

# **EAST LOS ANGELES COLLEGE**

## **MIDTERM REPORT**

Submitted by

East Los Angeles College  
1301 Avenida Cesar Chavez  
Monterey Park, CA 91754

To

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

March 15, 2012

# CONTENTS

<b>Statement on Report Preparation</b> .....	1
<b>Response to Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letter</b> .....	4
College Recommendation 1: Mission .....	4
College Recommendation 2: Improving Institutional Effectiveness .....	4
College Recommendation 3: Instructional Programs .....	11
College Recommendation 4: Instructional Programs .....	16
College Recommendation 5: Student Support Services .....	18
College Recommendation 6: Decision-Making Roles and Processes .....	19
District Recommendation 1: Financial Resources & Board Administrative Org.....	21
District Recommendation 2: Financial Resources & Board Administrative Org.....	22
District Recommendation 3: Financial Resources & Board Administrative Org.....	24
<b>Self-Identified Issues – Progress</b> .....	28
Student Learning Outcomes.....	28
Other Self-Identified Issues .....	31

## STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

The nine recommendations made by the visiting team during the spring 2009 visit to East Los Angeles College include six college-specific and three district recommendations. The college recommendations address the college mission statement; improving institutional effectiveness through the integration of planning with decision making and budgeting processes to ensure effective resource allocation; the acceleration of SLO implementation and assessment to achieve proficiency level of the ACCJC rubric by 2012; development of a transparent program review process that is clearly communicated; regular evaluation of and augmentation, if necessary, of staffing, services, and programs in the student services division; and full development of a formal written policy describing the college governance and decision-making structures and processes. Districtwide recommendations are focused on the monitoring of post-retirement health liability for potential fiscal ramifications, the need for consistent adherence to the *Functional Map*, and the development, implementation, and communication of methods for the evaluation of role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes for the college and the district.

The responses to the college recommendations were directed by the Accreditation Liaison Officer and the faculty accreditation chair, in conjunction with members of relevant campus committees and administrators.

- **College Recommendation 1:** The college mission statement that had been approved by campus constituencies prior to the team visit was formally approved by the Board of Trustees in 2009. Since that time a new mission statement has been approved by the appropriate governing bodies at the campus and district levels.
- **College Recommendation 2:** The college has clearly articulated, in written format, its planning structure, the integration of planning with the decision-making and budgeting processes, and the evaluation of the planning processes in its *Shared Governance and Decision-Making Policy Handbook*.

The college planning structure reflects the college's commitment to shared governance and to obtaining campuswide and community input on the college goals and objectives that will shape the college's future. The ELAC Shared Governance Council (ESGC) serves as the central governing body for all planning decisions and makes recommendations directly to the college president as part of the shared governance process. In addition to the ESGC, the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC), Educational Planning Subcommittee (EPSC), Facilities Planning Subcommittee (FPSC), Technology Planning Subcommittee (TPSC), Program Review and Viability Committee (PRVC), and the Budget Committee also play key roles in the development and implementation of the college planning agenda. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE), formerly the Office of Research and Planning, facilitates the development of the college planning documents and assists in the implementation and evaluation of the planning agenda.

- **College Recommendation 3:** The college is committed to achieving the proficiency level of the ACCJC rubric relative to Student Learning Outcomes by the year 2012. To reach this goal, the college has increased the reassigned time (2 FTEF) for a SLO coordinator and three SLO facilitators. Each facilitator is assigned to specific academic departments, student services, and academic units. The SLO team (also referred to as the learning assessment team), assisted by the research staff in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE), has attended department and unit meetings and held campus workshops, winter retreats, and opening day sessions to help the campus community to understand SLO development and SLO assessment and how to use assessment results. The SLO team

publishes a monthly newsletter and maintains the SLO website to educate the campus on outcome- and assessment-related issues and to keep the campus informed of policies related to SLOs and the campus's progress.

SLOs have been developed at the course, program, and institutional level. The SLO Assessment Committee (SLOAC), now the Learning Assessment Advisory Committee (LAAC), was established to ensure that the SLOs at all levels are tied to the college mission and to the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and are assessed regularly with authentic assessment strategies. The learning assessment facilitators use a rubric to assess each department's course learning outcomes (CLOs), assessments, results, and use of results plans. They provide feedback to departments regarding best practices for CLOs and areas where improvements are needed. The facilitators also prepare reports on learning trends based on what they find. The LAAC hears the reviews of all end-of-the-year SLO reports given by the learning assessment facilitators, and the committee analyzes the assessment results and use of results plans for teaching and learning trends to inform the college community of needed changes and to improve institutionwide student learning by making recommendations of any needed institutional changes to the Academic Senate and the Educational Planning Subcommittee.

- **College Recommendation 4:** All college units must prepare a comprehensive program review every six years and an Annual Update Plan as the starting point for all decision making regarding the allocation of resources and the measurement of student success. Further, each of the college's four clusters (Liberal Arts and Sciences, Workforce Education and Economic Development, Student Services, and Administrative Services) must develop annual cluster plans which offer a global perspective of the needs of the campus and each individual cluster. Therefore, it is imperative that this important process be transparent and clearly communicated. The college has undertaken a number of activities to ensure transparency and better communication.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) conducts annual workshops and desk-side training to assist departments in the preparation of their documents by providing internal and external data and explaining the use of the data. The OIE provides continual updates regarding program review at the Shared Governance Council (ESGC) meetings. As part of the program review process, the commendations and recommendations for all departments and units provided by the Program Review Validation Committees are noticed and approved at the ESGC. Minutes of the meetings are posted on the college website. Council members are expected to report proceedings to their constituent groups. When supervisors/deans meet with their units to review requests for positions, equipment, and increases to their base budget for the upcoming fiscal year, the Annual Update Plan and Comprehensive Program Review are the primary documents used during consultation. Vice Presidents present their cluster reports in an annual address to the campus community to communicate goals and priorities for the following year

- **College Recommendation 5:** Efforts to provide the necessary staffing, services, and programs in the student services division are ongoing. The college has multiple methods for the evaluation of student service units. In the same manner as academic and administrative units, student service units undergo a comprehensive program review every six years and complete an Annual Update Plan to justify resource allocations on a yearly basis. Validated recommendations from the program review process serve as a regularly occurring evaluation meant to improve their operation. Regular evaluation of student services by the students is accomplished by alternating between point-of-service surveys and general student body surveys. An example of the use of data to improve student services is the Transfer Center's development of a program to expand awareness of its services.

- **College Recommendation 6:** Following the ACCJC team visit in 2009, the Accreditation Response Group (ARG) was formed. ARG's first task was the development of the *Shared Governance and Decision-Making Policy Handbook* to clearly describe how decision-making processes at ELAC integrate into the overall Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation cycle of the college. The *Handbook* serves as a guide for students, faculty, staff, and administrators who desire to be or are already involved in college planning and other campuswide decisions. The *Handbook* includes descriptions of college processes, college committees, and a schedule of college planning, evaluation, and reevaluation. The *Handbook* is also used as a reference guide for those who wish to participate in the shared governance system or develop the campus's planning agenda. Each section describes the manner in which decisions are made and the committees responsible for each decision-making area. These processes include thorough and regular evaluation mechanisms for creating a cycle of continuous quality improvement in college practices. As such, the *Handbook* is a living document that can regularly be adapted to any changes made in decision-making processes in an effort to continually improve college governance through the use of regular formative and summative evaluations.

The *Handbook*, now in its second edition, is posted on the college website. Elements of the *Handbook* are highlighted in workshops on developing the Annual Update Plan, which are presented by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness annually.

The responses to the three district recommendations were initiated by the Los Angeles Community College District Office of Institutional Effectiveness on behalf of the college.

- **District Recommendation 1:** The LACCD took significant steps to address the issue of its unfunded liability for retiree health care (District Recommendation 1) in fall 2006 by negotiating an agreement, approved by the district's six unions and its Board of Trustees, to begin pre-funding a portion of its unfunded obligation into an irrevocable trust. Also, in 2010, the district's health care plans for both active and retired employees were moved to CalPERS, resulting in significantly lower costs.
- **District Recommendation 2:** The LACCD District Planning Committee conducted a full assessment of the *2008 Functional Map* that engaged faculty, staff, administrative, and student leaders in a dialogue on the mutual roles and responsibilities of the colleges and the district system. This dialogue led to the replacement of the *2008 Functional Map* with the *LACCD District/College Governance and Functions Handbook*. Further, the results of customer satisfaction surveys, begun in 2008, for every major service unit in the district office continue to be collected and the results used to measure the effectiveness of support services.
- **District Recommendation 3:** The District Planning Committee has taken steps to implement a new cyclical process for self-assessment of the effectiveness of its role delineation and the decision-making processes. The district now employs a biennial governance assessment cycle and an annual self-assessment of district governance committees.

This midterm report was reviewed internally by the Accreditation Response Group; the Academic Senate; the Shared Governance Council; the Office of Institutional Effectiveness; and members of the administration, including the interim president and vice presidents of academic affairs, student services, and administrative services. The Shared Governance Council approved the report on January 9, 2012. On February 22, 2012, the report was presented to the members of the District Institutional Effectiveness Committee and then approved by the Board of Trustees.

# RESPONSE TO TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS AND THE COMMISSION ACTION LETTER

## College Recommendation 1: Mission

*The team recommends that in order to meet standards, the college ensure that the revised mission statement receives board approval (Eligibility Requirement 2; Standard I.A.2).*

The college addressed this recommendation in its first Follow-Up Report (October 2009). The Board of Trustees approved the college mission statement on May 13, 2009. Further, the College has now adopted a policy that is detailed in its *Shared Governance and Decision-Making Policy Handbook* (<http://www.elac.edu/departments/accreditation/Shared%20Gov%20Dec%20Making%20Policy%20Handbook%202nd%20edition.pdf>) that clearly states the process by which all future revisions of the mission statement will be undertaken, including forwarding of the statement to the district for approval by the board. The Accrediting Commission notified the college on January 29, 2010, that the Follow-up Report 1 had been accepted.

Since that time, the college has adopted a new Mission Statement, along with a revised Vision Statement, Goals, and Strategic Plan. The Strategic Planning Committee conducted a review of these documents during spring 2011. The committee analyzed the previous Mission Statement to determine its continued relevance and the manner in which it fit the needs and assets of the current and projected student body.

The Strategic Planning Committee vetted the revised College Mission Statement, along with the Vision Statement, Goals, and Strategic Plan, throughout the campus community at four open forums for faculty, staff, and the general student body, as well as through the Academic Senate, the Associated Student Union, and the Shared Governance Council. The goal of the vetting process was to receive input from all constituent groups in a manner that promoted the development of a revised mission with collegewide support. After the Shared Governance Council approved the documents, they were forwarded to the president, who upon acceptance forwarded them to the Board of Trustees for approval. Following Board approval on August 10, 2011 (**CR.1.1 – Board Minutes, August 10, 2011, p. 7**), the Accreditation Liaison Officer released the revised Mission Statement for use in all official college documents, including the college schedule and catalog.

### **MISSION STATEMENT**

*East Los Angeles College empowers students to achieve their educational goals, to expand their individual potential, and to successfully pursue their aspirations for a better future for themselves, their community, and the world.*

## College Recommendation 2: Improving Institutional Effectiveness

*Improving Institutional Effectiveness. As noted by the 2003 team, the current team recommends the previous recommendation given to the college in 2003: The college should integrate planning with decision making and budgeting processes to ensure that the decisions to allocate staff, equipment, resources, and facilities throughout the college are based on identified strategic priorities and to ensure a continuous cycle of evaluation and improvement based upon data (Eligibility Requirement 19; Standards I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.6, IV.B.2.b).*

## The College Planning Structure

East Los Angeles College (ELAC) has clearly articulated in written format its planning structure, the integration of planning with the decision-making and budgeting processes, and the evaluation of the planning processes in its *Shared Governance and Decision-Making Policy Handbook* (<http://www.elac.edu/departments/accreditation/Shared%20Gov%20Dec%20Making%20Policy%20Handbook%202nd%20edition.pdf>). The college has utilized the established process in its most recent adoption of the revised *Strategic Plan*, including the college's Mission Statement, Vision Statement, and Goals. The following narrative describes how these processes are accomplished.

The college planning structure reflects the college's commitment to shared governance and to obtaining campuswide and community input on the college goals and objectives that will shape the college's future. The ELAC Shared Governance Council (ESGC) serves as the central governing body for all planning decisions and makes recommendations directly to the college president as part of the shared governance process. In addition to the ESGC, the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC), Educational Planning Subcommittee (EPSC), Facilities Planning Subcommittee (FPSC), Technology Planning Subcommittee (TPSC), Program Review and Viability Committee (PRVC), and the Budget Committee also play key roles in the development and implementation of the college planning agenda. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE), formerly the Office of Research and Planning, facilitates the development of the college planning documents and assists in the implementation and evaluation of the planning agenda.

As part of a multi-college district, East Los Angeles College is guided by the Strategic Planning agenda provided by the district office. The District *Strategic Plan* sets priorities that guide district actions and initiatives. It also serves to align district goals and priorities with those established in the California Community College System *Strategic Plan*. The District Planning Committee (DPC) oversees the plan's implementation and works to coordinate the future planning efforts of all nine district colleges.

In formulating its own planning agenda, ELAC utilizes the District Planning Goals to guide its development. The college produces four planning documents, which are formally revised regularly on a six-year schedule.

1. The East Los Angeles College *Strategic Plan* serves as the central planning document for the college and contains the College Mission, Vision, and Goals. The Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) is responsible for the development, implementation, and evaluation of the *Strategic Plan* and reports to the ESGC. The *Strategic Plan* is used to guide the development of the other planning documents.  
([http://www.elac.edu/departments/accreditation/STRATEGIC%20PLAN%202011-2017\\_Final.pdf](http://www.elac.edu/departments/accreditation/STRATEGIC%20PLAN%202011-2017_Final.pdf))
2. The *Educational Master Plan* details all academic and educational planning objectives, including student and administrative service objectives that relate to educational goals. The Educational Planning Subcommittee (EPSC) is responsible for the development, implementation, and evaluation of the *Educational Master Plan*.  
([http://www.elac.edu/departments/accreditation/doc/Ed\\_Plan\\_12\\_11\\_08.pdf](http://www.elac.edu/departments/accreditation/doc/Ed_Plan_12_11_08.pdf))
3. The *Facilities Master Plan* describes all planning objectives related to facilities and college infrastructure. The Facilities Planning Subcommittee (FPSC) is responsible for the development, implementation and evaluation of the *Facilities Master Plan*.  
(<http://www.elac.edu/departments/accreditation/doc/FacilitiesMasterPlan.pdf>)
4. The *Technology Master Plan* describes all objectives related to educational technology and technology infrastructure. The Technology Planning Subcommittee (TPSC) is responsible for the

development, implementation and evaluation of the *Technology Master Plan*. All objectives are aligned with the strategic directions and values of the *Strategic Plan*.

(<http://www.elac.edu/departments/accreditation/doc/ELACTechMasterPlan2008-2011.pdf>)

All college planning agenda are created through data-driven processes that include national, state, local, and campus data. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness provides comprehensive college data on student outcomes and college core indicators of success, the latest of which can be viewed in the *Strategic Plan Data Report 2011-2017*

(<http://www.elac.edu/faculty/oie/Strategic%20Plan%20Data%20Report%202011-2017.pdf>). In addition, the Program Review process is used to substantiate the efforts made by departments to improve student learning and to identify the needs of ELAC students and the surrounding community. The Program Review and Viability Committee reviews and updates the college's Program Review Plan every six years. This plan includes the schedule for conducting comprehensive program review and annual update plans. The Comprehensive Program Review Questionnaire focuses on the manner in which each program is supporting the agenda items listed in the *Strategic Plan*. In addition, the Comprehensive Program Review and Program Review Annual Update Plans utilize Student Learning Outcomes to assess the degree to which departments and programs are working to improve the student learning process and creating improvements in student outcomes. Annual Update Plans are completed in between comprehensive reviews to determine the progress made in responding to Comprehensive Program Review recommendations and the program or department's own unit goals. The Annual Update Plans serve as the basis for resource allocation decisions, such as the hiring of new faculty and staff, purchases of new equipment, and increases or decreases to a unit's base budget. The Comprehensive Program Review and Annual Update Plans provide essential data in the development, implementation, and evaluative planning processes. The Comprehensive Program Review (**CR.2.1 - Form**) is currently undergoing revision to align with the mission and the goals of the new Strategic Plan. The form for *the Annual Update Plan 2011-2012* can be viewed at (<http://www.elac.edu/faculty/oie/programreview.html>).

All college planning is conducted using evaluation cycles focused on continuous quality improvement for all instruction, student services, and administrative programs. ELAC enters into six-year planning cycles in which the college progresses through phases of Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation (PIE). A chart that illustrates the college's cycle of Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation (PIE) can be viewed on page 23 of the *Shared Governance Decision-Making and Policy Handbook*

(<http://www.elac.edu/departments/accreditation/Shared%20Gov%20Dec%20Making%20Policy%20Handbook%202nd%20edition.pdf>).

By incorporating formative evaluations into operational decision-making, ELAC ensures that these annual processes are subject to self-reflective examination on an ongoing basis and that lessons learned contribute to improvements in these processes. Data-driven measures and formative evaluations contribute to a summative evaluation of the *Strategic Plan* implementation at the end of its six-year cycle. The link between the formative evaluations and summative evaluation ensures that continuous quality improvement is ongoing and is the driving force for revisions to the *Strategic Plan*. Through this model, the college ensures that all programs, as well as the college's governing and decision-making processes, are regularly and thoroughly evaluated.

In addition to six-year strategic planning, the college utilizes annual operational planning to ensure that the college is making adequate yearly progress on accomplishing the general planning agenda. Operational planning includes the annual implementation and evaluation efforts that take place through the use of Student Learning Outcomes, Annual Update Plans, resource allocation, operational decision making, and formative evaluation using an implementation matrix. These yearly decisions and their respective evaluations are used to improve the connection between strategic planning, daily decisions and

resource allocation and to gather data regularly on campus efforts toward accomplishing its planning agenda and in the overall summative college evaluation.

Meeting the planning needs of the college requires a staggered planning structure that allows the *Strategic Plan* to be developed prior to the master plans. In this manner, the global planning directions and values can be used to drive the completion of the specific master plan objectives and action items. Following the development of the master plans, the Program Review structure is revised using the college's new priorities and planning objectives. The Planning Calendar describes the college planning and evaluation sequence and its integration with the college's accreditation process. The calendar can be viewed on page 25 of the *Shared Governance Decision-Making and Policy Handbook* (<http://www.elac.edu/departments/accreditation/Shared%20Gov%20Dec%20Making%20Policy%20Handbook%202nd%20edition.pdf>).

Short-term and long-term planning at ELAC is accomplished using the skills and expertise of college faculty, administration, staff, and students. As a college invested in the shared governance process, ELAC has sought to develop and implement its planning agenda through the use of representative committees. The following paragraphs describe the major campus committees involved in the creation of strategic and master plans and their approval processes.

The **Strategic Planning Committee** (SPC) is a shared-governance standing committee that oversees the creation, implementation, evaluation, and revision of the *Strategic Plan*. Membership on this committee ensures representation from all vital constituent groups and those with the requisite knowledge to formulate the college planning agenda. The SPC reviews the strategic planning documents which include the Mission, Vision, and Goals. Formal reviews of the documents are conducted every six years; however, the committee can initiate a review of the *Strategic Plan* any time that changes in the college environment warrant possible revisions. Requests for such review can be made directly to the committee or through the ESGC. The **Educational Planning Subcommittee**, **Facilities Planning Subcommittee**, **Technology Planning Subcommittee**, and **Program Review and Viability Committee** all report to the SPC to ensure alignment of the planning and implementation process. The SPC is responsible for overseeing the implementation process of the strategic and master plans and reviewing ongoing formative evaluations.

During the summative evaluation cycle of the current *Strategic Plan*, the Strategic Planning Committee reviewed relevant data to be used in the strategic planning process in spring 2011 (<http://www.elac.edu/faculty/oie/Strategic%20Plan%20Data%20Report%202011-2017.pdf>).

The committee analyzed the previous Mission Statement to determine its continued relevance and the manner in which it fitted the needs and assets of the current and projected student body. The vision focuses on the future and serves as a statement of the college's commitment to student success. The goals are used in the development of the *Educational, Facilities, and Technology Master Plans*. These goals take into account the current and future needs of the college, its faculty, staff, and students.

The Strategic Planning Committee vetted the College Mission Statement, Vision Statement and Goals through the campus community, including but not limited to the Academic Senate, the Associated Student Union, and the faculty, staff, and general student body. The goal of the vetting process was to receive input from all constituent groups in a manner that promoted the development of a revised mission with collegewide support. The vetting process included four open forums (**CR.2.2 – Forum Announcements**) to present collegewide data supporting the development of the *Strategic Plan*. Once completed, the *Strategic Plan* was also circulated to all faculty and staff via email. Upon completion of the vetting process, the Strategic Planning Committee submitted the final draft of the *Strategic Plan* to the ESGC for approval. The ESGC-approved draft on May 23, 2011 (**CR.2.3 – ESGC Minutes, p. 2**) was forwarded to the president, who upon acceptance forwarded it to the Board of Trustees for approval and notified the

Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO). Prior to inclusion in any campus publications, the ALO formally requested that the campus-approved *Strategic Plan* be placed on the Board of Trustees' meeting agenda for approval on the soonest possible Board meeting date. Following Board approval on August 10, 2011, **(CR.2.4 – Board Minutes, p. 7)** the ALO released the revised Mission Statement for use in all official college documents, including the class schedule and the catalog. The approved *Strategic Plan* is forwarded to college planning subcommittees for use in the development of college plans.

The Strategic Planning Committee has three subcommittees: the Educational Planning Subcommittee, the Facilities Planning Subcommittee, and the Technology Planning Subcommittee. Each committee is made up of college faculty, administrators, staff, and students. An additional committee that is crucial to the planning process is the Program Review and Viability Committee.

The **Educational Planning Subcommittee (EPSC)** serves as the central planning committee for all educational matters, including those administrative and student service areas that overlap with or support educational goals. The EPSC completes and oversees the *Educational Master Plan*, determines the needs of the college, and makes recommendations for its revisions and funding for components from ESGC. In order to include leadership committees related to the educational needs of students, the following committees report to the EPSC: Distance Education Committee, Enrollment Management Committee, Matriculation Advisory Committee, Off-Site Committee, Student Learning Outcomes Committee; Student Success Committee, and Transfer Committee.

The **Facilities Planning Subcommittee (FPSC)** addresses issues regarding college facilities planning, completes and oversees the *Facilities Master Plan*, determines projected space needs, reviews bond projects and related programming, provides solid documentation of funding requests to the State, restructures current facilities to conform with State Utilization Standards, and meets objectives articulated in the *Strategic* and *Educational Master Plans*. The subcommittee serves as the central planning committee for all facilities matters, including those educational, administrative, and student service areas that overlap with or support educational goals.

The **Technology Planning Subcommittee (TPSC)** addresses issues regarding the college's technology use, completes and oversees the *Technology Master Plan*, determines the technology needs of the college, and meets the technology objectives articulated in the *Strategic* and *Educational Master Plans*. The subcommittee serves as the central planning committee for all technology matters, including those educational, administrative, and student service areas that overlap with or support educational goals.

During the summative evaluation cycle of the current plans, the subcommittees evaluate and revise each master plan. The timeline for summative and formative evaluations appears on p. 25 in the *Handbook* (<http://www.elac.edu/departments/accreditation/Shared%20Gov%20Dec%20Making%20Policy%20Handbook%202nd%20edition.pdf>). The subcommittees review relevant data to include district and state *Strategic Plans*; the formative evaluations and implementation history of the previous plans; the college external scan, internal scan, college profile, and core indicators; student surveys; bond initiatives; recent literature on technology trends in education; reports from related committees; program reviews and annual update plans; program student learning outcomes and college institutional learning outcomes; and any additional information relevant to the revision of each master plan.

Following the completion of the data review, the subcommittees construct planning objectives using the college mission, vision, and goals as a guide. Planning objectives are developed so that meeting these objectives will lead to the fulfillment of the college's goals. Each completed plan is vetted through the campus community, including but not limited to the Academic Senate, the Associated Student Union, and the faculty, staff, and general student body. The goal of the vetting process is to receive input from all constituent groups in a manner that promotes the development of the revised plans with collegewide

support. Upon completion of the vetting process, the subcommittees meet to finalize each draft to be sent to ESGC for approval. The ESGC-approved drafts are then forwarded to the Board of Trustees for approval. The approved plans are posted on the college's Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation websites.

A key component to the college planning processes is the Program Review and Viability Committee (PRVC). The Program Review and Viability Committee has the primary responsibility of developing the policies and structure related to comprehensive program review, annual updates, and program viability. The program review plan and documents are revised in the second year of the *Strategic Plan* and the first year of the master plans to reflect the changes in the college's planning agenda. The PRVC is made up of college faculty, administrators, and staff. The committee meets on a monthly basis to review and discuss comprehensive program review, annual update, and program viability processes. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness works with the PRVC to develop and refine the structure, process, and documentation of program review. The office is also the contact liaison for all constituencies involved in the program review process: the units under review, the validation committees, the ESGC, and the college president.

Upon completion of the college's *Strategic Plan* and *Educational, Facilities, and Technology Master Plans*, the PRVC creates a *Program Review Plan*. The plan consists of the schedule for the assessment and validation of all campus departments, units, and clusters. In addition, the PRVC revises the Comprehensive Program Review Questionnaire to reflect the changes in the planning documents and to assess the contribution that each unit is making toward fulfilling the college's plans, mission, vision and goals. The PRVC is responsible for direct oversight of the Program Review Plan. Yearly formative evaluations are conducted on an ongoing basis to ensure effective planning processes.

Following the creation of ELAC's planning agenda (*Strategic, Educational, Facilities, Technology, and Program Review Plans*), the campus is actively involved in implementing the college's objectives. The college's *Educational Master* and *Strategic Plans* guide the prioritization of resource allocation, including hiring and equipment purchases. In addition, the plans serve as a guide in daily decision-making regarding all aspects of ELAC policies and governance. The *Shared Governance and Decision Making Policy Handbook* describes the manner in which decisions are made through the roles and structures of the various groups and committees that play integral roles in the overall functioning of the college.

For example, the college Budget Committee is a shared governance body through which funding requests are vetted and budget recommendations are made to the ESGC. The committee also recommends budget policies and adjustments to the budget development process and develops policies that link resource allocation with the planning agenda presented in the *Strategic* and various *Master Plans*.

The ELAC budget development process effectively links resource allocation to planning and provides a general timeline toward achieving that goal. The Annual Update Plan is the central vehicle through which planning and budget are connected. Each year, every unit submits a plan detailing unit activities and future goals related to the Educational Master and Strategic Plans and the efforts made to respond to the unit's comprehensive program review recommendations. All requests for staffing, equipment, and additional resources required for those unit activities are identified in the unit's Annual Update Plan. College committees, such as the Hiring Prioritization Committee and the State Equipment Grants Committee, review resource requests and provide recommendations for allocations. Any department that does not complete an Annual Update Plan by the deadline is ineligible for increased staffing or other resources. Thus, the Annual Update Plans are an integral part of the college's budgetary processes.

The Budget Committee remains actively involved in establishing the link between annual planning through program review and the prioritization of budgetary needs. The vice presidents for Academic Affairs,

Workforce Education, Student Services, and Administrative Services are required to submit Cluster Update Plans (<http://www.elac.edu/faculty/oie/Annualupdates2011.html>) and to set annual cluster goals for the college. The cluster update runs parallel to the unit annual update planning cycle, but offers a global perspective of the needs of the campus and each individual cluster. This perspective assists in annual college planning efforts by providing a venue through which the vice presidents can identify overlapping needs that relate to the college's *Strategic Plan* and synthesize creative solutions that span multiple units within and between the clusters.

The vice presidents annually present their Cluster Update Plans to an open college forum during a standing Budget Committee meeting. In addition, the Educational Planning Subcommittee and the vice presidents, through Cluster Update Plans presented to the Budget Committee and the ESGC, prioritize the items in the lists of unfunded or underfunded objectives. The Budget Committee, in consultation with the college's fiscal office, reviews and forwards to the ESGC the potential costs and savings related to the hiring of faculty for growth and replacement positions as prioritized by the Hiring Prioritization Committee and approved by the Academic Senate. Additionally, the Budget Committee continues to assess the extent to which the budget development process ensures transparency concerning any large expenditure.

### **Evaluation of the Planning Structure**

The college recognizes that planning structures must be sustainable and implemented throughout the college. In this manner, the *Shared Governance and Decision Making Policy Handbook* calls for both formative and summative evaluations of the planning structures and, based on the results of these evaluations, the implementation of appropriate changes.

In the final year of each college plan, a summative evaluation occurs to determine the overall effectiveness of a plan's implementation and its impact on student outcomes. The planning evaluation includes reports of college core indicators and plan-specific quantitative measures. These measures are used to determine the impact of the plan on institutional access, student learning, and student success. The college core indicators are developed using the *Strategic* and *Educational Master Plans* as guides, and they serve as quantitative evidence of the impact of the college's planning agenda. The core indicators serve as quantitative benchmarks and are indicators of success. They can be viewed on pages 22-29, and 49 of the *Strategic Plan* ([http://www.elac.edu/departments/accreditation/STRATEGIC%20PLAN%202011-2017\\_Final.pdf](http://www.elac.edu/departments/accreditation/STRATEGIC%20PLAN%202011-2017_Final.pdf))

In addition to quantitative evidence, qualitative assessments are conducted. These evaluations include faculty and staff surveys that are conducted in the final year of each plan to determine the level of satisfaction with the planning process and perceived impact of the plan on program improvement, and to identify any potential areas of improvement in the planning process. The results of these assessments are used to improve future plans and planning processes. Assessment measures are provided to each planning committee and to the college community. The qualitative data is geared to initiate a dialog of self-evaluation and to stimulate improvements in planning procedures and the roles of the campus leaders that participate in the planning and shared governance process.

The results of formative and summative evaluations are distributed to the campus community via the Office of Institutional Effectiveness website and through the corresponding governance groups. The evaluations are used to stimulate a campus dialog on decision-making processes and the needs of the campus community. The goal of evaluation is to improve processes and measures of student success. Each committee works to incorporate the results of the evaluation to improve planning processes and as evidence of need in future data-driven planning.

### College Recommendation 3: Instructional Programs

*In order to achieve the proficiency level of the ACCJC rubric relative to Student Learning Outcomes by the year 2012, the team recommends the college accelerate its completion of Student Learning Outcomes for courses and programs and complete the assessment cycle by using assessment results to improve instruction and student services (Eligibility Requirements 8, 10, and 11; Standards II.A.1.b-c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2.e.-I, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.6.a).*

The college is committed to achieving the proficiency level of the ACCJC rubric relative to Student Learning Outcomes by fall 2012. To reach this goal, the college has increased the reassigned time (2 FTEF) for a SLO coordinator and three SLO facilitators (**CR.3.1 – Position Descriptions**). Each facilitator is assigned to specific academic departments, student services, and academic units. The SLO team (also referred to as the learning assessment team) has attended department and unit meetings and held campus workshops, winter retreats, and opening day sessions to help the campus community to understand SLO development and SLO assessment and how to use assessment results (**CR.3.2 – Examples – Let Us Help**). The SLO team publishes a monthly newsletter and maintains the SLO website to educate the campus on outcome- and assessment-related issues and to keep the campus informed of policies related to SLOs and the campus's progress (**CR.3.3 – Learning Assessment News**).

The SLO Coordinator

- Acts as the administrator of the college's online SLO reporting system, TracDat (<http://www.elac.edu/departments/slo/index.htm>)
- Chairs meetings of the Learning Assessment Committee (formerly the SLO Committee) and the Learning Assessment Advisory Committee (formerly SLO Assessment Committee or SLOAC)
- Serves as the principal interface for the campus regarding SLO development and processes by attending on-campus and off-campus meetings and workshops related to student success, SLOs, and accreditation
- Reports regularly to the Educational Planning Subcommittee (EPSC), the Academic Senate, and the department chairs
- Oversees the process that ensures all departments will receive support to assist them in working through the SLO development and assessment processes
- Is a member of the Program Review and Viability Committee (PRVC) to help guide the inclusion of SLO assessment data in the Annual Update Plan and the Comprehensive Program Review
- Is a member of the Accreditation Response Group (ARG).

Further efforts to promote the SLO process include

- In spring 2010, the SLO team was given an office, which has made their role on campus more formalized. The SLO facilitators hold weekly office hours, during which all staff and faculty are welcome to visit and obtain the answers to SLO- and assessment-related questions.
- The campus supports the SLO team's attendance at conferences and workshops to learn about SLO and assessment best practices and accreditation policies. For example, the SLO team has attended the RP Strengthening Student Success Conference and WASC-sponsored Assessment Retreats and the Academic Resource Conference.
- This year, the district supported sending the SLO coordinator to the WASC Assessment Leadership Academy. This experience has allowed the SLO coordinator to become more focused on how to facilitate assessment development. During this training, the coordinator learned that there is a trend toward the support of learning assessment offices and assessment coordinators in four-year colleges. The SLO team realized that this should be their mission: to focus on facilitating learning assessment by actively helping departments and units to build rubrics, run

focus groups, run norming sessions, and in general be a hands-on resource to assist with assessment on campus.

- During the 2011-2012 academic year, the team will be offering an online course based around four modules: the history of assessment, Bloom's taxonomy and how it relates to outcomes, assessment, and closing the loop. This course will provide a faculty development opportunity focused on learning outcome assessment.
- The Learning Assessment Committee meets monthly to discuss campus SLO-related issues, to present best practices, and to give guidance to the SLO team on their campus outreach. A representative from each academic department and representatives from the student service and administrative units serve on the SLO Committee.
- The SLO Assessment Committee (SLOAC), now the Learning Assessment Advisory Committee (LAAC), was developed; its membership is comprised of the following: the learning assessment coordinator, the three learning assessment facilitators, an OIE representative, an Academic Senate representative (CTE or Academic), a Student Services representative, and an instructional administrative representative. The purpose of LAAC is to ensure that the SLOs at all levels are tied to the college mission and to the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and are assessed regularly with authentic assessment strategies. The learning assessment facilitators use a rubric to assess each department's course learning outcomes (CLOs), assessments, results, and use of results plans. They provide feedback to departments regarding best practices for CLOs and areas where improvements are needed. The learning assessment facilitators also prepare reports on learning trends based on what they find. The LAAC hears the reviews of all end-of-the-year SLO reports given by the learning assessment facilitators, and the committee analyzes the assessment results and use of results plans for teaching and learning trends to inform the college community of needed changes and to improve institutionwide student learning by making recommendations of any needed institutional changes to the Academic Senate and the Educational Planning Subcommittee.

### **Course Learning Outcomes**

The college is committed to the SLO process being a faculty-driven process. Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) are developed and approved by the department's full-time faculty. This ensures that discipline experts with expertise in the course material are identifying the appropriateness and validity of the CLO. Departments can use the Learning Assessment Office for assistance in this development. The CLOs are reported on the Course SLO Approval Form, which is submitted to the curriculum chair to attach as an addendum to the Course Outline of Record (COR). The curriculum chair forwards a copy of the form to the Learning Assessment Office. The course learning outcome is then uploaded to TracDat and placed on course syllabi. The Senate passed a policy in May 2009 to ensure that all new courses have approved CLOs attached as an addendum to the course outline of record before being presented at the Senate for approval (**CR.3.4 – CLO Addendum to COR**). This ensures that departments have developed CLOs concurrently with all new courses. Currently, 92 percent of the college's courses have CLOs.

CLO assessments are developed by the department's full-time faculty, with part-time faculty input. These assessments are approved within the departments. The learning assessment team and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness are available to facilitate this process. At the end of spring 2011, the learning assessment facilitators worked with Architecture, Business Administration and Library Sciences faculty to refine CLOs for their high enrollment courses and develop authentic assessments for those CLOs. Those CLOs are currently undergoing assessment, and the facilitators will continue to work with faculty in those departments to assist with "closing the loop."

CLO assessments, results, and use of results are reported on TracDat. These reports are collected annually in June by the learning assessment coordinator to use in the annual report to the ACCJC and to report to LAAC. Currently, 58 percent of the courses have been reported on TracDat to have assessments in process. These CLO assessments and results are reported by departments in the Annual Update Plan and used as one piece of evidence for budgetary and hiring requests.

CLO assessment results have led departments to improve their CLOs and assessments, to improve teaching, and to change curriculum. For example:

- Accounting faculty recognized that after a few semesters of assessment and making minor changes in pedagogy that students still were unable to achieve one key CLO; in consultation with the department's learning assessment facilitator, faculty recognized their need to use active-learning techniques. For the first time since development, students in Accounting 1 exceeded the benchmark, with 78 percent of students successfully achieving the CLO, a marked improvement over the previous assessment in which only 61 percent of students were successful.
- Based on CLO assessment that showed students struggling with discipline-specific writing, Art History faculty developed a "Writing Guide for Art History," worked with the Writing Center and Learning Center to train tutors on their discipline-specific writing styles, created an assessment rubric to be used by all Art History faculty doing writing assessment, and worked with the Library to get a subscription to the ARTstor database so that students taking Art History would have better resources to access for research. As a result of these changes, Art History faculty have seen student success on the CLOs increase by 12 percent.
- After undergoing a major shift in curriculum, ESL faculty significantly revised their CLOs. In ESL 6A, all faculty use a discipline-approved rubric to assess the final project, in which students demonstrate the CLO. Use of the rubric has helped ESL faculty to identify gaps in teaching instruction to dialogue about best practices, and to revise the Course Outline of Record so that students can be more successful.
- Chemistry faculty recognized that even though Chemistry 65 students needed to have completed Math 115 before enrolling in 65, there was still insufficient math preparation for their students to be successful at the CLOs dealing with mathematical calculations. Chemistry and Math faculty created a 1-unit math course to supplement Chemistry 65.
- Nursing faculty, who track students through their success on the NCLEX, saw a drop in the success rate and linked that back to poor performance on CLOs. They underwent a curriculum shift that included the development of entirely new CLOs, as well as faculty buy-in and implementation of the Kaplan testing system, which allows for more 'remediation' for students throughout the learning process. Since implementing the Kaplan system, Nursing faculty have seen student success in the knowledge-based CLOs increase; this success has also created greater success for students at the program level, with more students passing the NCLEX on the first attempt.

### **Program Learning Outcomes**

During fall 2010, the Program Review and Viability Committee (PRVC) clarified the definition of programs on campus, creating the *Program of Study* and *Program of Service* ([CR.3.5 – Definition of Programs](#)). There are departments and disciplines that have many certificates that are similar to or are part of a larger degree or career plan for students. However, there are also many departments and disciplines that offer no degrees or certificates. Thus, PRVC created a Program of Study definition to account for both types of departments and disciplines; the definition was based on the student perspective of understanding what program a sequence of courses or certificate or degree fits into. The Academic Senate and ESGC approved the Program of Study definition in fall 2010. Spring 2010 was devoted to formalizing the declaration of program of study process and educating faculty of this change in program

definition through discussions at meetings of the Academic Senate, Chairs, Chairs Council, Learning Assessment Committee, EPSC, and ESGC.

The Learning Assessment Committee, with Academic Senate guidance, developed and approved in May 2011, *the Program of Study Declaration Form*, which includes three sections: Part A declares the Program of Study, its courses, and any associated degrees and certificates; Part B includes the Program Learning Outcome Listing with departmental approval; and Part C is the acknowledgement of the program shown by signatures from the Academic Senate president, the Curriculum Chair, and the Department Chair (**CR.3.6 – Program of Study Declaration Form**). This form is forwarded to OIE, who then distributes a copy to the catalog dean and to the Learning Assessment Office. OIE keeps records of these programs to plan for the comprehensive program review. The catalog dean adds the program learning outcomes to the catalog, and the Learning Assessment Office adds the programs of study and learning outcomes to TracDat.

During spring 2011, the faculty chair of PRVC, the learning assessment coordinator, and the dean of OIE met with some selected departments to discuss program of studies and initiate the process. During summer 2011, the learning assessment team and OIE held Program of Study workshops with department chairs. This year's Opening Day allowed departments and disciplines time to discuss their program of study, define PLOs, and their connection to the program's courses through curriculum mapping. The learning assessment team was on hand to advise several departments on the process. Additionally, department chairs received specific training on curriculum mapping at the Chairs Committee. All departments and disciplines were expected to complete the *Program of Study Declaration Form*, curriculum maps, and develop an assessment plan by November 16, 2011. To date, 96 percent of the academic departments have identified 57 programs of study with the associated program-level outcomes. Most departments have assessed their curriculum through the use of a curriculum map and developed an assessment plan to delineate when and what type of assessments will be conducted (**CR.3.7 – Example Completed Program of Study Declaration Form**).

The PLOs will be listed in next year's 2011-2013 Catalog Update, while assessment reports will be hosted on TracDat and discussed thoroughly in the Comprehensive Program Review. PLOs will be mapped to the ILOs. The following two items provide examples of how the PLO process is operating:

- Faculty worked with the Administration of Justice Student Club to write PLOs that clearly articulate what students will gain from the various programs that they offer. With the assistance of the student-run club, as well as with the various law enforcement agencies that hire Administration of Justice graduates, they follow-up on students to help them understand how their programs can function better.
- Respiratory Therapy developed their program of study with the assistance of their learning assessment facilitator. They have created an assessment method that triangulates student scores on licensure tests with the assessment—by more than one faculty member—of e-portfolios that are designed to demonstrate student knowledge and skills and to increase student qualifications for employment. They will work with the facilitator to norm on the rubric prior to their assessment of the portfolios.

The campus also has Student Services, Administrative Units, and special programs, i.e., MESA, Adelante, and Honors. Currently, 50 percent of these services/programs have Student Services Outcomes (SSOs) and Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUOs) developed, and 48 percent are involved in assessment. The SSOs and AUOs are focused on their programmatic goals and or student learning where applicable. These services/programs have performed assessments and are using these results in the evaluation of the success and programming. They also report their progress on TracDat, and discuss their assessment results in their Annual Update Plans. The PRVC also developed a Program of Service definition. These units are

reviewing their missions and deciding if they will be grouping into Programs of Service or remain alone for the comprehensive program review.

### **General Education Outcomes**

The campus has also been developing and assessing outcomes for the five General Education (GE) areas. The Academic Senate, with the recommendation of the Learning Assessment Committee, assembled general education committees to develop General Education Outcomes (GEOs) during spring 2010. The GEOs were shared with all faculty and discussed and refined during the 2010 Opening Day activities. The Senate approved GE outcomes in the fall 2010, and the GE-area specific committees met during fall 2010 to discuss, develop, and plan assessments. GE outcomes are delineated in the college 2011-2013 catalog, pp. 69-70 (<http://www.elac.edu/academic/catalog.htm>).

ELAC has GE outcomes for the following areas: Language and Rationality, Humanities, Natural Sciences, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Health and Physical Education. Assessments were created and proctored during spring and fall 2011 for Rationality, Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social and Behavioral Sciences. The GE outcomes for Language and for Health and Physical Education will be assessed during spring 2012.

- Since the Rationality portion of the Language and Rationality GE area is met by a broad range of classes, the faculty on that committee agreed to a common rubric that measures three criteria (the ability to analyze information; the ability to apply formulas, procedures, principles, or themes; and the ability to draw well-supported conclusions) that would be used to assess discipline-specific assignments. The assessment was conducted during spring 2011 with 527 students participating.
  - For the first criteria, the student's ability to analyze information, 79 percent of students were proficient; 21 percent of students were not.
  - For the second criteria, the student's ability to apply formulas, procedures, principles or themes, 71 percent of students were proficient; 29 percent of students were not proficient.
  - For the third criteria, the student's ability to draw well-supported conclusions, 68 percent of students were proficient; 31 percent were not.
  - The learning assessment team hosted a faculty-dialogue session in January 2012 during which norming of the rubric was completed, along with discussion of how to proceed in the process. Since only four of the ten disciplines covered by this area participated in this initial assessment, the participants in the dialogue session decided that it was critical to gather data from other disciplines before making a decision about how best to handle the results and the trend that was already noticed. The learning assessment team, with the assistance of the Speech Department, will be developing a video to explain how to use the rubric to complete the assessment. This video will be sent to all participating departments in March 2012 so that faculty have an easy resource to reference when completing this assessment.
- The Natural Sciences Committee created a common assignment and a rubric to judge students' proficiency on the assignment. A total of 849 students participated in this assignment. The learning assessment team hosted a norming session in January 2012 that was attended by faculty from a variety of disciplines within Natural Science as well as from other areas. After assessing approximately 400 of the submitted assignments, the attendees discussed improvements to the rubric. The learning assessment team will host another norming session in March to complete this process, discuss the results, and develop the report.
- The Social and Behavioral Sciences Committee created a common assignment. Instructors within that area were asked to choose a discipline-specific reading that was appropriate for their course and to have students compose a two-page essay in which the students identify and evaluate the

behaviors of individuals or groups portrayed and discuss how the issue/behavior can be applied to a similar current issue/behavior encountered within this discipline. In March 2012, the learning assessment team will host a norming session during which these assignments will be graded using a common rubric, followed by a discussion of the results.

- The committee for the “Language” portion of the Language and Rationality GE area will meet in early March 2012 to discuss which of two common rubrics will be used to assess student composition skills. Each discipline will then disseminate the rubric and ask that instructors assess student writing using that rubric and compile the results. The learning assessment team will host a dialogue session in April 2012 to discuss the results and develop a report.
- The Humanities GE area met in June 2011 to discuss the initial results they had gathered. This meeting was attended by stakeholders in every discipline covered by the Humanities GE Outcome. While results from each discipline were presented and discussed, ultimately, the committee decided to dismiss those results because they felt that they were getting “flawed perfection” based on a problematic outcome. They decided to revise the GE Outcome to better reflect what students would be able to do. Discussion continued on new language for the GE Outcome throughout fall 2011, and the Humanities GE Committee will be presenting the new outcome to the Academic Senate for vetting this spring.

Finally, the reports prepared by the committees will be discussed by the Learning Assessment Committee and the Academic Senate, with any recommendations based on the results going on to the Educational Planning Subcommittee.

### **Institutional Learning Outcomes**

The campus began its SLO endeavor with the development of core competencies, which are now called Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). Next the campus began developing CLOs and mapping them to the ILOs. The learning assessment coordinator and the campus researcher produced a report from TracDat that aggregated assessment results to the ILOs and discussed the report at the Learning Assessment Advisory Committee. This 800-page report did not prove to be useful in helping the campus to understand how students are performing in the ILOs. The current plan is to map the PLOs to the ILOs. In the development of a PLO, the learning assessment team is emphasizing the how the PLO can be clearly related to its ILO.

The Learning Assessment Committee is currently discussing a revision to the college’s ILOs and more effective ways to assess them. Topics under consideration include creating common rubrics for use across all course offerings. This dialogue represents a great shift in the overall perspective of how the college community embraces the value of the SLO process as a contributor to student success.

The campus is committed to making data-based decisions and has added this as a campus goal. The campus is also involved in the Achieving the Dream Initiative (AtD), which is focused on developing information that depicts why students are failing and developing successful interventions based on this data, and is aligning its SLO effort as part of the AtD effort. The college has integrated assessment into its culture and is making significant progress toward achieving proficiency in fall 2012.

### **College Recommendation 4: Instructional Programs**

*In order to improve, the team recommends the college ensure that the current program review process is transparent and clearly communicated to the college constituencies (II.A.2.f).*

All college units must prepare a comprehensive program review every six years and an Annual Update

Plan as the starting point for all decision making regarding the allocation of resources and the measurement of student success. Further, each of the college's four clusters (Liberal Arts and Sciences, Workforce Education and Economic Development, Student Services, and Administrative Services) must develop annual cluster plans which offer a global perspective of the needs of the campus and each individual cluster. Therefore, it is imperative that this important process be transparent and clearly communicated. The college has undertaken a number of activities to ensure transparency and better communication.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) conducts annual workshops and desk-side training to assist departments in the preparation of their documents by providing internal and external data and explaining the use of the data. For example, prior to the September 30, 2011, due date for the Annual Update Program Review Plan, the OIE offered four training workshops and desk-side training sessions for 14 academic departments, Student Service units, Administrative Services units, and the Chairs' Council (**CR.4.1 - Annual Update 2011 Training Schedule**). Staff are available to provide individual assistance by appointment. The training is also posted online (<http://www.elac.edu/faculty/oie/Annualupdates.html>).

The training workshops are a continuation of the focus that began on the August 27, 2009, Opening Day wherein the Office of Institutional Effectiveness assisted departments in connecting department/unit planning and subsequent program review recommendations with the college's *Strategic Plan* to promote student success. The OIE staff and faculty provided information to over 300 faculty and administrators on such topics as how to complete the Annual Update Plan, how planning and budget are linked, how data can be used to plan and make decisions, and how faculty inquiry can be used to collaboratively investigate and resolve issues that will improve student learning and success. In the afternoon, members of individual departments, using the Faculty Inquiry Group approach, met to collaboratively investigate and resolve issues that were raised in their previous program review that will lead to improved student learning and success. The Opening Day training continues to be referred to as units further develop goals and action plans each succeeding year.

The OIE provides continual updates regarding program review at the Shared Governance Council meetings. As part of the program review process, the commendations and recommendations for all departments and units provided by the Program Review Validation Committees are noticed and approved at the ESGC. Minutes of the meetings are posted on the college website (<http://www.elac.edu/departments/acadsenate/minutes/ebpac/index.htm>). Council members are expected to report proceedings to their constituent groups. When supervisors/deans meet with their units to review requests for positions, equipment, and increases to their base budget for the upcoming fiscal year, the Annual Update Plan and Comprehensive Program Review are the primary documents used during consultation. Vice Presidents present their cluster reports in an annual address to the campus community to communicate goals and priorities for the following year. Budgetary requests are then prioritized and presented to the college Budget Committee and Shared Governance Council in order to further create transparency for all college constituencies. Each unit's Annual Update Plan, including the Annual Cluster Plan, is posted on the college's website for referral by shared governance committees during the budget and resource allocation process.

Each year, the Program Review and Viability Committee (PRVC) reviews the Annual Update Plan and responds to recommendations on improvement provided by the Chairs Council, the Budget Committee, the ESGC, the Hiring Prioritization Committee, the Chairs' Council, and other administrative and student service unit users. The PRVC is currently reviewing the Comprehensive Program Review Questionnaire and program review process in preparation for its distribution in fall 2012. Once completed by users, each portion of the comprehensive program review will be distributed to applicable campus committees for review and commentary (e.g., new courses/programs to be reviewed by the Curriculum Committee and

departmental goal alignment to the *Educational Master Plan* to be reviewed by the EPSC) before final review by the unit's validation committee.

The *Shared Governance and Decision-Making Policy Handbook*, pp. 46-54, clearly describes the program review process, including the roles of the Annual Update Plan and the four cluster plans. The handbook is available online to all campus constituents (<http://www.elac.edu/departments/accreditation/Shared%20Gov%20Dec%20Making%20Policy%20Handbook%202nd%20edition.pdf>). The review of applicable portions of the revised comprehensive program review by associated campus committees is a new process that will be documented in the next edition of the *Shared Governance and Decision Making Policy Handbook*, scheduled for distribution in 2013.

### **College Recommendation 5: Student Support Services**

***In order to meet standards, the college should regularly evaluate and augment, if necessary, staffing, services and programs in the student services division to ensure student needs are being met (II.B, II.B.3.c.)***

The college has multiple methods for the evaluation of student service units. In the same manner as academic and administrative units, student service units undergo a comprehensive program review every six years and complete an Annual Update Plan to justify resource allocations on a yearly basis. The program review process uses validation procedures that include all campus constituencies. Validated recommendations from this process serve as a regularly occurring evaluation meant to improve student service units. Each unit responds to these recommendations on a yearly basis through the completion of the Annual Update Plan (<http://www.elac.edu/faculty/oie/Annualupdates2011.html>). All student service units completed the Comprehensive Program Review during the last cycle (**CR.5.1 – Comprehensive Program Review Form for Student Services**).

All student service units completed Annual Update Plans for the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 planning years. All but three of the student service units completed their latest Annual Update Plan for the 2012-2013 planning year (<http://www.elac.edu/faculty/oie/Annualupdates.html>). The completed student service Annual Update Plans detail the resources needed to satisfy the recommendations of the Comprehensive Program Review and/or meet college planning objectives. The vice president of Student Services completes an annual cluster plan that details the priorities of the Student Services Division as related to resource allocations. These priorities are reviewed by the Shared Governance Council, Budget Committee, and Educational Planning Subcommittee. An example of the results of this type of evaluative process is the recommendation from the Hiring Prioritization Committee for additional counselors to be hired. This exemplifies the process of regular evaluation of student services and a resulting augmentation to meet student needs.

Most student service units received a recommendation during their comprehensive program review process to create and administer point-of-service surveys to determine the quality of student services and the level of student satisfaction. In response to this recommendation, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) began a search for an effective software system that could be utilized for regular evaluation of student services and other college units. In summer 2009, the college purchased the Class Climate system, which is capable of administering paper and web-based surveys. The OIE met with the vice president of Student Services and the directors of each student service unit. This group collaborated to develop quality assurance and student satisfaction measures to be used for all student services. In addition, each unit worked with representatives from the OIE to create additional unit-specific questions to provide data on the work of each unit and the degree to which they are meeting their unit goals. When

appropriate, the OIE sought to create measures that would provide data related to the unit's Student Service Outcomes (SSO).

In fall 2009, each student service unit distributed the point-of-service survey to students seeking their services (**CR.5.2 – Examples – Student Services Point-of-Service Surveys 2011**) . More than 1,000 surveys were collected. The results indicated a general satisfaction with the services provided. However, each measure was reviewed with the unit directors and college researchers. Any measure ranking lower than the average for that unit was highlighted for follow-up. Point-of-service surveys will continue to be administered on a regular basis.

Although point-of-service surveys provide indications of overall quality, they only target those already receiving the services and do not assess actual usage among the general student population, nor do they assess whether there are any barriers to service. These shortcomings proved to be problematic in that the demographic of those completing the point of service survey did not match the overall campus population. To address this issue it was determined that a general student survey was needed in order to determine the effectiveness of student services.

To enhance the evaluation of student service offerings, the OIE developed a general student survey that was administered to a random sample of ELAC students. The need for this type of assessment was confirmed by the results of the point-of-service surveys which indicated that more than 50 percent of students surveyed were full-time students. This trend did not match the student population, which is only 25 percent full-time. In January 2010, the college's assistant research analyst completed a report detailing the methods for administering a general student survey to a random sample of ELAC students. In spring 2010, the general survey was administered, which focused on the use, awareness and satisfaction with the student services provided. The survey resulted in 3,193 completed surveys. The results, which can be viewed at

[http://www.elac.edu/faculty/oie/campus\\_surveys/Student%20services%20by%20enrollment%20status%20report.pdf](http://www.elac.edu/faculty/oie/campus_surveys/Student%20services%20by%20enrollment%20status%20report.pdf)) indicated that a key weakness of most units was that many students were unaware of the services available to them. As an example, over 20 percent of students reported having no awareness of counseling services, even though this is a primary need for all students. Over 40 percent reported having no familiarity with the Transfer Center. This data was submitted to the Student Services Division and to the college through the Strategic Planning Committee data report. The overall results were incorporated into the college evaluation for the new Strategic Plan. Individual results were used by the student service units to plan improvements. As an example, the Transfer Center has used the results to justify increased in-reach to the campus community to expand awareness of the services provided.

The college plans to continue this method of regular evaluation by alternating between point-of-service surveys and general student body surveys. The next round of point-of-service surveys (in progress at this writing) will be followed by another general student survey in the 2012-2013 academic year. The results of these two surveys will be compared to the previous surveys to determine if any progress has been made.

### **College Recommendation 6: Decision-Making Roles and Processes**

*In order to meet standards and improve communication and continuity, the team recommends the college fully develop a formal written policy describing its governance and decision making structures and processes. The policy should define the roles and responsibilities of the constituent groups in governance and then develop methods for the regular assessment of governance and decision making structures, widely distributing the results and using the results for continuous improvement (IV.A.2, IV.A.5).*

The intent of the *Shared Governance and Decision-Making Policy Handbook* is to illustrate how decision-making processes at ELAC integrate into the overall Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation cycle of the college. ELAC has sought to establish structures and procedures that promote student success and utilize campus shared governance processes. The *Handbook* serves as a guide for students, faculty, staff, and administrators who desire to be or are already involved in college planning and other campuswide decisions. The *Handbook* includes descriptions of college processes, college committees, and a schedule of college planning, evaluation, and reevaluation.)

The *Handbook* is also used as a reference guide for those who wish to participate in the shared governance system or develop the campus's planning agenda. Each section describes the manner in which decisions are made and the committees responsible for each decision-making area. These processes include thorough and regular evaluation mechanisms for creating a cycle of continuous quality improvement in college practices. As such, the *Handbook* is a living document that can regularly be adapted to any changes made in decision-making processes in an effort to continually improve college governance through the use of regular formative and summative evaluations.

One of the college's Accreditation Response Group (ARG) primary responsibilities is to evaluate and update every other year the *Shared Governance and Decision Making Policy Handbook*. At ARG's meeting of July 15, 2010, it was determined that sections from the first edition would be circulated to each planning and decision-making committee headed by administrative and faculty leaders to identify gaps in the college's current decision-making processes and develop ways to further improve college planning and governance.

The second edition of the *Handbook* was adopted by the Shared Governance Council on January 24, 2011, and is posted on the college website. Elements of the *Handbook* are highlighted in workshops on developing the Annual Update Plan which are presented by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness annually.

The basic process for how the college planning structure itself will be evaluated is described in the *Evaluation* section of the *Handbook*. Every planning and governance committee uses formative and summative evaluations to gauge the degree to which it has been successful. For example, after the Hiring Prioritization Committee made its recommendations for hiring probationary faculty in fiscal year 2010-2011, the committee began to evaluate its operation. This discussion is ongoing.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) oversees the formative evaluation process. Each planning agenda item has a responsible entity assigned to ensure that the agenda item is met. Each year, the responsible entities submit a narrative describing the progress made, any obstacles encountered, and whether there is any need for changes associated with the objective or action items. These narratives serve as a historical knowledge base for future planning and college decision-making. In the event that a planning objective is found to no longer be relevant or needs to be modified, the narrative assists the planning committees in understanding the practical limitations faced by those attempting to implement the college's planning agenda and to create more appropriate goals for the institution.

The results of formative and summative evaluations are distributed to the campus community via the Office of Institutional Effectiveness website and through the corresponding governance groups. The evaluations are used to stimulate a campus dialog on decision-making processes and the needs of the campus community.

Initial evaluations have indicated a need to improve the process for evaluating the effectiveness of committees themselves as well as their planning procedures and successful completion of goals. Among

other methods, it is anticipated that revisions will focus on the development of annual committee evaluations that assess the role of the committee in the college planning process and the effectiveness of those serving on the committee. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will conduct further survey evaluations in all major committees, and a description of these procedures will be included in the third edition of the *Shared Governance and Decision-Making Policy Handbook*, scheduled to be distributed in January 2013.

### **District Recommendation 1: Financial Resources and Board Administrative Organization**

***In order to improve, the post-retirement health liability should be carefully monitored for the potential fiscal ramifications that could arise over the next few years (IV.B.3.e).***

The LACCD took significant steps to address the issue of its unfunded liability for retiree health care in fall 2006 by negotiating an agreement, approved by the District's six unions and its Board of Trustees, to begin pre-funding a portion of its unfunded obligation. The District annually directs 1.92 percent of the previous fiscal year's full-time employee payroll into an irrevocable trust, managed through CalPERS. In addition, an amount equivalent to the District's annual Medicare D refund was also diverted from the District's operating budget into the trust. In 2007, Governor Schwarzenegger's Commission on Public Employee Post-Employment Benefits issued a report in which the LACCD's prefunding plan was cited as a best practice (**D.1.1 - Funding Pensions and Retiree Health Care for Public Employees, a report of the Public Employees Post-Employment Benefits Commission, pp. 169-173**).

The Fair Market Value of the Trust on September 30, 2011, was \$35,132,579.64 (**D.1.2 - California Employer's Retirement Benefit Trust Quarterly Statement, September 30, 2011**).

In 2009, facing a state budget crisis and enormous increases in the cost of health benefits, the District's Joint Labor-Management Benefits Committee (JLMBC) took action to reduce the cost of health care coverage for both active and retired employees. After a great deal of research and discussion, the JLMBC voted and the Board approved the move to health care plans administered by CalPERS, which took effect January 1, 2010 ([http://www.laccd.edu/board\\_of\\_trustees/board\\_minutes/documents/7-15-09minutes.pdf](http://www.laccd.edu/board_of_trustees/board_minutes/documents/7-15-09minutes.pdf) pp. 8-10). Because of the significantly lower retiree benefit costs under CalPERS, the district has reduced its GASB obligation by about \$97 million (**D.1.3 - Los Angeles Community College District Postretirement Health Benefits Actuarial Valuation Study, September 22, 2010**).

The decision to move the District's health care plans to CalPERS was an important step to help to control spiraling health care costs and reduce the District's post-retirement obligation. Reducing the District's post-retirement healthcare liability by \$97 million demonstrates the LACCD's clear commitment to monitoring this issue.

Although the District does not fully fund the annual (accrued) OPEB cost calculated based on the Annual Required Contribution (ARC), under the current plan, the District has committed to fund each year out of the General Fund the annual retiree health benefit payments (\$23,117,855 for fiscal year 2011) plus a 1.92 percent of the previous fiscal year's full-time employee payroll and Medicare Part D refund invested into the CalPERS irrevocable trust. The contribution for fiscal year 2010-11 totaled \$33,804,289, which was more than 82 percent of the Annual Required Contribution (ARC) of \$40,908,000. The District monitors its liability and continues to assess the adequacy of its annual contribution.

Considering that each year the District prefunds 1.92 percent of the total full-time salary expenditures in addition to the annual pay-as-you-go amount, the District will accumulate sufficient funds invested in the irrevocable trust over the next 15 to 20 years to fully fund the ARC and significantly reduce the unfunded

liabilities. Even though, over the last three years, the District received less funding from the State due to the budget crisis, the District has not interrupted its annual contribution under the plan. The District is committed to continuing the current contribution plan and will ensure that adequate cash will be available to pay for OPEB liabilities when those costs become due.

## **District Recommendation 2: Board and Administrative Organization**

***In order to improve, both the district and the college need to evaluate the consistent adherence in practice to the recently developed delineation of operational responsibilities and functions (IV.B.3.a).***

The District has been actively engaged in addressing this standard since it participated in the ACCJC's first Multi-College Pilot Program in 1999. Several generations of functional maps delineating the mutually-defined operational roles and responsibilities of the district system and the colleges have been produced since then. The version in place at the time of the last comprehensive site visit in March 2009 was the *2008 Functional Map*, a 130-page document containing descriptions of the roles of the Board of Trustees and its committees, the functions and membership of 56 districtwide governance and administrative committees, a definition of the functional relationship between the district and the nine colleges, a grid of District Office Service Outcomes detailing the function of each division and administrative unit and outlining its relationship with its college counterparts, and flow charts showing participation in administrative processes ([D.2.1 – 2008 Functional Map](#)).

Although the evaluation teams concluded that the *Functional Map* may not have been sufficiently publicized at the campus level, they felt that it did successfully delineate the roles and responsibilities of the district and the colleges ([D.2.2 – ELAC Report, p. 49](#); [Trade Report, p. 48](#)). However, the teams felt that the District needed to take the additional step of evaluating the accuracy of the delineation of district/college roles and responsibilities and use the information to improve effectiveness.

To respond to this recommendation, the District Planning Committee (DPC) created a project that culminated in a full assessment and revision of the *2008 Functional Map* ([D.2.3 – DPC Process for Addressing District Recommendations](#)). This process engaged faculty, staff, administrative, and student leaders in a dialogue on the mutual roles and responsibilities of the colleges and the district system.

The following activities were undertaken:

- So that District Office Service Outcomes would accurately reflect operational responsibilities, in fall 2009, all District Office administrative units reviewed the sections that described the relationship between their units and their college counterparts. They checked for accuracy, simplified and condensed descriptions, when possible, and made sure that outcome measures were feasible and appropriate. The new draft version was circulated among primary user groups for critique and comment ([D.2.4 – District Office Service Outcomes Review Process](#)) and suggestions were used to produce a final version of the service outcomes.
- All standing districtwide committees and councils were asked to revisit and revise their descriptions using a new template to provide uniform information on the committees' description and charge, reporting authority, consultation and collaboration, chair and membership by position, meeting dates and times, and date of annual self-evaluation and goal setting ([D.2.5 – Committee Evaluation Template](#)). Revised descriptions with templates of more than 50 districtwide committees were created for inclusion in the new handbook.

- Realizing it was necessary to include more detail on districtwide governance, planning, and decision-making processes, the DPC incorporated additional sections to clarify the principles of governance in a partially decentralized district, policy formulation processes, the roles and responsibilities of stakeholder groups and districtwide committees, and the process and timeline for cyclical evaluation of effectiveness and revision of the new handbook. This was done in conjunction with a districtwide effort encouraging the nine colleges to document their governance and planning processes by creating college handbooks (**D.2.6 – DPC Goals**). After researching several models, the DPC designed a guide for colleges to use (**D.2.7 – Governance Handbook Template**). The DPC reviewed the new segments and members of appropriate stakeholder groups reviewed sections on participatory governance.
- The DPC also launched a survey to assess the accuracy of the current definition of the district/college relationship. The results were used to create an assessment report with action items for continuous improvement of district/college role delineation. [See Response to District Recommendation #3.]

All of these efforts led to the replacement of the 2008 functional map with the *LACCD District/College Governance and Functions Handbook*, which was approved by the Board of Trustees in March 2010 and was posted on the District website and distributed to the colleges and constituency groups ([http://www.laccd.edu/inst\\_effectiveness/documents/RevCopyofHandbook8-23-2011.doc](http://www.laccd.edu/inst_effectiveness/documents/RevCopyofHandbook8-23-2011.doc)). The handbook serves as a convenient, user-friendly guide to district/college roles and responsibilities and decision-making processes and provides employees with a more accurate and informed understanding of the District's role in relation to the colleges. It is helping faculty, administrative, staff, and student leaders navigate districtwide governance and decision-making processes more effectively. The Office of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness keeps the online edition updated. Beginning in spring 2012, the handbook will be re-assessed and revised on a two-year cycle. [See response to District Recommendation #3.]

In addition, the institution of Customer Satisfaction Surveys has greatly improved the understanding of roles and responsibilities across the district for all campus constituencies. To assess the District's effectiveness in providing services, these surveys for every major service unit in the District Office were piloted in fall 2008 and continue to be collected (**D.2.8 – Customer Satisfaction Surveys**). The results are used to measure the effectiveness of support services, leading to improvement of unit performance and the refining of District Office operations.

For example, respondents answering the Human Relations survey reported that they needed to increase their knowledge about the products, services, and staff in that division. In response, the HR Division created a series of publications called HR Guides and other useful resources, which are posted on the District's intranet. The division also established an HR help desk.

When District IT sent out its satisfaction survey, most colleges overwhelmingly responded that they were dissatisfied and frustrated with the current Student Information System, which was purchased in 1982. Consequently, a consultant firm was brought in to assess District needs and a new Student Information System was added to the list of Proposition J bond projects.

As a result of another satisfaction survey report, the Office of Diversity Programs concluded that it needed to provide more training in compliance issues (e.g., sexual harassment and reasonable accommodations), to provide guidance, leadership, and direction on diversity and equal employment issues (so as not to be only associated with investigations of complaints), and to continue providing technical assistance to colleges on prohibited discrimination complaints. Since receiving this feedback, the Office of Diversity Programs has provided more training and assistance to the colleges.

### **District Recommendation 3: Board and Administrative Organization**

*To meet standards, develop and implement methods for the evaluation of role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes for the college and the district. Widely communicate the results of the evaluation and use those results as the basis for improvement.*  
(IV.B.3.g)

The LACCD has been continuously delineating the roles played by the District and the colleges and has a long history of active participatory governance at the district level; however, the effectiveness of its role delineation and its decision-making processes had not been formally assessed prior to the ACCJC evaluation team site visits in spring 2009. In response to the teams' recommendations, in fall 2009, the District Planning Committee (DPC) took steps to implement a new cyclical process for self-assessment.

First, in fall 2009, the DPC conducted a survey of the accuracy of the definition of the district/college functional relationship as documented in the *2008 Functional Map*. Given the size and scope of district operations, the DPC decided to survey faculty, staff, administrative, and student leaders who participate directly in administrative or decision-making processes that involve active district/college collaboration. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with statements on whether the delineation accurately reflected the roles of the District in relationship to the colleges and were also invited to offer suggestions to make the descriptions more accurate and for administrative or operational changes that they believed would improve district/college effectiveness (**D.3.1 – District/College Roles and Functions Survey**).

The results of the survey, completed by 185 respondents, were presented to the DPC in January 2010 for review and analysis (**D.3.2 – DPC Minutes, January 29, 2010**). Suggestions to improve the accuracy of the description of the district/college functional relationship included making the delineation of functions as brief as possible, adding a glossary of terms, and including the names of those responsible for various functions. Suggestions for improving the district/college relationship included improving communication, streamlining operations, creating a districtwide ombudsperson to channel concerns, and more time spent by District senior staff at the colleges.

The DPC issued an assessment report that analyzed and summarized this project (**D.3.3 – District/College Roles and Functions Assessment Report**). Although most college leaders endorsed the accuracy of the delineation of district/college operational responsibilities as defined in the original *Functional Map*, to address some of the issues raised, the report included these recommendations:

1. Review the District Budget Process
2. Optimize District/College Administrative Operations

[Follow-up efforts for #1 are described below, since this recommendation was also made in the governance survey assessment report. Follow-up on #2 is handled by the District Office on an ongoing basis -- it reviews the results of Customer Satisfaction Surveys and makes changes in its processes, when necessary. See examples described in the response to District Recommendation #2.]

Also in fall 2009, the DPC conducted a survey of stakeholder satisfaction with districtwide participatory governance, targeting faculty, staff, administrators, and student leaders directly involved in some form of district- or college-level governance (**D.3.4 – Districtwide Governance Survey**). Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with 21 questions about the roles played by stakeholder groups, the effectiveness of decision-making processes, administrative and Board support of participatory governance, and the effectiveness of decision making in relation to the District's stated mission. In addition, respondents were invited to indicate problems and suggest solutions.

On the 311 surveys completed, results indicated generally positive approval of district-level governance overall, tempered with concerns about the effectiveness of communications, the transparency of decision-making processes, and the level of centralization. Most of those surveyed agreed that all stakeholder groups play an appropriate role and are effectively represented in district-level decision making and that the Board supports participatory governance at the district level. Suggestions included more use of video conferencing, e-bulletin boards, periodic status reports to the colleges, open forums, and a web page dedicated to fiscal transparency. Some felt that the colleges need more freedom to make their own decisions and indicated that geographical dispersion and the large number of stakeholder groups make district-level governance cumbersome and time-consuming, which discourages participation and distances district-level activity from realities at the colleges ([D.3.5 – Districtwide Governance Survey Results](#)).

In spring 2010, the DPC issued a report summarizing and analyzing the results of the survey ([D.3.6 – Districtwide Governance Assessment Report](#)) and included four action plans for improving district-level governance and decision making processes. The report was approved by the Board in March 2010 ([D.3.7 – Board Minutes, March 10, 2010](#)) and communicated to key stakeholder groups, including the Chancellor’s Cabinet, the three administrative councils, the District Academic Senate, the AFT Faculty and Staff Guilds, the colleges’ Academic Senates, and the colleges’ shared governance councils.

The four action plans were the following:

1. Implement a Districtwide Communications and Transparency Initiative
2. Review the District Budget Process
3. Streamline District-level Governance and Planning Processes
4. Enhance Professional Development on District Governance

The following steps have been taken to implement the recommended action items:

1. Implement a Districtwide Communications and Transparency Initiative

In the past year, the District Office of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness has done the following to improve communication and the flow of information between the District and the colleges.

- Established a new link, District-level Governance Committees, on the District home page and moved agendas and minutes from the intranet to the new LACCD 411 page ([http://www.laccd.edu/inst\\_effectiveness/DL\\_Governance\\_Committees/](http://www.laccd.edu/inst_effectiveness/DL_Governance_Committees/)).
- Collected and posted minutes of key District committees whose minutes were not current; the minutes are now up to date.
- Added a search feature so that visitors can search for information in the minutes. In the first two months of being posted, the page had over 600 hits.
- Reminded district-level governance chairs of their responsibility to send agendas to the IE Office at least 72 hours before each meeting as well as approved minutes following the meetings for posting on the District website.
- Posted information on major District student success initiatives on the homepage – visitors to [www.laccd.edu](http://www.laccd.edu) who click on “What’s New” will find information on District Strategic Planning, Achieving the Dream, and the Student Success Initiative.

So that the flow of information can be a two-way street, District IT will pilot a system to allow college constituents to comment and provide feedback on documents, such as plans and proposals, posted by District committees. In August 2011, District IT began the process of

completely revamping the District Office website ([D.3.8](#) – **District Website Redesign Kick-Off Meeting**), to be launched in May 2012.

The new District chancellor, who took office in August 2010, made a commitment to improving communication between the District and the colleges. The Chancellor’s Office issues frequent bulletins to all employees at the colleges with budget updates and relevant information, including resolutions passed by the Board ([D.3.9](#) – **Chancellor’s Bulletins**).

The new chair of the District Strategic Planning Committee made a similar commitment to improve communication. At its July 2011 meeting, the committee discussed the Strategic Plan Communications Plan ([D.3.10](#) – **District Strategic Plan Communications Plan**), which is designed to increase employee understanding of how their roles relate to the strategic plan. The committee will conduct a pre- and post-assessment. The goal is to increase the percentage of employees who understand the relationship to 50 percent above the baseline by June 2012.

## 2. Review the District Budget Process

The Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee (DBC) has been reviewing the District’s current budget allocation formula, examining base allocations, the use of ending balance policy, assessments for District Office operations, enrollment growth targets, and the college deficit repayment policy. It has been looking at other multi-college district budget models to determine whether it is necessary to develop a new model or make changes to the current one.

In January 2012, the committee issued a draft proposal to revise its budget allocation process, based on a review of current mechanisms ([D.3.11](#) – **Report and Recommendation of the Executive Committee of the DBC January 2012**). The recommendation, to increase the colleges’ basic allocation to include the costs of minimum administrative staffing and Maintenance & Operations, will go to the DBC for a vote on February 15, 2012.

## 3. Streamline District-level Governance and Planning Processes

The DPC designed a process for the annual self-evaluation of district-level participatory governance committees to assure that activities align with the committees’ charges, solicit reflections on achievements, and generate recommendations for improvements. To guide each committee’s self-evaluation, the DPC designed a Districtwide Governance Committee Self Evaluation Form, an assessment template originally piloted at Los Angeles Mission College. It requires committees to provide information on such aspects as a monthly summary of major issues addressed, accomplishments, obstacles to effective functioning, and future goals. District committees performed the self-evaluation process in 2010 and 2011 ([D.3.12](#) – **District Committees’ Self Evaluation**). District-level governance committee self-evaluations will be conducted every year and results will be reported to the Board as part of its annual review of district effectiveness ([D.3.13](#) – **Board of Trustees Effectiveness Review Cycle**).

The DPC will ensure that the District takes steps to follow up on recommendations stemming from the biennial governance assessment cycle and the annual self-assessment of District governance committees so that governance processes can be continuously improved.

## 4. Enhance Professional Development on District Governance

The District Academic Senate is taking the lead on this by hiring a multimedia specialist to develop an online professional development training module, which will be posted on the District

website for use in training constituents about the inter-connection between local shared governance decision-making structures and district governance.

Both of the comprehensive assessment efforts described above led to the creation of the new *LACCD District/College Governance and Functions Handbook* [See the response to District Recommendation #2].

To close the loop on its biennial cycle of governance assessment and improvement, in spring 2012, the DPC will send out a revised assessment survey. The results will be used to craft new recommendations to improve district-level governance and decision-making processes and be included in the new *Districtwide Governance Assessment Report* to be issued in late spring 2012. The results of this assessment, along with specific recommendations for further improvement, will be presented to the Board of Trustees in a new report, and districtwide governance and decision-making processes will be re-assessed and refined every two years.

The District's follow-up regimen – the newly implemented biennial governance assessment cycle and the annual self-assessment of District governance committees – was created to improve district-level governance and decision-making processes and ensure that ongoing efforts to enhance district-wide decision-making are sustainable and lead to continuous improvement of governance processes. The Board's new District Effectiveness Review Cycle is expected to increase the Board's ability to monitor districtwide progress on all district-level strategic goals and Board priorities and help guide district-level decision making.

# SELF-IDENTIFIED ISSUES – PROGRESS

## Student Learning Outcomes

During the self study year, as the contributors to the self study prepared responses for the standards based on extensive dialogue, the need for a number of planning agenda items related to student learning outcomes became apparent. Most of them have been addressed in Recommendation 3. Further details are presented in this section.

***Standard I.A.1. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes and its student population.***

**Planning Agenda #1** (Oversight: Coordinator, SLOs; Dean, Institutional Effectiveness; and Academic Senate)

In consultation with the college's Academic Senate, the Research and Planning Office (now Office of Institutional Effectiveness) will develop an integrated system of measurement that accounts for Student Learning Outcomes and their connection to achieving established College Core Competencies (now Institutional Learning Outcomes). Research and Planning will then integrate this data along with the ongoing College Profile Data to assess whether the college is fulfilling its mission to its students and community.

### Response

As explained in Recommendation 3, after the SLO coordinator and campus researcher attempted initial analysis of mapping the course assessment results to the ILOs, it became clear that the course-level outcomes mapping was an ineffective means of assessing institutional learning outcomes. The SLOAC (now Learning Assessment Advisory Council) decided that mapping would be more effectively accomplished at the program level. Current efforts are focused on developing an appropriate alignment between course and program, and program and institutional outcomes. This work includes a focus on the integration of program- and course-level outcomes into the program review cycle and the use of this data as a means of assessing institutional learning outcomes.

***Standard II.A.1. The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity.***

**Planning Agenda #2** (Oversight: Coordinator, SLOs, and Dean, Institutional Effectiveness)

Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) activities will be implemented in all courses. The college will rely on the program review process to maintain the educational integrity of all programs regardless of delivery method.

### Response

The college relies heavily on the program review process to evaluate the integrity of the programs it offers. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, in collaboration with the Strategic Planning Committee, has produced multiple reports on the successful outcomes of students, which have included an investigation of the modality and location of course offerings. These reports have demonstrated that students at the college's main off-site location, South Gate Educational Center, are succeeding at near equivalent rates as the students at the main campus. Those in distance education courses have been shown to be less successful, and the college has engaged in a collective effort to investigate the determining

factors for student success in these courses and develop effective strategies through the college Distance Education Committee.

***Standard II.A.1.c. The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.***

**Planning Agenda #3** (Oversight: Coordinator, SLOs; and Dean, Institutional Effectiveness)

The SLO coordinator and facilitators will work with departments and administration to complete the SLO cycle in every campus unit.

#### **Response**

The SLO coordinator and facilitators have worked with departments and administration to complete the SLO cycle in every campus unit. [Please see Recommendation 3.]

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

**Planning Agenda #4** (Oversight: Coordinator, SLOs; and SLO Committee)

The SLO Committee, which is in the process of developing the SLO Assessment Committee (SLOAC), will validate the assessment tools, review data collected, and ensure the core competencies are addressed.

#### **Response**

The SLO Assessment Committee (SLOAC) was formed. SLOAC members hear the reviews of all end-of-the-year SLO reports given by the SLO facilitators, and they analyze the use of assessment results for trends to inform the college community of needed changes, and to improve institutionwide student learning by making recommendations of any institutional changes needed as supported by SLO assessment to the Academic Senate and the Educational Planning Subcommittee. In September 2011, SLOAC was renamed and is now known as the Learning Assessment Advisory Council (LAAC).

***Standard II.A.2.f. The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs, including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies.***

**Planning Agenda #5** (Oversight: Coordinator, SLOs, and Dean, Institutional Effectiveness)

The college will ensure that SLOs and assessments are developed for all courses and programs, and will link them directly into the college's Core Competencies. Results will be aggregated into institutional information with the expansion of activities by the Research and Planning Office to continually assess the effectiveness of all programs.

The Office of Research and Planning is also creating a template for a new Internet-based Research and Planning newsletter.

#### **Response**

Please see Recommendation 3 and Planning Agenda II.A.2.a.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, formerly Research and Planning, regularly produces a newsletter to provide faculty with insights into institutional data on student outcomes ([PA.5.1 – OIE Newsletter](#)). In addition, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has increased the data provided to departments and decision-making committees. The focus of this additional data has been creating data that meets the needs of campus leaders and moving the campus to evidence-driven discussions on student learning and student success. The campus has also joined the Achieving the Dream (AtD) initiative. Through this effort, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness will also produce AtD newsletters with an emphasis on longitudinal student outcomes, equity, and student success ([PA.5.2 – AtD Newsletter](#)).

***Standard II.A.2.i. The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program’s stated learning outcomes.***

**Planning Agenda #6** (Oversight: Coordinator, SLOs, and Dean, Institutional Effectiveness)

The college is in the process of developing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for courses and for degree/certificate programs. Development of SLO assessment tools will enable departments to assess a student’s achievement of a program’s stated learning outcomes. The college will more effectively link achievement of program SLOs with the granting of degrees and certificates.

**Response**

Please see Recommendation 3. The Program Review Annual Update allows for discussion of what has been learned from course-level SLO assessment and to delineate any needs. PRVC is currently constructing an updated Comprehensive Program Review form that will include PLO reporting, discussion of assessment results, and how those results align with the degrees and certificates awarded by the college.

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

**Planning Agenda #7** (Oversight: Coordinator, SLOs, and Dean, Institutional Effectiveness)

The college will create programmatic SLOs, including creating specific outcomes for students completing the General Education portion of each program.

**Response**

Please see Recommendation 3.

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

**Planning Agenda #8** (Oversight: Coordinator, SLOs; PRVC; and Dean, Institutional Effectiveness)

The use of added evaluation components will help SLOs become a greater part of the college culture. The use of SLOs as component of the unit’s Program Review and Program Review Annual Update will also assist in the development of interdisciplinary discussions on student learning and the effective use of SLOs.

## **Response**

SLOs have been integrated into the college's annual update process as a component of the college's overall program review process. This integration includes the ability of departments to request additional resources needed to implement changes resulting from the analysis of SLO assessment data. See page 5 of the Annual Update Plan 2011-2012 (<http://www.elac.edu/faculty/oie/programreview.html>).

The Faculty AFT contract states that faculty can be evaluated on their participation in the SLO process. See page 185 of the contract ([http://www.laccd.edu/faculty\\_staff/hr/documents/2008-11FacultyContract.pdf](http://www.laccd.edu/faculty_staff/hr/documents/2008-11FacultyContract.pdf)). However, the campus SLO mission statement clearly states that the college's purpose for assessment is to improve student learning, and the results of assessment will not be used to evaluate faculty performance (<http://elac.edu/departments/slo/index.htm>). Further, the college's current Mission Statement clearly demonstrates the college's commitment to student success and making data-supported decisions, with the assessment of SLOs being one piece of evidence used in decision making.

## **Other Self-Identified Issues**

***Standard I.B.1. The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and educational processes.***

### **Planning Agenda #9 (Oversight: Student Success Committee)**

It is one thing to create action plans, but another to implement them. Part of the college planning agenda for Student Success and Basic Skills must be to implement the four newly created action plan matrices. The Student Success Committee has formed four ad hoc task forces, one for each matrix, which will identify actions to be taken, implement and supervise these actions, and determine how they will be budgeted for the next one to two years. This will depend on the coordinating efforts of the new associate dean.

## **Response**

The associate dean position was not filled. To compensate, the college utilized the team approach, creating four co-chairs/captains to lead the Student Success Committee and Basic Skills Initiative efforts. Through institutional dialogue, the college has developed a campuswide initiative to partner with Achieving the Dream (AtD), described in Recommendation 2. Through this work, the college's action plan matrices have evolved into four campuswide student success goals that align with its educational planning goals: (1) expand the college's bridge program, (2) launch a new software that tracks student interactions in the resource centers, (3) review gatekeeper courses, and (4) increase participation in faculty development programs. Based on data received from the Achieving the Dream focus groups and other data-gathering methods, the Student Success Committee will forward recommendations to the appropriate shared governance committees for institutional implementation, assessment, and evaluation.

***Standard I.B.3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.***

### **Planning Agenda #10 (Oversight: PRVC and Division Vice Presidents)**

The PRVC, in collaboration with the vice presidents of all divisions, will oversee the development of structures and processes that will formalize the use of departmental planning processes and measures of effectiveness through Program Review in budget allocation. The college Budget Committee will review the collegewide structure and process for the allocation of discretionary funds established in 2005 to

assess its applicability toward current budget allocation. Upon full assessment and confirmation of these processes, they will be forwarded to the ESGC for approval.

### **Response**

The Program Review and Viability Committee established a process in 2009 to use annual updates as a central mechanism for requesting and determining the allocations of resources. Development of an annual update, detailed in the college's *Shared Governance and Decision Making Policy Handbook*, provides the first step in the collegewide budgeting process. Each department or unit is responsible for reviewing their area to determine what resources are needed to best meet student needs and that will impact student outcomes in a manner consistent with the college mission and strategic plan. The annual update includes sections dedicated to the advanced planning of curriculum development, the use of SLOs to determine student need, responses to previous comprehensive program review recommendations (comprehensive reviews occur on the college's six-year planning cycle) and departmental planning.

The completed forms are delivered to the individual committees responsible for prioritizing faculty hires and special funds, such as Perkins funds and State Equipment funds. The remainder of the requests is reviewed by the vice presidents and associated deans over those areas. These administrative representatives review the requests in context and determine which requests are needed to maintain essential college functions, which are desirable as they relate to the college's ability to progress toward achieving its strategic planning goals and which are not prioritized at this time. Each of the vice presidents completes a cluster plan which details the priorities of those areas and lists the funded and unfunded items. These reports are submitted to the Budget Committee for a collegial discussion on the funding priorities of the college and a recommendation is made, via the Shared Governance Council, to the college president for the incorporation of these items in the college's budget (**PA.10.1 – Budget Committee and ESGC Minutes**).

The college has recognized the need to continually assess the degree to which its processes are purposeful and effective. Annually, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness solicits feedback from department chairs, administration and decision-making committees in an effort to improve and streamline the budget allocation process and enhance the college's ability to fund those areas most needed to enhance student learning. Each year, the PRVC has reviewed and made changes to both the process and the forms to enhance the overall process.

***Standard II.A.7. In order to assure the academic integrity of the teaching-learning process, the institution uses and makes public governing board-adopted policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or worldviews. These policies make clear the institution's commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.***

**AND**

***Standard III.A.1.d. The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel.***

### **Planning Agenda #11 (Oversight: Academic Senate)**

The District Academic Senate has almost finalized an Academic Freedom policy that is similar to the one used by the California State University system. When approved, the college will print that statement in its Catalog.

**AND**

### **Planning Agenda #12 (Oversight: Academic Senate)**

The Academic Senate will work toward reviving its inactive Ethics Committee.

## **Response**

The Academic Senate formally acknowledged Board Rule 1204 regarding academic freedom and code of ethics at a Senate meeting on October 25, 2011. ELAC does not have its own policy on academic freedom, but in the coming months, the Senate Executive Committee will propose a policy to the faculty that is reflective of how academic freedom is perceived by those at ELAC.

In reviewing its committee make-up and structure, the Senate Executive Committee decided not to pursue the reactivation of the Ethics Committee. However, as the Senate reviews the Board Rules detailing the code of ethics and develops its own code of ethics and academic freedom policy, the Senate will reconsider the activation of an Ethics Committee.

***Standard II.B. Student Support Services: The institution recruits and admits diverse students who are able to benefit from its programs, consistent with its mission. Student support services address the identified needs of students and enhance a supportive learning environment. The entire student pathway through the institutional experience is characterized by a concern for student access, progress, learning, and success. The institution systematically assesses student support services using student learning outcomes, faculty and staff input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of these services.***

### **Planning Agenda #13 (Oversight: Vice President, Student Services)**

The Student Services Division will annually review and update its cluster plan and develop strategies to improve student services.

## **Response**

As previously described in Recommendation 5, the Student Services Division reviews the Annual Updates from each student service unit. The division vice president analyzes the needs of each unit and proposes campus funding priorities for the improvement of student services. These efforts result in a list of funding priorities that meet the college's strategic planning goals. To inform departments and units in the annual update process and the division in its analysis, the college has conducted regular evaluations of its student services. These evaluations have included point-of-service surveys, as well as a general campus survey, to determine the awareness, use, and satisfaction with each service. The college has also sought to improve the data systems to inform decisions in the student services area. Most of student services are now located in a single student services building, which opened in fall 2011. This building was designed with input from user groups to ensure that the facilities could adequately address student needs.

***Standard II.B.1. The institution assures the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, support student learning and enhance achievement of the mission of the institution.***

### **Planning Agenda #14 (Oversight: Vice President, Student Services)**

The college needs to hire regular staff that can be trained in all aspects of student services programs to provide direct information and service in the morning and evening at the Rosemead Center. The college also needs to hire a Student Services Specialist and cross-train him or her in the diverse student services programs and services provided to students for the Rosemead Center by the spring 2009 semester.

## **Response**

The Rosemead Center serves as a swing space for ELAC and is a temporary location, with the lease scheduled to end in 2013. A full-time academic administrator manages the location. The college moved the Community Services Operation to Rosemead Center to provide oversight to the Rosemead Center and direct students to the appropriate services. The Community Services operation is open six days a week, with business hours from 8:30 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. An administrator is assigned nightly duty Monday through Thursday from 5:30 pm to 10:00 p.m. to coordinate evening hours support. A Student Services Specialist was not hired for this location due to the short-term lease agreement and the fact that the facility serves as a swing space and not as an educational center. Currently, students are directed to the main campus for assessment and financial services. The number of students needing these services is small since many students have classes at both the main campus and at the Rosemead location.

## **Planning Agenda #15** (Vice President, Student Services, and Chair, Counseling Department)

The college needs to work with off-campus vendors to investigate the feasibility of increasing web-based student services in the areas of Admissions, Counseling, and Financial Aid. The college will also investigate the feasibility of an online counseling system to increase access to services for online and general student populations.

## **Response**

In 2008-2009, the Counseling Department began to utilize the basic email system to address the issue of counseling students online. In June 2009, the Counseling Department, in conjunction with the Information Technology unit, developed a web-based interface to enhance the online counseling advising service.

In January 2011, the Counseling Department implemented E-SARS, the online appointment scheduling system for student use. This provides online access for students who wish to make a counseling appointment via the Internet (<http://www.elac.edu/studentservices/counseling/appointments.htm>).

The Counseling Department, in conjunction with Information Technology, has explored the use of the California Community College Confer system (CCC Confer), Veri Show software, and a homegrown Microsoft portal to provide online counseling student appointment services. In spring 2012, the Counseling Department will pilot this online counseling student appointment system.

***Standard II.B.3.a. The institution assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method.***

## **Planning Agenda #16** (Oversight: Vice President, Student Services, and Dean, Institutional Effectiveness)

By the end of 2008, with the development of Student Service Outcomes (SSOs) and the collection of assessment data, there will be a systematic approach of assessing how the student service units and programs are meeting the needs of the students. The college recognizes the need to provide greater access to student services through improved technology. The Student Services Division is in the process of determining the feasibility of implementing online student services. Specifically, the Student Services Division plans to provide a means through which counseling services can be provided to students over the internet.

## Response

As described in Recommendation 5, the college has conducted two rounds of point-of-service surveys and one general student survey to determine the manner in which student services are meeting the needs of students. The first point-of-service survey revealed that students were overwhelmingly satisfied with the services provided. However, these units determined that those being served provided only part of the data that they required. An additional general student survey focused on awareness and use to ensure that services were adequately reaching all populations, regardless of location, modality, or time of attendance. The results indicated a lack of awareness of services in many areas and a lack of use in others. These results gave the information needed to improve student services. A follow-up evaluation at each point of service will be completed in fall 2011, and results will be available in spring 2012. Additionally, the college has engaged in other activities to gain more detailed information. These efforts include faculty inquiry groups on counseling services, plans to incorporate initial counseling and orientation services into the Achieving the Dream evaluation efforts, and data analysis conducted through the Educational Planning efforts.

The Counseling Office conducted a feasibility study and determined that some counseling services could be offered online. The Educational Planning Subcommittee had already listed this goal in the college's *Educational Master Plan* and ranked the need for these services as one of its highest funding priorities. The funding allowed the college to produce an online system for academic advising. Additionally, the college has hired a counselor for the continued development and oversight of these services. Since 2009, the Counseling Department has made significant gains toward offering counseling services online. As previously stated in another planning agenda, the Counseling Department has implemented the use of E-SARS (the online appointment scheduling system) and online counseling advising, and will pilot the online counseling student appointment system in spring 2012.

***Standard II.B.3.c. The institution designs, maintains, and evaluates counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.***

### **Planning Agenda #17 (Oversight: Chair, Counseling Department)**

The Counseling Department will develop and implement online counseling by the end of 2008.

The Counseling Department will seek to increase the number of counseling faculty members to meet the increased demand of the growing student population.

By the end of spring 2009, the Counseling Department plans to have established Student Service Outcomes (SSOs) for implementation, and to start the collection of data for review by the fall 2009 semester. This process will include the deployment of a survey system capable of creating Point of Service surveys for all Student Service units including Counseling.

## Response

The Counseling Department has worked to increase the services provided to students online. The first achievement was adapting the college's scheduling system to permit students to book face-to-face counseling appointments online. The Counseling Department has also developed an online academic advising system that allows students to receive answers to their questions regarding their academic pursuits (<http://www.elac.edu/student-services/counseling/quickQuestion.htm>). This system falls short of a true online counseling system, which would allow the counselors to work interactively with students to create a Student Educational Plan online. A joint taskforce, composed of representatives from the Counseling Department and IT, is developing a more effective system. To aid in this endeavor, the

college has hired a counselor to work online and has scheduled other existing counselors to work on this system.

The Counseling Office is now incorporated into the college's Hiring Prioritization Committee processes. This has allowed the college to weigh the need for additional counselors in relationship to academic departments. The results have been that the Counseling Department has hired three replacement positions and one growth position. The department will continue to seek additional growth positions through the annual update and hiring prioritization processes.

The Counseling Department had created SSOs that were reflective of the standards as they were understood at the time. Assessments were conducted using general and point-of-service surveys and the data was used to inform decision-making through the department's normal processes and within a special Faculty Inquiry Group. Through the learning process, the department has adjusted its SSOs to be more reflective of the current SLO rubrics and will be entering into re-assessment with new SSOs in this round of surveys.

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

**Planning Agenda #18** (Dean, Institutional Effectiveness, and chairs for Chemistry, Math, and English Departments)

The Research and Planning Office and the Chemistry, Mathematics, and English Departments have committed to conducting regular evaluations of the assessment placement instruments in coordination with the Assessment Office and the State Chancellor's guidelines in accordance with Standards, Policies, and Procedures for Evaluation of Assessment Instruments Used in the California Community Colleges.

The college plans to conduct validation studies on newly selected instruments during winter and spring of 2009. Newly validated Mathematics and English assessment tests will be deployed thereafter. These efforts have been integrated into the Basic Skills Planning Matrix for the 2008-2009 academic year. Regular evaluations will be conducted on each instrument on a continual basis.

### **Response**

As part of the college's *Educational Master Plan*, the college sought to implement computer-based adaptive testing instruments. This process began in 2009 with an evaluation of the current instruments used for math and English assessments. The results of this assessment were three-fold. First, the use of a single written instrument for multiple years raises concerns regarding test security and the integrity of the testing process. Second, scheduled paper-based sessions were inconvenient for students and forced students to be present for at least two hours and up to three hours. The use of a computer-based system would allow an open-entry lab environment for assessment. Lastly, many students were placed into additional assessments, requiring the student to return to the college or have no placement. This was especially the case in math, which had four test levels that students selected. Up to 20 percent of students were mandated to reassess, and in some years as many as 12 percent were still requiring a reassessment at the end of the year. The result of this analysis was a faculty vote in both departments to select new testing instruments from state-approved, computer-based instruments.

Following this initial decision, each department organized a group of faculty to review the state-approved instruments and select one as the college's placement tool. These groups met and reviewed the instruments for content validity, appropriateness for the student population and the usability of the tool itself. Each department voted and *Accuplacer* was selected for English and math, while *Compass* was selected for ESL. After confirming the selections, the college conducted validation procedures for the

initial cut scores. As described in the matriculation guidelines, initial cut scores require only content validation with a plan for quantitative analysis for criterion validation and to evaluate disparate impact. Compass validation involved this type of content validation. Accuplacer is being used at multiple colleges within the district. For initial cut scores, the college evaluated the success rate of each college's placement model and the correlation between raw scores and success in the placed course. Informed by the content validation and quantitative data, each department selected initial cut scores. These scores went into effect in January 2011. The college has an assessment plan in place to evaluate the success rate of students taking the recommended courses at the end of fall 2011. The initial enrollments in spring 2011 were not substantial enough to allow a thorough analysis since those taking the new placement tests were doing so at a time in which most math and English courses were already full.

Chemistry conducted an evaluation of its testing instrument in 2009. In addition to using state-recommended content validation techniques, the assessment instrument was administered to entering Chemistry 101 students and exiting Chemistry 065 students. Based on both sets of data, the Chemistry department set initial cut scores for its placement instrument.

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

**Planning Agenda #19** (Oversight: Dean, Admissions and Records)

The college's Admissions Office will seek the additional staffing resources to dedicate to directly scanning or contract scanning of all admission documents to an outside company. The admission forms will be redesigned for the ease of indexing and scanning into the computer database.

**Response**

The college complies with Board Rule 7708, which classifies all admission documents as either permanent records, optional records, or disposable records. All permanent records were scanned to electronic format several years ago with back-up files maintained by campus IT and an outside scanning company. The college has hired a staff person to specifically input all new incoming permanent records into the scanning system. All classes of Admission records in hard paper format are stored in fireproof cabinets within a fireproof vault until scanned into the system. Disposable records are stored for approximately two years and are destroyed according to Board Rule 7709.1 procedures ([http://www.laccd.edu/board\\_rules/documents/Ch.VII-ArticleVII.pdf](http://www.laccd.edu/board_rules/documents/Ch.VII-ArticleVII.pdf)).

The college release of student records complies with LACCD board rules and Federal FERPA regulations ([http://www.laccd.edu/board\\_rules/documents/Ch.VIII-ArticleIV.pdf](http://www.laccd.edu/board_rules/documents/Ch.VIII-ArticleIV.pdf)). Transcripts, enrollment information for a student, or student records are released to the requesting student or other educational institute based upon a signed student release request, judicial order (subpoena), Federal or State mandate including Financial Aid, authorized research studies, or emergency health and safety issues.

***Standard II.C.1.b. The institution provides ongoing instruction for users of library and other learning support services so that students are able to develop skills in information competency.***

**Planning Agenda #20** (Oversight: Director, Learning Assistance Center)

To assess the quantitative impact of workshops provided by the Learning Assistance Center that promote information competency, the Learning Center will determine the following: (1) total class orientations and workshops for the past three years as noted on the Appointment Calendar; (2) The number of repeat class orientations and workshops requested by particular instructors; (3) total number of orientations and

workshops for special populations for the past three years; (4) the number of repeat orientations and workshops for special populations for the same time period; (5) Total number of LAC workshops for online applications to UC and CSU for the past three years as noted in the Appointment Calendar and at the Transfer Center; and, (6) total number of FABSA workshops conducted for the past three years.

To assess the qualitative impact of workshops that promote information competency, the Learning Center will develop evaluation tools for the following: (1) class orientations and workshops; (2) online college application workshops; and, (3) individual tutoring sessions on word processing, Internet and email access.

## **Response**

The Learning Assistance Center (LAC) has been reviewing its records, including its Student Satisfaction Survey for CAI Lab Services and its Appointment Calendar, for the past three years. The following narrative covers calendar year 2009 and discusses the preliminary results to its quantitative survey on the number and type of class orientations held during that year.

In spring 2009, the LAC assisted 42 classes by providing use of its computer lab facilities. Twenty faculty and staff from eleven departments or programs brought their students to the Center to receive orientations on the ACE system, become familiar with their web-specific materials, take tests, and apply online for financial aid and transfer to four-year institutions.

Furthermore, in summer 2009, the LAC assisted 17 classes by providing use of its computer lab facilities. Ten faculty and staff from nine departments or programs brought their students to the Center to receive orientations on the ACE system, get familiar with their web-specific materials, take tests, and research four-year institutions.

Finally, in fall 2009, the LAC assisted 30 classes by providing use of its computer lab facilities. Twenty-one faculty from eleven departments or programs brought their students to the Center to receive orientations on the ACE system, become familiar with their web-specific materials, take tests, and apply online for transfer to Cal State Universities or the University of California.

This quantitative study for calendar year 2009 demonstrates that the LAC is heavily requested by faculty and staff to assist their students in a variety of activities essential for their students' academic success. The LAC is conducting similar quantitative studies for calendar years 2010 and 2011 (up to the summer session).

This study also demonstrates that faculty support the LAC on a regular basis and bring their students more than once a semester to use its services. These faculty will be invited to participate in a qualitative survey to determine the level of assistance that the Center has provided to them and their students ([PA.20.1 – CAI Laboratory Evaluations Spring 2007 to Spring 2011](#)).

Currently, the Learning Center Director is working with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to develop a satisfaction survey to be distributed during fall 2011 among the faculty and staff who regularly use LAC's services.

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

**Planning Agenda #21** (Oversight: Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs)

The responsibilities and purpose of the newly created District Human Resource Council should be communicated to all college leadership, including the faculty, to ensure their input, suggestions, and recommendations.

**Response**

The District’s Human Resource Council “hears matters regarding classified service forwarded by the Vice Presidents Council and the Personnel Commission and serves as a consultative body on other human resources issues and policies.” The Council, which meets monthly, is comprised of two college presidents (co-chairs); two vice presidents of academic affairs; two vice presidents of administrative services; two vice presidents of student services; the senior associate vice chancellor of the Human Resource Division; the personnel director of the Personnel Commission, serving as a resource person; the associate general counsel, serving as a resource person; and five additional human resources division staff serving as resource persons.

The Council’s charge is to

- Review all issues regarding classified service
- Serve as a management consultative body on matters outside the scope of collective bargaining
- Serve as a consultative body on human resources policies and other matters that relate to the implementation of the systems modernization project
- Perform additional responsibilities and duties as may be determined by the Chancellor’s cabinet

The process for creating any human resource guide begins with consultation with the District Academic Senate or Staff Guild or any representative body; then the guide is sent to the President’s Cabinet; after review it is sent to the Human Resource Council.

*Standard III.A.1.b. The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.*

**Planning Agenda #22** (Oversight: Academic Senate)

The college faculty leadership will study the evaluation process for possible flaws and forward recommendations to the faculty. Recommendations may include trainings and workshops for potential evaluators.

**AND**

**Planning Agenda #23** (Oversight: Academic Senate)

The Senate leadership will encourage the District Academic Senate to review AFT faculty evaluation forms and processes, formulating recommendations to be considered for the next contract ratification.

**Response**

During the preparation of the *College Strategic Plan*, ELAC faculty and staff participated in an online survey during fall 2010 that assessed their opinions of the college planning process. The Senate leadership contributed to the development of the survey. The results of the survey of ELAC faculty and staff reveal that the faculty (3.1 average on a scale of 1 to 5) and administration (3.4 average on a scale of 1 to 5)

believe that the “current faculty process is thorough and effective” and that the “current faculty evaluation process encourages faculty improvement”

([http://www.elac.edu/faculty/oie/campus\\_surveys/Faculty%20and%20Staff%20Survey%20Report%20Fall%202010.pdf](http://www.elac.edu/faculty/oie/campus_surveys/Faculty%20and%20Staff%20Survey%20Report%20Fall%202010.pdf)).

Because the evaluation process is provided for in the faculty contract, the District Academic Senate (DAS) leadership has been conversing with the District American Federation of Teachers (AFT) leadership to continue to improve the evaluation process. The DAS discussed formulating recommendations to be considered for the 2011 contract discussions. The DAS leadership decided that an ad hoc group should be formed to study effective practices in faculty evaluations and to report its findings to the DAS and AFT leadership. Because the task force would need time to compile the report, it was not practical to forward suggestions before the contract negotiations would begin. While the new AFT agreement (only recently ratified) may provide for some improvements to the current process, the DAS still plans to follow through with its ad hoc committee to forward suggestions for a more aggressive improvement to the current faculty evaluation process that may be incorporated into a Memo of Understanding or into the next contract negotiations.

The District AFT offers annual workshops for department chairs, deans and vice presidents on contractual issues. Focused presentations included performance standards for creating effective evaluations and evaluation processes.

#### **Planning Agenda #24** (Oversight: Academic Senate)

The college president and the Academic Senate will continue to work together to create a means of addressing the completion of the current vice presidents’ evaluation process. While still maintaining confidentiality, the college shall adopt a process for providing feedback to the faculty to ensure integrity and transparency in the vice presidents’ evaluation process.

#### **Response**

The college president did not agree to create a means of addressing the completion of evaluations for all vice presidents. Although two vice presidential evaluations were completed and included faculty input, the college Academic Senate did not think the president provided substantial or meaningful feedback during this process.

***Standard III.A.6. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.***

#### **Planning Agenda #25** (Oversight: Dean, Institutional Effectiveness; Vice President, Administrative Services; PRVC, Budget Committee)

The college will work to improve the link between college planning, Program Review, and budget decisions to ensure that the funds are distributed in a manner that enhances the institution’s ability to fulfill its mission.

#### **Response**

As described in the response to Recommendation 6, the college has institutionalized its process for tying planning, program review, and budget decisions in the creation of its *Shared Governance and Decision-Making Policy Handbook*. The *Handbook* details the planning process on a six-year cycle as well as its incorporation into the annual budget cycle. The centerpiece of this process is the Annual Update Plan, which is the single mechanism for requesting additional resources and justifying this need through the

department's goals, program review recommendations, SLO assessment results, and work toward fulfilling the college's Goals. The college regularly reviews this process and makes improvements to enhance the connection between budget and planning. These efforts have resulted in yearly changes to the annual update document, its submission process, and its use by administration. They have also resulted in a second edition of the handbook that reflects these changes.

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

**Planning Agenda #26** (Oversight: Information Technology Department)

Budget conditions permitting, the IT Department will hire more staff to assist in supporting the current technology as well as developing and deploying future projects.

**Response**

During the fall 2008 semester, the IT Department hired an Assistant Computer and Network Support Specialist and a Computer and Network Support Specialist. However, IT has been unable to hire a Data Communications Specialist (DCS), a primary position in the department that manages the core network, switches, and security equipment, because the district does not have a DCS hiring. Furthermore, as the campus continues to expand with new buildings being developed and brought online, the IT Department has proposed, through the Program Review process, to hire an additional Assistant Computer and Network Support Specialist (A-Shift, off-site), a Computer and Network Support Specialist (B-Shift), and a Senior Computer and Network Support Specialist.

The IT Department has expanded its service support hours to 7 a.m. to 10 p.m., Monday through Thursday; 7 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Friday; and 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Saturday.

**Standard III.C.1.a.** *Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution.*

**Planning Agenda #27** (Oversight: Information Technology Department)

The IT Department will develop and administer Point of Service surveys for students. These surveys will be administered during the fall 2008 semester.

**Response**

During spring semester 2009, the IT Department administered two Online Student Technology Surveys to determine the use and satisfaction of the technological services provided to students. Students were asked how often they used various services as well as their opinions on the availability and maintenance of the equipment and services (**PA.27.1 – Student Technology Survey**). The surveys were administered in February and May of 2009 with an aggressive advertisement campaign in the interim to make students aware of the services. Overall results showed an increase in the amount of use of the Academic Computing Environment (ACE) services such as the student email system, wireless internet, web portal, and document storage system. The next student survey will be administered during the 2012 spring semester.

**Standard III.D.1.a.** *Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning.*

**Planning Agenda #28** (Oversight: Dean, Institutional Effectiveness; Vice President, Administrative Services; Program Review and Viability Committee; Budget Committee)

The college will revise and improve the integration of financial and institutional planning. The ESGC will receive reports from the strategic planning subcommittees that will identify unfunded and under-funded projects to ensure those needs are accounted for in preparing the annual budget or identified for funding from the college's positive balance.

The college will also ensure the successful implementation and assessment of the annual update process to ensure decisions about the annual budget are based on the strategic goals.

### **Response**

As previously noted, the college has defined its planning and resource allocation process in its *Shared Governance and Decision-Making Policy Handbook* and has integrated the request process through the use of Annual Update Plans. The Budget Committee annually reviews the college's funding priorities to ensure alignment with the college's strategic goals and forwards these to the ESGC for approval as a final recommendation to the President. In addition, the college has had situations in which it has been given access to additional monies. In this case, the college's Educational Planning Subcommittee met and developed a priority funding list of the items listed in the *Educational Master Plan* to inform resource allocation. An example of this recommendation is the funding of work to provide online counseling. The college annually seeks feedback from department chairs during the Chairs meetings and Chairs Council meetings to ensure that the annual updates are meeting the needs of faculty leaders. Additional feedback is solicited from the various campus committees and the administration. The Program Review and Viability Committee synthesizes these comments and modifies the forms and processes annually in an effort to create a more responsive and effective planning and resource allocation process.

***Standard III.D.1.d. The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development, with all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets.***

### **Planning Agenda #29** (Oversight: PRVC; Dean, Institutional Effectiveness)

The college will implement the program review annual update process for non-academic units.

### **Response**

The college conducts Annual Update Plans for all non-academic units to ensure that appropriate resource allocation decisions are made. In the 2011 cycle, 84 percent of the non-academic units submitted their Annual Update Plans on time and are thus qualified to have their resource requests reviewed. In addition, the college has worked to include key committees and offices in the annual update process. For example, both the SLO office and the Academic Senate submit Annual Update Plans to inform the college of their goals and to align their efforts with the college's resource allocation process.

***Standard III.D.2.a. Financial documents, including the budget and independent audit, reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services. Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.***

### **Planning Agenda #30** (Oversight: Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs, Administrative Services, and Student Services)

The college will communicate audit findings beyond the ESGC.

### **Response**

District Office auditors, both internal and external auditors, communicate their findings to each of the nine campuses through the District Office Accounting Department. The District Accounting Manager sends the *Auditors Audit Findings Report* that pertains to specific ELAC programs to the Vice President of Administrative Services, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, and the Vice President of Student Services. Each division vice president requests that the director of any program for which an audit finding has been found prepare a written response to the finding. After reviewing the response from their respective director of the program, the division vice president transmits the response to the District Accounting Manager ([PA.30.1](#) – **East CAP Findings for 2009-10**). Anyone can request a copy of the latest audit report from each of the Divisions.

***Standard IV.A.1. Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning and implementation.***

**Planning Agenda #31** (Oversight: Budget Committee; Dean, Institutional Effectiveness)

The Budget Committee will develop a narrative of the process and structure of the budget allocation process at all levels and will provide a graphic that assists the college at large in understanding this process. It will be incorporated in the college’s decision-making handbook when it is completed.

The Research and Prioritization Committee will establish a collegewide research agenda and post this agenda on the college’s Research and Planning website. Additionally, through consultation with the Research and Planning Office, the Research Prioritization Committee will develop a structure and process for the dissemination and use of data and research findings by faculty, staff, committees, the president and his cabinet for use in decision making.

The Budget Committee will report to ESGC recommendations on spending any discretionary monies derived from the college’s yearly fund balance.

**Response**

The Budget Committee developed a narrative, which has been published in the college’s *Shared Governance and Decision-Making Policy Handbook*. This policy has incorporated the district’s budget development timeline and has integrated this timeline into the college’s decision-making structure. To this end, the budget planning process begins in May of the previous year with the dispersal of the annual update forms to the departments and units. The departments and units respond by the end of September and the vice presidents develop budget priorities by the middle of November. These priorities are presented to the Budget Committee and the ESGC, which make formal recommendations to the college president for the incorporation of requests into the college’s final budget.

The college developed a Research Prioritization Committee, but found that the simple evaluation of department- or unit-level requests was inefficient and ineffective in driving the college’s research agenda. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness determined that the overall research priorities should be driven by the shared governance structure and should begin with the development of data to inform the college’s planning committees. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness met with the Strategic Planning Committee and engaged the committee in a discussion on what information was needed to inform the review of the college’s mission and revision of its goals. The discussion was moderated to maintain focus on developing data needs that would lead to effective decision-making. The end result was a list of priority research projects to inform decision-making and planning. The Office then evaluated the

feasibility of each request and developed a timeline for data production. The completed data report was given to the Strategic Planning Committee, which revised the college mission, goals, and strategic plan based on this information. The Office is currently replicating this process for the Educational Planning Subcommittee, Technology Planning Subcommittee, and Facilities Planning Subcommittee and to inform the development of the next program review self-evaluation through the Program Review and Viability Committee.

In addition, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has developed annual goals for itself. These goals focus on the development of data that is informative to teaching faculty. Bulk success rates give little information about where students are failing and what can be done to improve student learning. These efforts have been integrated into the Achieving the Dream Initiative, which is focused on developing information that depicts why students are failing and developing successful interventions based on this data. Efforts are currently underway to use multiple datasets and to integrate the use of student surveys and focus groups at the course level.

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

#### **Planning Agenda #32 (Oversight: Academic Senate)**

In light of the recent increase in the hiring of new faculty, great opportunity exists for recruiting new committee participants. The importance of participation on committees should be stressed during new faculty orientation, at department meetings, and during opening day activities. The college, led by the faculty leadership, classified leadership, and administrators, will collaborate via a workshop or retreat to determine methods of promoting the involvement of all constituents in the governing process.

The Academic Senate will reexamine professional development guidelines to develop a specific policy that supports faculty participation on committees.

#### **Response**

Faculty involvement in institutional governance continues to be crucial to the continued development of shared governance on campus. Using professional development activities at such as the New Faculty Institute, Adjunct Institute, Adjunct Orientation, and Opening Day, faculty members are encouraged to become a part of the decision-making process by participating in campus committees. The Academic Senate and the Chairs Council regularly notify department chairs when faculty are needed on committees so that these opportunities may be announced at department meetings. Faculty participation on committees is specifically supported as eligible for flex credit in the updated *Professional Development Handbook* posted on the college website (<http://www.elac.edu/departments/tlc/docs/PDHANDBOOK2010.pdf>).

Rather than pursue a single workshop or retreat, the college has moved in the direction of institutionalizing ongoing dialogue among all constituents in the governing process. This strategy has been an outgrowth of the college's *Shared Governance and Decision-Making Policy Handbook*. Evidence that this collaboration has taken root is found in the college's implementation of the three-year Achieving the Dream (AtD) endeavor that encompasses administrators, faculty, staff, and students focusing on student success (<http://www.achievingthedream.org/>). The Academic Senate will continue to find ways to increase faculty involvement, especially among new faculty, in campus- and districtwide committees.

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

**Planning Agenda #33** (Oversight: Academic Senate and College President)

The Academic Senate and college president will work to iron out areas of disagreement in the faculty hiring policy, with the goal of formalizing an official policy.

**Response**

The Academic Senate Executive Committee assumed the responsibility of revising the current unofficial faculty hiring policy. Working diligently for over a year, the Senate Executive Committee produced a final draft and presented it to the administration for feedback and further revisions. Eventually, a final document was produced, with two key areas yet to be resolved. The president (now retired) questioned the clause in the policy that the faculty on the hiring committees should be allowed to conduct reference checks of finalists; most importantly, the president remained steadfast in his objection to allowing the chair of the interview committee to sit in on the final candidates' interviews with the college president and his vice president.

At the invitation of the Senate, the president met with the full Senate to discuss these issues. Several senators offered reasonable arguments in favor of the proposed changes. Nevertheless, the college president remained committed to his position.

While the Senate leadership was preparing to take the issue to the Board of Trustees, the District Office began to consider the process of revising both the administrative and faculty hiring guidelines. At the same time, the college president announced his retirement, leaving the Senate with the option of waiting for another college president to review and possibly come to an agreement regarding the revised hiring policy or waiting to see if the district's new guidelines would include the changes the Senate is seeking. Ultimately, the district did not move forward with its revision of the hiring guidelines. The Senate is now pursuing a finalization of the hiring policy with the interim president.

**Planning Agenda #34** (Oversight: Academic Senate and College President)

The Academic Senate and college president will work toward improving transparency and timeliness of communication between the president and the Joint Hires Committee (now the Hiring Prioritization Committee) regarding final hiring decisions and explanation of any deviations from Joint Hires recommendations.

**Response**

For the past two years, the president (now retired), concerned about budget constraints brought on by the current fiscal crisis, has not provided timely decisions, and many approvals for hires have been made well into the spring semester, resulting in late summer (or even early fall semester) hires. Members of the District Budget Committee have advocated for more timely deadlines so that college presidents can commit to a specific number of hires early in the fiscal year (by December) and hiring committees can conclude their processes by the end of the spring semester.

***Standard IV.A.4. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationship with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission Standards, policies, and guidelines and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self-study and other reports, team***

*visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.*

**Planning Agenda #35** (Oversight: Accreditation Liaison Officer)

The college will be more responsive to the preparation of substantive change reports as required by the guidelines and policies of the Accrediting Commission.

**Response**

The college's Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) meets annually with the vice presidents and the Distance Education coordinator to determine any need to prepare substantive change proposals. Once need is determined, the Accreditation Liaison Officer produces a timeline for completion, including meeting dates for the applicable college- and district-approval bodies, to ensure review and approval in time for submission to the Commission's Substantive Change Committee. Constituents are given ample opportunity to provide feedback at each level of the college's approval process. During the past two years, the college has submitted and received approval for two substantive change proposals for distance education to the Commission for their evaluation and approval. Substantive change proposals will be prepared as additional online courses are developed.

The college has recently submitted to the CCCO Inventory proposals for SB 1440 Transfer degrees. Once the degrees are approved, the ALO will formally communicate the acceptance of these degrees to the Commission to determine whether they are considered substantial changes. In addition, substantive change reports will be submitted to the Commission a few months before the opening of two new locations where more than 50 percent of existing programs are planned to be offered.

***Standard IV.A.5. The role of leadership and the institution's governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis of improvement.***

**Planning Agenda #36** (Oversight: Dean, Institutional Effectiveness)

The Research and Planning Office will present the District Core Indicator measures and the measures for monitoring the strategic, educational, facility, and technology plans to the ESGC. Additionally, it will determine the exact timeline it will use to report the progress on these measures to the college at large over and above posting results on the Research and Planning website.

**Response**

With the development of the college's *Strategic Plan* and *Educational Master Plan*, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness created college core indicators of success. These indicators, which were reported as evidence of success in the college's *Strategic Plan Data Report*, can be viewed at (<http://www.elac.edu/faculty/oie/Strategic%20Plan%20Data%20Report%202011-2017.pdf>).

This data was used to inform the development of the new Strategic Goals (see next page). Each new goal is linked to a new core indicator and has an associated target for improvement. The following chart summarizes the college's new core indicators. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will report annual improvement reports during the summer for dispersal in each fall semester. Each objective for the Educational, Technology, and Facilities Master Plans will be linked to a specific objective to demonstrate alignment of goals and targeted improvement.

Goal	Measurement	Baseline	Target
<b>Goal 1:</b> Increasing student success and academic excellence through student-centered instruction, student-centered support services, and dynamic technologies.	In-course retention	85.42%	90%
	In-course success	63.79%	70%
	First-year persistence	53.47%	59%
	Certificate rate	4.82%	6%
	Graduation rate	11.41%	15%
	Transfer rate	17.00%	25%
	Student Right to Know (SRTK) completion/transfer rates	19.12%/8.15%	21%/9%
	ARCC student progress and achievement	43.30%	48%
	Math improvement rate	11.31%	25%
	English improvement rate	20.11%	40%
ESL improvement rate	37.09%	45%	
<b>Goal 2:</b> Increasing equity in successful outcomes by analyzing gaps in student achievement and using this, to identify and implement effective models and programming to remedy these gaps.	Hispanic/Latino in-course retention	84.32%	90%
	Hispanic/Latino in-course success	60.38%	70%
	Hispanic/Latino first-year persistence	52.03%	59%
	Hispanic/Latino certificate rate	3.62%	6%
	Hispanic/Latino graduation rate	10.33%	15%
	Hispanic/Latino transfer rate	11.00%	25%
	Hispanic/Latino Math improvement rate	11.31%	25%
	Hispanic/Latino English improvement rate	18.48%	40%
Hispanic/Latino ESL improvement rate	21.48%	45%	
<b>Goal 3:</b> Sustaining community-centered access, participation, and preparation that improves the college's presence in the community, maximizes access to higher education and provides outlets for artistic, civic, cultural, scientific and social expression as well as environmental awareness.	Size of entering cohort	3,925	4,318
	English preparation - % college-ready	12.00%	25%
	Math preparation - % college-ready	5.00%	15%
	Size of summer bridge program	228	1,000
	Number of high schools involved in formal partnerships via grants or other special agreements and/or programs (not regular outreach activities)	25	30
	Entering students will have a positive perception of ELAC as a center for academic excellence and community involvement	No Baseline	65.00%
<b>Goal 4:</b> Ensuring institutional effectiveness and accountability through data-driven decision-making as well as evaluation and improvement of all college programs and governance structures.	Budget linked to mission	49.3% agree the budget is linked to the college mission	75.00%
	Data use and awareness	46.48% agree that data is available and usable	75.00%
	% Completion of program review	100%	100%
	Number of courses that incorporated changes as a result of SLO assessments	170	600
	Number of programs of study and programs of service that have incorporated changes as a result of SLO assessments	0	30