LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

College Council

Thursday, March 21, 2013
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

AGENDA

1. Call to Order — Walthers
2. Review and Approval of Agenda — Walthers
3. Review and Approval of Minutes – February 21, 2013 — Walthers
4. Old Business
   a. Climate Action Plan — Carson/Schatz
5. New Business
   a. Institution-Set Standards for Achievement (ACCJC's Annual Report) (Attachment A, p. 11,12) — Samra
   b. College Mission, Vision, Values Statements — Thompson/Walthers
   c. DBSG Information — Walthers
6. Area Reports and Decisions
   a. Academic Services — Noble
   b. Administrative Services — Walthers
   c. Student Services — D. Rodriguez
   d. College Enrollment Management Committee (CEMC) — Orf
   e. Facilities Committee — Walthers
   f. Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) — Samra
   g. Tangible Resources and Allocation Committee (TRAC) — D'Elena
   h. Staff Development Committee — Sato
   i. Sustainability Committee — Ansell

LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

College Council
Thursday, March 21, 2013
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

j.	Academic Senate	Thompson
k.	Classified Senate	DeNisco/Steffan
l.	Student Senate	Aboud
m.	Faculty Association	McCoy
n.	SEIU	Eddy

7. Equity Perspective & Reflection: CCN Equity Point Person Questions
    a. How did the decisions we made impact various members of our community? Consider matters such as equitable distribution of resources, student access to services, barriers related to language, economic status, transportation, and literacy level, etc
    b. In what ways has the meeting process been equitable? Were all constituencies heard from? Were there voices that were not considered?
    c. Do we need more information or support related to this dialogue? What additional information or support is needed to assist the decision-making process?

8. Adjournment

NEXT REGULAR MEETING:
Thursday, April 18, 2013
2:30 – 4:30 PM
Room 4129

Draft 1

LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

College Council

February 21, 2013
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

MINUTES

Voting Members Present:
Quorum = 9

Position	Name	Present		Position	Name	Present
President (Chair, Non-Voting)	Kevin Walthers	X		**VP Academic Services**	Janice Noble	X
VP Administrative Services	(vacant)			**VP Student Services**	Diana Rodriguez	X
Academic Senate President	Sarah Thompson	X		**Academic Senate Vice President**	Elena Cole	
Classified Senate Co- President	Frances DeNisco	X		**Classified Senate Co-President**	Todd Steffan	X
Student Senate President	Cherry Bogue	X		**Student Senate Vice President**	Ignacio Cortina	X
Planning&Budget Comm. Chair	Bob D'Elena	X		**Facilities Comm. Chair**	Scott Miner	
CEMC Chair	Thomas Orf			**Staff Development Comm. Chair**	Michael Sato	X
Sustainability Comm. Co- Chairs	Rita Carson	?		**Inst. Effectiveness Comm. Chair**	Rajinder Samra	X
CLP FA Site VP	Jane McCoy	X		**LPC SEIU VP**	William Eddy	

Others Present: Teresa Henson, Sharon Gach, Admin. Asst.

1. **Call to Order** – The meeting was called to order at 2:32 by Dr. Walthers, who joined the meeting remotely. Also remotely attending were Vice Presidents Janice Noble and Diana Rodriguez.

2. **Review and Approval of Agenda** - The agenda was approved with one minor change. Under 6.g. the committee name has changed from "Tangible Resource Allocation Committee, TRAC" **to: "Resource Allocation Committee, RAC".**

3. **Review and Approval of Minutes** – The minutes of November 29, 2012 were reviewed and approved. (M/S/P DeNisco/Rodriguez.)

4. **Old Business**

   a. **Planning Task Force Report - Vision and Values Statements -** The proposed Mission, Vision and Values statements from the Planning Task Force were presented by Bob D'Elena, Task Force member. Mr. D'Elena reminded the Council that the Planning Task Force was asked by the College Council to review the College's Mission, Vision, and Values Statements.

   A next step for the Task Force will be to review College Strategic goals review college goals in order to be more compliant with ACCJC requirements of assessing the outcomes of all goals. It was noted however, that the 2008 Institutional Strategic Goals (posted

here: http://www.laspositascollege.edu/about/mission.php) are still in effect. Only the Mission, Vision and Values are under review and revision at this time.

Mr. D'Elena stated that he is presenting the Mission, Vision, and Values statements to the College Council today in order to begin the review and approval process. He requested permission to visit each of the next meetings of the Shared Governance Entities, for comment and review and approval. If review causes additional revision, this would be taken into account and brought to College Council's attention; as well as to all governance entities.

Mr. D'Elena stated that the Planning Task Force process started with examination of the existing Mission, Vision and Values statements and explained each

Mission Statement – The Task Force found that a Mission Statement should be a short sentence that people could remember and recite easily. The process used for writing this proposed Mission Statement included examination of the existing statement and presentation at the November 2012 Town Meeting by Teresa Henson and Justin Garoupa. At the Town Meeting breakout sessions, ideas 7and input were gathered from all faculty and staff present. Out of those breakouts many concepts and terms were identified, including: inclusive, learning centered, educational opportunity and support. Some of these concepts are also in our current Mission Statement.

Mr. D'Elena then put these concepts into paragraphs for the Planning Task Force to work on. Out of this work came the recommended Mission Statement, as shown in page 9 of this meeting packet.

Ms. McCoy asked, regarding the Glossary of Terms with the Mission Statement, if in discussing the "Educational Opportunities" section, did anyone mention Athletics? Mr. D'Elena said that this was not on the lists from the November breakout sessions. **The Council agreed by affirmation to add Athletics to the Glossary of Terms under Educational Opportunities.**

The Council asked the Task Force to recommend a place on the Mission Statement webpage (under President's Place) where to place the Glossary of Terms.

Vision Statement – Mr. D'Elena stated that the Planning Task Force then studied the Vision Statement. A Vision Statement should talk about the overall vision for the ideal Las Positas College. Mr. D'Elena shared that the Task Force worked on this for several meetings, and the recommended Vision Statement is shown on page 10 of this packet.

Values Statement – Mr. D'Elena shared the process used for recommending the attached Values Statement on page 10. The Task Force discussed many ideas however kept coming back to the 2008 Values Statement, as those concepts were discussed intently in the November Town Meeting, and still seemed valid. He said that upon the recommendation of Ms. DeNisco the Task Force kept the main concepts of the former Values Statement and added more power to the statements.

Next Task Force Steps - Mr. D'Elena stated that the next Task Force job is to discuss and recommend SMART* college goals. This may be delayed until Fall 2013 as the number of months for meetings are now limited for this academic year. [*Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic,Trackable.]

Dr. Walthers asked for consensus for Mr. D'Elena on behalf of the Planning Task Force to take this to each Constituency Group/ Senate for review, and assent or recommendations for change. ***The College Council agreed to this by affirmation.***

It was clarified that, if possible, Senates try to approve all three Statements as a whole. However, if a group has changes to recommend to the Council and other groups that the recommending group provide an alternate in writing, and then approve the Statements they agree on individually.

5. New Business

a. **Accreditation – Substantive Change Proposal/DE –** Dr. Noble said that the 37 page Substantive Change Proposal is included in this meeting packet as a separate attachment. Any time a college changes items such as courses or program names, a Substantive Change Proposal needs to be sent to the ACCJC. Mr. Vigallon of the Distance Education Department is very attentive in tracking the number of programs which offer courses at 50% or more online. Six more programs just reached this 50% mark, which triggered Mr. Vigallon to write this comprehensive report. She presented this as an informational item to the Academic Senate last week.

   Dr. Noble said she also received feedback from Susan Clifford of the ACCJC who made a few recommendations, which are now in this report. With those suggestions input, she now recommends that this proposal be reviewed and approved by the College Council. It would then go to the Academic Senate for approval, the Distance Education Committee for approval, and then be sent on to the District Board.

   The College Council agreed to review this and provide any comments to Dr. Noble.

b. **Program Review –** Ms. Henson presented the Program Review process for approval of the College Council. As adoption of this new, all-college Program Review process is not documented in the Governance Handbook, the Program Review Committee would like to be as all-encompassing as possible in approvals. The Program Review Committee is currently a sub-committee of Academic Senate, however, non-instructional department will also be using the process, and the committee name has changed from Instructional Program Review to 'Program Review'.

   Therefore, Ms. Henson explained the outline of the Program Review Process, and referred to the presentations made in previous Town Meetings to educate all campus entities also. Ms. DeNisco said that she had already forwarded this information to Classified Senate members with a deadline to comment by February 27th.

   The next step will be to make a template for all departments (instructional and non-instructional) to complete via a fillable PDF. Scott Vigallon and Jeff Sperry volunteered to create this. Program Review Committee members are writing instructions for each section.

   Having worked with VP Noble to plan, the PR committees hopes to roll this out in March to the Divisions. Rajinder is also collecting data for departments to use in forms, and he will demonstrate where to locate this at the March Town Meeting.
   Ms. Henson stated that the key is getting used to the start-up timeline and then the regular rotation of tasks. She noted that:

   - Under the previous schedule Program Review of all academic departments should have been completed this Spring, but they wouldn't be used until Spring 2014 for planning. The PR Committee noted a problem with such a big gap in time between 'need', review and request for allocations'.
   - Since there was a gap of one year it is recommended that all Program Reviews be written in the Fall of 2013.
   - In addition our former cultural thinking was "If it wasn't in the Program Review I can't ask for it." The Committee would like to change that thinking and process.

- It was problematic to have a process that took 2 years, where the data would be reviewed, examine how progress is going based on SLOs and see if there was efficiency, and equipment, and then report out on that, but nothing could be implemented for 2 years.

- In recent years needs arose to be able to react quickly to unforeseen situations, such as situations which occur during the Program Review 'gap year'.
  - There were problems that 'came at' the College before the 2 years, such as reacting to unfunded mandates, resignations with the need to re-fill a position, and equipment breakdowns.
- Thus, the Committee wished to create a way to not be penalized for things that departments could not possibly anticipate during the 'gap year'. Procedurally the Committee is now working out how to put 'gap year unforeseen items' into the request process.
- She noted that programs which apply for resources this Fall 2013 through the RAC will not have done a PR, so documentation will not be available.

The Student Services and Non-Instructional PRs will be modified slightly to make the reviews more applicable. Dr. Walthers said that the goal is to try to make the non-instructional reviews as close to the instructional as possible for comparative purposes. Dr. Noble has presented the process to the Administrative Team, and all are on board to get them done on time.

Ms.Henson stated that the Annual and Three Year reviews will be a process for the campus to get used to, and the committee will start orienting the campus at the March 6th Town Meeting.

On behalf of the College Council, Dr. Walthers thanked the Program Review Committee members of the past several years. Everyone has put in an enormous amount of work and this is appreciated and respected by the Council and the College as a whole. Members of the PR Committee since 2010 are listed at the end of the minutes.

c. **Active Shooter Update** – Dr. Walthers shared that there has been good feedback from the February Town Meeting, with presenter Kim Aufhauser on 'Active Shooter' situations. The President's Advisory Group on Active Shooter has also been meeting and is taking a comprehensive look at our campus facilities and practices and will finish their work in March with a recommendation on things we could change to become more educated in an emergency and more safe in our rooms/offices. He also said that with some state grant funds we are already improving our mental health awareness to assist students who may have concerns or express problems to faculty or staff.

d. **Budget/DBSG Update** – Dr. Walthers said that the Planning Task Force has put together the LPC position on district funding allocations and will present it to the DBSG on March 1st. Featured in our recommendation are the share of FTES, keeping the foundation (state) money separate, and asking for a different way to address our part of the FTEF number (LPC is 12 FTEF under, CC is 13 over). Dr. Walthers and the VPs have met with district office personnel to work on possible details for an equitable transition in the FTEF numbers for the future years. CC's Nursing and Dental Hygiene numbers substantiate the subsidy amounts, so this could be factored into the allocation (currently a $600,000 subsidy).

e. **IEC Recommendation to Eliminate 94 KPIs** – Mr. Samra presented the Institutional Effectiveness Committee recommendation to eliminate 94 Key Productivity Indicators (KPIs), as was discussed at the last meeting. There are a total of 116 KPIs for LPC, written in 2008-09. The IEC has reviewed each one for SMART*, and recommends the 94 be eliminated as not being SMART. Mr. Samra had previously shown the list of the 94

KPIs the IEC was recommending for elimination. [*Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Trackable.]

Therefore, it was M/S/P to eliminate these 94 KPIs (McCoy/Thompson).

6. Area Reports and Decisions

a. **Academic Services** – Janice Noble shared a number of items.
   - The Catalog Addendum due out by April 30th. Thanks go to Carolyn Scott, LaVaughn Hart, Marina Lisa and others. This will include more information including a review of courses. In mid-March a draft will be sent to discipline representatives and deans in both Student & Academic Services to review their portions. This Addendum will be distributed electronically, and a few copies will be available at the bookstore for sale. This is the first time we are printing this all in house.
   - We have received a response from the State to the TBA (To Be Arranged) Lab Audit Findings from last year. Dr. Noble did a presentation at Town Meeting and this was discussed in Division Meetings this month. We now have excellent forms and directions, thanks to the Deans and documents will be ready before Fall 2013. If any area plans to continue using TBA hours, please discuss this with the Dean so that the process is planned in advance.
   - An Academic Dishonesty Form is being developed and responsibility for this issue will now be placed with the VP of Student Services so it can be tracked and documented accurately. Repeat offenders will be disciplined in a more timely manner, according to policies.
   - Administrators will also be doing their Program Reviews with similar time frames.
   - Dr. Noble gave kudos to everyone who worked on the Accreditation Midterm Report. The ACCJC sent the receipt letter saying that we have no other items to do therefore we are done with active Accreditation duties for now.

b. **Administrative Services** – Dr. Walthers reported that the fiscal tech interviews are in process. He also mentioned that he and VP Rodriguez met with Safety Officers and had a good conversation about safety services. As a result, beginning on Monday, February 25th the Safety Department will report to Student Services.

c. **Student Services** – Diana Rodriguez advised the Council on a number of items:
   - The schedule is on track for the first wave of moving into Bldg 1600. First to move will be Bldgs 100, 100B and 1300A on March 15th. Two other waves will be done during and after the first week of April (Spring Break).
   - Her office is assisting Academic Services with the Catalog Update
   - A new initiative is starting up, the East Bay Youth and Family Initiative, which is a specific plan for benefitting families of Puente Program students.
   - Student Services had a very success College Night, with over 800 people representing over 30 high schools.. Many thanks to everyone who helped.
   - Spring 2013 Headcount is 8158 (compared 8068 in Spring '12).
     - Spring 2013 FTES is 3018 (compared to 2926 Spring '12.
     - Therefore we are on track to meet our targets.
   - All units in Student Services are working on their SLOs, and are close to completing cycles
   - Student Services will begin using the Program Review form soon.
   - Since the last College Council meeting in November the department has only had 12 student discipline cases.
   - Ms. Schreibman in the Financial Aid department will be presenting at local high schools to encourage attendance of community college. She will also include a presentation on the Dream Act.

- At a future Town Meeting VP Rodriguez will do a presentation on Mental Health issues and challenges and on the new Academic Dishonesty process. This will be an electronic process to track repeat offenders, discuss processes, and offer teachable moments for students.

d. **College Enrollment Management Committee (CEMC)** – Dr. Walthers met with DEMC and they set targets, although they may need to re-address later based on new numbers through the DBSG process. LPC overestimated which will make it easier to adjust later.

e. **Facilities Committee** - Dr. Walthers reported on a several items for the Facilities committee:

- **Small Project List -** There was no February meeting due to the President's Holiday, however the committee had electronic discussions and are working on the Small Projects list (using $7 million from the Measure B funds). This list will be shared regularly with the college and the Committee will track expenses and project status in Executive Staff meetings.
- The committee is also developing priorities for the remaining $23 Million in Measure B funds, which includes $7 Million already set aside for the small projects list and instructional equipment.
- The committee will likely set aside some funds in case a State matching funds grant becomes available.
- Buildings 700 and 900 will also incur a $4.5 – 5 million remodel project, which is on the medium sized project list.

Dr. Walthers thanked VP Rodriguez and Exec. Asst. Renee Pegues for going above and beyond to make sure the move to Bldg 1600 goes smoothly. In addition the Technology Department under Steve Gunderson has been going all out to assure a smooth move.

f. **Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)** – Mr. Samra said that the IEC is charged with "evaluating key college process" and will evaluate 2 this term, and will later evaluate how effective was the process used to review the Mission, Vision and Values statements revisions (using the Planning Task Force). The committee will also determine if Common Tool distributed the resources of the college effectively

g. **Resource Allocation Committee - RAC (formerly PBC)** – Bob D'Elena mentioned that the Instructional Equipment Requests for Fall Term were light ($73,000) and the Committee was able to fund all requests. The Spring semester requests are due to the Deans on March 13th. The Committee created and agreed on the new Instructional Request Approval Form, and is now working on a rubric for its use which will be rolled out in Fall semester 2013. The form will have everything in one place and ties into Program Review. Non-Instructional positions were presented at Division Meetings yesterday and will be presented to the RAC on March 7th.

h. **Staff Development Committee**– In Mike Sato's absence Jane McCoy reported that the Staff Development Committee is doing a Needs Assessment Survey of what faculty feel their development needs are.

i. **Sustainability Committee** – As no representative was able to be present, Dr. Walthers shared that with the help of Tim Nelson and Jeff Kingston our campus safety vehicles will be replaced. The planning group had discussed going from our current Hybrid Escapes to full size Explorers, and then began looking the Polaris Gem. This is an all-electric, wall-charging vehicle, which has quick-chargers on the vehicle, and is street legal. It looks like

the college will buy 2 of these, which are half the price of the Explorer and a 10 on the Carbon Scale. Sean Prather researched these very well, we can customize them for our Safety Officers, and it will help with our Climate Action Plan.

j. **Academic Senate** –Ms. Thompson said that a presenter at the ACCCA meeting today misrepresented the LPC Academic Senate as an example of strange 10+1 decisions and that it is not interested in free speech. She explained how he took only one part of a set of minutes and ignored the full context of them, and created a false scenario. She explained to the College Council that she has asked him to post a retraction and apology on his website for saying this in front of a large audience.

   Ms. Thompson reported that the Academic Senate is actively working with faculty members in disciplines which want to create transfer degrees (AAT) and has created a support group to assist each other. Most of those interested are from the Arts and Social Sciences and they are in various levels of progress. She estimates that 15 AAT degrees will be finished by Spring 2014.

k. **Classified Senate** – Frances DeNisco submitted a written report as she and co-president Steffan could only attend the first part of the meeting. The Senate is providing input for the Statewide Classified Senate on staff development for senates throughout the State, and is planning to send someone to the State conference this June. The Senate has funded two scholarships again this year, and is completing plans for Classified Flex Day, on Feb. 28th. She asked that everyone encourage their co-workers among the Classified Staff to attend.

l. **Student Senate**– Cherry Bogue introduced the new Interim Vice President Ignacio Corina. She reported the Senators are getting ready for the March 4th, March In March on Sacramento. She explained that they could only fill 1 bus last year, and lost money on renting a second, so only ordered one for this year. She thanked the FA for donating money for bus rental in past years.

   They are also researching a State Amendment for the Parcel Tax law which would change the approval vote to a simple majority, not the two-thirds majority now required. Last November's Parcel Taxes would have won in many districts if that had been the requirement. This was introduced to the Assembly and State Senate in December and they are starting to discuss it in Sacramento now. Ms. Bogue is also looking into legislation to cap unit fees for community colleges, CSUs and UCs, because Proposition 30 will be in effect for the next 7 yrs.

m. **Faculty Association (FA)** – Ms. McCoy mentioned that the FA will hold its Executive Board elections soon and that after 20 years on the Board she will not be running for VP. LaVaughn Hart will run for this position.

n. **SEIU** - No representative present.

7. Equity Perspective & Reflection: CCN Equity Point Person Questions

a. How did the decisions we made impact various members of our community? Consider matters such as equitable distribution of resources, student access to services, barriers related to language, economic status, transportation, and literacy level, etc…

Discussions were held with all members of the community in mind.

b. In what ways has the meeting process been equitable? Were all constituencies heard from? Were there voices that were not considered?

The Council inquired several times to make sure all constituencies were heard from.

c. Do we need more information or support related to this dialogue? What additional information or support is needed to assist the decision-making process?

For ongoing projects additional information will be brought to the Council as needed.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Gach
Administrative Assistant, Office of the President

Program Review Committee

Those who have served, 2010-2013. Those marked with * have served since 2010.

Faculty:
Jill Carbone*
Elena Cole
Teri Henson*
Keith Level
Marilyn Marquis
Jason Morris
Robin Roy*
Karin Sprin*(on leave this spring)
Catherine Suarez
Mark Tarte (2010-through f2012)
Nadiyah Taylor*
Kimberly Tomlinson
Angella VenJohn
Cheryl Warren*

Administration:
Pamela Luster
Amber Machamer
Philip Manwell
Janice Noble
Diana Rodriguez
John Ruys (as interim Dean)
Marilyn Flores
Rajinder Samra

LAS POSITAS
COLLEGE

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 20, 2013

To: Dr. Judy Walters, Interim Chancellor
Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

From: Dr. Kevin Walthers, President
Rajinder Samra, Chair – Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Re: Proposed Institution-set Standards for ACCJC Annual Report

---

Background

The 2008 Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act required institutions of higher education to set standards to "meet educational quality and institutional governance expectations." As part of the ACCJC 2013 Annual Report, the ACCJC added five new questions in the Student Achievement Data section that ask for a comparison of outcomes to a standard set by the institution. Institutions were alerted to the coming change on January 31 through a memo from ACCJC:

> (The ACCJC) will be enhancing its review of student achievement in relation to institution-set standards for achievement, the use of that data in college decision-making, and the institution's efforts to make this information accessible to prospective students and other members of the public. The enhanced review will be seen in college annual reports submitted to the Commission, in clarified requirements for institutional self-evaluation reports, and in the training of external evaluation teams.[1]

On March 1, 2013, ACCJC member colleges received the new template for the annual report. The report asks for data regarding an institution-set standard for five elements (questions 14 to 18 in the Annual Report):

1. Course completion rate: the number of students who receive a successful grade over the number of students who enrolled in the course.
2. Students retained from fall to fall: the number of students who completed a course in fall 2011 and were enrolled in a course fall 2012.
3. Number of degrees awarded
4. Number of students who transferred to 4-year colleges/universities.
5. Number of certificates awarded.

Each of these are data elements already tracked by Las Positas College and shared among constituent groups. Historical data are housed on the website of the Office of Institutional Research and are regularly discussed. Based on the ACCJC request, it is now imperative for LPC to establish institutional standards

---

[1] Beno, Barbara (January 31, 2013). Memo: U.S. Department of Education Regulations on Institutional and Accreditor Use of Student Achievement Data in Accreditation.

and convey those standards to the CLPCCD Board of Trustees. According to instructions provided by ACCJC in the Annual Report:

> A "standard" is the level of performance set by the institution to meet educational quality and institutional effectiveness expectations. This number may differ from a performance improvement "goal" which an institution may aspire to meet.[2]

Said another way, the standard is the "floor" that establishes a level of expectation that, if not met, triggers intentional and deliberate action to address an issue. LPC seeks to consistently exceed the standard and continue to strive for goals as promulgated through the institution's program review and student learning outcome processes.

In developing the standards, LPC approached the issue in a way that builds a consistent standard based on past results. To that end, the baseline standard for each measure will be to meet or exceed 95% of a rolling five year average. This provides a logical tie to minimal statistical confidence intervals (.05) and provides a base number that is less volatile. If LPC should drop below the standard on any measure, this would trigger a report to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees that offers an analysis of the shortfall and provides a solution to address the item in question.

In responding to ACCJC for the 2013 Annual Report, LPC clarified the definition for each measure to ensure year to year consistency. The table below provides the definition for each measure, current year performance and the established standard based on 95% of a rolling five year average.

Measure (Annual Report Question)	*Las Positas College Institutional Definition*	*Inst. Standard*[3]	*2011-12 Ac. Year*	*Meet/ Exceed?*
Course Completion (Q14)	ACCJC Definition, see above	66.8%	70.5%	Yes
Student Retention (Q15)	RP Group Definition[4]	44.5%	49.2%	Yes
Degrees Awarded (Q16)	AA/AS Degrees Conferred Prior Year	474	500	Yes
Number of Transfers (Q17)	Number of UC/CSU Prior Year Transfers	490	542	Yes
Certificates Awarded (Q18)	Number of Certificates Awarded Prior Year	145	155	Yes

[2] ACCJC Annual Report Questions (March 2013). Question 14b.
[3] The institutional standard is calculated as 95% of the most recent five year average.
[4] Students enrolled at Fall Census that return the subsequent Fall Semester