being discontinued. There is a consistent theme that indicates the current Library space is inadequate to house all the Library holdings; as a consequence, the Library is forced to discard dated titles and/or cease ordering new collections.

Findings and Evidence

The Library is staffed with one department chair, three full-time librarians, and three library technicians. The Library also has one part-time librarian and a student worker. Collection development is supported by recommendations of the faculty through the results of the curriculum process and by a list of student requests (II.C.I.a). The library hosts a website that provides access to databases, study aids, and other information for all students, regardless of location. Although it has been a challenge to maintain the website's currency given the workload of the Information Technology Department staff, a librarian was recently granted permission to update the site, which has alleviated the currency issue (II.C.1.c). The Library offers six different information competency workshops. The topics of these workshops are Research Strategies, Searching for Books, Locating Journal and Newspaper Articles, Internet I- the basics, Internet II- Searching and Evaluation, and MLA Format. These topics grew out of the Senate-based Information Competency Taskforce to establish learning outcomes for information competency. The student learning outcomes were developed by this taskforce and adopted by the Senate in 2001. In 2003 the college adopted information competency as

one of the nine general education student learning outcomes. Over 75 workshops are scheduled each semester by the Library to accommodate the requirement that LAMC students be information competent. Each student must complete an exercise at the end of each library workshop to measure whether the students can apply the skills learned in the workshop (II.C.1.b).

Informal agreements exist among libraries of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) to borrow and lend books. There are 865,000 items in the combined LACCD Library database. Contracts exist for the use of online databases that the Library makes available for students. The efficacy of informal agreements should be explored to evaluate whether resources and services are adequate for the institution's purposes (II.C.1.e).

The Learning Center hosts the Computer Commons and is staffed by one full-time assistant computer and network support specialist, one part-time instructional assistant, and one student worker. Staff assists students in logging in, operating the computer, accessing the Internet, and using word processing programs. They also refer students to the Library, which offers a number of workshops to assist students in the development of research computer skills (II.C.I.b).

The Multimedia Studies Program provides learning support services specific to students enrolled in multimedia courses. The multimedia facilities include three classrooms, which function dually as classrooms and labs when classes are not in session. Faculty and tutors are assigned to assist students in the labs daily. Tutors are funded through VTEA. Given the constant state of technological change, the lab has had a number of budget constraints. However, the college hired a long-term substitute in the fall of 2006 and recently initiated the process to hire a permanent replacement for fall 2007. In 2006, the Multimedia Program obtained Title V Cooperative Grant funding to convert the PC lab to a Mac lab and upgrade software (II.C.I.b).

The Computer Applications and Office Technologies Center provides extensive learning support services to students. Two labs are located in the Instructional Building and provide equipment and staff necessary to assist students in acquiring technological skills and in developing information competency. The staff includes one .75 Instructional Assistant and one .5 Instructional Assistant. VTEA funds 35 hours of tutors per week (II.C.I.b).

The Computer Science-Information Technology (CSIT) Lab located in the Instructional Building has an open-door policy and offers students, staff, and the public a variety of services. While the lab is primarily intended for Computer Science-Information Technology students and supports CSIT courses and assignments, all LAMC students and members of the community are welcome to use the lab to complete assignments or have access to the internet. Faculty in disciplines other than CSIT often use its services or consult with CSIT staff to incorporate technology into content-area curriculum. The CSIT department has two full-time instructors as well as several adjunct faculty. Faculty members are available in the CSIT lab at various times throughout the week. Tutors and instructional assistants are also available during all hours of lab operation to assist students. Tutors are funded for

approximately 20 hours per week; the two instructional assistants work 24 hours and 36 hours, respectively (II.C.I.a).

Other Learning Support Services include the Adaptive High Tech Center housed in the DSPS Office. State-of-the-art adaptive equipment, including computers, operate daily to assist students with a variety of disabilities to access online classes, the Internet, application programs and special adaptive software to accommodate disability issues particularly as they impact academic performance. The Center is staffed by a DSPS Access Technology Specialist and is also staffed by specialized tutors (II.C.I.b).

In March 2006 a Math Center opened which served over 348 students by the twelfth week of the fall 2006 semester and has provided over 2,400 hours of tutoring services (II.C.I.c).

The institution believes that space is needed to upgrade and maintain numerous publications requested. Security is adequate for the Library, although security concerns exist in the Computer Applications and Office Technologies Center (II.C.I.d).

In 2000 the Academic Senate formed an Information Competency Taskforce to establish learning outcomes for information competency and make recommendations for their implementation. The student learning outcomes developed by this taskforce were adopted by the Academic Senate in 2001. In 2003 the college adopted information competency as one of the nine general education student learning outcomes. Several models for infusing information competency skills into the general education experience of students were reviewed. As a result of this discussion, an instructional librarian was hired in spring 2001 to develop, market, coordinate, and teach a library instruction program that included information competency skills. A number of pilot information competency skills workshops were launched in 2002, which has led to over 75 workshops scheduled each semester by the library to accommodate the information competency core required for all LAMC students.

The Library and Learning Support Services areas should be encouraged to continue the dialogue to develop a more comprehensive approach to establishing student learning outcomes that include systematic approach to data collection and employ research analysis to establish measurable outcomes that lead to continuous improvement. Although the college conducted a Student Survey in the spring of 2006, such surveys have been conducted sporadically. The Library is not slated to participate in the unit assessment process, formerly known as program review, until spring 2008. Clearly, collaboration and effectively linking of planning to resource development is problematic (II.C.2).

Conclusions

There have been directed efforts to incorporate the Library into institutional student learning outcomes. Absent from the self-study and interviews with the librarians was dialogue among units about student learning outcomes. There has been no specific training, consistent evaluation, or inclusion of Learning Support Services in developing specific student learning outcomes. The quality and sufficiency of learning resources appears adequate, although a systematic approach is absent and a comprehensive analysis of service improvement is anecdotal at best (II.C.I.a, II.C.2).

The college should work to expand its dialogue on student learning outcomes to include the Library and Learning Support Services. Meaningful, timely, and inclusive dialogue to identify student learning outcomes is absent among these units. They were mentioned in 2001, but not since. Once learning outcomes are identified, the college should systematically assess student learning outcomes and use the results of these assessments for the improvement of institutional effectiveness (II.C.1, II.C.1.b, II.C.2). (See Recommendation 5)

The team believes the college would benefit from the implementation of the new unit assessment process in a timely manner. The Library is not slated to enter into this process till spring 2008 (II.C.2). (See Recommendation 5)

Standard III Resources

General Comments

The overall quality of the self-study is good and thorough. There are, however, several changes in the college's enrollment, subsequent funding, and an overall lack of integrated institutional planning that significantly impacts the college's ability to adequately meet Standard III and necessitates further discussion of this standard.

Recently, LA Mission has taken the responsibility of hiring faculty as part of a decentralization process for district hiring functions. Faculty evaluations currently do not include an SLO component (III.A.1.c). There is no evidence, however, that any policies, procedures, funding, or personnel resources have been dedicated to this new function. Further, there is no evidence of communication between the district and the college that would enable the college to monitor and verify when and if college personnel were actually evaluated.

LA Mission has benefited from the successful passing of two construction bond measures. Funds from these bonds will be used for renovation, construction, and/or equipment for multiple facilities. With the dramatic increase in construction costs, it is not anticipated that all projects will be funded unless another bond measure is passed. Subsequently, the college is prioritizing existing projects with a focus on educational needs. Considering the college currently has eight vacancies in College Facilities Department and is under a hiring freeze, the college faces serious staffing challenges to ensure access, safety, and security. These challenges will be compounded as each construction project is completed and turned over to the college.

The college has made significant progress in modernizing the technologies available to its constituents; however, purchases have been made on a one-time basis without apparent consideration for ongoing funding and replacement cycles. The existing technology plan is almost four years old and, despite calling for "Quality Improvement in Teaching and Learning," "Enhancing Student Services," "Effective and Efficient College Operations," and Assuring Comprehensive Electronic Communication Capability for All Constituents," there

is no evidence that the technology plan is being used nor does it appear to have any linkages to any larger institutional plan or resource allocation model. The college proposes a three-year computer replacement cycle and anticipates addressing technology replacement needs with block grants for faculty, students, and labs. Administrators will be provided with the three-year-old computers when the cycle for faculty and students had reached its third year and is due for replacement. This means that administrators will have computers that are three to six years old.

The college does not have a budget development process or resource allocation model that links to the institution's mission, any institutional planning documents or processes, or any measures of institutional effectiveness. The budget development process is a roll-over of the previous year's budget plus any additional requests forwarded from the vice-presidents and their respective areas. The 2006-07 fiscal year was the first fiscal year in which the various college areas were required to provide justification for their budget requests. However, there is still no process for evaluating the justifications provided or the needs expressed. Subsequently, there is, in effect, no difference in practice from prior years. Further, once a budget has been developed, there are no controls in place to prevent budget overruns. The district establishes the college's target enrollments and academic affairs determines the schedule. There is no evidence of ongoing dialogue between administrative services, which controls the budget, and academic affairs with regard to establishing a plan for the number and types of section offerings nor any review of progress. The district appears to lack a sound plan for addressing its long-term liability for post-employment employee benefits (III.D.1.c).

Findings and Evidence

A. Human Resources

LA Mission's current fiscal challenges, frequent and recent turn-over in administrative leadership, and breakdown in both institutional planning and shared governance have greatly impacted the college's ability to adequately address Standard III.

The college has had considerable turnover in its administrative leadership. Due to its current enrollment challenges, the college has also put in place a hiring freeze and is currently down eight staff in the maintenance and operations area. Further, some programs are without a full-time faculty member. Overall, however, the college does "employ qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services." The hiring process for all classifications is "somewhat" known by the college staff, but there is no formal documentation on the process. The recent decentralization of the faculty hiring process has also created some additional confusion. This has been compounded by the significant turnover in college leadership. No additional resources were provided to the college to accommodate for this change. In the evaluation of employees, the district and college lack a line of communication to enable the college to verify and monitor when and if evaluations have taken place (III.A.1.a, III.A.1.d, III.A.2, III.A.3.a, III.A.3.b, III.A.3.c, III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b, III.A.6).

B. Physical Resources

The college is positioning itself to address both current and future physical resource needs with funds received through the successful passage of a 2.2 billion dollar districtwide bond measure. The significant increase in construction costs, however, will prevent the college from completing all previously planned projects. The college is prioritizing projects that it can fund based on educational needs. The district is proposing to cover any unfunded projects through the pursuit of a second bond measure (III.B.1.a, III.B.1.b, III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b).

C. Technology Resources

The most recent technology plan is over almost four years old. There is no evidence that the college is using this document for planning purposes nor that it is used as the basis for any budget allocations. The college does not have any budget line items for technology despite the technology plan calling for “Quality Improvement in Teaching and Learning,” “Enhancing Student Services,” “Effective and Efficient College Operations,” and Assuring Comprehensive Electronic Communication Capability for All Constituents.” There is no evidence of ongoing planning that links technology to address the college’s need to “support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of its programs and services” (III.C.1.a, III.C.1.d, III.C.2).

D. Financial Resources

There is no evidence of a link between financial planning and institutional planning. The college’s interim budget committee serves as a forum to share the current budget state and discuss district and state issues as they pertain to the budget, but it does not serve as a forum for discussion around budget development. The college had a deficit of \$1.5 million in 2005-2006 and is projecting a deficit of \$600,000 in 2006-2007. Though the district establishes enrollment targets for the college, it is up to the college to define how it will meet the targets. There is no evidence of an enrollment management process being utilized to define how best to develop or plan the schedule. Further, there is no evidence of regular dialogue between academic affairs and administrative services with regard to planning and funding the academic schedule. The college also lacks an internal check and balance system to prevent areas (*i.e.*, academic affairs or student services) from going beyond budgeted amounts. It is anticipated that the new SAP system will assist in addressing this issue. The district does provide a mechanism for the college to repay its deficit over a three-year period, with a one-year grace period prior to repayment. The district has also developed an allocation grant procedure whereby a college which presents a self-study of the causes of its anticipated deficits may be forgiven its deficit. Subsequently, a taskforce has been assembled to provide recommendations to the college. If the college follows the recommendations of the taskforce, a part of its deficit will be offset by funds from the district’s reserves (III.D.1.a, III.D.1.d, III.D.2.a, III.D.2.g, III.D.3). The district’s plan on addressing its long-term liability for post-employment employee benefits is unclear and is in need of review (III.D.1.c).

Conclusions

LA Mission College has made significant strides towards addressing Standard III; however, its current fiscal challenges, lack of institutional planning, breakdown in shared governance, and high turnover in its executive leadership, have significantly hindered its ability to fully address the previous team's recommendations.

The college has integrated staff development as part of its culture and can be observed through committee work, committee links to the College Council, multi-year planning documents, and the training opportunities and benefits afforded to employees.

The team believes the college would benefit from the development of business processes and the allocation of resources for the institutionalization of human resource functions. These processes should be linked to institutional planning and accommodate for implementing, conducting, monitoring, and evaluating, employee hiring and evaluation (III.A.1.b, III.A.2, III.A.6). (See Recommendation 6)

The team believes the college would benefit if the college were to update its technology strategic plan on a more frequent basis, develop a distance education plan, and link the plan to the college's budget planning process as opposed to relying on grants to fund its technology needs (III.C.1.c, III.C.2) (See Recommendation 4)

The team believes the college would benefit if the college were to develop, implement, and systematically review a budget planning process that is linked to institutional planning and effectiveness (III.D.1, III.D.3). (See Recommendation 4)

Commendations

The college's technology and distance education committees should be commended for their forward thinking and commitment to quality educational experiences despite a lack of stable funding.

The college should be commended for its commitment to continuing to plan, promote, and develop professional development activities despite funding cut-backs.

The college should also be commended for its commitment to prioritizing education in its facilities planning.

Standard IV Leadership and Governance

General Comments

LA Mission College has created a governance system, the College Council (IV.A.1-3), that is intended to be the principal decision-making body for the college. It reviews and approves a variety of plans, policies, and recommendations from the different standing committees that make up the Council; its members include the chairs of the standing shared governance committees, representatives from the Academic Senate, the AFT Faculty Guild, AFT Staff

Guild, the Associated Student Organization, and members of the administration. “Classified staff participation is on a volunteer basis.” The College Council is chaired by the college president, who is a non-voting member of the Council. Previously, three of these committees (Assessment and Planning, Resource Analysis, and Institutional Effectiveness) carried the primary responsibility for linking planning and resource allocation. The 2005-2008 AFT Contract introduced significant changes that required modification of the college shared governance committee structure which has now been approved as of March 2007.

In addition to College Council and the standing committees, other bodies play a role in college planning and policy issues. These bodies include the executive staff, the faculty and classified staff unions, and the faculty Academic Senate. There are five different unions that represent faculty, staff, and some administrators. The Academic Senate is the organization whose primary function is to make recommendations with respect to academic and professional matters (IV.A.2.b). The Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate makes recommendations to the administration regarding curriculum, degree and certificate requirements, grading policies, and educational program development.

LA Mission College operates as one of nine colleges in the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) and takes its direction from the eight-member Board of Trustees. The Board is clearly an independent policy-making body, “establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution” (IV.B.1). Working under published bylaws and policies and in concert with the District Academic Senate, the Board establishes policies consistent with its mission, adheres to a code of ethics, and regularly reviews its policies and practices.

At the college level, there has been significant turnover among the upper administration. In the last seven years, there have been three campus presidents, three vice presidents of student services, three vice presidents of administrative services and five vice presidents of instructional services.

Findings and Evidence

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

The confluence of a number of difficulties has left the college struggling to measure up to the fourth accreditation standard. The inability of the district to ensure stability in the senior administrative ranks (IV.B.2, IV.B.2.a) has softened the college’s focus on a number of important structures, including the complete implementation of the unit assessments (*i.e.*, program reviews that were called for in an earlier accreditation standard). The incomplete development of student learning outcomes presents another hurdle to the implementation of a thorough-going cycle of data-gathering and analysis linked to resource allocation. Furthermore, the overall downturn in apportionment in 2003-04, the district budget allocation model that penalizes the smaller colleges in the district (IV.B.3.c), and the sudden loss of noncredit FTES through errors in reporting have compromised LA Mission’s financial stability (IV.A.4, IV.B.2.d). These difficulties have seriously undermined the College Council, which is the centerpiece of the shared governance structure at LA Mission. Without

the requisite unit assessments and the assessment of student learning outcomes, there is sometimes little data to drive the planning cycle. A systematic review of integrity and effectiveness was not regularly conducted by each of the standing shared governance committees (IV.A.5). Without the necessary funds over base, the resource allocation committees have had little to work with and participation in the process has declined.

To compound matters, there appears to have been a failure of communication regarding the role of the College Council in the governance of the college and a perception that the administration has often “acted outside of the shared governance structure.” While the College Council has performed well in the role of “disseminating information on a variety of college issues,” it has suffered from a lack of a clear definition of the role of the Council members (IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a) and has failed “to play a key role by defining areas of focus for the college, approving prioritization of unit assessments, evaluating the assessment process of learning outcomes, and determining whether activities required continued funding” (IV.A.1). In practice, decisions regarding the allocation of resources were not linked to the unit assessment process. As a result, the cycle of planning, evaluation, and resource allocation was not linked. This contributed to the low participation in the unit assessment process, impeded its implementation to non-instructional areas of the college, and ultimately led to administrative decisions being made outside of the shared governance committee structure (IV.A., IV.A.3). Planning for declining resources was not adequately addressed by Assessment and Planning or Resource Analysis. Other bodies and leadership groups (such as Executive Staff, the Academic Senate, and department chairs) assumed that responsibility (IV.A.3).

B. Board and Administrative Organization

Most current Board of Trustees members have served for several years, and incumbents are commonly re-elected. The Board has an appropriate self-evaluation process for assessing its performance and improving its operations, but this should be linked to the districtwide goals (IV.B.1.g). The Board of Trustees, the district administration, and the AFT Faculty Guild have worked together to address past accreditation concerns related to college funding (IV.B.1). The Board of Trustees has performed regular evaluations of the chancellor and college presidents; however, the process for that evaluation has not been set down in writing (IV.B.1.j).

The Board of Trustees of the Los Angeles Community College District has clearly established policies that align with the mission of the college and that fully support student learning. (IV.B.1, IV.B.1.a-i). The district should be proud of its effort through the Multi-College Pilot Program to draw a “Functional Map” of the differing responsibilities of the district and the nine colleges (IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a). The current interim president should be commended for his considerable efforts to maintain effective communication with the college community (IV.B.2.e).

The Board works collaboratively with the District Academic Senate and is engaged in developing a process for the regular, automatic review of policies and regulations. The lack of adequate and permanent staffing in Academic Affairs has contributed to a lack of

institutional history, uncertainty, and ineffective planning (IV.B.1).

Some of the governance structures, including Collective Bargaining, Merit System Rules, and other district rules and regulations make the management of colleges more challenging. A new funding model will correct some of the structural disadvantages for small colleges that exist in the current allocation model (IV.B.3.b-e).

Conclusions

LA Mission College only partially meets the requirements of Standard IV. Mission has created many of the structures expected for effective shared governance since 2001. However, the downturn in apportionment, loss of certain additional revenues, and the considerable instability of the senior administrative ranks have negatively impacted the ability of the college to fully implement each of the prior team's recommendations and to develop a sound planning model linking progress in student learning with allocation of resources (IV.B.2.b-c).

The college presidents have exercised control over the college budget and have taken actions to control expenditures. However, the ability of the president to effectively regulate expenditures is limited by employee labor agreements, district bureaucratic processes, and limited resources.

The district effectively controls its expenditures and maintains a reserve at the end of each year since the revision of the budget allocation model in 1998; however, five of the nine colleges had a budget deficit in 2005-2006 (IV.B.3.c). The maintenance of a significant contingency fund has allowed the district to minimize the impact of state budget cuts on local college programs and has made it possible for colleges to obtain financial support from the district when needed.

The relatively new model for the district/college relationship is based on the principles of decentralization and college autonomy. The district and colleges have developed and are continuing to revise a document describing the delineation of district/college responsibilities in a number of different operational areas (IV.B.3.f-g).

The team believes the college would benefit by clearly defining the roles of the various members of the College Council and implementing a planning model that securely ties systematic assessment of student success with resource allocation (IV.A.1-3). (See Recommendation 2)

The team believes the college would benefit if the College Council were to develop processes for the regular and systematic evaluation of the effectiveness and integrity of its shared governance committees by fall 2008 (IV.A). (See Recommendation 3)

The team believes the college would benefit if clearly written policies that encourage institutional leaders to work together were established and regularly shared with the educational community (IV.A.2, IV.A.3). (See Recommendation 1)

Commendations

The college presidents should be commended for exercising control over the college budget and taking steps to control expenditures during a challenging financial period.

The district should be commended for effectively controlling its expenditures and maintaining a reserve at the end of each year.

The college should be commended for a current climate that is positive and collaborative.

Summary

The visiting team was impressed with the overall climate of the college, the facilities, the spirit of student services, and the effectiveness of the teaching and learning that was occurring at Los Angeles Mission College.

In particular the team observed and cited several areas for commendation:

1. The College is to be commended for a comprehensive array of user-friendly programs that support student success.
2. The Maintenance and Operations staff is to be complimented on the appearance of the buildings and grounds. This is especially notable given the minimal staff. The staff appears to be fully dedicated to the support of the instructional program.
3. The college curriculum process is making good progress for conversion of the curriculum to an online database.
4. The college creates a positive and welcoming environment for students, as evidenced by student reports expressing appreciation for the support given them by the college faculty and staff.
5. The facilities and campus design are open, student friendly, and maximize the space for teaching and learning.
6. The college has many exemplary programs including Culinary Arts, Tutoring Services, Financial Aid, Library and Learning Resource Center, and Disabled Students Programs and Services.
7. The district-wide functional map is an important step in clarifying the respective duties of the district and the college.
8. The college, under the leadership of the interim president, has strengthened the relationships with the community.
9. The college should be commended for its commitment to continuing to plan, promote and develop professional development activities despite funding cut-backs.

The college has worked through a turbulent time of conflict among faculty. The current status of the college climate is positive and collaborative. The college is commended for the creation of new governance process, which if fully implemented and institutionalized will assure sustainability of a collaborative and collegial college climate. The visiting team gave special emphasis to the areas of governance, planning, completion of the implementation of student learning outcomes and assessment, and definition of administrative responsibilities in the following six college center recommendations. Four additional recommendations

(Recommendations 7, 8, 9, and 10) were coordinated with other visiting teams and are directed to the district's attention.

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).

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).

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 shared governance committees by fall 2008 (Standard IV.A.5).

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).

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).

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).

Recommendation 7: District Progress on SLOs

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.).

Recommendation 8: District Plan for Retiree Health Benefit Liability

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).

Recommendation 9: Board of Trustees Self Evaluation Process

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).

Recommendation 10: Evaluation of College Presidents

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).