

EVALUATION REPORT

LONG BEACH CITY COLLEGE

4901 E. Carson St.
Long Beach, CA 90808

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

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Long Beach City College from October 13 – 16, 2008

Thomas A. Crow, Ph.D.
Chair

LONG BEACH CITY COLLEGE

Team Roster

October 13 – 16, 2008

Dr. Thomas Crow (Chair)
Chancellor
State Center Community College District

Mr. Anthony Cantu (Team Assistant)
Vice President, Instruction
Fresno City College

Dr. Baba Adam
Director of Institutional Research
Butte College

Ms. Margaret Mayfield
Head Faculty Librarian
Hartnell College

Dr. David Bezayiff
Professor, History
Porterville College

Mr. Steven Reynolds
English Instructor/Interim Dean
College of the Siskiyous

Dr. Kristin Bruno
Dean, Instructional Services
Glendale Community College

Mr. Scott Thomason
Vice President, Administrative Services
Reedley College

Dr. Marcia Corcoran
Dean, Language Arts
Chabot College

Dr. Karolyn van Putten
Psychology Professor
Laney College

Ms. Melinda Matsuda
Vice President of Student Services
Chabot College

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

Institution: Long Beach City College

Date of Visit: October 13 – 16, 2008

Team Chair: Thomas A. Crow, Ph.D.
Chancellor
State Center Community College District

An 11-member team visited Long Beach City College from October 13 – 16, 2008, for the purpose of determining whether the institution continues to meet accreditation standards. The visiting team evaluated how well the college is achieving its stated purposes, analyzed how the college is meeting the commission standards, and provided recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement. At the conclusion of the visit, the team submitted recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding its accredited status of the college.

In preparation for the visit, the team chair attended an all-day training workshop on August 19, 2008, in Oakland. On August 26, 2008, the team chair and team assistant visited Long Beach City College to make logistical arrangements for the team visit. The entire team participated in an all-day team training workshop in Oakland conducted by the staff from ACCJC on September 10, 2008.

Prior to the actual visit to Long Beach City College, team members were assigned to four sub-groups according to the accreditation standards. Each team member prepared a written response to the previous team's recommendations, recorded his/her general observations and impressions regarding the self study's findings and evidence, submitted a list of individuals to interview, and prepared a preliminary written report on their assignment.

During the visit, the team conducted three open forums, attended several classes in person and online, and met individually and collectively with more than 60 faculty, classified staff, students, and managers at the college.

The Long Beach City College self study document is 336 pages and covers all appropriate topics. In general, the self study was very lengthy and lacked evidence in several areas. There was a concern about the lack of participation in the self study process by faculty, classified staff, and students.

ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT FOR LONG BEACH CITY COLLEGE

Comprehensive Evaluation Visit
October 13-16, 2008

INTRODUCTION

Long Beach City College recently celebrated its 80th anniversary. It was founded in 1927 as part of the Long Beach Unified School District. The college separated from the school district in 1970, creating the Long Beach Community College District. The district today is a single-college district with two principal sites: the Liberal Arts Campus and the Pacific Coast Campus.

The college student body represents the rich diversity of the surrounding area. Thirty-six percent of the students are Latino, twenty-six percent white, seventeen percent Asian/Pacific Islander, and thirteen percent African American. Long Beach City College is a large urban college with an unduplicated headcount enrollment in fall 2007 of 29,000, and a corresponding full-time equivalent student count of 8,600. The college has experienced a decline in enrollment for the past several years. Fifty-two percent of the students are female. Twenty-six percent of the enrollment is in evening classes.

The district is governed by a five-member, publicly-elected Board of Trustees, who serve staggered four-year terms. The college has earned tremendous community support, as evidenced by the passage of two general obligation bonds since 2002, totaling over \$600 million, to fund new construction and major renovations on the two campuses.

The Long Beach Community College District services an area of approximately 128 square miles. The district includes the cities of Long Beach, Lakewood, Avalon, and Signal Hill, with a total population of over 550,000 residents.

2008 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the 2002 self study report, reviewing the evidence, conducting a college visitation, and the fact that Recommendation 2 of the 2002 accreditation recommendations has only been partially addressed, the team developed eleven college recommendations.

COLLEGE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The team recommends that the college expand the active participation in the ongoing accreditation process to involve all constituent groups, with special emphasis on classified staff and students (1A, 1B4, 2B, 3A1c, 2B3b, 3A4c, 4A4).
2. The team strongly recommends, as did the visiting team in 2002, that the college strengthen its commitment to a comprehensive student learning outcomes (SLOs) process that includes the development of outcomes at the course, degree, program, and institutional levels; assess the student attainment of SLOs; include SLOs in course syllabi; include the attainment of these SLOs in the evaluations of faculty and others responsible for student learning; and integrate the assessment of SLOs into the planning, decision-making, and resource allocation processes and that it develop a plan to complete this task by 2012. Further, the team recommends that the college establish student learning outcomes for general education and align those outcomes with its general education philosophy (IA, IB1, IB3, IB5, IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2b, IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2h, IIA2i, IIA3, IIA3a, IIA3b, IIA3c, IIA5, IIA6, IIB1, IIB4, IIC2, IIIA6, IIIC2, IVA1, IVA2).
3. The team recommends that the college immediately complete its revision of the program review process, begin implementation, effectively communicate the program review process and the results of program review in a timely manner to all constituent groups, and more fully integrate program review into the planning and resource allocation processes for continuous quality improvement (IB, IB2, IB5, IB6, IB7, IIA, IIA2e, IIB1, IIB4, IIC2, IIA6, IIC1c, IIIC2).
4. The team recommends that the college include the academic freedom statement and a clarification of the acceptance of transfer credit in the catalog, using the language of Board Policy and Administrative Regulation 4019 (IIB2).
5. The team recommends the college develop a college-wide code of ethics for use by all constituent groups in the college (IIIA1d, IV4, IV5A).
6. The team recommends that the college continue its efforts to update board policies and administrative regulations to reflect approved changes, including sections on selecting the superintendent/president and specifying a penalty for board members violating the code of ethics and conduct (IIIA3, IVB1, IVB1b, IVB1d, IVB1e, IVB1h).
7. The team recommends that the college commit to technology funding which is responsive to college planning (IIIC1c, IIIC2).

8. The team recommends that the college evaluate the role of collegewide leadership in institutional governance and use that evaluation to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of organizational processes, practices, and decision-making (IVA1, IVA2, IVA3, IVA4, IVA5).
9. The team recommends that the college continue to encourage participation by all constituent groups in the college governance process (IVB2b).

COMMENDATIONS

1. The team commends the college for the respect and support it has earned in the community, as evidenced by the passage of two general obligation bonds for the improvement of facilities.
2. The team commends the college on the welcoming environment and sense of purpose demonstrated by students and employees.
3. The team commends the college on the commitment to increasing opportunities for students at the Pacific Coast Campus (PCC) through improved facilities, services, and course offerings.
4. The team commends the college on its leadership with the Long Beach College Promise, a partnership with Long Beach Unified School District and California State University, Long Beach, to improve college access for high school graduates. The team further commends the Long Beach City College Foundation for raising \$6 million to pay for one semester of college for all graduates from the Long Beach Unified School District.
5. The team commends the college on its Student Success Plan which integrates instructional and support services and demonstrates the college's continued commitment to student access, equity, and success of all students regardless of ability.

Team Evaluation of Institutional Responses to 2002 Recommendations

Recommendation 1:

Whatever the current issues or state of labor affairs at a college, full and consistent participation in the self study and accreditation process is critical to the integrity and validity of the process. Long Beach City College should preserve its relationship with the commission by assuring it has institutional commitment and involvement in the accreditation process and that the self study and site visit processes not be weakened or delayed due to labor unrest (2.8, 10B8, 10B9).

Labor issues did not hinder the 2008 self study process. The team expressed concern over the lack of student participation in the accreditation process. In a college with a very active student government and activities program, the absence of students in the self study process was acknowledged by the college. Of particular note was the lack of participation by the classified

employees. Interviews with classified leadership indicate a better relationship with the administration. The classified staff feels more valued and understands the importance of participating in the accreditation process. Overall, it appears that the “buy in” to the accreditation process is improving. The college has partially met this recommendation.

Recommendation 2:

In order to strengthen the college’s efforts in the area of institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the college move forward in assessing student learning outcomes in instructional, student services, and information resources areas. In support of this, the college needs to resolve the issues regarding the Coordinator of Student Learning Outcomes position quickly (3A3, 3A4, 3B2, 3C1, 3C2, 4B3-6, 4D2-3, 6.7).

As noted in the previous accreditation report, the college was a reluctant participant in the SLO process. The college proposed a completion date of 2020, which is completely unacceptable by accreditation standards. Dr. Barbara Beno met with various constituent groups at the college to inform them of the consequences of not having all aspects of student learning outcomes completed by 2012. At the time of the visitation, there was limited completion of SLOs, and almost no assessment. The “buy in” is improving, although it has not been totally embraced by all faculty. The Coordinator of Student Learning Outcomes position was approved as a 60 percent position in 2003, but was not filled until 2005. The college has partially met the intention of the recommendation.

Recommendation 3:

The team recommends that the college conduct an actuarial study of retiree medical benefits and consider setting a reserve for the cost of these benefits (9A2, 9C1, 9C3).

The college has received two actuarial studies since the last accreditation visit. The college has begun funding this liability and has established an irrevocable trust managed by Futuris Public Entity Investment Consortium. The college meets the recommendation.

Recommendation 4:

The team recommended that the college immediately review, clarify, improve, and document its accounting practices, processes, and procedures to ensure conformity with good accounting practices (9A4, 9B6).

The college has made significant progress and received unqualified certified annual audits. The college followed up on audit findings and made the necessary procedural changes. The fiscal operations department has been reorganized. The college has satisfactorily addressed the recommendation.

Recommendation 5:

The team observed a pervasive institutional climate permeated by suspicion and mutual distrust by leaders of all employee constituent groups. To ensure that the climate does not further erode and undermine powerful college-wide initiatives, the team recommended that all groups at Long Beach City College immediately find and use internal and external resources and processes to reestablish the spirit of collaboration and collegiality (10B5, 10B8, 10B9).

The college is making strides in improving the level of trust and mutual respect among all constituent groups. Administrative training on problem solving has been conducted. The college has developed a new Staff Planning Committee, a revitalized Classified Employees Recognition Week, and a new Classified Staff Development Day. Also, there is a new Professional Development Committee with a website, and a Staff Diversity Initiative. The college is working hard to address the recommendations and is making progress, but efforts will have to continue to develop an atmosphere of mutual respect and trust. The college has partially met this recommendation.

ACCREDITATION THEMES

1. Dialogue

ACCJC accreditation requirements emphasize that an “institution-wide dialogue must be at the heart of the self-evaluation process,” and that the processes that promote communication should be “inclusive, informed, and intentional” in order to continuously improve the quality and effectiveness of teaching and learning on the campus (IB1, IB2, IB4). The last accreditation underscored the importance of dialogue to “reestablish the spirit of collaboration and collegiality,” and Long Beach City College (LBCC), through numerous venues of committees, work groups, forums, informal meetings, and planning and governance bodies, has made an effort to willingly support the central core values of this theme. Some outgrowths of these forums and committees have been campus dialogues that focused on issues such as student success (Equity for All Project, the Missing 87, Deming Report, and the Task Force of College Readiness and Student Success) (IIB5). However, there are indications that a “deeper” dialogue is still needed in order to build “a spirit of trust on the campus.”

LBCC has been candid about past issues related to establishing a positive climate of dialogue on the campus. It appears, however, that LBCC has now made a strong commitment to promote internal and external dialogue that is open, collegial, ongoing, and purposeful, in order that the institution can enhance excellence in teaching and learning and document learning outcomes (IIA1a). Furthermore, the entire college community, student body, administration, faculty, and staff, should continue to engage in, and continue to recognize the importance of dialogue for the well-being of the institution (IA, IVA1, IVA2a, IVA3).

2. Student Learning Outcomes

The essential theme of an institution should be that its teaching is effective “at the course, program, and degree level” (IA). This theme requires that above all else, the institution can demonstrate that it is engaging “in self-analysis leading to improvement of all that it does regarding learning and teaching.” In sum, it should be able to demonstrate through assessment its efforts to produce SLOs in both instruction and student support services (IIA1c, IIA2, IIA2b, IIA2c). The institution has been taking steps to emphasize the importance of SLOs by encouraging all departments to focus on SLOs, an Assessment Student Learning Outcomes (ASLO) committee was established, as well as a Student Success Plan. In addition, the college brought in a nationally recognized expert on critical thinking to assist faculty interested in refining their exams to promote student learning outcomes. The Academic Senate approved a Study Skills Task Force to promote SLOs in conjunction with a Title 5 grant. Some LBCC faculty have also attended workshops and conferences sponsored by the State Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. To provide an integrative approach to implement SLOs, the ASLO committee established 11 core competencies. However, attention has mostly been given to only the first core competency, critical thinking, and the campus needs to aggressively work to develop the other ten. Despite the efforts to initiate and implement SLOs, the institution still faces serious challenges. It must develop a clearer plan to not only balance curriculum offerings at both LBCC and PCC sites, but it must also make certain SLOs at both sites are moving forward simultaneously. Moreover, the college also has a great deal more to do at the departmental level, where there is a distinct dissonance between faculty members who are actively engaged in incorporating SLOs into their syllabi, and those who are not willing, or are reluctant to do so. The college must also develop a method to achieve an effective alignment between Instruction and Student Services at both the LBCC and PCC sites. Through its several campus committees and subcommittees, Curriculum, Planning, Educational Master Plan, and ASLO, the several dialogues that have taken place need to be moved to another level, meaning that the importance of the objectives of this theme, move from continued dialogue to substantial implementation throughout the college (IIA2f, IIA2g, IIA2h, IIA2i, IIC1b, IVA1).

3. Institutional Commitments

The Governing Board has approved and adopted a mission statement for LBCC that underscores the college’s commitment to providing high quality opportunities for student learning to a diverse student population (IA, IA1, IA3, IA4). The primary goal of the college is to effectively incorporate the underlying values of this mission statement into its planning and development. In addition, a “vision statement for 2020” and the “core competencies” are intended to be viewed as integral parts of the mission statement too. Moreover, the college is exploring ways to better publicize and inform its service community about its mission Statement. Attention has also been given to ensuring that college publications, schedule of classes, catalog, websites, and physical signs denoting the mission statement, are consistent and accurate. The college continues to wrestle with being able to better connect the mission statement to institutional effectiveness within its internal audiences of administrators, faculty, and staff. Within the campus organization are “dissidents,” whose voices “are not given ample access.” The problem is further compounded because the “majority of administrative officers and faculty leaders are on one campus.” Finding ways to improve communication, and build a sense that there is “inclusion” in the areas of

dialogue, collaboration, stewardship, and decision-making between the two campus sites, will do much to achieve a greater degree of institutional effectiveness (IIA2a, IIA2c, IIA2f).

4. Evaluation, Planning, and Improvement

LBCC is engaged in a conscious effort to implement programs and practices to ensure student learning through a continuous process of evaluation, planning, and improvement (IA). Its Educational Master Plan (EMP) identifies four overarching goals to facilitate the evaluation, planning, and improvement of the college (IB, IB1, IB 2, IB.4, IB5, IB6, IVA, IVA1, IVA2, IVA2a, IVA3). The goals focus on Learning, Equity, Teamwork/Organizational Development, and Infrastructure. To reinforce institutional accountability, the college added student learning outcomes. In addition, the Office of the President issued an 18-Month Agenda that was intended to operationalize the goals of the EMP. Taken all together, the intent of the plans was to create a culture of institutional responsibility and accountability in student learning. Despite the intentions of the planning documents, deficiencies within them became apparent and the college, through retreats, dialogue, surveys, and dissemination of information, has attempted to remedy them through a collegial refinement process. The college recognized that program planning and program review needed better integration and cooperation. As a result, LBCC appears to enjoy an improved climate between planning and budgeting, and this does much to foster a “systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation.”

5. Institutional Integrity

Institutional integrity is a reflection of the college’s concern and commitment to honesty, truthfulness, and the manner in which represents itself to the community it serves. The adoption of the college’s goals in December 2005, emphasize the importance of, and the institution’s commitment to integrity. In these goals the very fabric of the institution is defined—how it intends to serve students, provide quality education, demonstrate commitments to students and their learning needs, and provide leadership throughout the communities it serves (IA, IB3, IB4, IB5). The college has demonstrated that it has clear and measurable intentions of providing outstanding instructional and student services that are articulated in the EMP, 18-Month Agenda, School & Department Plans Guide, 2007, Program plan/program review task force, and the Equity for All Project (IIA1c, IIA2, IIA 2a, IIA2b, IIA2c, IIA2f, IIA2g, IIA2h, IIA2i, IIIC, IIIC1, IIIC2). To ensure institutional commitments to teaching and learning, to improve communication, to address fiscal and planning practices, the college has made many efforts through committees, conferences, consultants, and institution-wide dialogue to demonstrate its commitments to the communities it serves. There is still much more to be done and fortunately the college recognizes this and continues to address what needs to be done. There is in place a sound infrastructure for decision-making, program and curriculum evaluation, self-assessment of policies, practices, and procedures, SLOs, and equally important, an ongoing concern that the integrity of the college remains intact (IVA, IVA1, IVA2, IVA2a, IVA3).

6. Organization

Central to the organizational structure of LBCC are the personnel who are responsible for carrying out the mission of the college (IIIA, IIIA1, IIIA2). The previous team recommended

that the college strengthen its efforts in institutional effectiveness and student learning outcomes. There has been a concerted effort on behalf of the college to meet this recommendation through the establishment of committees specifically intended to address them, such as the ASLO. The college has developed an EMP which was intended to meet both present and future student needs through an ongoing process of dialogue and systematic change. The institution has adequate staff and is moving towards increased collaboration and collegiality in addressing the implementation of SLOs, facilities and fiscal planning, and fulfilling the stated mission of the college (IA, IB, IB1, IB4, IB5). Still, it is apparent that the organization must do much more to ensure that the themes are integrated and supported across the institution, and that both campus sites genuinely believe they are one organization (IVA, IVA1).

Eligibility Requirements

1. AUTHORITY

The visiting team validated that Long Beach City College is authorized to operate as an educational institution and to award degrees under regulations of the California State Department of Education and the California Community Colleges. It is accredited by the Accreditation Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

2. MISSION

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College's mission is clearly defined and appropriate for an institution of higher learning and the students it serves. The college's mission statement was approved by the Board of Trustees on March 6, 2006, and is published in its catalog and webpage.

3. GOVERNING BOARD

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College is governed by a publicly elected five member independent policy-making Board of Trustees that is responsible for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the college. The board ensures that the mission of the college is being carried out

4. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College's superintendent-president is appointed by and reports to the Board of Trustees.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College has an administrative staff that is appropriate in number and possesses the preparation and experience to support its mission and purpose.

6. OPERATIONAL STATUS

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College is operational with students actively pursuing its degree programs.

7. DEGREES

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College offers 116 degree programs and that a majority of its students are enrolled in them.

8. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College offers degree programs that are congruent with its mission, are based on recognized higher education fields of study, are of significant length and content, and are conducted at a level of quality and rigor appropriate to the degrees offered.

9. ACADEMIC CREDIT

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College awards academic credits based on accepted practices in degree granting institutions of higher education. Information about academic credit is published in the college catalog and schedule of classes.

10. STUDENT LEARNING AND ACHIEVEMENT

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College has defined and publishes educational objectives for its programs in the college catalog.

11. GENERAL EDUCATION

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and promote intellectual inquiry. Students must demonstrate competency in writing, reading, and mathematics. General education courses include an introduction to some of the major areas of knowledge.

12. ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College faculty and students are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as judged by the academic/educational community in general. The board has adopted policies and administrative regulations that address academic freedom.

13. FACULTY

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College has 283 full-time faculty and 747 part-time faculty (fall 2007). Faculty are qualified and have the necessary experience to support all of the college's educational programs. A statement of faculty responsibilities exists in faculty contracts and the faculty handbook.

14. STUDENT SERVICES

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College provides a full complement of student support services that support student learning and development. These services are consistent with its mission and the students the college serves.

15. ADMISSION

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission and comply with California Code of Regulations, Title 5.

16. INFORMATION AND LEARNING RESOURCES

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College provides specific long-term access to sufficient information and learning resources and services to support its mission and all its educational programs and services.

17. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

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

18. FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College annually undergoes and makes available an external financial audit by a certified public accountant. The audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards.

19. INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College has established an institutional planning and evaluation process for the development of the college. It has not fully implemented a process for the assessment of student learning outcomes to measure student achievement of educational goals. The college has begun a process that integrates planning and resources allocation. However, the college needs to systematically evaluate all of its planning processes.

20. PUBLIC INFORMATION

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College publishes in its catalog, web site, and other sources current information that describes its purpose and objectives, admission requirements and procedures, fees, rules and regulations directly affecting students, degree and certificate requirements, and other information pertinent to students.

21. RELATIONS WITH THE ACCREDITING COMMISSION

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College adheres to the eligibility requirements, accreditation standards and policies of the Commission. It describes itself in identical terms to all its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accredited status, and agrees to disclose information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities.

Standard I

Mission and Institutional Effectiveness

A. Mission

General Comments

The college's broad educational programs and offerings are aligned with its purposes, character, and student population. (IA). The college has continued to promote dialogue and foster discussions throughout the college community regarding the ongoing relevance of the mission statement to student learning and student learning outcomes. The self study report also demonstrated that the college annually reviews vocational course offerings and programs to ensure they too are in alignment with local needs (IA1).

The mission statement of the college has been approved by its Board of Trustees and is published in appropriate and accessible media, college catalog, and the LBCC website (IA2).

LBCC has a formal process for reviewing the mission statement that is linked to the master plan development cycle, a cycle that occurs every three to five years. However, the college allows for the revision of the mission statement in the event the college undertakes to implement new educational programs that need to be included as part of the mission statement. The current mission statement was last reviewed in revised in March 2006 (IA3).

The self study demonstrated that the college mission statement is a central element to assist the college in its planning and decision-making processes (IA4).

Findings and Evidence

Both the self study report and the college catalog provided evidence that the college has established and implemented programs and services aligned with its purposes, character, and its

student population (IA1). The minutes of the March 6, 2006 meeting of the Board of Trustees documented that the Board approved the most recent version of the mission statement on that date. The mission statement is published in the college catalog, and on the college website (IA 2).

Conclusions

The college appears to be in adequate compliance of all sections of Standard IA.

Recommendations

None

B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Comments

The last accreditation visiting team in 2002 recommended that LBCC move forward with assessing student learning outcomes in instructional, student services and information resources area. Overall the college climate in relation to institutional effectiveness has improved since the last comprehensive and mid-term visits. There has been a renewed effort in the last year to conduct collegial and self-reflective dialogue about student learning and institutional progress (IB1).

The college has adopted the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) report to measure or improve institutional effectiveness (IB2). However, the college does not appear to have a cyclical process to assess progress toward achieving the ARCC goals or other core indicators of institutional effectiveness as enumerated in the ACCJC accreditation standards and the Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness in terms of program review, planning and student learning outcomes (IB3).

In August 2007, the college initiated a new planning committee that is called the College Planning Committee. This committee was designed to develop, coordinate, and monitor progress on institutional goals of the EMP. However, the process is not fully linked to resources allocation (IB6, IIIA, IIIB, IIIC, IIID).

The past planning process could not be validated for its broad base or the use to allocate resources or improve institutional effectiveness (IB4). The college has partially documented some assessment results; however, the results are not used to communicate quality (IB5) and the college has a limited evaluation mechanism for institutional effectiveness (IB7).

LBCC has not fully complied with the previous team's recommendation on this standard. Since the last self study visit and mid-term report and visit, the college's staff and faculty have initiated dialogue and conducted some pilot projects. However, there seems to be a protracted lack of agreement between the faculty and administration on resolving the issues.

In 2005, a faculty member with 60 percent release time was assigned to coordinate SLOs after getting a United States Department of Education Title 5 – (Hispanic Serving Institution) grant.

Several college faculty and staff have attended various professional development and training activities related to institutional effectiveness and student learning outcomes.

After the retirement of the dean of institutional research and dean of planning in 2008, the college created an Office of Institutional Effectiveness, which is staffed with an associate dean, four research analysts and one planning analyst. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness has a data warehouse and has produced several reports.

Findings and Evidence

Based on campus interviews of the executive vice president of academic affairs, the coordinators of student learning outcomes assessment, curriculum committee chairs, the associate dean of institutional effectiveness and the faculty senate president and reviewing the available evidence, the college has yet to fully comply with the ACCJC's institutional effectiveness standards.

Reviewing evidence the college provided and interviews with college faculty and staff members confirm that the college has a high degree of institutional dialogue about student learning and student achievement. However, the college has not developed institutional processes for evaluation and plans for improvement and does not use the results of measurement to plan and implement institutional improvements (IB1).

The college has a six-year program review cycle. Many of the student services departments have conducted program review. However, only a limited number of academic programs has completed the cycle (IB3). The self-evaluation and planning agenda section of the self study report have partially met the intent of this standard (IB4). There was limited evidence that the college's faculty and departments were involved in SLOs for the general education courses and for the programs leading to degrees.

Conclusions

To comply with the accreditation standards, the college needs to make some progress in strengthening institutional effectiveness programs in regards to SLOs for all courses, programs and degrees. Currently, there is no evidence to confirm the college has been able to complete the cycle of program review and or planning.

Recommendation

2. The team strongly recommends, as did the visiting team in 2002, that the college strengthen its commitment to a comprehensive student learning outcomes (SLOs) process that includes the development of outcomes at the course, degree, program, and institutional levels; assess the student attainment of SLOs; include SLOs in course syllabi; include the attainment of these SLOs in the evaluation of faculty and others responsible for student learning; and integrate the assessment of SLOs into the planning, decision-making, and resource allocation processes and that it develop a plan to complete this task by 2012. Further, the team recommends that the college establish student learning outcomes for general education and align those outcomes with its general

education philosophy (IA, IB1, IB3, IB5, IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2b, IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2h, IIA2i, IIA3, IIA3a, IIA3b, IIA3c, IIA5, IIA6, IIB1, IIB4, IIC2, IIIA6, IIIC2, IVA1, IVA2).

STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Services

A. Instructional Programs

General Comments

The college has used the self study experience to conduct a thorough analysis and assessment of its strengths and weaknesses. It presents an honest look at itself, citing its successes as well as areas where the institution can still improve. The college ensures the quality of its courses and programs through a rigorous curriculum and program approval process. It ensures the quality of its courses and programs regardless of delivery mode. A core of faculty has spearheaded the institution's efforts to establish learning outcomes for all courses, programs, and the institution. The course evaluation subcommittee of the curriculum committee reviews all course outlines to ensure that student learning outcomes are included. The ASLO committee, another subcommittee of the curriculum committee, provides guidance to faculty in creating SLOs. This subcommittee has also ensured professional development activities to train faculty on SLOs and assessment issues. In the last two years, the faculty have focused their energies on developing institutional SLOs, the Core Competencies, and encouraging more faculty to infuse these institutional SLOs into courses and programs, determining assessment methods, piloting assessment activities, evaluating the effectiveness of the assessment methods, implementing the assessment on a broader scale, and analyzing the results.

In emphasizing the core competencies, the college has paid little attention to assessment of student learning at the course and program levels. Program Reviews do not discuss assessment results and do not use assessment results in their discussions of program effectiveness. Hence, student achievement of learning outcomes in courses and programs is not really a factor in program planning and resource allocation, although other effectiveness measures and data are discussed in program review and are used in planning and resource allocation.

Findings and Evidence

From a broad perspective, the college partially meets the standards for instructional programs. The college has been successful at aligning courses, degree programs, and certificate programs to the college's mission (IIA1a, IIA1b, IIA4, IIA5). This is seen in the catalog descriptions of its degree and certificate programs and its descriptions of the educational opportunities it provides to its diverse student population. The catalog provides accurate information on courses and programs in vocational fields, transfer education, basic skills education, and non-credit and community education for lifelong learners. The catalog also provides accurate information regarding transfer requirements, graduation requirements, and other information (IIA6, IIA6a,

IIA6c). The accuracy of this information is reviewed annually before the catalog goes to print. The schedule of classes is reviewed for the accuracy of the course information prior to its going to print. Much of the information on the college website is taken directly from the college catalog and the schedule of classes. The accuracy of information contained on individual department web pages within the college site is dependent on the vigilance of department members to keep the information updated.

The catalog identifies the general education patterns for degree seekers at Long Beach City College. The college identifies three general education options to suit individual student's goals, though each option adheres to the college's general education philosophy as published in the catalog and each option covers the breadth of general education issues as outlined in the accreditation standards (IIA3, IIA3a, IIA3b, IIA3c). Interviews with faculty on the curriculum committee, however, reveal that inclusion of courses in the general education patterns is based on their finding comparable courses at other colleges and not on established LBCC student learning outcomes for general education (IIA3).

The college relies on faculty expertise for the quality and integrity of its courses and programs (2A2). Minutes of the curriculum committee record faculty participation in the course and program approval process and record the actions taken. In the case of its vocational programs, the college also relies on the expertise of its advisory committees (IIA2b).

The college assures the quality of its courses and programs regardless of mode of delivery. Through its Instructional Technology Development Center, the college provides faculty with a team of persons to work with others to provide training in distance learning methodologies as well as distance learning technical support. The training assures the quality of the instructional methodologies and the course evaluation subcommittee of the curriculum committee assures the quality of course content when courses are proposed as distance learning courses (IIA1, IIA1b). This is evidenced in the Distance Learning Plan and in the Curriculum Reference Handbook. Online courses that were reviewed during the visit contained appropriate content and delivery systems. Student learning outcomes for all distance learning courses are the same as for traditionally delivered courses.

The college still needs to make strides in the area of establishing and assessing SLOs. Although SLOs have been identified for courses, faculty are not yet informing students of those expected learning outcomes (IIA6). Not all faculty include SLOs on the syllabi for their courses (IIA6). Also, although all instructional programs undergo an extensive review every six years to assure their quality, relevance, and currency, program review documents reveal a lack of discussion of student achievement of learning outcomes beyond a summary of end-of-course grades (IIA2e, IIA2f). Even though a recommendation from the previous accreditation visit required the college to move forward with the assessment of student learning outcomes, the team found little evidence that this is occurring beyond a few voluntary pilot projects by a handful of faculty or beyond the pilot assessment of the one core competency. As for awarding degrees and certificates based on student achievement of learning outcomes (IIA2i), the college has just begun to identify student learning outcomes for its degree and certificate programs, and this task is far from complete. Faculty have been encouraged to create SLOs for their programs only on a voluntary basis. This task has not been required of all departments and programs. Those faculty

who have volunteered provided reports of their work resulting from their participation in the Learning Outcomes Summer Institute, 2008. Still, interviews with members of the ASLO subcommittee reveal that there is an ongoing struggle to define what a program is. In not defining what a program is, faculty are not able to determine exactly what the learning outcomes should be. Consequently, the college is not assessing student achievement of its programs' learning outcomes, student achievement of learning outcomes is not directly tied to program review, nor is student achievement of learning outcomes tied to program planning and resource allocation, and student achievement of learning outcomes is not directly tied to the granting of degrees and certificates (IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2b, IIA2c, IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2i).

Evidence that there is a lack of forward progress on SLOs and assessment is found in the annual ACCJC SLO reports, in program review documents, and in interviews with faculty and administrators. Evidence is also found in the DVD of the June 24, 2008, board meeting in which Barbara Beno clarified for the board and for the college that the progress on SLOs and assessment has been inadequate so far. The ASLO subcommittee of the curriculum committee has had a goal of having continuous sustainable outcomes assessment practices in place by the year 2020. As result of Dr. Beno's visit to the campus, faculty are rethinking their strategies and have moved their target date to 2012.

Conclusions

The college is confident in the high quality of its curricula for courses and programs. It is confident in its meeting the needs of the student population that it serves, and it is confident that all its courses and programs serve the mission it has created for itself as a community college. As well it should be confident in all those areas—LBCC has a long-standing tradition of offering high quality instructional programs and services to its students and the surrounding community. And the faculty demonstrate tremendous interest in student success. However, the team finds that the college has only partially addressed the student learning outcomes issue from the previous evaluation visit and does not appear to recognize the seriousness of the issue.

In not assessing student achievement of stated learning outcomes for courses and programs, the college is missing an opportunity to assure and demonstrate the quality of its courses and programs. By not assessing learning outcomes for courses and programs, it also misses the data it needs to validate its felt sense of success and to determine specific directions for improvements at the course and program levels. The college will be able to provide quality assurance in a more complete way once it is able to establish and sustain a continuous cycle of assessment of student learning, analysis of data, communication of the results, and planning for improvements. This will involve commitment from every individual in the college community; it will involve ongoing, honest, inclusive dialogue; it will require a high degree of trust among all constituent groups; and it will require their commitment to each other and each other's best interests as professionals in higher education.

Recommendation

2. The team strongly recommends, as did the visiting team in 2002, that the college strengthen its commitment to a comprehensive student learning outcomes (SLOs) process

that includes the development of outcomes at the course, degree, program, and institutional levels; assess the student attainment of SLOs; include SLOs in course syllabi; include the attainment of these SLOs in faculty evaluation; and integrate the assessment of SLOs into the planning, decision-making, and resource allocation processes and that it develop a plan to complete this task by 2012. Further, the team recommends that the college establish student learning outcomes for general education and align those outcomes with its general education philosophy (IA, IB1, IB3, IB5, IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2b, IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2h, IIA2i, IIA3, IIA3a, IIA3b, IIA3c, IIA5, IIA6, IIB1, IIB4, IIC2, IIIA6, IIIC2, IVA1, IVA2).

B. Student Support Services

General Comments

LBCC offers a comprehensive array of student support services organized to serve a diversity of students and designed to enhance a supportive learning environment. The organization of service delivery demonstrates that student services administrators, faculty, and support staff are committed to student access, equity, and success. Organizational priorities for 2008-2009 include increasing transfer, promoting student learning and assessment, and improving processes and policies affecting students (IIB1).

The college publishes a college catalog that is accurate and current pertaining to the required general information, requirements (admissions, student fees, and degree, certificate, transfer, and graduation), major policies affecting students, and locations or publications where other information may be found. Both the college catalog and the semester class schedule can be found on the college website (IIB2a, IIB2b, IIB2c).

In addition to the services offered at the Liberal Arts Campus (LAC), comparable and reliable services are provided for distance learning students on-line, and for students at the PCC to adequately support the appropriate number of students to be served. The college online counseling portal is accessible for students in special programs (i.e., EOPS, DSPS, student athletes, and international students) and the general student population. A survey instrument is available on line to measure the effectiveness of on-line counseling services (IIB1, IIB3a).

PCC houses full comparable services for students that include full-time supervisors, counselors, and support staff for most student services functions. Bilingual staff are available to support the needs of the large ESL population. Because of the commitment to serve the socio-economic level of students in the Pacific Coast community, Financial Aid and EOPS Programs are fully staffed at PCC. Deans and directors spend appropriate proportionate amounts of time at the PCC (IIB1, IIB3a).

The college has numerous programs and activities contributing to an environment encouraging personal and civic responsibility and intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development. These include co-curricular programs, student activity and leadership programs, intercollegiate athletics, and other student services units contributing to these values. The associated students

offer a program of clubs and activities. The associated student body president, with her motto, “school spirit means student involvement,” has held forums to encourage students to become engaged with student life, including standing committees (IIB3b).

Comprehensive counseling and/or advising services are offered to students at various program locations including PCC and online. Professional development for counseling faculty is provided through in-service training and regular staff meetings both on campus and through various regional and state-sponsored conferences and workshops. Although evaluation does not fully incorporate the assessment of SLOs at this time, program reviews, student satisfaction surveys, and workgroup and task force-directed investigations of particular aspects of counseling have implications for supporting student success (IIB3c).

LBCC has a student services staff that reflects the diversity of its student population and provides professional role models at all levels, programs, practices, and services across the college, which supports and enhances student understanding and appreciation of diversity. The evidence to support this can be found in various initiatives including the associated student body cultural affairs council, a diverse array of student clubs, events, activities, and special programs and services addressing the unique and special needs of targeted student groups (IIB3d).

As with other California Community Colleges, LBCC’s open enrollment policy does not require admissions instruments except for the administration of the Ability to Benefit instrument as appropriate. The college participates in the statewide approval and validation of its various assessment instruments utilized for placement, incorporated with multiple measures, incorporated in counseling sessions for placement recommendations (IIB3e).

The area of permanent, secure confidential student records is solid, with board policies and regulations and procedures emphasizing student confidentiality in all programs and services. The Confidentiality of Student Records and Information Policy is strictly adhered to through a Confidentiality/Security Agreement. The dean of admissions and records regularly conducts FERPA workshops and the agreement is part of all full-time and part-time hiring packets for faculty and staff (IIB3f).

The college has utilized three LBCC student perception surveys including a Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey, the LBCC Graduation Satisfaction Survey, and the NASPA Student Profile Survey. More recently, the previous comprehensive counseling and student services program review utilizes various assessment measures, and although they may not incorporate student learning outcomes, there are immediate upcoming plans to fully meet this standard (IIB4).

Findings and Evidence

Two areas of the LBCC catalog require revisions: the academic freedom statement and clarification of the acceptance of transfer credit. This needs to be the language outlined in Board Policy and Administrative Regulations 4019 (IIB2).

There is evidence in the comprehensive program review for student support services (2004-2005, 2005-2006, and 2006-2007) to address issues aligned with collegewide goals and their status

and/or results. Although at the time of these past reviews most units had not incorporated student learning outcomes into their program review model, the categorical programs (Matriculation, EOPS/CARE, DSPS, and CalWORKs) had begun the development of SLOs through the Statewide Review model.

More recently, under the leadership of the vice president of student services, there is evidence that most student services units have developed student learning outcomes and service area outcomes supporting institutional core competencies. They are aligned with specific strategies for assessment and specific descriptions for use of the results for continuous quality improvement through annual cycles for all programs and services. This work is being organized across student services in a more consistent, systematic, and effective way to ensure that once incorporated into the program review process, they will be effective for improving programs and services in a way that is transparent and useful for all faculty and staff. New teams and task forces have been formed to look at barriers to student success, student success plans, and improvement of matriculation, with evaluation components incorporated that are mindful and not cursory in nature. The program reviews for student services are incorporated into collegewide planning through the program plan/program review task force and the larger college planning committee (IIB1, IIB4).

Conclusions

The student services leadership is to be commended for their more recent work toward contributing to meeting the institutional accreditation standards. Although most student support services have participated in annual program review processes, current efforts are working toward the transparent improvement of this assessment process with faculty, staff, and student input, to more effectively improve services. The dialogue around the development of student learning outcomes has increased and led to the development of thoughtful SLOs with accompanying means of proposed assessments (IIB1, IIB4). As with other areas throughout the college, student support services will need to implement assessment as part of the program review process for continuous quality improvement.

Recommendations

2. The team strongly recommends, as did the visiting team in 2002, that the college strengthen its commitment to a comprehensive student learning outcomes (SLOs) process that includes the development of outcomes at the course, degree, program, and institutional levels; assess the student attainment of SLOs; include SLOs in course syllabi; include the attainment of these SLOs in faculty evaluation; and integrate the assessment of SLOs into the planning, decision-making, and resource allocation processes and that it develop a plan to complete this task by 2012. Further, the team recommends that the college establish student learning outcomes for general education and align those outcomes with its general education philosophy (IA, IB1, IB3, IB5, IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2b, IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2h, IIA2i, IIA3, IIA3a, IIA3b, IIA3c, IIA5, IIA6, IIB1, IIB4, IIC2, IIIA6, IIIC2, IVA1, IVA2).

The team recommends that the college include the academic freedom statement and a

clarification of the acceptance of transfer credit in the catalog, using the language of Board Policy and Administrative Regulation 4019 (IIB2).

C. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

LBCC provides support for college instructional programs through its two college libraries, basic skills education, learning skills, tutorial services, and over 80 computer labs located on the LAC and the PCC (IIC).

The LBCC libraries support the college's instructional programs through collections of books, electronic books, media, periodicals, and electronic database subscriptions (IIC). The library teaches credit information competency courses, library orientations, and workshops to develop information literacy skills and competencies among students (IIC, IIC1b). Adult Basic Education (ABE), tutorial services, the student success centers, and other labs offer a variety of support and instructional opportunities for students (IIC1, IIC1c).

Findings and Evidence

Currently the LAC library is undergoing major renovations, so collections and services are located in multiple temporary locations. Ninety percent of the print (books and periodicals) collection is in storage. To meet much of the students' needs for journal articles and books, the library is relying on electronic database subscriptions, electronic books, interlibrary loan, and a partnership with California State University, Long Beach, which extends borrowing privileges to LBCC students (IIC, IIC1c, IIC1e).

The new PCC library and learning resource center recently opened to serve students. The two story building features a library with reference, reserve, and circulation services, study space, group study rooms, copy machines, periodicals, online catalogs, books, and other information resources (IIC). On the second floor students have access to academic computer labs for a variety of needs and course support (IIC).

LBCC has an information competency graduation requirement, and the librarians teach credit courses in information competency that meet this requirement (IIC1b). The faculty librarians also teach orientations, workshops, and flex credit activities that build information competency skills (IIC1b).

Librarian faculty discipline liaisons have been established to link faculty with librarians responsible for collection development purchases for all college disciplines (IIC1a). This information is easily accessible from the library's webpage (IIC1c). Team evaluation interviews confirm that faculty participate in the decision making process for technology planning, and the selection of appropriate software applications on the computers in the various campus labs (IIC1a).

The library and learning support services conduct student and faculty surveys, perform program review, and are beginning to conduct systematic assessment of student learning outcomes to measure and evaluate the effectiveness of student learning (IIC2). Tutorial services surveys students every semester, Adult Basic Education (ABE) does so annually, and the library conducts surveys among students taking library courses each semester (IIC, IIC1). Although most surveys of students, faculty, and graduates of LBCC give the libraries a high satisfaction rating for services, the library's collections receive mixed reviews. Interviews conducted by team members confirm that the library's book and media collections have not been funded for the last five years. There is some question if the collections have the quantity, currency, depth, and variety sufficient to fulfill the library's goals and mission of supporting the college's instructional programs (IIC1). However, with the building renovations and the majority of books in storage during construction, purchasing of library books has been put on hold until the library renovation is complete.

College services undergo program review every three years, and instructional programs every six years (IIC). A program review that included the libraries and labs was conducted in 2006 (IIC2).

The library, ABE, and the Learning and Academic Resources Department (LAR) have all written SLOs, and conducted assessments (IIC2). The librarians have conducted two assessments for library orientations, and they are compiling data for analysis and review (IIC2). ABE has developed student learning outcomes, assessed outcomes, and uses data to make changes in programs (IIC2). The LAR which includes tutorial services, multidisciplinary learning support services, learning skills instruction, and supplemental instruction, has created student learning outcomes, completed some assessments, and has developed action plans for implementation based on the results of assessments (IIC2).

In regards to maintenance and security of the library and labs, the library uses the 3M detection system to protect library collections (III1d). When personnel in the open access computer labs check out laptop computers to students, the borrowers sign an agreement and leave photo identification as a security deposit (III1d). All the campus labs require students to log on to the computers with their student ID, and lab personnel provide assistance to students and monitor the lab's activities (IIC1d). Academic Computing and Information Technology (ACIT) provides technical support and maintains the campus computer labs and technology (IIC1d).

A broad diversity of services and resources are provided to students on both campuses and online access to these is available in the areas of tutoring, supplemental instruction, library databases, library research tutorials, reference services, electronic books, and a helpdesks for online students (IIC1).

Conclusions

The college significantly meets this standard. The quality of library and learning support services is high at LBCC. Through the library's webpage a rich array of electronic resources are provided, and students have around the clock access to many services and collections. The college features over 80 computer labs at its two campuses, and some labs are open 15 hours each day. Many support services are also offered online, including tutorial services, supplemental instruction, and computer helpdesks for online

students. A new library and learning resource center recently opened at the Pacific Coast Campus (PCC), and the remodeling of the Liberal Arts Campus library (LAC) is scheduled to be completed soon. New state-of-the-art libraries and labs providing improved study space, more computers, and access to the library's complete collection will enhance students' learning opportunities at LBCC. One weakness is funding for the library's print collections. Over time the lack of updated, relevant print materials and out-of-date videos will not offer sufficient support for the institution's instructional programs.

Recommendations

2. The team strongly recommends, as did the visiting team in 2002, that the college strengthen its commitment to a comprehensive student learning outcomes (SLOs) process that includes the development of outcomes at the course, degree, program, and institutional levels; assess the student attainment of SLOs; include SLOs in course syllabi; include the attainment of these SLOs in faculty evaluation; and integrate the assessment of SLOs into the planning, decision-making, and resource allocation processes and that it develop a plan to complete this task by 2012. Further, the team recommends that the college establish student learning outcomes for general education and align those outcomes with its general education philosophy (IA, IB1, IB3, IB5, IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2b, IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2h, IIA2i, IIA3, IIA3a, IIA3b, IIA3c, IIA5, IIA6, IIB1, IIB4, IIC2, IIIA6, IIIC2, IVA1, IVA2).

STANDARD III

Resources

A. Human Resources

General Comments

Human Resources has 15 employees, including a vice president and executive assistant, a human resources director who is paid 50 percent by the district and 50 percent by the Personnel Commission; a human resources manager, classified; a human resources manager, academic; an associate vice president; a staff development coordinator; two specialists; three assistants; and four technicians. The department is committed to attracting, retaining, and supporting a diverse staff. As of fall 2008, it serves 454 classified employees, 336 full-time professors, 823 adjunct professors, and 124 managers. Human Resources works with the collective bargaining units, the Personnel Commission, and the board to develop policies and plans regarding personnel records, employment hiring practices, and equity. Human Resources offers direct services and supports other groups to provide professional development to managers, staff, and faculty.

A new reorganization plan expected to be presented to the Board of Trustees in November 2008 will look at staffing and budget in relation to institutional priorities, and the planning council will determine a way to assess the effectiveness of this reorganizational structure.

In December 2007, human resources hired a staff development coordinator. A Staff Equity Plan, designed to enhance staff diversity was approved in March 2008. Results from a reclassification

study to research current classified and management position duties and responsibilities were implemented July 1, 2008.

Findings and Evidence

The college determines qualifications of faculty through the rationale of a hiring priorities committee, written administrative regulations, and established procedures to review applicant paperwork from human resources. A review of faculty qualifications verified faculty all meet minimum qualifications. Foreign transcripts are evaluated by the National Association of Credentials Evaluations Service (NACES), listing twelve organizations with which potential candidates may submit transcripts directly (IIA1a).

A two-year reclassification study of staff and managers, based on work from the consultant, Rewards Strategy Group, was implemented in July 2008 to ensure position duties and responsibilities are current, with over 20 percent modifications in duties and 50 percent changes in salary.

A plan for the review and alignment of administrative regulations with current practice regarding academic administrative hiring is promised by 2011.

Standard evaluation procedures are in place per the collective bargaining agreements and are conducted annually. Ratings of “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory” are accompanied by facts and suggestions for improvement (IIIA1b). The classified evaluation timeline has been shifted in the new contract to improve timeliness of reporting and improved ability for addressing grievances, though grievances have declined since 2006 when new manager training on evaluation processes has been offered annually. An updated 2005 management performance evaluation lists three criteria related to student learning outcomes, though administrative regulation 3007 do not yet reflect this update. For the contributions of staff and tutors toward student learning outcomes, criteria related to student learning outcomes is not explicit.

Criteria related to effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes are not explicit in full-time or part-time faculty evaluations; in fact, none of the professional standards mention student learning. Several town hall meetings have offered opportunities for dialogue around the topic of incorporating student learning outcomes assessment into the faculty evaluation procedure but it is “a work in progress” and many are reticent about incorporating student learning outcomes into individual evaluations. Pockets of faculty have written course-level outcomes. In the fall of 2007, the student learning outcome coordinator met with department heads, but participation of faculty is “voluntary” and there is no tracking of faculty involvement. Discussions about assessment tools have occurred in some areas. The summer institute debated if the core competency of critical thinking could be measured from a multiple choice format, but it is not systematic. The team did not find data on student learning, discussions about how to improve student learning, or changes resulting from analyses of student learning (IIIA1c).

Codes of ethics exist for some constituent groups and are in writing. The Board of Trustees reviewed and revised its existing code of ethics and conduct policy, implementation of the policy, and process to deal with violation of this code was effective August 2008. The self study

notes plans to develop one collegewide code of ethics and the development of a board policy for dealing with behavior that violates the code of ethics (IIIA1d).

The number of full-time faculty exceeds the Chancellor's Office Full-Time Faculty Obligation, a guideline the college currently uses for what determines a sufficient number of full-time faculty. A new reorganization request requires various levels of approvals for new classified staff. A new realignment/reorganization plan, which is expected to be approved in November 2008, shows sufficient number of management (IIIA2).

Personnel policies ensuring fairness in employment procedures are established and posted. Written regulations allow employees access to records and maintain the confidentiality of employee records. A security breach in April 2008 resulted in training for managers on security awareness and in training for all employees on identity theft (IIIA3).

The college collects data to compare the ethnic diversity of employees with the ethnic diversity of the community (IIIA4b). Copies of Board Policies on Affirmative Action, Unlawful Discrimination, and Sexual Harassment are distributed to all new employees.

In February 2008, the Academic Senate passed motions to encourage the development of programs and hiring practices that foster diversity and to revise hiring processes to ensure the advancement of diversity among faculty. Screening committees for regular contract faculty are diverse, when possible, and include a non-voting equal opportunity member to ensure a committee's adherence to equal opportunity laws. A Staff Equity Plan was developed in March 2008 and a staff equity committee, in collaboration with human resources and the Academic Senate, will implement the plan. The plan includes strategies for addressing the need to create a faculty population more representative of the community the college serves, including dialogue, hiring, and policies. Policies for fairness in hiring for part-time faculty will be undergoing review to ensure equal opportunity compliance (IIIA4).

Training activities are evident for learning styles, disability, college resources, SafeZone, team building, communication, and retention, and the college is sending teams to local diversity conferences. The college participated in Equity for All and the California Benchmarking project through the Center for Urban Education and developed new initiatives targeting minority and low-income students (IIIA4, IIIA4c, IIIA5).

The faculty development committee is responsible for planning, implementation, and evaluation of on-campus professional development. It oversees new faculty orientations and mentoring as well as approvals for conference attendance. Sessions are evaluated, and the committee uses results to plan future activities.

Human Resources hired a new staff development coordinator in December 2007, and initiated additional training opportunities (Professional Development Program) in order to organize more systematic professional development for classified and management. An assessment survey in August 2007 summarized 448 responses of professional development needs, and results were used to guide planning for future activities. Collegewide learning goals and the president's 18-Month Agenda also provided input regarding priorities for professional development.

Administrators, faculty, and staff attend conferences such as the Community College Leadership Development Program as part of the Management Development Plan (IIIA5).

A task force on professional development recently brought together some of the various groups (for example, the faculty development coordinator; the student learning outcome coordinator, staff development coordinator, staff, and a couple of managers) to look together at ways to coordinate and to develop a Professional Development Plan, but they have not met this year due to an administrative change, limiting opportunities for integration. The Instructional Technology Development Center offers technology training for faculty while staff development offers technology training for staff; little collaboration occurs between these groups. Human Resources has not been active in SLO workshops or retreats.

Human resources planning is integrated with institutional planning in its hiring practices, personnel policies and procedures, and equal opportunity. The faculty hiring priorities committee includes three vice presidents, deans, and the academic senate executive committee, and after hearing proposals votes on positions. Proposals requesting new full-time faculty positions require departments to have recently undergone program review and to provide both qualitative data from the program review and department plans and quantitative data (e.g., enrollment management data and external data such as the job market) to support requests. Another example where human resources coordinates with institutional priorities is in the Staff Equity Plan, coordinated with the Academic Senate and approved by the college planning committee in February 2007 (IIIA6).

The classified staffing process is not as clearly linked to program reviews or institutional priorities. Personnel changes or requests for classified or management are requested by the immediate supervisor and approved by the dean, human resources, fiscal, and appropriate vice-president before being presented to the executive committee for discussion. Once approved, the president forwards the request to the Personnel Commission. A planning agenda identifies the program plan/program review task force for recommending a process to ensure human resources decisions are linked to the results of evaluation of program and service needs.

It is also not clear how institutional plans determine human resource allocation priorities or how professional funds might be augmented. For example, faculty development has no funds for speakers and limited funds for conference attendance; to fund a retreat on student learning outcomes the coordinator asked the vice president of academic affairs for money. Though funding may be gleaned from varied sources and may be allocated by the budget advisory council based on specific criteria provided by the college planning council, faculty and staff do not appear to understand the process for requesting funds (IIIA6).

Conclusions

Personnel policies are clear, and personnel are qualified and evaluated on specific criteria. The college demonstrates an understanding of issues of equity and diversity and is making progress on its equal opportunity goals.

Plans are in place for the college to move forward on the issues identified in this standard: developing an institution wide code of ethics, reviewing discrepancies in hiring practices from written regulations, examining the sufficiency of funding for off-campus faculty professional development. The college now needs to move forward on these plans.

A range of professional development opportunities are provided, but their integration with institutional planning is inconsistent.

Contributions to student learning outcomes and assessment are included explicitly in management evaluations. Faculty and others responsible for student progress toward achieving student learning outcomes do not have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those outcomes (IIIA1c).

Recommendations

2. The team strongly recommends, as did the visiting team in 2002, that the college strengthen its commitment to a comprehensive student learning outcomes (SLOs) process that includes the development of outcomes at the course, degree, program, and institutional levels; assess the student attainment of SLOs; include SLOs in course syllabi; include the attainment of these SLOs in faculty evaluation; and integrate the assessment of SLOs into the planning, decision-making, and resource allocation processes and that it develop a plan to complete this task by 2012. Further, the team recommends that the college establish student learning outcomes for general education and align those outcomes with its general education philosophy (IA, IB1, IB3, IB5, IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2b, IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2h, IIA2i, IIA3, IIA3a, IIA3b, IIA3c, IIA5, IIA6, IIB1, IIB4, IIC2, IIIA6, IIIC2, IVA1, IVA2).
5. The team recommends that the college develop a collegewide code of ethics for use by all constituent groups in the college (IIIA1d, IVA, IVA5).
6. The team recommends the college continue its efforts to update board policies and administrative regulations to reflect approved changes, including sections on selecting the superintendent/president and specifying a penalty for board members violating the code of ethics and conduct (IIIA3, IVB1, IVB1b, IVB1d, IVB1e, IVB1h).

B. Physical Resources

General Comments

The community has demonstrated its support to the college by passing the Measure E General Obligation Bond for \$440 million to be utilized for the facilities of the college.

In accordance with the provisions of Proposition 39 requirements, a Citizen's Bond Oversight Committee was formed to oversee the expenditure of the general obligation bond funds. This committee consists of 21 members appointed by the Board of Trustees. This committee is charged with overseeing the expenditure of bond proceeds and insuring that the proceeds are expended only for the purposes set forth in Measure E.

Regular updates of critical path timelines, cost estimates, cash flow projections, and other reports encompassing all aspects of each project are provided to the college and the board of trustees.

Findings and Evidence

The Safety Committee has members representing all constituent groups and meets monthly. Annual safety inspections are performed by independent consultants. These independent consultants also provide specialized training to college staff on safety as well as appropriate operation of equipment (IIIB1a).

College staff are participating in the Disaster Resistant California Community College NIMS and SEMS training administered by the State Chancellor's Office (IIIB1a).

The college centers facilities are furnished and equipped comparably to those one the main campus (IIIB1b).

Through the program review process, the safety committee, and the facilities advisory committee employees are able to identify facility and equipment needs for their areas. Needs for modification of the college's facilities necessary to provide safe and secure physical environment for its students, employees, and community members are also identified. The college has employed consultants to create its Facilities Master Plan, which is integrated with program review and the educational program plans (IIIB1b, IIIB2, IIIB2b).

Conclusions

LBCC meets the standards of physical resources.

Recommendations

None

C. Technology Resources

General Observations

In general, LBCC is to be commended for its technology infrastructure. It has two departments for managing a large amount of technology. An extensive list of supported hardware, software, and telecommunications is listed in the appendices of the Technology Master Plan 2006-2011.

First, LBCC has the Academic Computing and Information Technology (ACIT) department, residing in administrative services, which is divided into three sections: application support and development, network services and technical support, and academic computing and multimedia services. This is a standard organizational structure for an IT organization, and it manages a wide variety of hardware and software. In addition, LBCC has implemented PeopleSoft in the past five years, and a "Responsible Managers User Group" has been implemented.

The ability of ACIT to be effective is limited by staffing. The staffing has not been commensurately increased as the amount of hardware and software has grown exponentially since 2002. Although a satisfaction survey of the college community shows great appreciation for the ACIT staff, there is a general feeling of dissatisfaction with its level of performance (ACIT Program Review 2007), due to staffing constraints.

The second organization is the Instructional Technology and Distance Learning (ITDC) department, residing in academic affairs, which operates a Faculty Resource Center. Again, staffing is the major constraint on the department's ability to deliver quality service. LBCC's ITDC is to be commended for implementing a team approach to development of online courses in which the faculty member, as the content expert, works with the technical staff to produce the class. An internally developed online learning environment, ezLearn or the e-learning zone, has been quite successful. However, it is not fully linked to PeopleSoft, and it may be difficult to support with expected growth in the future.

It is clear that LBCC is struggling like most colleges with the cost of technology and also how to integrate it into the planning process. While the college is to be commended for writing and approving a Technology Master Plan 2006-2011 and a Distance Learning Plan, the goal of ensuring that planning drives technology purchasing decisions is not yet fully realized. For example, "Technology planning at LBCC has been increasingly integrated into institutional planning since the late 1990's," Standard III C2, p. 268; "For the last several years without a systematic approach LBCC has pieced together available resources, in many cases through categorical funding sources, to sustain and manage this growth," Standard III C1d, p. 267; and "Although the current program review process identifies specific technology needs, there is no formal or systematic means of communicating these needs to ACIT," Standard III C2, p. 269).

LBCC has recently set aside a substantial amount of technology funding which is clearly a commitment to the importance of technology (\$1.4 million in 2006-7, \$536,986 in 2007-8, and \$1 million in 2008-9). However, this type of year by year funding, mostly used to replace outdated equipment, while important, does not move the college in a strategic direction to use technology to support teaching, learning, and the college's administrative functions.

Findings and Evidence

LBCC is doing a very good job of using the staffing and equipment resources it has to support teaching, learning, and administrative staff. Further, it is clear that there is a new emphasis on the technology needs of the campus (Goal 2 of the "Board of Trustees' Goals for 2007-2009" and the President's "18 Month Agenda for the Advancement of Student Success and Community Development January 2007-June 2008.") To this end, LBCC has committed significant resources to technology in the past three budgets (\$1.4 million in 2006-7, \$536,986 in 2007-8, and \$1 million in 2008-9). The appendices of the Technology Master Plan 2006-2011 outline how this funding is being used to upgrade equipment.

However, it is stated in Standard III C1d, "For the last several years without a systematic approach, LBCC has pieced together available resources, in many cases through categorical

funding sources, to sustain and manage this growth,” and verified in the Budget Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes, September 18, 2008, “Other Financing Sources—From Capital Projects Fund—increase of \$1,000,000 to continue with the Technology efforts; the funding became available from the capitalized interest account that existed for the COPS; since the COPS has been paid in full, these funds are available for capital outlay purposes.” While this commitment to technology resources is to be commended, a secure, ongoing source of technology funding could not be verified.

Conclusions

There is much to commend in LBCC’s technology progress, including the planning (as evidenced in the Board of Trustees’ Goals for 2007-2009, the President’s 18 Month Agenda for the Advancement of Student Success and Community Development January 2007-June 2008, and the Technology Master Plan 2006-2011) and the funding commitment in the budgets of 2006-7, 2007-8 and 2008-9. However, the challenge will be to develop an ongoing source of technology funding to realize the benefits of the extensive technology planning.

Recommendations

2. The team strongly recommends, as did the visiting team in 2002, that the college strengthen its commitment to a comprehensive student learning outcomes (SLOs) process that includes the development of outcomes at the course, degree, program, and institutional levels; assess the student attainment of SLOs; include SLOs in course syllabi; include the attainment of these SLOs in faculty evaluation; and integrate the assessment of SLOs into the planning, decision-making, and resource allocation processes and that it develop a plan to complete this task by 2012. Further, the team recommends that the college establish student learning outcomes for general education and align those outcomes with its general education philosophy (IA, IB1, IB3, IB5, IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2b, IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2h, IIA2i, IIA3, IIA3a, IIA3b, IIA3c, IIA5, IIA6, IIB1, IIB4, IIC2, IIIA6, IIIC2, IVA1, IVA2).
7. The team recommends that the college commit to technology funding which is responsive to college planning (IIIC1c, IIIC2).

D. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

General Comments

The college monitors student enrollments and develops its annual budget with the intention of maintaining a budget that balances revenues and expenditures. The Budget for FY 2008-2009 was developed utilizing the Board of Trustee Goals for 2007-2009.

Financial status reports are provided to the Board of Trustees monthly and fiscal projections are also provided quarterly using the Quarterly CCSF 311 reports. The college regularly performs both short term as well as longer term projections of its financial position.

College staff monitor the financial position of the college as well as the financial position of the State of California on an ongoing basis. Staff participate in appropriate professional associations, attend workshops and conferences, and represent the college's financial interests on boards of insurance JPAs. The college regularly monitors local and state economic developments that may impact the college's funding and develops potential options to be pursued by the college to adjust expenditures to the amount of funding available.

Findings and Evidence

The college implemented a new planning and budget process to integrate its budget development to support the college's mission and goals for FY 2008-2009 (IID1).

Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning. The college relied on the program review process, and the efforts of its standing committees and limited term task forces in the development of its FY 2008-2009 Budget. For FY 2004-2005 thru FY 2007-2008, the college adopted annual budgets in which expenditures did not exceed projected revenues. Each of these budgets also contributed to increasing its general fund reserves. At the end of FY 2007-2008, these efforts had resulted in an ending balance of its general fund reserve that exceeded the minimum prudent reserve of 5 percent required by the Community Colleges State Chancellors Office. The recently adopted FY 2008-2009 budget has expenditures that exceed revenues, however, this budget still provides an ending balance that exceeds the 5 percent minimum prudent reserve amount. Current projections are for the college ending FY 2007-2008 with an 8 percent reserve (IID1a).

The college continually monitors enrollment trends in order to identify and respond to changing needs and demands. The college's Economic Development Office and Grants Office have been highly successful in its efforts to acquire additional funding from exterior sources (IID1b).

College staff are monitoring the discussions occurring at the State level relative to the recently adopted FY 2008-2009 State Budget due to the possibility of current year cuts resulting from projected state revenues being significantly below projections utilized during the recent adoption of the FY 2008-2009 State Budget. The college is utilizing the services of Jeff Kischunk of Total Compensation Services to provide required actuarial studies of its Retiree Health Benefits obligations. These studies will be performed every two years as required. The most recent study was accomplished in January 2008. In addition to including funds in its annual budgets to pay the current year obligation, the college has been setting aside funds to provide for its long term commitment for providing post retirement health benefits for its employees. The college has also joined the FUTURIS JPA thereby meeting the requirements of GASB 45. When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability (IID1c).

A new integrated planning and budget development process was implemented for FY 2008-2009 (IID1d).

Monthly financial reports, Quarterly 311 reports, a tentative budget and final annual budgets are provided to the Board of Trustees. This information is also made available on the college's website (IID2b).

The college pursues appropriate strategies for risk management through participation in several JPAs with other institutions of higher education. The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to

maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and realistic plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences (IID2c).

As it has for several years, the college again received an unqualified audit with no findings in its Annual Audit for FY 2007-2008 (IID2d).

The college has appropriate checks and balances in place to ensure that all grant applications are approved at the appropriate level of the college prior to grant applications being submitted to funding sources (IIC2e).

All contractual agreements are reviewed by the Risk Management Office as well as legal counsel prior to the college entering into any contractual agreements. This includes ensuring that contracts align with the college mission and goals (IIC2f).

The college contracts with an independent auditing firm for its annual audit. Annual independent performance audits and financial audits are performed as required for the college's general obligation bonds. In addition numerous reviews of financial management records for categorically funded programs occur throughout each year relative to its categorically funded programs to ensure compliance with state and federal requirements (IID2g).

Financial resource planning is integrated with institutional planning and the results are used for improvement of the institution (IID3).

Conclusions

LBCC meets the standards of fiscal resources.

Recommendations

None.

STANDARD IV

Leadership and Governance

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Comments

LBCC appears to have most, if not all, of the elements to become a collegial and collaborative institution. Most of those elements, however, were quite recently established, largely as a result of numerous changes in administrative leadership. The recently hired (January 2007) superintendent-president has taken steps to streamline governance processes, including the creation of a President's Leadership Council, and the College Planning Committee, but the processes for evaluating the success of these changes have only recently begun.

The college's full-time faculty has experienced significant turnover. Within the past ten years at least 50 percent of the faculty has been replaced, primarily due to retirements. Several of the new faculty have been hired since January 2008. There are two campuses, which are approximately five miles apart, and until quite recently, the PCC, was experiencing significant disparities in the

assignment of faculty, course offerings, student support services, and facilities. Having explored the possibility of creating a two-college district and having come to the conclusion that there were valid reasons why such a change would be ill advised, the college considers the PCC an educational center and it has made significant strides toward upgrading all of its aspects.

Findings and Evidence

Regulations and policies exist (Board Policy 2006 and Administrative Regulations 2006.6) that specify and describe the “roles and involvement of each constituent group involved in the participatory governance structure (LBCC Self Study, p. 294).” It appears that, in principle, there are six primary governance bodies, the Board of Trustees, the President’s Leadership Council, the College Planning Committee, the Academic Senate, the Classified Union, and the Associated Student Body. These six are supplemented by at least four more that are also advisory to the President.

The newly restructured College Planning Committee (LBCC Self-Study, p. 294) was approved in August 2007. It is composed of: 1) all members of the Superintendent-President’s Executive Committee, excluding the Superintendent-President, 2) the Academic Senate Executive Committee, 3) a representative from the department heads, elected by them, 4) a representative from the instructional deans, 5) a representative from the student services deans, 6) nine representatives from, respectively, the ASB (Associated Student Body), Community College Association (CCA), Certificated Hourly Instructors (CHI), and American Federation of Teachers (AFT).

Although “mechanisms and protocols have been established to provide constituents with an opportunity for input into the institutional decision-making process” (LBCC Self Study, p. 295), the institution has not yet conducted an evaluation of the effectiveness of these policies, protocols and processes, nor is there evidence of a plan for when or how that will occur.

Conclusions

LBCC partially meets Standard IVA.

Recommendations

2. The team strongly recommends, as did the visiting team in 2002, that the college strengthen its commitment to a comprehensive student learning outcomes (SLOs) process that includes the development of outcomes at the course, degree, program, and institutional levels; assess the student attainment of SLOs; include SLOs in course syllabi; include the attainment of these SLOs in faculty evaluation; and integrate the assessment of SLOs into the planning, decision-making, and resource allocation processes and that it develop a plan to complete this task by 2012. Further, the team recommends that the college establish student learning outcomes for general education and align those outcomes with its general education philosophy (IA, IB1, IB3, IB5, IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2b, IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2h, IIA2i, IIA3, IIA3a, IIA3b, IIA3c, IIA5, IIA6, IIB1, IIB4, IIC2, IIIA6, IIIC2, IVA1, IVA2).

8. The team recommends that the college evaluate the role of collegewide leadership in institutional governance and use that evaluation to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of organizational processes, practices, and decision-making (IVA1, IVA2, IVA3, IVA4, IVA5).

B. Board and Administrative Organization

General Comments

LBCC is governed by a five-member elected Board of Trustees. The board meets its legal responsibilities of duly notifying the public of meetings, agendas, and minutes. At the meetings, there are ample opportunities for the public to offer input. Annual goals are developed, which guide the operations of the district.

The superintendent/president was selected utilizing a process that included constituent groups and the community. The board delegates the operation of the district to the superintendent/president (IVBj).

The district is presently undergoing a process to revise many out of date policies and administrative regulations. Among the revisions are sections on the selection of the superintendent/president and the penalty to board members violating their code of ethics (IVBb, IVBh).

The board conducts annual self evaluations, which lead to the formation of their annual goals. By contract, the superintendent/president is also evaluated annually (IVBg, IVBj).

The superintendent/president is implementing new processes and committees to ensure avenues of communication throughout the college. It will be important for the constituent groups to “re-engage” in the college governance responsibility. There is work to be done in planning and resource allocation, as well as the accreditation process (IVB2a, IVB2b).

Findings and Evidence

The board has a manual of board policies and administrative regulations that guide the district in its operations. However, many sections are very dated. There is no policy or practice to review the policies on a regular basis. Proposed board policy changes are vetted by constituent groups, after which the superintendent/president recommends changes to the board. Since the self study, the college has formed a committee to review the policies. The committee is active and reviews critical sections first, and has revised several policies to date. The college also contracts with the Community College League of California for the policy services (IVBb).

The trustees participate in a formalized annual self-evaluation process (IVBg). From this evaluation, board goals for the next year are formulated. The goals are vetted among all constituent groups. From these goals, the college units set their goals and develop budget

priorities. It appears to be working quite well, and formalizes the board's leadership over the direction of the college. The major goals for the past year were "Measure and Improve Student Success" and "Measure and Improve Fiscal and Infrastructure Stability."

In April 2003, the board adopted a Code of Ethics and Conduct (IVBh). The code does not define actions that can be taken if a board member violates the code of ethics. The Code of Ethics and Conduct includes language on conflict of interest. The committee on board policy revisions is addressing the issue of violation of the code of ethics.

In 2007, a new superintendent/president was hired. There was a screening committee that included representatives from all of the constituency groups and the committee. There is, however, no policy that defines the search process for the hiring of the superintendent/president. This area is also being addressed by the committee rewriting the board policies. The superintendent/president is formally evaluated by the board on an annual basis.

The Board of Trustees has policies in place that define the governance of the district, including participatory governance. The board conducts its business within the framework of law and policies. There are numerous opportunities for the public to provide input at all meetings.

The board meets the requirements of posting the publicizing policies, meeting notices, agendas, and minutes. Information regarding the district, trustees, and trustee areas are also posted on the web site. Additionally, board meetings are videotaped. The board actively participates in board development activities and professional development. Several members hold or have held leadership positions in state and national trustee organizations. New member orientation is conducted on an informal basis. New trustees are paired with senior administrators to learn about the district. New members are encouraged to attend the workshop for new trustees sponsored by the Community College League of California. Additional information is provided at workshops, study sessions, and retreats.

Trustees are updated on the accreditation process in several ways. The accreditation liaison officer and superintendent/president make formal presentations and send periodic progress reports to the board. A board member is designated as the liaison to the process.

As noted in the previous accreditation report, the lack of collegial relationships has been a major stumbling block to addressing critical issues at the college. Committees have been restructured, the planning processes have changed, and some progress in collegiality is noted. The new superintendent/president is providing more avenues for input, and is welcoming constituent input.

The superintendent/president published an 18-Month Agenda in 2007 to guide the direction of the college. A 12-Month Agenda was published in 2008. The agenda calls for results-oriented goals and identifying needs with a funding source. The superintendent/president is actively involved in implementing the planning process and communications issues are being addressed. The new President's Leadership Council appears to have positive buy-in from constituent groups.

Regarding institutional research, the board and superintendent/president receive an institutional effectiveness report, and the superintendent/president receives an annual staff diversity report.

In response to a previous accreditation recommendation, reassigned time was allocated for a coordinator of student learning outcomes. The approval was made in 2003, but the position was not filled until 2005.

The linkage between department planning and resource allocation continues to develop.

The new superintendent/president halted the previous planning processes. A new planning process was approved in 2007, but the college needs to better communicate the process to all constituents and develop an evaluation process.

The college struggled with enrollment for the past few years. They were on stabilization funding from the Chancellor's Office for two years, but have shown a positive increase in their reserves for the past two years.

As an aside, the entire section on governance in the self study seemed to pit the current practices against the previous administration for reasons that are unclear.

Recommendations

2. The team strongly recommends, as did the visiting team in 2002, that the college strengthen its commitment to a comprehensive student learning outcomes (SLOs) process that includes the development of outcomes at the course, degree, program, and institutional levels; assess the student attainment of SLOs; include SLOs in course syllabi; include the attainment of these SLOs in faculty evaluation; and integrate the assessment of SLOs into the planning, decision-making, and resource allocation processes and that it develop a plan to complete this task by 2012. Further, the team recommends that the college establish student learning outcomes for general education and align those outcomes with its general education philosophy (IA, IB1, IB3, IB5, IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2b, IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2h, IIA2i, IIA3, IIA3a, IIA3b, IIA3c, IIA5, IIA6, IIB1, IIB4, IIC2, IIIA6, IIIC2, IVA1, IVA2).
5. The team recommends that the college develop a college-wide code of ethics for use by all constituent groups in the college (IIIA1d, IV4, IV5A).
6. The team recommends that the college continue its efforts to update board policies and administrative regulations to reflect approved changes, including sections on selecting the superintendent/president and specifying a penalty for board members violating the code of ethics and conduct (IIIA3, IVB1, IVB1b, IVB1d, IVB1e, IVB1h).
9. The team recommends that the college continue to encourage participation by all constituent groups in the college governance process (IVB2b).