Responses to Recommendations from the 2008 External Evaluation Report

Recommendation 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 (IA, IB4, IIB, IIB3b, IIIA1c, IIIA4c, IVA4).

Upon receiving the 2008 evaluation visiting team’s report and the Commission action letter from February 2009, faculty and staff throughout the college responded with a strong sense of urgency to correct the deficiencies identified, especially those concerning the processes of student learning outcomes assessment, program review, planning and resource allocations. In March 2009, the Academic Council formed a Process Oversight Group charged with monitoring and overseeing the college’s responses to ACCJC’s warning and recommendations. This group comprised faculty leaders of the Curriculum Committee, including the Curriculum Committee chair, the Course Evaluation Subcommittee chair, the Department Planning/ Program Review Subcommittee chair, and the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Subcommittee chair, in addition to the Accreditation Liaison Officer. The Process Oversight Group was charged to oversee the activities of each of the work strands set forth in the LBCC Accreditation Blueprint (R1.1), including student learning outcomes assessment, program planning and review, institutional effectiveness, and process management which called for the coordination of multiple college groups through professional development, communication and resource support to quickly meet accreditation proficiency requirements by October 2011 and sustainable continuous quality improvement the following year.

The Board of Trustees was also actively engaged in the college’s response to ACCJC by requesting monthly updates on the college’s progress toward meeting all recommendations from the Commission and the visiting team. These updates were provided by the Accreditation Liaison Officer from March through September 2009 (R1.2 – 9). Even after the Commission had reaffirmed the college’s accreditation status in January 2010, the Board requested and received another update in October 2010 to ensure that the college sustained ongoing progress (R1.10). Then in June 2011, the Board participated in a study session entitled “Framework for the Content of Program Planning and Review.” This session was facilitated by the Academic Senate president and the associate dean of Institutional Effectiveness and allowed the Board to learn in greater detail about the college’s progress in implementing its new planning and review process (R1.11). At the August 2011 Board of Trustees meeting, the Academic Senate president facilitated another study session to allow for further discussion regarding faculty’s progress with student learning outcomes assessment in anticipation of the fall 2012 deadline that colleges meet proficiency with this work (R1.12).

Student journalists for the student newspaper, The Viking, also responded by interviewing several college staff and faculty to more fully understand the accreditation process and the
Responses to Recommendations from the 2008 External Evaluation Report

college’s plans for addressing the Commission’s recommendations. After the college received its response from the Commission to the Follow-Up report, another article was published in *The Viking* that explained how and why the college’s warning status had been lifted and the work that needed to continue.

Active and consistent student involvement in the accreditation process also occurred through contributions that the student representative on the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Subcommittee made to faculty and administrators especially during the 2010-11 year. The connection between SLO assessment and accreditation standards was discussed numerous times at ASLO meetings, and the student representative reinforced the importance of SLOs to students. The student representative also facilitated the outreach between the SLO Coordinator and student groups, including student leaders of the Associated Student Body.

All constituent groups were also actively involved in preparation and review of the Midterm Report submitted to ACCJC in 2011. For the first time at Long Beach City College, classified and student co-chair positions were established and filled to collaborate with the faculty and administrative co-chairs who led the Midterm review process. Both the classified and student co-chair conveyed thoughtful suggestions about ways to increase opportunities to participate in college governance and to remove disincentives that had not been well understood. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate formed a study group to provide extensive feedback on the first draft of the Midterm Report. Also, in September 2011, the Board of Trustees received a report highlighting the contents of the Midterm Report prior to its submission.

For the current institutional self evaluation, the four chair model, which proved effective for the midterm review, was continued. The same classified co-chair was appointed by the AFT to represent classified staff and a new student co-chair was appointed by the ASB. The classified co-chair worked closely with the AFT president to encourage volunteers at the start of the process when the standard teams were being formed. Her efforts contributed to a near-quadrupled increase in the number of classified staff who participated on the standard teams; in 2008 there were two classified staff, whereas there were 44 in 2014. A forum was held specifically for classified staff at a FLEX Day in March 2014 to share highlights and receive feedback on the first standard drafts. Student participation in the 2014 institutional self evaluation also saw a significant increase from only one student in 2008 to 11 in 2014. A forum for student leadership was also conducted at the Pacific Coast Campus where the same summary highlights of the report were discussed. The student perspective was also given voice through the focus groups on college governance. The faculty co-chair of the Accreditation Steering Committee conducted one of these focus groups with his own students, and their input was incorporated into the final report on the findings.
**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 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 (Standards IA, IB1, IB3, IB5, IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2b; IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2h, IIA2i, IIA3, IIA3a, IIA3b, IIA3c, IIA5, IIA6, IIB1, IIB4, IIC2, IIA6, IIC2, IVA1, IVA2).

Long Beach City College responded to this recommendation regarding student learning outcomes assessment with a strong commitment to quickly address all deficiencies identified by the 2008 visiting team, to integrate SLO assessment into structures and processes that previously existed and functioned well, to provide a robust infrastructure and support for faculty driving the work, to monitor progress of the counts and percentages of courses, programs, and degrees with ongoing assessment, and to continually strive to keep the work meaningful and focused on real improvements in student learning. In 2009, the Follow-Up visiting team identified 12 key findings that demonstrated significant advancements in SLO assessment in the first year after the recommendation was received. These findings led the team to commend the college for its “renewed commitment to SLOs and their assessment.” The team confirmed that the college had

1. Formed a Process Oversight Group to monitor and oversee work designed to address the ACCJC rubric for SLO assessment.

2. Reviewed and revised all course outcomes based on clarified definitions and developed assessment plans for all of these.

3. Revised the college’s philosophy of general education and its General Education Outcomes.

4. Agreed upon using existing curriculum guides to define a program for which SLOs would be established and assessment plans developed.

5. Developed a definition for service unit outcomes, building on the work done by the Student Services Support division, to be used for other administrative units of the college.

6. Included program level student learning outcomes and General Education Outcomes in the college catalog and on the college website.

7. Begun including program and course SLO assessment results in program review.

8. Developed rubrics to support multiple General Education Outcomes.

9. Conducted an internal audit to validate that SLOs are included in course syllabi.
10. Begun discussion on how to incorporate the achievement of student learning outcomes in the faculty evaluation process.

11. Begun integrating SLOs into the planning, decision-making and resource allocation process.

12. Implemented the web-based software, TracDat, to store SLOs at all levels and track progress of assessment.

Over the next two years, leading to the Midterm report, further advancements were made:

1. Refinements to TracDat were made so that the 5-column reporting format facilitated analysis of assessment results in terms of gaps in achievement of target levels, as called for by the ACCJC rubric for evaluating SLO assessment.

2. A SLO Officer pilot program was instituted which provided faculty union negotiated positions for which roughly 35 faculty received stipends by supporting the SLO assessment work in their departments. A core responsibility of the SLO Officers was to input assessment data into TracDat. In addition, management, communication, guidance, monitoring, and quality control of the assessment plans and results were required of each Officer. This pilot was continued for three consecutive years, using just over $75,000 annually from unrestricted general funds.

3. A massive effort led by the SLO Coordinator and the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (ASLO) Subcommittee to develop an outcomes assessment website as a key resource for faculty and other college staff also took place.

4. The ASLO Subcommittee established a direct line of communication with colleagues through a newsletter, Outcome-ings and Goings, which provided information on SLOs, SUOs, and progress updates on assessment at the college.

5. The ASLO Subcommittee engaged in outreach to adjunct faculty by requesting that CHI, the Part-Time Faculty union, fill the vacancy on the subcommittee, by announcing inclusion of adjunct faculty as eligible to participate in the SLO Officer work, and by sending an email to all adjunct faculty acknowledging the importance of their contributions to SLO assessment and sharing a white paper that underlines the subcommittee’s commitment to support their continued engagement in SLO assessment.

6. The ASLO Subcommittee also prioritized efforts to outreach to students about student learning outcomes by visiting student leadership groups at both campuses and using student suggestions which included placing a link to the college’s course outline database on the schedule of classes’ webpage and creating a Student Guide to Learning Outcomes webpage designed especially for students.

7. In 2010, the ASLO Subcommittee initiated the formation of a General Education Outcomes (GEO) work group, comprising members of the ASLO Subcommittee and the Associate Degree / General Education (AD/GE) Subcommittee, to evaluate alignment of the college’s GEOs with the Associate’s Degree General Education Pattern, Plan A and with the college’s Philosophy of General Education. This work involved comprehensive mapping of curricular offerings to the established GEOs. It should also be noted that in 2009, the college had reviewed and updated
its Philosophy of General Education to make evident the connection between SLO assessment and the college’s understanding of and commitment to provision of a coherent and integrated general education program at LBCC.

The ASLO Subcommittee has driven pivotal collaborations during this cycle intended to embed student learning outcomes assessment into established college processes and protocols. Members of the ASLO, led by the college’s SLO Coordinator, have strategically worked with the Course Evaluation Subcommittee to ensure inclusion of SLOs on course outlines, with the Associate Degree / General Education Subcommittee to include SLOs on curriculum guides and to align GEOs with Plan A and the GE philosophy and to conduct curricular mapping of course outcomes with GEOs, with the Program Plan / Program Review Subcommittee to ensure integration of SLO assessment with program reviews, and with the Associated Student Body to facilitate effective communication about SLOs with students.

After submission of the Midterm report, the college continued to make progress by reaching agreements with both the full- and part-time faculty unions to include SLO assessment work as part of faculty evaluations. In March 2012, evaluation procedures for full-time probation and tenured faculty were revised to include a component of self evaluation (CCA – LBCC Master Agreement, Article X, Appendix E-10, and R2.2) that requires each faculty member to describe his or her involvement with student learning outcomes assessment. Revisions made in August 2013 to part-time faculty evaluations now require all part-time faculty members to participate in student learning outcomes assessment by providing SLO assessment data to their department head and/or dean when the information is requested. This change is contained in the CHI-LBCC Master Agreement, Article VII – Hours of Employment/Service Load, D. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment, pages 20-21 (R2.3).

While the ASLO Subcommittee has continually hosted SLO workshops throughout this cycle, with various aspects of SLO assessment featured at every FLEX Day, in recent years the subcommittee has developed programs that provide part-time faculty with critical information needed for their effective participation. In the fall of 2012, the ASLO Subcommittee held a paid training session, before the beginning of school, to familiarize adjunct faculty with SLO assessment practices. This training was well attended and positive feedback on its usefulness was received so that another paid training on SLO assessment for adjunct faculty was held just prior to the start of the 2013-14 academic year.

Further commitments to SLO assessment at LBCC are reflected by ongoing resource allocations, both through inclusion of effective SLO assessment as criteria for program discontinuance and new faculty hiring and in the form of resources secured to support the process. In 2012-13, when the Academic Council worked through the difficult process of program discontinuance, program participation in SLO assessment was among the criteria included in the reports upon which recommendations about program discontinuance were made. Also, in 2012-13, the Faculty Hiring Committee added SLO assessment to the criteria used to decide which departments would be granted new faculty hires. General fund budget allocations were also made in 2013-14 to purchase ten new Scantron machines with the latest software to support more efficient scoring of tests whose items match specific course and program SLOs. A new permanent full-time position was also approved and filled in fall 2013 for an Educational Assessment Research Analyst (EARA) who is dedicated to support department faculty and the ASLO Subcommittee with SLO assessment and analysis and to relieve the SLO Officers from the responsibility of entering SLO information in TracDat.
Some of the budget allocation for the SLO Officers was shifted to partially support this position, while a core of ten SLO Officers, re-titled Accreditation Mandate Advisors, two for each academic school, is being continued into the 2014-15 year. The new research analyst has made remarkable progress in the past seven months providing direct support to faculty in completing assessments, determining actions to take to close gaps in student performance and to more completely and efficiently document assessment work into TracDat. The college has seen the percentage of courses with ongoing assessment nearly double (67% as of May 2014) since the hire of the EARA and continued progress in this area is expected in the upcoming year with her dedicated support. In addition, she has worked with department faculty to begin creating websites for schools where data can be collected for all course and program-level SLOs within the school. A prototype SLO website for the Department of Visual and Media Arts has been created and shared with all department heads in spring 2014. Work is planned over summer 2014 to develop more websites for additional departments. Each department webpage will include links to separate webpages for each course taught in that department. The course webpages will each include a Google document where faculty can enter student scores tied to specific SLOs. Once the data has been entered, faculty in each department can analyze it or send the file to the analyst who will provide analyses of student performance in relation to the targets set by faculty. These analyses will then be shared with faculty for discussion about how to respond to the results.

Finally, the ASLO Subcommittee has also made progress with SLO assessment at the General Education level. In spring 2014, a report on the project to assess cultural sensitivity/diversity, a component of the Civic Engagement GEO, was completed. The ASLO also registered to participate in the National Study of Learning, Voting and Engagement (NSLVE) to assess the democracy component of the Civic Engagement GEO, which will provide the campus with data on students’ civic and political engagement. The college will receive the data from the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement in summer 2014. The subcommittee also began to use indirect methods of assessment at this level by developing and implementing a student survey that captures the impact of courses which map to the Aesthetics and Creativity GEO on students’ attitudes toward and engagement with works of art. In spring 2014, responses from more than 400 students were collected from this survey, and preliminary results have been shared with the college via the outcomes assessment website (R2.4). The final report will be available for review and discussion at the start of the coming year. Also in fall 2013, the ASLO developed custom questions that were added to the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) that specifically prompt students to rate the degree of impact their experiences at LBCC have had on all of the college’s General Education Outcomes. Over 750 students completed the survey in spring 2014, and the college will receive the data in July 2014 from the Center for Community College Student Engagement.
Recommendation 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, IIC2).

As reported in the LBCC Follow-Up report in 2009, the college began implementation of its new planning and review process starting in fall 2009. At that time, all units of the college, including those in instructional, student support and administrative departments, had completed and uploaded plans into TracDat. The Follow-up visiting team observed that the database made available data on student access, student achievement, department productivity, SLO assessment results as well as progress toward unit goals and outcomes at all levels. The team concluded that the college had met the recommendation of the comprehensive evaluation team but cautioned that “its challenge will be to maintain momentum and support for its efforts for the long term.”

Each year since implementation in 2009, all units of the college have participated in the annual planning process which starts at the department level and proceeds so that department plans inform school or inter-level plans that go on to inform vice president level plans for Academic Affairs, Student Support Services, Administrative Services, Human Resources and College Advancement and Economic Development. These plans have been archived and are publicly available on the college’s program review website. While plans are typically developed with three-year goals in mind and updated annually to develop resource prioritizations that inform the budget for the following year, program reviews are conducted every three years. All instructional programs have completed a program review using the new template and validation process during this accreditation cycle. Given the volume of programs, clusters of programs are reviewed on a staggered three-year cycle. The student support and administrative units of the college all conduct program reviews at the same time, also on a three-year cycle.

Based on survey input from all groups and on discussions in the Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee, considerable focus has been dedicated in the past two years to create a strong connection between planning and resource allocation. Improvements have been realized each year with the latest planning process that concluded in spring 2014 resulting in vice president level plans that make resource prioritizations more clear and explicit than plans from all previous years. Despite great progress, the college continues to seek ways to improve the process by making it more streamlined, by making it better able to accommodate contingency planning, and by communicating resource decisions communicated more effectively and in a more timely manner.

The process of program review has also improved each year, with increased quality in the analyses of SLO assessment and narratives of improvements made based on student achievement data and learning outcomes. Both instructional and support unit reviews use a peer validation process which, during the early years of implementation, served largely to educate faculty and staff on the process itself while, over successive years, it has helped to
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communicate the content of the reviews and has been used to identify ways to refine the template and process itself (including the most recent year when the Word template was converted to using fields in TracDat to capture content for each component of the reviews).

Although all program reviews are posted on the college website, making them available to all constituent groups and the public, the college has lagged in its progress to more directly communicate the results of program review to broader audiences. In 2013-14, a few departments presented their program reviews to the Curriculum Committee, a practice to be expanded moving forward. In 2013-14, department plans were synthesized by the chair of the Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee of Curriculum, and are being used to inform the development of faculty innovation grants with funding to come from a James Irvine Foundation Grant awarded to the college the same year. After the award-winning proposals are implemented, their results will be captured in program reviews that can be communicated to all constituent groups through the Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee, the Student Success Committee, and Academic Council.

**Recommendation 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).

The 2013-14 LBCC college catalog includes on page 31 the Long Beach City College District Board Policy 4012 on academic freedom. The policy states:

“In the spirit of academic inquiry and in keeping with the code of ethics adopted by the Academic Senate of Long Beach City College, it is the policy of the Board of Trustees that the professional staff shall be free to define and discuss relevant information and concepts in the classroom or any other appropriate forum and shall be free to select materials and methods of presentation.”

[Administrative Regulation 4019](#) on Acceptance of Transfer Credit from Other Institutions appears in its entirety on page 29 of the 2013-14 LBCC college catalog. The regulation names the administrative authority of the district responsible for establishing and enforcing the regulation. It describes the institutions within the United States for which transfer credits are accepted by LBCC. Acceptance of transfer credits from foreign institutions is described. Further guidelines on acceptability of credits from other colleges, universities and institutions are delineated in accordance with Administrative Regulation 4019.

The policy on transfer of credit, advanced placement, and credit by examination for the Associate Degree Nursing Program appears on page 30 of the 2013-14 LBCC college catalog.

The 2009 Follow-Up visiting team concluded that the college had fully addressed this recommendation and meets the Standard cited ([R1.1](#), p. 5).


**Recommendation 5:**

The team recommends the college develop a college-wide code of ethics (IIIA1d).

On May 1, 2009, the President’s Leadership Council, which has representation from all constituent groups, discussed a new policy on Institutional Code of Ethics that was brought forth by the district’s Human Resources office. The President’s Leadership Council approved the policy, which was presented to the Board of Trustees for first reading on June 23, 2009. On July 14, 2009, the Board of Trustees adopted Policy 3008.

In June 2009, the college adopted its new Administrative Regulations on Institutional Code of Ethics (Administrative Regulation 3008, R5.1). This new regulation has become an important tool for preventing unethical and unprofessional conduct. The entire management team received training on this regulation at the time of adoption. And, in February 2014, the regulation was sent to all employees.

The vice president of Human Resources is responsible for overseeing this regulation. There are multiple avenues for reporting violations of the Institutional Code of Ethics or unprofessional conduct. Written or verbal complaints can be reported to an area supervisor/manager, dean or vice president. Complaints can also be reported directly to the Human Resources Department. The college has also implemented a confidential fraud hotline where individuals can anonymously report allegations of fraud, which are investigated by Human Resources and/or the internal auditor.

In addition to the board policy that governs professional ethics for all employees, both the full-time and part-time faculty collective bargaining agreements have been recently revised and updated through the collective bargaining process to include the expectation that all faculty members demonstrate, cultivate, and encourage courtesy, respect, and professionalism in relationships and learning environments with students, colleagues, staff members, and the community and that they adhere to the ethical standards and principles as referenced in the Institutional Code of Ethics.

The 2009 follow-up visiting team concluded that the college had fully addressed this recommendation and meets the accreditation Standard (R1.1, p. 6).

**Recommendation 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).

Oversight of the process for periodic review and updates of all board policies and administrative regulations was assigned to the Office of Business Support Services, a department within Administrative Services. This office developed a matrix that tracks all policies and administrative regulations and the most recent date of adoption and/or revision for each. The college uses the Community College League of California (CCLC) sample
policies and procedures as guidelines to support the district’s review and update process. Reviews are designed to ensure compliance with current education and legal codes as well as locally identified requirements. Draft revisions or newly proposed policies and regulations are developed under the oversight of the administrator primarily responsible for implementation of the policies or regulations. The vice president of the appropriate area takes the revised draft policies and regulations to the Executive Committee for feedback. Next, the members of the President’s Leadership Council are charged with sharing the drafts with their constituent groups and forwarding all comments and concerns to the vice president of Administrative Services, who then forwards final policies and regulations to the Board of Trustees for review and approval. Since the college received this recommendation in 2009, the superintendent-president has directed all vice presidents to initiate a review of policies and procedures related to their areas. The district has created or revised 67 of the 141 (48 percent) board policies and 59 of the 125 (47 percent) administrative regulations since the last comprehensive site visit (R6.1).

On September 26, 2008, the President’s Leadership Council received for review Board Policy 2020, Policy on Superintendent-President Selection. On February 17, 2009 the Board adopted this policy, which states, “In the case of a Superintendent-President vacancy, the Board shall establish a search process to fill the vacancy. The process shall be fair and open and comply with relevant regulations” (R6.2).

On June 24, 2008 the Board of Trustees received for first reading and discussion a new policy, Board Policy 2014, developed by the Board of Trustees, on the Board’s Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice. Also received on that date for first reading was Administrative Regulation 2014, describing how the Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice policy is to be implemented and the process to deal with a violation of this code by any Board member. The Board agreed on some changes to be made under 2014.5.A, 2014.7, and 2014.8.F (R6.3).

Board Policy 2014 and Administrative Regulation 2014 were approved and adopted by the Board on July 8, 2008. Administrative Regulation 2014.8, sections C through F on Unethical Behavior state,

C. Violation of the Board’s Code of Ethics will first be addressed by the President of the Board, who will discuss the violation with the Trustee in question to reach a resolution of the issue.

D. If resolution is not achieved and further action is deemed necessary, the President may appoint an ad hoc committee to examine the matter and recommend further courses of action to the Board, which may include a recommendation of censure of the Trustee in question.

E. If the President is perceived by another Trustee to have violated the Code of Ethics, the Vice President is authorized to pursue resolution.

F. If the violation is perceived to have legal implications, the matter will be referred by the Board to an attorney selected by the Superintendent-President to advise the Board as to the character of the conduct and the Board’s options. If the matter is perceived to be a criminal offense, upon the recommendation of the Superintendent-President, in consultation with the Board President or, if the Board President is implicated in the
violation, in consultation with the Board Vice President, the matter will be referred to the appropriate prosecutorial agency.

**Recommendation 7:**

The team recommends that the college commit to technology funding which is responsive to college planning (IIIC1c, IIIC2).

In 2008, the comprehensive evaluation team noted among its findings that the college had 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).” This level of commitment has been extended in subsequent years. The LBCCCD Board of Trustees has approved budgets that have designated reserve funding for technology as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Reserved for Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$278,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$249,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$225,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>$84,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>$84,986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(All fiscal budgets are available from the Fiscal Services website.)

In addition, for the 2013-14 budget, the Budget Advisory Committee approved a one-time allocation of $1 million to upgrade firewalls and replace out-of-date computers in instructional labs and for instructors. At the same time, an ongoing annual allocation of $400,000 was recommended to support a complete technology refresh program (R7.1, R.7.2). Later in 2013-14, the Budget Advisory Committee approved an additional $500,000 one-time allocation for the technology refresh project (R7.3, p. 3).

Notably in adopted budgets for 2008-09 and 2009-10, technology reserves were earmarked for “Technology Replacement and Support,” while beginning with the 2010-11 adopted budget, the technology reserves were identified to support the Technology Master Plan, which was significantly revamped in 2010 to adopt a more strategic and longer-range planning approach.

During the especially challenging fiscal constraints imposed on all community colleges in recent years, these budget allocations for technology further demonstrate LBCC’s understanding of the importance of technology in supporting teaching, learning, research and administrative functions. Still, the college has embraced the importance of the evaluation team’s recommendation as is reflected in the most recent update to the LBCC Technology Master Plan (R7.4). In the section entitled “Funding structures and Strategies,” on page 31, the update notes that the college’s technology planning had “transitioned from a ‘catch up’
Responses to Recommendations from the 2008 External Evaluation Report

"...phase to a maintenance phase." This has happened, in part, through an approach that uses a "total cost of ownership" model and circumvents a crises-response mode of campus technology management. In addition, technology planning is informed, in part, by the department planning and program review processes at all levels of the college. Further, the updated Technology Master Plan outlines a strategy that is flexible, adapts to evolving conditions, and is scalable. The plan further states:

*It is critical when establishing budgets for procurement and acquisition of technology that a comprehensive approach is established. While the previous plan addressed funding cycles for equipment, it did not address a broader perspective that is needed by looking at all funding sources as well as all funding needs.*

The following is a visual representation of all considerations:
That the college is moving beyond crisis management and cyclic updates to an initiative driven process that leverages a comprehensive array of funding sources is evidenced by some significant funding allocations in recent years. The web-based database TracDat, purchased and implemented in 2009 to support the program planning and review process as well as student learning and service unit outcomes assessment, marked a significant investment that was informed by institutional priorities established by the College Planning Committee. An additional investment of $162,000 to correct a broken implementation of Cognos data warehouse software was made in order to enable enrollment management and program planning data support, as well as more efficient data retrieval for other functional areas of the college. An additional $20,000 in training to support advanced reporting with Cognos was expended in spring 2014. A Business Analyst was hired to support TracDat as well as the college data warehouse and Cognos business intelligence reporting tools. Although Title V funds were used to support this position initially, the cost was institutionalized through the allocation of district funding beginning with the 2011-12 fiscal year. In 2009-10, a Content Management System (CMS) with a training plan was implemented, making new webpage development and web updates easy to accomplish. The CMS has improved the quality of the college’s academic programs, support services, and administrative functions. There are more than 120 sites being hosted in the Content Management System with nearly 100 distinct users in the system.

Other institutional priorities include the accelerated development of a student degree audit system which required a reorganization of the Admissions and Records Department and a new position that was dedicated to making this service, in its first phase of development, available in spring 2012, implementation of a PeopleSoft module for electronic capture and update of student educational plans first utilized in spring 2014, and implementation of Resource 25, a classroom and facilities scheduling system, beginning in fall 2013. Other recent investments in technology include licenses for TaskStream’s student electronic portfolios piloted in 2013 with a group of first-year Promise Pathways students and the implementation and support of School Dude, a facilities software system used for preventative maintenance and work order processing. In 2013, a college-wide conversion to Voice Over Internet Protocol (VOIP) was completed that integrates all phone messaging with user email to support communication efficiencies for faculty and staff. Another related expansion of the district’s network accessibility has been the creation of a call center that enables voice message transcription that can be sent as text messages and emails.

Bond funds are being leveraged to advance the district’s technological infrastructure, particularly within specific building projects. Examples include a new data center in Building O1, a newly acquired and remodeled facility that has become the new home for Instructional and Information Technology Services (IITS). The district’s network, which through the VOIP conversions now includes telephones, is being steadily improved through Bond funding as well. The North Loop Infrastructure and Main Point of Entry projects have done much to improve the technology infrastructure at the Liberal Arts Campus.

A variety of cost-savings strategies have also been used to make more prudent use of the technology funding that is in place. For example, the network connection between the LAC and PCC sites was upgraded in a manner that will save the district approximately $5,000 each year. The district’s current telephony strategy relies on Microsoft’s products that cost less than the previously used Cisco suite of products. Moving to Microsoft’s voice mail
product has saved the district approximately $20,000 beginning with the 2012-13 fiscal
year’s budget.

The ongoing annual allocation for supporting the college’s technology refresh program,
along with the technology reserves ensure that all new faculty hires receive new computers
and phones. These funds, along with IITS general fund money, have been allocated to
upgrade several hundred computers that will remain productive. By adding memory (RAM)
and refreshing these computers with Windows 7, they will be able to provide a few more
years of service with minimal investment compared to a refresh program of replacements.

Finally, the vice president of Administrative Services has ensured that the college’s software
budget, equipment leasing budget for the data center, and telecommunications budgets
remained intact while discretionary funds from all areas across the college undertook a 20
percent reduction to ease the college’s deficit spending for the 2011-12 fiscal year.
Furthermore in 2013-14, the college augmented the technology budget so that it could
purchase an Adobe site license for the benefit of all employees and students. IITS also
increased staffing by 2 FTE to better maintain existing systems and to provide support for the
campus (R7.5, slides 7 – 9).

Recommendation 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).

The college has engaged in ongoing evaluation and improvement of the governance
structure, processes, practices and tools throughout this accreditation cycle. In fact, since
significant restructuring of the planning committees had been implemented in fall 2007 based
on a previous evaluation of the effectiveness of the structure and supporting processes, the
evaluation reported here is actually a re-evaluation based on the newly implemented structure
and processes. Two surveys were implemented, one in spring 2010 and another the
following year, to determine from faculty and staff how well the redesigned planning and
review process worked during these initial years of implementation. These surveys also
collected feedback on the effectiveness of the web-based database TracDat, implemented fall
2009, to collect and communicate plans, resource requests, and program review results,
including student learning and service unit outcomes results across all units of the college.
Results from both of these surveys led to activities designed to improve multiple aspects of
the process, including training on how to write more effective and cohesive plans,
refinements to the data collection fields in TracDat and modifications to the reports and plans
that TracDat generates to improve readability and usefulness. The results also pointed to a
continuing need to enhance communication about resource prioritization decisions at the
conclusion of each planning year. Incremental improvements in this area have been made
throughout this cycle.

In addition, committees have included as part of their work regular evaluative discussions
about how well the planning structure and processes of planning and resource allocation are
working to help the college fulfill its mission. The Program Planning/ Program Review
Subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee (referred to as the Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee as of fall 2012) has had annual discussions about ways to improve department planning and the process by which peers validate each other’s plans and program reviews. The College Planning Committee has also routinely discussed needed modifications to the structure, to committee charges and membership, and ways to better align practices with agreed-upon processes. These discussions have most recently contributed to an improvement plan, already underway, to develop a participatory governance handbook that will be posted on the college’s website and used in annual orientations for all standing committee and task force members. A first version of this handbook will be ready for the start of the fall 2014 semester. College leaders anticipate that the more than 40 new faculty members joining the college at that time will greatly benefit from the handbook as will numerous faculty and staff who are known, partly through survey results and focus groups, to lack sufficient understanding about how to effectively participate in governance at LBCC.

Academic Council began discussing the need for a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of the college’s governance in spring 2011, and this discussion made careful reference to the 2008 evaluation team’s recommendation concerning this need. Further discussions took place in September 2011 when the Academic Council decided that a more qualitative and in-depth evaluation was more appropriate than using a survey to fully understand the experiences of each constituent group and of leaders and non-leaders in each group. A more robust evaluation was also needed to constructively inform modifications to the governance structure and processes to make the college more effective in advancing student success. At that meeting, a work group was established comprising the Academic Senate president, two faculty representatives, the vice president of Human Resources, and the associate dean of Institutional Effectiveness. The tasks of the work group were to develop a clear statement of what the college would evaluate with respect to the visiting team’s recommendation, to establish the conditions that should exist for the governance process to be effective, to recommend the principles that would guide the evaluation, and to describe the methodology for the focused interviews with all constituent groups. The group completed its work in spring 2012 when the Academic Council approved the evaluation plan to conduct focus group interviews with members of all constituent groups including the Academic Senate, Classified Union, Associated Student Body, and Administration/Management/Confidential. Participants were also randomly selected from the employee and student groups with structured inclusion of faculty and staff from both campuses. A total of eight focus groups were defined. An interview protocol was also approved and piloted in May 2012 when minor revisions were made. About 50 individuals in total participated in these focus groups.

Although the focus groups were to take place in fall 2012, they were delayed until late spring 2013 due largely to the college’s engagement in the process of program discontinuance during fall 2012 and through early spring 2013. By this time, the college had begun to organize for the institutional self evaluation, and the Accreditation Steering Committee agreed that the moderators for the focus groups on governance would be the faculty and administrative co-chairs for the institutional self evaluation. All of the planned focus groups were completed by summer 2013, and the analysis was shared with Academic Council at the retreat that kicked off the fall 2013 semester. The Accreditation Steering Committee also received the results and was encouraged to share with all standard team members. The report
Responses to Recommendations from the 2008 External Evaluation Report and analysis are posted on the Institutional Effectiveness page of the college website (R8.1, R8.2).

During the time when the governance focus groups were taking place, the Academic Senate’s Consultation on Governance Committee administered a survey to faculty soliciting concerns about governance and leadership. The results from this survey were discussed by the Academic Senate and led to Senate Resolution 48.4 on Faculty Consultation on Scheduling and Curricular Decision-Making. The report submitted to the Academic Senate by the Consultation on Governance Committee summarizes that “many of the problems mentioned in the survey reflect an institutionwide lack of understanding of shared governance/collegial consultation processes” and that “both faculty and administration seem to exhibit a lack of clarity” on “what collegial consultation actually means and which constituents have the primary responsibility for specific tasks” (R8.3, R8.4). The report also called for the Senate to develop a process to monitor implementation of a set of recommendations and for the Senate president and the chair of the Governance and Consultation Committee to share the survey results with the Accreditation Steering Committee co-chairs and the Superintendent-President which took place late spring 2013.

At the start of fall 2013, a college-wide survey was administered that included items about governance, leadership, and college communication, among other aspects of the college that align with accreditation standards. The survey was intended to balance input obtained through the in-depth focus groups with relatively few individuals (albeit with representation from all groups and levels of leadership experience) with input from the wider college population. Participation in the survey was high; 640 responses were received yielding a 44 percent response rate. The findings corroborated much of what was learned through the focus groups and have been utilized by the accreditation standard teams as data to partially inform the self evaluation and actionable improvement plan sections of related standards.

As called for by this recommendation, the college has committed considerable time and effort as a community to evaluate, using multiple methods, leadership and governance at LBCC. Work has begun during the 2013-14 year to address some key concerns that emerged from the evaluation. The problem of “morale across campus” was identified from the employee survey as a top issue needing improvement at LBCC (R8.5, p. 5). In response, the Superintendent-President created a Collegiality and Morale Advisory Group, which met several times during the year and developed a set of recommendations. Some of the recommendations were implemented in fall 2013, including Coffee Mondays where all employees are invited to gather for free coffee on Monday mornings; holiday open houses, where departments decorated their areas and hosted open house for employees in other departments to socialize and share food and beverages; and, most recently, Spring Olympics which featured a full morning of competitive events with teams from all departments and levels of the college. All of these activities have been intended to boost morale, break down barriers of communication between groups and to specifically address complaints about the lack of accessibility of top leadership to lower levels of staff and about strained relations between administration and faculty and staff largely as a result of multiple years of budget cuts, layoffs, and the discontinuance of 11 programs in 2012-13 (R8.6, R8.7).

The college’s evaluation of leadership and governance also uncovered tension among college groups over the implementation of new programs and practices. The Promise Pathways program, while innovative and having received local, state and national accolades, has also
been criticized internally for having been implemented outside the official planning process of the college. Focus group input also shows that the college can do more to establish a clear and effective mechanism within the planning process for all employees to bring new ideas forward for innovation and for such innovation to be effectively incentivized. Initial steps are underway to address this need using the James Irvine Foundation Leadership Award money that the Superintendent-President has set aside to support ongoing innovation. The Faculty Professional Development Coordinator, also serving as the chair of the Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee, is working with the Executive Committee and Academic Council to establish links between this funding source and a previously established Faculty Innovation Grants program and the annual planning process. The college expects that in 2014-15, specific faculty proposals will be selected as innovative student success projects to fund using a portion of the James Irvine Foundation grant.

As mentioned, the pervasive need for ongoing professional development about the college’s governance structure, the committees and task forces that make up the structure, how they function and the respective roles of co-chairs, committee members and the constituent groups with representatives working on them, emerged from the employee survey, the governance focus groups, and numerous discussions in Academic Council and the College Planning Committee. A tangible start to address this problem is to develop and publish on the college website a participatory governance handbook and to use this handbook to support regular training of new employees and new committee members and leaders and as a resource for ongoing use through the year to help the governance and decision-making bodies work more effectively. A table of contents for the handbook was discussed and approved at the May 6, 2014 meeting of Academic Council, and a work group has committed to working on the handbook during summer 2014 so that a first version of the resource will be ready for use at the start of the following year (R8.8).

**Recommendation 9:**

**The team recommends that the college continue to encourage participation by all constituent groups in the college governance process (IVB2b).**

The comprehensive evaluation team observed that at the time of their visit in 2008, the college had regulations and policies (Board Policy 2006 – Participation in Governance, and Administrative Regulations 2006.6) in place that specify and describe the “roles and involvement of each constituent group involved in the participatory governance structure.” A revised Board Policy 2006, which updated the name of the official body representing classified staff in collegial shared governance, exclusive of collective bargaining issues, was adopted on May 12, 2009 (R9.1). Further review of other related regulations that separately described the roles of the Academic Senate (AR 2009), Students (AR 2010) and the Classified Union (2012) was continued in 2011, and Administrative Regulation 2006 was further revised to consolidate Administrative Regulations 2009, 2010, and 2012 so that participation by all constituent groups is described in one regulation. This regulation also describes the following: the district structure for participation in governance; the planning process and planning committee structure; the college’s self-evaluation process for accreditation; the academic and professional matters on which the Board of Trustees rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate, the Academic and
Professional Matters on which the Board of Trustees reach mutual agreement with the Academic Senate; appointment of faculty, administrative representatives and classified staff to committees; areas in which the Board of Trustees provide the opportunity for students to participate; and the classified and professional matters on which the Board of Trustees and the Superintendent-President provide participation to Classified staff (R9.2).

There are several forms of evidence of the college’s efforts to encourage participation among constituent groups in its governance process. The first is the actual composition of each of the committees, task forces and groups that comprise the structure for participation. Great care has been taken to ensure adequate representation of all constituent groups in the membership of all primary governance bodies in accordance with their designated responsibilities. The proposed addition of any standing committee to the planning structure of the district requires that the charge and membership be reviewed and approved by the Academic Council. The Student Success Committee and the Enrollment Management Oversight Committee are the most recent additions to standing committees that are overseen by the CPC (R9.3, R9.4). They were added in 2008 and 2011 respectively. The addition of task forces is determined by the College Planning Committee as part of its annual development of institutional priorities. The memberships for each of the task forces must include representation from all constituent groups.

All committees, task forces and work groups track attendance as a means to monitor constituent groups’ participation in college governance. At the time of the 2008 comprehensive visit, the Superintendent-President had just formed the President’s Leadership Council (PLC) which serves as a consultative body for the Superintendent-President on issues of college leadership and matters of college-wide importance. The Council also serves as the primary body for reviewing policies and regulations and for consulting with and keeping constituencies informed on issues discussed by the Council. In 2008, the visiting team noted, “The new President’s Leadership Council appears to have positive buy-in from constituent groups.” Evidenced from attendance records for the PLC, participation at meetings has been active for all constituent group representatives throughout this cycle, with the exception of students during the 2012-13 year where no student representative attended any of the meetings. Other planning committees that maintained good participation from all groups throughout this cycle include the Budget Advisory Committee, Facilities Advisory Committee (with lapses in 2010-11 for the full and part-time faculty union representatives and in 2013-14 for full-time faculty union and student representatives), and the Staff Equity Committee (except for no part-time faculty union and student representation in 2009-10 only). The Student Success Committee (SSC) has had representation from all groups except for students in the first year and then again in 2011-12 and 2012-13. During this last year, there has been active student participation in the SSC. The College Planning Committee shows the weakest participation across constituent groups among all the standing committees and task forces. For the last two years, there has been no attendance from part-time faculty or student representatives at CPC meetings (R9.5).

There have been a variety of ways the college has tried to encourage and support participation in governance. At the start of every year, the Planning Systems Analyst who supports the College Planning Committee, contacts leaders of all constituent groups to notify them of vacancies that need to be filled for each of the planning committees and task forces. The co-chairs of these committees and task forces also work directly with constituent leaders.
to provide information describing the work of their committees so that this can be conveyed to prospective representatives. The Planning Systems Analyst has also worked with the Office of Student Life to provide information about committee charges so that staff can help students match their interests with committee work. One known barrier to participation is that committees do not always set their meeting schedules in advance so that although there may be interest in serving, conflicts in schedules often prohibit participation. This problem will be addressed when the participatory governance handbook is developed as the handbook will include a master planning calendar.

The college has made provisions to encourage participation of classified staff in the college’s planning and review process at all levels. At the level of the departments, participants in the process are to be documented by name and title in the final plans that are uploaded into TracDat each year. Classified staff members are indicated as participants in the development of Student Support Services and Administrative unit plans. At the school level, the composition of the planning groups was specified by the Program Plan/Program Review Implementation Task Force on pages 44 - 45 of their final process design document to include “the academic administrative assistant for the area, as well as any additional appropriate staff members as agreed upon by the school.” The composition of the vice president level planning groups is to include “additional representatives from administration, faculty, and staff as determined by the CPC. Group members should include reasonable representation for all areas under the specific vice president’s purview.” At the college-level, institutional priorities are developed by the College Planning Committee, whose membership includes the AFT president as well as the college’s Planning Systems Analyst who is among the classified staff (R9.6, R9.7).

Finally, as the college has evaluated the effectiveness of governance structures, great care was taken to structure and conduct the governance focus groups so that the sessions with each group were held at the most convenient times possible and so that an environment was created where all participants were made to feel comfortable and safe in speaking openly and their anonymity assured. Likewise, all college employees were invited to complete the survey, which centrally addressed issues of governance, and, as reported above, nearly half of all college staff from all employee groups provided input.
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