Los Angeles Mission College

Executive Summary of Current Status and Recommendations

**Date of last site visit:** April 24-25, 2014 (Follow-Up)

**Current status:** Reaffirmed

1. The College is following up on five ACCJC recommendations.
2. The College fully resolved nine recommendations after the last Evaluation Team follow-up visit (April 24-25, 2014).
3. A Follow-Up report addressing the remaining 5 recommendations is due to ACCJC by March 15, 2015.

**Background:**

After the March 2013 Accreditation Team visit, LAMC received 14 ACCJC recommendations and was placed on “warning” status. A follow-up report was due in March 2014 with a visit scheduled in April 2014. Following the April 2014 accreditation site visit, LAMC received an Action Letter dated July 3, 2014 in which the Commission communicated its action to **remove warning** and **reaffirm accreditation**. Furthermore, the Evaluation Team verified resolution of nine recommendations (recommendations 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12 and 13).

The College’s Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) continued to address the necessary actions to make improvements and finalize resolutions on the remaining 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. 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.

**Conclusion:**

It is important to note that continuous, sustainable systems are now in place to address these recommendations annually. Additional work, finalized in the spring 2015 semester, will resolve the deficiencies to meet the cited standards. In March, the visiting team will receive an update of the continued progress, established systems and remaining tasks and timeline to demonstrate complete resolution of the remaining recommendations by spring 2015. Although the College cannot speak for the Commission, LAMC expects that the Commission will be pleased with the progress and sustainable systems, and will reaffirm the College’s accreditation.
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ORGANIZATION OF THE FOLLOW-UP REPORT

Notification of Los Angeles Mission College warning status with the ACCJC was communicated to the campus on July 9, 2013. As noted in the Commission letter dated July 3, 2014, the College was removed from warning status and reaffirmed accreditation. As instructed, the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report, the External Evaluation Report, and Commission action letters were made available to all signatories, the LACCD Board of Trustees, the District Chancellor, College staff, and local community members through the college website.

Los Angeles Mission College began its preparation on this Follow-Up Report immediately following the visit by the site team in April 2014. Upon receipt of the Commission Action Letter dated July 3, 2014, the College developed a more focused approach to completing the Follow-Up Report. The College commissioned a Professional Services Contract to retain assistance from Matthew Lee, Ph.D., Special Projects Consultant for Higher Education, for the 2014-15 academic year. Dr. Lee worked with the Student Services Division to train and assist in Student Area Outcome development and assessment, as well as to strengthen a sustainable program review cycle that aligns with the college approved processes.

The Vice President of Academic Affairs, who serves as Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), is designated as the coordinator for this Follow-Up Report, along with the Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) Co-Chairs: Administrative Co-Chair, Daniel Villanueva; and Faculty Co-Chair, Kelly Enos. The ASC has broad representation, strong participation, and served as the primary committee for development of this document. The Committee met monthly throughout 2014, to review and discuss the timeline and updated progress of each recommendation.

The ASC assigned responsibility for each recommendation to the division Vice Presidents who monitored and reported progress while ensuring that the writing teams contained broad representation from faculty, staff, and administration. The writing teams met during the spring, summer, fall, and winter terms to oversee the progress of resolving the recommendations and organize the writing of the draft report. The administrators, ASC Co-Chairs, ALO and writing teams collaborated to ensure that the timelines were monitored, updated and adhered to, that processes were updated as necessary, and data and evidence collected. Progress of the recommendations and draft reports were presented and reviewed by the ASC writing team regularly. As drafts were reviewed and updated, they were made available on the campus share drive. In addition, evidence supporting each recommendation was gathered and posted on the College’s website. The final report was compiled and edited by the ASC Co-Chairs, the ALO, and the ASC writing team.

To keep the campus community informed about the status of the Follow-Up Report process, the President, in collaboration with ASC leadership, held Town Hall meetings and the Accreditation Steering Committee made monthly reports to the Educational Planning Committee, Academic Senate, and College Council. The opportunity to review the final draft of the Follow-up Report for accuracy and evidence review was made available to the campus community. Minor changes were recommended and incorporated.

The Los Angeles Community College District, Board of Trustees Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee met with the College’s ASC on February 2, 2015 and were apprised of the process and progress of the Follow-Up Report. The final Accreditation Follow-up Report was approved by College Council on January 29, 2015 and the Academic Senate on February 5, 2015. The Board of Trustees approved the final Accreditation Follow-Up Report on February 11, 2015.
COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 2

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, ER 10).

PROGRESS IN ADDRESSING THE RECOMMENDATION

The College has strengthened and fully implemented its broad-based, comprehensive system for assessing student learning and achievement outcomes to ensure the continual improvement of student learning and institutional processes. There is college wide engagement in these processes, and the results are broadly distributed and discussed.

Update on SLO, PLO, and ILO Outcomes Assessment

The College has accelerated its efforts to assess outcomes in all courses, programs, degrees and certificates. The College has worked diligently to assess its Course, Program, and Institutional Learning Outcomes and to have meaningful discussions about the results and plans for improvement (2.1). Los Angeles Mission College has now assessed 100% of its PLOs (90 programs with 213 PLOs) and has assessed 99% of its active (those offered within the last two years) course SLOs (2.2). All seven ILOs have been assessed twice (2.3). These numbers demonstrate the College’s substantial progress in these areas.

Course Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

In fall 2014, 486 course assessments and 213 of Program Learning Outcome (PLO) assessments (2.4) were completed. In spring 2014, 279 course assessments were completed and 186 in fall 2013) (2.5). All assessment results since 2011 are posted on the Los Angeles Mission College SLO Online System. These statistics demonstrate the acceleration in assessments and show that departments are actively engaged in the outcomes assessment process. Progress has been assisted by the Vice President of Academic Affairs, who is now beginning his third year at Los Angeles Mission College, the hiring of two academic deans, and a research analyst to assist the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness. A subcommittee of Council of Instruction was formed in September 2014 to establish a policy to ensure that all faculty members are engaged in the outcomes assessment process and are meeting timelines...
(2.6). The policy specifies how guidance will be provided to departments that are not meeting their deadlines and delineates consequences for continued noncompliance (2.7).

**Program Learning Outcomes Assessment**

The College recognized the need to focus significant attention on the assessment of PLOs. In spring of 2014, the College had 95 programs and 292 PLOs. Of these 95 programs, 63 (66.3%) of them had had at least one PLO assessed (2.8). As a result of a concerted effort by department chairs, Los Angeles Mission College now has assessed 100% of its PLOs (2.9). This improvement is the result of several steps. In the spring and fall of 2014, the SLO Coordinators worked with departments to streamline the number of their PLOs and archive those that were no longer relevant. In addition, the SLO online system was augmented in the fall of 2014 with Program Learning Outcome screens (2.10) and faculty members were able to link each program outcome to its supporting course SLOs and assessments. The rubric average from all the related SLO assessments is calculated and displayed to aid in the analysis of each PLO (2.11). This has enabled department chairs to do “roll-up” assessments based on the related course SLO assessments (2.12). To create a PLO roll-up assessment, the course assessments that support a PLO are selected for a time period (e.g., three years). A cumulative rubric average is calculated to help determine if the PLO Benchmark was met. The assessor then examines the rubric average, supporting reports, analyses, and rubric summaries for that time period. Similar to the SLO screens, textboxes have been added so that chairs can report the PLO assessment results, analyze the results, recommend improvements, and request resource allocations. In addition to the roll-up method, PLOs are also assessed by using surveys, interviews, and portfolios of students’ cumulative work.

Reducing the number of PLOs from 292 to 213, along with the additional online components (including supporting course assessment links for each PLO), made it possible for department chairs to complete any previously-unassessed program outcomes. This accomplishment illustrates the concerted effort that chairs made to accelerate the assessment of their Program Learning Outcomes. Cross-curriculum assessments have been examined to ensure meaningful results that focus on the program as a whole. The PLO Assessment Schedule (2.11) has been reviewed and revised and is further evidence of ongoing assessment.

**Improvements Implemented as a Result of 2014 Assessments**

Some improvement highlights implemented as a result of 2014 assessments are listed below. A more complete list is posted on the SLO website (2.12):

- More time has been spent going over areas in which students need to improve, such as how to fill in particular contracts in Law classes; some topics have been eliminated in other classes; and others added to strengthen the important concepts.
- Additional handouts, PowerPoint presentations, exercise materials, in-class assignments and activities have been added to English, ESL, and Computer Application classes to enable students to have more opportunities to practice required skills.
• Assignments are being paced more evenly over the semester and assignments related to the course outcomes are often now introduced earlier.
• More group work has been assigned along with shared writing.
• More model examples of assignments and practice have been provided before an assignment is due, which gives students opportunities to redo and refine final versions before submitting them; rubrics are more frequently distributed and discussed when an assignment is given.
• Time management strategies are being emphasized, especially for first-time college students.
• More peer review is being emphasized before completed assignments are due.
• Online interactive systems are being used as an alternative to the standard textbook to incorporate more video lectures and testing materials.
• Student engagement has been encouraged by incorporating both technology and changes in pedagogy to enable more in-class collaboration and discussion, as opposed to lecture-style approach.

Course and Program assessments are both posted on the SLO online system and summarized in each semester’s department chair reports, which are posted on the SLO website (2.13). As of January 22, 2015, 431 courses have been assessed more than once (2.14). It should be noted, however, that this number reflects only the assessments posted on the online system from 2012 to the present. Previously (2007-2012), records of numbers of assessments conducted were kept on Excel spreadsheets; the yearly summaries of these are posted on the SLO website (2.15). Hard copies of the assessments are kept by department chairs and representative samples are filed in the SLO Coordinator’s Office. The LAMC SLO/PLO Online System was developed beginning in 2008, and began to be implemented in 2010 for the purposes of having a more effective means of keeping track of assessments and enabling the College to do automated reports efficiently.

Most SLO assessments include recommendations for improvement. However, some do not. For example, if the rubric average on the assessment was sufficiently high, faculty members often felt that the best way to ensure successful outcomes was to continue doing what was working. If a recommendation for improvement was made, the next time the course was assessed, a follow-up textbox appeared in the system with a request for information on the results of the implementation of the improvement. Three hundred forty-one courses have documented results of implemented changes (2.16) and reassessment, and thus have gone through a full assessment cycle of implementing changes and documenting improvements based on those changes.

ILO Assessments

Los Angeles Mission College’s seven ILOs have been assessed and the results are posted on the SLO website (2.17). The seven ILOs were assessed in 2011 using a student survey; this
was followed by an additional assessment of each individual ILO. The last ILO to complete assessment was Information Competency. It was assessed in the spring of 2014 and the report of the results and recommendations for improvement were completed in the summer of 2014 (2.18, 2.19). The results and recommendations from the assessment were discussed at the Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (LOAC) (2.20). During the fall of 2014, a task force met to plan a follow-up assessment of the Information Competency ILO in the spring 2015 semester (2.21). ILO assessment links have also been added to the SLO assessment section. Thus, when a faculty member creates a new assessment or modifies an existing assessment, he/she is required to select at least one of the ILOs that were assigned to the SLO when it was created (2.22, 2.24). This will allow for ILO “roll-up” assessments based on related course assessments. This involves examining a representative sample of related course SLO assessments to determine if the students achieved the ILO and met the established benchmark. Previous ILO assessment results were discussed in the taskforces that conducted them and were posted on the SLO Web page (2.21, 2.22, 2.23). During LOAC meetings, follow-up discussions and planning for the next assessments took place (2.20, 2.21).

Discussion and Distribution of Assessment Results

Since the College’s 2014 Follow-Up Report was written, two college wide events have provided venues for broad-based discussion of assessment results and assistance with posting the results on the online system: the Spring 2014 PLO Assessment Retreat held on May 2 (2.25) and the 2nd Annual SLO Summit held on October 17, 2014 (2.26). Forty-two people attended the spring retreat (2.27) and over ninety faculty and administrators attended the 2nd Annual SLO Summit (2.27). As a result of these events and the administrative support from a fully-staffed Office of Academic Affairs, LAMC has now assessed 100% percent of its programs (2.28, 2.29).

A survey on Student Learning Differences (2.30) was conducted in the fall of 2014. One of the questions on the survey was “Indicate any forums/venues where you engaged in dialogue about meaningful assessment practices and/or how to improve pedagogy and student learning during Fall 2014, including sharing successful practices with colleagues.” Forums/venues that were identified included the Fall 2014 Flex Day, informal discussions on campus, department/discipline meetings, the Fall 2014 SLO Summit, conferences/outside events, Eagle’s Nest activities, shared governance committee meetings, and LACCD District meetings and events.

Another means by which assessment results were distributed were the summaries of the results reported in the Spring 2014 Program Review and the department chairs’ Spring 2014 and Fall 2014 SLO/PLO Summary Reports. These were distributed and discussed at the LOAC, Academic Senate, and Council of Instruction (COI) meetings, as well as at department meetings and Career and Technical Education program advisory committee
meetings. Results were also discussed at the 2nd Annual SLO Summit held on October 17, 2014 (2.31). Discussion at these venues ensured broad-based distribution of results and college wide engagement.

**Internal Quality Controls**

The SLO Coordinators, department chairs, deans, and vice presidents review their respective areas to assist with quality control. In analyzing the program review processes at Los Angeles Mission College, the Program Review Oversight Committee (PROC) devised a process whereby a systematic review of all academic affairs program reviews is completed by the deans of academic affairs who, in turn, provide feedback to department chairs prior to the commencement of the next program review cycle. The deans’ reviews also are reported to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, who then provides a summary (in SWOT analysis form) of the major planning objectives and resource requests to PROC, which in turn reports the findings to the College Council (2.32).

To ensure internal quality:

- The online SLO/PLO/ILO reporting system and SLO website continue to be refined; the systems have been evaluated to correct any inconsistencies.
- Benchmarks for student success have been established for each SLO/PLO/ILO (2.33).
- The six-year master schedules (two three-year cycles) for assessment of all learning outcomes have been updated for the academic areas (2.34). These schedules also are linked in the program review template for ease of reference, and they are posted on the SLO website.
- Checkboxes have been added to the Program Review template for chairs to indicate whether an objective that has been created is related to improving their SLOs and or PLOs, and if so, it is given more weight when allocation of resources is being considered (2.35).
- A means to archive previous, but no longer used, SLOs and their assessments has been created in the online SLO system for historical documentation purposes (2.36).
- An addendum to the Course Outline of Record (COR) (2.37) was created and modified over the summer of 2014 to make it easier to update SLOs and to fast-track the changes through the curriculum process to ensure consistency of the CORs with the course syllabi.

**Role of the Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (LOAC)**

The LOAC is the primary coordination and communication body for the outcomes cycle at Los Angeles Mission College. It met 23 times between fall 2013 and fall 2014 (2.38). This Committee is co-chaired by the SLO Coordinator and the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness. All committee meetings are well attended. Almost all academic departments are represented, and representatives from the Student Services and Administrative Services areas participate in the meetings. LOAC and PROC met jointly three times during spring 2014 to collaborate.
on creating recommendations for the creation of a structure and process that would more strongly integrate SLO assessments and student learning improvements with institutional planning and resource allocations. Agendas and minutes of these meetings are posted on the College SLO website (2.38).

LOAC helped to plan and conduct the May 2, 2014 PLO Assessment Retreat and the 2nd Annual SLO Summit on October 17, 2014. The PLO retreat and SLO summits have provided further opportunities for cross-disciplinary dialog, as well as supplied venues for sharing assessment results and ideas and plans for improvement. Departmental and informal discussions among faculty have continued (2.39, 2.40).

**Student Achievement Outcomes Assessment and Standards**

Assessment of student achievement outcomes is an integral part of the program review process. The existing program review self-evaluation process was expanded to include the evaluation of programs in comparison with institution-set standards. The Program Review Online System was enhanced in spring 2014 to incorporate the institution-set standards for successful course completion and retention rates, and each discipline received data to evaluate the percentage of total college certificates and degrees it has awarded each year (in addition to the number awarded annually). This data was analyzed as part of the program review process. In addition, disciplines were asked to evaluate their levels of performance in relation to the institution-set standards, to develop strategies and/or interventions to be implemented to bring about improvement in the achievement outcomes where needed, and to assess the effectiveness of any implemented strategies and interventions (2.41, 2.42, 2.43). The academic deans and Educational Planning Committee (EPC) further evaluated all departments’ fall 2013 and spring 2014 program reviews. For departments that completed comprehensive program reviews, EPC applied its validation process, which resulted in commendations and recommendations to the department chairs. For the rest of the departments, the academic deans prepared a Strengths/Weaknesses/Opportunities/Threats (SWOT) analysis based upon program review annual updates (2.44). This information was then discussed with the appropriate department chairs and the Vice President of Academic Affairs.
At the institutional level, the College has established an annual process to review the institution-set standards and the College’s performance as compared to the standards (2.45), which was implemented in fall 2014. A sub-committee of the Academic Senate was provided with data regarding College’s performance on each of the student achievement outcomes (successful course completion, course retention, fall-to-fall persistence, degrees, certificates, and transfers) for the last five (or in some cases, six) years from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE). The data were disaggregated by different student characteristics and by program (where appropriate). The OIE also provided the sub-committee with data regarding the performance of the state averages for related student achievement outcomes from the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Data Mart so that trends and performance levels could be compared (2.46). The OIE met with the sub-committee on December 9, 2014 to review the data and evaluate the College’s performance with respect to the institution-set standards, draw conclusions about College progress and reasons for any identified trends/changes in performance, and make preliminary recommendations regarding the standards themselves, goals for improvement, and actions that may be taken to bring about improvement in student achievement (2.47, 2.48). These conclusions and preliminary recommendations have been shared with the Educational Planning Committee and Council of Instruction for their feedback. Based on this feedback, the subcommittee of the Academic Senate will refine its recommendations and submit them in spring 2015 to the College Council, which will make its final recommendations to the President.

Conclusion

The College has fully resolved Recommendation 2. It has continued to improve its institutionalized and sustainable process of ongoing outcomes assessment, use of results to improve pedagogy, recommend improvements, and allocate resources. It has substantially accelerated its assessment progress. One hundred percent (100%) of Program Learning Outcomes and Institutional Learning Outcomes have been assessed, as well as 99% of active course Student Learning Outcomes. Documented improvements in student learning have been demonstrated as a result of implementing changes based on assessment results. Furthermore, processes have been devised to ensure timely completion and high quality assessments. The College has engaged its members in discussing outcomes assessment results and has broadly distributed those results to improve student learning and achievement.
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College Recommendation 2

2.1 Spring and Fall Department Chairs’ SLO/PLO Summary Reports and LOAC Minutes 2013-2014
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2.3 SLO Web page – ILO Assessments Reports
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2.5 SLO Excel Report Generated by Web Architect
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2.12 Screenshot of Linked SLO Assessment from the SLO Online System
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2.16 See 2.2 – Excel Spreadsheet Prepared by Web Architect – PLO and SLO Assessments re. Follow-Up Textbox Summary
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2.29 See 2.7 – Excel Spreadsheet Prepared by Web Architect – PLO Assessments
2.30 Findings from the Follow-Up Survey on Student Learning Differences, January 2015
2.31 Minutes of LOAC, Senate, and COI Meetings; Department Meeting Minutes; Advisory Meeting Minutes
2.32 Program Review SWOT Analysis
2.33 LOAC Minutes re. Benchmarks and Screenshots of SLO Online System
2.34 Link to SLO Web Page – Six-Year Master Assessment Schedules
2.35 Screenshot of Program Review Template – Checkbox
2.36 Screen Shot from the SLO Online System re. Archived SLOs
2.37 Addendum to Course Outline of Record (COR)
2.38 Link to SLO Webpage – LOAC Agendas for Fall 2013, Spring 2014, and Fall 2014
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2.40 Link to SLO Webpage – LOAC Agendas and Minutes – Joint PROC/LOAC Meetings
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COLLEGE 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).

PROGRESS IN ADDRESSING THE RECOMMENDATION

The College has institutionalized mechanisms for providing faculty with guidance and opportunities for dialog about connecting pedagogical approaches to student learning styles and needs and improving student learning outcomes. Because of these mechanisms, there is use of these processes across a wide array of departments as they strive to improve pedagogy and student learning based on their students’ specific learning styles needs.

In the spring of 2014, the College’s Office of Institutional Effectiveness conducted a survey on the assessment and application of student learning differences (5.1). As a result of that survey, Los Angeles Mission College adopted the following working definition of how to address student learning styles and needs: “Adapting your materials, pedagogy or content to take into consideration your student’s different abilities, background, knowledge, and interests.” The survey responses indicated that the majority of faculty members use a variety of methods to determine student learning styles and needs, including classroom discussions, individual student meetings, non-graded classroom assessment techniques, and other in-class learning assessments (5.2). Using the survey’s findings, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, in collaboration with the Academic Senate leadership and the Library, embarked on initiatives to provide resources and training opportunities designed to assist faculty members in investigating and utilizing various strategies to assist their students in achieving student learning outcomes.

In April 2014 the Eagle’s Nest, a faculty resource center, was officially opened (5.3). The Eagle’s Nest provides a forum for interdisciplinary research/discussions centered on student learning outcomes assessment and improvement, development of innovative curriculum, and alternate modes of delivery (pedagogy) to improve both teaching and student learning. The Eagle’s Nest aims to promote a culture of informed, committed, engaged faculty through training, workshops, conferences, community building, and other resources. In September 2014, the Academic Senate and Vice President of Academic Affairs interviewed potential candidates to serve as the Eagle’s Nest Coordinator (5.4, 5.5). Two full-time faculty members were selected to co-coordinate the Eagle’s Nest (5.6). The Academic Senate compensates each of these faculty members with 0.1 reassigned time (5.7). To date,
the co-coordinators have developed a robust and comprehensive webpage (http://libguides.lamission.edu/eaglesnestfacultyresources, 5.8) containing active links to videos, websites, and print resources related to student learning styles and pedagogy (5.9).

During the fall 2014 semester, the Eagle’s Nest sponsored eight faculty professional development opportunities designed to promote this new faculty resource and to train faculty members on how they can more effectively align instructional delivery and pedagogical approaches with identified student learning styles and needs (5.10). Among the sessions were a workshop on addressing learning styles and needs in online courses and a special brown-bag lunch in which faculty discussed relating student learning styles and needs to pedagogical approaches with the Vice President of Academic Affairs (5.11). To date, nearly 100 faculty members have participated in the Eagle’s Nest activities (5.12). Furthermore, the co-coordinators of the Eagle’s Nest are developing the spring 2015 schedule of events based on the results of the fall 2014 follow-up survey described below.

In the fall of 2014, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness administered a follow-up survey on student learning differences to the faculty (5.13). The survey included the following questions:

- Have you taken student learning styles and needs into account in your classes for fall 2014?
- What primary methods did you use to assess differences in student learning styles and needs in Fall 2014?
- What change(s) did you make to your pedagogical approach(es) based on your students’ different learning styles and needs?
- How did these changes improve your students’ learning outcomes?
- Please indicate any forum/venues where you engaged in dialogue about meaningful assessment practices and/or how to improve pedagogy and student learning during Fall 2014, including sharing successful practices with colleagues.
- Please enter any additional comments you have related to student learning styles and needs at LAMC.

Survey respondents included full-time and adjunct faculty representing 20 different disciplines/areas. The survey results were very positive: 95% of the respondents reported that, while teaching their fall 2014 courses, they had taken student learning styles and needs into account. The survey responses indicated that faculty employed the following primary methods to assess student learning styles and needs:

- Classroom discussions
- Exams or essays administered before mid-term exams
- Non-graded classroom assessment techniques or “learning checks”
- Individual meetings with students
Based on the results of these assessments, the faculty made several changes to their pedagogical approaches to better meet the identified student learning styles and needs. Some pedagogical changes cited by faculty include the following:

- The use of on-line materials to enhance students’ understanding of concepts presented in the classroom
- Altering the pace and/or order of the material being presented in the classroom
- Assigning small groups of students to collaborate on the achievement of specific competencies
- Providing class time to practice newly introduced concepts and skills presented in the lecture
- Requiring students to submit metacognitive logs that highlight their interpretation of important concepts from assigned readings

These pedagogical changes, such as those noted above, resulted in enhancements of student learning. In general, faculty reported an improvement in class attendance and student engagement, interest in course material, and use of critical thinking. Most importantly, faculty communicated that the changes in pedagogy resulted in a variety of student learning outcome improvements such as:

- An elevated ability to identify and explain a literary issue in proving a thesis
- An improved understanding and performance on laboratory reports and assessments
- An enhanced ability to compose a college-level argument with supporting evidence
- An improved ability to thoughtfully organize concepts and ideas

In addition, 50% or more of the survey’s respondents revealed that they utilized the following forums for engaging in dialogue on how best to improve student learning and pedagogy:

- Fall 2014 Flex Day
- Informal campus discussions
- Department/discipline meetings
- Fall 2014 SLO Summit
- Conferences/outside events

To further augment the Eagle’s Nest budget, the College requested and received designation as an eligible institution under Title III and Title V programs of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Once the Department of Education publishes its 2015-16 Strengthening Institutions Program (SIP) Request For Applications, the College will compete for funds that will supplement and strengthen faculty professional development activities (5.15 a-b) by providing additional training materials, workshops and resources related to aligning instructional delivery and pedagogical approaches with student learning styles and needs.
With the goal of more actively engaging the faculty in meaningful assessment practices, and approaches to addressing student learning styles and needs, the College held its Second Annual SLO Summit on October 17, 2014 (5.16, 5.17, 5.18). It was attended by over 90 College faculty and staff members. During the Vice President of Academic Affairs’ welcome, he stressed the importance of significant dialogue in developing an integrated and valuable outcomes-assessment cycle, and how educators define explicit expectations so that students can demonstrate what should be learned at the end of a course or program of study (5.19). The Summit’s agenda included a presentation by Dr. Bob Pacheco, the Assessment Chair of the Resource and Planning Group for California Community Colleges. Dr. Pacheco’s presentation, entitled “Evaluating Assessment Findings and Closing the Loop,” included information and practical exercises on conducting meaningful and high quality assessments. The agenda also provided dedicated time for department/discipline faculty members to discuss the effectiveness of previous student learning outcome assessments and how assessments should be used to improve pedagogical strategies and student learning. Participant evaluations of the Summit were extremely positive (5.20).

At the discipline/departmental level, faculty have increasingly applied the information and approaches they learned in the Eagle’s Nest, the Summit, and other experiences focused on addressing specific student needs to the classroom experience of students, for example:

• Sociology Discipline utilizes FLEX day as well as other scheduled department and discipline meetings to review and discuss SLO assessment results. As a result of these meetings, the department has instituted several pedagogical changes to increase student success (5.21).

• Culinary Arts Discipline shared with the advisory board, including faculty and industry and community representatives, their program outcomes and assessment results, which were discussed to assist with the implementation of curriculum changes (5.22).

• Child Development Department had numerous meetings throughout the fall and summer sessions to address course content and SLO and PLO assessment quality (5.23).

• Arts/Media/Humanities Department meets monthly as a department and regularly, as disciplines, throughout the academic year. Based on the discussion and results, multiple pedagogical changes have been made at the course and program levels (5.24).

In further demonstrating the College’s commitment to aligning student learning styles and needs with appropriate pedagogical approaches, the Vice President of Academic Affairs has required the following desired qualification on every new faculty position job announcement:

“Respond to various student learning styles by utilizing a variety of teaching strategies” (5.25). It is now standard practice to have the Vice President of Academic Affairs present at each screening committee’s first meeting in order to more fully describe this desired qualification (5.26).
Conclusion

Since its last Follow-Up Report, Los Angeles Mission College has made great progress and has fully resolved recommendation 5. The faculty actively analyzes the relationship among student learning styles and needs, instructional delivery and pedagogical approaches, and achievement of student learning outcomes, using both quantitative and qualitative evidence, and improve those outcomes based on the analysis. Furthermore, systems are in place to ensure that student learning assessments and assessment reports are meaningful and are of high quality, and numerous institutionalized venues and professional growth opportunities are provided on an on-going basis that allow for widespread dialog about how to improve student learning and pedagogy and for sharing successful practices with colleagues. These efforts have resulted in the regular review and improvement of pedagogies and student learning outcomes.
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COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 7

To meet the Standards, the 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; ER 14).

PROGRESS IN ADDRESSING THE RECOMMENDATION

During academic year 2013-2014, the College undertook a systematic and detailed analysis of its student support service offerings to determine the full scope of services it needed to meet the diverse needs of its students, and comply with all federal and state requirements. The analysis identified gaps in services and the staffing needed to implement its planned services (7.1-7.9). Execution of a two-year Staffing Plan, as recommended by College Council and approved by the College President, commenced in spring 2014 (7.10, 7.11). The College has allocated fiscal resources from its base budget and categorical funding to satisfy the identified student services staffing deficiencies.

The service and staffing gaps that were identified included: the need for additional counselors and counseling hours; added staff in Admissions & Records, the Assessment Center, and Outreach and Recruitment; and management in Student Services to supervise the new Student Success and Support Program (3SP), and assist in the delivery of services that are critical to increasing student achievement. In accordance with the following chart, phase I of the Student Services Action Plan will be completed by the end of spring 2015:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Notice Of Intent (NOI)Submitted</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Gap Filled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Dean of Student Success</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>December 08, 2014</td>
<td>Provides leadership and supervision for Student Success initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(formerly listed as Dean of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services) (7.12a-c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Student Services Aide</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>December 15, 2014</td>
<td>Provides extended hours in the Assessment Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(formerly listed as Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Assistant) (7.13a-c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Outreach and Recruitment</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>July 14, 2014</td>
<td>Provides comprehensive coordination of campus outreach effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator (7.14a-c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions and Records Evaluation Technician (7.15a-c)</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>July 28, 2014</td>
<td>Provides a second A&amp;R evaluator responsible for processing graduation petitions and records evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Two Limited Term (one year)</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
<td>First level interviews: week of February 2, 2015</td>
<td>Provide counseling appointments to meet the Student Success Initiative mandates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors (7.16a-c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Second level interviews: week of February 9, 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*General Counselor (7.17a-c)</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>February 9, 2015</td>
<td>Provides additional counseling hours for student advisement, student educational plan development and general counseling support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation Officer/Counselor</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>First level interviews: February 25-26, 2015</td>
<td>Provides support in general counseling and continued articulation support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.18a-c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Second level interviews: March 4, 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Counselors (approximately 1.5 FTEF)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>All adjunct assignments offered for hourly counseling through the Counseling Department Seniority List</td>
<td>Provide support to extend the Department’s evening hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014-Spring 2015 (7.19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Associate Dean of Disabled</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
<td>First level interviews: February 17-18, 2015</td>
<td>Provides the mandatory, consistent, and stable leadership for this student population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Program and Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Second level interviews: February 25, 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.20a-c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anticipated start date: March 16, 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid Supervisor (Evening)</td>
<td>Not submitted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The Financial Aid Office made arrangements for a current staff person to fill this gap.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Execution of phase II of the two-year staffing plan, as recommended by College Council and approved by the College President, will commence, and all personnel appointments will be made in spring 2015 for fiscal year 2015-2016 start dates (7.10). In accordance with the Plan, the College will fill the following positions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Gap Filled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*New International/Veterans Counselor</td>
<td>Provides counseling services to international students and veterans, in support of the College Student Equity Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*New Career/Transfer Center Counselor (7.21)</td>
<td>Provides additional counseling appointments for transfer-bound students and formalizes career counseling services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Student Support Services Representative (7.22)</td>
<td>Provides general and procedural information and guidance to the office of Admissions and Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*New Student Services Specialist</td>
<td>Provides the office of DSP&amp;S with additional student services support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Office Assistant</td>
<td>Provides clerical support for the Associated Student Organization/Student Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*New One Career Guidance and Counseling Assistant (7.23)</td>
<td>Provides the office of Outreach and Recruitment counseling-related support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub and Relief Support (7.24)</td>
<td>Provides the offices of Admissions and Records and Financial Aid with technical support during high-volume registration periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Assistant (7.25)</td>
<td>Provides clerical support for the growing International/Veterans Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By aligning future data gathering through the use of student/staff surveys and focus groups that are aligned with the College’s comprehensive program review cycle, the Division of Student Services will assess and evaluate the effectiveness of the Student Services Plan objectives. Through the shared governance process, the Vice President of Student Services, in consultation with the Student Support Services Committee, will recommend any appropriate changes needed to maintain and enhance an appropriate level of services to support student success inside and outside of the classroom. In addition, when applicable, Student Services units (e.g. EOPS, DSPS, Financial Aid, Student Support Services Program (TRiO), and Matriculation (now identified at Student Success and Support Program) will continue to submit timely annual reports to those State or Federal agencies that fund or regulate their respective programs, so as to maintain compliance with all mandated regulations (7.26).
Conclusion

The College has fully resolved this recommendation and has met ER 14. The College undertook a systematic and detailed analysis of its services and offerings, determined the full scope of services needed to meet the diverse needs of its students, and investigated its compliance with applicable State and Federal regulations. A comprehensive Student Services Action Plan to ensure appropriate staffing levels was developed and adopted. Phase I of the Student Service Action Plan has been completed, and mechanisms are in place to complete Phase II by the end of spring 2015. The College has augmented its personnel to meet the diverse needs of its students in order to deliver an acceptable and sustainable level of service.
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COLLEGE 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).

PROGRESS IN ADDRESSING THE RECOMMENDATION

To ensure that all units were scheduled to engage in a consistent and sustainable program review process, the Student Support Services Committee reported to College Council its decision to conduct comprehensive program reviews (CPR) for all units within the division (9.1). Completing all the CPRs in Student Services would also enable the division to revise, update, and/or propose new SAOs; assess them; implement program improvements; and conduct a re-evaluation of program improvements. In order to fully engage the Student Services division in the College’s outcomes-assessment process and complete a full cycle of assessment for all of its units, significant measures were taken to assist Student Services with the alignment to and completion of a common, campus wide comprehensive program review cycle.

With the support of the College President, a consultant was hired to advise the Student Services Division by providing an overview of the purpose and importance of the program review and outcomes cycle processes. The consultant also assisted the Division in creating a sustainable methodology for the completion of comprehensive program reviews and sound validation of program reviews and Service Area Outcomes (SAOs). In an effort to support the units in this accelerated process, the College President created a Student Services Task Force (SSTF) (9.2), the membership of which included faculty, staff and administrators from the Student Services Division. The SSTF was charged to assist Student Services with the alignment of the program review and SAO processes. The SSTF met with the consultant several times prior to training the entire Student Services staff in order to establish a training plan for the Student Services Division. The training session for all Student Services staff occurred on April 17, 2014 (9.3). The training was extremely successful and resulted in the following outcomes (9.4, 9.5):

- All unit members of Student Services acquired a more in-depth understanding of the overall importance of program review.
- A timeline was established to ensure completion of all comprehensive program reviews in Student Services in 2014 (9.6).
• An evaluation and validation/rubric form was created for use in the program review process (9.7).

Members of the SSTF continued to work with the Student Services units and departments to implement the cycle of SAO assessments, analyze data, program changes, and re-evaluate program improvements in the spring of 2015, and plan to do so every semester thereafter.

Following the Student Services Division training, the SSTF continued to meet with the consultant three additional times in May 2014 (9.8). The SSTF was charged with mentoring and supporting the managers and directors of all Student Services units in the completion of their comprehensive program reviews and SAO assessments. Each member of the SSTF was assigned specific units to mentor, and charged with ensuring that all Student Services comprehensive program reviews be completed and validated by August 30, 2014 (9.9, 9.10). The members of the SSTF helped clarify questions unit members had about the new process, and were instrumental in the development of improved SAOs. The new processes created during training sessions were utilized and all deadlines were met, with the completion of all comprehensive program reviews by June 30, 2014 (9.11).

The SSTF also trained the Student Support Services Committee (SSSC) on the newly-established validation process developed as a result of the trainings with the consultant. The S SSCC members were divided into teams to carry out, using the established template, the validation process (9.12). The validation teams were responsible for the following:

• Meeting with each director/chair/supervisor to review his/her CPR and provide feedback
• Utilizing the new template to complete the CPR validation
• Reporting out completed validations to the SSSC, who then met with each department’s director/chair/supervisor (9.10)
• Providing an official letter presenting the results of the CPR, which included commendations and recommendations, to each director/chair/supervisor (9.11)

Upon completion of the validations, the Comprehensive Program Review Validation Forms were posted on the Student Services website (9.9). Each unit participated in and completed a uniform validation process by August 27, 2014 (9.13).

Throughout the summer of 2014, in addition to the CPR process, Student Services was able to review, revise and, when applicable, archive all Student Service Division SAOs. (9.14). The Student Services Division completed a full cycle of assessment, and implemented program changes. For the CPRs completed by Student Services, half of the SAOs were assessed at the end of the fall semester. The remaining half will be assessed by the end of the spring 2015 semester (9.14). The units that assessed their SAOs in the fall semester utilized that information to develop program improvement plans for implementation in spring 2015. This process will be repeated for those units assessing SAOs in the spring 2015. Beginning spring 2015, five departments will undergo the process of Comprehensive Program Review
each year so that, moving forward, all Student Services units will undergo a CPR once every three years (9.15, 9.16). The completion of all CPRs during the summer 2014 and SAO assessments during the fall 2014 and spring 2015 now aligns the Student Service Division with the College-approved program review and SAO cycle (9.17). The Student Services Division has established a sustainable system to complete the cycle of SAO assessments (9.18, 9.19, 9.20).

As part of assessing the College’s Distance Education (DE) Plan, the DE Committee assessed counseling and support services for DE students in fall 2014 (9.21). In addition, based on available data from the LACCD District wide Student Survey that was conducted in fall 2014 with both DE and on-campus students, the percentage of online students that were dissatisfied with LAMC’s counseling services (17.8%) did not significantly differ from that of students that completed the survey in their on-campus classes (17.5%) (9.22, 9.23). This result suggests that, for the most part, DE students are receiving adequate counseling services, comparable to those of on-campus students, although room for improvement still exists. Thus, the Counseling Department is actively collaborating with the Distance Education Committee to discuss the merits and practical applications of e-counseling and other online services that are already being piloted in other areas of the College (9.24, 9.25). Using the data from the DE Plan evaluation, and to better address the needs of our DE students, the Counseling Department has developed an SAO focused on online counseling services (9.26). Through this collaboration, the Counseling Department met on December 11, 2014 to discuss pilot projects, including costs, customization, and training (9.27). The Department has piloted Anymeeting.com, and will be reviewing several others to determine the platform that best fits the needs of the College DE program (9.28). It is anticipated that online counseling services will be made available to students by April 2015.

Effective September 2014 and November of 2014, the College President re-assigned management of the Assessment Center and the Child Development Center, respectively, to the Vice President of Academic Affairs (9.28). Since the program review specifics between Student Services and Academic Affairs differ, Academic Affairs will now work with these two units to ensure completion of SAOs and compliance with the program review process.

Conclusion

The Student Services (SS) division of the College has fully resolved this recommendation. All Student Services units have completed a full cycle of comprehensive program review and will complete the full cycle of SAO assessment and improvement by the end of spring 2015. With the guidance of the SSSC and the SSTF, the College has developed a sustainable comprehensive program review and validation process, as well as a scheduled timeline, for SAO assessments. In addition, the Counseling Department and DE Committee will address the need for DE counseling services by April 2015. These processes and services ensure continuous improvement of Student Services’ programs to align with approved College processes and benefit student achievement and success.
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COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 14

To meet the standards, the team recommends the college undertake an evaluation of 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 of improvement (IV.A.5, IV.B.2.a).

PROGRESS IN ADDRESSING THE RECOMMENDATION

Enhancement of Administrative Structure

Organizational effectiveness is critical to the success of the College. The College recognizes that vacancies in the administrative structure hinder the ability to manage the College’s Mission efficiently. Since the last ACCJC team visit in April 2014, the previously-vacant Dean of Academic Affairs position, responsible for overseeing curriculum, has been filled, and the administrative structure has been expanded by the hiring of a new Dean of Student Success (14.1a-f). The hiring of an Associate Dean of Disabled Students Programs and Services is underway, with an anticipated start date of March 16, 2015 (14.2a-c). The two new Dean hires were widely announced to the campus community (14.3a-b), and have made significant contributions to the College’s Mission, vision, and purpose. Indeed, based on the results of the 2014 Faculty/Staff Survey, the campus community has recognized the increase in administrative leadership when compared to fall 2013, as the percentage of Fall 2014 Faculty/Staff Survey respondents that “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the statement, “There is a sufficient number of administrators to support the College’s mission and purpose” was 65%, as compared to 56% in 2013 (14.4a-d). Faculty, supervisors, and department chairs also indicated in the fall 2014 focus groups (described in more detail below) that, due to the new hires in Academic Affairs and Student Services, the administrative structure has improved (14.5). In addition, since the last ACCJC team visit, there have been no changes in administrative leadership at the College, creating increased stability in governance and institutional effectiveness.

Communication of Collegial Governance and Decision Making Processes

Shared governance at Los Angeles Mission College operates through a collaborative decision making process, and ensures the campus constituencies – administration, faculty, staff, and students - participate in the development of campus policies (14.6). The College is committed to widely communicating the shared governance process and how decisions are made and implemented.
To ensure faculty, staff and students are fully aware of the campus’ shared governance and decision making processes, the Shared Governance Oversight Committee (SGOC) provided a campus wide training on April 1, 2014. This training, attended by 54 faculty, staff, students and administrators, presented the overall purpose of shared governance and the roles and responsibilities of each shared governance committee and its members. This training was recorded and made publically available on the SGOC website (14.7, 14.8).

In fall 2014, the College President conducted two Town Hall meetings on September 23 and December 9, 2014. The purpose of these Town Hall meetings was to report on current campus initiatives and the state of the College, as well as provide a primer on the collegial governance structure on campus. These Town Hall meetings were recorded and made publically available on the College website along with the presentation materials (14.9, 14.10, 14.11).

**Evaluation of Collegial Governance and Decision Making Processes**

As stated in the visiting team’s response to the 2014 Accreditation Follow-Up Report:

*The College has developed a permanent subcommittee, the Shared Governance Oversight Committee, to ensure that all committees are abiding by their charter, are aligned with the College mission, and are actively participating in the process of planning and decision-making. The committee is also charged with evaluating the effectiveness of the overall collegial governance process and confirms that the committees are working to meet their identified goals/objectives. Evaluation of the governance process takes place annually and recommendations for improvement and key issues facing committees are brought forward through the College Council.*

The SGOC conducted its annual evaluation of the shared governance process in spring 2014 (14.12). This evaluation provided the college community with an update of activities, improvements, and decision making processes within each of the collegial shared governance committees and made recommendations for improvement (14.13, 14.14). Based on this evaluation, the collegial governance and decision making processes were improved by implementing the following recommended actions:

1. Keep shared governance committee membership current, and recruit members on or before Flex Day in the fall semester.
2. Post all meeting documentation such as agendas and minutes on the committees’ respective websites in a timely manner.
3. SGOC recommended that shared governance committee meetings be attended by its members, that include Associated Student Organization representatives, on a regular basis, and a strict 3-absence policy be enforced by committee co-chairs.
4. Committee reports to College Council and self-evaluations should be posted on the SGOC site every fall semester.
5. All websites for each committee should be consistent.

6. All committees are reminded to use the prescribed templates for agendas and meeting minutes.

7. SGOC and committees provide training workshops to new members.

The College conducted a college wide evaluation on collegial governance and decision making in the fall of 2013. Based on 133 responses, the evaluation demonstrated that the faculty and staff had a positive view of collegial governance and decision making processes. The area that needed improvement was making sure that faculty, staff, and students were fully aware of the processes, committees and individuals involved in the collegial governance and decision making processes (14.15a-b). To understand more fully the underlying reasons for the gaps in awareness of collegial governance and decision making found in the Fall 2013 Faculty/Staff survey, the College conducted four, hour-long focus groups on November 18, 2014. The focus groups were attended by full-time and adjunct faculty, supervisors, department chairs, and classified staff (14.16). Student focus groups are being planned for spring 2015 to complete the evaluation process by all campus constituencies. The focus groups that were conducted helped college leadership gain a better understanding of the campus’ perceptions of collegial governance, decision making and the overall effectiveness of the administrative structure.

A summary of responses from each focus group was prepared (14.17). The main findings from the focus groups are the following:

- The supervisors, faculty, and department chairs felt that the collegial climate had improved. Classified staff did not share this sentiment. Classified staff said that they are “not being heard and are micromanaged.”
- Faculty, department chairs, and supervisors wanted to see more collaboration among the three college divisions.
- Department chairs felt that the college climate has improved dramatically, but that the campus must be more consistent in handling conflict on campus.
- Faculty members appreciated that the AFT and Academic Senate leadership are working well together, which had not always been the case in the past. This has greatly improved collegiality and campus climate.
- Faculty noted that Academic Senate meetings are upbeat, there is a good vibe, and there is order.
Findings specifically related to decision making and the awareness of college governance and decision making included the following:

- Adjunct faculty members did not feel that they were stakeholders – many indicated that they didn’t have the time to get involved.
- Faculty members mentioned a lack of knowledge about how to access the campus organizational chart, that decision making was not always transparent, and that committee information is not always disseminated.
- Faculty stated that weekly updates, a calendar of events, and committee-related informational emails would be helpful.
- Department chairs felt they were fully informed and that the leadership of the campus is doing a good job providing information on decision making, planning, and governance.

The findings were shared and discussed at the January 29, 2015 College Council meeting. As a result, College Council identified future actions to address the findings in order to improve communication and shared governance awareness of the campus (14.18).

**Conclusion**

Los Angeles Mission College has fully resolved this recommendation. The College has hired key leadership positions in Academic Affairs and Student Services, and the remaining administrative structure of the College has remained stable since the last accreditation team visit. The stability in leadership demonstrates a sustained commitment to the collegial governance process and has improved institutional effectiveness. The shared governance and decision making processes have been widely disseminated to the college community through the Shared Governance Oversight Committee’s (SGOC) campus wide training, the President’s Town Hall meetings, and the College website. Through SGOC, the College has also sustained its commitment to the evaluation of its collegial governance processes through completion of the shared governance committees’ self-evaluations and validations, resulting in specific recommendations that being implemented to continue to improve the shared governance process and transparency at LAMC. Finally, the campus conducted focus groups have added an evaluative tool that has provided invaluable feedback to further improve collegial governance, decision making, and institutional effectiveness.
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