AGENDA

1. Welcome--Perez (2 minutes)

2. Purpose of the Meeting--Field and Eng, Barrera (5 minutes)

3. Public Comment

4. Review of Accreditation Report Recommendations--Kimble, Barrera (5 minutes)

5. Introduction of Key Faculty and Staff--Perez (2-3 minutes)

6. Report on College Responses--Accreditation Steering Committee Co-chairs (20 minutes)

7. Questions & Answers--Field and Eng (30 minutes)

8. College Statement on Self Assessment--Perez and Co-chairs, Barrera (5 minutes)

9. Summary Statement on Meeting--Field and Eng (5 minutes)

10. Adjournment
Los Angeles Mission College  

Executive Summary of Current Status and Recommendations

Date of last site visit: March 18-21, 2013

Current status: Warning (reaffirmation is delayed, but institution remains accredited)

1. College received fourteen (14) recommendations
2. Follow-Up report is due to ACCJC by March 15, 2014
3. Follow-Up report will be followed by a visit by Commission representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation Number</th>
<th>Recommendation Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Develop and institute a formal process for reviewing the <strong>college mission statement</strong> on a regular basis and making revisions as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>Complete SLO assessment and demonstrate use of results for improvement of student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Develop and implement a <strong>comprehensive program of research and evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>Develop and implement a plan for <strong>Distance Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>Assess student learning styles so as to improve instructional delivery and achievement of student learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>Develop a set of metrics and performance standards to better monitor the <strong>effectiveness of its planning and resource allocation decisions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>Assess student support services to determine the full scope of services needed to meet student needs as well as federal and state requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>Develop and maintain a comprehensive report of student complaints/grievances for the last five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>Ensure that all student support programs complete a full cycle of program review and outcomes assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>Assess the effectiveness of efforts to improve collegiality and complete the code of conduct approval process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>Integrate human resources planning into institutional planning in order to maintain a sufficient number of qualified faculty, staff, and administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>Improve the established planning and budget development process by integrating planning for maintenance and periodic replacement of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>Address attendance accounting audit findings for &quot;To Be Arranged&quot; (TBA) courses, eligibility verification for college categorical programs, and verification of census reporting documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td>Evaluate collegial governance and decision-making processes as well as the overall effectiveness of the current administrative structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DATE: November 7, 2013

TO: Michael Allen, Vice President and ALO
Los Angeles Mission College

FROM: Krista Johns
Vice President for Policy and Research

SUBJECT: Feedback on College Status Report on SLO Implementation

Los Angeles Mission College
College Status Report on SLO Implementation submitted in Spring 2013

This report has been prepared at your request, to provide feedback on the 2012-2013 SLO report. In order to understand your college’s scores, below, please refer to your College Status Report along with this feedback report. The information provided here is for use in discussions at the college about how your report compared with the review criteria that were applied, with the average scores across the region, and with where you are and want to be in your SLO practice. Please note that the scores are only useful to gain a broad sense of results across the Western Region. They are a gross measure of a particular point in time as self-reported among peer institutions. However, the review criteria for this report may be helpful to spark conversations about where the Proficiency expectations in college practice were in 2012-2013, and where meeting Accreditation Standards for SLOs will be from this point forward.

In accordance with ACCJC practice for monitoring annual self-reports from member institutions, staff reviewed the 2012-2013 College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation and prepared a composite report on the results for review by the Commission. Each college’s report was also retained for inclusion with annual reports, annual fiscal reports, audits, and other college materials for external evaluation teams when conducting a review of the institution.

The 2012-2013 SLO reports completed by all institutions provided a means for gaining understanding of progress across the Western Region in the implementation of student learning outcomes assessment. The Commission based this report on the Proficiency implementation level on the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Part III (Rubric), as that had become very familiar to individuals at the campuses who worked with SLOs. Moving forward, colleges are reminded they must demonstrate the Accreditation Standards are met as to student learning outcomes.

In order to gather a snapshot of SLO implementation across the region, a scoring rubric was used to pull together elements from the submitted reports. The rubric was based upon the information provided by colleges in their reports as it related to the Proficiency level. While the scoring rubric elements captured the largest aspects of practice and majority of reported items, there were a few unique responses provided by colleges to some questions, and these were scored to give benefit to the institution.
Scoring Rubric

5- Exceeds Norm of Effective Practice
   (Described practices indicate breadth, depth, innovation, or other aspects beyond expected effective practices)

4- Solidly Meets Expectation of Effective Practice
   (Effective Practices in all aspects of this element of SLO implementation are present)

3- Barely Meets Expectation of Effective Practice
   (Effective Practices are Present in all areas, but they may be at a basic level or just starting out)

2- Doesn’t Fully Meet Expectation of Effective Practice
   (Some aspects of effective practice are not present)

1- Doesn’t Meet Expectation of Effective Practice
   (Performance in this area is deficient)

The scoring rubric above was applied to each question in accordance with the levels defined for the question. Both the numerical and narrative responses were evaluated. A score of 4 indicated the information self-reported by the college met the 2012-2013 expectations of effective practice as defined for this review.

Numerical Responses

The 2012-2013 expectation was that student learning outcomes were being assessed regularly in all venues where students are learning. The scoring of numerical responses took into account variations at colleges of how certain activities were conducted or defined.

Proficiency Rubric Statement 1: Student Learning outcomes and Authentic Assessments are in Place for Courses, Programs, Support Services, Certificates and Degrees.

Quantitative Evidence/data on the rate/percentage of SLOs defined and assessed

1.1 Courses
   a. Total number of college courses (active courses in the college catalog, offered on the schedule in some rotation).
   b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes.
      Percentage of total: This item was not rated separately for the SLO implementation review. Colleges are expected to have completed the definition of SLOs. Expectations for a College response (to get a score of 4): 95% or greater.
   c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes.
      Percentage of total:
      Scoring: Expectations for College Response: 75% or greater
      \[5=95+; 4=75+; 3=65+; 2=55+; 1=<55; 0=dnr\]
      Average score: 3.66
      Your college score: 5

1.2 Programs
   a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college).
b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes.
   Percentage of total: *This item was not rated separately for the SLO implementation review. Colleges are expected to have completed the definition of SLOs. Expectations for a College response (to get a score of 4): 95% or greater.*

c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: Percentage of total.
   Scoring: Expectations for College Response (to get a score of 4): 85% or greater
   \[
   5=95+; 4=85+; 3=75+; 2=65+; 1=<65; 0=dnr
   \]
   
   Average score: 3.49
   
   Your college score: 5

1.3 Student Learning and Support Activities
a. Total number of student learning and support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SLO implementation).

b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes.
   Percentage of total: *This item was not rated separately for the SLO implementation review. Colleges are expected to have completed the definition of SLOs. Expectations for a College response (to get a score of 4): 95% or greater.*

c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes. Percentage of total:
   Scoring: Expectations for College Response (to get a score of 4): 85% or greater
   \[
   5=95+; 4=85+; 3=75+; 2=65+; 1=<65; 0=dnr
   \]
   
   Average Score: 4.14
   
   Your college score: 5

1.4 Institutional Learning Outcomes
a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined:
   *This item was not rated separately for the SLO implementation review. Colleges are expected to have completed the definition of these SLOs.*

b. Institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment:
   Scoring: Expectations for College Response (to get a score of 4): 75% or greater
   \[
   5=90%; 4=75%; 3=66%+; 2=50%+; 1=<50%; 0=dnr
   \]
   
   Average Score: 4.07
   
   Your college score: 5
Narrative Responses

1.5 Proficiency Rubric Statement 1: Narrative Response

Student Learning outcomes and Authentic Assessments are in Place for Courses, Programs, Support Services, Certificates and Degrees.

Expectations for College Response (to get a score of 4):
- Narrative supports numerical data provided
- addresses courses, programs, certificates, degrees and support services
- Discusses *authentic* assessment (assessment that leads to understanding about student learning and gaps which need to be addressed)

Average Score: 3.51

Your college score: 4

Proficiency Rubric Statement 2: There is a widespread institutional dialogue about assessment results and identification of gaps.

2. Proficiency Rubric Statement 2: Narrative Response

Expectations for College Response (To Get a Score of 4):
- Beyond providing a listing of meetings at which assessment is addressed, the narrative addresses specifically where/how/for what purpose assessment results are discussed
- Describes processes for identifying gaps and instituting changes to address the gaps
- Institutional messages value assessment and improvement

Average Score: 3.38

Your college score: 4

Proficiency Rubric Statement 3: Decision making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.

3. Proficiency Rubric Statement 3: Narrative Response

Expectations for College Response (To get a Score of 4):
- Descriptions in narrative about how decision-making includes results of assessment
• Discussion of how institution-wide practices are aligned/realigned to support and improve student learning

Average Score: 3.29

Your college score: 3

Proficiency Rubric Statement 4: Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.

4. Proficiency Rubric Statement 4: Narrative Response

Expectations for College Response (To Get a Score of 4):
- Discussion of how resources are allocated and fine-tuned to improve student learning
- Mention of all kinds of resources: fiscal, employee, technology, and physical
- Institutional resource allocation/fine-tuning is oriented toward student learning

Average Score: 3.22

Your college score: 4

Proficiency Rubric Statement 5: Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.

5. Proficiency Rubric Statement 5: Narrative Response

Expectations for College Response (To Get a Score of 4):
- Narrative describes the cycle and format of assessment reports
- Participation in report completion/updating, and comprehensive nature of assessment reports is addressed

Average Score: 3.15

Your college score: 4

Proficiency Rubric Statement 6: Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.

6. Proficiency Rubric Statement 6: Narrative Response

Expectations for College Response (To Get a Score of 4):
• Description of alignment of course level outcomes with degree level outcomes
• Indication of completeness of alignment work in this regard
• Alignment includes discipline and general education components of degrees

Average Score: 3.54
Your college score: 4

Proficiency Rubric Statement 7: Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.

7. Proficiency Rubric Statement 7: Narrative Response

Expectations for College Response (To Get a Score of 4):
• Narrative discusses the manner in which students are made aware of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled
• Basis for determining that students demonstrate awareness

Average Score: 2.63
Your college score: 3

Self-Assessment on Level of Implementation: What Level of SLO Implementation Would you Assign your College? Why? What Efforts Have you planned to Address Needed Improvements?

8. Proficiency Rubric Statement 8: Narrative Response

Expectations for College Response (To Get a Score of 4):
• College states the level of SLO implementation it believes to have achieved
• Narrative discusses basis for this self-assessed level
• Discussion of planned improvement efforts (more than “keep doing what we are doing”; focus is on improving the value of SLO assessment rather than on instrumentalities of SLO assessment)

Average Score: 3.25
Your college score: 3
Table of Evidence: List the evidence used to support your narrative report, section by section.

Not rated separately for this report. Many of the colleges took an “everything but the kitchen sink” approach that was not helpful in understanding the relevance—for the college—of items included in evidence to the points being made in the report. If we were to ask of college leaders at various places in the organization, “as to this criterion or standard, please tell us what you regularly review to assess college progress,” the answer would also inform the selection process for evidence to external evaluators. This list would be further refined by determining which of that evidence is critical to decision-making, communication, and improvement.

Overall average score: 3.44
Your college’s overall average score: 4.08

Enclosed with this report are two documents:
- “Crosswalk Linking Proficiency Level of SLO Implementation to the ACCJC Accreditation Standards,” one of the documents included with the College Status Report on SLO Implementation form.
Accreditation Executive Summary

Background

During the March 2013 Accreditation visit, LAMC was placed on “warning” and received 14 recommendations by the ACCJC. Immediately following the July 3rd Action Letter, the College’s Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC), began to address the necessary actions to make improvements and begin resolution on the recommendations. The ASC, composed of faculty, staff, administrators and students, works to support the college and serve as a resource to College Council and the Academic Senate to assist in reviewing, gathering and monitoring the College’s efforts to meet or exceed the set standards.

The College regards the completion of the recommendations as vital to the continued advancement of institutional effectiveness. As listed below, LAMC has established a more collegial environment with an evidence-based culture that is working on the progress of all recommendations to assure that they are met within a sustainable and systematic structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 1</strong>: To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college develops and institutes a formal process utilizing its established governance and decision making processes for reviewing its mission on a regular basis and making revisions as necessary. (I.A.3)</td>
<td>Completed. An annual review of the mission statement was initiated and completed in the Fall of 2013, utilizing a formal process of governance and decision making. The annual review of the College mission statement will take place during each fall semester, to be effective the following academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 2</strong>: To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college assess the achievement and learning outcomes for each of the past five years by programs and the college, set standards for student success including student achievement and student learning, accelerate its efforts to assess outcomes in all courses, programs, degrees and certificates and assess how findings have led to improved student learning and the achievement of the college mission, and widely distribute the results so they may be used as the basis for all constituent groups to engage in self-reflective dialog about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes. (I.B, II.A, II.B, I.B.2, I.B.6, II.A.1.c, II.A.2)</td>
<td>Substantial Progress. The college has assessed the achievement and learning outcomes for each of the past five years and set standards of achievement and student learning. It has accelerated its efforts to assess outcomes through the program review process, completed this fall, and will use these results for a self-reflective dialog in the spring of 2014. The program review was modified to include information on how academic affairs departments, student services programs and administrative services units contribute to student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 3</strong>: To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college develop and implement a comprehensive program of research and evaluation to support the assessment of student, program and institutional learning outcomes, and</td>
<td>Substantial Progress. The college has developed a comprehensive program of research and evaluation in concert with the assessment of student, program, and institutional learning outcomes. Data collection for the annual institutional effectiveness report, AtD, SSSP, Faculty/Staff, Student Surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Accreditation Executive Summary

| Recommendation 4: | To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college develop and implement a plan for Distance Education that includes an evaluation of Distance Education for alignment with the needs of the college's intended student population, an assessment of the quality of instruction and compliance with US Department of Education regulations, infrastructure to support online teaching and learning, and a systematic assessment of student learning and achievement outcomes in order to ascertain how well students are learning in distance education courses. Such a plan should be integrated with other college planning efforts and linked to the resource allocation process (I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.7, II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.7, II.A.8, II.B.3.c).

**Substantial Progress.** The College has developed and implemented a DE plan and has initiated the evaluation of DE and its alignment with the needs of its intended population and an assessment of instruction in compliance with the U.S. Department of Education. The systematic assessment of student learning and achievement outcomes for DE courses will be completed in the Spring of 2014. The DE plan is integrated with the other college planning efforts and will be linked to the resource allocation process.

| Recommendation 5: | To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college adopt mechanisms for assessing: student learning styles and needs, the alignment of instructional delivery and pedagogical approaches with student learning styles and needs, and how instructional delivery and pedagogical approaches are related to achievement of student learning outcomes (II.A.2.d).

**Completed.** The college has adopted mechanisms to assess student learning styles. First to define learning styles and needs for faculty to conduct an assessment in the spring of 2014. Second, the college established the *Eagle’s Nest*, a dedicated space with computers to conduct training on instructional delivery and pedagogical approaches related to achievement and student learning outcomes.

| Recommendation 6: | To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college develop a set of metrics and performance standards to better monitor the effectiveness of its planning and resource allocation decisions in achieving improvements in student learning (I.A.1, II.A.1, II.A.2.f).

**Completed:** The Budget and Planning Committee developed a set of metrics and performance standards to monitor the effectiveness of its planning and resource allocation decisions to achieve improvements in student learning. These metrics and performance standards will be utilized for the 14-15 resource allocation decisions in the spring of 2014.

| Recommendation 7: | To meet the Standards, the

**Completion in spring 2014.** The College conducted college wide faculty/staff and student surveys to...
team recommends the college undertake an overall assessment of its student support service offerings to determine the full scope of services it needs to offer to meet the diverse needs of its students as well as all federal and state requirements. The assessment should also determine the level of staffing needed to deliver an acceptable level of services based on its budgeted student enrollment, and develop the resources needed to employ the staff required to deliver the planned services. (II.B.1)

**Recommendation 8:** To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college develop and make available to visiting teams a report of student complaints/grievances that details the date of the complaint/grievance, the name of the individual filing the complaint/grievance, the nature of the complaint/grievance, the disposition of the complaint/grievance, and the date of the disposition. The report should cover a five year period and be updated annually. (II.B; II.B.2.c; II.B.3.a; II.B.4 ER 20)

**Completed.** A report of student complaints/grievances that meets all the requirements of the recommendations has been completed. The report covered a five year period. This report will be generated annually using an automated system of data collection created by the IT department to track the resolution of all student complaints/grievances.

**Recommendation 9:** To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college ensure that all student support programs, including counseling for distance education students, are actively engaged in the program review and outcomes assessment process to determine how they contribute to the institutional student learning outcomes. All of the student services programs and services should complete a full cycle of review and assessment which includes gathering of data, analysis of data, implementation of program changes for improvement and the re-evaluation of implemented improvements (II.B.3, II.B.3.c, and II.B.4).

**Completed in Spring 2014.** Student support programs completed their program reviews. An analysis of the program reviews and how student support services programs and units contribute to institutional learning outcomes will be completed in January. An annual analysis of program changes and services for improvement and re-evaluation will be implemented every spring semester beginning with 2014.

**Recommendation 10:** To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college assess how effective the collegiality efforts have been in promoting a productive collegial workplace, how it subscribes to, advocates, and demonstrates integrity in the treatment of all employees, and then implement improvements based on the outcomes of the...
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**Recommendation 11:** To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college integrate human resources planning into its institutional planning in order to maintain a sufficient number of qualified faculty, staff, and administrators to support the college’s mission, purposes and programs. (III.A.2, III.A.6)

**Completed.** A human resource plan was completed and an assessment of the sufficient number of qualified faculty, staff, and administrators to support the college’s mission, purposes and programs was conducted.

**Recommendation 12:** To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college determine the cost of maintaining and periodically replacing the technology acquired through grant funding and factor those costs into their established planning and budgeting process. (III.C.1.c, III.C.2; III.D.1.d)

**Completed.** The technology plan was discussed with the shared governance technology committee and the IT department. The replacement plan that will be factored into the institution’s budgeting process will be submitted in the spring of 2014.

**Recommendation 13:** To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college provide appropriate training to staff on the proper documentation procedures identified in the audit for: “To Be Arranged” (TBA) courses, eligibility verification for college categorical programs, and verification of census reporting documents. The college also must establish internal controls to ensure that audit findings are resolved prior to the subsequent audit. (III.D.2.a, III.D.2.d, III.D.2.e)

**Completed.** The TBA training was conducted last October and internal controls to resolve and prohibit future audit findings are in place.

**Recommendation 14:** To meet the Standards, the team recommends the college undertake an evaluation of its collegial governance and decision-making processes, as well as the overall effectiveness of the current administrative structure, and that it widely communicate the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement. (IV.A.5, IV.B.2.a)

**Completed.** The faculty/staff and Student Surveys provided the campus with an evaluation of the collegial governance, decision making and effectiveness of the current administrative structure. Again positive gains in collegiality were achieved. These results will be disseminated college wide in the spring of 2014.

## Conclusion:
Accreditation Executive Summary

It is important to note that continuous, sustainable systems are now in place to address these recommendations annually. Thus, additional work in the spring and fall of 2014 will yield more significant progress. In April, the visiting team will receive an update of the continued progress and action plans in place to complete the remainder of the recommendations, with an additional supplementary report to the Commission on May 15 to reveal even more progress. Although the College cannot speak for the Commission, LAMC expects that the Commission will be pleased with the significant work and advancements made and anticipate we will be removed from Warning status.